Also, papers to accompany a bill (H. R. 11425) for the relief of Catherine Webb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Manufacturers' Association of Bridgeport, Conn., protesting against the passage of the Bacon-Bartlett anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McKENZIE: Petition of citizens of Erie, Ill., favoring the Hobson prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petitions of officers and members of the Waddington and Brasher Falls Auxiliary of St. Lawrence Presbyterial Society of Home and Foreign Missions, favoring the passage of the antipolygamy amendment to the National Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of business men of Gouverneur and Canton, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 5308, relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of Belt Hamedrosh Magodel Nussh Asknaz, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petitions of the San Francisco Labor Council, of San Francisco, Cal., and 32 other labor organizations in the city of San Francisco in behalf of the passage of the seamen's bill (S. 136); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Joe Levye, of Providence, R. I., and the 13 lodges and 2,300 members of the Hebrew race of the State of Rhode Island, protesting against the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of organizations of the State of Rhode Island, protesting against the passage of the Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Cigar Makers' Union, No. 94, of Pawtucket, R. I., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, for Federal prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of citizens of Jamaica and vicinity, State of Vermont, protesting against the passage of the Sabbath-observance bill (H. R. 9674); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of the Hebrews of Meriden, Conn., protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of American National Retail Jewelers' Association, favoring the passage of bill relative to fraud in gold-filled watchcases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Yale Lodge, No. 268, and citizens of New Haven, Conn., protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States, Branch No. 38, of Sayreville, N. J., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, for Federal prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of the Italian Journal, of New York City, and Long Branch (N. J.) Lodge, No. 526, Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petitions of John O. Ferris, the Brown Drug Co., and H. Levin & Son, of Colorado, protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, for Federal prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Order of Railway Conductors, favoring the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Colorado, protesting against the passage of the Sabbath-observance bill (H. R. 9674); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of the Italian Journal, of New York City, against immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Charles F. Glen, of Muskegon, Mich., against House joint resolution 168; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: Statement of Eugene Gallup, carrier on rural route No. 3, Altamont, Albany County, N. Y., showing actual cost of necessary equipment and maintenance of same to properly serve his route during the year 1913; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, statement of Walter Kernbolt, carrier on rural route No. 1, Altamont, Albany County, N. Y., showing actual cost of necessary equipment and maintenance of same to properly serve his route during the year 1913; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, statement of George H. Cunningham, carrier on rural route No. 1, Ravena, Albany County, N. Y., showing actual cost of necessary equipment and maintenance of same to properly serve his route during the year 1913; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. THACHER: Memorial of New Bedford (Mass.) Lodge, No. 304, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, against the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Memorial of Frederick Keye Camp, No. 1, Department of North Dakota, United Spanish War Veterans, favoring the passage of the Crago bill, granting pensions to widows and minor children of Spanish War veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of North Dakota, protesting against the elimination of a publication called The Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of members of Elendale (N. Dak.) Local, No. 26, Socialist Party, favoring an investigation of the strike in Michigan; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, *January 31, 1914.*

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

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

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF ELECTRICAL MEANS OF COMMUNICATION (S. DOC. NO. 399).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 12th instant, a report entitled "Government ownership of electrical means of communication," prepared by direction of the Postmaster General by a departmental committee consisting of the First Assistant Postmaster General, the chief clerk of the department, and the superintendent of the division of salaries and allowances of the Bureau of the First Assistant. The communication will be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Postmaster General, together with the information furnished, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is perfectly apparent that the request of the Senator can not be complied with. On account of the size of the document, it will have to go to the Committee on Printing before it can be printed.

Mr. NORRIS. Then, Mr. President, I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of opinion that it should go first to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and it can subsequently be referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. NORRIS. I think, under the Chair's statement, it will have to go at least to the Committee on Printing before it can be printed; and sending it to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads only delays it. Sending it to the Committee on Printing, of course, does not necessarily mean that the document will be printed. That committee will investigate it; and it seems to me that really the only thing to investigate will be whether or not it ought to be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska desire to appeal from the ruling of the Chair that the document be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not, but I make the request of the Chair that he refer it to the Committee on Printing, instead of to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair can not refer it to two committees. The Chair has referred it to the appropriate committee, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

WASHINGTON & OLD DOMINION RAILWAY (S. DOC. NO. 398).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington & Old Dominion Railway for the year ended December 31, 1913, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram in the nature of resolutions adopted at a special meeting of delegates representing 57 organizations of various nationalities in the city of Hartford, Conn., and ask that the same may

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

be read by the Secretary and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

There being no objection, the telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Immigration, as follows:

[Telegram.]

HARTFORD, CONN., *January 28, 1914.*

Hon. FRANK B. BRANDEGEE,
Senate, Washington, D. C.:

At a special meeting of delegates representing 57 organizations of various nationalities of this city had at Hartford, Conn., January 20, 1914, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress the Burnett immigration bill; and

"Whereas said bill includes a literacy test for immigrants: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we emphatically protest against the passage of this bill as un-American and antagonistic to the true American spirit of making this country a home for the oppressed and a refuge for the needy; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House and the Senators and Representatives of the State; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the resolution committee, consisting of N. H. Finesilver, Nathan Pronnsle, Morris Older, Henry Melroe, Frank Palloti, and J. Stanisheck, be empowered to sign this resolution for the above organizations."

Mr. ROOT. I present a set of resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, together with a letter from the secretary of that board, and also a letter from the Merchants' Association of New York. I ask to have the resolutions printed in the RECORD, and that the remainder be printed for the use of the Committee on Commerce, to which I ask that the matter be referred.

There being no objection, the matter was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Eugenius H. Outerbridge, chairman of the committee on the harbor and shipping, offered the following preamble and resolution and moved their adoption:

"Whereas the Boston, Cape Cod & New York Canal, generally known as the Cape Cod Canal, is nearing completion; and

"Whereas said canal will furnish a short, direct connection between the port of New York and the port of Boston, and afford for the 25,000,000 tons of freight now passing around Cape Cod a channel free from the dangers and delays connected with passage across Nantucket Shoals; and

"Whereas the full benefit to commerce can be realized only if navigators are assured that the course be always properly marked by buoys and lights; and

"Whereas such marking and lights in the open navigable waters of the United States should not be left to establishment and maintenance by a private corporation in waters over which it exercises no control or jurisdiction: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That all aids to navigation in Buzzards and Barnstable Bays should be located and maintained by the United States Government as an integral part of the general system of coastal buoys and lights; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York urges the United States Senators from the State of New York to take such steps as may be in their power to secure such action by the United States Government.

"Respectfully submitted.

"E. H. OUTERBRIDGE, *Chairman*,
"CHESTER B. LAWRENCE,
"ERNEST C. BLISS,
"CHARLES SOOYSMITH,
"MCDOUGALL HAWKES,
"HERMANN WINTER,
"GUSTAV LINDENTHAL,
"*Committee on the Harbor and Shipping.*"

NEW YORK, *January 6, 1914.*

Mr. LODGE presented a memorial of New Bedford Lodge, Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, and of Brockton Lodge, Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, both of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing an educational test for immigrants to this country, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. PERKINS presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Woodland, Cal., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Selma, Cal., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Covelo, Cal., praying for the suspension for one year of the naval programs of the great powers, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Canners' League of California and a memorial of the Dried Fruit Association of California, remonstrating against the proposed separation of the Central and Southern Pacific Railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Spokane and Hillyard, in the State of Washington, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. SHIVELY presented petitions of the Federation of Musicians, of Hammond; of the Socialist Local of Elkhart; of the Central Branch Socialist Local of South Bend; of the Socialist Local of Madison County; of the Socialist Local of Grant County, Marion; of the Allen County Central Socialist Local of Fort Wayne; of the Marion County Socialist Local of Indianapolis; and of sundry citizens of Terre Haute, all in the State of Indiana, praying for an investigation into the conditions existing in the mining district of Michigan, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a memorial of members of John A. Logan Post, No. 1, Department of Michigan; of Woman's Relief Corps, No. 239, Department of Michigan; of Soldiers' Home Camp, No. 39, United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Michigan; and of the officers and members of the Michigan Soldiers' Home, Grand Rapids, Mich.; and of Col. Myron Baker Post, No. 33, Department of Michigan, Grand Army of the Republic, of Morenci, Mich., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation proposing a change in the United States flag, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BRYAN, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 1759) to reimburse certain fire insurance companies the amounts paid by them for property destroyed by fire in suppressing the bubonic plague in the Territory of Hawaii in the years 1899 and 1900, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 208), thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, to which was referred the bill (S. 1701) to admit legislative journals of State and Territorial legislatures to the mails as second-class mail matter, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 210) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (S. 3307) for the relief of F. J. Fearis, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 209) thereon.

Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to which was referred Senate resolution 253, to pay Nannie P. Diggs, widow of John H. Diggs, deceased, a sum equal to six months' salary of her late husband, reported it with an amendment.

REBECCA C. PEPPER.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 2563) for the relief of Rebecca C. Pepper, and I submit a report (No. 207) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to the report.

Mr. TOWNSEND. May I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill? If it leads to any discussion I will withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Whereas Rebecca C. Pepper on September 28, 1908, under the laws of the United States, was allowed to make homestead entry 0381 for the south half of the northeast quarter of section 33, township 21 north, range 16 west, principal meridian of Michigan, the same showing on the books of the Federal land office at Marquette to be open to entry; and

Whereas several years later and after she had complied with the conditions of the homestead act as to residence on the land, and when she made offer of payment to the Government of the amount due on such land, she was informed that a military bounty-land warrant under the act of 1855 had been issued to William Weston on April 12, 1866; and

Whereas the homestead entry of the said Rebecca C. Pepper was canceled, and on appeal to the Department of the Interior said cancellation was affirmed and the case closed on June 26, 1911; and

Whereas the said Rebecca C. Pepper was without fault in the matter, she having relied upon the Government's records in making her entry and having complied with the legal conditions as to residence on the said land, not knowing and having no means for finding out that said records were not right: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to convey to Rebecca C. Pepper 160 acres of land in the State of Michigan, located on the public domain subject to homestead entry, upon payment by Rebecca C. Pepper to the Secretary of the Interior for the United States the sum of $100, without requiring her to comply with the usual homestead provisions as to residence on such land.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was rejected.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 4275) to promote the safety of employees and passengers on railroads engaged in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 4276) granting an increase of pension to George W. Winfield;

A bill (S. 4277) granting a pension to James Christian;

A bill (S. 4278) granting an increase of pension to Elisha J. Melton (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4279) granting an increase of pension to William W. Green (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 4280) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Tazewell, in the State of Virginia; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 4282) to establish in the War Department and in the Navy Department, respectively, a roll designated as "The Army and Navy medal-of-honor honor roll," and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 4283) for the relief of Oliver P. Pring; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4284) granting a pension to Helen M. Curl (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 106) to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes," approved June 23, 1913; to the Committee on Industrial Expositions.

IRRIGATION BY THE RESERVOIR SYSTEM.

Mr. BRISTOW. I introduce a bill and desire to make a very short statement in regard to it.

The bill (S. 4281) providing for the continuance of investigation authorized by the act of August 10, 1912, upon the feasibility and economy of irrigation by the reservoir system or plan in western Kansas and western Oklahoma; for the extension of the investigation to western Nebraska, eastern Colorado, and eastern New Mexico; and for the construction of reservoirs and lakes for the purpose of impounding the waters of these States, was read twice by its title.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced provides for an appropriation of $1,000,000 to continue the investigation authorized by the act of August 10, 1912, as to the feasibility and economy of irrigating by the reservoir system on the plains in western Kansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, and in eastern Colorado and New Mexico, and also appropriates $20,000,000 for the purpose of constructing reservoirs and lakes.

The investigation that has already been made was, because of lack of funds and time, more or less incomplete, but it demonstrates that there are a number of reservoir sites upon these semiarid plains where irrigation systems may be provided by collecting the surplus waters in reservoirs and distributing them at the seasonable time for the growth and maturing of the crops. It also demonstrates that there are many sites where lakes can be created by holding back the surplus waters from running in flood time into the streams below.

These lakes would serve two purposes that would be exceedingly beneficial. The evaporation from their surface during the dry months would create a degree of atmospheric humidity far in excess of that which now exists. This would greatly temper the destructiveness of the dry weather. These lakes would also feed the underflow by seepage and make its supply greater and more useful than it is at the present time.

We have expended practically $100,000,000 on the Mississippi River. This expenditure has been made largely to protect the lands adjacent to the river from overflow. The holding back of the surplus waters during the rainy seasons upon these great watersheds would supplement the work that has already been done on the Mississippi and tend to prevent the congestion of waters there during periods of flood. While serving this good purpose it would at the same time be of inestimable value to the inhabitants of these semiarid regions by mitigating their droughts. It would also serve to give a steady flow to the streams by preventing the surplus water from rushing in torrents at one time into the rivers.

If it is right for the Government to build dikes and levees on the Mississippi, it is proper for it to build lakes and reservoirs on the plains at the headwaters of the Mississippi.

If the production of this vast fertile region of our country should be increased 10 per cent per annum beyond its present possibilities, it would add every year to the wealth of our Nation many times the amount which I ask to be appropriated to construct these lakes and reservoirs. Between a line running from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, through central Kansas and Nebraska, and the crest of the Rocky Mountains, lies a vast region the soil of which is of untold fertility. There probably is not such an area anywhere else on the face of the earth that is its equal in producing capacity if it had regular and uniform rainfall. It has been a short-sighted policy of our Government to neglect this region so long, when a comparatively small expenditure could have immeasurably increased its producing capacity.

Standing upon the banks of the Arkansas and Platte Rivers in the springtime you can see great floods of water, millions of cubic feet per hour, sweeping by on its way to the sea. It is not only running to waste but increases the destruction by floods in the Mississippi Valley. This great waste of water, so useless then, in but a few months would be more precious to the people living upon these plains than mines of gold and silver. If it were held back and impounded to be utilized later upon the country where it fell instead of being an agent of destruction and devastation as it is in the valley below, it would be a source of untold wealth, producing more value per year than is taken from the mines in the mountains beyond.

Every year there is a sufficient amount of this water that runs away unused to irrigate thousands of acres of land that now lies practically idle and unused. And in addition to this direct benefit there would be the advantage of increased humidity over the entire area during the growing season, which would further increase the productiveness of the millions of acres that it is not practicable to irrigate.

This appropriation which I suggest will furnish the country a permanent and inexhaustible source of wealth tenfold more valuable than the coal, the copper, and the gold of Alaska.

During this session of Congress we have appropriated forty millions to open up the riches of our Alaskan Territory, and I am heartily in favor of such appropriation, but I must insist that we owe a duty to the people upon these western plains equal to our duty to the people of Alaska. We appropriate millions every year for the improvement of rivers and harbors, not only for the benefit of navigation but also to protect from destructive floods the valley lands adjacent to the rivers. How, then, can we refuse with any degree of consistency to make an appropriation for the protection of the plains from drought when it will not only serve that purpose but also supplement the work we are already doing in building levees along our great rivers to protect the valleys from the floods?

It is my purpose to urge this legislation with all the earnestness of which I am capable. I believe that it is not only wise legislation, but I know it is just, and I trust that it will have the support of those who for so many years have been enjoying liberal appropriations to protect their States from the Mississippi River overflow.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill may be referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and I hope we shall have a favorable report at an early date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. SHIELDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

WATERWAYS COMMISSION AND BOARD OF RIVER REGULATION.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to introduce the bill which I send to the desk as a substitute for the bill (S. 2739) known throughout the country as the Newlands river-regulation bill, submitted by me on July 14, 1913. This substitute is intended to remove all doubt as to the purpose of the original bill regarding the Mississippi River. It proposes to make the Mississippi River, with its banks, its levees, its spillways, and its cut-offs, a national highway.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the title of the bill.

The SECRETARY. A bill to create a waterways commission and a board of river regulation to promote interstate commerce by the development and improvement of the rivers and waterways and water resources of the United States and the coordination of and cooperation between rail and water routes and by providing a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of rivers and for the maintenance at all seasons of a navigable stage of water in waterways and for the connection of rivers and waterways with the Great Lakes and with each other, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for water storage and for the beneficial use of flood waters for irrigation and water power and for the conservation and use of water in agriculture and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires and for the cooperation in such work of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada desire that the bill lie on the table?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I desire that it shall lie on the table, and I offer it as a substitute for the bill previously introduced. I wish it to take the same number, as it is well known by that number throughout the country.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the bill can not take the same number, but will have to be offered as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill previously introduced by the Senator from Nevada. Otherwise it will be necessary to give it a new number or it will be impossible to keep track of it in the Secretary's office.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Then I ask that it be received as a substitute for the bill heretofore introduced by me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. So that it is really an amendment in the nature of a substitute? It will be so noted as an amendment to the original bill by way of substitute, and it will be printed and lie on the table, to be called up by the Senator from Nevada at his convenience.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask leave to have inserted in the RECORD a copy of the substitute, and also a few newspaper clippings explanatory thereof. They are quite brief.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Nevada be willing to have the clippings printed as a public document?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I prefer that they go into the RECORD. The bill is attracting a good deal of attention throughout the country, and in every section of the country; it has been indorsed by seven or eight legislatures, and I should like to have these statements go out in the RECORD in connection with it.

Mr. SMOOT. Do they embrace all that the Senator now has in his hand?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes. The Senator from Utah can see that they will not consume very much space, and a good deal of it is taken up with illustrations.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Nevada does not expect the illustrations to go into the RECORD?

Mr. NEWLANDS. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I am not going to object, but I am going to say to the Senate that within the last few days I have undertaken to ascertain what percentage of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the last year is a record of statements made upon the floor of the Senate and of the other House and what percentage has been from outside sources. Of course I have not brought the information anywhere near down to date, but so far I have ascertained there is about 40 per cent of outside matter contained in our RECORD. I repeat, however, I am not going to object to the insertion of the matter referred to by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understand, then, Mr. President, that permission is granted to insert the matter to which I refer?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, permission to do so is granted.

The substitute and matter referred to is as follows:

NEWLANDS RIVER REGULATION BILL.

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the sum of $60,000,000 annually for each of the 10 years following the 1st day of July, 1913, is hereby reserved, set aside, and appropriated, and made available until expended, out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated, as a special fund in the Treasury, to be known as the "river regulation fund," to be used to promote interstate commerce by the development and improvement of the rivers and waterways of the United States and their connections with the Great Lakes and with each other, and by the coordination of and cooperation between rail and water routes and transportation, and the establishment and maintenance of adequate terminal and transfer facilities and systems and their maintenance, improvement, and protection, and by the making of examinations and surveys and by the construction of engineering and other works and projects for the regulation and control of the flow of rivers and their tributaries and source streams, and the standardization of such flow, and by the maintenance of navigable stages of water at all seasons of the year in the waterways of the United States, and by preventing silt and sedimentary material from being carried into, and deposited in, waterways, channels, and harbors, and by the conservation, development, and utilization of the water resources of the United States, and by flood prevention and protection, through the establishment, construction, and maintenance of natural and artificial reservoirs for water storage and control, and the protection of watersheds from denudation, erosion, and surface wash, and from forest fires, and the maintenance and extension of woodland and other protective cover thereon, and the reclamation of swamp and overflow lands and arid lands and the building of drainage and irrigation works in order that the flow of rivers shall be regulated and controlled not only through the use of flood waters for irrigation on the upper tributaries, but also through controlling them in fixed and established channels in the lower valleys and plains, and by doing all things necessary to provide for any and all beneficial uses of water that will contribute to its conservation or storage in the ground or in surface reservoirs as an aid to the regulation or control of the flow of rivers, and by acquiring, holding, using, and transferring lands and any other property that may be needed for the aforesaid purposes, and by doing such other things as may be specified in this act or necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes thereof, and by securing the cooperation therein of States, municipalities, and other local agencies, as hereinafter set forth, and for the payment of all expenditures provided for in this act; the ultimate purpose of this act being the maintenance at all times of a navigable stage of water in all inland waterways, and flood prevention and protection, and river regulation and the control of the volume of water forming the stage of the river from its sources, so as to standardize the river flow, as contradistinguished from and supplemental to channel improvement as heretofore undertaken and provided for under the various acts commonly known as river and harbor acts.

CREATION OF THE WATERWAYS COMMISSION AND THE BOARD OF RIVER REGULATION.

SEC. 2. That a commission is hereby created, to be known as the "waterways commission," consisting of the President of the United States, who shall be the chairman of said commission, with the power of veto, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the chairman of the board of river regulation, to be appointed as hereinafter provided. The chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission shall be ex officio advisory members of said waterways commission.

The waterways commission shall have authority to direct and control all proceedings and operations and all things done or to be done under this act, and to establish all rules and regulations which may in their judgment be necessary to carry into effect such direction and control consistent with the provisions of this act and with existing law and with any provisions which Congress may from time to time enact.

All plans and estimates prepared by the board of river regulation, as hereinafter provided, which contemplate or provide for expenditures from the river regulation fund, shall be submitted to the waterways commission for final approval before any of the expenditures therein provided for or contemplated are authorized or made, or any construction work undertaken or contracts let under or in pursuance of such plans: *Provided*, That in case of an emergency the chairman of the board of river regulation shall have full power to act, and shall report in detail his action in every case to the waterways commission at its next meeting after his action.

The members of said commission shall serve as such only during their incumbency in their respective official positions, and any vacancy on the commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

A board is hereby created, to be known as the "board of river regulation," consisting of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, the chairman of the Mississippi River Commission, the Director of the United States Geological Survey, the Director of the Reclamation Service, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, the Forester of the Department of Agriculture, the Superintendent of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Fisheries, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, one civil engineer, one sanitary engineer, one hydroelectric engineer, one expert in transportation, and a chairman of the board. The last seven shall be appointed by the President and hold office at his pleasure, and they shall each receive an annual compensation of $10,000, except the chairman, who shall receive $12,000, and they shall receive a per diem in lieu of actual expenses when absent from headquarters on official business, to be determined by the waterways commission. Such compensation and per diem, together with all the general expenses of the board, shall be payable out of the appropriation hereinafter apportioned to the Smithsonian Institution. The members of said board, with the exception of the seven members appointed by the President, shall serve as such only during their incumbency in their respective official positions, and any vacancy on the board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

The seven members of the board appointed by the President shall constitute an executive committee of which the chairman of the board shall be chairman, and said executive committee shall have the general executive direction and supervision of the operations of said board of river regulation under rules and regulations to be established by the waterways commission.

A secretary of the board shall be appointed by the executive committee, and shall hold office at their pleasure, and he shall receive an annual compensation of $5,000 and a per diem when absent from headquarters on official business to be determined by the waterways commission, payable out of the appropriation hereinafter apportioned for the Smithsonian Institution.

All formal action taken and all expenditures made or authorized by the board of river regulation shall be reported to the waterways commission and shall be by the commission transmitted to Congress annually, or at such more frequent times as may appear to the commission desirable, or at such times as Congress may require.

Whenever, in their judgment, it may be advisable, in order to expedite construction, the waterways commission may order such construction work as they may determine to be done under the immediate direction, by contract or otherwise, of the executive committee, in which case such work shall be paid for from the apportionment of the service or bureau or organization under which it would otherwise have

been done, such transfer and application of any apportionment made by this act being hereby authorized.

The waterways commission may, if at any time it shall be in their judgment advisable, appoint from the public service additional members of the board of river regulation; and they may also create and appoint from the public service the members of subordinate boards or commissions to promote the purposes of this act and expedite and facilitate the administration thereof and operations and construction thereunder.

COOPERATION WITH STATES, MUNICIPALITIES, AND OTHER AGENCIES.

SEC. 3. That the board of river regulation shall, in all cases where possible and practicable, encourage, promote, and endeavor to secure the cooperation of States, municipalities, public and quasi public corporations, towns, counties, districts, communities, persons, and associations in the carrying out of the purposes and objects of this act, and in making the investigations and doing all coordinative and constructive work provided for herein; and it shall in each case endeavor to secure the financial cooperation of States and of such local authorities, agencies, and organizations to such extent and in such amounts as the waterways commission shall determine to be a just and equitable apportionment of work, costs, and benefits, under all the circumstances, in each case; and it shall negotiate and perfect arrangements and plans for the apportionment of work, cost, and benefits, according to the jurisdiction, powers, rights, and benefits of each, respectively, and with a view to assigning to the United States such portion of such development, promotion, regulation, and control as can be properly undertaken by the United States by virtue of its power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce and promote the general welfare, and by reason of its proprietary interest in the public domain, and to the States, municipalities, communities, corporations, and individuals such portion as properly belongs to their jurisdiction, rights, and interests, and with a view to properly apportioning costs and benefits, and with a view to so uniting the plans and works of the United States within its jurisdiction, and of the States and municipalities, respectively, within their jurisdictions, and of corporations, communities, and individuals within their respective powers and rights, as to secure the highest development and utilization of the waterways and water resources of the United States: *Provided, however*, That the control of the Mississippi River shall be regarded as a national problem, imposing an obligation which alone can be discharged by the General Government for the preservation of the depth of its water for the purpose of navigation, the building of levees to maintain the integrity of its channel, and the prevention of the overflow of the land and its consequent devastation, resulting in the interruption of interstate commerce, the disorganization of the mail service, and the enormous loss of life and property, which has resulted therefrom, and that the Mississippi River shall be improved and developed as a national waterway, exclusively under the control of the Federal Government, and all work connected with the creation and maintenance of such a national waterway, including levees, revetments, bank-protective work, flood-water channels, outlets, spillways, and all work thereon herein contemplated or provided for shall be done exclusively by and at the cost of the National Government.

The board may receive and use any funds or property donated or subscribed to it or in any way provided for cooperative work, but no moneys shall be expended under any arrangement for cooperation until the funds to be provided by all parties to such arrangement shall have been made available for disbursement.

ENCOURAGEMENT OF INDEPENDENT INITIATIVE AND CONSTRUCTION.

SEC. 4. That all things done under this act shall be done with a view not only to constructive cooperation, as herein provided, but also with the definite and specific object of enlarging the field of accomplishment contemplated by the act through promoting and encouraging independent initiative and construction by States, municipalities, districts, and other local agencies and organizations, and creating object lessons and building models and making demonstrations that will have that effect and influence, and induce such supplemental and independent action and construction.

CONFERENCE AND COOPERATION OF BUREAUS AND STATES.

SEC. 5. That it shall be the duty of said board to coordinate and bring into conference and cooperation the various scientific and constructive bureaus of the United States with each other and with the representatives of States, municipalities, public and quasi-public corporations, towns, counties, districts, communities, and associations, and of foreign nations on international streams, in the carrying out and accomplishment of all the provisions, purposes, and objects of this act.

The board shall have authority to call upon and to bring into cooperation any other Federal department or bureau whose investigations or assistance may be found necessary to the carrying out of the provisions of this act, and the board is hereby authorized to defray the expenses of such investigations or assistance through a transfer of so much of its appropriation as may be necessary to the Federal department or bureau thus brought into cooperation.

CORRELATION, COORDINATION, AND ADMINISTRATIVE ECONOMY.

SEC. 6. That the board shall harmonize and unify and bring into correlation and coordination the investigations made, and information, data, and facts collected and obtained by the various bureaus or offices of the Government relating to or connected with the matters and subjects referred to and the questions involved in this act, and to print, publish, and disseminate the same, and it shall exercise such general supervision as may be necessary to provide against duplication or unnecessary, inadequate, unrelated, or incomplete work in connection therewith, and shall make such recommendations to the waterways commission as it may deem advisable at any time for the accomplishment of that end or in the interest of harmonious cooperation, efficiency, and economy in carrying out the purposes of this act. The special function of the board at all times shall be to promote the adoption of the best and most approved methods and systems of investigation, administration, construction, and operation in carrying out such specific improvements, works, and projects as are authorized by this act, or which may be from time to time authorized by Congress, if within the scope of the work of the said board as herein set forth; and it shall further be the special function of the board to effect the largest possible saving as the result of the unification, correlation, and coordination of the work of the various bureaus in the investigations and administrative and constructive work provided for in this act in accordance with existing law or with such provisions as Congress shall from time to time impose.

REPORTS, PLANS, AND ESTIMATES BY THE BOARD.

SEC. 7. That the functions of the board shall be to obtain full information through its members concerning all proposed expenditures provided for within the scope of this act. Each bureau or service chief member shall report to the board the work proposed by the bureau or organization which he represents, and shall present full plans and estimates covering such proposed construction or action. The findings and conclusions of the board and plans adopted by it for construction and action shall be binding upon the members thereof in so far as may be consistent with existing laws.

REFERENCES TO AND INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE PRESIDENT.

SEC. 8. That all matters involving apparent conflict with departmental authority, jurisdiction, or procedure, or as to which the board may desire suggestions or advice, shall be laid before the President, who may thereupon call into conference the waterways commission, and after consideration of such matters by the commission, suitable instructions shall be issued by the President to heads of departments with a view to securing unity of action along the lines approved by the President and the commission.

EXECUTION OF PLANS AND WORK BY THE SEVERAL BUREAUS.

SEC. 9. That in the execution of all plans and duties intrusted or delegated to the several bureaus the respective chiefs thereof, acting under departmental regulations and procedure, shall execute the work according to the methods prescribed by law, the functions of the board of river regulation being those of a consulting and advisory body with power to make recommendations to the President and the waterways commission, and through the President to the heads of departments, with a view to effective coordination and cooperation as to all things proposed by this act, and to carry out such work as Congress shall from time to time prescribe or has prescribed in this act.

COMPREHENSIVE PLANS FOR RIVER REGULATION.

SEC. 10. That the board of river regulation shall develop, formulate, prepare, consider, and determine upon comprehensive plans for the conservation, use, and development of the water and forest resources of the United States in such manner as will best regulate the flow of rivers and their tributaries and source streams, and the stage of water in inland waterways, and the confinement of all rivers and waterways at all times within fixed and established channels, and embracing, with that object, the construction of levees and revetments and all works necessary for the fixation of channels and flood protection, drainage, and the reclamation of swamp and overflow lands; water storage in natural and artificial reservoirs; the beneficial use of waters for irrigation and for all domestic, municipal, and industrial purposes; the maintenance and development of underground water supplies and the storage of water in the ground and in irrigated lands and underground reservoirs; the enlargement of the areas and raising of the levels of the ground waters; the construction of flood-water canals, by-passes, and restraining dams; the control and regulation of drainage and the replenishment of streams by return seepage; the perpetuation of forests and maintenance of woodland cover as sources of stream flow; the prevention of denudation and erosion; the protection of channels and harbors from eroded soil materials; the clarification of streams; the utilization of water power; the prevention of the pollution of streams and rivers; the sanitary disposal of sewage and purification of water supplies; the best distribution of forests, woodlands, and other growth, and of cultivated and irrigated areas in their relation to river flow; the protection of forested and woodland areas from destruction by fire or insects; the reforestation of denuded areas; the planting of forests and establishment of forest plantations; the preservation and planting of woodlands and any other growth and protective cover on watersheds; the increase and development of the porosity and absorbent qualities and storage capacity of the soil upon which rain or snow may fall; the making and furnishing of plans for flood-water storage and other works for irrigation and power for farms, towns, and villages; the acquisition, subdivision, and settlement in small, intensively cultivated farms of lands for water storage by irrigation; the building of the irrigation systems for such lands, including reservoirs, dams, canals, ditches, and all necessary works; the protection of farms, villages, towns, and municipalities from damage by freshets and overflow; and the impounding of flood waters in artificial lakes and storage reservoirs to prevent floods and overflows, erosion of river banks, and breaks in levees, and to regulate the flow of streams and reenforce such flow during drought and low-water periods, the ultimate object of all such work being to regulate and, so far as possible, standardize the flow of rivers and their tributaries, the accomplishment of that object to induce and secure the cooperation of States, municipalities, districts, counties, towns, and other local agencies and organizations.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

SEC. 11. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution to give especial attention to the acquisition from foreign countries and from all sources of all obtainable knowledge concerning the problems involved in the work of the board and to diffuse and disseminate the same, and to establish and maintain a museum of water and forest resources in which such knowledge shall be placed before the people, with object lessons illustrating the disastrous consequences that have resulted from the neglect of such conservation, and particularly the failure to conserve the forest and water resources in other countries of the world, and to utilize the resources of the institution under his charge, which may be available for that purpose, to aid in the education of the public in the elements of knowledge which lead to the successful regulation of water and of the flow of rivers and the use of water in connection with agriculture and the intensive cultivation of land, and in connection with all other industries.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

SEC. 12. That it shall be the duty of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture to collate and bring together for the information of the board the results of all investigations with reference to soil and the production of crops through the use of water as a fertilizer and stimulant to plant growth, and of the relation of water in excess or deficiency to successful crop production. He shall recommend for the consideration of the board such further investigations as may properly be conducted in connection with the purposes for which the board is created and which shall lead to the largest and most valuable results being obtained through the use of water in connection with successful plant growth and increased crop production, and the establishment of a national system for the information of the people in the intensive cultivation of small tracts of land, with a view to increasing food production and thereby reducing the cost of living and encouraging suburban and rural settlement and homemaking, and the beneficial use of water in connection therewith as an ultimate influence for river regulation in aid of interstate commerce.

FOREST SERVICE.

SEC. 13. That it shall be the duty of the Forester of the Department of Agriculture to present to the board all essential facts bearing upon

the relation of forests to the various problems under consideration and the value and importance of forests and woodland and other growth and their proper control and extension and protection from fire; also such facts as may be essential to the proper enlargement of forested areas for the protection of watersheds and the maintenance of the flow of rivers during the low-water season and the prevention of denudation and erosion, with consequent silting up of waterways and harbors, and to prepare and present to the board comprehensive plans for the protection of the forests from fire and other destructive agencies.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

SEC. 14. That it shall be the duty of the Director of the Geological Survey to recommend to the board appropriate surveys and examinations, and upon proper approval cause to be executed topographic surveys of each drainage basin, these being planned with reference to the work contemplated by the board and the immediate demands and needs of the board. Such surveys shall include and show in addition to the topography the character of all lands embraced therein, and it shall be his duty to classify the same and designate the best use to which said lands may be devoted in carrying out the provisions of this act. The topographic maps shall be of such scale as will bring out the existence of feasible storage or reservoir sites. He shall make such additional surveys of specific localities as may be required by the constructing engineers, and in such surveys he shall establish monuments based on geodetic horizontal and vertical control. The surveys shall be of such nature as to provide adequate bases for geologic investigation and engineering works. He shall also cause measurements to be made of the flow of streams at such places as may be designated by the board as yielding results of largest importance in the discussion of the problems in hand and the execution of proposed engineering works, and shall carry on such studies in river pollution and purification, in water-power possibilities, and other stream investigations as the board may designate. It shall be his further duty to examine all forested lands or lands intended to be afforested or reforested which it is proposed to purchase under this act, and to report whether the control and use of such lands will influence the preservation of water supplies or stream flow or tend to regulate the flow of navigable rivers on whose watersheds they are located.

RECLAMATION SERVICE.

SEC. 15. That it shall be the duty of the Director of the Reclamation Service to bring before the board the results attained in the construction of works of irrigation and reclamation throughout the arid and semiarid regions of the United States and the application of the experience thus obtained to the conditions existing in the more humid sections of the United States. He shall extend the surveys and investigations and construction of irrigation works such as are authorized in the act of June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act, throughout the United States and including reclamation of land by drainage as well as by irrigation: *Provided, however*, That no part of the fund created by the act of June 17, 1902, shall be expended for this purpose. Such further investigations and construction and operations in States and Territories other than those covered by the original act above referred to and amendments thereto shall be made in accordance with such rules and regulations as shall be established by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall be subject to such of the terms, provisions, and requirements of said reclamation act as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine are to be made applicable thereto, but shall be at the expense of the river regulation fund created by this act, and expenditures from said last-mentioned fund may be similarly made in any State or Territory. He shall construct, operate, and maintain, until otherwise provided by law, such irrigation and drainage works and systems as the board may determine are needed for the regulation of the streams and rivers and the improvement of agricultural conditions, or for the proper control, disposition, and utilization of sewage or other waste waters which, without such regulation, would pollute the streams or injuriously affect the health or prosperity of the community. He shall also present to the board proposed plans for cooperation with irrigation or drainage projects or enterprises constructed, initiated, or contemplated by States, districts, municipalities, corporations, associations, or individuals, and shall negotiate agreements for coordinating and making more useful works already in existence or proposed through their incorporation into more effective systems.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS, UNITED STATES ARMY.

SEC. 16. That the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army shall present to the board all proposed plans for works proposed to be built under this act which the waterways commission shall determine are to be built under his supervision, including plans for levees, dikes, revetments, dams, canals, cut-offs, spillways, controlled outlets, flood-water channels and wasteways, bank-protective and channel-fixation works, reservoirs or basins for the storage of flood waters for flood prevention and river control, or works for which examinations and surveys have been made by or with the cooperation of States, municipalities, or districts, and which it is sought to have constructed under this act, together with such facts and data as may be required for the construction of such works, or any of them, for the regulation of the flow of rivers. He shall also construct, operate, and maintain such levees, flood-protection, channel-fixation, and bank-protective works as are built in accordance with this act and also such reservoirs as are so built for the storage of water to control and regulate the flow of rivers, and to reenforce such flow in seasons of low water and to prevent floods and protect lands and communities from overflow as may be determined by the waterways commission: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this section shall be so administered as in no way to supersede or conflict with any specific provisions which Congress shall from time to time make by way of appropriations other than such as are made by this act for work and improvements to be performed or maintained by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, but that all work prescribed under this section shall be supplemental to and coordinated with the work as specifically prescribed by Congress in other acts.

DUTIES OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT.

SEC. 17. That it shall be the duty of the members of the board of river regulation appointed by the President and constituting the executive committee of the board of river regulation, as hereinbefore provided, under the direction of the chairman of the board, to consider, prepare, and present to the board comprehensive plans providing for the best utilization of the water resources of the United States in connection with river regulation, flood prevention and protection, and the increase of the flow of rivers in low-water seasons and the maintenance at all times of a navigable stage of water in the waterways of the United States, and providing also for the coordination of and cooperation between rail and water routes and transportation, and the establishment, maintenance, and protection of terminals and transfer sites and facilities for transshipment between rail and water routes, and to adjust all the plans contemplated for the projects constructed under this act to the ultimate purpose of regulating and standardizing the flow of the rivers and inland waterways of the United States, in aid of interstate commerce as aforesaid; and, further, to give expert advice to the board in its consideration of details, problems, and projects; and it shall be their special duty to constantly promote and stimulate harmonious and effective cooperation between the different bureaus and services of the National Government and between the Nation and States, municipalities, and other local agencies in working out constructive plans under this act; and it shall further be their duty to examine and study the plans presented to the board for consideration, with the view of promoting the fullest possible measure of efficiency and economy in administration and construction and avoiding all duplication in the work of the respective bureaus.

EQUITABLE APPORTIONMENT AMONG WATERWAY SYSTEMS.

SEC. 18. That in carrying out the provisions of this act regard must be had, as far as practicable, to the equitable apportionment and contemporaneous execution of the works and projects contemplated under this act among the several waterway systems of the United States.

Not less than $10,000,000 annually for 10 years shall be apportioned to the Appalachian and Atlantic region, including the territory within the drainage basins of all rivers flowing into the Mississippi River below the Ohio River or into the Gulf of Mexico east of the Mississippi River or into the Atlantic Ocean.

Not less than $10,000,000 annually for 10 years shall be apportioned to the drainage basin of the Ohio River.

Not less than $5,000,000 annually for 10 years shall be apportioned to the drainage basin of the Mississippi River above St. Louis and the territory included in the drainage basins of the rivers draining into Canada or into the Great Lakes or into the Mississippi River from the east between East St. Louis and Cairo, Ill.

Not less than $10,000,000 annually for 10 years shall be apportioned to the Mississippi River from St. Louis to the Gulf of Mexico, and the territory lying between the Atchafalaya River, the Mississippi River, and the Gulf of Mexico, and including the Atchafalaya River as a flood-water outlet for the Mississippi River, and including the controlling works necessary for such use of said Atchafalaya River, and all levees and bank protective works, cut-offs, and auxiliary flood-water channels necessary to control and prevent all overflows from said Atchafalaya River, which shall in this respect be regarded as in the same class with the Mississippi River and entitled to the same recognition in the matter of levee construction and flood protection for adjacent territory as the main Mississippi River.

Not less than $10,000,000 annually for 10 years shall be apportioned to the territory included in the drainage basins of the Missouri River and of other rivers, bayous, and waterways flowing into the Mississippi River from the west below St. Louis or flowing or debouching directly or through connecting waterways into the Gulf of Mexico west of the Atchafalaya River.

Not less than $5,000,000 annually for 10 years shall be apportioned to the territory including the drainage basin of the Colorado River, and extending on the west to the crest of the watersheds draining into the Pacific Ocean, and on the north to the drainage basin of the Columbia and Snake Rivers; not less than $5,000,000 annually for 10 years to the drainage basins of the rivers flowing through or into the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys or into the Pacific Ocean in California; and not less than $5,000,000 annually for 10 years to the drainage basins of the Columbia and Snake Rivers and other rivers flowing into the Pacific Ocean in Oregon and Washington.

The drainage basin of every river above mentioned shall be understood to include all the tributaries and source streams of such rivers.

REPLENISHMENT OF RIVER-REGULATION FUND BY BOND ISSUE.

SEC. 19. That the President is authorized, whenever the current revenues are insufficient to provide the $60,000,000 annually appropriated for the river-regulation fund, to make up the deficiency in such fund by the issue and sale of United States bonds, bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 3 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, and running for a period not exceeding 30 years.

APPROPRIATIONS AND APPORTIONMENT.

SEC. 20. That the moneys hereby annually appropriated in section 1 of this act, unless otherwise apportioned by the waterways commission, shall, subject to all the provisions of this act, be apportioned and expended by the services and bureaus herein named in carrying out the purposes and provisions of this act and under the direction of the heads of the respective departments and in accordance with existing laws and regulations or such modifications thereof as may be made from time to time in accordance with the general system or systems proposed by the board and approved by the waterways commission in the following sums annually, which shall be available until expended for the following purposes:

For the Smithsonian Institution, for obtaining information and material relating to the subjects covered by this act in the United States and foreign countries, and publishing and distributing the same to the people of the United States, and for the establishment and maintenance of a Museum of Water and Forest Resources, and for any other purposes mentioned or referred to in section 11 of this act, $1,000,000.

For the Department of Agriculture, for the increase and development of the porosity and absorbent qualities and storage capacity of the soil upon which rain or snow may fall in order that its run-off may be in that way checked and the water absorbed into the earth, and to that end for the establishment and maintenance of garden schools and demonstration garden farms, and instruction in intensive cultivation and the use of water for irrigation therein and in rural industrial communities, and for investigations and instruction with reference to terracing and methods of cultivation adapted to preventing erosion on hillside slopes, and with reference to the use of water as a fertilizer and stimulant to plant growth in all ways, and the adoption of all methods of agriculture that will increase the porosity and absorbent qualities of the soil and check surface wash or erosion or sudden run-off, and thereby tend to prevent the formation of floods, and for the acquisition of lands that may be required for such purposes, and for any other purposes mentioned or referred to in section 12 of this act, $5,000,000.

For the Department of Commerce, for the work of the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries, in cooperation with other departments, to promote the objects of this act in such manner as may be directed by the waterways commission, $2,000,000.

For the Geological Survey, for topographic surveys and the measurement of streams and other hydrographic and hydrologic works, and for the examination of lands intended to be purchased under this act, and

for any other things required by the board to be done in connection with any investigation or construction done under this act, $3,000,000.

For the Reclamation Service, for the reclamation of lands by either irrigation or drainage, or both, and for the building of irrigation and drainage systems to aid in the regulation or equalization of the flow of rivers and their tributaries and source streams through the conservation, utilization, and ground storage of waters in irrigated or drained lands, and for the acquisition and improvement by irrigation or drainage of specific tracts of land for intensive cultivation and settlement, and for the building of canals and ditches, and carrying to completion any and all methods of utilizing water for irrigation as a means for water conservation or river regulation, and for any other purpose mentioned or referred to in section 15 of this act, $20,000,000.

For the Forest Service, (a) for the protection from fire and insect infestation of national forests, where such protection is essential to the preservation and maintenance of water supplies, and for the acquisition of lands within or near existing national forests or other lands which are necessary to the adequate protection of water supplies, and for building the necessary roads, trails, fire lines, fire-protection stations, telephone lines, and for any and all other things required for such fire protection, including the fighting of fires and the employment of forest guards and rangers, $2,000,000.

(b) For the protection from fire of the forested watersheds of all rivers and streams, and for the organization and maintenance of a system of fire protection on any private or State forest lands situated upon the watersheds of such rivers or streams, in cooperation with any State or group of States, in the manner provided for in an act entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of rivers," known as the Appalachian National Forest act, and also in direct cooperation with cities, counties, towns, villages, and other owners of woodlands and forested areas on watersheds, and wherever essential to the preservation of water supplies and for the protection of such forested watersheds and areas from insect infestation, $1,000,000.

(c) For the protection, perpetuation, enlargement, maintenance, regulation, and control of water supplies by the establishment and maintenance of forest nurseries, the planting or replanting of forests, the reforestation of denuded areas, the carrying out of silvicultural improvements in the national forests, and the establishment and maintenance of forest plantations and parks and the acquisition of lands therefor to provide instruction in the planting and care of trees and forests for the purpose of awakening and maintaining a local interest in and knowledge of the relation of forests to the preservation of water supplies and stream flow, $1,000,000.

(d) For the acquisition of forest lands by and through the National Forest Reservation Commission as and in the manner provided for in the Appalachian National Forest act above referred to, subject to all the conditions and requirements contained in said act, including lands along the Mississippi River which may have been thrown outside the levees or left without levee protection in designing the levee systems, $5,000,000.

Provided, That the provisions of the said Appalachian National Forest act shall, after the expiration thereof by limitation, still continue and be in force with reference to all moneys made available for expenditure thereunder by this act, either for fire protection or for the acquisition of forest lands.

For the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for building bank protective works to prevent erosion and cutting of the banks and consequent caving, and to control the river and hold it in a permanently fixed and established channel, and for building and maintaining levees, revetments, dikes, walls, embankments, gates, wasteways, by-passes, cut-offs, spillways, controlled outlets, drainage canals, flood-water canals and channels, weir dams, sill dams, restraining dams, impounding basins, and bank protective works for river regulation, and, as a means to that end, the building of works for reclamation, drainage, and flood protection, and for building reservoirs and artificial lakes and basins for the storage of flood waters to prevent and protect against floods and overflows, erosion of river banks, and breaks in levees, and to regulate the flow of source streams, rivers and waterways, and reenforce such flow during drought and low-water periods, and for the operation and maintenance of the same, $20,000,000.

—

[From the News-Scimitar, Memphis, Tenn., January 15, 1914.]

THE NEWLANDS BILL.

A comprehensive, practical, and efficient measure is the Newlands bill for the control of the floods of this great valley, and it is growing more and more in public favor as it is better understood. The makeshifts and patchwork efforts of less comprehensive measures are falling more and more into disfavor, particularly when the secret forces opposing the Newlands bill are discovered. The public is rapidly learning that the same influences that delayed the opening of the Panama Canal for more than a quarter of a century, plus the railroads which oppose revival and expansion of inland waterways competition, politicians who do not desire the elimination of the politically powerful levee boards, power-site speculators who do not desire the Federal Government to survey and reveal the reservoir and power sites in the source-stream country, those financiers who do not desire the internal development work of the Government coordinated and made fully efficient, and those national politicians who desire to retain power to choke off executive initiative, have thrown every possible obstruction in the way of progress in the campaign for the passage of the Newlands river-regulation bill. But their labors are in vain. The Newlands bill is really the river plank of the national platform of the Democratic Party translated into legislative form, and it is so designed as to ultimately solve all the great problems incident to the now uncontrolled drainage of the country in such a way as to rehabilitate the navigable waterways and put an end to the waste of water, which means a waste of wealth. The country is slow to learn, and it takes its time about solving great problems. When once its mind is made up, however, and the work entered upon, it is always done with a thoroughness and intelligence that insures its success.

—

[From the Mobile Item, Jan. 22, 1914.]

THE NEWLANDS BILL.

At the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, held in Atlanta a few days ago, Judson G. Wall, vice president of the association, addressed the division of social and economic science on flood control and protection. Mr. Wall, who is tax commissioner of New York City, has made a deep study of the problems presented by soil erosion and the unnecessary waste of waters. He declared that the present river-regulation policy is wrong: First, because it does not prevent flood losses averaging over $100,000,000 a year, and, second, because it not only permits, but provides for, the unimpeded passage to the sea of countless billions of tons of water needed where it falls for crop-raising purposes.

The Newlands bill now before Congress proposes a policy of flood prevention and river regulation, a policy that clearly recognizes the vital necessity of conserving the food supply of the Nation. This policy provides for the construction of storage reservoirs on the source streams, which would supply water for navigation during the dry season. It also provides for diversion canals along the upper levels for irrigating purposes and for otherwise distributing water where it will be most beneficial. Under this plan water would be compelled to perform its proper and normal function of enriching the soil before seeking, through seepage, the river and the sea. The season of freshets would thus provide for the season of drought. It is claimed there would be no possibility of floods, and there would be assurance of a safe and certain volume of water in navigable streams at all seasons of the year.

The storage of water on the source streams would result in the development of a large number of hydroelectric power plants, which would lessen the cost of production. There are nearly 300,000,000 acres of land now idle, owing to a deficient rainfall, but which could be made productive if the amount of precipitation that does occur were all utilized, which it is practicable to do. This plan of making the best use of all precipitation would also increase the productiveness and thereby enhance the value of farms in all parts of the country.

Hundreds of business organizations and newspapers throughout the country are demanding from Congress the adoption of this new policy of flood protection by conservation. And they ask that the plan be turned over to the Army engineers who constructed the Panama Canal for execution. If these engineers are ordered to stop the floods, they can do so. And they will at the same time stop the waste of soil by erosion, and the waste of water, which is one of the most valuable assets of the Nation.

—

FLOOD PREVENTION AND RIVER REGULATION.

The broad and comprehensive national policy embodied in the Newlands-Bartholdt-Broussard river-regulation bill was declared and indorsed by the Trans-Mississippi Commercial Congress 10 years ago in the following resolutions drawn by George H. Maxwell, and then adopted as an expression of the broad western vision of what should be done to prevent the waste and destruction of our national resources and safeguard against the annually recurring menace of the floods.

TRANS-MISSISSIPPI COMMERCIAL CONGRESS.

Resolutions adopted at the fourteenth annual session held at Seattle, Wash., August 18–21, 1903:

"CONSERVE NATURAL RESOURCES.

"The unparalleled era of prosperity through which we are now passing results from the rapid development of the material resources of our country, and we must preserve those resources if we are to maintain that prosperity. We are drawing from nature's treasure vaults the wealth that has been accumulating through the ages. That wealth is in our forests, our mines, and our farms. Their products are the basis of both our internal and our foreign trade and commerce and the original source of all employment for labor.

"This mighty resource of natural wealth must not be wasted or destroyed. Not only should the natural resources of the trans-Mississippi region be systematically preserved, but the home markets for its products should be protected.

"We have a higher destiny as a Nation than the mere creation or accumulation of capital. We must preserve and bequeath to future generations the natural resources which will be necessary to their material welfare, and without which in the years to come the masses of our people will inevitably be reduced to poverty and suffer privation and distress.

"WHAT MUST BE DONE.

"We may use and enjoy these vast natural resources without destroying them, and by a wise governmental policy they may be enormously developed and enlarged. But if this is to be done—

"1. The appalling ravages from forest fires must be stopped.

"2. The reckless destruction of our timber resources by careless and wasteful methods of lumbering must cease.

"3. The forests must be preserved by right use, not only as a permanent source of supply for wood and timber, but as sources of water supply and great natural reservoirs to hold back the flood waters and lessen the destructive volume of floods.

"4. The waters that now run to waste must be stored both for flood protection and for use in irrigation and to create electric power and for the improvement of navigation.

"5. Reservoirs should be built throughout the mountain regions and wherever practicable in the natural depressions and basins of the great plains in the valleys of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers and their tributaries.

"6. The building of a multitude of small reservoirs and ponds by damming the draws and coulees should be brought about.

"7. The river channels should be, wherever necessary, deepened, straightened, and improved and the banks protected by revetments.

"8. Levees should be built along the rivers for flood protection and to improve the channels for navigation.

"9. The public lands should be held as a sacred trust for those who will build homes upon them, and their rapid absorption into private ownership by speculators and to create great ranges for live stock should be immediately stopped.

"10. The National Government should build the great irrigation systems necessary for the reclamation and settlement of the arid region by actual settlers and home makers, and the lands reclaimed should repay to the Government the cost of the construction of the works.

"GREAT ENGINEERING WORKS.

"The great engineering works necessary for the utilization of the waters of such large rivers as the Columbia, the Missouri, the Colorado, the Snake, the Milk, the Salt, and Gila, and the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers in California should proceed as rapidly as the lands reclaimed will be utilized, and will repay to the Government the cost of the works; and in the great interior central valley of California the problem of the control of the floods of the Sacramento River, which would furnish water enough to irrigate 10,000,000 acres of land if conserved and utilized, should be treated as a single problem involving arid-land reclamation, flood control, navigation, and drainage, and while the improvements of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers

should be continued and extended by the National Government to fully develop the navigability of those rivers, the necessity of coping with the problem in its broadest aspects should be recognized and a complete and comprehensive plan for its entire solution should be prepared without delay by the engineers of the Reclamation Service and of the War Department of the United States."

—

[From the Southern Lumberman, Nashville, Tenn., December, 1914.]

FLOOD CONTROL—IMPOUNDING WATERS AT THEIR SOURCE.

[By George H. Maxwell, executive director, National Reclamation Association, New Orleans, La.]

How few there are who ever stop to realize how easy it is to catch and control the drops of water where they fall in the form of rain or snow on the farms or in the forests of the watershed of a great river.

Or how impossible it may become to control those same drops of water when they have been aggregated into a mighty flood in the lower valleys or reaches of the river draining that watershed.

The farmers in the arid regions or in the truck gardens of New Jersey have learned by experience the value of water as an aid to plant growth, and have likewise learned how to control it and apply it for beneficial use in agriculture.

Ask the alfalfa raiser of Arizona, the orange grower of southern California, the grape grower of the San Joaquin Valley, the apple grower of Oregon, the prune grower of Washington, the wheat grower of Montana, the truck gardener of New Jersey or Florida, whether they could control and use to increase crop production on their farms 1 acre-foot of water.

They will tell you they want no more profitable undertaking and an acre-foot of water is just the equivalent of 12 inches of rainfall. It is water enough to cover 1 acre 1 foot deep.

How many are there whose lives are menaced or property devastated by floods in the lower valley who ever stop to think what the difference is to them whether an acre-foot of water over the watershed above them (12 inches of rainfall) is saved and used to increase crop production, or allowed to run off in an unchecked and uncontrolled flood?

THE GREAT FLOOD OF MARCH-APRIL, 1913.

The great flood of March-April, 1913, in Ohio was caused by an average run-off of only 8 inches from 3,000 square miles. There are 201,000 square miles in the drainage basin of the Ohio River. A run-off of 1 acre-foot, or 12 inches of rainfall, simultaneously over that entire area, would make a wall of water a mile wide, a thousand miles long and 200 feet deep. Can you see that wall of water in your imagination? Can you imagine what it would mean if it ever gathered in a great flood extending from Pittsburgh to Cairo? The distance between those two cities is about 900 miles.

Or can you imagine what such a simultaneous run-off of 12 inches would mean if it were poured in the form of a flood into all the tributary valleys of the Ohio, the Allegheny, the Monongahela, the Muskingum, the Scioto, the Miami, the Wabash, the Kanawha, the Kentucky, the French Broad, the Cumberland, and the Tennessee?

To be exact, it would mean a flood one-third worse than that of March-April, 1913, on the Scioto and the Miami at Dayton or Columbus or Chillicothe extended to every tributary of the Ohio and devastating every valley in the drainage basin of the Ohio River.

WHY FLOODS DO NOT OCCUR EACH YEAR.

Why is there not such a flood every year in these valleys?

For the very simple reason that a large portion of the rainfall is absorbed into the ground and mother earth becomes a great reservoir, restraining the run-off and regulating the flow of the rivers by absorbing into the soil the water that would otherwise run off in floods.

And in addition to what is now saved from waste by being absorbed into the soil, it would be entirely practicable on all land not too steep for farming purposes to catch and hold in the soil as a reservoir an additional 12 inches of rainfall that now runs off and runs to waste.

And on all the land on which this was done the profitable production of crops would be enormously increased, the farms made to pay better, their value increased, the life of the farmer's wife made easier, and that of his family happier and more full of the things of which poverty now deprives many of them, that would make for better education and higher civilization.

PIONEERS IN NEW AGRICULTURE.

That all the rain that falls on such farm lands, not only on the flat land but on the sloping hillsides, too, can be saved and turned to profit by the farmer who has the brains, the industry, and the adaptability to do it, has been demonstrated and proved beyond question by at least two pioneers in this new agriculture. One is Col. Freeman Thorp, of Hubert, Minn., the practical value of whose work is vouched for by W. J. Spillman, of the Department of Agriculture, who has visited and examined the demonstration farm of Col. Thorp. Another is M. B. Waite, who is connected with the Bureau of Plant Industry, at Washington, D. C. Mr. Waite's demonstration orchard is near Washington and his experiments cover contour plowing, cover cropping, and preventing erosion, as well as catching all the rainfall and conserving it in the soil by methods of increasing the porosity and absorbent qualities of the soil.

It is quite true that the Government can not do the work of thus conserving on the farms the rainfall or snowfall that the farmers now permit to run to waste.

Neither could the Government compel a farmer who owned a farm on which was located a valuable placer gold mine to work the gold mine and get the gold out of the ground and into his pocket or his bank account. But the Government could show the farmer that the gold was there, and show him and all others how to do the things necessary to get the gold.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD TEACH THE FARMER.

And so the Government can and should establish a great comprehensive and complete system of training the farmers of the whole drainage basin of the Ohio River and all its tributaries how to save and use water, and stop their farms from gullying, and heal the scarred and defaced hillsides of the slopes of the Appalachians, and how to increase crop production and increase their own incomes and increase the Nation's food supplies.

The Agricultural Department can just as well do that as to teach the cotton planters how to fight the boll weevil, how to diversify their crops, how to raise more corn to the acre, or how to fatten steers for the market.

THE NEWLANDS RIVER-REGULATION BILL.

The Newlands river-regulation bill provides for just such an educational campaign and system to educate farmers to enrich themselves by checking run-off and using it to raise crops instead of allowing it to go to waste in devastating floods while their crops are left to burn up with drought for the need, later on, of the moisture that should have been conserved in the soil to nourish the growing plants.

The Newlands river-regulation bill appropriates the money and gives the Secretary of Agriculture the power to do everything needed to be done to make such a campaign effective and successful. Demonstration farms could be established in every county, under that bill, and farm demonstrators put to work to go straight to every farmer with the information needed to better his condition by making better use of the water available for crop production on his farms.

A farmer out in Missouri has demonstrated a way by which every gullied field in the Ohio River drainage basin, level enough to be cultivated, could be leveled and restored to agricultural use. How many farmers with gullied fields are there who know of this system? It is so cheap, simple, and effective that any farmer could adopt it. The writer ran across it by mere accident in a pamphlet issued by the W. S. Dickey Clay Manufacturing Co., of Kansas City, Mo.

The better methods of the conservation and use of rainfall in agriculture as advocated and demonstrated by Mr. Waite and Col. Thorp do not include surface irrigation. They contemplate merely the conservation of the moisture in the soil itself, an adaptation to the humid and subhumid regions of the East of principles somewhat similar to those utilized in the Campbell system of soil culture in the West, supplemented by contour plowing, terracing, cover cropping to prevent erosion, contour embankments, and other methods of conserving the rain or snowfall in the ground itself.

PLANTS NUT-BEARING TREES ON HILLSIDES.

This system is applied by Col. Thorp on forested lands and forested hillside slopes, as well as on lands level enough for cultivation. He plants on the steep hilly slopes the natural nut-bearing trees of the country, conserving the run-off by contour embankments, and turns the hogs into this nut-bearing forest to harvest the crop of nuts. He finds the tree growth and the crop of nuts largely increased by saving the run-off for the nourishment of the tree, instead of allowing it to be precipitated into a stream channel to contribute to a flood.

How many millions of acres there are in the Appalachian region that could be thus made doubly profitable—by producing nuts for hog feed, systematically developing that crop, and at the same time gradually maturing a crop of timber to be harvested in the future years and then replanted according to the German system.

The conservation of rainfall in the soil is an effective method of checking sudden run-off and preventing floods, because of the enormous volume or quantity of water mother earth is capable of absorbing and holding back until it is fed to the plants and trees to aid their growth or fed to the springs or gradually seeps into the streams and replenishes their flow in the summer season.

The stupendous aggregate volume of water that 12 inches of rainfall thus absorbed into the earth would make in the Ohio Valley—a wall of water a mile wide, a thousand miles long, and 200 feet deep—has already been referred to.

IN THE VALLEY OF THE MISSOURI.

To illustrate the same condition in the arid region, in the Valley of the Missouri we have an equally striking result.

The average amount of water needed for irrigation in that country is 2 acre-feet per year. Take that amount of water out of the flooded streams and soak it into the ground on 10,000,000 acres of land and you have soaked into the ground water enough to make a flood extending from Cairo to the Gulf of Mexico in the Mississippi River 1 mile wide and 30 feet deep.

To increase the porosity and absorbent qualities of the soil, and soak the rainfall into the ground, using mother earth as a natural reservoir, is only one method of checking sudden run-off and preventing floods, but it is the most important of all, because of the enormous quantity of water in the aggregate that the earth will absorb, provided the snow or rain is caught and conserved when it falls and not allowed to run off and accumulate in stream channels in the form of floods.

ARTIFICIAL SURFACE RESERVOIRS.

Next in order of flood-prevention measures comes artificial surface reservoirs in which the flood water can be stored until needed for some beneficial use or until the channel below will carry it without overflow or damage.

A multitude of small reservoirs may be more advantageous for flood prevention than a few large ones, because more widely scattered over the watershed. The value of the small reservoir is now well appreciated in the West. The floods of the South Platte River have been completely controlled and stopped by numerous small reservoirs in Colorado. There are probably a thousand such reservoirs in that watershed. They would prove just as valuable in every foothill valley of the Appalachians, for more profitable agriculture, as well as for flood prevention.

SLOGAN OF "DAM THE DRAWS."

Years ago "Dam the draws" was a slogan of the National Irrigation Congress, and to-day the governor of Kansas is promoting a State-wide campaign to advocate this idea. Among those who have proved its practical advantages and profits are J. C. Hopper, president of the Citizens' National Bank, Ness City, Kans., on his ranch near that place.

Under the Newlands river-regulation bill the same diligent, persistent, and comprehensive campaign of education to store water in small reservoirs should be conducted to induce farmers to conserve water in this way as well as to conserve it in the soil.

The drainage basin of the Ohio River includes the entire watersheds of the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers and all their tributaries and source streams, and throughout that entire region such small farm reservoirs would prove of enormous value for farm power and farm irrigation for fruit orchards, garden truck, and meadows for dairying.

In a very few years the value of a farm reservoir for power will be so well demonstrated and widely known that no farmer will ignorantly neglect to avail himself of such an opportunity on his own farm. Much may be done, however, by an educational campaign under the Department of Agriculture to stimulate the construction of such reservoirs and farm power plants.

The same is true of farm reservoirs for irrigation. On thousands of farms in the Ohio Basin opportunities exist for utilizing such reservoirs, and the Newlands river-regulation bill contemplates that the farmer shall be shown their location and how he can make money by building and using them. The value of supplemental irrigation as crop insurance against drouth has been too thoroughly demonstrated to need argument. The Skinner Irrigation Co., at Troy, Ohio, manufactures a

system of overhead pipe irrigation by which the gardener can have rain whenever he chooses to turn on the water.

All the foregoing methods of checking run-off are things that the Government can get done only by a great system of education and demonstration, such as is provided for in the Newlands river-regulation bill, to show the farmers how they may make money for themselves by better farming methods.

This brings us to the things that the Government can do under this bill to prevent floods.

The first and most immediately important is flood-storage reservoirs, such as have been surveyed and recommended by the engineers of the Pittsburgh Flood Commission and the engineers of the flood committee of Dayton.

The Pittsburgh Flood Commission surveyed and selected 17 reservoir sites that would cost about $20,000,000 to construct and would, when built, lower the floods at Pittsburgh 10 feet.

The watersheds of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers are about one-tenth of the entire drainage basin of the Ohio River, which include the Cumberland and Tennessee. It may therefore be safely estimated that $200,000,000 would create flood storage that would lower the floods at Cincinnati, Louisville, and Cairo 10 feet.

APPROPRIATION IN THE NEWLANDS BILL.

One hundred million dollars of this is provided by the Newlands bill for flood prevention in the Ohio River drainge basin. With the National Government standing ready to contribute this amount, judging by past successful experience with cooperation between the Nation and the States in such matters, it is entirely safe to assume that the States and local sections affected would more than double this amount, and that the Newlands river-regulation bill, when enacted, will settle the flood question for all those in the Ohio River Basin and on every river in that basin.

The keynote of the Newlands river-regulation bill is cooperation. It not only provides for cooperation in all the methods heretofore mentioned, but in all things necessary to perpetuate the forest and woodland cover on the watersheds.

It proceeds on the principle that it is better policy to perpetuate the forest protection against erosion and gullying and the consequent filling of navigable channels with silt, than to let the mountain sides be denuded and washed into the rivers and then spend millions to dredge them out so as to preserve the navigable channels.

The people of the Appalachian region made a grand fight for the Weeks Appalachian National Forest act. The Newlands bill merely enlarges its benefits.

The flood-prevention plan of the Newlands bill includes three classes of prevention: (1) Outlets, (2) levees, (3) source stream control and protective measures.

ADEQUATE SYSTEM OF CONTROLLED OUTLETS.

Starting at the mouth of the river it provides first for an adequate system of controlled outlets in the lower reaches on the Mississippi. This includes a great controlled cut-off, absolutely protecting the adjacent country from overflow, which would take off all the excess flood water that would otherwise go above 16 feet in New Orleans and carry it by way of the Atchafalaya to the Gulf by a route only one-third as long as the route by the Mississippi River from that point to the Gulf.

Lowering the flood plane of the Mississippi 10 feet at the Atchafalaya would lower it on a gradually ascending plane far above this great outlet and the Atchafalaya cut-off would carry in addition the floods of the Red River and could be extended to another outlet below the bluff at Helena, guaranteeing absolute safety to all the west side country below Helena.

The Newlands bill contemplates bringing the levee system up to the full standard of strength proposed by the Army engineers, but it contemplates further: (a) Adequate bank protective works to be built immediately, that will prevent caving banks and stop the caving of the levees into the river. There are 749 miles of rapidly caving banks from Cairo to the Gulf, and the lowest estimate of the cost of protection against them is $86,400,000. (b) The Newlands bill recognizes the danger to the levees when they are built over a bed of quicksand or streaks of shifting sands or old filled-over channels or log jams. This danger it proposes to remove by fixing a standardized flood plane above which the flood against the levees would never rise. First, as the result of source stream control, and second, as the result of the outlet system.

Furthermore, the Newlands bill recognizes the fact that as now built the levees are equivalent to long dams built on the surface of the ground without any foundations, and it contemplates the necessary cost of putting foundations under the levees in all these weak places.

GREAT INLAND WATERWAY.

Above all things the Newlands river-regulation bill contemplates a great inland waterway—a system of 20,000 miles of feeders for the Panama Canal. The great trunk artery of water-borne commerce would be the main Mississippi River from New Orleans to St. Louis, with a main branch to Chicago, another to St. Paul and Minneapolis, and a third to Kansas City, and with another main trunk artery of inland water-borne commerce on the Ohio from Cairo to Pittsburgh.

The Newlands bill recognizes the impossibility of maintaining such a waterway so long as there is annually caved into the river for each mile of its length an area of land equal to 9½ acres 66 feet deep, and the river must carry to the Gulf or deposit in its channel 1,250,000,000 cubic yards of cavings and eroded material—five times as much each year as the total excavation necessary to construct the Panama Canal. There can be neither a waterway nor flood protection until that caving is stopped.

The Newlands river-regulation bill is nonsectional. It is just to all parts of the country. It is comprehensive and broad in its remedial measures, and it has nation-wide support from the press and powerful commercial organizations. It treats every river system as a unit from source to mouth, and it provides for the adoption not of one method of flood protection in one section only, but for the adoption of all practicable methods in all sections of the United States. If one section is entitled to relief all flood-menaced sections are equally entitled to it.

The bill stands on the impregnable foundation that it will really create a great system of inland waterways because it will regulate and standardize for navigation the flow of the navigable rivers.

It will hold back the water that now goes to waste in floods and put it into the rivers in the low-water season when it is needed to float boats on and carry the water-borne commerce of the Nation.

ISSUE OF PATENTS TO PUBLIC LANDS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7951.

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to call up from the calendar a bill on which there can possibly be no discussion.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I withdraw the motion for the present.

Mr. GRONNA. It will take only a few minutes to dispose of it. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 474) to authorize the issuance of absolute and unqualified patents to public lands in certain cases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed in cases where patents for public lands have been issued to entrymen under the provisions of the acts of Congress approved March 3, 1909, and June 22, 1910, reserving to the United States all coal deposits therein, and lands so patented are subsequently classified as noncoal in character, to issue new or supplemental patents to such entrymen, conveying to them the absolute and unqualified title to the lands so previously entered, patented, and thereafter classified as noncoal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I understood that the resolution I introduced was to be considered this morning, the discussion having been cut off by the expiration of the morning hour yesterday. I do not see the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], the chairman of the committee, present, and I do not wish to take any advantage of him, but I should like to have the matter disposed of as soon as I can do so properly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gronna	O'Gorman	Shively
Bankhead	Hitchcock	Oliver	Simmons
Brady	Johnson	Overman	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Jones	Page	Smith, Ga.
Bristow	Kenyon	Perkins	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Lane	Poindexter	Smoot
Burton	Lodge	Pomerene	Stephenson
Chamberlain	McCumber	Ransdell	Sterling
Clapp	Martin, Va.	Reed	Stone
Clark, Wyo.	Myers	Root	Thompson
Cummins	Nelson	Saulsbury	Townsend
Dillingham	Newlands	Shafroth	Walsh
Fall	Norris	Sheppard	Williams

Mr. ASHURST. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. CHILTON] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] are absent from the Senate on official business.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. THOMAS]. He is paired with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT]. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. RANSDELL. The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. THORNTON] is absent on account of sickness.

Mr. SHIVELY. I beg leave to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. KERN]. He is paired with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I desire to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I wish to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution No. 241, Order of Business No. 130, which has already been under discussion.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of Senate resolution 241, directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to conduct an examination to ascertain whether facts or evidence exist justifying the Government in instituting proceedings for recovery of fines, etc., from the United States Steel Corporation, its subsidiaries, or any common carrier, because of unlawful rebates within the last six years, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with amendments.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, if there is no further discussion, I should like to have a vote on the resolution.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I understood the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] to say yesterday that he wished to be heard upon the subject. He is in the cloakroom now, and I should like to give him the opportunity to be heard.

Mr. TOWNSEND entered the Chamber.

Mr. LANE. I was just saying I understood that the Senator from Michigan wished to be heard on the resolution. I had the floor when the entertainment closed yesterday, and I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Do I understand the Senator from Oregon to say that he wishes to make some remarks?

Mr. LANE. No; I understood the Senator from Michigan desired to speak, and I desire to give way to him. I had possession of the floor at the time the discussion closed on yesterday. I am trying to be courteous.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Oregon proceed with his discussion.

Mr. LANE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I shall delay the Senate only for a moment, and perhaps it is unwise for me to take any time, because the matters which I shall present may have been discussed in my absence; but as a member of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which had consideration of this resolution, I have felt it was incumbent upon me, at least, to express to the Senate my understanding of the situation.

This resolution, as it came to the Senate, directed the Interstate Commerce Commission to investigate something not specified and to call upon one Green, named in the resolution, to give testimony before the commission as to certain wrongs which it was supposed had been committed in the way of receiving rebates by the United States Steel Corporation and its subsidiaries. There was not the least information given to the Senate at the time the resolution was submitted as to any facts upon which it was based; in fact, it was expressly declared by the Senator who introduced it that he knew nothing about the facts of the case.

The resolution was sent to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, and it asked the Senator from Oregon to appear before it. He did appear, and repeated what he had said in the Senate, namely, that he knew nothing about the case; that he knew of no facts connected with it; and that he did not know Mr. Green, who had presented the resolution to him. We then asked that Mr. Green appear before the committee, in order that the committee might have some basis upon which to found its report. We were told that Mr. Green did not wish to appear before the committee, but after having appeared before the committee once or twice, the Senator from Oregon concluded that he would go to his office, where Mr. Green was at that time, and ask him to come before us at our request. The Senator from Oregon came back and reported that Mr. Green wanted 10 minutes in which to decide whether he would comply with our request. At the end of 10 minutes, or about that length of time, Mr. Green appeared, and in answer to questions stated that he had felt obliged to consult with Mr. Lamar before he could make a statement to the committee. Mr. Green was asked if Mr. Lamar was his counsel, and he said, "No." I asked him if he could testify before the committee without consulting Mr. Lamar, and he said, "No." He stated that he was acting under the advice of a board of strategy, but he did not give us the names of any of the members of that board, excepting that of Mr. Lamar. He further testified he knew nothing about the facts in this case. He was asked why he had had his name inserted as a witness to be called to give testimony before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and he said he did not know about that; that they put it in. He refused to tell us anything upon which we might base a favorable report.

I thought that that was not treating the committee fairly. I felt that for us to bring in a report here advising that the resolution be passed would subject us to ridicule, and Senators might rise on the floor and ask us why we had reported it and we could make no intelligent answer. I am stating this because everything was done in public in that committee, so far as I know. We insisted that the doors should be open. I moved that the chairman of the committee be authorized to obtain authority from the Senate to subpœna witnesses and to take testimony, and the motion prevailed. But it was thought by the committee that, inasmuch as the author of this resolution admitted that he knew nothing about the case, and wanted to conceal things from the committee, and that he would not give the name of any witness who could give any facts relating to the resolution, it would be wise perhaps to give what strength it could to the resolution by referring it to the Interstate Commerce Commission. The majority of the committee thought that way, but I confess that I did not agree with them. I wanted to have further hearings.

I have made this explanation, Mr. President and Senators, so as to show that the committee acted as best it could in reference to a resolution which evidently was surrounded by such mystery that there was no opportunity for us to get at the facts; in fact but one presumption could be drawn, and that was that no facts existed. It was also in our minds, Mr. President, that if this man Green was a crook—and I am not assuming that he is or that he was; but I do say that so far as the circumstances before us revealed he might have been, and if he wanted to get immunity for anything that he had done we wanted to know whether or not he was connected with these matters—he could not have devised a better plan than to have had himself called as a witness in order to escape prosecution in case he should have been guilty himself. He asserted that he had not been to the Interstate Commerce Commission with the matter. He said he believed it was a Democratic measure and ought to be pressed by the Democratic Party, and that he had taken it to the President, but the President would not hear him. He said he then went to Mr. Bryan——

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. I will ask the Senator if Mr. Green made any such statement as that—that it was a Democratic measure?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understood him to say that he wanted the Democratic Party to get the benefit of it. The record will disclose what he said.

Mr. LANE. I beg the Senator's pardon, but the Senator made the flat assertion here that this man Green said this was a Democratic measure. I should like to have him state whether in fact Mr. Green made any such statement at all.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not wish to be understood as saying that it was a Democratic measure, but he wanted to make it such.

Mr. LANE. I should like to have the Senator point out any place where he said he wanted to make it a Democratic measure.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Is the record printed, Mr. President?

Mr. LANE. It is.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The record will disclose what he said in reference to the matter. I may not have quoted him literally; but there was but one inference to be drawn from his statement, and that was that he wanted a Democrat to take up the matter.

Mr. LANE. Then I will ask the Senator whether he has not done Mr. Green an injustice if in fact he did not say that? If the Senator has alleged here, as he has, that Mr. Green made a statement which he did not make, in the Senator's opinion has he not done Mr. Green an injustice?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly I have.

Mr. LANE. It seems to me so.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If I have misquoted him, I have certainly done him an injustice, and I want to correct it, and I will proceed to correct it if that is true. I have not looked up the record; but my understanding of it is—and I think I am not mistaken about it—that Mr. Green said he wanted this matter taken up by the Democratic Party; that he had gone to the President with it, and could not get a hearing there, and then he went to the Secretary of State with it, and the Secretary of State suggested that he submit something in writing, but he could not get it considered; so he had adopted the advice of the "board of strategy," whose names were not given, one of them being Mr. Lamar, and that he knew nothing about the facts in the case.

I do not believe there is a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee who does not desire an investigation if any facts are presented upon which to base it; but I submit that it is an unusual proceeding for a Senator of the United States to present here a resolution about which he admits he knows nothing himself and about which the principal witness and the only witness whom he mentions in the resolution says he knows nothing, and he does not wish to tell us who does know them. I say it is an unusual thing for a resolution of that kind to be passed without further consideration and without some facts being disclosed.

Mr. LANE. I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan again if the witness did not say, in answer to the question of the Senator from Michigan, that he would testify to facts, would be a witness himself, and if he did not repeat the same statement to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT]? Is not that true?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not know what he may have said. I am stating what I know he said, that all he knew about the matter was the names of witnesses, which he did not give, who would disclose something if they were present before the commission. I know that his testimony on this subject is conflicting, but I am stating what he did testify to.

Mr. LANE. With the Senator's permission, I should like to quote from the record at page 33:

Senator TOWNSEND. I thought you said at the beginning that you were willing to be heard and have the case submitted here under oath before the committee.
Mr. GREEN. I said I should give some of the evidence myself, but those witnesses would not come without a subpœna.
Senator TOWNSEND. That is, you could give the evidence; what they would testify to, you mean?
Mr. GREEN. And what I know myself.
Senator TOWNSEND. I thought you said you did not know anything yourself.
Mr. GREEN. I do know some things; yes.

Further down the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] said:

I am just left in a little doubt on one point which I wish Mr. Green would clear up. A little while ago he said he knew nothing of these cases of his own knowledge. He now says, as I understand it, that he does know something about these cases of his own knowledge. Is that so, Mr. Green? Which way is it?
Mr. GREEN. As I say, it gets back to the same proposition. I do not quite understand the legal status in which the thing is put. I do know something of my own knowledge.
Senator LIPPITT. About these rebates?
Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir.

It seems to me that bears out my statement.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, as I said before, the testimony is quite confused; but I am stating the fact that Mr. Green testified before the committee that he knew nothing about the facts of the case, but that he did know the witnesses who did have information, and that he would disclose those witnesses to the commission but not to the committee. So I am stating what the record will disclose, I am sure, if it has been faithfully transcribed—and I have no doubt it has been—in reference to this matter.

I wanted this matter investigated. I was willing that it should be referred to the Interstate Commerce Commission or to the Attorney General for the purpose of disclosing the facts; but for us to report that this man Green should be called as a witness without knowing his relation to the transactions about which he complained, without knowing whether his complaints were based upon any foundation of facts whatever, I could not consent to, and I do not believe any self-respecting Member of the Senate could consent to it.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield the floor.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I can call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to the part of the testimony which he evidently was not able to put his hand on at the moment. We were examining Mr. Green before the committee, and at page 20 the following occurred:

Senator TOWNSEND. Why was your name put in this resolution to be called by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the only name mentioned in the resolution?

The reply of Mr. Green to that direct question was this:

Mr. GREEN. To name those witnesses. Now, gentlemen, I want to say this, that I have absolutely no interest in this matter except that of serving the public. I have no interest, directly or indirectly.

So I think the Senator from Michigan was quite correct in his statement that Mr. Green stated that his object in having his name put in the resolution was to name those witnesses. Afterwards there was some colloquy which seemed to indicate that he might have something that he would testify to himself, beyond that, but he absolutely disavowed any accurate knowledge which would entitle him to be heard as a witness in any court.

If I may occupy the attention of the Senate for one moment, I joined in the report of the committee to refer this matter to the Attorney General and the Interstate Commerce Commission. My reason for doing so was a desire to be courteous to the Senator from Oregon, who had introduced the resolution and, at the same time, not to give the sanction of the Senate to any unjust or improper criticism either of the Department of Justice or of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which I think this resolution may be construed to make. The Senator from Oregon, I think, when he was before the committee, showed that he had not been treated with frankness by Mr. Green, the gentleman who had brought this resolution to his office. To recall his mind to the condition of things as it came before our committee, I desire to read what he himself said, at page 18 of the printed record, regarding the gentleman who was engineering the proposed investigation:

Senator LANE. I saw my distinguished friend, Mr. Green, and he said he would let me know in 10 minutes, and he also assured me, for your information, that your friend Lamar is not engineering the proposition at all.

On page 20 of the testimony, Mr. Green having appeared, Senator LIPPITT, to whom Senator LANE had spoken in calling him "your friend," in examining Mr. Green asked this question:

Senator LIPPITT. Have you consulted with Mr. Lamar within the last 10 minutes?
Mr. GREEN. I have met Mr. Lamar; yes, sir.
Senator LIPPITT. Within the last 10 minutes?
Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir.

And he goes on:

Senator LIPPITT. You are in close touch with him?
Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir; I am.
Senator LIPPITT. And it was at his instigation that you did this?
Mr. GREEN. No, sir.
Senator LIPPITT. How is it that you consulted him as to whether you should appear before this committee or not?
Mr. GREEN. I wanted to know just what a strategist would do. I am not a strategist.
Senator LIPPITT. Did you consult anybody besides Mr. Lamar within the last 10 minutes?
Mr. GREEN. No, sir; I was consulting him as a strategist, not as an interested party.

That was immediately following the statement by the Senator from Oregon that Mr. Green had informed him that Mr. Lamar was not engineering this resolution.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Certainly.

Mr. BRYAN. I call the attention of the Senator to a further statement made by Mr. Green in response to some questions put to him by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], found on page 33 of the report of the committee:

Senator TOWNSEND. Would you be willing to testify if you had your attorney or Mr. Lamar in here with you?
Mr. GREEN. I have not given Mr. Lamar that designation yet.
Senator TOWNSEND. He is the man you consult with. I ask you now, would you be willing to testify if he were in here to advise you?
Mr. GREEN. I do not know, Senator. Mr. Lamar has not got any authority to release those gentlemen.
Senator TOWNSEND. I am talking about your own testimony now.
Mr. GREEN. Yes; I think I would.
Senator TOWNSEND. You think you would?
Mr. GREEN. I think I would, Senator.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am obliged to the Senator for calling my attention to that testimony. That was the purport of all the testimony before the committee.

The gentleman whose name was put in the resolution seemed to me to be an entirely honest man, but he was probably an enthusiastic follower of trusts and corporations. I myself do not believe it probable that there can be enough made by the Government out of this inquiry to pay for printing the resolutions which we have been considering for so many days; but out of courtesy to the Senator from Oregon we thought this was the proper course to pursue in regard to resolutions of this kind. The matter being under investigation by both the Attorney General's office and the Interstate Commerce Commission, we thought we would simply refer the whole matter to the Department of Justice and to this body, which is charged with both the investigation of matters of this character and the enforcement of the law.

These gentlemen are unwilling, as they have stated through Mr. Green, to give us the names of the witnesses; and Mr. Green also expressly stated, at page 21, in the following terms, that he was unwilling even to tell the committee why he wanted an open hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] asked him:

Why do you want an open hearing by the Interstate Commerce Commission?
Mr. GREEN. Well, I have my own reasons for that.

I do not think it comports with the dignity of this body to give its backing, as it is sought to have it do, to any such resolution as this. I shall certainly vote for the amendment proposed by the committee, and then for the adoption of the resolution. Otherwise I think I should vote against the resolution.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I think on page 34 the whole attitude of this witness is disclosed; and possibly, after hearing this, the Senate will draw its own inference as to his attitude throughout his whole testimony.

He was asked this question by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND]:

Senator TOWNSEND. Mr. Green, have you in your mind that this committee is hostile to the disclosing of the facts?
Mr. GREEN. No, sir; but I mean this: That this committee calculates to squeeze everything out of me, irrespective of whether I am permitted to give it. I say, the only purpose I have got to do is to

put this out, and yet this matter is put to me in such shape that I can not give it out that way.

In other words, he did not propose to allow that body—the Interstate Commerce Committee—to squeeze out of him certain testimony that he thought it would be the proper thing to give out elsewhere, and he just wanted authority from Congress to give it out according to the strategists at another place.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I wish to refer to exactly what was said in reference to making this a Democratic measure. I wish what I am to say here now to stand as a correction of anything I may have said if it was contrary to this, for I had not seen this report and spoke from memory.

On page 23 of the record this colloquy occurred:

Senator TOWNSEND. Did you tell Senator NORRIS and the Secretary of State any more than you have told us and Senator LANE?
Mr. GREEN. I told Senator NORRIS more; yes.
Senator ROBINSON. Did you ask Senator NORRIS to introduce this resolution?
Mr. GREEN. No, sir.
Senator ROBINSON. Why did you not do that?
Mr. GREEN. Because he was a Republican.
Senator ROBINSON. You did not want to ask any Republican to introduce the resolution?
Mr. GREEN. I did not think it was the best strategy; no.

Also permit me to give the testimony of Mr. Green as to his personal knowledge of the matters he desired to be called as a witness to give testimony.

On pages 19 and 20 is the foundation for my statement that the witness said he knew nothing about the facts in the case. I quote first from the top of page 19:

The CHAIRMAN. How is it with reference to yourself? Have you any knowledge of these facts?
Mr. GREEN. Just the knowledge that I get from hearing them.
Senator THOMPSON. You have no personal knowledge, then?
Mr. GREEN. No, sir; no personal knowledge.

And again from the bottom of page 20:

Senator TOWNSEND. All you know about this is what somebody has told you?
Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir. I did not receive any of these rebates.

Mr. LANE. That is right. He said he did not receive any of the rebates. Now, Mr. President, that opens up the subject again.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question or two.

It appears from the report of the committee that there was a hearing held by the committee the proceedings of which were not taken down by a stenographer. I notice on page 16 a statement made by Senator LIPPITT, as follows:

I want to say for the benefit of one or two Senators who were not here—Senator CLAPP and, I think, Senator OLIVER—that the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in his testimony the other day, said that Mr. Green had not appeared before his commission; that a short time ago Mr. Lamar, who was familiarly known as the "Wolf of Wall Street," did appear and came to them with some sort of similar testimony, and that the character of the man and the character of the testimony was such that the Interstate Commerce Commission felt that it was not a matter that they wanted to go into on account of the associations of Mr. Lamar with Wall Street tactics, in the bulling and bearing of stock.

Now, I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan one or two questions.

Did the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission appear before the committee?

Mr. TOWNSEND. He did.

Mr. BRYAN. Was the Senator from Michigan there when he made that statement?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I was.

Mr. BRYAN. Is it not a fact that the whole record taken together shows that this resolution was fathered by Mr. Lamar, to whom the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission referred?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It was drawn by Mr. Schulteis, according to Mr. Green; but the only man whom it was found necessary for Mr. Green to consult—the only man who was a member of the "board of strategy" which was controlling this matter—was Mr. Lamar.

Mr. BRYAN. And Mr. Green said that this strategist, Mr. Lamar, had no confidence in the committee.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do.

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator will permit me, I wish to state that there was no stenographer present at the first hearing, at which the Assistant Attorney General and the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission were heard. My recollection of the statement of the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission is not that the suggestion of Mr. Lamar was rejected simply because of the general associations of Mr. Lamar, but that his proposal was rejected because it involved the condition imposed by Mr. Lamar that the commission should allow him to designate the attorney who was to conduct the investigation, and the commission thought that was not a proper thing to do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is my understanding of the testimony.

Mr. BORAH. Before the Senator from Michigan takes his seat, in view of what the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN] has just said as to the testimony or statement of the member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the effect that they had investigated this matter and did not desire to take it up and were not prepared to indorse it, I ask again, as I asked yesterday, why do the idle thing I referred to? Why send this resolution which we do not pass but merely refer it without any suggestion whatever?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I did not understand the Senator from Florida in his question to ask me if the commission had investigated this particular question. Mr. Clark testified, my understanding of it is, that he could not say whether the question here involved had been investigated or not. Neither could anybody, because the witness himself said that he did not know just exactly what questions were involved in some matters heretofore investigated, or what they were; only it was his understanding that they had not been presented to the commission. But there was no way for the commission to answer our question. We could not ask intelligent questions on that subject, because there was nothing to ask about.

This was a sort of blanket charge, but the commission said that in a similar matter involving rebates this man Lamar had been to them and suggested that certain things could be done if Lamar was permitted to name his attorney to make the investigation.

Mr. BORAH. Now, if Mr. Lamar went to the Interstate Commerce Commission and advised them of the condition of affairs, in which he said he would like to name the attorney, that would not hinder the Interstate Commerce Commission from proceeding without permitting him to name the attorney.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Not a bit.

Mr. SAULSBURY. If the Senator will permit me, I think I can recall the statement of the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I would like to have it confirmed by Members who were present, but I think I recall the statement of the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission before our committee. It was that, immediately when this resolution was introduced, when the name of William H. Green, of Creighton, Nebr., was mentioned, the commission had instructed an agent of theirs, who happened to be at Omaha or somewhere in Nebraska, to call at Creighton, Nebr., and interview Mr. William H. Green as to what information he had on this subject.

I only mention this as showing the entire willingness of the commission to investigate every subject connected with rebates of this character or in any way connected with the investigation which is pending in regard to the Steel Trust, thus showing to the Senator from Idaho that there was no disinclination on the part of the commission to ascertain any facts. They might, of course, disregard the statements of unreliable witnesses, and probably should do so, but when anything is given to them they will doubtless investigate it. In this case, according to my recollection—and the chairman of the committee confirms that recollection—they had an agent call at Creighton, Nebr., on Mr. Green and try to get the information he had.

Mr. BORAH. I did not ask the question with a view of reflecting on the Interstate Commerce Commission, but rather for the purpose of disclosing the utter uselessness of sending it back to them in this form or manner.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I quite agree with the Senator in that respect. I think I suggested, when the matter was up originally, that all Mr. Green had to do was to go to the commission and this whole matter would be investigated. Mr. Clark stated before the committee that if they could get the facts it would not require any resolution of Congress to induce action on the part of the commission, for they wanted the facts. But I remember the Senator from Idaho suggested that it would go with greater force, possibly operate more strongly upon them, if the Senate called their attention to it.

So, while I did not support this report as it comes here, I wanted more facts by the committee, and if we were not going to have any more facts I wanted to report it adversely, because of what had been disclosed. And yet I can see that the reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission may induce Mr. Green himself to go before the commission, or they may call him before them as they are trying to get him, and he may disclose the names of some of the witnesses so that they can

examine those witnesses and find if there is any foundation for the implied charges made by Mr. Green.

Mr. BORAH. Do I understand the Senator to say that the Interstate Commerce Commission is trying to get Mr. Green before them?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It ordered its representative to stop off in Creighton, Nebr., to see him. We were informed, or at least we understood, that the witness was in the city, but we could not locate him until the Senator from Oregon told us he was in his office.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I should like to give a brief history of this resolution and call attention to a number of things connected with it which have attracted my attention.

I brought the resolution here in the manner in which I have related on a number of occasions. Mr. Green is the man who asked me to present it. He stated that he was in possession of and had access to facts which would prove that the Steel Corporation had illegitimately robbed the people of this country out of $75,000,000 or thereabouts; that there was a suit pending now for the dissolution of that trust in which these facts had not been alleged, and if they were not presented speedily and promptly and in a manner which would attract the attention of the Department of Justice to them the people of this country would lose a large sum of money; that the manner of securing these rebates was unfair to the people of the country; and that as a representative of the people of the country he thought it was my duty, if on taking it up I found him to be a reputable man, making a statement in good faith, to present the matter to the Senate and secure their assistance, if I could, in having this nefarious method of doing business discontinued.

I took that view of it. He referred me to the Secretary of State as being a man of his acquaintance. Mr. Bryan by telephone informed me that Mr. Green's reputation as an honorable man was good. I called on Senator HITCHCOCK, and he stated that as far as he knew the reputation of Mr. Green was that of an absolutely honest man. Senator NORRIS told me the same. I found that the man had been interested at one time in the investigation of the Harvester Trust, and had rendered the Government aid there; that he assisted in breaking up that combination, which was an illegal one and was preying upon the people of this country.

I found he had been a member of the convention which nominated Mr. Wilson. He had more indorsements and more laurels attached to him than the majority of the members of this body. He had better recommendations that many of us could procure. I saw no reason to question him, and I thought the simplest way was to present the resolution. I brought it here in good faith. I saw no reason for questioning him further.

Mr. TOWNSEND. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. LANE. You may; but when I become real eloquent I dislike to be interrupted.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I notice the Senator did not want to interrupt others, and I will not interrupt him.

Mr. LANE. Go ahead. That was a pleasantry.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; all right.

Mr. LANE. So I presented this resolution here in good faith under the assumption that it was simply a proposition purely within the function and right and power of the Interstate Commerce Commission to handle the question.

In connection with the criminal side of it, I have not given much thought. I thought that, if the facts exist, here is a commission in whom the people of this country have great confidence. They do have great confidence in the commission; there is no doubt of that; and in a few minutes or a few hours I was assured that they would be able to determine whether there was anything in it or not, and if it was a baseless charge, they would dismiss it; and if they found that the facts justified it, they could report either back here or to the Department of Justice and the thing would be in course of a proper and just adjudication.

So I brought the resolution in here, as I thought the simplest way was by presenting a resolution. Then the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of this body developed a desire to get it into his committee and secure possession of it by having it referred to that committee. I did not want it before his committee. I said to him that the reason why I did not want it was that there was too much delay attached to our proceedings in committee, and I did not like that method.

I am frank to say, with all due respect to the chairman, I do not like it at all. I do not think it is fair. I do not think we are doing our duty. We are merely the servants of the people and I do not think we have a right to lock them away from us. I feared, I confess, that behind locked doors would go this resolution, that there would be a preliminary trial of it there, and that is exactly what I did not want.

Now, Mr. Green in his evidence before the committee said the reason why he did not testify before that committee was that he wanted to get it before the commission in an open hearing; what he asked was that it might be tried before a jury of the whole people of this country and not in secret. Now, then, despite my protest——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understood the Senator from Oregon to state that the hearings were held with locked doors.

Mr. LANE. I have not said that; I have not come to that. I ask the Senator to be patient.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I was told by one of my associates that the Senator made that statement.

Mr. LANE. I will make that assertion, and I will make it so that the Senator will have no doubt about what I say.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to correct that statement at the proper time.

Mr. LANE. The Senator will have the opportunity.

Now, then, I offered the resolution. We had our battle here on the floor, and I lost out. It was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I do not know what afterwards happened exactly in sequence. The next thing I remember about it I had a telephone message that the Interstate Commerce Committee was in session and were considering the subject, and I was requested to present myself. I am located on the third floor of the Senate Office Building, down a long corridor. Down the marble hall, at the near end of it, there are large double folding doors, about the size of those of this Chamber, and on those doors was painted in gold letters "Interstate Commerce." It does not say anything about committee. I assumed that that was the room. I tried to get in at the door. I tried the door knob, first one way and then the other, but it would not work; it was stubborn. Then I wandered down to the corner and came to another hospitable-looking double door. I tried that, and it was also locked tight as a drum. Then I went back and tried the other one. Then I began to get a little out of temper. A man came along, wheeling a gocart with a lot of mail. He was delivering mail. I said, "How can I get in here? Is this the Interstate Commerce Committee?" He said, "I do not know." I thought that almost anybody who delivered the mail around there ought to know the room. Another man came along, and I said as much to him. He said, "I think perhaps if you go down there and try that side door you can get in." I went to the side door, and that proved to be true. It was smaller than the other door and not so hospitable in appearance. But, still, I got in at that door and found a small room, and on passing through it I reached the committee room, and there sat the distinguished gentlemen of the committee behind locked doors. They were behind locked doors, and one had to go around and work his way through a labyrinth into it. It is a large room, with the doorframes decorated on the side with gingerbread strips of carved marble, and is about the size of the Marble Room, and is most beautiful. You could hold a ball in it.

My experience put me out of humor. I was sorry that I had gone to the committee at all. I would have kicked in that double door if I had been sure that I would have arrived in the right room after doing so and have taken the chances of getting licked for it.

Anyhow, there they were. It is said that they had no reporter. There were two distinguished gentlemen present, one of whom I was introduced to as an assistant in the Department of Justice, and the other was the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Mr. Clark. They had had some conversation before I arrived there with the Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. LANE. Very well.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I will state, Mr. President, that the rooms of the Interstate Commerce Committee are three in number, and that the entrance is through the middle room, my own private room being at one side and the committee room, a very large room, on the other side.

Mr. LANE. I will ask the Senator on which door is the sign which indicates the committee?

Mr. NEWLANDS. There are signs, I believe, on all the doors. It is true that the doors of the larger room, in which the committee sat, were closed, and when the Senator appeared

he called attention to the fact that the doors were closed—locked, as he termed it.

Mr. LANE. They were locked.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I inquired then of the clerk of the committee why the doors were locked, and he informed me that the guides of the Capitol were in the custom of going into this room as one of the show rooms of the Senate Office Building, and that he had locked the doors in order to secure privacy. I immediately ordered the doors to be opened, and so informed the Senator from Oregon, and thereafter the doors were open continuously.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, that may be. They were not in the habit of being open before that.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to say that this was at the very commencement of the hearings.

Mr. LANE. Not quite.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Not quite, but very near.

Mr. LANE. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that he has no other signs on his doors but the one. I will ask him to look when he goes back. I do not think he can be very familiar with his rooms. He will find no signs painted "Interstate Commerce" except upon one door, and on the door of the room through which one enters is his name in small letters, and it is dark there and it is very hard to see them. They are not easily read; they are not like the good old gold-lettered sign which you see so plainly over the door that was locked, as I say, tight as a drum, and through which you could not enter.

I first tried that door and still another and then I found the one that was unlocked. I find he has a double-headed committee and there are two sources of information. In wandering down through the depths of the Capitol Building I came across another set of rooms with double doors with "Interstate Commerce" painted upon them. I ask the Senator if he has rooms here, too? I should like to know. I did not go in, but I am informed that they are very fine rooms. So it is a sort of game of hide and seek as to where to find the committee to begin with, and when I did find it, as I said, it was behind locked doors, and that irritated me and I did not like it. I did not think it was proper. I think the doors should be wide open, and when these hearings take place, hearings of a nature which involve matters of most serious import to the people of this country, the doors should be kept open, and the public should be invited there.

The witness who came before the committee was embarrassed before this committee. He was overawed. He did not use the expression, but looked as if he felt like a stray cat in a strange garret. He said, "Now, gentlemen, I realize that I am up against the greatest brains of the country"—the room is rather dark in the corner where the committee sits—"and I am only just a 'rube,'" and he repeated a number of times that he was overwhelmed to find himself in the presence of such distinguished gentlemen.

I will state further that I am informed by the chairman that that hearing was informal. The proceedings were not public. A part of the formal proceedings are here in good legible type, but a part of them are left out. It is formal all right in some respects and informal in others. It gives full acount of that part of the seance in which the "Wolf of Wall Street" casts his shadow over the happiness of the committee, but it does not come out on the first page with the statement of the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which was that this was a subject which was entirely within the scope and the power of the commission; that they had full power to consider and act upon it; that they would be willing to do so, and would gladly do so if it were presented to them. So, you see, here was an easy way out of this difficulty. I did not want this matter considered in a preliminary trial by the committee and then afterwards be considered in executive session in order to decide what should be done with this matter of great public importance. I wanted it to be considered publicly where I could see what was going on. The chairman of the commission said he would take it, and I asked that he have it.

When this man had been certified to me by such eminent gentlemen, it would have been an insult to them had I refused to believe that he was a good man and a true man, whose testimony was worthy of hearing by the commission. I think he is all right; but, as I have said, he was overawed when he came in there and they put him on the grill. That was at the third meeting—the meeting where they had an official committee stenographer present.

By the way, before we go farther I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that before I called his attention and the committee's attention—and there are some of its members here—to the fact that they were sitting behind closed doors considering this question of great and paramount importance there had been other men trying that door after I had failed to get in, for I stood close to it, down at the end of the table, and I heard them, but they could not get in. That is the reason why I called your attention to it—for the reason that, after I failed to get into your committee room, others were trying your doors and they could not get in. Then you asked your clerk—or instructed him—to unlock the door; but he did not open it. No one else came around. I do not think people are in the habit of getting in at that door. There are not many visitors.

The witness whom I offered to present said, upon further inquiry, that he did have knowledge of facts concerning rebates. He said that specifically, although that statement of his is at all times overlooked by those opposing this resolution. His first statement, which he corrected afterwards, is the one which has been played up in the discussion which has taken place upon this subject.

If you will read the testimony, you will find that there was almost no interest evinced in regard to the great matter of the wrong which had been done to the people of this country; that the great Steel Trust and its methods were matters in regard to which little curiosity was evinced; but there was a search all down the line of the testimony of this witness as to what he knew, what other witnesses there might be whom he could bring to prove his assertions, and inquiries into his character and what influence the "Wolf of Wall Street" had upon the matter. You will find but little regard paid to the conduct of these other wolves who in one year steal more money than the "Wolf of Wall Street" could pick up in a hundred years, and who have robbed the people of this country each and every year—indeed, if the truth about them is told, if the information which I have received from many reputable quarters is true, they have robbed the people of this country of more in one year than all the yeggmen and highway robbers take out of the people in a century. There was but little interest in that. I resented the attitude of the committee in that respect. The only information that committee should have desired to ascertain was, Is this a reputable and honest witness; does he think he tells the truth? If so, then it is our duty to help him, not to badger him and to cause him unnecessary embarrassment. Read the testimony. The "Wolf of Wall Street," Lamar, is no doubt nosing about this affair. It is a gigantic one; but here is a direct, specific charge, and it is for you, the servants of the people, to deal with it as you please. It is a charge that a corporation, the largest in existence in this country, has been systematically robbing the people of this country of millions upon millions of dollars by nefarious and thieving processes, and here we are fiddling away day by day, fearing that the "Wolf of Wall Street" will upset us in some way if he has anything to do with it; we are mincing along with it in the fear that we may do something which will not balance with the traditions of this body and in some way compromise ourselves, instead of going directly at the matter and putting it before the Interstate Commerce Commission and letting them settle in three hours, as they will, whether or not the allegations made are true or not.

I am assured by other persons, whom I know personally, who do not know either Mr. Green or the "Wolf of Wall Street," who never saw either one of them, that these conditions do exist. There was a man who came to my office since this matter came up, the publicity given it having attracted his attention, who assured me that a committee had been sent out from the Pacific coast to consult the head of the Steel Trust in an effort to secure lower rates upon the structural building material upon which the railroads had refused to give a rate. They were told by the railway companies' agents that that matter was in the hands of the Steel Trust, and that they would have to go there for relief. When they came here the boon was denied them by the Steel Trust. This man also told me that not 1 pound of structural steel coming from their mills is allowed to go over any route except that which the Steel Trust designates. The man Green may be an infernal liar. I do not think he is; I think he has stated the truth; but since this investigation started, since they have been taking up our time upon this resolution which I introduced here, a statement has been published in the papers of this city and in papers all over the United States, to the effect that the Interstate Commerce Commission has detected one of the subsidiary companies of this great trust accepting rebates to the tune of millions and millions of dollars. That corroborates what the man Green says. The "Wolf of Wall Street" apparently had nothing to do with that. Whether he had or not, if the statements are true, I do not see what difference it makes whether or not he had any connection with the matter.

As I said the other day, if he could wolf Wall Street he has been wolfing among wolves. If stocks went down, that would not be a greater crime than it is to keep the price of stocks up by means of rebates and other evil practices; it would not be as great a crime as these other criminals are committing. It seems to be a question, according to some, the solution of which depends upon the "Wolf of Wall Street." The theory is held by many others that it is very hard to get justice from the hands of the large corporations, and that it is hard work to get this Government to act in behalf of the people.

A short time ago there died one of the greatest financiers of the country, who is said to have dug the entrails out of the New Haven Railroad system. Talk about "wolfing Wall Street"! The process of wolfing had been practiced on the people of New England, widows, orphans, and trust funds, to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars by the largest firm of financiers in this country, that of the late lamented J. P. Morgan, who is said to have manipulated that affair. Those affairs, if the truth be told, are absolutely as criminal and as barefaced thefts as were ever practiced on a community, yet he is reported to have said before he died that he relied upon, and that his great desire was to have his son continue to disseminate, the doctrine of salvation and the washing away of sins through the blood of the blessed Redeemer; and then he reached down in his hip pocket and pulled out a harp and lit out for the gates of Paradise, where I suspect St. Peter reached behind a post and met him with a baseball bat.

Now, as I have said, this is a simple proposition, and it is a fair one. I am not in any wise—and Mr. Green assures me that he is not—depending upon the "Wolf of Wall Street," Mr. Lamar. You can put that theory to one side. I believe if you ever allow him to appear before the Interstate Commerce Commission to present in open daylight and before the public the facts which he will produce in relation to the statement which he has made, that this company is guilty of this crime, that he will prove it, and the "Wolf of Wall Street" will stop him not one whit, nor will he help him. I hold no brief for him; I care no more for him than you do. It is a question independent and outside of him; but I do not want this investigation concealed or knocked out on the assumption that that is the crux of the situation.

Now, then, I am going to say one more unpleasant thing, and then stop. Here is your report that you have put in and have been quoting—your report of your proceedings, doctored—a doctored report, played up as to some facts and others minimized; some interrogatories kept out of it entirely. What, the "Wolf of Wall Street"! Yes. If you are going to put in a report to the Senate, put it in full and complete. I challenge it; I challenge it——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

Mr. LANE. I claim that it does not present all the facts. How far it is lacking, I do not know; but, to a certain extent, I do know and allege——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

Mr. LANE. Just a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair——

Mr. LANE. Just a moment. It may be—I am willing to concede it——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. LANE. I do not want to do so at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will be compelled to enforce the rule against charging Senators with improper conduct. That may not and must not proceed in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. LANE. I was stopped before I finished my sentence.

Mr. LODGE. I rise to a question of order. A distinct charge has just been made here that a committee, or members of a committee, or the chairman of a committee, have tampered with a stenographic report; that questions have been taken from it. Now, Mr. President, all the rest of this stuff about locked doors is not worthy of anybody's attention, but that is a serious charge, which ought not to be made.

Mr. LANE. Will you allow me——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is insisting that charges of bad faith and dishonesty may not proceed in the Senate of the United States——

Mr. LANE. I withdraw that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. While the present occupant of the chair is in it.

Mr. LANE. Then I withdraw that. I do not wish to do anything that is unparliamentary, and I do not wish to make any reflections. I was going to qualify that statement by saying that it might have been done by error, but there are questions which were asked that do not appear in this record.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I make the point that the Chair having called the Senator to order, he must take his seat under the rules until the Senate permits him to proceed.

Mr. LANE. I will sit down.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I ask for the reading of the Reporter's notes as to what the Senator from Oregon did say. I understood him to say that certain features of the report had been "played up" and certain features minimized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Reporter will read from his notes.

The Reporter read as follows:

Now, then, I am going to say one more unpleasant thing and then stop. Here is your report that you have put in and have been quoting—your report of your proceedings, doctored—a doctored report, played up as to some facts and others minimized; some interrogatories kept out of it entirely. What, the "Wolf of Wall Street"! Yes; if you are going to put in a report to the Senate, put it in full and complete. I challenge it; I challenge it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington will state it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I observe from hearing the language used by the Senator from Oregon read by the Reporter that there is no charge contained in it against any Senator.

Mr. LODGE. It is against the committee; against the whole body of the committee.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator will pardon me for just a moment until I complete what I have to say. The Senator from Oregon did charge that the report was not a correct report, and, apparently, impliedly charged that it was intentionally not correct.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to make the point of order that debate is out of order. I call the attention of the Chair to Rule XIX, section 2 and section 4, on page 19 of the Manual.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is not any question of doubt about what the rule is.

No Senator in debate shall, directly or indirectly, by any form of words, impute to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

The charge is directly as to the report of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, whom the Chair knows are Senators of the United States of America, and when the rule is transgressed it is the duty of the Presiding Officer to call the Senators so transgressing to order, and, when called to order, he is required to sit down and not proceed without leave of the Senate and until it is granted.

Mr. POINDEXTER and Mr. HUGHES addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Proceeding with the parliamentary inquiry which I was addressing to the Chair, I desire to inquire whether the Senate has not the right to hear discussed in the Senate, and to inquire, for the purpose of informing itself, whether or not the report of proceedings had before a committee is a correct report of what proceedings were actually had. Is there anything in the rules of the Senate which forbids such an inquiry? If there is anything in the rules which forbids it, I am unaware of it; and if so, it would be a very unfortunate situation that the Senate could not inquire into the truth of proceedings reported to it.

I do not question the ruling of the Chair upon the other matter, as to the prohibition of impugning the conduct of Senators; but the inquiry which I am now making has no relation whatever to any charge of misconduct made against any Senator, but it is as to whether or not, when the statement is made in the Senate that a report which we are considering is not a correct report, if we have not the power to inquire into the truth or falsity of that assertion? If we have not that power, we ought to have it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to ask the Senator to permit the Reporter to read the language of the Senator from Oregon. There was so much confusion in the Chamber that we could not hear it over here.

Mr. JAMES. I move that the Senator from Oregon be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I insist that the notes be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi has the right to hear the language. The Reporter will again read.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the Senator from Washington yield before the notes are read?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Let the notes be read.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think in the interest of orderly procedure——

Mr. HUGHES. I simply wanted to ask the Senator if he would yield the floor for the purpose of having the motion put that is suggested by the Senator from Kentucky, and then the language can be read.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I insist on the reading of the language.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator that the language can be read on that motion.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Let it be read first.

Mr. HUGHES. Then the whole question would come before the Senate as to whether or not the Senate would permit the Senator from Oregon to proceed in order.

Mr. JAMES. The only motion that was in order after the Senator from Oregon was called to order was a motion that he should be permitted to proceed in order.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I insist that we have a right to have read the language used by the Senator from Oregon. It has been read, but there was so much confusion in the Chamber at the time that the Senators in this part of the Chamber did not hear it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Reporter will again read the language.

The Reporter read as follows:

Now, then, I am going to say one more unpleasant thing and then stop. Here is your report that you have put in and have been quoting—your report of your proceedings doctored—a doctored report, played up as to some facts and others minimized; some interrogatories kept out of it entirely. What, the "Wolf of Wall Street"? Yes; if you are going to put in a report to the Senate, put it in full and complete. I challenge it; I challenge it.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I insist that the motion I made is the proper order of the Senate.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I decline to yield to the Senator, for the moment, for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington is entitled to the floor.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I desire to insist upon my parliamentary inquiry as to the limits of debate upon an assertion made that a report which we are considering is not a correct report. That question is entirely dissociated from the question of privilege, that no Senator——

Mr. LODGE. I rise to a point of order. I ask the Chair to rule whether this is a parliamentary inquiry which is now being made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that it is not a parliamentary inquiry. When the question comes before the Chair, the Chair will rule on it; but the Chair refuses to inject into the RECORD an obiter dictum.

Mr. JAMES. Then, I move that the Senator from Oregon be allowed to proceed in order.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will proceed.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senate that I do not wish to cast any reflections upon it as a body, nor do I desire to do it an injustice in any way. I may make mistakes; if I do, I will make amends conscientiously.

As I was saying—and I had about finished—the people of this country will not prosper by the enactment of modified laws dealing with the tariff, with the currency, nor will they succeed——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LANE. Yes.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to understand from the Senator from Oregon whether he withdraws the charge which he has made, that this report is a "doctored" report.

Mr. LANE. A doctored report?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Yes.

Mr. LANE. Yes; I am willing to leave that out. Yes; I will withdraw that term "doctored."

I should like to ask a question for information. If there was evidence given there which I heard and it does not appear—questions asked by the chairman—am I allowed to call attention to that without insult to the committee? Is that a breach?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I could not hear what the Senator said.

Mr. LANE. I say if there were questions asked witnesses there which were not printed in that report, am I not allowed to call attention to them?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. And if there was evidence given there before that committee informally which was left out of your statement, your edited statement, your preface, am I not allowed to call attention to that without getting in contempt of this body?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. Then what shall I call it? What is the term by which it should be characterized?

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Senator could certainly make a statement regarding this matter that would be a truthful one and a candid one without impugning the action or the motives of his brother Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is not any doubt about that.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The fact was that on the first day of the meeting of the committee upon this subject there was no stenographer present. I had sent notice to the Attorney General, the Chief of the Bureau of Corporations, and the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, asking them to appear before our committee with a view to ascertaining whether any action was pending in either one of those bureaus or departments relating to this subject matter; and an invitation was also extended to the Senator from Oregon to be present. We had no idea at that time as to whether there would be any necessity for taking any testimony or having any stenographer present, and statements were made by the Senator from Oregon and by these officials or their representatives which were not taken down by a stenographer; so, of course, in annexing the stenographic report to this report, we were able to give practically only the hearing of Mr. Green, all of which was taken down, and all of which was presented.

Those are the facts. If the Senator wishes to state anything that occurred at the hearing when the stenographer was not there, he is at liberty to do so. Possibly Members who were there may differ as to the exact language that was used, but I am sure there will be no material difference between any who were there as to what took place and as to what was said.

As to the hearings, as I have already stated, there are three rooms assigned to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, of which the central room is the entrance, though there are signs upon the other rooms. The doors of the very large room, in which the committee meetings are held, are generally open. The Senator from Oregon tested one of those doors, instead of the main entrance, and found it locked, and called attention to it as soon as or shortly after he entered the room. I immediately inquired of the clerk as to what was the cause of the locking of the door. I was unconscious that it had been locked. He informed me that it was the custom of the Capitol guides to bring crowds of sight-seers into the large committee room, and that he had locked the outer doors of this room, not locking the main entrance of the suite, with a view to securing privacy for the hearing. I immediately gave him orders to have them opened, and the substantial part of the hearing was held with open doors immediately after the Senator from Oregon called attention to the fact that the doors were locked.

Mr. SAULSBURY. And nobody came in.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And nobody came in that I can recall.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President——

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. SHIVELY. I wish to ask whether there is any question of their being a full and complete report here of the hearings when there was a stenographer present?

Mr. LANE. There is a matter which I consider of great importance, and I presume most of you do not, yet it is one which I think is of prime importance to the people of this country, and that is that they shall have access to and full knowledge of the manner in which their business affairs are carried on. I feel that we are the servants of the people and our first duty is to them, and that in dealing with their affairs we should deal with them openly and not go behind closed doors into executive sessions and bar them out. I am further of the opinion——

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President——

Mr. LANE. Just a moment, and I will be through. It will not take me a minute more.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I should like to ask a question right there, if I may.

Mr. LANE. Yes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am very much interested in this matter. While I knew nothing about the report, I should like the Senator to answer directly, if he can, whether the report as printed does not contain all that was taken down by the stenographer?

Mr. LANE. I was just going to come to that point, Mr. President. I was leading right up to that.

I claim, and I hold the opinion and the fixed belief, that no good, or not much good, would be accomplished for the benefit of the people of this country until that system is adopted.

When I went to the committee room, the main door of that committee room, which has the sign upon it—if that is any indication of the main door—a double door, with the sign upon it which says "Interstate Commerce"—was locked. I tried it on two different occasions. I heard others try it. I heard them fumbling with the door knob when I was inside the room. Then, afterwards, during the queries which were being made, when an official stenographer was taking this testimony, the chairman of the committee said to the witness, "You see, now, that you are having a full, free, and open public hearing, that the doors are open"; and I called attention to the fact that there was not a soul in there but the committee, and that an "open public hearing," so far as public access to it was concerned, did not exist. Do you remember that, or something like that?

That is not in here. I consider that important. Why that query should be left out and the other left in is a thing I did not understand; nor did I understand why, on the other side of it, in the preface, which is the report, a part of the proceedings which they say were informal should be given space, and the very most essential statement coming from the Interstate Commerce Committee, in my opinion, should be left out.

That was the reason. Out of respect for the Senate I want to withdraw anything reflecting upon it, and I will withdraw that language. I wish to say, however, that in my opinion the report is inaccurate. I believe it to be inaccurate. I did not like it, and I do not like it, and there is nobody going to make me say I do if I can help it.

I do not want to have my language unparliamentary, nor to have it do injustice to anyone; but I expect to get fair treatment, and I think I am entitled to it. I do not want to say anything harsh or offensive; but I want to insist that this report does not present the proceedings in the manner in which I consider they should be presented in fairness.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I should like to ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat. Has the Senator investigated the stenographic report and compared it with the printed report here?

Mr. LANE. What does the Senator mean by that?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I mean the notes taken down by the stenographer of those hearings.

Mr. LANE. No.

Mr. TOWNSEND. They must be in existence.

Mr. LANE. I do not know anything about them. I have never seen them. The Senator refers to the manuscript, does he?

Mr. LODGE. The original stenographic notes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The original stenographic notes would show whether or not there has been any change in the printed report. I was wondering if the Senator had made a comparison of them.

Mr. LANE. I do not read shorthand. I have not seen them.

Mr. BRISTOW. As I understand, the Senator from Oregon complains that at one time during the proceedings, when a stenographer was present and taking the testimony, he suggested that the doors ought to be opened and complained because there was not sufficient publicity, and that his suggestion and the replies thereto did not appear in the record of the proceedings of the committee. Is that correct?

Mr. LANE. No; that is not it. I referred to the question which was asked, or the assertion which was made, by the chairman of the committee to the witness, that "Here you have a full and open hearing; the doors are unlocked"; and it struck me as being funny and ridiculous for the reason that the doors were closed, and that there was not a soul there outside of the committee and the witness. That kind of a "public hearing," and an assertion that that was a public hearing, struck me as being funny and I mentioned it. I made sarcastic comments upon it that were cut out.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator if, at the time when he made these observations and the chairman responded, there was a stenographer present and taking the testimony?

Mr. LANE. That is what I am assured by the chairman of the committee. Yes; it was the day when these official hearings were held, and the stenographer was there when the witness Green was upon the stand as a witness.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I do not know much about this resolution. The principal objection that seems to be urged against any investigation is that the complaints emanate from a scoundrel by the name of Lamar, and that, he being a scoundrel, anything he might say should not be given any consideration.

I do not know whether Lamar is a scoundrel or not. I have the impression that he is from what I have read about him, but if he has any information relating to violation of the laws by the Steel Trust his character should not be any bar against any investigation of the information that may come from him.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator whether he thinks it was the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to comply with Mr. Lamar's proposition, which struck them as a corrupt proposition?

Mr. BRISTOW. If Mr. Lamar has made a corrupt proposition to the Interstate Commerce Commission, if it is a proposition in violation of law, he ought to be prosecuted for it.

Mr. LODGE. He said he would furnish the information, but he required to be allowed to name his attorney as the attorney for the commission.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes. I take it for granted that such a proposition would not receive any respectful consideration from any member of the Interstate Commerce Commission or any other officer of the United States Government who had any character, because certainly they would not let Lamar select the prosecuting officers for anybody.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand, unless he got his terms he would not furnish his information.

Mr. BRISTOW. That may be true; but if he has any information, he can be compelled to furnish it, and it is for us to decide whether or not that information is worth anything.

Mr. LODGE. Then let us take a vote right off and decide it.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 7951) to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside that the matter before the Senate may be completed.

Mr. LODGE. Let us vote and finish it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Georgia ask that it be temporarily laid aside?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask that it be temporarily laid aside, in order that we may reach, if possible, a vote upon the matter before the Senate.

Mr. CUMMINS. I shall not object, but I am a great deal more interested in the agricultural bill than I am in the farce which is now going forward in the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. So am I.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President——

Mr. BRISTOW. I suppose the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT] is making a speech, though he has not addressed the Chair. He has said that he is tired of the Senate being dragged around here as the tool of a blackmailer. That may be true. It may be not just as inappropriate for the Senator from New York to make such remarks as it was for the Senator from Oregon to make the remark he made a short time ago, but we seem very tender when it comes to discussing the Steel Trust, the stock of which has gone up 10 per cent, $500,000,000 of which is water and represents not a dollar of invested capital. When that great corporation is under discussion here we examine with great care the witnesses who may be called against it to see whether or not they have a standing that is reputable.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Was the request that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside granted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been granted as yet.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then I object to the request.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. I regret that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW], casually overhearing, and without any fault or purpose on his part, a remark I made to the Senator from Iowa, should have seen fit to make it a matter of public discussion.

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Kansas is in the habit of doing those things. Personally I am tired of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Objection has been made to proceeding with this matter.

Mr. BORAH. If we are going to continue this discussion, we will all continue it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I objected to the request to lay the unfinished business aside. Let us have the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] as being entitled to the floor.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President——

Mr. NEWLANDS. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada for any question touching the bill that is now before the Senate.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas on the same condition.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to have the remark made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], which I did not distinctly hear, read from the Reporter's notes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I make the point of order that the request at this time is not in order. Many Senators are in a somewhat bad humor, and I think the best course is to go along with the regular order. I insist upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is whether the Senator from Iowa yields for that purpose to the Senator from Kansas or does not yield to him.

Mr. CUMMINS. For the purpose of having a remark made by the Senator from Missouri read, assuming that no discussion of the question will follow it, I have no objection to yield.

Mr. SHIVELY. Is that demanded as a question of personal privilege?

Mr. BRISTOW. My demand is as a question of personal privilege, if necessary.

Mr. NEWLANDS. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me——

Mr. CUMMINS. Let this matter be determined.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let one question be decided at a time.

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield for that purpose, but following it I will not yield for any discussion.

Mr. STONE. I hope the Senator will yield for a discussion and let us settle the whole thing now.

Mr. CUMMINS. If the Senator from Georgia desires to yield to the Senator from Kansas, I am willing.

Mr. STONE. I have gotten tired of this performance of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator yields for that purpose, he ought to yield for the purpose of a reply.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will Senators take their seats? The Senator from Iowa having yielded to the question of personal privilege, if the Reporter heard the language he will read it.

The Reporter read as follows:

Mr. STONE. The Senator from Kansas is in the habit of doing those things. Personally I am tired of it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope we may now turn from the resolution, which undoubtedly will be taken up again on Monday, to the bill under consideration.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I wish to make one statement in a single sentence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator to make the statement, but not for the purpose of discussion.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That is all. I am not sure whether the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] made a complete withdrawal of the charge that this report is doctored.

Mr. LANE. Yes, Mr. President; I wish to say that I withdrew that.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Very well; then I accept your withdrawal. I was about to state to the Senate that if a withdrawal was not made fully and completely I should ask for a committee of investigation.

Mr. LANE. I withdrew it.

COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION WORK.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7951) to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of an act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and of acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, one aspect of the comparison I made yesterday between Georgia and Iowa related to the size of the improved farms. When I examined the report of the Census Bureau I was surprised to find that the average size of an improved farm in Georgia was 42 acres. I was not so much surprised to find that the average size of a farm in Iowa was 135 acres, because I happened to know it before.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. What is the Senator's source of information? Is it from the census report?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is from the census report. I had the good fortune to receive a little information upon the point after the Senate adjourned last night, and with the consent of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who gave it to me, I may be permitted to suggest that the ownership of farms in Georgia is probably quite as large if not larger than in Iowa. But I am told that the owner of land rents upon some terms, either in cash or for a part of the crop, small pieces of his holding, and that each of the persons thus cultivating a small tract of land is regarded as a farmer, as he well might be, and that the tract of land which he holds and cultivates in this manner is regarded as a separate and distinct farm. With that suggestion, which did not occur to me at all, the explanation of this diversity in size between the two parts of the country is easy and clear.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. If the Senator from Iowa will yield to me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPPARD in the chair). Will the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. At this point I will state that I think the Senator's last explanation is unquestionably correct. There are quite a number of large tracts of land owned in the State where small farms are rented and rented perhaps continuously for years by the same family. I am told in the Census Office that under those circumstances they treat a piece of land occupied by a distinct family as a distinct farm. The term of rental usually is one of joint participation in the gross receipts, the landlord furnishing the stock and advancing the provisions and furnishing the money to buy the fertilizers, and the cropper, as he is called, occupying a farm perhaps of 50 acres with his family, handling it practically as his property under the direction and supervision of the owner of the land, and continuing it frequently for quite a number of years.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I desire to suggest another comparison between Iowa and Georgia. I think it must be assumed that, generally speaking, the men who vote are the more responsible people of the Commonwealth, and that their influence will do more toward improving the conditions of the State, and more toward improving the manner in which the soil is cultivated, than an equal number of people who do not exercise the high franchise of the voter. I find that in 1912 there were cast in Georgia for presidential electors 121,524 votes. In the same year there were cast in Iowa, with practically the same population, 492,356 votes. I do not suggest, Mr. President, that this comparison creates a standard which should in and of itself be accepted as the proper one for the distribution of this appropriation. I only mention it as one of the things that indicates that States like Iowa are not fairly dealt with in the distribution.

I group several States in order that the comparison that I have made may be seen to be not peculiar to the two States I have mentioned.

I have before me a table upon which there are noted certain statistics regarding 12 States of the South and 12 States of the North. I have taken from the North the chief agricultural States. The Southern States that I have named are Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia.

Alabama is to receive out of this appropriation 3.58 per cent; Arkansas, 2.78 per cent; Florida, 1.08 per cent; Georgia, 4.19 per cent; Kentucky, 3.51 per cent; Louisiana, 3.22 per cent; Mississippi, 3.22 per cent; North Carolina, 3.83 per cent; South Carolina, 2.62 per cent; Tennessee, 3.53 per cent; Texas, 5.99 per cent; Virginia, 3.21 per cent.

These 12 States receive in the aggregate of the appropriation 39.89 per cent, practically 40 per cent, and I shall hereafter use that percentage because it abbreviates my address. These States produced in 1910 an agricultural output of the value of $3,236,398,813. The 12 States I have taken for comparison in the North are Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, and Wisconsin. Without reading the percentages which each of these States receive, it is sufficient to say that the 12 receive 36.11 per cent, which, for brevity sake, I will call hereafter 36 per cent, and these States produced in 1910 agricultural crops and produce of the value of $6,184,292,673, practically double in value the product of the 12 States which I first mentioned. These 12 States receive of the appropriation here provided for 36 per cent, against 40 per cent received by the Southern States.

I can not believe that such a mode or plan of distribution does justice to all the people of the country. I am forced to

the conclusion that if the purpose is to increase the general volume of agricultural products so that prices may decline without interference with the fair profit of the producer, we ought to give more attention than is here given to the 12 States which produced in 1909, I think, quite 50 per cent of the entire agricultural product of the country. The value of all the agricultural product of the country, as I take it from the census report for 1910, was $12,337,644,446, and the 12 Northern States which I have mentioned, produced 50.12 per cent of the whole.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What year was that?

Mr. CUMMINS. 1910; the year adopted by the Census Bureau for their last census report upon agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think it is the census of 1909.

Mr. CUMMINS. It may be 1909. I thought the statistics were for 1910, but I may be mistaken about that. The value of the agricultural product for that year, whether 1909 or 1910, in the 12 Southern States was 26.25 per cent of the whole, and yet in the effort to increase the aggregate output, to make each acre of land that is capable of cultivation bear more for the use of the country, the States which produced but 25 per cent receive 4 per cent more of the appropriation than do the States which produce 50 per cent of the whole.

I agree that this appropriation can not be divided by any plan that may be conceived with exact equity. I know that some arbitrary basis must be adopted and that inequalities and injustice will result; but we ought to reduce those inequalities and that injustice to a minimum by finding some test or some standard that would, in the greater number of instances, result in justice.

Allow me to make a comparison between some other States. We will take the State of Nebraska as an illustration. Nebraska receives, under the plan of the bill, 1.79 per cent of the appropriation. Nebraska produced in 1909, or, according to the last census report, agricultural products to the value of $466,865,189. Florida receives of the appropriation 1.08 per cent, nearly as much as Nebraska. Yet Florida produced in that year but $65,375,202.

I take another State, Missouri. Missouri receives under this distribution 3.84 per cent; but Missouri produced of agriculture in 1909, $591,094,522. There are but one or two States that in that year produced an agricultural output of greater value than Missouri.

Now, remember, she receives under this bill 3.84 per cent of the whole. I will take a State that receives exactly the same amount, and I am glad the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] is listening to me. North Carolina receives 3.83 per cent of the appropriation, but North Carolina produced in 1909 but $241,882,595 worth of agricultural products, very much less than one-half of the product of the State of Missouri. And yet in the effort to increase the fertility and the productivity of our soil, in the aid that we are giving to the States to carry forward their educational work, notwithstanding the fact that Missouri is capable of doing so much more for the people of the Nation than is the State of North Carolina, the latter is given the same aid as the former. I do not believe that is just or fair. I think Missouri is entitled to more than North Carolina, because I believe that the money spent in Missouri will yield greater results than a similar amount of money spent in North Carolina.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Has the Senator any figures to show the per capita production of each of the citizens of the different States? Has the Senator any facts showing the relative productive power or capacity of the citizens of the State of Missouri to the citizens of the State of North Carolina?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not, Mr. President. I do not believe——

Mr. VARDAMAN. What is the difference in population?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not believe there are any such statistics.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Has the Senator the population of the two States?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will give the population.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The rural population.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will take Missouri. Missouri, according to the statistics, has a total population of 3,293,335.

Mr. VARDAMAN. What is the rural population?

Mr. CUMMINS. The rural population of Missouri is given as 1,894,518.

Mr. VARDAMAN. What is the rural population of North Carolina?

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course practically the same, or the percentage would not be the same. Let me give the exact figures. North Carolina has a population of 2,206,287 and a rural population, so called, of 1,887,813, practically the same as Missouri, because that is the basis of the computation of these percentages; and inasmuch as North Carolina receives the same percentage as does Missouri, her rural population must necessarily be the same.

Mr. VARDAMAN. According to these figures, Mr. President, the productive capacity of the rural citizen of Missouri is very much greater, as shown by the census report, than that of the rural citizen of North Carolina, is it not?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes; assuming that the 1,800,000 people of Missouri who are listed as of the rural population are all engaged in agriculture. They produce, as I said a moment ago, $591,094,522 of agricultural output; and the 1,887,000 of rural population in North Carolina, if they are all engaged in agriculture, produce but $241,882,595.

Mr. VARDAMAN. But the purpose of this bill is to enhance and increase the capacity of the citizen to produce.

Mr. CUMMINS. Ah, Mr. President, that is quite true; but we must not only take into account the capacity of the citizen to produce, but we must also take into account his opportunity to produce. This money ought to be expended where it will be of the greatest service to the people of the United States. I do not believe that we ought to divide the appropriation upon the theory that the people of North Carolina are more in need of education or instruction than are the people of Missouri. If that were so, my answer would be at once, "Let us give North Carolina proper aid"; but we must depend upon the States themselves to equalize, if you please, the educational stages at which their people have arrived.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I thought the purpose of this bill was to develop and improve the man, for, as the old saying goes, "there is very much more in the man than in the land," and if the people of North Carolina are backward, if they are not so progressive as are the people of Missouri——

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not ready to say that.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It seems to me that, if the Government is going to lend aid in a matter of this kind, it should be given to those who most need it. We do not want to send missionaries to Christians. It is the heathen that we are trying to bring to righteousness.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, there is, of course, a great deal of force in what the Senator from Mississippi says, but he ignores one thing, and that is the opportunity to increase the agricultural output. I do not believe that a similar number of people in North Carolina could produce as much as the same number of people in Missouri, no matter how much education were given to those people, because I do not think their opportunity is so great.

Mr. VARDAMAN. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, to be candid with the Senator from Iowa, there is an element in this question which has not yet been discussed. About 33 per cent of the population of North Carolina are of very different character; they are a different race; radically different in every respect from a large majority of the citizenship of the State of Missouri; and it does not make any difference what you may do, the capacity for producing can not be given to the colored population which the white man possesses. That is really the cause of this disparity.

Mr. CUMMINS. I shall come to that presently, although I have not desired to enter upon it at all; but I may. I desire, however, to suggest, in answer to the former part of the inquiry of the Senator from Mississippi, that I have been led to believe, and I do believe, that the people of North Carolina are as far advanced in the science of agriculture as are the people of any other State in the Union; I think they have given as much attention to the subject as have the people of any State in the Union. There have been some most gratifying examples of their forwardness and their progressiveness exhibited in the Senate from time to time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will pardon an interruption, when he uses the word "people" he may be using a double middle. If he means by "the people of North Carolina" the white people of North Carolina, I have no doubt at all of the correctness of his statement that they equal any part of the United States, but if the Senator means by "the people," as I suppose he does, the entire population of North Carolina, then there remains no doubt that the people of Missouri are more progressive and more intelligent than are the people of North Carolina. The percentage of the colored population in North Carolina, as given by the census, is very much less than the percentage of the colored population on the farms as a part of the rural population. Most of the darkies live in the country.

If the Senator will pardon me, I find fallacy in every parallel which he has drawn. If there be anything unfair about this basis of distribution, he has not thus far demonstrated it, because he has chosen in every instance to compare a State with a free, progressive, intelligent, initiative population of the white race with a State a large percentage of whose population consists of a backward, uninitiative, unintelligent, incapable black race. If the Senator were to take Iowa and compare it with Minnesota; if he were to take Kansas and compare it with Nebraska; if he were to take Alabama and compare it with Mississippi; if he were to take North Carolina and compare it with Georgia, so that there should be something comparable compared with something comparable, he would find that this basis fixed in the bill is fair enough. You can not abolish a race fact in connection with this distribution. It would be an absolute shame to the white people of the State of Iowa if they had failed to produce twice as much per capita as the entire population of Georgia per capita, with the colored race existing in Georgia. It is not at all astonishing that a State with twice the white population of Georgia should produce twice as much as Georgia produces, although that is not strictly true, for Iowa does not produce quite twice as much as Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I want to assert most positively that Iowa produces nothing like twice as much as Georgia.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Iowa does not produce anything like twice as much?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will discuss that later.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And I will guarantee that the percentage of negroes constituting the rural population in Georgia is at least 45 per cent, and probably 55 per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. About one-half.

Mr. VARDAMAN. A good deal more than half, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The percentage in the State is how much, I will ask my colleague?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Forty per cent.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. A little over 40 per cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But I will undertake to say that the percentage of that as constituting the "rural population" is at least 57 per cent.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I recognize the fact stated by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator, before he goes on, allow me to add one more fact, and that is, if there are any people in this country who do need instruction it is the southern darkies?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, we are reaching the real proposition toward which I was coming. I was undertaking to show that, unless we began with the assumption that there was a part of the country that needed instruction more than another, unless there was a class of people who needed education more than another class, the basis adopted here is wrong; and I asked the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], when I began, whether this bill was to be considered and this basis debated upon the assumption that there was one part of the country that needed education more than another or that there was one class of people who needed instruction more than another; and I think he replied to me, if not expressly, tacitly, that the bill was not based upon any such theory. The comparison is perfectly fair, and just for the purpose of demonstrating that, assuming equal or even stages of progress or education in the different parts of the country, the standard here adopted is very unfair to the people of my State and generally to the agricultural States of the North. I agree that there is a vast difference between the educational stage to which the negroes of the South have arrived and the educational stage to which the white people of the North have arrived.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And the Senator will add to that, I hope, that he admits that there is a vast difference between the productive capacity of the one and of the other.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do. I agree that there is a great deal of difference between the competency, if you please, of the colored people in the South and the competency of the white race—a race that has enjoyed from time immemorial advantages and opportunities which have been denied to the colored race.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not intend to enter upon the question of whether the colored people are capable of taking on the same competency and the same education as are the white people; that is foreign to this discussion, and I shall not be led into it; but I know that they ought to have the opportunity.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator yield a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to say, Mr. President, that I yield to no man in my desire to promote the material interests of all the people of America. I am not an enemy to the colored man—or the negro, as I prefer to call him, because that is the correct term—but I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the negro has not been denied the opportunity for developing which the Caucasian enjoys. As a matter of fact, in the morning of time they started together; neither had anything to lend or to borrow from the other. By reason of the initiative and the inherent qualities of the Caucasian he progressed, he evolved, he created the civilization which glorifies the beginning of the twentieth century. The negro remained stagnant; and as Charles Francis Adams found him in the heart of Africa in 1906 living in the same huts, governed by the same clubs, speaking the same language, enjoying the same no-literature, and worshiping the same voodoo that he did when the Pharaohs ruled in Egypt. Notwithstanding the fact he was touched by the tides of civilization that swept over the eastern continent in the forenoon of the ages, it made no more impression upon him as a race than a drop of water upon the oily back of a duck.

> There were no stars, no earth, no time,
> No check, no change, no good, no crime;
> But silence and a stirless breath,
> Which neither was of life nor death;
> A sea of stagnant idleness,
> Blind, boundless, mute, and motionless.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Mississippi will recognize that he ought not to interrupt my argument for a speech of that character.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Well, Mr. President, if the Senator will just pardon me for a moment, the Senator's remarks indicated that he thought the negro had not been given a chance. He has been given a chance. As a matter of fact, he has received more help from the white man and has done less for himself than any race on earth. He has never had any civilization except that which has been inculcated by a superior race; and it is a lamentable fact, as proven by history, that his civilization lasted only so long as he was in the hands of the white man who inculcated it. I deny that he has been oppressed. He has had just the same opportunity that every other race has had, and if he has not improved his opportunities it is because of his racial characteristics.

Mr. CUMMINS. Now, Mr. President, I do not concur with all that the Senator from Mississippi has said. I had not intended, however, to discuss that old and difficult discussion which he has injected into the debate. I said that the negroes have been denied the opportunities which the white race have enjoyed. I did not refer, of course, to the dawn of creation. I had not in mind Noah's ark and the equality of the races as they emerged from that refuge. I do say, however, that the power, no matter how it was acquired, which the white race in one way or another gained over the colored race has been abused; and in that respect they have been denied the opportunity to advance toward their maximum capacity.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

Mr. CUMMINS. I will not yield for another speech on that subject.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am not going to make a speech, if the Senator will permit me. I want to correct him.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Mississippi, of course, will have an abundant opportunity to answer me. However, I yield for any question that he may desire to ask.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I was simply going to make this suggestion to the Senator, because I know he wants to arrive at the truth. His mental processes are always honest and his desire universally is to reach the truth. When the Senator stated that the negro had not been given a fair, square deal, I want the Senator in his ratiocination to contrast the condition of the negro—I know what he has reference to—in 1861 in the United States with his condition when he was brought here 200 years before, and see if the white man has been his oppressor.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know, Mr. President, that he has very greatly advanced since his ancestors came here 200 years ago or more. That, however, does not disprove my suggestion that he has not had the same opportunity that our own race has had; but I do not want to enlarge upon it, because I agree that we ought to extend to him now every opportunity that we can to fully enter the field of his competency, whatever that may be.

We have now come to an admission on the one side, which is accepted, I think, upon the other, that one of the reasons why the States in which the negro is found in large numbers are to receive a greater proportion of the appropriation than their circumstances or conditions would warrant, is because the negro farmer needs instruction more than does the white farmer, and that the public throughout the country will be better served and their welfare will be more greatly promoted if a larger percentage goes into those States to give this race, which has suffered such singular misfortune, an opportunity which they otherwise would not have.

If it is put upon that ground, and if some provision can be found by which the citizens of our country who confessedly need the instruction more than other citizens of our country can enjoy the appropriation which is here provided for, I would be very slow to oppose that appropriation; but to make that the basis of distribution, the real spirit of distribution, and at the same time reach it through the standard of rural population, without any recognition of the real reason, seems to me to be unfair to the country and unfair to Senators themselves.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, would it annoy the Senator for me to make another suggestion?

Mr. CUMMINS. It will not annoy me at all if the Senator will propound a question.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to say to the Senator——

Mr. CUMMINS. I think it would be unfair to the Senator from Mississippi to have his address incorporated in mine.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am always glad to be associated in any way with the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator is very kind, and I yield to the suggestion of the junior Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I thank the Senator. I wish to say to the Senator that in the discussion of this question I think we ought to be absolutely candid with each other. I think the time has come in dealing with this great problem when the Members of the United States Senate should speak candidly and should tear off the mask. I think the representatives from the South should tell those from the North, who know nothing about the question, the whole truth. The Senator from Iowa, in the very nature of things, can not understand this question as the Senators from Mississippi understand it, because in the entire State which the Senator has the honor in part to so ably represent upon this floor, there are fewer negroes than there are in the little city of Jackson, Miss.

In the distribution of this money whatever progress the negro farmer may make must be made under the direction, by the assistance, and through the counsel of the white man, because, I say to you—and I challenge any Senator upon this floor to question the accuracy of the statement—that the negro has never enjoyed any civilization except that which has been inculcated by the white man, and that civilization has lasted only so long as he was under the control and domination of the white man. When left absolutely to himself he has universally retrograded to the barbarism of the jungles. Take Haiti, for instance, where he has had control of the country for a hundred years, and where they have a revolution every year, where they worship the voodoo, and where cannibalism is common. Except in the seaports, which are dominated by the whites and mulattoes, there is no semblance of civil government upon that island to-day, which, when the negroes got control of it, was the gem of the Antilles.

In the distribution of this money the fact should not be overlooked that the South has a fearful burden to carry; it is a tremendous handicap; and while the white farmers and the white people of Mississippi and Georgia and Alabama and the Carolinas are doing everything they can to improve the moral and material interests of the negro, they have got to do it. You can not with any sort of prudence or any hope for good results leave the disbursement of this money, or any part thereof, in any other hands except those of the white people.

In my State 59 per cent of the population are black. There are counties in Mississippi where 95 out of every 100 of the population are as black as my coat. When the Senator understands that as we feel it and know it he will realize the necessity for giving to us whatever assistance there may be in this bill, in order to enable us to lead this benighted race, congenitally an inferior race, to higher and better endeavor.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I assume that this appropriation must be expended by some government, either the government of the State or the Government of the United States. The Government of the United States is under the control of the white race, and I believe it to be true that the government of every State is under the control of the white race. I was minded to ask the junior Senator from Mississippi how much the State of Mississippi had expended, or is expending annually, in order to educate the negro farmer in the science of agriculture?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I shall be very glad to answer the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. I shall be glad to know.

Mr. VARDAMAN. We are maintaining there one of the best-equipped agricultural and mechanical colleges in America. We are giving to the negro not less than four months, and in some instances nine months, of common-school educational opportunities; and I might say, for the benefit of the American people, that the white man is paying 90 per cent of the taxes that maintain this system.

Mr. CUMMINS. My question was, How much is the State of Mississippi annually expending for the education of the negro farmer in the science of agriculture, and how is it spent?

Mr. VARDAMAN. The negro farmer has the same opportunity that the white farmer has. The negro youth has the same opportunities in the agricultural and mechanical colleges that are extended to white youths.

Mr. CUMMINS. We are discussing here farm-demonstration work, and we are intending to enlarge the field of that work. How many demonstrations have been made upon the farms of negroes in Mississippi during the last year?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I can not tell that exactly, but there have been some. There are no negro demonstrators.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not asking that; I say, upon the farms of negroes?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I can not tell how many there are on the places belonging to the white farmers either, but the negroes are given the same instruction, the same opportunities to learn—which they do not embrace, of course—that the white people enjoy.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is, when a farm demonstration is going on in a community, all the people, whether they are white or black, come in to see what is being done and how it is being done? That is the way, I assume, that the work is carried on there?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Yes; I think that is true.

Mr. CUMMINS. I infer, then, from what has been said by the Senator from Mississippi, that there is no discrimination whatever between the white and the black with reference to the demonstration work?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Oh, I think that as a matter of fact 99 out of every 100 of the farms upon which the work is done are farms belonging to white farmers, because it is not very safe to leave that work to be done by negroes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely. Then does the Senator from Mississippi think that this large proportion of the appropriation which is to be expended in the South, as compared with that which is to be expended in the North, will be expended in fair proportion for the benefit and the instruction of the negro farmer?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Absolutely, as much as he will take; as much as he is capable of absorbing.

Mr. CUMMINS. I just asked the Senator from Mississippi, in these farm demonstrations that are being made upon the farms of white men—and that is natural—whether the negro renter, the negro farmer in the vicinity, is called in to see how it is done and why it is done?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Why, certainly he is. If the Senator could understand the relationship between the white man and the negro of Mississippi, he would understand that it is cordial. The negro has his place. He does not vote. He has very little to do with the government of the country; but he has in the white man a cordial, well-wishing, helpful friend, who is glad to assist the negro in any way he can to make his land produce more, to enable him to make two blades of grass grow this year where one grew last year, to instruct him in the raising of stock. There is nothing in the world that affords the average southern white man more pleasure than rendering this kindly assistance to the negro.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think I understand that very well, and I have no doubt of the facts stated by the Senator from Mississippi; but it establishes just what I attempted to say, or at least what I have ventured to believe—that the real demonstration work in the South is intended to educate and instruct the white farmer, or the white owner of land, who then takes his renters or those who work his farm and gives them the benefit of the instruction he has received in demonstration work.

That shows, as I think, the inequality and the injustice of the distribution, for we need that in the North just as much as you need it in the South. Whenever you turn every white farmer into an educator, as you are trying to do, and as we all ought to try to do, he then reaches, in his way and a great variety of ways, those who actually till his soil.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator overlooks the fact that many negroes in Mississippi own their own farms, and a great many of them are prosperous, and a great many of them are absorbing ideas from the white man. If the Senator understood the negro as I do, he would understand that he is essentially an imitator. He is devoid of the initiative. He has no power of origination. He is a follower. He is controlled by his passions and his appetite and is utterly incapable of that pertinacity of purpose which is so essential to progress and permanent betterment.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Mississippi is simply proving my case as rapidly as he can. That is just what I have been asserting; that you intend to take this appropriation and put it into the hands of your schools, which are, of course, con-

trolled by the dominant race, and these schools will teach the men who are best adapted to take the instruction, and from them the information will go out to the negro farmers respecting the best way in which to cultivate the tracts of land which have been allotted to them, either through leases or some form of sale.

If that be true, Senators—and I am now appealing to the sense of equity which I know is uppermost and dominant in the minds of Senators, both on that side of the Chamber and on this—why should Georgia, with a vastly less population than Iowa of farmers owning the soil, and who are expected to receive the instruction directly and disseminate it, have 1.06 per cent more of the appropriation than we are to receive?

My complaint is not with regard to the conditions in the South. I know how difficult, how insoluble the problem is. I have never yet heard a philosopher, no matter how impartial, present an answer to that great racial question. I do not know whether it can ever be answered; at least, I have never heard an answer that satisfied my mind.

Mr. VARDAMAN rose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Mississippi desire me to yield again?

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator desires me to answer the question why Georgia should have the assistance that this bill carries, I will say that Georgia has over a million negroes. I hope the Senator will realize that fact.

Mr. CUMMINS. I realize that.

Mr. VARDAMAN. She has that burden to carry. She has that incubus upon her material progress.

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course, it is a burden to carry.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It is the purpose of this bill, as I understand, to assist the individual and so to educate and develop him that he may be able to find in the soil all of its latent and undeveloped riches.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that perfectly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. With this great load which Georgia is carrying, I can understand why she should have this advantage over Iowa, whose population is made up of a pure-blooded Teuton or Anglo-Saxon race, the greatest race of people on earth, and the only race of people who are capable of understanding the genius of American institutions.

Mr. CUMMINS. I appreciate the compliment bestowed upon my State, and I think it is deserved; but I decline to be led away from the inquiry we are pursuing. After all, this bill is not to relieve Georgia of a burden which circumstances have put upon her. This bill is not to help Mississippi to carry a load which time and evolution and war and all the strifes of humanity have created for her. That is not the purpose of the bill. The purpose of the bill is so to distribute the money we are willing to give as to increase most greatly the product of the soil. The junior Senator from Mississippi is insisting that, in fact, it ought to be distributed according to the rural population, because both Iowa and Georgia are largely populated by men and women who fall within the class named in the bill. I have been attempting to show that that is a false basis, for the very reason that the people of Georgia intend to take the money and have it used by the white people, and the instruction or benefit which the colored people will receive from it will be derived from the knowledge gained by the dominant race. There is no question about that. Then why should the vast colored population be reckoned for the purposes of this distribution and not reckoned for any other purpose in our system of government?

Mr. VARDAMAN. If it will not interrupt the Senator, I should like to make another suggestion. Has the Senator any doubt that a great truth can not be developed in the cultivation of the soil of Georgia and a method discovered by which those lands will produce more than they are now producing without benefiting every citizen within the confines of the Commonwealth?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Then, if the Senator admits that, in connection with the fact that the white man is bearing the burdens of the colored man; that the white man is leading the colored man out of the darkness; that the white man is civilizing and improving the colored man, does he not think, in the name of God, that the white man ought to have all the assistance a law of this kind can give him in the solution of that great problem?

Mr. CUMMINS. When it comes to determining whether the General Government should make an appropriation to aid certain States in civilizing or educating a certain class of their people, I shall not be found wanting in generosity or liberality; but that is not the question I am discussing. I have no doubt that the soil of Georgia is capable of producing more than it does produce. I have no doubt that the developments of science will multiply twofold, threefold, fourfold the products of Georgia; nor have I any doubt that the same science will multiply twofold, threefold, fourfold the products of my own State. We reckon it to be a large average if our cornfields produce 40 bushels of corn per acre. Indeed, that is a miximum average, taking the years in the past, rather than a fair average. I have no doubt that when the science of agriculture is mastered by the farmers of our State, and when these principles are honestly and diligently applied, Iowa will produce 80 or 100 bushels of corn for every acre that she plants in that crop; and therefore we need the aid just as much as do the people of Georgia.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to make just one suggestion to the Senator. He seems to have the idea that the darky in Mississippi or Georgia would acquire benefit from the operation of this bill solely by a process of infiltration. I desire to disabuse his mind of that impression by calling his attention to what would be the actual fact.

Even if this demonstration work were done upon the land owned by a white man, in nine cases out of ten the actual labor would be done by the black man. He would be brought into direct, not indirect, connection with this work. It would affect him more directly, in proportion to his intelligence, of course, than it would the white man who owned the place. It would be under the direction of the demonstrator that the black man would do the plowing and whatever else was to be done, the fertilizing, and everything else; so it would be an actual object lesson of which he would be a part, and magna pars at that. Therefore the Senator is mistaken in thinking that whatever benefit came to the black man from this bill would be indirect. It would be direct.

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like to ask the senior Senator from Mississippi a question. The average number of acres in an improved farm in Mississippi is 32.8. The average size in my own State, as has been said so often, is 135 acres. We will say, then, taking the same area, that there are four farms in Mississippi to one in Iowa.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Giving a different definition in the two States to the word "farm," of course, owing to the difference of conditions.

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, certainly. The reason that the rural population is taken as a standard must be, then, because upon 135 acres in Mississippi there are four times as many people living as there are upon that number of acres in Iowa.

Does the Senator from Mississippi believe that the fact that in his State there are four times as many people living upon 135 acres as there are in Iowa entitles Mississippi to four times as much aid from the General Government as is given to Iowa when the object is to make each one of those acres as productive as possible?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the problem is one of both acreage and population, as far as that is concerned, when you come to the operation and the effect of it.

The Senator has cited the fact that the farm in Mississippi is very much smaller than in Iowa. As a matter of fact, of course, what you are in the habit of calling a farm—not in the census sense—in Mississippi is from three to four or five times as large as in Iowa. There would be upon one man's plantation 50, 60, or 70 farms; very frequently 10, 20, or 30. Each one of these men is raising a totally different crop from yours, and that is the reason why the farm of the tenant farmer—the share farmer—is smaller.

You can take machinery and raise wheat, and one man can cultivate I do not know how many acres. In corn one man will cultivate 75 acres or so, I am told, with machinery. A totally different growth prevails in your country. You may go over a Mississippi field to-day with one of your machines and clean it thoroughly of all the weeds upon it, and if it rains as soon as you are through you can go back day after to-morrow and start over afresh. That does not take place in Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, when you come to raising cotton, there is practically no machinery that has been adapted to it, for the simple reason that there is no particular use in adapting it to the cultivation, because with the present methods one man can raise more cotton than he and his family can pick, and as a consequence he must hire somebody to help him pick it. Therefore there never will be any great application of machinery to cotton planting until a machine to pick cotton is invented. As soon as a machine to pick cotton is invented, if it ever is, it will be followed by the application of very much of the machinery already existing to the cultivation and planting of it.

These are separate and distinct problems, and the point under it all is this: A certain number of people are interested in

agriculture, and the Government and the people of the United States are interested in making those agricultural producers better producers. Therefore the main thing to be considered is the man who is doing the producing. It is a matter of instruction by demonstration. If you had two schools, one with a thousand pupils and one with five hundred, I take it for granted that you would want to devote more money to educating the thousand than to educating the five hundred.

The Senator can turn it around as he pleases, and in as many different ways as he pleases, and he is doing it with perfect intellectual honesty; but when he gets through with it all he comes back to the fact that instruction requires an instructor and a man to be instructed, and the chief thing to be considered is the man to be instructed. Therefore the population to receive instruction is the best basis, although no basis can be perfect.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Mississippi has stated the question with entire fairness. I agree to every word he has said. The question is, though, Who is to receive the instruction?

This is not for the purpose of teaching a man how to handle a hoe. It is not for the purpose of teaching a man how to handle a plow. It is for the purpose of teaching the responsible man, whoever he may be, who controls these acres, how to select his seed, when to plant his seed, how to cultivate the ground, and when and how to harvest whatever shall be produced.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And when and how to fertilize it.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is a false conception to think of the whole population that may be upon the soil as receiving this instruction. We shall not be able to make all of the workers upon farms scientists in agriculture, and it is for that reason that I am protesting against the unfairness of this distribution.

Take 135 acres in Mississippi or in Georgia, and I venture to say that instruction to fewer men will be required in order that the land may yield its full harvest than for a similar number of acres in Iowa or Minnesota. If it were intended that each worker who contributes his labor to the farming pursuit should receive this instruction, then there would be much to be said in favor of this basis. That is not the purpose, however. It is utterly impossible to accomplish any such purpose, and if it were intended to devote enough money to this purpose to educate every man in the country in the science of agriculture I for one could hardly favor the proposition.

A man works upon a farm. He may be a worker there this month; he may be a worker in the city next month; he may be a worker in a dozen avocations within the course of the year. However valuable it would be to the country to educate every man, no matter what his avocation is or how various his employments may be, to the highest point he is competent to reach, that is not the purpose of this bill.

I again say that it seems to me the very argument made by the senior Senator from Mississippi adds to the strength of the amendment I have proposed.

Mr. SMOOT. Before the Senator concludes I should like to ask him a question, with his permission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, take the percentages of the mountain States. They would be allowed 64 per cent on the basis of the rural population of the United States. On the basis of the improved land in farms, according to the amendment offered by the Senator, the allotment of the mountain States would be only 10.8 per cent.

In other words, if the money should be distributed under the Senator's amendment, the mountain States would be penalized for all of the mountains that are within those States; the allotment would not be based upon the rural population or the population that is engaged in agricultural work; and it certainly would work very great hardship to all of the mountain States.

Mr. CUMMINS. Montana is the first one. I desire to be entirely fair, and I desire now to take up the mountain States. Under the plan of the bill Montana will receive forty-nine one-hundredths of 1 per cent of the appropriation. Under the plan I have proposed Montana will receive seventy-six one-hundredths of 1 per cent, nearly double the amount provided in the bill.

The next State is Idaho. Idaho will receive under the plan proposed by the bill fifty-two one-hundredths of 1 per cent. Under the plan of my amendment Idaho will receive fifty-eight one-hundredths of 1 per cent, an increase of six one-hundredths of 1 per cent.

Wyoming under the plan of the bill will receive twenty-one one-hundredths of 1 per cent. Under the plan of the amendment she will receive twenty-six one-hundredths of 1 per cent, an increase of five one-hundredths of 1 per cent.

Colorado under the plan of the bill will receive eighty one-hundredths of 1 per cent. Under my amendment she will receive ninety one-hundredths of 1 per cent.

Under the plan of the bill New Mexico will receive fifty-seven one-hundredths of 1 per cent and under the plan of my amendment thirty-one one-hundredths of 1 per cent, the first State to receive less under my amendment than under the bill.

Arizona, under the plan of the bill, receives twenty-nine one-hundredths of 1 per cent. Under the basis of acres in improved land Arizona receives but seven one-hundredths of 1 per cent.

Utah, under the plan of the bill, will receive forty-one one-hundredths of 1 per cent. Under my amendment she will receive twenty-nine one-hundredths of 1 per cent.

Nevada under the bill will receive fourteen one-hundredths of 1 per cent and under the amendment sixteen one-hundredths of 1 per cent.

The Mountain States, in other words, will receive more under my amendment than under the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The figures of the Senator may be right, but they are not in conformity with those that were handed to me, taken from the census. Before I say anything more about it I shall check them up and then call the Senator's attention to them if I find them wrong. The percentages that I spoke of were of the whole of the States and not of any particular State; but, of course, if the percentages which the Senator has just read are right the percentages here do not conform to them.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, one further suggestion and I shall bring my address to a close. As is well known, the Department of Agriculture has been doing a great deal of work in farm demonstration in the last few years under an appropriation made in the ordinary agricultural appropriation bill. Those who are familiar with the matter understand that a very large percentage of the money so appropriated and expended by the Department of Agriculture has been expended in the South. I do not know just what the percentage is, but the Senator from Georgia will correct me if I am wrong.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was trying to hear the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have said that a very large part of the appropriation annually made for the Department of Agriculture for the purposes of farm demonstration was used in the South; I think somewhere between 80 and 90 per cent. I have no complaint of that. I think there was a good reason for so distributing the money. I assume, and I think the Senator from Georgia also understood, that this bill was to take the place of the former arrangement with regard to farm-demonstration work, and that we would no longer continue the appropriations under which the Secretary of Agriculture had been proceeding. That, I am sure, was the understanding of the Department of Agriculture. That would have been the effect of the bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia.

But during the passage of the bill through the House the Department of Agriculture presented an amendment, so I am informed, which I now read. I do not mean that the department formally presented it, but it was instrumental in presenting an amendment to the bill on its passage through the House. That amendment was:

That pending the inauguration and development of the cooperative extension work herein authorized nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere with either the farm-management work or the farmers' cooperative demonstration work now conducted by the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture.

There could have been no objection to that. It simply provided for a period of transition, a period of organization, a period of preparation. But the House, in the bill before us, accepted a part of that amendment and declined a part. It eliminated the words "pending the inauguration and development of the cooperative extension work herein authorized" and adopted this amendment:

Provided, That nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere with either the farm-management work or the farmers' cooperative demonstration work now conducted by the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture.

So we are not only distributing, as I believe, an unfair proportion of this money in the Southern States, but we are continuing the work already organized, and which was very properly done largely in the South, whereas I am sure that it was the intention of the Senator from Georgia that the work I have last mentioned should continue only long enough to put the plan we are now establishing in full and complete operation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to say that the Senator is right, in my view of the original bill and in my view clearly as to how the bill will finally work out. I understood that the suggestion was made to gentlemen on the other side of the Capitol that they might desire to continue some of that work at some time in the Agriculture appropriation bill, and if the language used in the bill as introduced was adopted, it would be necessary to repeal it or else a restriction would be put upon the Agricultural Committees and the department in doing any work of that character. However, I think we all still agree that, generally speaking, the purpose is to absorb the work now done by the department in this work.

Now, just one word more. I think it is true that more of the past demonstration work has been done in the South than anywhere else, because it really originated there. It originated by Dr. Knapp's experiments in Texas in an effort to fight the boll weevil. But I think it has been rapidly spreading from the South to other sections. I do not think anything like the same proportion as that which the Senator mentioned is still being spent in the South. I think the policy of the department for the past two or three years has been to carry it into any State where there was a desire to have it used. It has in the past been controlled in its distribution by a Secretary of Agriculture from Iowa, a very great Secretary, too, I think, and certainly there was not any effort sectionally to absorb it.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know that it was done with a sense of equity and fairness by the Secretary of Agriculture. I have no criticism for it. I believe it was well done. I absolve every Representative from the South of any purpose to secure in that work or in this appropriation an undue advantage. But, Mr. President, it is unfair to continue the work as it has been originated. If the appropriation we are about to make is to be made, I intend at the proper time to move to strike from the bill the words I have read and which were engrafted on the bill in the House.

Mr. President, it is of vastly less importance to the people of this country that appropriations be fairly distributed so far as the money itself is concerned than it is to preserve in the minds of all the citizens of the United States an abiding sense that the Congress of the United States intends to deal fairly with all the people for whom it makes laws. There is nothing so disintegrating, there is nothing that so tends to draw the people of the country apart, nothing that so effectually sows in their hearts the seeds of discontent, there is nothing that so shatters the confidence that citizens should hold in their Government as the suspicion, the belief of discrimination, the conviction of unfairness.

We have already experienced it once. I do not intend to debate the tariff bill, but I repeat here what I said when the tariff bill was under discussion. It is a bill which does discriminate in favor of the East and against the West. It is a bill which does not afford to people of my part of the country the same protection it confers upon the people of another part of the country. It is not sectional in the sense that it favors the South as against the North. It is sectional in the sense that it favors the East and the manufacturer against the West and the farmer. That, however, is water which has gone over the wheel and it can not, at this time at least, be recalled.

But let us avoid introducing a like injustice in the bill now before us. Let us attempt to divide this appropriation in a manner that will appeal to the general equitable sense of the people. None of the people want an advantage, either South or North, either East or West. We will not be faithful to them if we give to any part of the country an advantage over any other part. I say again that this standard was not brought forward by the Senator from Georgia, and I do not believe that his committee is originally responsible for it. I know something of the origin of the bill. I know that it was proposed—I think somewhat impulsively proposed without due reflection—by men who have but one object in view, namely, the promotion of the agricultural interests of the United States. I do not think it has ever before received great consideration. That is the reason why I have felt impelled and felt warranted in opening it up in this rather elaborate way, so that we can now without bias, without prejudice, without any sectional feeling, reach a conclusion that will satisfy the highest conscience of the whole people.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to call the Senator's attention, before he takes his seat, to some of the figures that he used that I am not able to verify, and therefore I wanted to hear from the Senator about them. I refer to the comparison of agricultural products between Iowa and Georgia, in which he gave Iowa credit for $789,000,000, according to the last census, when I find that all the crops of Iowa for that year are given by the census at $314,000,000.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have not limited the agricultural products to crop product, neither in the case of Iowa nor in the case of Georgia. There are included within these items all the products that are ordinarily known as agricultural products. They include, of course, cattle; they include swine; they include sheep; they include all the things that a farmer produces.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield further to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask leave to suggest, further, to the Senator that, having added up the entire list, embracing all that he has mentioned, I do not make it as much as the sum he gave. I wish also to suggest to him whether he thinks it exactly just to count the animals and also to count the corn that was fed into the animals? Is not that a double claim of production?

Mr. CUMMINS. No, Mr. President; I do not think it is; but I will say with regard to these figures that they were prepared for me by a statistician and used by me in an address that I made during the course of the debate upon the tariff bill. They are the same statistics that I used at that time, in so far as the agricultural products of the various States are concerned. I have had no reason to doubt their correctness, although I do not pretend to have gone over them item by item and verified them myself.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I desire to ask the Senator here also this question: Was there a deduction made in the estimate of the animal products of Iowa for the number of animals brought into Iowa from other sections before they were sold in Iowa, having been brought there to be fed with Iowa's splendid corn?

Mr. CUMMINS. I can not answer the Senator from Georgia definitely, because I simply gave a direction to a statistician, who was formerly, if not then, in the employ of the Census Bureau, to ascertain for me from the census reports the value of the agricultural products of all the States in the Union, and he prepared for me the list or table which I used during the tariff debate. I am not able to say just what items were included in his general results. I assume that he did his work properly and faithfully, and, having used it in the tariff debate and no one having questioned its correctness, I thought the table was probably authentic and right.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is one more question I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield further to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield further.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Under the plan the Senator suggests is it not true that 83 per cent of Iowa's land classed as improved agricultural lands would form the basis of distribution to Iowa, while the average percentage throughout the United States of improved agricultural land is only 25 per cent, and is it not also true that the Senator's plan would increase the percentage as to 12 States and reduce it for practically all the balance?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not undertaken to determine how many States would be increased and how many diminished. I have undertaken to find what I believed was an equitable standard. I believe that Iowa has 83 per cent of all her land under cultivation, and if Iowa is to contribute to the people of this country her products raised upon those acres, and if it is necessary that they shall be made more productive, then she is entitled to that proportion which her acres which she puts to the service of the people bear to all the acres that are used in the service.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. What I was undertaking to suggest to the Senator was that the figures of Iowa's real production were about $250,000,000 in excess of what I thought was a proper calculation.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think so, Mr. President, but I value any suggestion of the Senator from Georgia, and I will undertake to analyze before the bill is put on its passage the statistics relating to Georgia and Iowa, and if I find that the statistician I employed introduced factors that ought not to be introduced, I shall be very glad to make it known to the Senate, whether it affects Iowa disadvantageously or whether it affects Georgia disadvantageously.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No class of figures can fail to give Iowa a splendid position among the agricultural States of this country. I do not want it to be understood that I do not recognize that.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am sure of that.

Mr. President, I have now concluded what I desired to say upon this amendment; but before I close I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks the various tables which I have used and to which I have so constantly referred during the course of my observations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CUMMINS. They are several in number, but I assume I need not describe them in order that they may be identified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the request is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Total vote cast in presidential election of 1912.

Alabama	117,879
Arkansas	124,029
Florida	50,817
Georgia	121,524
Kentucky	453,698
Louisiana	79,315
Mississippi	64,319
North Carolina	243,918
South Carolina	50,350
Tennessee	247,821
Texas	304,670
Virginia	136,976
Total	1,995,316
Illinois	1,146,173
Indiana	654,473
Iowa	492,356
Kansas	365,444
Michigan	551,016
Minnesota	334,219
Missouri	744,962
Nebraska	249,871
New York	1,587,983
Ohio	1,103,557
North Dakota	86,580
Wisconsin	399,972
Total	7,716,606
Total of both groups	9,711,606

Table for agricultural-extension appropriation.

States.	Per cent under proposed plan.	Per cent under plan of Cummins amendment.	Value of agriculture products, 1910 census.
Illinois	4.38	5.86	$786,157,142
Indiana	3.16	3.54	449,517,639
Iowa	3.13	6.16	789,642,784
Kansas	2.43	6.25	532,667,826
Michigan	3.01	2.68	373,214,810
Minnesota	2.48	4.11	420,808,760
Missouri	3.84	5.14	591,094,522
Nebraska	1.79	5.10	466,865,189
New York	3.91	3.10	551,311,116
Ohio	4.26	4.02	529,935,941
North Dakota	1.03	4.28	311,270,882
Wisconsin	2.69	2.49	381,806,062
Total	36.11	52.73	6,184,292,673
Alabama	3.58	2.03	243,837,496
Arkansas	2.78	1.69	223,593,243
Florida	1.08	.38	65,375,202
Georgia	4.19	2.57	344,006,114
Kentucky	3.51	3.00	304,631,712
Louisiana	3.22	1.10	141,638,829
Mississippi	3.22	1.88	255,270,338
North Carolina	3.83	1.84	241,882,595
South Carolina	2.62	1.27	205,364,768
Tennessee	3.53	2.28	278,841,030
Texas	5.99	5.72	714,538,096
Virginia	3.21	2.06	217,419,390
Total	39.89	25.82	3,236,398,813

Mr. CUMMINS. Value of all agricultural products in the United States in 1910 census was $12,337,644,446, of which amount the agricultural products in the first 12 States enumerated above constitute 50.12 per cent, while the value of agricultural products in the last 12 constitutes but 26.25 per cent.

Farm land and farm property—Averages per farm, by divisions and States, 1910 and 1900.

Division or State.	Average acres per farm.				Average value per farm.									
	All farm land.		Improved land.		All farm property.		Land.		Buildings.		Implements and machinery.		Live stock.	
	1910	1900	1910	1900	1910	1900	1910	1900	1910	1900	1910	1900	1910	1900
United States	138.1	146.2	75.2	72.2	$6,444	$3,563	$4,476	$2,276	$994	$620	$199	$131	$774	$536
Geographic divisions:														
New England	104.4	107.1	38.4	42.4	4,593	3,333	2,024	1,477	1,782	1,276	269	190	519	390
Middle Atlantic	92.2	92.4	62.6	63.4	6,319	4,759	3,122	2,512	2,094	1,501	358	239	745	506
East North Central	105.0	102.4	79.2	76.3	9,007	5,004	6,437	3,498	1,462	827	239	147	869	532
West North Central	209.6	189.5	148.0	127.9	12,195	5,488	9,057	3,670	1,407	715	332	186	1,398	917
South Atlantic	93.3	108.4	43.6	47.9	2,654	1,511	1,694	935	542	319	88	55	330	202
East South Central	78.2	89.9	42.2	44.5	2,094	1,324	1,273	784	394	250	72	54	354	236
West South Central	179.3	233.8	61.8	52.7	4,069	2,146	2,880	1,264	437	245	127	103	625	534
Mountain	324.5	457.9	86.8	82.9	9,581	5,934	6,402	2,803	791	538	269	186	2,119	2,406
Pacific	270.3	334.8	116.1	132.5	14,643	7,864	11,829	5,953	1,221	798	350	241	1,242	871
New England.														
Maine	104.9	106.2	39.3	40.3	3,320	2,064	1,441	832	1,219	795	241	148	419	289
New Hampshire	120.1	123.1	34.3	36.7	3,833	2,927	1,646	1,211	1,530	1,181	217	176	440	360
Vermont	142.6	142.7	50.0	64.2	4,445	3,276	1,785	1,384	1,657	1,125	311	228	692	539
Massachusetts	77.9	83.4	31.5	34.3	6,135	4,843	2,859	2,305	2,401	1,885	313	234	562	419
Rhode Island	83.8	82.9	33.7	34.1	6,234	4,909	2,836	2,441	2,442	1,765	337	231	619	472
Connecticut	81.5	85.8	36.9	39.5	5,944	4,205	2,693	1,946	2,466	1,669	258	184	528	406
Middle Atlantic:														
New York	102.2	99.9	68.8	68.8	6,732	4,718	3,283	2,431	2,212	1,486	388	247	849	554
New Jersey	76.9	82.0	53.9	57.1	7,610	5,470	3,707	2,694	2,777	1,998	391	269	734	508
Pennsylvania	84.8	86.4	57.8	58.9	5,715	4,690	2,875	2,566	1,873	1,440	323	227	645	457
East North Central:														
Ohio	88.6	88.5	70.7	69.5	6,994	4,333	4,727	2,953	1,354	793	188	132	725	455
Indiana	98.8	97.4	78.6	75.2	8,396	4,410	6,164	3,099	1,235	694	190	123	807	494
Illinois	129.1	124.2	111.4	104.9	15,505	7,588	12,270	5,732	1,717	952	293	170	1,226	734
Michigan	91.5	86.4	62.0	58.0	5,261	3,396	2,973	2,084	1,381	782	241	142	666	389
Wisconsin	118.9	117.0	67.2	66.2	7,978	4,781	5,148	3,125	1,636	916	299	172	895	567
West North Central:														
Minnesota	177.3	169.7	125.8	119.2	9,456	5,100	6,527	3,616	1,558	713	335	195	1,035	576
Iowa	156.3	151.2	135.9	130.8	17,259	8,023	12,910	5,497	2,098	1,053	440	253	1,811	1,220
Missouri	124.8	119.3	88.7	80.4	7,405	3,626	5,216	2,441	975	521	183	100	1,031	564
North Dakota	382.3	342.9	275.1	212.8	13,109	5,631	9,822	3,824	1,241	561	590	310	1,456	936
South Dakota	335.1	362.4	203.8	214.5	15,018	5,654	11,625	3,596	1,320	588	435	232	1,639	1,238
Nebraska	297.8	246.1	188.0	151.7	16,038	6,155	12,450	4,004	1,533	749	341	205	1,714	1,196
Kansas	244.0	240.7	168.2	144.7	11,467	4,992	8,648	3,074	1,122	644	272	170	1,426	1,103
South Atlantic:														
Delaware	95.9	110.1	65.8	77.8	5,830	4,201	3,224	2,454	1,681	1,101	296	222	629	424
Maryland	103.4	112.4	68.6	76.4	5,849	4,448	3,341	2,616	1,600	1,191	242	187	666	454
District of Columbia	27.9	31.6	23.7	22.1	39,062	42,882	33,152	36,060	4,781	5,850	426	506	704	466
Virginia	105.9	118.6	53.6	60.1	3,397	1,927	2,145	1,195	747	423	98	59	407	250
West Virginia	103.7	114.7	57.1	59.2	3,255	2,196	2,142	1,446	593	366	73	54	448	329
North Carolina	88.4	101.3	34.7	37.1	2,119	1,041	1,352	632	447	235	73	40	247	134
South Carolina	76.6	90.0	34.6	37.2	2,223	989	1,523	642	363	174	80	43	256	130
Georgia	92.6	117.5	42.3	47.2	1,995	1,016	1,273	616	374	200	72	44	276	157
Florida	105.0	106.9	36.1	37.0	2,863	1,321	1,874	755	488	244	89	48	412	274
East South Central:														
Kentucky	85.6	93.7	55.4	58.6	2,986	2,007	1,869	1,241	583	387	80	65	453	314
Tennessee	81.5	90.6	44.3	45.6	2,490	1,519	1,510	899	444	281	87	68	450	271
Alabama	78.9	92.7	36.9	38.8	1,408	804	825	449	271	154	62	39	250	162
Mississippi	67.6	82.6	32.8	34.4	1,554	925	926	520	292	168	62	44	274	193

Farm land and farm property—Averages per farm, by divisions and States, 1910 and 1900—Continued.

Division or State.	Average acres per farm.				Average value per farm.									
	All farm land.		Improved land.		All farm property.		Land.		Buildings.		Implements and machinery.		Live stock.	
	1910	1900	1910	1900	1910	1900	1910	1900	1910	1900	1910	1900	1910	1900
West South Central:														
Arkansas	81.1	93.1	37.6	38.9	$1,864	$1,015	$1,146	$588	$294	$168	$79	$49	$345	$210
Louisiana	86.6	95.4	43.8	40.2	2,499	1,712	1,558	929	413	288	157	246	371	249
Oklahoma	151.7	[1]212.9	92.3	[1]79.4	4,828	[1]2,570	3,413	[1]1,383	471	[1]198	142	[1]97	801	[1]891
Texas	269.1	357.2	65.5	55.6	5,311	2,733	3,909	1,680	503	285	136	85	763	683
Mountain:														
Montana	516.7	885.9	138.9	129.9	13,269	8,815	8,651	3,939	948	700	402	275	3,268	3,901
Idaho	171.5	183.4	90.2	80.9	9,911	3,850	7,140	2,031	815	391	340	188	1,616	1,240
Wyoming	777.6	1,333.0	114.3	130.0	15,217	11,071	8,092	3,845	820	579	334	224	5,971	6,423
Colorado	293.1	383.6	93.2	92.1	10,645	6,520	7,858	3,658	990	648	277	192	1,520	2,022
New Mexico	315.9	416.8	41.1	26.6	4,469	4,367	2,770	1,407	365	290	116	93	1,219	2,577
Arizona	135.1	333.2	38.0	43.8	8,142	5,163	4,590	1,965	535	390	194	132	2,823	2,676
Utah	156.7	212.4	63.1	53.2	6,957	3,878	4,590	2,070	833	549	206	151	1,328	1,108
Nevada	1,009.6	1,174.7	279.7	262.3	22,462	13,129	13,119	6,079	1,611	1,071	586	407	7,145	5,572
Pacific:														
Washington	208.4	256.0	113.4	104.4	11,346	4,338	9,208	2,991	971	491	297	189	870	667
Oregon	256.8	281.0	93.9	92.9	11,609	4,821	9,048	3,157	964	536	290	182	1,307	946
California	316.7	397.4	129.1	164.9	18,308	10,980	14,935	8,691	1,513	1,068	414	294	1,447	928

Division or State.	Total population, Apr. 15, 1910.		Rural population, Apr. 15, 1910.		All farms, Apr. 15, 1910.		Total land area (acres), Apr. 15, 1910.		All land in farms (acres), Apr. 15, 1910.		Improved land in farms (acres), Apr 15, 1910.	
	Number.	Per cent of total.	Number.	Per cent of total.	Number.	Per cent of total.	Number.	Per cent of total.	Number.	Per cent of total.	Number.	Per cent of total.
United States	91,972,266	.....	49,348,883	.....	6,361,502	100.00	1,903,289,600	100.00	878,978,325	100.00	478,451,750	100.00
Geographic divisions:												
New England	6,552,681	.....	1,097,336	.....	188,802	2.97	39,664,640	2.08	19,714,931	2.24	7,254,904	1.52
Middle Atlantic	19,315,892	.....	5,592,519	.....	468,379	7.36	64,000,000	3.36	43,191,056	4.91	29,320,894	6.13
East North Central	18,250,621	.....	8,633,350	.....	1,123,489	17.66	157,160,960	8.26	117,929,148	13.42	88,947,228	18.59
West North Central	11,637,921	.....	7,764,205	.....	1,109,948	17.45	326,914,560	17.18	232,648,121	26.47	164,284,862	34.34
South Atlantic	12,194,895	.....	9,102,742	.....	1,111,881	17.48	172,205,440	9.05	103,782,255	11.81	48,479,733	10.13
East South Central	8,409,901	.....	6,835,672	.....	1,042,480	16.39	114,885,760	6.04	81,520,629	9.28	43,946,846	9.19
West South Central	8,784,534	.....	6,827,078	.....	943,186	14.83	275,037,440	14.45	169,149,976	19.25	58,264,273	12.18
Mountain	2,633,517	.....	1,686,006	.....	183,446	2.88	549,840,000	28.89	59,533,420	6.77	15,915,002	3.33
Pacific	4,192,304	.....	1,809,975	.....	189,891	2.98	203,580,800	10.70	51,328,789	5.84	22,038,008	4.61
New England:												
Maine	742,371	.....	360,928	.....	60,016	0.94	19,132,800	1.01	6,296,859	0.72	2,360,657	0.49
New Hampshire	430,572	.....	175,473	.....	27,053	0.43	5,779,840	0.30	3,249,458	0.37	929,185	0.19
Vermont	355,956	.....	187,013	.....	32,709	0.51	5,839,360	0.31	4,663,577	0.53	1,633,965	0.34
Massachusetts	3,366,416	.....	241,049	.....	36,917	0.58	5,144,960	0.27	2,875,941	0.33	1,164,501	0.24
Rhode Island	542,610	.....	17,956	.....	5,292	0.08	682,880	0.04	443,308	0.05	178,344	0.04
Connecticut	1,114,756	.....	114,917	.....	26,815	0.42	3,084,800	0.16	2,185,789	0.25	988,252	0.21
Middle Atlantic:												
New York	9,113,614	.....	1,928,120	.....	215,597	3.39	30,498,560	1.60	22,030,367	2.51	14,844,039	3.10
New Jersey	2,537,167	.....	629,957	.....	33,487	0.53	4,808,960	0.25	2,573,857	0.29	1,803,336	0.38
Pennsylvania	7,665,111	.....	3,034,442	.....	219,295	3.45	28,692,480	1.51	18,586,832	2.11	12,673,519	2.65
East North Central:												
Ohio	4,767,121	.....	2,101,978	.....	272,045	4.28	26,073,600	1.37	24,105,708	2.74	19,227,969	4.02
Indiana	2,700,876	.....	1,557,041	.....	215,485	3.39	23,068,800	1.21	21,299,823	2.42	16,931,252	3.54
Illinois	5,638,591	.....	2,161,662	.....	251,872	3.96	35,867,520	1.88	32,522,937	3.70	28,048,323	5.86
Michigan	2,810,173	.....	1,483,129	.....	206,960	3.25	36,787,200	1.93	18,940,614	2.16	12,832,078	2.68
Wisconsin	2,333,860	.....	1,329,540	.....	177,127	2.78	35,363,840	1.86	21,060,066	2.40	11,907,606	2.49
West North Central:												
Minnesota	2,075,708	.....	1,225,414	.....	156,137	2.45	51,749,120	2.72	27,675,823	3.15	19,643,533	4.11
Iowa	2,221,771	2.42	1,544,717	3.13	217,044	3.41	35,575,040	1.87	33,930,688	3.86	29,491,199	6.16
Missouri	3,293,335	.....	1,894,518	.....	277,244	4.36	43,985,280	2.31	34,591,248	3.94	24,581,186	5.14
North Dakota	577,056	.....	513,820	.....	74,360	1.17	44,917,120	2.36	28,426,650	3.23	20,455,092	4.28
South Dakota	583,888	.....	507,215	.....	77,644	1.22	49,195,520	2.58	26,016,892	2.96	15,827,208	3.31
Nebraska	1,192,214	.....	881,262	.....	129,678	2.04	49,157,120	2.58	38,622,021	4.39	24,382,577	5.10
Kansas	1,690,949	.....	1,197,159	.....	177,841	2.80	52,335,360	2.75	43,384,799	4.94	29,904,067	6.25
South Atlantic:												
Delaware	202,322	.....	105,237	.....	10,836	0.17	1,257,600	0.07	1,038,866	0.12	713,538	0.15
Maryland	1,295,346	.....	637,154	.....	48,923	0.77	6,362,240	0.33	5,057,140	0.58	3,354,767	0.70
District of Columbia	331,069	.....	.....	.....	217	.....	38,400	(2)	6,063	.....	5,133	.....
Virginia	2,061,612	.....	1,585,083	.....	184,018	2.89	25,767,680	1.35	19,495,636	2.22	9,870,058	2.06
West Virginia	1,221,119	.....	992,877	.....	96,685	1.52	15,374,080	0.81	10,026,442	1.14	5,521,757	1.15
North Carolina	2,206,287	.....	1,887,813	.....	253,725	3.99	31,193,600	1.64	22,439,129	2.55	8,813,056	1.84
South Carolina	1,515,400	.....	1,290,568	.....	176,434	2.77	19,516,800	1.03	13,512,028	1.54	6,097,999	1.27
Georgia	2,609,121	.....	2,070,471	.....	291,027	4.57	37,584,000	1.97	20,953,413	3.07	12,298,017	2.57
Florida	752,619	.....	533,539	.....	50,016	0.79	35,111,040	1.84	5,253,538	0.60	1,805,408	0.38
East South Central:												
Kentucky	2,289,905	.....	1,734,463	.....	259,185	4.07	25,715,840	1.35	22,189,127	2.52	14,354,471	3.00
Tennessee	2,184,789	.....	1,743,744	.....	246,012	3.87	26,679,680	1.40	20,041,657	2.28	10,890,484	2.28
Alabama	2,138,093	.....	1,767,662	.....	262,901	4.13	32,818,560	1.72	20,732,312	2.36	9,693,581	2.03
Mississippi	1,797,114	.....	1,589,803	.....	274,382	4.31	29,671,680	1.56	18,557,533	2.11	9,008,310	1.88
West South Central:												
Arkansas	1,574,449	.....	1,371,768	.....	214,678	3.37	33,616,000	1.77	17,416,075	1.98	8,076,254	1.69
Louisiana	1,656,388	.....	1,159,872	.....	120,546	1.89	29,061,760	1.53	10,439,481	1.19	5,276,016	1.10
Oklahoma	1,657,155	.....	1,337,000	.....	190,192	2.99	44,424,960	2.33	28,859,353	3.28	17,551,337	3.67
Texas	3,896,542	.....	2,958,438	.....	417,770	6.57	167,934,720	8.82	112,435,067	12.79	27,360,666	5.72
Mountain:												
Montana	376,053	.....	242,633	.....	26,214	0.41	93,568,640	4.92	13,545,603	1.54	3,640,309	0.76
Idaho	325,594	.....	255,696	.....	30,807	0.48	53,346,560	2.80	5,283,604	0.60	2,778,740	0.58
Wyoming	145,965	.....	102,744	.....	10,987	0.17	62,460,160	3.28	8,543,010	0.97	1,256,160	0.26
Colorado	799,024	.....	394,184	.....	46,170	0.73	66,341,120	3.49	13,532,113	1.54	4,302,101	0.90
New Mexico	327,301	.....	280,730	.....	35,676	0.56	78,401,92	4.12	11,270,021	1.28	1,467,191	0.31
Arizona	204,354	.....	141,094	.....	9,227	0.15	72,838,400	3.83	1,246,613	0.14	350,173	0.07
Utah	373,351	.....	200,417	.....	21,676	0.34	52,597,760	2.76	3,397,699	0.39	1,368,211	0.29
Nevada	81,875	.....	68,508	.....	2,689	0.04	70,285,440	3.69	2,714,757	0.31	752,117	0.16
Pacific:												
Washington	1,141,990	.....	536,460	.....	56,192	0.88	42,775,040	2.25	11,712,235	1.33	6,373,311	1.33
Oregon	672,765	.....	365,705	.....	45,592	0.72	61,188,480	3.21	11,685,110	1.33	4,274,803	0.89
California	2,377,549	.....	907,810	.....	88,197	1.39	99,617,280	5.23	27,931,444	3.18	11,389,894	2.38

[1] Includes Indian Territory.

State.	Total population.	Total rural population.	Per cent of total rural population in the United States and by States.	Amount of appropriation allotted each State.
United States	91,972,266	49,348,883	53.7	$3,000,000
Alabama	2,138,093	1,767,662	3.58	107,400
Arizona	204,354	141,094	.29	8,700
Arkansas	1,574,449	1,371,768	2.78	83,400
California	2,377,549	907,810	1.84	55,200
Colorado	799,024	394,184	.80	24,000
Connecticut	1,114,756	114,917	.23	6,900
Delaware	202,322	105,237	.21	6,300
Florida	752,619	533,539	1.08	32,400
Georgia	2,609,121	2,070,471	4.19	125,700
Idaho	325,594	255,096	.52	15,600
Illinois	5,638,591	2,161,662	4.38	131,400
Indiana	2,700,876	1,557,041	3.16	94,800
Iowa	2,224,771	1,544,717	3.13	93,900
Kansas	1,690,949	1,197,159	2.43	72,900
Kentucky	2,289,905	1,734,463	3.51	105,300
Louisiana	1,656,388	1,159,872	2.35	70,500
Maine	742,371	360,928	.73	21,900
Maryland	1,795,346	637,154	1.29	38,700
Massachusetts	3,366,416	241,049	.49	14,700
Michigan	2,810,173	1,483,129	3.01	90,300
Minnesota	2,075,708	1,225,414	2.48	74,400
Mississippi	1,797,114	1,589,803	3.22	96,600
Missouri	3,293,335	1,894,518	3.84	115,200
Montana	376,053	242,633	.49	14,700
Nebraska	1,192,214	881,362	1.79	53,700
Nevada	81,875	68,508	.14	4,200
New Hampshire	430,572	175,473	.35	10,500
New York	9,113,614	1,928,120	3.91	117,300
New Jersey	2,537,167	629,957	1.28	38,400
New Mexico	327,301	280,730	.57	17,100
North Carolina	2,206,287	1,887,813	3.83	114,900
North Dakota	577,056	513,820	1.04	31,200
Ohio	4,767,121	2,101,978	4.26	127,800
Oklahoma	1,657,155	1,337,000	2.71	81,300
Oregon	672,765	365,705	.74	22,200
Pennsylvania	7,665,111	3,034,442	6.15	184,500
Rhode Island	542,610	17,956	.04	1,200
South Carolina	1,515,400	1,290,568	2.62	78,600
South Dakota	583,888	507,215	1.03	30,900
Tennessee	2,184,789	1,743,744	3.53	105,900
Texas	3,896,542	2,958,438	5.99	179,700
Utah	373,351	200,417	.41	12,300
Vermont	355,956	187,013	.38	11,400
Virginia	2,061,612	1,585,083	3.21	96,300
Washington	1,141,990	536,460	1.08	32,400
West Virginia	1,121,119	992,877	2.01	60,300
Wisconsin	2,333,860	1,329,540	2.69	80,700
Wyoming	145,965	102,744	.21	6,300

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS].

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa referred to the proviso on page 2 of the bill which reads as follows:

That nothing in this act shall be construed to discontinue either the farm-management work or the farmers' cooperative demonstration work as now conducted by the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture.

And he suggested that it be made to read:

That pending the inauguration and development of the cooperative extension work herein authorized, nothing in this act shall be construed—

And so forth.

Did I understand the Senator from Georgia to say that he would accept that amendment to the proviso?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No; I did not say that. I said that the original policy was to use the language contained in the bill as first drawn, and that the change was made, as I understand it, solely upon the idea that Congress might deem it advisable at some time in the future to direct some demonstration work by the department and carry it in an appropriation bill, and that the language of the bill as first drawn might prevent it. It was done not so much on the theory of keeping up the present demonstration work as that we would leave Congress in an attitude where without special legislation repealing this act it could not be done.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say that the object the Senator has in view, as just stated, meets with my hearty approval, but the amendment suggested by the Senator from Iowa was recommended by the department itself, and I am told that if the provision as it appears in the bill, approved by the House, is passed, it will probably embarrass the Secretary of Agriculture in working out a comprehensive plan.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does the Senator refer to the first provision suggested by the department or the last one?

Mr. SMOOT. The first provision; that is, the provision suggested by the Senator from Iowa adding the words "pending the inauguration and development of the cooperative extension work herein authorized." That, in connection with the House provision, was recommended by the department, and the department itself claims now that unless those words are included in the proviso there will be embarrassment to the Secretary in working out a comprehensive plan.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not exactly understand the Senator. Does he mean to say that the department prefers the language as first used or the language contained in the House provision?

Mr. SMOOT. As first used and not in the House provision. I call it to the Senator's attention because I apprehend that we can not pass the bill to-night, and in the meantime I should like to have the Senator look up that question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would prefer the original language myself.

Mr. SMOOT. I say frankly, so do I; and I think those words ought to be included in the proviso.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will communicate with the department and find out. I was under the impression the change was made to preserve a latitude for the department, if the department found out at any time it wanted to ask for a special appropriation for some additional work.

Mr. SMOOT. I have been informed just the opposite, Mr. President.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I may have misunderstood it.

Mr. SMOOT. Therefore I ask the Senator to look it up between now and Monday.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the Senator will pardon me, I was engaged when the Senator stated the proposed change. Will he please state again his proposition?

Mr. SMOOT. I will state that the amendment approved by the House to the original bill, as introduced in the House, and found on page 2 of the bill, beginning on line 15, reads as follows:

Provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed to discontinue either the farm-management work or the farmers' cooperative demonstration work as now conducted by the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture.

I was suggesting to the Senator from Georgia, as the Senator from Iowa had suggested, to add the words "pending the inauguration and development of the cooperative extension work herein authorized," so that the proviso would read:

Provided further, That, pending the inauguration and development of the cooperative extension work herein authorized, nothing in this act shall be construed to discontinue either the farm-management work or the farmers' cooperative demonstration work as now conducted by the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I would be glad to have the Senator from Utah put the suggested modification in writing, so that we might have it before us.

Mr. SMOOT. I will do so with pleasure.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], as they consider further the question of division, look at the provision of Senate bill No. 3, with reference to this same matter. The provision reads:

These additional sums to be allotted annually to the States in proportion to their population engaged in agriculture, as shown by the Federal census next preceding the year for which such allotment is made.

I want to say in behalf of this language that when it was written not the slightest thought was ever given as to how it was going to affect any particular State. I would not for a moment have it inferred from this statement that I believe that the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Iowa have not designed to be absolutely fair in their respective provisions, but when Senate bill No. 3 was drawn I gave this question a good deal of thought, and it seemed to me then, and it seems to me now—and I say it after having listened with a good deal of care to the discussion that has been going on in regard to this measure—that we are seeking to educate by this bill men engaged in agriculture; we are not legislating as to improved farm lands, we are not educating the rural population, but we are seeking to educ men engaged in agriculture. How it will affect Vermont is not material. I certainly did not know, until some friend called my attention to-day to the fact, that Vermont would not be materially benefited or injured by the change which would be made if the language of Senate bill No. 3 were used; and it occurred to me that, if between these two wings of the discussion, the position of the Senator from Iowa and that of the Senator from Georgia, perhaps this was a very proper and happy medium which might be adopted.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, unfortunately, the position of the Senator from Vermont is not between that of the Senator from Georgia and myself; it is far beyond that of the Senator from Georgia. If the standard suggested by the Senator from Vermont were used, it would very greatly increase the proportion of the appropriation passing to the States in the South I have been discussing and diminish the proportion of the States which really produce the bulk of the agricultural products of the country, and that for a very simple reason. Practically all of the colored people in the South are classified as persons engaged in agriculture—I think so large a proportion of them that the remainder would be negligible—and while I have not worked out in its effect upon the States the basis suggested by the Senator from Vermont, I think that, upon a little reflection, it would not be insisted upon by anybody. I do not think the Senator had this in mind when he inserted it in his bill. The truth is, we are trying to educate the people who control the manner in which the land shall be used, who control, as I said before, the way in which the soil shall be tilled, the crops that shall be planted, the manner in which they shall be cultivated, and the way in which they shall be harvested. If we depart from that idea and enter upon a general scheme of educating in agricultural science all the people who may at any time work upon the farm, we have quite a different proposition.

I do not know how the Senator from Georgia feels about the matter, but I have not a doubt that he will agree with me that the basis of persons engaged in agricultural pursuits would make the disparity that I have been endeavoring to emphasize still more marked.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have not examined the matter or conferred with officers of the Census Bureau upon the subject. I inquired for the figures showing the number classified from each State as engaged in agriculture, and I was informed that they had not been completed and that we could not procure them for several months. So I abandoned any further inquiry upon the subject.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator could obtain them probably as to a few States; at least, I have that information from a few States.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should not be at all surprised, from my knowledge, if the view of the Senator from Iowa was correct.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the view of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] would be borne out by the statistics from the few States which I have already seen. I think he is perfectly correct in the statement he has made.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it had been my purpose to address the Senate this afternoon and present the views which I think sustain the language contained in the bill upon the subject of the distribution, not with the opinion that I could show that they were all we would wish, but rather that they were the best plan to carry out the bill that we could obtain. I find, however, that a number of Senators, even of the few who are still here, are quite anxious for an adjournment, and I will only make one reference to the subject.

I wish to say—and I say it now because I wish it to appear in the RECORD to-morrow morning—that this plan of distribution was not the work of the Representative from South Carolina or of myself; indeed, I do not think either of us had any idea how it would affect the different States. It was the work of a committee from the colleges of agriculture and experiment stations, who acted in connection with Dr. True, Director of Experiment Stations. The committee consisted of Dr. Thompson, of Ohio; Dean Russell, of Wisconsin; Dean Butterfield, of Massachusetts; Dean Jordan, of New York; and Dean Curtis, of Iowa. It was from them that we received this plan of distribution, which they, viewing the matter not in any way sectional, but contemplating it broadly in the interest of the entire country, submitted to us.

Mr. President, I hope to be able to present on Monday some views in reply to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS]. I now ask that the bill be laid aside, after which I shall move to adjourn, unless some Senator desires to have an executive session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be temporarily laid aside.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 10 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 2, 1914, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 31, 1914.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSIONERS.

Winthrop More Daniels, of Princeton, N. J., to be an interstate commerce commissioner, to fill the unexpired term of John H. Marble, deceased. (Term expires December 31, 1916.)

Henry Clay Hall, of Colorado Springs, Colo., to be an interstate commerce commissioner, to fill the unexpired term of Charles A. Prouty, resigned. (Term expires December 31, 1914.)

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Christian A. Niemeyer, of Creston, Iowa, to be collector of customs for the district of Iowa, in place of George L. Godfrey, resigned.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

James A. Herring, jr., of Tampa, Fla., to be appraiser of merchandise at Tampa, in the district of Florida, in place of Frank W. Morse, superseded.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 31, 1914.

RECEIVERS OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

John W. Cloyd to be receiver of public moneys at Sterling, Colo.

George I. Smith to be receiver of public moneys at Portland, Oreg.

R. R. Turner to be receiver of public moneys at Roseburg, Oreg.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Robert W. Clark to be a passed assistant paymaster.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Robert R. Wilson to be register of the land office at Dodge City, Kans.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

L. N. Douglas, Trumann.
Ethel Leeper, Lockesburg.

CONNECTICUT.

E. Franklin Byron, Sharon.
Edward C. Cox, Wallingford.
Adelbert W. Crane, South Glastonbury.
Albert L. Lamb, West Hartford.
Edward P. McGowan, Watertown.
Albert H. McMahon, New Milford.
George B. Moroney, Collinsville.
Philip Troup, New Haven.

ILLINOIS.

Charles S. Barker, Oswego.
E. D. Beird, Bluffs.
Leo J. Byrne, Rossville.
F. A. McGowan, Manhattan.
William Whalen, Franklin.

MICHIGAN.

C. D. Aldrich, East Lansing.
George H. Anklam, Pidgeon.
Martin M. Bies, Palatka.
Mark Burlingame, Bangor.
George Cutler, Luther.
Francis O. Gaffney, Cadillac.
G. Martin Harrington, Bancroft.
Levi A. Harris, Gaylord.
Albert A. Howard, Watervliet.
William J. Irwin, Republic.
John A. Jackson, Clare.
Charles E. Johnston, Merrill.
Clinton Joseph, Quincy.
H. J. Klee, Rogers.
A. Le Roy Locke, Bronson.
Hugh McLaughlin, Iron Mountain.
Malcolm McPhee, Newberry.
A. H. Meeker, Sparta.
W. T. Menge, L'Anse.
A. M. Miller, Bay City.
Neil Mills, Armada.
Le Roy Palmer, Coldwater.
A. W. Peterson, Ironwood.
Herbert A. Sarford, Mount Pleasant.
Edwin Shellhorn, Lake Odessa.
Herman G. Spring, Unionville.

Henry C. Stevenson, South Lyon.
Peter Trudell, jr., Negaunee.
John S. Wittliff, Port Huron.

NEW YORK.

Peter T. Conley, Fulton.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Pauline M. Schultz, Leeds.

OHIO.

P. D. Amstutz, Pandora.
Charles J. Betz, Baltimore.
Thomas H. Code, Mentor.
William R. Foster, Perry.
William J. Evans, New Berlin.
Cyrenius C. Hughs, Utica.
Harry C. Lieurance, Jamestown.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Thomas F. Curry, Expedit.
B. B. Stewart, Rimersburg.

TENNESSEE.

W. A. Hamby, Crossville.
Hiram M. Moore, Portland.

WEST VIRGINIA.

J. Carl Vance, Clarksburg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *January 31, 1914.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by Mr. FERRIS as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Be Thou, O God our Father, our inspiration, our counselor, our guide, that we may be the instruments in Thy hands for the furtherance of the great eternal plan which Thou hast ordained, setting above the material the intellectual, moral, and spiritual attainments, that as individuals and as a Nation we may be worthy of the trust Thou hast reposed in us as free moral agents, and we will ascribe all praise to Thee, our God and our Father. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order, the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 6060, the immigration bill.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States, with Mr. HAY in the chair.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentlemen opposing the bill use some of their time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair please inform me how much time has been used by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], and also how much by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] has used 2 hours and 3 minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has used 62 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] 45½ minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COADY] five minutes.

Mr. COADY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the bill now before the House for its consideration because it contains the literacy test. Such a test is not only undesirable but it is, in my judgment, unfair and unreasonable, and it violates every principle of justice and fair dealing.

It violates the principle that this country shall be a refuge and asylum for the oppressed of other lands, a principle that we were all taught at school and at home to revere and cherish.

The only questions with which we should concern ourselves respecting the immigrant are those that concern his health, his morals, and the condition of his mind.

We should rigidly exclude as undesirables the criminal, the insane, the permanently disabled, the diseased, and all others who are likely to become charges on our communities. And I believe we have at this time ample provisions in our statutes to meet such cases.

I would have no opposition to offer to this measure with the literacy test stricken out.

We heard a great deal here yesterday about the vetoes of President Cleveland and President Taft, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] sought to excuse the veto of President Cleveland, and said that conditions were different at that time. But, Mr. Chairman, President Cleveland, in sending his veto message to this Congress, did not say that he was governed by conditions, but he said, on the contrary, that he was governed by principles. [Applause.] Let us see what he said. He said that the ability to read and write, as required in the bill submitted to him, did not afford a test of contented industry, nor did it supply satisfactory evidence of good citizenship.

Prof. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard, said in a very recent interview published in our papers, that there had been no destruction of our ideals by the immigrants, but that they had lived up to and cherished them.

Yesterday when somebody asked the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] about the veto of Mr. Taft, the gentleman said the people of this country at the last election demonstrated what they thought of Mr. Taft's veto. Why, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the gentleman from Alabama, that is the most absurd statement that I have heard in this whole debate, and it is just about as strong and convincing as the other arguments that I have heard on the other side of this question.

Mr. BURNETT. I made no such statement.

Mr. COADY. You said it by inference, and the RECORD will prove it. You may have been urged on to say that by the oracle of wisdom who sits at your right, and who has prompted you several times during this debate.

Mr. GARDNER. Is there any necessity for the gentleman being personal?

Mr. COADY. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I only intended that in a pleasant sort of way.

Mr. BURNETT. It did not sound that way.

Mr. COADY. Mr. Chairman, the great metropolitan dailies of our big cities are opposed to this test, and in this course they are upheld by the overwhelming sentiment of their communities.

I am in favor of education—free public education—for the children; it should be free as the air we breathe, and I believe in making it compulsory.

But I would not contend that the lack of an education, undesirable as it is, and unfortunate, too, unfits a man for the duties and obligations of citizenship. I know that it does not. Some of the best men I have met were illiterate. They could not read or write, but they were honest, industrious, law-abiding citizens.

They accumulated property; raised large families, and reared them well; gave them education; showed them good example, and by their labor contributed to the welfare and prosperity of their adopted country.

Only the other day a prominent man, descendant of foreign-born parents, said to me right here in Washington, and he is a man who has met with great success; he said that if a law like this had been in effect when his parents came to this country, they would have been excluded, for neither could read nor write. And this is true of many other prominent men in this country—prominent in the church, in business, in the professions, and prominent in the activities of organized labor.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] well says in the minority report submitted by him, that this bill fails to take into account the rough manual work that must be done in a great country like ours, and which the educated and more-favored citizen will not do.

It is not only the educated and more-favored citizen who will not do such work, but it is a difficult thing to get anyone for this class of work, except the kind of people this measure seeks to exclude.

For some time past we have been witnessing the flow of people from the country into the big cities and centers of population. We want immigrants to take the places of these people on the farms. I believe we can get them. I am told that of the foreigners who came here last year, 300,000 are men who till the soil. We want these men, and we want more like them. The trouble lies not in the influx of too many foreigners, but in their locating in the big cities.

And I believe the time is coming—and soon, too—when the problem of distributing them over the country will be successfully solved.

The people of my district are opposed to this bill.

I have received numerous protests, written and oral, against its passage, and few—but very few—have asked me to vote for it.

I sincerely hope it will be defeated, as it deserves to be, because the literacy test it provides is undesirable and unjust, and it will keep from our shores the unskilled labor we need in the great work of developing our resources. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, on December 19 I received the following telegram:

The 2,000,000 members of the National German-American Alliance vehemently protest against the passage of the immigration bill now before the House. We particularly object to the educational test, which we believe to be foolish and iniquitous. Please present this protest to the House of Representatives.

C. J. HEXAMER,
President of the National German-American Alliance of the United States.

This protest is significant for more than one reason. In the first place, it represents the deliberate judgment of 2,000,000 American voters, and therefore alone is entitled to respectful consideration. But what makes it still more significant is the altruism which has dictated it. In this you will agree with me when I remind you that the pending bill will affect but very little, if at all, the immigration of Germans into this country. The percentage of illiteracy among Germans, I am happy to say, is not even 1 per cent—hardly worth mentioning. It is less than that of any State of the American Union. Consequently the barrier which the bill proposes to erect will not keep out any Germans to speak of. Yet that element protests most vigorously against its enactment. How do you account for it? Permit me to give you my explanation. In the first place, they do not want to deny to others the opportunity which they or their ancestors have enjoyed. In this they are actuated by a simple sense of justice. But this is not the whole explanation of their attitude. There is something else, even more important than a sense of fairness, and that is a sentiment of lofty patriotism. That element of the population, I dare say, without speaking boastfully, clings most tenaciously to American ideals and traditions. One of those traditions is that America is the asylum of the downtrodden and oppressed of the world. Pass this bill and that proud boast will be forever silenced; pass this bill and you will rob Columbia of one of her crown jewels and at the same time you will commit the identical wrong which formed one of the main indictments hurled by the American colonists against George III. Thus think and speak our fellow citizens of German birth and descent, and I call special attention to their position because it shows that in protesting against a proposed violation of a sound American principle and a needless departure from a time-honored American policy they are again as true to the genius of the Republic as is the magnet to the pole.

I am fully aware, Mr. Chairman, that arguments will not avail anything in this debate. If they did, the fate of this bill would be sealed. There would not be a single vote cast in its favor, because as against the patriotic intellect which condemns it, there is not one valid argument to uphold it. What are the reasons which the advocates of this measure assign for its alleged necessity? Latter-day immigration, they say, is not what it used to be. It has deteriorated, and the elements that are coming now are not as desirable and as easily assimilated as the former immigrants were. It will be remembered that identically the same objections were raised by the Know-nothings in the fifties against the German and Irish immigration and have been raised ever since against every kind of immigrants who came in considerable numbers. It is admitted now that it was mere prejudice against foreigners in general which swelled the sails of the Know-nothing Party, and if it was prejudice then, what is it to-day? A few years ago the so-called Boxer movement in China culminated in infuriated mobs shouting, "Kill the foreign devils." Is it not humiliating to confess that, in spite of our boasted Christian civilization, we have a similar movement in America? We have, Mr. Chairman, and the only difference is one of degree. We do not kill, but we propose to build a Chinese wall around our country for the purpose of accomplishing what? For the purpose actually of excluding the people we do need and of admitting many we do not need. However, to this feature I shall refer later on. First, let me enumerate some of the other so-called arguments constantly advanced in justification of this Boxer movement in America.

Some are actually afraid that the country will soon be overcrowded. Mr. Chairman, if you move the whole population of the United States into Texas, that State will not be populated as densely as Belgium is to-day. When the United States will have a population of ten times a hundred millions, then its population will be about equal in density to that of the German Empire to-day, and not until then. America supports 30 people to the square mile, Europe more than 300. In view of these indisputable figures, how ridiculous the cold sweat of our faint-hearted friends must appear to those who come after us and will live a hundred years from now.

The advocates of the literacy test no longer pretend that this test is to be imposed in the interest of education. They admitted in the last Congress that their real purpose was restriction. They lack the courage to name the Italians, the Poles, the Russian and Galician Jews, and so forth, and so they proceed to exclude these classes by shrewdly imposing conditions which many of them can not fulfill. This may be very smart, and we may pat each other on the backs on account of our smartness, but I wonder what the civilized world will say when a Yankee trick, as they will call it, is to be clothed with the dignity of American law? As much as I believe in immigration, as essential as I hold a continued healthy influx of newcomers for the future development of our country, I would rather see the gates of the Republic closed altogether than have it said that in the enactment of any law this Nation was hypocritical and insincere. If you object to the immigrants of southern Europe because that part of Europe is mostly Catholic, say so like men, or if you want to deny the right of asylum to the Jews fleeing from Russian oppression, make a manly declaration to that effect in the bill, but pray do not creep behind a subterfuge and dignify Anglo-Saxon hypocrisy with the name of law.

In the last Congress during the debate on this bill some of its advocates went so far as to even slander the immigrants by asserting that immigration was proving a menace to the country. This "scum of the earth," they said in so many words, "is lowering our standards, is tending to corrupt the American people physically as well as morally, and is causing trouble everywhere." It is the old charge, Mr. Chairman, of the wolf against the lamb muddying the water, though the little innocent lamb was standing below stream. The ratio of a year's immigration to our total population is like 1 to 300. If every one of the poor fellows who come here merely to better their condition and to make an honest living can spoil, physically and mentally, 300 of our citizenship, then our morality and our physical health as a Nation must, indeed, rest on a pitifully weak foundation. To assert it is really an insult, not to the immigrants, but to the American people. And I challenge the friends of this bill to cite one single case, one single event, in the history of our country in which the attitude of the immigrants and the adopted citizens was other than patriotic to a fault. They rallied around the flags of Washington to fight and die for American independence. They fought almost to a man under Abraham Lincoln for the preservation of the Union. Indeed, history credits them with having enlisted on the right side of every great question, and with having helped to uphold right and liberty either by their bullets or their ballots.

To cite only one instance of more recent history, it is an admitted fact that by their almost solid vote for sound money they saved the country from the calamity of a corrupted monetary system and national dishonor. Cause to find fault with our immigrant population, therefore, have only those who in the dark hours of the country's crises were on the wrong side of those great questions. Query: Will the American people, with their proverbial sense of fairness, permit the proposed legislative revenge on the newcomers because the older immigration dared to do what was right for the country? In this connection we may again be told that the new immigration is not what the old was, but I deny it. A man is not inferior to me simply because he was born in a part of the world other than where my cradle stood, and even a lack of education does not make him morally inferior, for the simple reason that education and character are two entirely different things. And character alone should be the test of a man's worth.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the immigrant has taken part in labor disturbances, for wherever, in field, factory, and forest, the hardest work is being performed there you find the immigrant. But these troubles are not racial, but economical, and where they occur native workmen are usually the leaders. If the immigrant joins hands with his native comrades in these emergencies, he simply proves what I have often asserted, namely, that when he finds he has to pay American prices for American goods he also demands American wages, a fact, by the way, which is a complete refutation of one of the stock arguments of our labor leaders, namely, that he, the immigrant, is an unfair competitor in the labor market. And this brings me to the only objection which I recognize as really sincere, the objection of labor to immigration as an economic problem. However, the protest of labor is being paraded on this floor, not out of friendship for labor, but because it suits the purposes of the restrictionists. The workingman looks upon each immigrant as an unwelcome rival, whose presence lessens his opportunity of employment. As will be remembered, he regarded every new invention and every machine in the same light, and yet he has learned that through the introduction of labor-saving machines the opportunities of labor were increased rather than diminished.

The same is true, I claim, of the immigrant, for he is not only a producer but also a consumer, and his coming here and casting his lot with us and spending the earnings for his support in this country is a thousand times preferable, from an economic standpoint, to his remaining in Europe and merely sending the product of his labor to the United States. If immigration would really injure American labor, this bill would not be a proper remedy, for it excludes not only the lowest class of toilers, such as do not compete with our own workingmen, but also admits those who do compete with them, namely, skilled laborers, who as a rule are not illiterates. If the reasons which prompt the protest of organized labor against immigration were economically sound, then the advocates of this legislation were handing labor a gold brick, and, indeed, the western miners appear to have seen through the scheme when in their recent convention they resolved that the gates of the country should be completely shut as long as one American workman is out of employment. A beautiful idea, by the way, but as long as they sincerely believe in its feasibility you can not fool them with a bill like this. By such a demand on the part of labor I can not help being reminded of a simile. I see before me a vivid picture of that terrible disaster which befell the *Titanic*, when hundreds of the unfortunate shipwrecked were struggling with the waves, trying frantically to reach the lifeboats and rafts. Supposing those in the boats had prevented these unfortunates from getting a hold and had pushed them back into the roaring sea, though there had still been ample room in the lifeboats, what would you think of such an act? The immigrants who come to our shores are shipwrecked, too, Mr. Chairman, and I will never believe that, if this was made the issue, the arm of American labor would ever earnestly be raised to push the downtrodden of the world back into the sea while attempting to board our well-supplied craft. [Applause.]

So far I have endeavored to enumerate and answer only a few of the alleged grievances against the immigrant. There are more—in fact, there seems to be a universal outcry against him—and he is commonly regarded as a sort of general scapegoat. If all the several elements of our population could pass by him in rotation, each single one would probably give him a kick, and each one for a different reason. The capitalist and manufacturer denounce him when he joins a strike, the laboring man when he refuses to do so.

The farmer inveighs against him when he stays in the city, and the city man because he does not go to the country. The A. P. A.'s kick him when he happens to be a Catholic, and other people with religious prejudices abuse him when he happens to be a Jew. In fact, a veritable religious war has been kindled on his account, although we live in the enlightenment of the twentieth century; and while this war does not appear on the surface here, for obvious reasons, it is nevertheless being waged with a bitterness which, as a Protestant, I can not characterize otherwise than disgraceful. But he is not yet sufficiently punished. There are others who would like to add their kicks. There are our good friends, the professional prohibitionists, who are afraid that the influx from Europe will eventually swell the ranks of those who oppose their foolish fad, and so they mix their shrill voices in the chorus of condemnation, causing a general hubbub which reminds us vividly of the time when the pious Puritan ancestors of the gentleman from Massachusetts burned witches at the stake. It is a most remarkable social phenomenon, Mr. Speaker, one which is worthy to be described by the future historian as an exhibition showing a strange lack of the Christian virtue of tolerance and humanity. I had almost said a lack of knowledge, too, because the most intense prejudice against the immigrant seems to be displayed by those who do not know him from personal contact, while the only sympathy shown him comes from the representatives of districts which are overrun by and actually congested from immigration.

Even this spectacle, with all its repulsive features, can not shake my abiding faith in the sense of justice of the American people. And justice, plain, simple justice, is all the immigrant asks. He will get it when his case rises above the vote-catching stage and reaches a forum before which his friends can successfully plead the cause of American fair play and the true interests of the country. Two American Presidents, a Democrat and a Republican, have had the courage to stamp this bill out of existence by a veto, and there is no reason to doubt that President Wilson will rise to the same height of consistency and self-respect as his predecessors have done.

It is easy to plead the cause of immigration. Traduced as it is, no shortcoming of any kind can justly be laid at its door, and in no instance has its influence been other than highly beneficial to the country. The immigrant comes to us with good and honest intentions. In return for a living he offers us his brain and brawn. He is eager to learn and to identify himself with our institutions, for, even if uneducated, he has one trait which fits him superbly for American citizenship. It is his love of liberty and his hatred of oppresson and injustice. Our whole history is an irrefutable witness to the fact that he becomes a law-abiding citizen and taxpayer, loyally devoted to the flag, and most anxious that his children become good and true Americans through education in the public schools. And do you ever consider that in order to pass through the gates of Ellis Island he must be well-nigh a perfect human being? No country on earth, no matter how densely populated, has immigration laws as strict as the United States has. An immigrant must be absolutely sound in body and mind. His past conduct, too, must have been exemplary, and anarchists, polygamists, or persons who do not believe in the present order of things are rigidly excluded, the same as those who were so reckless as to procure the promise of a job before leaving their homes. If finally admitted, it is only on probation, because for a period of three years they can be deported if they do not behave. Can you beat it? But not enough; it is now proposed to add the requirement of a certain school education. The "land of opportunity" is to penalize those who are guilty, without fault of their own, of a lack of opportunity. No matter how pure their lives, how good their character, how desirable their presence here, if they can not read the door of a happier future will be shut in their faces. They would be readily admitted in heaven, and according to the standards of the Almighty they would be most welcome there, but they are not good enough to enter this free country. In the language of the Latin proverb, it is difficult not to write a satyre. Think of how deeply imbued with the Christian gospel of brotherly love must be the originators of such a plan, and how mindful they must be of the fact that, as a nation of immigrants, we owe everything—our growth, our development, and our very existence—to the source which they now propose to stop!

But let me proceed to the conclusion of my argument. From what I have already said it must be plain to all that not one of the objections raised against a continuance of the time-honored American immigration policy is well founded, unless it be one which I have not yet mentioned, namely, that the advocates of this bill are expecting something unforeseen and are anxious to take precautions, the same as the people out West do when they take to the cyclone cellar and fasten all the doors behind them. If this is one of their motives, I want to warn them that such precaution might easily hasten the very crisis which they dread. If the majority of this House has confidence in the tariff legislation which they enacted, then they should not deem a further restriction of immigration necessary, and if the new tariff should work out well, which we all hope in the interest of the country, then it would not be necessary. But if, on the other hand, idleness on a large scale should result, this restrictive measure would be no less unnecessary, for the simple reason that immigration, as a rule, regulates itself. In good times it comes and in hard times it goes. If the official figures are any indication—and I think they are—the human influx is not only receding, but the departures of immigrants to their home countries have already begun to an unprecedented degree. In the Immigration Bulletin for December, just issued, I find, under the classification of laborers, that in December 16,911 arrived, while 22,031 departed; in other words, we had over 5,000 more departures than arrivals during the last month. During the last fiscal year 220,992 laborers arrived and 191,604 left the country, a surplus of only 29,000 in the whole year. If this keeps on, Mr. Chairman, immigration will be even less of a problem by the time this bill reaches the President than it is supposed to be to-day.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me again warn this great body against coining race prejudice into law. It is unworthy of any nation to be actuated by motives such as are the propelling force behind this bill, and it is especially unworthy of the American people, because they are a Nation of immigrants. Immigration has made America what it is to-day. It has kindled the fires in the furnaces, cleared the forests, tilled the soil, built the railroads, and worked the mines. It has identified itself with the country and its institutions, defended liberty and law, and supported loyally every movement for progress, for the betterment of social and industrial conditions, and for the elevation of the race. In peace and war it stood shoulder to shoulder with the American patriots, and in no crisis of the country's history has it been found wanting. It is not because 60 years ago the Know-nothing Party accomplished its purpose, but rather because that party failed in carrying out its exclusion program, that the country has made those strides in industrial development, wealth, and general growth which are the marvel of the world to-day. Therefore, do not undermine the foundations of future growth and development by killing

the goose that lays the golden eggs, and do not withhold the protection of the Stars and Stripes from those who wish to escape from the oppression of the Old World and with a heart full of love of liberty are anxious to cast their lot with us and make for themselves a brighter future in the "land of the free and the home of the brave."

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHARP].

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this limited time to-day because I shall not be able, unfortunately, on account of serious sickness in my family, to be present and vote on the measure when the roll is called. It is on that account that I wish to express myself in favor of this bill, as I did at the last Congress, when I also voted for practically the same bill. It has seemed to me in considering the arguments that have been made in opposition to the measure, both at this session and in the former Congress, that one important fact has been overlooked, and that is that if we are to undertake to please everybody and to meet with everybody's views we never will have any kind of restriction adopted to prevent the indiscriminate immigration which we have seen coming to our shores in such alarming volume within the last few years. As an illustration, we heard a good many arguments made against the recent banking and currency law, but everybody admits now that there was need of reform in that direction. If we had waited to conform to the views of every financier and everyone who thought he was a financier, we never would have had this law or any other kind of law on our statute books. This leads me to observe, in criticism of the arguments of my very good friend from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT], that, however serious may have been some of the objections to the banking and currency law, I did not hear anyone bold enough to urge as an argument that because the conditions that then prevailed in the country as regarded the banking and currency laws of 100 years ago were satisfactory we should have no other system or policy now. And for the same reason it seems to me preposterous to undertake to compare conditions that existed 100 years ago with reference to immigration laws to the very serious problems that confront us to-day, when during every year more than one-third as many people come to our shores from foreign countries as were living in this country in those colonial days.

So, Mr. Chairman, if we are to wait until we get a perfect bill we never shall take the initiative. I admit here, having examined the subject somewhat with care, that this literacy test is by no means conclusive. Of course it is not. The mere fact that a man may be required to read some language, even his own, may not make him a good upright citizen in every respect, but it is a step in the right direction, and if we are to-day to answer the appeal—that which I believe to be the almost universal sentiment and desire of nine-tenths of the people of this country—we certainly will take some forward step at this time and put a law upon the statute books that will make for reform. It will not be a perfect law. There may be other needs of further restriction based on better criterions very apparent before it is in operation very long; but as those problems arise I trust the wisdom, patriotism, and justice of this body to solve them in a proper manner.

In making these few remarks I cast no reflection on that sturdy and patriotic body of men who came here years ago from foreign shores and contributed so much to the material prosperity and development of this country. I have all praise for those men.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman would not interrupt me now, as I have only a very short time. I would be very glad to answer his question, but I can not take the time to do it now. Surely the time has come to take at least a very careful survey of conditions which will permit upward of a million a year to come to our shores of all grades and classes of people, many of whom have no intention of becoming American citizens and whose competition in the field of labor has at times become most distressing with that of our own people to whom we emphatically owe our first duty. I may further say, in answer to the argument of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] that instead of its being a stain on the escutcheon of fair Columbia, as he said, it will rather be an additional mark of honor that there is one country on the face of the earth at least where some sort of test of the standard of citizenship is required before such newcomers, many of them so foreign to a knowledge of our institutions, can take upon themselves the obligation and privilege to exercise the American franchise. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Chairman, since the creation of this Government we have said to the enlightened nations of the world, "Come; the door is open; there is room enough for all."

We are now asked to inaugurate a new policy—to close the door; put up the bars; and say to the world, "Stay out; we want no more of you."

Are we ready and can we afford to do this? This is the ultimate question for solution.

Gentlemen say, "Oh, no; this is a very mild and reasonable exclusion act; it will only arbitrarily exclude a certain per cent."

Mr. Chairman, that is not the purpose of this measure. This is the beginning of the end; it means final exclusion of all aliens. That is the purpose prevalent in the minds and hearts of those who are urging the passage of this bill. That is the ultimate question we are facing to-day.

We know what an illiteracy test means. It means whatever those charged with its enforcement choose to make it mean.

We have illiteracy tests now relating to the right of franchise, and wherever these tests are enforced it results in total exclusion.

Mr. Chairman, I shall assume that this course of legislation means in the end the final exclusion of all immigrants. Now, are we ready to adopt that course?

We have listened here with much interest to the gentleman from Alaska, Judge WICKERSHAM, who so graphically described to us a few days since the great possibilities of that Territory. He told us of its wonderful opportunities for agriculture, its wealth as a mining country, and one gentleman told us a great fish story. We are going to build a great system of railroads in that Territory. What do we want there for the development of that country? We want people.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] also told us that there were 360,000,000 acres of unsold Government land in this country.

The gentleman from Oklahoma also suggested that there were many times that many acres of unoccupied land in the United States. What do we need for the improvement of this land? People. A few days ago I made a trip through the South. I saw thousands of acres of unimproved lands, much of it susceptible of cultivation. Gentlemen from the South tell us of the wonderful possibilities of their country, that land of sunshine and perpetual summer. As I rode along in the car I picked up a newspaper published in Mobile and noticed a headline which was the single word "shame." The paragraph read:

Alabama can raise the best corn in the country, yet we shipped in 20,000,000 bushels last year.

I have no doubt there is a shortage of other cereals in that country. What is most needed in the South? People. It is true they have the black man, but the colored man is not a constructive man. He works for to-day. He has no thought of the future. The immigrant works for to-morrow. Gentlemen have spoken of the old immigrants. They have been fulsome in their eulogies of those who came here from Ireland, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries. I venture to say, however, that if this illiteracy test had been enforced against them large portions of them would have been excluded. Perhaps one-half of them came here, as the saying is, "with tags on their backs." If that test had been enforced against this class of foreigners, one-half of the Members of this House would not be here to-day. They might possibly be members of the British Parliament.

There are two objections urged to the present immigrants; one is that they come in competition with American labor. I shall not take the time of the House to answer this argument. It has been fully and conclusively answered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT]. The other argument is that these people are poor, ignorant, and do not readily assimilate with our people. I admit that they are poor; they are not ignorant, and they will assimilate with our people.

I live in the great manufacturing district of Indiana known as the Calumet district. There are 80,000 foreigners in that district, chiefly from southern and eastern Europe. In the city of Gary there are perhaps 12,000 adult foreigners from these countries. I hold in my hand a newspaper printed in my home town. I desire to read a paragraph therefrom:

More than 3,000 men and women are enrolled in the night schools in Gary.

What city in this country of the size I indicate can make such a showing. These foreigners display an intense desire not only to learn to read and to write, but to familiarize them-

selves with our institutions. Let us take the second generation. I have here a public document printed by the Government. It is known as Bulletin No. 51, issued by the Department of Education here in Washington. On the first page of this bulletin is a letter from P. P. Claxton, Commissioner of Education, and addressed to the Secretary of the Interior. Speaking of these immigrants, the writer says:

That these people are interested in the elementary education of their children, or at least obedient to the school-attendance laws, is shown by the fact that the least illiterate element of our population is the foreign-born children of foreign-born parents. The illiteracy among the children of native-born parents is three times as great as that among the native-born children of foreign parents.

Speaking of these immigrants and of the people who oppose them, on page 19 of this bulletin are the following statements:

Such people in their zeal forget that the immigrant frequently brings his contribution to enrich our civilization. The things of the higher kind—the spirituality, the reverence for authority, the love of art and music are valuable to soften the materialism that has accompanied our great advance in prosperity, and they should not be crushed out in the attempt to remake the immigrant.

These people are a people of our blood and our race. They are the descendants of some of the greatest and most patriotic nations in the world's history. "Rome in that early day sat upon her Seven Hills and ruled the world." One of the great generals of the Revolutionary War was Kosciusko, the great Polish patriot who came here and offered his services to fight for American freedom.

Mr. Chairman, there is no logic, justice, or reason in favor of the adoption of this literacy test. Further, it is un-American and undemocratic. In our last national convention the Democratic Party declared in no uncertain terms against such unreasonable exclusion acts as the present bill provides for. In approving the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN], like he, I desire to disclaim any opposition to the interests of American labor. I am in favor of American labor and the organization of American labor. I am in favor of its protection, both from improper competition and unreasonable legislation, and I desire to take this opportunity to declare myself in favor of the passage of the Bartlett-Bacon bill. I will support that bill and vote for its passage.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

[Mr. RAKER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BURNETT. I will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to use some of his time now.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY].

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am opposed to this immigration bill. If it becomes a law, the Democratic Party will have to shoulder the responsibility for its passage. Its enactment will be an acknowledgment upon the part of those who favor it that national bumptiousness has been substituted for economics, and that antipathy to the foreigner has taken the place of social science. To the satisfaction of a vast majority of the American people the Democratic Party has recently redeemed its promises and fulfilled its pledges by tearing down the Chinese wall of protection, behind which the special interests of the country fattened for many years upon the vast body of the public. We have liberated trade and bidden the American manufacturers to go forth into the markets of the world in honest competition so that the people may derive a long-deferred justice. Under the stimulating influence of real tariff reform and a currency bill, whose sponsors are the people and not the bankers and manufacturers alone, the country gives evidence of a splendid awakening to renewed opportunities in the commercial arena. And having torn down one Chinese wall, this Congress proposes to erect another without logic or sense. The only argument that ever had substance in support of a measure of this kind was that which was based upon the unfair advantage the manufacturers of the country enjoyed under a high protective tariff; it was argued with plausibility that the bars were up against foreign goods but open to foreign labor, and the cry went up for equality and fair play under the law. But now that we have removed the bar which gave a special advantage to the manufacturer, what just cause is there for complaint? Do we not put ourselves in an indefensible position if we legislate in favor of one class and against another?

I take it that what is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. Now, illogically, the Democratic Party proposes to say to valiant men and women throughout the world, "Keep out; we do not want you here, because, forsooth, you can not read 40 words." Oh, what a humbug and what a preposterous test for admitting aliens! We will have to change the pose of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, now bidding a thousand welcomes to the men and women who seek our shores in order that they may benefit themselves and their posterity. We will have to change the statue so that with a forbidding countenance and with a defiant hand it shall say in effect, "Go back; we do not want you. The statistics of America prove that your children love Americanism; the statistics of America prove that your children are fond of education. They prove that men like you have made ideal citizens." Educationally considered one seeks in vain for any argument to support it. If we love to consider the liberalizing influences of American civilization, we must stand appalled at the hard-heartedness of those who would deny the extension of our beneficent laws and embracing citizenship to those whose lives attest a love of it. Let us turn for a minute to the statistics dealing with the children of the native and foreign-born whites. We find in the Census of 1910 that the lowest percentage of illiteracy, 1.1, was among the native whites of foreign or mixed parentage, while among the native whites of native parentage the percentage was 3.7. Here is an eloquent answer to those who decry the influence of the foreigner upon our American institutions. We find their children avid for learning, and their parents making every sacrifice so that their children may fit themselves for the duties and responsibilities of prospective citizenship.

We can not stop the process of evolution. Those who are so furiously engaged in restricting immigration should remember that the despised immigrant of years ago is the honored citizen of to-day. All around us we have seen where the German was displaced by the Irishman, the Irishman by the Pole, the Pole by the Hungarian, and the Hungarian by the Italian. All of them have been necessary in their time and place in the upbuilding of this great country of ours; in opening up new land, in bridge work, in mining, in the construction of railroads, in the building of sewers and trenches, in the erection of the great buildings in our many cities which house a residential and commercial population. It is farcical to say that we are suffering from a congestion of population. The mountain States of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Nevada have no more than a population of 3.1 inhabitants to the square mile.

Washington, Oregon, and California have 13.2 inhabitants to the square mile. So I might go on with the other divisions of States, showing that only in 10 out of the 48 is there a population of more than 100 to the square mile. In this House men talk of the opportunities of the West, and only a day or two ago the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], in speaking against the Alaska railway bill, spoke of the opportunities awaiting the settlers who would come to cultivate the thousands of acres which were waiting for ownership and labor. The men supporting this bill, consciously or unconsciously, are but drawing a herring across the trail. They are fastening the eyes of the Nation upon the worthy immigrant, painting him in false colors, and diverting the people from a consideration of our own failures and derelictions. If the immigrant laborer here gets but a scanty wage, the fault lies not with him, but in the distribution of the fruits of labor. Let us lay the blame upon our own industrial system and not upon those who have to make their bread and butter under it. Let us have more of the spirit which actuated the great dry goods merchant, Altman, of New York, whose will testifies to his consideration of those who helped him make his fortune. Let us have a multiplication of the beneficence of Henry Ford, of Detroit, who labors not for himself alone, but thinks of those who labor and cooperate with him in his great industrial plant. We have hampered trade by restrictive tariffs and bartered away our natural opportunities for a song. And now, with the sanctity of the Pharisee of old, we are preparing to visit our own sins upon the heads of innocent immigrants. Another thought comes to me: One would imagine, listening to the debate in this House, that immigrants do nothing but labor and that they existed without eating and ran around without clothes. Let us remember that they are consumers as well as producers and that their needs vastly broaden the market of commerce. If there is no reason other than the obsession of some people on this subject, and that is all there seems to be to it, then this bill should meet with the defeat it deservedly merits.

Oh, my friends, you will be writing a black chapter in the history of American politics the day you enact this legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is recognized.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, something has been said in this debate about the vetoes of immigration bills carrying the illiteracy test by former Presidents Cleveland and Taft. When Presi-

dent Cleveland exercised his veto the percentage of illiterate aliens coming into this country was less than 3 per cent. To-day the illiterates entering our country are over 33 per cent. President Taft vetoed a similar bill to the one we are now considering in a 12-line message, in which he stated that he did it with much reluctance. Now, I wish to submit to the House the utterances of two other ex-Presidents and the present occupant of the White House on the immigration question. President McKinley, on this identical kind of legislation now under discussion—the great McKinley, who was wise, just, and humane—in a message to Congress said:

Our naturalization and immigration laws should be further improved to the constant promotion of a safe, a better, and a higher citizenship. A grave peril to the Republic would be a citizenship too ignorant to understand or too vicious to appreciate the great value and beneficence of our institutions and laws, and against all who come here to war upon them our gates must be promptly and tightly closed. Illiteracy must be banished from the land if we shall attain that high destiny as the foremost of the enlightened nations of the world, under Providence, we ought to achieve.

The Republican convention which nominated President McKinley placed this plank in the platform:

For the protection of the quality of American citizenship and the wages of our workingmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.

Mark you, when this plank was adopted and approved by a large majority of the American voters the percentage of illiterate aliens entering the country was less than 6 per cent, to-day it is more than 33 per cent.

President Roosevelt, one of the political idols of the American people, and twice their choice for President by unprecedented majorities, made this statement to Congress in one of his messages:

The second object of a proper immigration law ought to be to secure by a careful and not merely perfunctory educational test some intelligent capacity to appreciate American institutions and act sanely as American citizens.

President Wilson, to-day the head and leader of the Democratic Party, when not seeking as a candidate the so-called "foreign vote," wrote as an impartial historian in 1902 this statement, which will be found in volume 5, page 212, of his History of the American People:

The census of 1890 showed the population of the country increased to 62,622,250, an addition of 12,466,467 within the decade. Immigrants poured steadily in as before, but with an alteration of stock which students of affairs marked with uneasiness. Throughout the century men of the sturdy stocks of the north of Europe had made up the main strain of foreign blood which was every year added to the vital working force of the country, or else men of the Latin-Gallic stocks of France and northern Italy; but now there came multitudes of men of the lowest class from the south of Italy and men of the meaner sort out of Hungary and Poland—men out of the ranks where there was neither skill nor energy nor any initiative of quick intelligence—and they came in numbers which increased from year to year, as if the countries of the south of Europe were disburdening themselves of the more sordid and hapless elements of their population, the men whose standards of life and of work were such as American workmen had never dreamed of hitherto. The people of the Pacific coast had clamored these many years against the admission of immigrants out of China, and in May, 1892, got at last what they wanted—a Federal statute which practically excluded from the United States all Chinese who had not already acquired the right of residence; and yet the Chinese were more to be desired, as workmen if not as citizens, than most of the coarse crew that came crowding in every year at the eastern ports.

[Applause.]

The gentleman [Mr. SABATH] signing the minority report on this bill tells us that had this bill been in operation he would have been denied admission to this country as an alien, and yet in his personal biography carried in the Congressional Directory he states he attended the "grammar and high schools in Bohemia," and I submit that if he attended said schools and could not read 40 words in his own language, then he was, indeed, a very dull scholar. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Not unless the gentleman gives me some time.

Mr. SABATH. That is not the reason I assigned. It was the money test that I assigned.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; but this bill, so far as the money test is concerned, is a copy of the very law which was in existence when the gentleman landed, a lad of 15 years of age.

Mr. SABATH. Not the same rules, however.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman's own statement, printed in the RECORD this morning, is to the effect that if this bill had been the law at the time of his arrival in this country he would have been embarrassed and perhaps prevented from becoming an American citizen.

Let us see if the city of Chicago, from which the gentleman [Mr. SABATH] hails, is in need of any aliens. During the past 30 days the Chicago daily papers have stated there are more than 100,000 unemployed in that city and that every charity agency is overtaxed as never before; that they have been compelled to house and care for the unemployed in the public buildings and in the various churches.

I submit the following letter from the officers of the United Charities of Chicago:

JANUARY 6, 1914.

DEAR SIR: This is a personal letter to you, respecting a public matter of vital concern. The statement accompanying it contains compelling facts about present poverty conditions in Chicago. Prompt emergency methods must be used to meet this situation, otherwise we will be unable to care for all the families that come to us.

Almost unprecedented conditions of unemployment exist. There is much suffering that the United Charities can alleviate, and more that it can prevent if provided with the means to do so.

Human understanding can not encompass the suffering that results from failure to heed the cry of the destitute. There are many thousands of them.

We are sure that only a very special reason will prevent you from answering this appeal with a contribution as generous as you feel you can make.

Please send your check—now.

Urgently, yours,

CHAS. W. FOLDS,
Chairman Finance Committee.
C. R. HENDERSON,
President.

On the back of this letter I read the following extracts:

HERE ARE THE FACTS.

1. The present is a period of almost unprecedented business depression in many circles. It has resulted in more unemployment among small wage earners than Chicago has ever experienced. We believe that fully 25,000 families, or 100,000 individuals, will suffer the cruel sting of poverty here this winter.

2. Two weeks ago in one section of Chicago over 6,000 men out of 36,000 normally employed were reported laid off, while one-half of the remainder were working on half time, with half pay. We have statements to this effect from superintendents of the plants over their own signatures. The cold fact is that thousands more have been laid off in Chicago since then, and employers unite in saying that not a man will be reinstated for three months.

Unemployment is given as the cause in 80 out of every 100 families calling upon us for aid right now. One father of three children was sent to 10 big shops, without getting a job. Unemployment is the forerunner of illness, intemperance, discouragement, and desertion, thus increasing the seriousness of the situation.

3. Appeals for aid from homeless men and boys have increased nearly 400 per cent over last year. From December 1 to 17, 1913, 1,410 families not known to us before came for aid, compared to only 779 during the entire month of the previous year. Our district offices looked after 4,925 families of all kinds from December 1 to 17, 1913, this being 645 more families than we carried during the whole month of December, 1912. Approximately 75 poor families that had been served with eviction papers came to us in one day in December for help to find roofs to cover their heads. Twenty full days' overtime was put in in one week in our west side office by 16 of our workers responding to the avalanche of appeals that poured in upon them.

Because of these facts we have had to spend more money for relief than in other years. Four hundred thousand dollars will be needed for 1914. We need $148,000 in addition to what we expect to get from our regular subscribers and our income. Will you help us?

Even in the face of this appalling story of the condition of the unemployed people in the city of Chicago, one of its Representatives [Mr. SABATH] is demanding that we permit a still further increase in the number of the unemployed in his home town by keeping our doors wide open and continuing to permit more than a million of aliens to land on our shores every year.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] says there is no demand for this legislation. Let us see. The American Federation of Labor, with a membership of more than 2,000,000 wage earners, in every national convention of recent years, with every State represented, has asked for this legislation. The United Mine Workers of America, with 450,000 deserving and industrious members, favor restriction. In fact, the last resolutions they adopted a few days ago demanded the suspension of all immigration until the million of unemployed men now in this country could be furnished work.

The Farmers' Union, with a membership of 3,000,000, men who till and cultivate the soil in the United States, demand it. The National Grange, the Farmers' National Congress, the Railway Trainmen's Association, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Conductors, and Firemen, and practically every patriotic organization of this country insists upon and demands this legislation. Pennsylvania, a State having the second largest number of aliens, through its legislature has demanded it, and the Legislatures of Ohio, Vermont, Tennessee, and other States have joined Pennsylvania in its demand. This bill passed the Senate in the Sixty-second Congress without a roll call, for practically every Senator favored it; and on its passage over President Taft's veto only 17 out of a total membership of 96 voted to sustain the President's veto. This House, fresh from the people, elected by a direct vote of the people, lacked only 8 votes of recording a two-thirds vote in favor of overriding the Taft veto. Yet the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]

says there is no demand in this country for this proposed legislation.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am sorry I can not yield, but I have not the time. I commend to my able and genial friend [Mr. GOLDFOGLE], who wishes to interrupt me, the article in last Friday's Washington Times, wherein is told the story of a great public meeting held in his home city, New York, a meeting in the interests of the unemployed. The article states that strong men and women broke down and cried over the many stories of hardships, misery, and unhappiness in the ranks of the army of the unemployed in New York City.

The public authorities in that city have not only overcrowded every charitable institution, but have been compelled to even utilize the recreation piers and the boats owned by the city to house and relieve thousands of aliens without work. Yet the gentleman from New York City [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] insists that we shall continue to annually accept more than 1,000,000 aliens in this country seeking employment, a great majority of whom are unloaded in the harbor of New York. We have received in this country, 1,500,000 aliens from one of the countries of southern Europe and 850,000, or 54 per cent, of them can not read or write, and only three-tenths of them have become naturalized.

Our last national census was taken on February 15, 1910, and at that time we had in the United States 13,515,886 persons born in foreign lands. From the 15th day of February, 1910, to December 31, 1913, we have received 4,278,889 aliens, making a total of 17,794,775 persons in this country of foreign birth on January 1, 1914.

The opponents of this bill have taunted us with the great amount of ignorance and illiteracy in the Southern States. They have declared it to be a drawback and an evil to the South. Yes; we of the South know it. We feel and we realize it, and therefore the Members from the Southern States, almost to a man, wish to reduce, and not increase, ignorance and illiteracy by keeping our doors closed to that class of immigrants from all the world. [Applause.]

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I can not yield. Ill does it become the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] to taunt the author of this bill [Mr. BURNETT] about illiteracy in Alabama and the South. The Civil War destroyed our southern homes and cities. The southern Union and Confederate soldiers returned to their homes possessing practically nothing but a brave and undaunted spirit and determination to rehabilitate the South. We had turned over to us 4,000,000 of slaves to educate and train for citizenship.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; I will not yield unless the gentleman will yield me more time.

We know the evils, we know the hardships and difficulties of illiteracy, and we are opposed to illiterates entering the Southern States from Europe, Mexico, India, Japan, Turkey, or any other portion of the world. We have sufficient burdens and responsibilities of this character.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] is certain the labor leaders of this country and their two or three million followers do not understand this important question, and has assured us that if he and Louis F. Post had an opportunity to address them, they would be convinced of their mistake in believing that this bill is in the interest of the American workingmen.

Samuel Gompers, Frank Morrison, John Mitchell, and the men they represent and speak for, as well as the nine able and distinguished men on the Immigration Commission created by Congress seven years ago, who spent four years of study and investigation in this and foreign countries of every phase of the immigration question, no doubt could be highly enlightened, informed, and convinced by the modest Member from Minnesota.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] after criticizing the labor leaders stated the great West needed more farmers and for this reason we should not restrict immigration. I believe the record shows that only 2 per cent of the aliens we are now receiving go upon the farms, although many efforts have been made by various organizations and local, State, Federal, and railroad officials and newspapers to induce a greater number to do so. There are thousands of unemployed aliens at present in our overcrowded cities of the Eastern States from whom Minnesota can recruit its farmers without keeping our doors open for additional millions in foreign lands, who could not be induced or even forced to locate on the farms of the country if permitted to come in. Thirty per cent of the aliens return to their foreign homes to enjoy what gentlemen call tyranny and oppression. When do they go? After they have saved their wages and accumulated money, never having had any intention to make this their permanent home. Last year $90,000,000, $7,500,000 per month, made in America, were sent to their foreign homes in international money orders alone. Yet you say they came here for freedom and the blessings of a Republic.

Mr. Speaker, they tell us that we are receiving a blessing in having over 300,000 illiterate aliens land on our shores every 12 months. In this connection let me read a letter from the prosecuting attorney of Somerset, N. J., addressed to President Taft on February 8, 1913:

My duties as prosecuting attorney of Somerset County, N. J., have given me an excellent opportunity to check up in one important particular the investigations and conclusions of the Immigration Commission with reference to the illiteracy test. During the last two years I have kept a careful record of the last 114 criminal cases that I have prosecuted against aliens, with the following interesting results:

	Illiterate.	Literate.
Homicide	3	
Atrocious assault and battery	34	6
Simple assault and battery	9	2
Larceny	14	2
Sexual crime	7	1
Perjury	2	1
Excise	11	5
Marriage	3	1
Frauds	2	4
Miscellaneous	6	1
Total	91	23

The following conclusions are deducible from the above:

(1) Of the 114 crimes committed by aliens 54 were acts of personal violence; and of these 54, 46 were committed by illiterates, while only 8 were chargeable to those able to read and write.

(2) Of the 46 committed by illiterates, 3 were homicides, 34 were atrocious assaults (by maiming and wounding with a deadly weapon), and only 9 were simple assaults, showing conclusively that the illiterate alien 37 times out of 46 makes use of a deadly weapon in order to avenge his wrongs, fancied or real.

(3) Out of 16 cases of larceny (stealing of all kinds), 14 defendants were illiterate.

(4) Out of 8 sexual crimes, 7 were committed by illiterates, 3 of these being carnal abuse of infants under 10 years of age.

(5) Out of 3 perjury cases, 2 were against illiterates; that is, of those brought to justice.

(6) Out of 16 cases for violation of excise laws, 11 were illiterates, showing an utter diregard for laws.

(7) Of the 4 crimes against the institution of marriage, 3 were illiterates.

(8) Only in cases of fraud did the literate exceed the illiterate.

I am, Mr. President, sincerely, yours,

FREDERICK A. POPE.

Prosecutor of Pleas, Somerset County, N. J.

Another interesting document, and one to which I call the special attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE], is that of Secretary McGarr, of the New York State Commission in Lunacy, printed in the New York Daily Times of March 23, 1913:

INSANE ALIENS.

The Times is informed by Secretary McGarr, of the State commission in lunacy, that of the 31,432 insane patients under treatment in the 14 State hospitals on February 10 last, 13,163, or 41.9 per cent, were aliens. Foreign-born patients have increased since the Federal census of December 31, 1903, by 1,552, or 13.4 per cent. In the two State hospitals for the criminal insane there were 1,230 patients on February 10, of whom nearly 44.4 per cent were of alien birth; the Federal census of 1910 showed a percentage of aliens to total population in this State of 29.9 per cent.

The prevalence of insanity among immigrants is evidently much greater than among the native born. Of the 5,700 patients admitted to the civil hospitals for the year ending September 30, 1911, 2,737, or 48 per cent, were aliens, and 1,481, or 26 per cent, were of alien parentage, while only 1,224, less than 26 per cent, were of native stock. Of the whole number, the nativity of but 218, which is 3.8 per cent, was not ascertainable. Insanity among the foreign peoples of this city occurs in a still larger percentage of cases. Of the first admissions to the hospitals, 2,006 out of 3,221 residents of the city were of foreign birth; that is 64.1 per cent, although the foreign-born population is but 40.4 per cent of the whole.

A recent Democratic governor of New York issued an appeal to the governors of other States for a conference to take steps to provide for the enormous expense of caring for the alien insane that have landed in this country under the present immigration laws. Had these laws been rigidly enforced it would have saved the taxpayers of New York State alone from three to five million dollars per annum, and the taxpayers of Pennsylvania $1,000,000 per annum. The administration of our immigration laws as it affects the insane, criminal, and pauper class is a fraud, a farce, and a delusion. [Applause.] I make this statement because I was for more than a year in a position to observe and study the American method of immigration inspection.

The very fact that the insane asylums, hospitals, prisons, and other State institutions in New York and Pennsylvania are filled with aliens; that the Black Hand Society, the white

slave operators, the gunmen have flourished in New York and other places; that out of more than a million aliens admitted in 12 months, and less than 25,000 rejected, is convincing proof of the inability or unwillingness of our immigration authorities to rigidly enforce existing laws.

This bill will not accomplish what we hope and expect unless there is greater vigor and thoroughness in its administration and enforcement than we have had under existing immigration laws.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I wish to say something about the foreign steamship companies that are responsible, in a large measure, for inducing, encouraging, stimulating, and working up foreign immigration to this country in order that they make from this business $50,000,000 per annum and use our country as a dumping ground. While in Europe I had occasion to visit the office of a steamship company, and was informed that that company alone had 1,200 agents scattered all over Europe, and I take it that every other steamship company has an equal number of local or field agents. In every attempt we have made to protect our country from the unwise, unjust, and unpatriotic continuation of a policy which brings burdens upon us in caring for the insane and criminal classes and the education of the illiterate of foreign lands we are antagonized and opposed in every conceivable way by the foreign steamship companies. They have no care or concern for our land or people. Their god is mammon. Their action is selfish and at the expense of our beloved country. We are here to represent the best and highest interest of the American people, who by their votes commissioned us to legislate for them and not for a foreign steamship trust. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ANSBERRY].

Mr. ANSBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the literacy test in this bill. I think the balance of it is good legislation, but the literacy test is sufficiently bad to outweigh all the good in the bill, and for that reason I shall vote against it. The literacy test not only prevents good men and good women from coming to our shores to establish a home, but it absolutely destroys the best part of our liberal policy, the text of which is found in the Constitution of the United States, in the Declaration of Independence, and in our legislation which has heretofore encouraged honest, healthy, sane men and women to find homes in this country.

In spite of the fact that this committee and the commission heretofore appointed by this House have recommended the literacy test as one of the best means to arrive at a proper solution of the question as to what kind of immigrants are considered undesirable in this country, I hold in my hand a sheet which has, boiled down in epigrammatic sentences, the consensus of the best thought in the United States of America on this question.

It is the thought of educators, of men at the head of educational institutions throughout the length and breadth of this land—sectarian and nonsectarian, Catholic, Protestant, and Jew—and each and every one of them say in unmistakable terms that it is a reversal of one of our best policies, as well as a right about face on our traditions, and that it is not the proper method of producing legislation that will keep undesirable people from our shores, but its results will be to prevent coming into our country men and women who would make good citizens.

Among these men are Harry Pratt Judson, president of the University of Chicago; Lyon G. Tyler, LL. D., president of William and Marys College, Virginia; George Lewis Mackintosh, president of Wabash College, Indiana; George S. Davis, LL. D., president of the Normal College, city of New York; John Cavanaugh, LL. D., president of the University of Notre Dame, Indiana; James A. B. Scherer, LL. D., president of Throop College of Technology, Pasadena, Cal.; Stephen M. Newman, D. D., president of Howard University, Washington, D. C.; Herbert L. Stetson, LL. D., president of Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich.; Winthrop E. Stone, LL. D., president of Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.; Dr. John A. Earl, president of Des Moines College, Iowa; Leo Haid, president St. Mary's College, Belmont, N. C.; Dr. H. B. Brown, president of Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.

To this list can be added the name of almost every well-known educator in this great country. President Cleveland, in 1897, perhaps stated as succintly as possible the principal objection to the literacy test when he vetoed a similar bill to this one because of that objectionable test. He said:

> The ability to read and write as required in this bill in and of itself affords, in my opinion, a misleading test of contented industry, and supplies unsatisfactory evidence of desirable citizenship, or a proper apprehension of the benefits of our institutions. If any particular element of our illiterate immigration is to be feared for other causes than illiteracy, these causes should be dealt with directly instead of making illiteracy the pretext for exclusion to the detriment of other illiterate immigrants, against whom the real cause of complaint can not be alleged.

President Taft also gave expression to his unalterable opposition to this test when he vetoed practically this selfsame bill in the last Congress.

Secretary Nagel was of the opinion that illiteracy was often due to oppression, and that it was because of this that many of these immigrants, thus sought to be excluded, were coming to our shores; that they were really striving to free themselves from the conditions which made them illiterate. Ex-President Eliot, of Harvard, states his position as follows:

PRESIDENT ELIOT'S VIEWS.

> I beg leave to invite your attention to the following statement of the principles which should govern the national legislation on immigration:
>
> (1) Our country needs the labor of every honest and healthy immigrant who has the intelligence and enterprise to come hither.
>
> (2) Existing legislation is sufficient to exclude undesirable immigrants.
>
> (3) Educational tests should not be applied at the moment of entrance to the United States, but at the moment of naturalization.
>
> (4) The proper education test is capacity to read in English or in the native tongue, not the Bible or the Constitution of the United States but newspaper items in some recent English or native newspaper which the candidate can not have seen.
>
> (5) The attitude of Congress and the laws should be hospitable and not repellant.
>
> The only questions which are appropriate are: Is he healthy, strong, and desirous of earning a good living? Many illiterates have common sense, sound bodies, and good characters. Indeed, it is not clear that education increases much the amount of common sense which nature gave the individual. An educational test is appropriate at the time when the foreigner proposes to become a voting citizen. He ought then to know how to read.

So that I think that I did not overreach the mark when I said in the beginning that the position of the committee was opposed by the consensus of the best thought in America, and the names I have mentioned are but a few, as compared to the vast number of experts in education who take this position. I have before me a statement made by Commissioner of Education Claxton, a man of broad view and profound learning, as any member of the Committee on Education who has heard him can testify. He said:

> The least illiterate of our population are the native-born children of foreign parents. Illiteracy among the children of native-born parents is three times as great as that among native-born children of foreign parents.

I think that there is but little demand in this country for this legislation, and were it not for the spirit of intolerance and bigotry there would be no legislation of this character. The district which I have the honor to represent, which has no city in it of more than 10,000 and which has few immigrants within its confines who have been in this country less than 20 years, is not demanding this legislation. I have not received more than 20 letters on this question. It is true that all of these were opposed to the bill; but I am more than satisfied when I consider that less than half a century ago this splendid district in northwestern Ohio was sparsely populated because of dense forests and almost impenetrable swamps. That this condition does not exist to-day is due to the fact that countless thousands of immigrants left the Old World and in that portion of Ohio sought a home and freedom, at least one of which in too many instances had been denied them at home. These men, some of whom with their wives and their children, might have been excluded from participating in this great work had this literacy test been upon the statute books at that time. Their descendants and themselves are as hardy and robust in their Americanism as any within the sound of my voice.

They have made from a swamp and forest as fine and productive a country as the sun shines upon, and I would be wanting in a proper sense of loyalty to these people if I did not oppose with tongue and vote this measure. It is said by the proponents of this bill that this literacy test will exclude a very small percentage of the German and other desirable immigrants of northern Europe. We can not even spare any small percentage of this very desirable class, who, coming here during every period of our national life, have learned to appreciate and to revere our institutions and have made our best citizens. In any event, even though none of the immigrants from northern Europe would be affected, we are not willing to sacrifice the principle, and we are not going to write ourselves as so supremely selfish as to deny others the privileges which we enjoy, particularly since our country can house and take care of, without any inconvenience, millions more.

I am opposed to this bill because I believe, as some one has expressed it, that this country can afford to use and ought to give opportunity to every man and woman who is sound in morals, mind, and body, and who comes here in good faith to spend his or her energies in our life. I am opposed to this bill because it contravenes the consensus of the best thought of

our country; because it turns its back upon our country's best traditions; and because it is dictated by a spirit of intolerance, narrowness, and bigotry, the same spirit of intolerance which but half a century ago dictated legislation of a similar character aimed at the good people who made smiling farms of the forest and impenetrable swamps which once covered the district which I represent. Despite the fact that it is regrettable, every student of our history knows that even though so broad a statesman as Benjamin Franklin bitterly opposed the encouragement offered to the thrifty German immigrants, who in those early days sought here a home; and Otis prided himself in his denunciations of the same class of immigrants who came in in that day from Ireland. Others denounced the immigrants from Denmark, Holland, Sweden, and Norway; and I unhesitatingly say that had the desires of these statesmen been crystallized into legislation the United States would now be a byword and a reproach instead of what it is to-day, foremost among the nations of the world.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will now use some of his time.

Mr. MOORE. I wish the gentleman from Alabama would continue, because I have no one at present to yield to. We are so far ahead in the quality of the arguments and the time consumed that I wish the gentleman would proceed. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE].

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion of a great public question such as is involved in this bill for the restriction and regulation of immigration to our country all personal or individual interests and prejudices should be laid aside, and we should enter upon the discussion with open minds, striving solely for the ultimate and lasting welfare of our country. I regret that in this discussion and in former discussions on similar measures some of the speeches delivered have bristled with statements plainly indicating the prejudice and bias of those engaging in debate. For myself, I feel that while an advocate of the pending legislation I am not constrained in my support of the same from any desire to unjustly curb or handicap the aspirations of the people of any other land in their efforts to better their condition in life.

I trust that not only I but all who believe in the wisdom of the proposed legislation have more exalted reasons to offer in support of our position. In passing I wish to say that it is true that our country has been peopled by those coming from foreign lands in order that they might enjoy greater opportunity for improving their condition. It is true that in the past they came by thousands from the sturdy middle classes of northern and western Europe—the Irish, Dutch, English, Scotch, Swiss, Germans, Russians, French, and Scandinavians—and here with turgid muscles and hopeful hearts they proceeded to make new homes for themselves. It is true they felled the forests and reclaimed the wilderness and quickly adjusted themselves to our form of government. Practically all these different nationalities were of Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, and Germanic origin, all races well qualified by nature to understand and submit to constitutional representative government, being able to readily comprehend the great basic principle underlying our form of government—majority rule and peaceable acquiescence by the minority.

At this point I wish to say that my position on this measure has been criticized, and it has been said to me, "Your father was an immigrant. How can you favor such legislation?" True, my father was a Highland Scotchman of the most pronounced type, and the memory of old Scotland's lochs and hether were ever dear to him; but he, like the millions from the countries I have mentioned who migrated to our country, became an American citizen and gloried in the institutions of his adopted country. In view of my origin, I might be charged by some with lack of charity for the unfortunate of other lands and that I am narrow minded. God forbid that any other motives than love of country and patriotic devotion to the welfare of our people should influence me in the performance of my duty as a representative of the people.

In the enactment of laws such as is proposed in this bill, bearing directly on the very life and destiny of our Government, we should not be controlled by the present or immediate future effect of such legislation. But we should have in mind the welfare of unborn generations and its effect upon the perpetuity of the Government. I contend by this legislation we aim to remedy some present evils, but the great controlling factor in it is to forestall future impending danger to the Republic. This danger may now seem to be remote, but is none the less certain. For my part, I am willing to concede that some of the provisions of this bill are aimed at the immigration from southern Europe and oriental countries. It is contended by those opposing the bill that the immigrants from southern Europe, while perhaps illiterate, are honest and industrious and make good citizens, and that we are unjustly and purposely discriminating against them. It is further stated that we need them to perform our common labor and should welcome them with open arms, assuring us that the shrine of liberty will never be desecrated by them. True, they admit that the standard of living of these people is lower than the American's; but what of that? They dig our ditches, grade our railroads, and perform the bulk of our common labor. We need them in our business, so let them come. They dwell on the magnanimity of such a course on our part, extending our hands to the poor and the oppressed of the earth. Have we not listened to the recounting of the long list of poets, philosophers, soldiers, and statesmen of southern Europe? Certainly; and we also read that the light of liberty flickered for a time in Greece and Rome, until extinguished by corruption and barbaric force centuries ago. I am willing to concede all these things to be true. But we are legislating for the future welfare of America, not Greece and Rome.

I intend to support this bill because the class of immigrants it is intended to prevent from coming here, by their ways and manner of living, tend to lower the standard of American labor, and by this statement I do not simply mean the lowering of the wage of labor, but also the social tone or standard of labor. I am inclined to think no one will dispute this. However, if such there be, permit me to ask him, if he had a son, would he consider him occupying as high a plane of labor when placed upon a public work with a gang of such laborers, with whom he could not converse and who inhabit crowded tenements or box cars, as if he were laboring alongside men who recognize the American standard of living? I am speaking of the son who labors, not a foreman or timekeeper. Of course no one would admit such to be the fact. What has been and is the present effect on the standard of labor? To any observer it is plain, so far as common labor is concerned upon public works in our country, the standard has fallen to a level where Americans refuse to engage in it, both on account of the wage and the association. All will agree that labor should be exalted, and no man should blush to admit he labors for a livelihood, and that callouses on the hands produced by honest toil should be considered badges of honor rather than disgrace. But under existing conditions the American youth feels humiliated and disgraced when classed as a common laborer. Why? To my mind it is, in a great measure, due to the lowering of the standard of labor.

While it may be possible for the present generation of American boys to escape common labor, the unborn generations of the future will be unable to do so, and we should have a thought for them.

This is our country. Our posterity must abide here. Shall we consider their welfare, or shall we, unmindful of them, rush recklessly on, blocking every avenue of opportunity, and all done in the name of the downtrodden of other lands? Let us raise the standard of labor now, or at least make an effort to prevent it going still lower. How much better it would be if those who employ a large number of laborers would aid in raising the standard, pay better wages, and get better results even from Americans. I am fully aware that many of those opposed to this legislation are governed by humanitarian instincts, but I fear there are those more selfish and whose sentiments are expressed in the following lines—the name of the author I do not know:

Breed us more men, ye daughters of toil;
Ye alien mothers in far-off lands,
Sire them strongly, clean brawn and bone,
For we sift from the chaff the wheat alone,
When they come to die at our hands.

Think on our greed in your travail throes,
Think of us when ye bare your breast,
Mine and smelter shall claim their toll,
Roads shall be broken and reach their goal,
Though ye smell their blood from the west.

We build us strong on your woman's woe
Pier of granite and iron span,
Glare of furnace and caisson's gloom,
Of him whom ye gave us—a man.

Seas shall not bar your sons from harm;
Steppe or forest or alpine slope,
Our arms are long to grasp what we need,
The New World springs from your trampled seed;
Ye drain the dregs of our draught of hope.

So much for the effect of immigration on the standard of American labor. What of the ultimate effect upon our Government of the unlimited immigration of southern European and oriental races? Is it problematical? We are assured there is no danger. I am apprehensive. Not that I consider these races more criminally inclined than others, but the nature and characteristics of these people and their past history causes me to

doubt their proper assimilation without danger to our country. I do not make this assertion intending to cast any reflections upon them. I know the story of the many brave and brilliant men of southern Europe. But I can not but feel that the people of northern and western Europe have demonstrated to a much greater degree their capacity for self-government and the ability to control themselves at such times when a more hot-blooded race would have plunged into revolution. I am satisfied in my own mind that the admission of countless thousands of immigrants into our country from southern Europe and oriental countries is a danger—remote, perhaps, but no less certain—to the life of our Government. It is revolution within, not danger from without, that will be the ever-present menace to our country. [Applause.]

The congenial assimilation of races so different in temperament and traditions as those of southern Europe and oriental countries with the races of northern and western Europe is a practical impossibility, even in this land of freedom. The former, lacking in comprehension of the true spirit of our institutions, can not be elevated to the true standard of American citizenship by assimilation, but the tendency would be to proportionately lower the present standard. The incentive which brings these people to our shores is different from the incentive which caused the migration of northern and western Europeans to our country.

With perhaps some exception the immigrants we seek to bar from our shores do not come here with the avowed purpose of making this their permanent abiding place, but for the time being to take advantage of the greater opportunities here afforded to earn and save some money and later on to return to their native land, there to spend their declining years in comparative comfort on the small fortune accumulated here. They do not come with any clear understanding of the meaning and purpose of our Government, nor do they join with patriotic impulse in the hopes and aspirations of our people; they simply come to labor for the gold given as a recompense, never realizing the true sentiment of American citizenship. Strangely different were the feelings of the men of northern and western Europe, who, perhaps, possessed as great a love for native land, gave it up when they landed on our shores, and not only entered into the labor necessary to carve out for themselves homes here but they enter into the spirit of our political institutions, and, as soon as possible, under our laws, swore allegiance to our flag, and with joyous hearts sang in unison with native-born Americans "My country 'tis of thee" and so forth. More than this, when revolution threatened our country's existence these men rallied around the old flag, and no braver defenders did it have than the sons of Erin who followed the banner of Sheridan and Birney and brave Phil Kearney; and the Scots, under McPherson, McArthur, and others; and the Germans who fought with Sigel, who after a hard day's battle in defense of our flag could be heard around their camp fire singing the songs of the fatherland. Thus was our country made strong and mighty by these classes of immigrants. But it is no argument, because this is true, that we should have unrestricted immigration into our country.

Much of the criticism of this bill is directed against that provision which provides for a literacy test, alleging that this is an unreasonable and indefensible provision. That it will permit the educated criminal to come in but will bar out the honest, industrious illiterate. I do not contend that illiteracy necessarily makes one a bad citizen, but I do contend that in a country such as ours the safety of the Government depends upon the intelligence of the people. To my mind it is not an unreasonable requirement to ask of those coming from foreign lands seeking all the privileges and opportunities of American citizenship. Surely to ask a man to be able to read 30 words in his native language as a passport into this land of ours is a very insignificant limitation, and will not be seriously objected to by anyone who favors restriction at all.

In supporting this bill I feel we are performing a patriotic duty. To charge us with having no charity for the unfortunate of other countries is idle declamation. If our friends who are opposing this bill are sincere in their devotion to the poor and unfortunate of other lands, why bar the pauper immigrant? Why not let him come in where he will have an opportunity to participate in the generous charity and hospitality of our friends, who undoubtedly are better able to contribute to his need than his own countrymen? The truth is that the position of the advocates of this legislation is reasonable, logical, and patriotic. We have our own poor needing our care and charity; we have our own laboring man, whose interest we should guard; we have our country's future welfare to consider.

Our own people, our laborers, artisans, and tradesmen, are entitled to our first consideration. Our institutions should be protected from destruction by improper immigration. Certainly this is our plain duty, and I would say, in the language of that great American, Abraham Lincoln, "with malice toward none and charity for all," I stand first for America, her citizens, her homes, her hopes and aspirations, with a profound desire to see her flag, the emblem of the free, continue to float with ever increasing glory through the coming years. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill because I conceive it to be my duty here as a Representative on this floor to cast my vote and participate in legislation, first, for the United States and for our people; and when I say "our people," I do not limit that term to the native-born American, but I include within that term all who are now here, whether they were born here or whether they have come from a foreign country. I shall support this bill, Mr. Chairman, because I am unwilling for a vote I may cast upon this floor to be considered in any way as lending any effort to bringing about any condition of affairs whereby an American born 100 years from to-day, 500 years from to-day, or 1,000 years from to-day shall be denied the privilege and the opportunity of exerting his power and directing his efforts in enterprises, the result of which may be the fullest success and the fullest prosperity which he may deserve. I do not look upon the United States as a temporary institution, but I look upon it, on the contrary, as a permanent institution which shall not only live 100 years, but which shall live for 1,000 years; and it is an economic fact, Mr. Chairman, that the more the population increases, the more thickly any country becomes populated, the more people an acre of land must support; and if conditions of immigration, as they are to-day, shall continue for 100 or 200 years, or a shorter period of time, I can conceive of a condition which will make it necessary for an acre of ground in the United States to support more people than it can possibly support, and that it will be necessary, in order that the American child and the American citizen may be supported and have an opportunity to bring about a condition which will bring prosperity to him, to find an avenue of exit instead of an avenue of entrance. I am unwilling that my vote on the floor of this House shall contribute to a condition, however far removed it may be, when the American-born citizen shall be compelled to find a new avenue of escape into other countries in order that he may find the opportunity to bring about success, the opportunity for education and prosperity which we believe he ought to enjoy here at home. [Applause.] I am unwilling, Mr. Chairman, to cast a vote upon this floor which will, now or hereafter, take from the mouth of any American-born baby one spoonful of food in order to give it to a child born on some other shores. I am unwilling to cast a vote which will, now or hereafter, bring about a condition which will take one single job from an American citizen in order to give it to some one born on a foreign shore. And I do not say that with any prejudice against any man who comes from a foreign nation.

My ancesters, in common with those of every man who sits upon this floor to-day, emigrated from a foreign shore to the American Continent. Why did they do it? Because they sought a betterment of their condition. Why are millions coming to-day from foreign shores? In order that they may better their condition. I am unwilling, Mr. Chairman, to cast a vote here that may be construed as an approval of a continuation of those conditions, so that in the future, however far removed it may be, it will become necessary for my posterity to emigrate to another country in order that they may better their condition and obtain that to which they are entitled here. [Applause.] And I am unwilling that those who come after me and those who shall come after you and all of us shall be compelled to exist in penury, want, and squalor in order that we may afford temporary relief to those who are existing in similar conditions in foreign countries to-day. It is not a political question in the sense that it is partisan; it is not a religious question in the sense that it is denominational; it is not a geographical question in the sense that one State wants it and another is opposed to it. It is a question whether we shall continue to exploit our own country to the same degree as in the past, and thus rob millions yet unborn of their rightful patrimony in order that we may give it to others. It is a question whether we shall in haste to-day exhaust the storehouse of our own resources instead of preserving and conserving it for those who shall come after us. It is a question whether we shall now and in the long years which shall follow withhold from those now amongst us the opportunities for which they yearn to work and prosper in order that we may accommodate others we do not need and whose presence may become burdensome to our institutions.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly convinced of my duty, as I said at the outset, first to vote in favor of the people of the United States, and if other countries want to bring about a condition which will enable their people to enter here under this bill, let them enact laws to bring about such conditions both as to the people and their Government as will enable them to come in under the provisions of this law.

I am unable, Mr. Chairman, to see why those Members of this House who have heretofore cried out against the importation of the manufactures and products of foreign labor into the United States on the ground that it interfered with American labor are now willing to turn their faces upon that proposition and vote to let in the foreign laborer who makes the foreign product which they do not want to come into the United States. How can a man believe in the policy of shutting out the manufacture of the Italian or of the Greek or of the Pole or of the Russian because it will come into competition with the American laborer, and yet at the same time raise his voice in behalf of that same man who comes into the United States and takes a position away from the American laborer, whom he pretends to protect upon the floor of this House? It is not a question, Mr. Chairman, as to whether the ignorant man is either a better or worse citizen than a man who is educated. I admit that may not be always a fair test, but it will bring about a decrease in the immigration and permit us to use our efforts and our energies to better the conditions of those already here, and that is the object which is sought in this legislation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] yield some of his time?

Mr. MOORE. How much time has the gentleman left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has 49 minutes left.

Mr. MOORE. I will ask the gentleman to use some of his time. We have very little on this side.

Mr. SABATH. Do I understand that I have 49 minutes left?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the record left here by the chairman of the committee [Mr. HAY].

Mr. BURNETT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Is not that the entire time left to those opposing the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. No; that is the time that is recorded here as belonging to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Permit me just a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Not to come out of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I desire to correct the RECORD just ahead of you, and it will take but a moment.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I hope that will not come out of my time.

Mr. MOORE. That can come up later.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I suggest to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] that he can correct the RECORD in the House.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I trust this will not be taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will not. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

[Mr. GOLDFOGLE addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to use some of his time.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EDMONDS].

Mr. EDMONDS. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House No. 6060, known as the immigration bill, has aroused considerable public discussion, both favorable and unfavorable, on account of the proposed literacy test.

Those opposed to the bill and those in favor of it might well be divided into three classes—those in favor for patriotic reasons, those opposed for sentimental reasons, and some in favor of the bill and some opposed to it for economic reasons.

It would perhaps be well to take up each class separately, and after studying what must be the fundamental reasons for the stand taken, place the bill in the balance for judgment.

The first of these great classes are those in favor of the bill for patriotic reasons. Let us examine their contentions. They believe that it is time to call a halt upon the great number of immigrants arriving annually; that the admixture of races foreign to American practices and without education is detrimental to the country; that the continued influx of these people will eventually break down American institutions and cause revolution; and that the various classes of people who are now immigrating to this country have neither the moral nor intellectual standing to make good American citizens.

Those opposed to the bill for sentimental reasons have an argument equally in their favor. They contend that to stop anyone from entering this country on account of being illiterate is un-American; that being illiterate does not interfere with his or her intellectuality, morality, or civic worth; that in most cases illiteracy is not of one's own choosing, and that the illiterate immigrants have in the past, and will in the future, contribute their fair share of the upbuilding and expansion of our country; that this country would still be undeveloped had it not been for the many thousands of immigrants, many of them illiterate, who have been welded into a homogeneous mass to make America the greatest Nation on earth. There is a kindly feeling for those people who are suffering under burdens that their forebears were able to cast aside when they came to this country.

It must be conceded by every fair-minded person that both of these arguments are very strong and that the opponents of the bill and those in favor of it have an argument equally convincing.

The economic question, however, is one that should be most carefully considered. After all, it is important to consider the public welfare of our country from this standpoint.

From 1899 to 1910, inclusive, there were admitted into our country 9,555,673 immigrants, of whom 2,506,713 were without occupation—including women and children. The remaining 7,048,953 reported as having occupations. Of these, 23.4 per cent were farm laborers, 35.9 per cent were laborers, and 20.2 per cent were employed in skilled occupations.

There should be no doubt in our minds that a great number of our laborers employed on the farms, in our great public works, or our railroads, must be recruited from this mobile force of workmen reaching our shores almost daily. Therefore, is it possible for us to successfully continue our great public improvements without their assistance?

A study of the following table, showing the countries from which immigration is now the greatest, will lead to some solution of the problem.

Principal countries reported, 1899-1910.	Number.	Farm laborers.	Laborers.	Skilled occupations.	Percentage illiterate.	Number departing for 100 admitted during 1908, 1909, and 1910.
		Per ct.	*Per ct.*	*Per ct.*		
Croatian and Slovenian	298,324	32.8	53.6	5	36.1	56
English	249,998	2.5	11.6	48.7	1	12
Finnish	123,008	5.2	62	6	1.3	18
German	458,293	17.9	19.8	30	5.2	20
Greek	197,718	19.4	66.8	7.7	26.4	25
Hebrew	590,267	1.9	11.8	67.1	26	8
Irish	376,268	4.6	30.6	12.6	2.6	7
Italian, North	296,622	18.7	47.8	20.4	11.5	62
Italian, South	1,471,659	34.5	42.5	14.6	53.9	55
Lithuanian	141,540	29.5	46.6	6.7	48.9	14
Magyar	259,276	41.2	36.3	8.6	11.4	64
Polish	748,430	30.5	44.8	6.3	35.4	30
Ruthenian	128,400	43.4	37.2	2	53.4	12
Scandinavian	475,094	7.6	36.2	50.5	.4	15
Slovak	290,247	35.3	44.7	4.4	24	59

Taking all the emigration from the country at 100 per cent, we find 10.7 per cent are skilled workmen; 1.5 per cent are farm laborers; 1.4 per cent are farmers; and 64.2 per cent are laborers, showing that labor seeks a market the same as any other commodity, and the farming demand for labor retains a greater percentage of the immigration than either skilled or ordinary labor.

Take the immigrant from the south of Italy. During the years 1899 to 1910, inclusive, 1,471,659 came to the United States, over half of them being illiterate. Had the bill under consideration been in effect during these years at least 750,000 would not have been able to enter. The statistics for 1908, 1909, and 1910 show that 55 out of every 100 immigrants return home. It will therefore be seen that the ebb and flow of the labor market has evidently taken care of any surplus immigration. But out of the 1,471,659 immigrants, 77 per cent were either farm laborers or labors unskilled, doing work of the kind that is least desirable to American born or educated workmen. The same is true of the Croatian and Slavonian, the North Italian, the Magyar, and the Slovak, and to a less extent among the Polish.

During the years 1899 to 1910, taking the six races given, there arrived in the United States 3,364,558 immigrants who had occupations. Of these about 1,100,000 were farm laborers and about 1,500,000 were ordinary laborers. Had this bill

been in operation during this period about 1,200,000 of these immigrants would have been excluded.

After consulting the report of the Bureau of Immigration, which shows the number of foreigners leaving the United States during 1908, 1909, and 1910, and by applying the same ratio to the period of 1899 to 1910, I find that over 1,640,000, or about 50 per cent of the foreigners from the six aforesaid countries have left our shores for other climes. The permanent growth of our foreign population from these races has therefore become much smaller than the reports of the Immigration Bureau would lead us to believe.

The recent report of the Department of Agriculture shows that only 27 per cent of the tillable land of the United States is actually under cultivation. This report is based upon the reports of over 35,000 correspondents. In other words, for every 100 acres that are now tilled about 375 more acres may be tilled when the country is fully developed. In the development of the agriculture of the country the land which was most easily brought into a state of cultivation, as the great Mississippi Valley, was the first to be brought into such use. Extension of tilled acres will be at greater expense for clearing, drainage, and irrigation unless we have sufficient labor.

The same is true of our public works. We in Philadelphia are contemplating an extensive system of subways, together with many other larger improvements. Men to do this kind of work are very hard to find among people who have education, no matter what price the labor is paid. This is a fact that must be given serious consideration.

The American Federation of Labor weekly news letter of January 10, 1914, contains this paragraph:

> This literacy test is very broad and liberal. When it is enacted into law it will prove to be equally valuable as a means of protection to native-born American workmen, foreign-born workmen already here, and foreign-born workmen who may come in the future. A foreign-born workman able to read will not be so easily imposed upon as the foreign-born workman who can not read. It will enable such to become more easily acquainted with American institutions and American trade-unions, and protect all from the greed and rapacity of the big corporations that are striving their utmost to keep labor in this country under their subjection.

Theoretically this statement is very true, but as a practical proposition it can easily be seen that an unnatural restriction of the ebb and flow of any commodity such as labor is exactly the same as an unnatural restriction of the ebb and flow of money. Such a condition is sure to cause trouble and disaster.

If 150,000 immigrants per year are restricted from coming into this country from the six races mentioned, what will happen to our contemplated extensions of public works? What will become of the present public works which are being carried on in all of the larger cities? What about the great railroad extensions under contemplation? Who will gather the crops during the two or three months of pressing demand made by the farming districts every year, thereby preventing the ruination of those crops? Will it be possible to recruit from among our present population sufficient workmen to meet the demand even at higher wages? There is not a Member of Congress who does not know that every year during certain months there is a scarcity of labor in his district and that a surplus of labor only exists during a business depression.

The cry has been raised that the foreign laborer does not spend his money here, but takes it back home with him. This is undoubtedly true; but for the wages paid does he not give his labor in return?

The Panama Canal would not have been finished for years had the literacy test been in operation on the Isthmus.

Since the report of the Immigration Commission medical science has made such strides that we should in the near future be able to restrict our immigrants to those who are healthy and fit in every way to become American citizens. The proper solution of the immigration question would be for a strict inspection on both sides of the water, so as to prevent any immigrant with either a moral or physical defect entering our country.

I firmly believe that we should be willing to give opportunity for admission to every man, woman, or child of sound morals, mind, and body. While the bill under discussion contains some very good features, until the literacy test is eliminated, however, I am compelled for the economic reasons given to vote against it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I happened into the Chamber this morning when my colleague [Mr. RAKER] protested against the criticisms that had been launched against the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Immigration [Mr. BURNETT] because the latter's State of Alabama had been pointed out as having a large percentage of illiterates. I think that the criticisms hurled at the gentleman from Alabama are just. When a physician has a remedy or nostrum with which he proposes to cure an evil, if he be afflicted with the disease which his remedy is supposed to heal, he ought to be willing to take a dose of his own medicine to cure himself; and when a barber wants to sell a hair restorer to his baldheaded customers, if he himself be baldheaded, he should be willing to use it first upon himself and bring back the hair on his own head. [Laughter.] "Physician, heal thyself," is certainly applicable in such cases.

All too frequently prejudice, bigotry, and race hatred are brought into problems of this kind. Questions of this character have cropped out frequently in this country ever since the foundation of Plymouth Colony. The Pilgrims who landed at Plymouth Rock left their native land on account of religious persecution. They had been in the New World but a few years before they drove out into the wilderness Roger Williams because he had broader ideas, broader views on religious subjects than they had. He was the first to proclaim the doctrine of religious liberty in the Colonies, and was exiled by religious exiles in consequence.

Mr. Chairman, it has been said frequently that we are living in an age of hysteria. The sentiment for much of the legislation we are called upon to enact in these days of fads and faddists has been worked up by hysterical men and women. Why, only last Monday this House passed a bill of that character—the so-called red-light bill. No one on this floor can stand up and defend vice; we all agree that vice, wherever it exists, ought to be eradicated; and yet after that bill was passed what happened? I have heard that some of its most earnest advocates rushed to the White House and asked the President for God's sake not to sign that bill until they had a chance to do something for those unfortunate women that that red-light law would drive into the streets. Why did they not look out for the unfortunate women first? Why did they not try to secure employment for them beforehand? Oh, if they had only taken to heart the lesson that one finds in the New Testament. I recall the incident of the woman taken in adultery, who was brought before the Christ. Under the Hebraic law she would have been stoned to death. But when the lowly Nazareen was informed of her offense he meekly said, "He that is without sin among you let him first cast a stone at her." Abashed, her accusers sneaked out of the room, and when they had all slunk away and he and she were alone, he exclaimed to the woman in God-like spirit, "Go and sin no more." How much better to meet these questions and these problems in that kind of spirit rather than in the narrow, bigoted, prejudiced spirit in which many of them are met nowadays.

And so, urged on by fanatical, hysterical, but probably well-meaning, men and women, we are now requested to take another leap in the dark. We are urged to enact this illiteracy-test immigration law regardless of the consequences upon those American industries that require the kind of labor that the illiterates alone seem to be willing to perform.

Mr. Chairman, I know that there are certain publications in the United States that are vigorously advocating this kind of legislation. They are also denouncing with bitterness and vindictiveness the members of a certain religious denomination in our country. They carry at the head of their columns the words "For freedom of speech," "For freedom of the press," but they seem to forget or overlook the words "For freedom of religious worship." And to show that the fathers of the Republic held of paramount importance the freedom of religious worship, to show that the right to worship one's God in one's own way was esteemed even a higher right than freedom of speech or freedom of the press, let me call attention to the first amendment to the Constitution, which reads as follows:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

That language must convince every American citizen that the founders of the Republic held freedom of religious worship ahead of freedom of speech or freedom of the press.

Sir, the petitions I have received in favor of this legislation come almost entirely from the same classes that would ostracize many of our fellow citizens on account of the religious belief of these fellow citizens. The spirit that actuates them in the latter instance—the spirit of blind, unreasoning prejudice—is the same spirit that inspires them to ask for this illiteracy test.

Mr. Chairman, we are all agreed that we should oppose the admission to our shores of criminals, paupers, the physically and the mentally unfit. There is no difference of opinion so far as their exclusion is concerned. But these illiterates do a class of work that the native Americans will not do.

The American native born ordinarily does not do the hard work of laying railroad ties and rails, of digging trenches, of balancing roadbeds, and work of that character that these illiterates do. You find this same character of immigrants in England; you find them in Germany; you find them in all of the progressive countries of the world, because the natives of those countries do not do that hard, manual, physical work which educated men everywhere refrain from doing. It is your illiterate, your uneducated man, who has to work with his brawn and not with his brain, who is willing to do it; it is he who is your hewer of wood, your drawer of water; and you want to shut the door upon that kind of immigration. I say you could better afford to keep out some of your educated skilled labor than lose the benefit of the brawn and muscle of the illiterate laborer who is content to take that employment which the educated man can not or will not perform.

Why, sir, the application of the illiteracy test provided for in this bill will deny 250,000 immigrants the right of admission to our shores every year. If that be what you contemplate, why are you not honest enough to say so? Why hide behind a subterfuge of this kind? Why do you not say right out and out, "We want to close the doors against further immigration; we do not want any more immigrants to come here, because we are opposed to their coming on principle"? But you dare not do that. Oh, no; you cloak yourselves behind the illiteracy test.

Mr. Chairman, Nancy Hanks, the mother of President Lincoln, was an illiterate, and Andrew Johnson, who became President of the United States, was educated by his wife after he was married. Many of the men who fought in the Revolutionary War, from whom Sons of the American Revolution and Daughters of the American Revolution are proud to be descended, were illiterates who could not write their names. Many of the early colonists could neither read nor write; they had to make a mark in place of a signature in signing important documents. It was not their fault. They did not happen to have the opportunity to learn how to read and write. After all, education is largely a matter of opportunity. And many of the illiterates who come to this country to-day are illiterate because they were denied educational advantages. But we have had this question of excluding immigrants before us at every stage of our history. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] stated awhile ago that even when we were Colonies the great philosopher, Benjamin Franklin, opposed the further immigration of Germans into Pennsylvania. About 20 years later he evidently found that his theories were wrong; that his fears were unfounded; for he was one of the committee of five of the Continental Congress who helped draft the Declaration of Independence, and in the Declaration of Independence one of the complaints against the King of Great Britain is that he refused to pass laws to allow foreigners to migrate to this country. In the early part of the nineteenth century the agitation against immigrants was directed against the Germans and the Irish. Why, even the children of Irish immigrants were insulted in the public schools in the larger cities of this country. The turner halls of the Germans were frequently attacked; the doors were broken and the windows were smashed by the prejudiced haters of foreign immigrants.

Even as late as 1898 there was complaint against the Swedes coming to this country, and it is universally conceded in these days that the Swedes, as well as Scandinavians generally, make a splendid type of American citizen. It is universally conceded in these days that the Irish and the German immigrants of half or three-quarters of a century ago were a fine class of men and women. Their descendants have added materially to the upbuilding of this American Commonwealth. And yet, if you were to read the attacks made upon them during the period they were flocking to our shores in great numbers, you would find that the language used against them was just as bitter, just as vindictive, as is the language that is being used against the immigrants of our day.

Mr. Chairman, statistics show that an overwhelming percentage of the immigrants of to-day are farm laborers and unskilled workmen. There is a crying demand for farm labor all over the Union. In the West millions of acres of arable land lie undeveloped on account of the scarcity of farm labor. With the opening of the Panama Canal much of this immigration will go direct to the West. We in California have already provided for an immigration commission that will try to locate these immigrants in our orchards, our vineyards, and our farms. The products of the soil will be greatly increased in that State. We will be able to send a greater abundance of the good things of life to the teeming masses of the East. And what is true of California is equally true of all the Pacific Coast States.

I for one have no fear of the illiterate immigrant. It is the educated scoundrel, who could easily work his way into this country under this Burnett bill, whose presence here will be the real menace to our institutions and our country's welfare.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMRIDGE].

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, if we allowed our judgment upon this legislation to be controlled by the eloquent addresses to which we have listened from the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], I am sure that we would lose sight of one of the most important elements to be considered in determining our action. As I approach the discussion of this measure I do so entirely from an economic standpoint, because I believe we should so consider it.

If the present volume of immigration is a national asset instead of a national liability, we certainly should not consider favorably legislation looking to its restriction. But after the consideration which I have been able to give to the measure, and after listening to the arguments which have been presented to the committee, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the course of wisdom and of national prudence lies along the line of the passage of this bill. It is, indeed, a pleasing picture which has been unfolded to us this morning of the great tide of immigration coming to our shores which is to be influenced and affected by contact with our free institutions, rising from childhood to manhood under the influence of American principles and of American government; and were these conditions universal and general so far as the immigrant is concerned, I am sure that our verdict upon this measure would be different. But, Mr. Chairman, as we follow this tide of immigration, and as we see it coming, like the tread of armed men, through the gateways of our country, and as we see it scattering into regions of this country where conditions portrayed by the gentleman from New York do not exist, we must admit, Mr. Chairman, that this flow of immigration has been largely due to the demand and to the market furnished by syndicated greed and monopoly. When the history of the past 25 years shall have been written by those who are able to give it impartial consideration and portrayal, the record of the thousands of lives which have paid the penalty to human selfishness and to human greed upon the altar of this Moloch of monopoly will arise to condemn this generation for not having adopted and passed legislation of this character years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I come from a section of country which to-day is being visited by an industrial disturbance of serious import and effect. And that disturbance and that trouble is largely due to the presence there of this element of foreigners who have been lured from their homes across the sea by attractive promises of reward and now find themselves exposed to all the hardships and sufferings which can be visited upon that type of people under conditions of labor which exist in our coal-mining camps. The history of West Virginia and of Pennsylvania and of other great industrial centers corroborates, in my opinion, the statement that, were it not for the commercialization of immigration causes for this legislation would largely have disappeared.

Mr. Chairman, I question seriously whether this country has not reached the acme and limit of its absorptive power. I believe with all my heart that America forever should be the land of the free and the home of the brave, but the question with me is whether we do not owe a greater duty to the children of our own nationality, to those who are already here, to keep and preserve for them the ideals of Americanism and patriotism which have been inherent in the life of this country from its very beginning.

Mr. Chairman, 50 years ago the tide of immigration broke over our borders and found its home in the great prairies of the West. The people who came to us then were those who were stimulated with a hunger and a desire to occupy the land. But to-day that tide breaks itself within the great congested centers of population, and the burden put upon the producers of the country by the great growth of our cities, with all the influences that grow out of such a condition, is rapidly weakening our productive energy until we find to-day that the cry is going up with increasing volume from the agricultural sections of this country for relief and for help in order that they may be built up and developed as in years gone by.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the passage of this bill. Its provisions are most wise and generous. It will tend to raise the standard of intelligence, not only in this country, but it will also serve notice to those who live in other lands that

this country must ever remain a home for those who are capable of understanding and appreciating the benefits of American civilization and who are willing to come here and join hands with us in the development of those principles of government which have been the characteristic of a true and free people. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman from Colorado consume all of the time—seven minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. He did.

Mr. BURNETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] proceed?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I have only a few minutes remaining.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LOGUE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LOGUE] is recognized.

[Mr. LOGUE addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] is recognized.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe in a restriction of immigration for the reason that I believe it is necessary in order to protect and preserve our standard of American citizenship. I believe it is necessary not only to protect and preserve our standard of American citizenship, but also to raise that standard, because in my opinion in no other way can we perpetuate and hand down to posterity the institutions of our country.

Mr. Chairman, a number of gentlemen have made the assertion on the floor of this House that Americans, being themselves only a few generations removed from immigrants, have no right to exclude others from coming to this country. I contend that such an assertion is both incorrect and based upon an inaccuracy of terms. The early settlers who came to America and laid the foundations for its future greatness were colonists, not immigrants. They came both to escape religious persecution and for the purpose of bettering their economic condition. They faced difficulties and evolved a civilization which, though complex, has to a great extent remained Anglo-Saxon in character. It is to a civilization already founded and a country in the full tide of its national career that these later persons, properly termed immigrants, are coming. They seek to share the advantages of this great Republic equally with those whose forefathers made it possible, nor would we wish to exclude any who bring with them health, intelligence, and a desire to have a part in the permanent upbuilding of the country. America has always held itself out as an asylum for religious and political refugees who are worthy and qualified in a proper sense to become American citizens, and against such we never wish to close our doors. It does not follow, however, because of the rather liberal open-door policy which has so long been maintained, that the people of this country have lost their right to say who shall come among them. This privilege has been enjoyed by all peoples since the earliest time. The Hebrews, the Greeks, the Romans, all hedged about their citizenship with the most rigid restrictions. America chooses to be liberal in this respect, but it does not follow that the people of this country have not the right to say what the character of its future citizenship shall be.

Immigration has already been somewhat restricted; we do not allow the admission of alien criminals or insane, which in the early days of the immigration movement were freely admitted, to later become a burden upon the taxpayers of this country. To show the extent of the burden imposed, the census of 1890 disclosed that 33.2 per cent of the insane in the United States were of foreign birth. In 1904 the New York State Lunacy Commission reported to the Department of Commerce and Labor that in Greater New York 60 per cent of the insane were of alien birth. In a recent tabulation of statistics it is pointed out that in 1912 of the 31,624 insane patients of the New York hospitals 13,728 were of foreign birth. Of this latter number 9,241 had never become naturalized citizens, so that 29.2 per cent of the total number of insane cared for by New York State were aliens. The average length of residence of the inmates of insane hospitals is 9.85 years, consequently the 9,241 aliens in the New York hospitals in 1912 represent a future cost to the State of New York of $25,412,038.44. It can be contended with great show of justice that it is unfair to impose upon New York the burden of meeting a condition for which the National Government alone is responsible. As regards diseased foreigners the immigration commission kept a record of all charity patients entering certain New York hospitals from August 1, 1908, to February 28, 1909, and of the 23,758 cases 52.3 per cent were foreign born. The expense of caring for these cases fell entirely upon the people of this country. No one now contends that we have not the right to exclude such undesirables. It would be illogical to say that we have no right to go further and exclude illiterates also, provided that we are convinced that their admission is having a detrimental effect on the country.

That the admission of such hordes of illiterates does have a harmful effect is not open to doubt. The statistics do not conclusively show that the illiterate and other foreigners are more criminal in the commission of certain crimes than are the native Americans, but they do disclose the fact that the children of immigrants are more inclined to crime. The report of the Immigration Commission contains the following statement:

> The proportion of the more serious crimes of homicide, blackmail, and robbery, as well as the least serious offenses, is greater among the foreign born.

It is not solely on the ground of their criminal inclination, however, that we wish to exclude the illiterates. It is undesirable for any State to have a large body of uneducated men, and particularly is this true of a republic, where each one can exercise the rights of citizenship. They must be educated, and the cost of doing so falls upon the taxpayers of this country.

We do not desire to aim a restrictive clause at any particular nation, yet it is a fact that the great majority of illiterate immigrants come from the countries of southern and eastern Europe. These are the countries with which we have least in common and whose people we find most difficult of assimilation. The number of immigrants coming from Europe is constantly increasing, and the great majority come from southern Europe and the countries bordering on the Mediterranean, Caspian, and Black Seas. Not all but many of these people are of mixed races. For thousands of years people from Asia, the north of Africa, and the south of Europe have contended for supremacy along the borders of these seas, and this in a large measure accounts for the mixed blood of the people living there to-day. The immigrants who came to this country prior to 1883 were mostly from England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. Those who came after 1883 were chiefly from Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, Greece, Italy, Montenegro, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Russia, Servia, Spain, Syria, and Turkey. Many years ago the State of South Carolina passed a law intended to encourage immigration from the north of Europe and by implication to discourage it from the southern European countries. The number coming into the United States from the north of Europe in 1882 was 563,170, as compared to 83,320 from southern European countries.

In 1907 the conditions were reversed, the northern Europeans numbering 227,851 and the southern ones 971,608. Computing from tables for the years 1899 to 1909, the per cent of illiteracy among northern Europeans was found to be 2.7 per cent, while among the southern ones it was 35.6. It will thus be seen that the literacy test will have the effect of excluding many immigrants from the countries of southern and eastern Europe. These people differ from us in their ideas of both government and religion, and coming in such large numbers are very difficult and to a large extent impossible to assimilate. A certain amount of new blood brought into a country may do good, but we do not want so many peoples of such different characteristics, or they will in time change the entire character of our civilization. Last year the immigrants coming to this country exceeded 1,400,000, and the present indications are that the number for this year will exceed 1,800,000. The United States already has one race problem on its hands—what the final solution will be nobody can say with certainty, except that the white race in this country will always rule.

It is also true that the present-day immigrants from southern Europe compose the large part of that class of transient immigrants which we find becoming such a factor in our civilization. Statistics show that of all the immigrants coming to this country about 30 per cent return home after a stay of a few years here.

Among the immigrants from eastern and southern Europe about 40 per cent return. Such a course is most beneficial to Europe, and the authorities there never discourage immigration where the immigrant expects to return shortly and invest his savings in his native country. Not only does the capital he brings with him increase the wealth of the home country, but the new ideas he has absorbed in America, the business methods he has learned, and his training there all contribute to make him a more desirable citizen than he was when he left home. He enjoys a state of affluence which makes him the envy of all the natives of his village and stimulates them with a desire to follow his example by emigrating to America as he has done

and returning home better off financially and in every other way.

It would be difficult to estimate the amount of American wealth which eventually finds its way to Europe. The newspapers always herald a new foreign alliance or marriage, dwelling upon the millions which will go out from America in the purchase of a foreign title, but the amount of wealth lost in this way is small as compared with the steady stream which flows every year in the wake of the returning immigrant.

It can not be said, however, that the return of the immigrants' earnings is an absolute loss to the United States. But looking at the question from our standpoint, it would be far better to secure a class of immigrants who intend to remain permanently and have a part in the upbuilding of this country. Then America would have the benefit not only of their energy, but of their accumulated capital as well. The immigrants of the older type from the north of Europe, being mostly of Anglo-Saxon extraction, easily adapt themselves to conditions in the United States and as a rule remain here. It is the races of southern Europe, alien to us in religion, blood, and ideals, that chiefly compose the birds of passage, coming to America for a few years and then returning with all they can carry away. As the literacy clause mostly affects these *southern* Europeans, it will have the effect of excluding many of the immigrants who come to this country for only a temporary stay.

In looking at any question of this nature it is well to see in just what way it is productive of most good or harmful effects. The demand for restriction comes with greatest insistence from the labor organizations throughout the country, and undoubtedly it is on them that the greatest influence of immigration is felt. The president of the American Federation of Labor, speaking for that organization, as did the officials of the Farmers' Union and many other organizations, including the Junior Order of United American Mechanics and substantially all other patriotic orders in this country, demanded that further restrictions be placed on the admission of aliens.

A great many immigrants from eastern and southern Europe go at once into the mines upon their arrival here, the great majority of them being unskilled in any line of employment. Being unable to speak English, and often to read even their own language, they are unable to comprehend intelligently the instructions given them or read the notices posted for their safety. As a result of both their ignorance and carelessness many accidents have occurred, rendering conditions under which the work must be done much less safe than formerly. Many of the later class of immigrants come without their wives or families, and being thus able to live, banded together in camps, they can accept lower wages than those on which the native laborer can live. As a result the scale of wages has been lowered to the point that the American laborer has been almost driven out of certain lines of employment, and this without benefit to the American people generally in the cost of living or otherwise. It is not the low tariff that results in low wages, but unrestricted immigration. Had the last Republican President been so solicitous for maintaining high wages he would not have vetoed a bill which had that end in view and was desired by labor organizations all over the country.

The literacy test seeks to remedy these evils so far as possible. No one test would absolutely result in separating the wheat from the tares, the good from the undesirable immigrants. By excluding the ignorant ones, however, we rid ourselves of many dangers. Neither do we absolutely close our doors against any persons honestly desiring to better their condition by emigrating to a land of equal opportunities. To learn to read and write one's own language is not an insuperable difficulty, and those who wish to come here will make better citizens if we require of them that they acquire some of the essentials for good citizenship before leaving their native country. I would also have the examination of their fitness made, if possible, at the point of embarkation. Then, at least, America will not be put to the expense of their education, and it will result in giving to us a better, because a more intelligent, and ambitious class of immigrants.

Mr. Chairman, I heartily approve of section 3 of the bill, which I shall insert at the close of my remarks:

SEC. 3. That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: All idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons, and persons who have been insane within five years previous; persons who have had one or more attacks of insanity at any time previously; paupers; persons likely to become a public charge; professional beggars; vagrants; persons afflicted with tuberculosis in any form or with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease; persons not comprehended within any of the foregoing excluded classes who are found to be and are certified by the examining surgeon as being mentally or physically defective, such mental or physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living; persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude; polygamists, or persons who admit their belief in the practice of polygamy; anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or of all forms of law, or who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government, or who advocate the assassination of public officials or who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property; persons who are members of or affiliated with any organization entertaining and teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government, or who advocate or teach the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either of specific individuals or of officers generally, of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character, or who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property; prostitutes, or women or girls coming into the United States for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons who procure or attempt to bring in prostitutes or women or girls for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons who are supported by or receive in whole or in part the proceeds of prostitution; persons hereinafter called contract laborers, who have been induced, assisted, encouraged, or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment, whether such offers or promises are true or false, or in consequence of agreements, oral, written or printed, express or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled; persons who have come in consequence of advertisements for laborers printed, published, or distributed in a foreign country; persons who have been deported under any of the provisions of this act and who may again seek admission within one year from the date of such deportation, unless prior to their reembarkation at a foreign port the Secretary of Labor shall have consented to their reapplying for admission; persons whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown that such person does not belong to one of the foregoing excluded classes; persons whose ticket or passage is paid for by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign Government, either directly or indirectly; stowaways, except that any such stowaway may be admitted in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor; all children under 16 years of age, unaccompanied by one or both of their parents, at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor or under such regulations as he may from time to time prescribe; persons who can not become eligible, under existing law, to become citizens of the United States by naturalization, unless otherwise provided for by existing agreements as to passports, or by treaties, conventions, or agreements that may hereafter be entered into. The provision next foregoing, however, shall not apply to persons of the following status or occupations: Government officers, ministers or religious teachers, missionaries, lawyers, physicians, chemists, civil engineers, teachers, students, authors, merchants, and travelers for curiosity or pleasure, nor to their legal wives or their children under 16 years of age who shall accompany them or who subsequently may apply for admission to the United States, but such persons or their legal wives or foreign-born children who fail to maintain in the United States a status or occupation placing them within the excepted classes shall be deemed to be in the United States contrary to law, and shall be subject to deportation as provided in section 19 of this act.

That after four months from the approval of this act, in addition to the aliens who are by law now excluded from admission into the United States, the following persons shall also be excluded from admission thereto, to wit:

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language, or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish: *Provided*, That any admissible alien or any alien heretofore or hereafter legally admitted, or any citizen of the United States, may bring in or send for his father or grandfather over 55 years of age, his wife, his mother, his grandmother, or his unmarried or widowed daughter, if otherwise admissible, whether such relative can read or not; and such relative shall be permitted to enter. That for the purpose of ascertaining whether aliens can read the immigrant inspectors shall be furnished with slips, of uniform size, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, each containing not less than 30 nor more than 40 words in ordinary use, printed in plainly legible type in the various languages and dialects of immigrants. Each alien may designate the particular language or dialect in which he desires the examination to be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect. No two aliens coming in the same vessel or other vehicle of carriage or transportation shall be tested with the same slip. That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States solely for the purpose of escaping from religious persecution; all aliens in transit through the United States; all aliens who have been lawfully admitted to the United States and who later shall go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of an offense purely political, not involving moral turpitude: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act relating to the payments for tickets or passage by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign Government shall not apply to the tickets or passage of aliens in immediate and continuous transit through the United States to foreign contiguous territory: *Provided further*, That skilled labor, if otherwise admissible, may be imported if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country, and the question of the necessity of importing such skilled labor in any particular instance may be determined by the Secretary of Labor upon the application of any person interested, such application to be made before such importation, and such determination by the Secretary of Labor to be reached after a full hearing and an investigation into the facts of the case; but such determination shall not become final until a period of 30 days has elapsed. Within three days after such determination the Secretary of Labor shall cause to be published a brief statement reciting the substance of the application, the facts presented at the hearing and his determination thereon, in three daily newspapers of general circulation in three of the principal cities of the United States. At any time during said period of 30 days any person dissatisfied with the ruling may appeal to the district court of the United States of the district into which the labor is sought to be brought, which court or the judge thereof in vacation shall have jurisdiction to try de novo such question of necessity, and the decision in such court shall be final. Such appeal shall operate as a supersedeas: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this law applicable to contract labor shall not be held to exclude professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious

denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants: *Provided further*, That whenever the President shall be satisfied that passports issued by any foreign Government to its citizens or subjects to go to any country other than the United States, or to any insular possession of the United States or to the Canal Zone, are being used for the purpose of enabling the holder to come to the continental territory of the United States to the detriment of labor conditions therein, the President shall refuse to permit such citizens or subjects of the country issuing such passports to enter the continental territory of the United States from such other country or from such insular possessions or from the Canal Zone: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent, hinder, or restrict any alien exhibitor, or holder of a concession or privilege for any fair or exposition authorized by act of Congress, from bringing into the United States, under contract, such alien mechanics, artisans, agents, or other employees, natives of his country, as may be necessary for installing or conducting his exhibit or for preparing for installing or conducting any business authorized or permitted under any concession or privilege which may have been or may be granted by any such fair or exposition in connection therewith, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, may prescribe both as to the admission and return of such persons: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to accredited officials of foreign Governments, nor to their suites, families, or guests: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall exclude the wife or minor children of a citizen of the United States.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] is recognized.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the House for consideration is in substance the one that passed the House and Senate last year by a vote of about 2 to 1, and but for the veto of a former President would now be a law. Last year I strongly advocated this measure, and I desire at this time to offer some observations upon it.

It has been contended here by gentlemen opposing this bill that it is un-American, and that we are reversing our policy of a lifetime by now attempting to restrict immigration to this country. I want to address myself for a few minutes to that feature of this proposition. I desire to assert that we are not only not reversing our policy in restricting immigrants by this bill but, upon the contrary, we are in thorough harmony and accord with it. From the very moment this Government began to pass laws upon the immigration question down to now it has consistently and in every instance, except one, passed laws restricting immigration. That one exception was when a law was passed in the year 1864 encouraging contract labor. That was repealed in 1868.

A little history of what this Government has done in the past in regard to this question will make perfectly clear the assertion I have just made.

The immigration to the United States is naturally divided into two periods:

First. The immigrants arriving before the year 1880, known as the old immigration; and

Second. Immigrants after that time, known as the new immigration.

From the first settlement of this country down to about 1835 immigrants came here as a matter of course. Practically up to that time the only legislation enacted, and practically all that was proposed, was the law of 1819 regulating steerage passengers at sea and making provision for recording statistics relative to immigration. None were kept before this.

From 1835 to 1860 the subject of immigration to this country was much discussed, and there sprang up what was known as the "native-American" and "know-nothing" movements, largely basing their opposition to immigrants to this country who embraced the Catholic faith. These movements soon assumed the form of a political organization known in history as the American Republican Party and later the "Know-Nothing Party." As a result of these organizations, in the main, affiliating with the new political movement, the United States Senate in 1836 passed a resolution directing the Secretary of State to collect information respecting the immigration of foreign paupers and criminals to the United States.

The House of Representatives in 1838 agreed to a resolution instructing the Judiciary Committee of the House to consider the propriety of passing a law prohibiting the importation of vagabonds and paupers into this country as well as to consider the expediency of making our loose naturalization laws more stringent. This resolution was referred to a committee of seven Members, and their favorable report was the first congressional report ever made concerning any phase of the immigration question.

A bill was introduced in Congress upon the recommendation of the majority report of the committee, which bill provided that any master of a vessel who took on board an alien passenger who was an idiot, lunatic, maniac, or one afflicted with an incurable disease, or one convicted of an infamous crime, with the intention of transporting such person to the United States, should, upon conviction, be fined $1,000 or be imprisoned from one to three years. This bill was not even considered by Congress, and for some 10 years following little attempt was made to secure immigration legislation; but the great increase in immigration to this country from Europe from 1848 to 1850 put new life and fears in the breasts of those fighting immigration; and it is recorded that in 1855 both the governors and Legislatures of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, California, and Kentucky were "Know-Nothings." The slogan of the "Know-Nothing Party" was that Americans must rule America, and their greatest strength was in the Thirty-third Congress, from 1854 to 1856, when they claimed 43 Representatives and 5 Senators. Ten years later, however, in the Thirty-eighth Congress, there was not a "Know-Nothing" Representative in the House, and the "Know-Nothing Party" disappeared without having accomplished anything against immigration. The truth is that in 1864 Congress passed a law to encourage immigration, especially the importation of contract labor. This law was repealed, however, in 1868, leaving on the statute books the act of 1819, amended slightly by the acts of 1847 and 1848, providing improved conditions in the steerage of immigration ships. The law of 1864 stands out as the only attempt on the part of the National Government to promote immigration. The States, however, have frequently made such attempts. New York, in 1824, passed a law requiring all masters of vessels arriving at the port of entry to make a written report, giving the name, age, and last residence of every person on board during the voyage, and whether any of the passengers had gone on board any other vessel with a view of proceeding to New York.

Another section of the law gave the mayor of New York City the power to require bond of every master of a vessel to indemnify the mayor and the overseer of the poor from any expense incurred for passengers brought in and not reported. This law was held to be constitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States, and in 1829 the State of New York passed another law, which provided that the master of every vessel arriving from a foreign port should pay to the health commissioner $1.50 for every cabin passenger, $1 for every steerage passenger, mate, sailor, or marine, and 25 cents for every person on a coasting vessel.

In 1837 Massachusetts passed a law requiring the owner of a vessel to pay $2 for each alien passenger brought to her ports and to give bond that certain immigrants should not become a public charge. Both the New York and the Massachusetts statutes were later held in part to be unconstitutional. California and Louisiana passed statutes looking to the limitation of immigration, which were held to be unconstitutional. In California the question of Chinese immigration was so acute that recourse was had to the Federal Government, which resulted in the Burlingame treaty, which was proclaimed on July 28, 1868, and which was the first treaty to deal with Chinese immigration to the United States.

The attitude of the United States in this treaty toward Chinese immigration was not popular in the Pacific Coast States, and they continued their agitation for further restriction of Chinese immigrants, which resulted in the Congress of the United States passing the act of March 3, 1875, aimed at immigrants from China, Japan, and other oriental countries. This law prohibited the importation of convicts, women for immoral purposes, coolie labor, and Chinese and Japanese subjects without their free and voluntary consent, and fixed heavy penalties for a violation of the provisions of the statute. Later other treaties and Chinese and Japanese exclusion acts forbade the immigration of Chinese and Japanese to this country as well as Korean laborers, skilled or unskilled. And that is the way the matter stands to-day. So the bill now before the House is not intended to exclude Chinese, Japanese, or Korean laborers, skilled or unskilled, as that is already provided for.

And while the National Government was experimenting with immigration in this way the various States had from time to time, as I have said, tried their hands at it. New York, Massachusetts, California, Louisiana, and other States passed immigration statutes of one form and another, the constitutionality of a number of which in time reached the Supreme Court of the United States for final decision. It became apparent that the subject of immigration was too big for State control, and in a very unusual decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on March 20, 1876, that court decreed that—

We are of the opinion that this whole subject—

Of immigration—

has been confided to Congress by the Constitution; that Congress can more appropriately and with more acceptance exercise it than any other body known to our laws, State or national; that by providing a system of laws in these matters applicable to all ports and to all vessels, a

serious question which has long been a matter of contest and complaint may be effectively and satisfactorily settled.

This decision virtually put the subject of immigration under Federal control, and on July 6, 1876, following the decision of the Supreme Court in March of that year, Senator Conkling and Representative Cox, of New York, introduced bills in Congress for the national regulation of immigration. No legislation, however, of this sort was put on the statute books until August 3, 1882. This law provided, among other things, that a head tax of 50 cents each be levied on all aliens entering the ports of the United States to defray expenses of regulating immigration and caring for needy immigrants after landing; that lunatics, idiots, convicts—except for political offenses—and persons likely to become public charges should not be permitted to land, and that the Secretary of the Treasury be charged with executing the provisions of the act, and that he be empowered to enter into contracts with such State offices as the governor of any State might designate to take charge of the local affairs of immigration within such State.

On February 26, 1885, the first act of Congress was approved forbidding the importation of contract labor to the United States. This law was defective in that no arrangement was made for its general execution, no inspection of the alien was provided for, nor deportation of the contract laborer, if found so to be. This act, however, was amended by an act of February 23, 1887, which gave the Secretary of the Treasury authority to deport within one year from landing any alien who had come to this country contrary to the provisions of the contract-labor act.

In 1889 a standing committee on immigration was established in the Senate of the United States, and a select committee on immigration and naturalization was established in the House.

In 1890 these committees were authorized to make a joint investigation of the immigration question, and especially to look into the various State laws on the subject. These committees, in making their report, suggested that while no very radical changes in the immigration laws were at that time advisable, still they found that throughout the country there existed a strong sentiment for a stricter enforcement of these laws.

The fact is that in the year 1890 one or more political parties in 23 different States demanded additional regulation of immigration. Responsive to this demand for stricter immigration laws and regulations, the Congress of the United States passed, and it was approved on March 3, 1891, an additional immigration act amendatory of previous acts. This act added to the list of aliens heretofore excluded those "suffering from a loathsome or contagious disease," "polygamists," and those "whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another or who is assisted by others to come," except, however, that any person living in the United States could pay the way of a relative or friend, provided, of course, that the relative or friend did not belong to some of the excluded classes. This act strengthened further the existing contract-labor law by prohibiting the encouragement of immigration by promises of employment through advertisements published in any foreign country, and steamship companies were forbidden under penalty to solicit or encourage immigration.

The law of 1891 also created the office of Superintendent of Immigration, and instead of some State officer, by appointment of the governor, having charge of the execution of the immigration laws in that State, as provided for in the act of 1882, the whole question of immigration for the first time was completely under Federal control.

This act also provided that the commanding officer of every vessel carrying aliens to our shores should furnish to the proper immigration officials the name, nationality, last residence, and destination of all immigrants on board; that medical examination of immigrants at United States ports should be made by surgeons of the United States Marine-Hospital Service, and within one year after arrival any immigrant might be returned who had come to this country in violation of law, and that, too, at the expense of the transportation company that brought him. For the first time inspection of immigrants on the Mexican and Canadian borders was established. While this was the most stringent immigration act passed by Congress up to this time, still the subject of immigration continued to be much discussed, and a strong movement for further restriction developed, owing largely to the industrial depression from 1890 to 1896. Investigations more or less extensive were conducted by joint committees of Congress and also by the Industrial Commission.

In 1894 an act was passed raising the head tax from 50 cents to $1, but President Cleveland vetoed another bill passed by both branches of Congress providing for a literacy test.

Based upon the report of the Industrial Commission made to Congress February 20, 1902, a bill was introduced in the House providing for a complete codification and rearrangement of all immigration acts from March 3, 1875, to the act of 1894. An amendment was offered to this bill and passed by the House by a vote of 86 to 7 providing that all persons over 15 years of age who were unable to read the English language or some other language should be excluded, making an exception in favor of wives, parents, grandparents, and children under 18 years of age. The bill so amended passed the House May 27, 1902. When it reached the Senate it eliminated the educational test, raised the head tax from $1 to $2, and made it unlawful for any person to assist in the entry or naturalization of alien anarchists. The House agreed to these amendments, and the bill was approved by the President March 3, 1903.

It was not until February 20, 1907, that any other immigration act of much import was passed by Congress, although by an act of February 14, 1903, the Department of Commerce and Labor was established and the Commissioner General of Immigration was placed under that department, his official position being that of a head of a bureau. On June 29, 1906, the Bureau of Immigration was changed to the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, a uniform rule for the naturalization of aliens was provided for, and the administration of the new naturalization law was charged to this bureau.

A little history of the immigration act of February 20, 1907, the latest now on the statute books, with a small amendment of March 26, 1910, and the one sought to be amended by the bill we are now considering, may not be amiss:

A bill introduced by Senator DILLINGHAM, of Vermont, was favorably reported by the Senate committee on March 29, 1906. This bill sought to amend the immigration act of 1903 by increasing the head tax from $2 to $5, by adding imbeciles, feebleminded persons, children under 17 years of age unaccompanied, and persons "who are found to be and are certified by the examining surgeon as being mentally or physically defective, such mental or physical defect being of such a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living," were added to the excluded classes. The section of existing law excluding prostitutes was amended by adding "women or girls coming into the United States for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose."

A division of information was created in the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization, and steamship companies were for the first time required to furnish to the proper immigration officials lists of outgoing passengers. In the Senate the bill was amended by the insertion of literacy tests very similar to the one this House is now considering and which I will later quote, and the Senate bill as amended by the literacy test passed the Senate May 23, 1906.

When the bill reached the House it was referred to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and they amended it by substituting one of their own, in many respects similar to it, including the literacy test. In the conference between the House and the Senate conferees the head tax was made $4, the literacy test eliminated, and a commission composed of nine members was authorized to make a complete investigation of the immigration question and report its findings to Congress. Composing this commission were to be three Members of the House, appointed by the Speaker, three Members of the Senate, appointed by the President of the Senate, and the other members of the commission to be appointed by the President of the United States. This commission, after an extensive investigation, both in this counry and in Europe, costing $1,000,000 and covering a period of four years, made a voluminous report covering 42 volumes of printed matter, covering all phases of the immigration question. This commission, after a most thorough investigation of the immigration question, found certain facts to exist and made some specific recommendations to Congress.

In the first place, the commission found that there were too many immigrants coming to this country; that there is now an oversupply of unskilled labor in the basic industries of the United States; that restrictive legislation ought to be passed by Congress; and that the literacy test was the best single method of accomplishing the desired end. Let me quote the exact words of the commission:

The investigations of the commission show an oversupply of unskilled labor in basic industries to an extent which indicates an oversupply of unskilled labor in industries of the country as a whole, a condition which demands legislation restricting the further admission of such unskilled labor. It is desirable in making the reduction that a sufficient number be debarred to produce a marked effect upon the present supply of unskilled labor.

And after enumerating more than a half dozen ways by which this reduction could be brought about, the commission added:

A majority of the commission favor the reading and writing test as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration.

And this is not a partisan political report for political purposes. It is a report by men of both parties after a most careful and painstaking investigation. The fact is that the question of immigration is not a political one.

So from what I have said you will see that the policy of this Government from the time it took any notice of this immigration question at all has been one of restriction, and every bill, with the one exception, that has been passed by Congress from the earliest history of this Government down to now has been one restricting and not encouraging the flow of immigration to this country. In the face of this legislation, showing beyond any doubt that one class of undesirable immigrants after another has been excluded by Federal legislation, I do not understand how Members can assert that by and through the bill before us we are reversing our policy as a Nation toward immigrants coming to this country.

I have briefly reviewed the legislation on this question, and before taking up and beginning to discuss the merits of the bill now pending before this House I want to adduce some proof to show that the question is nonpolitical and that restrictive legislation has been demanded in the national platforms of the two dominant political parties in this country. Away back in 1896, more than an eighth of a century ago, when the evils of immigration were not so great and not so well known as now, the Republican Party in its national platform of that year not only demanded a restriction of immigration but specifically indorsed the reading and writing test as a means to accomplish that end. The plank in the platform to which I refer is as follows:

For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our workingmen against the fatal competition of low-priced labor we demand that the immigration laws be thoroughly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.

This is one of the planks in the platform upon which the beloved McKinley was elected, and in his inaugural address he specifically indorsed the immigration plank and recommended an intelligence test to alien immigrants, to the end that American citizenship be protected and American institutions preserved.

In the Republican national platform of 1900 we find this language:

In the further interests of American workmen we favor a more effective restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from foreign lands, etc.

In his first message to Congress in 1901 ex-President Roosevelt indorsed unequivocally the restriction of immigration and an educational test. He used this pointed language:

The second object of a proper immigration law ought to be to secure a careful, and not merely perfunctory, educational test; some intelligent capacity to appreciate American institutions and act sanely as American citizens.

The Republican national platform this year (1912), the latest expression of the party on the subject, reads as follows:

We pledge the Republican Party to the enactment of appropriate laws to give relief from the constantly growing evil of induced or undesirable immigration, which is inimical to the progress and welfare of the people of the United States.

That the Republican Party stands for a restriction of immigration there is no room to doubt.

The Democratic Party, too, has put itself on record in regard to this great question. In its national platform of 1896 it used this language:

We hold that the most efficient way of protecting American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market.

In its national platform of 1900 the Democratic Party, while containing no plank upon the general subject of immigration, indorsed the Chinese exclusion law and recommended its application to the same classes of all Asiatic races.

And the Democratic national platform of 1904 contained no plank upon the general subject of immigration, but did specifically oppose the admission of Asiatic immigrants in this language:

We are opposed to the admission of Asiatic immigrants, who can not be amalgamated with our population.

The Democratic national platform of this year (1912) indorses more stringent immigration laws.

This is the latest expression of the Democratic Party on this important subject of immigration. Not only have the two dominant political parties in this country repeatedly expressed themselves in their national platforms in favor of restricting immigration, but the Republican platform of 1896 and the Republican President elected upon the Republican platform of 1900 have in express terms favored the literacy test—such a literacy test in substance that we are now considering. And what is that literacy test and what are the terms of the bill now before us?

I will insert at this point section 3 of the bill before us, which covers the classes of alien immigrants to be excluded:

SEC. 3. That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: All idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons, and persons who have been insane within five years previous; persons who have had one or more attacks of insanity at any time previously; paupers; persons likely to become a public charge; professional beggars; vagrants; persons afflicted with tuberculosis in any form or with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease; persons not comprehended within any of the foregoing excluded classes who are found to be and are certified by the examining surgeon as being mentally or physically defective, such mental or physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living; persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude; polygamists, or persons who admit their belief in the practice of polygamy; anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law, or who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government, or who advocate the assassination of public officials, or who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property; persons who are members of or affiliated with any organization entertaining and teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government, or who advocate or teach the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either of specific individuals or of officers generally, of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government because of his or their official character, or who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property; prostitutes, or women or girls coming into the United States for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons who procure or attempt to bring in prostitutes, or women or girls for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons who are supported by or receive, in whole or in part, the proceeds of prostitution; persons hereinafter called contract laborers who have been induced, assisted, encouraged, or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment, whether such offers or promises are true or false, or in consequence of agreements, oral, written, or printed, express or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled; persons who have come in consequence of advertisements for laborers printed, published, or distributed in a foreign country; persons who have been deported under any of the provisions of this act and who may again seek admission within one year from the date of such deportation, unless prior to their reembarkation at a foreign port the Secretary of Labor shall have consented to their reapplying for admission; persons whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown that such person does not belong to one of the foregoing excluded classes; persons whose ticket or passage is paid for by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign Government, either directly or indirectly; stowaways, except that any such stowaway may be admitted in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor; all children under 16 years of age unaccompanied by one or both of their parents, at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor or under such regulations as he may from time to time prescribe; persons who can not become eligible under existing law to become citizens of the United States by naturalization, unless otherwise provided for by existing agreements as to passports, or by treaties, conventions, or agreements that may hereafter be entered into. The provision next foregoing, however, shall not apply to persons of the following status or occupations: Government officers, ministers or religious teachers, missionaries, lawyers, physicians, chemists, civil engineers, teachers, students, authors, merchants, and travelers for curiosity or pleasure, nor to their legal wives or their children under 16 years of age who shall accompany them or who subsequently may apply for admission to the United States, but such persons, or their legal wives or foreign-born children who fail to maintain in the United States a status or occupation placing them within the excepted classes shall be deemed to be in the United States contrary to law, and shall be subject to deportation, as provided in section 19 of this act.

That after four months from the approval of this act, in addition to the aliens who are by law now excluded from admission into the United States, the following persons shall also be excluded from admission thereto, to wit:

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language, or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish: *Provided*, That any admissible alien or any alien heretofore or hereafter legally admitted, or any citizen of the United States, may bring in or send for his father or grandfather over 55 years of age, his wife, his mother, his grandmother, or his unmarried or widowed daughter, if otherwise admissible, whether such relative can read or not; and such relative shall be permitted to enter. That for the purpose of ascertaining whether aliens can read the immigrant inspectors shall be furnished with slips, of uniform size, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, each containing not less than 30 nor more than 40 words in ordinary use, printed in plainly legible type in the various languages and dialects of immigrants. Each alien may designate the particular language or dialect in which he desires the examination to be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect. No two aliens coming in the same vessel or other vehicle of carriage or transportation shall be tested with the same slip. That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States solely for the purpose of escaping from religious persecution; all aliens in transit through the United States; all aliens who have been lawfully admitted to the United States and who later shall go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of an offense purely political, not involving moral turpitude: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act relating to the payments for tickets or passage by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign Government shall not apply to the tickets or passage of aliens in immediate and continuous transit through the United States to foreign contiguous territory: *Provided further*, That skilled labor,

if otherwise admissible, may be imported if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country, and the question of the necessity of importing such skilled labor in any particular instance may be determined by the Secretary of Labor upon the application of any person interested, such application to be made before such importation, and such determination by the Secretary of Labor to be reached after a full hearing and an investigation into the facts of the case; but such determination shall not become final until a period of 30 days has elapsed. Within three days after such determination the Secretary of Labor shall cause to be published a brief statement reciting the substance of the application, the facts presented at the hearing and his determination thereon, in three daily newspapers of general circulation in three of the principal cities of the United States. At any time during said period of 30 days any person dissatisfied with the ruling may appeal to the district court of the United States of the district into which the labor is sought to be brought, which court or the judge thereof in vacation shall have jurisdiction to try de novo such question of necessity, and the decision in such court shall be final. Such appeal shall operate as a supersedeas: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this law applicable to contract labor shall not be held to exclude professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants: *Provided further*, That whenever the President shall be satisfied that passports issued by any foreign Government to its citizens or subjects to go to any country other than the United States, or to any insular possession of the United States or to the Canal Zone, are being used for the purpose of enabling the holder to come to the continental territory of the United States to the detriment of labor conditions therein, the President shall refuse to permit such citizens or subjects of the country issuing such passports to enter the continental territory of the United States from such other country or from such insular possessions or from the Canal Zone: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent, hinder, or restrict any alien exhibitor, or holder of a concession or privilege for any fair or exposition authorized by act of Congress, from bringing into the United States, under contract, such alien mechanics, artisans, agents, or other employees, natives of his country, as may be necessary for installing or conducting his exhibit or for preparing for installing or conducting any business authorized or permitted under any concession or privilege which may have been or may be granted by any such fair or exposition in connection therewith, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, may prescribe both as to the admission and return of such persons: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to accredited officials of foreign Governments, nor to their suites, families, or guests: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall exclude the wife or minor children of a citizen of the United States.

It will be observed that that provision of the bill relating to the literacy test excludes from entry into the United States—

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language, or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish: *Provided*, That any admissible alien or any alien heretofore or hereafter legally admitted, or any citizen of the United States, may bring in or send for his father or grandfather over 55 years of age, his wife, his mother, his grandmother, or his unmarried daughter, if otherwise admissible, whether relative can read or not; and such relative shall be permitted to enter.

This literacy test for the purpose of preventing objectionable foreigners from coming to this country is not a new proposition, as I have already observed. Not only have political parties in their national platforms specially declared for it, but Congress itself has unequivocally indorsed it.

The House, in the Fifty-fourth Congress, passed such a measure by the decisive vote of 195 to 20, while the Senate passed it by a vote of 52 to 10.

That literacy-test bill would have become a law but for the veto of President Cleveland.

In the Fifty-fifth Congress an immigration bill again passed the Senate, which carried a literacy-test provision, by a vote of 45 to 28.

In the Fifty-seventh Congress an illiteracy-test amendment to an immigration bill passed the House by the sweeping majority of 87 to 7.

The fact is that at no time in the history of the country has a literacy-test provision in any immigration bill ever been defeated by either House of Congress.

Upon the contrary, such a provision has invariably been passed by decisive majorities when the question was submitted to a vote.

And the various votes by both Houses of Congress on this subject is but a reflection of public opinion on the question.

Not all the newspapers, periodicals, and magazines of the country favor this legislation, but I think I am safe in saying that the bulk of the press do favor it.

Resolutions, petitions, memorials have poured in upon Congress, expressing the views and making known the wishes of large and representative bodies of our citizenship on this momentous and far-reaching question.

The Legislatures of the great States of Ohio, Tennessee, Vermont, and other States have memorialized Congress to pass more stringent immigration laws, and have specifically indorsed the literacy test.

The various farmers' organizations throughout the length and breadth of the land, the great labor organizations all over the country, the patriotic societies, powerful bodies representing charity, commerce, and the like, have upon divers occasions passed resolutions memorializing Congress to enact a law embodying an educational test and more stringent immigration laws generally.

There are a greater number of the people of the United States engaged in agriculture than in any other calling. The Farmers' National Congress, a body representing the highest ideals in agriculture in all the States of the Union and composed of representative farmers and students of agriculture from all the States, holds a national convention each year. Delegates are selected to attend these conventions by the governors of the various States as well as by the great agricultural organizations and bodies from the most skilled and scientific agriculturists in the whole country.

At these national gatherings they discuss the various problems affecting the welfare of the farmer, and often express their views in the form of resolutions.

At the last National Farmers' Congress they passed the following resolution:

Whereas the congressional Immigration Commission's report of 40 volumes has just been published and recommend the very measures which this organization has been advocating in its resolutions for years to judiciously restrict undesirable immigration:

Resolved, That we enthusiastically approve the commission's legislative recommendations that the head tax be increased, the illiteracy test be enacted, the foreign steamships be fined for bringing undesirables, and that other judicious measures be adopted, which are hereby urged upon the Congress of the United States.

The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union has a membership of over 3,000,000.

This is possibly the most powerful in point of numbers and influence of any of the farmers' organizations in this country. This organization has been much interested in restrictive immigration laws and has frequently indorsed the literacy test.

At a recent meeting of this organization it expressed itself in this fashion:

Whereas the Immigration Commission, after a four years' investigation at home and abroad, involving an expenditure of a million dollars, reports that "many undeniably undesirable persons are admitted every year"; that "there is a growing criminal element in this country, due to foreign immigration"; and that "substantial restriction is demanded by economic, moral, and social considerations"; and

Whereas that commission recommends increasing the head tax, excluding illiterate adults, requiring some visible means of support, fining the foreign steamships for bringing undesirables that could be rejected on the other side, and other measures, law in other new countries, and urged for years by this organization in its resolutions, before congressional committees, and otherwise; and

Whereas it is proposed to relieve the Northeast of its intolerable immigration evils and to continue the unloading of undesirables upon this country by diverting and distributing the incoming, ever-increasing influx from southern Europe, Asia, and northern Africa over the agricultural sections of the South and West.

Then it goes ahead to pass strong resolutions, and asks Congress to put on the statute books the laws they desire on this subject.

The American Federation of Labor, the largest labor organization in this country, has for years at its annual gatherings been passing resolutions and petitioning Congress to pass more strict immigration laws, and it has specifically indorsed the educational test—in substance the test we are now considering.

The Grand International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, the Knights of Labor, and other organizations have repeatedly passed resolutions specifically indorsing the literacy test and memorialized Congress to make it a law.

And what are the reasons for this widespread interest in favor of stricter immigrations? Why has the American Congress from 1819 to 1907 been adding one restriction after another to the continued stream of immigrants flocking to our shores?

The law of 1819 was but a little makeshift, regulating steerage passengers at sea.

The law of February 20, 1907, the latest on the statute books and the one we now promise to amend by adding a literacy test, provides in section 2:

That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: All idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons, and persons who have been insane within five years previous; persons who have had two or more attacks of insanity at any time previously; paupers; persons likely to become a public charge; professional beggars; persons afflicted with tuberculosis or with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease; persons not comprehended within any of the foregoing excluded classes who are found to be and are certified by the examining surgeon as being mentally or physically defective, such mental or physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living; persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude; polygamists, or persons who admit their belief in the practice of polygamy; anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or of all government, or of all forms of law, or the assissination of public officials; prostitutes, or women or girls coming into the United States for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons who are supported by or receive in whole or in part the proceeds of prostitution; persons who procure or attempt to bring in prostitutes or women or girls for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral pur-

pose; persons hereinafter called contract laborers who have been induced or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment or in consequence of agreements, oral, written, or printed, expressed or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled; those who have been, within one year from the date of application for admission to the United States, deported as having been induced or solicited to migrate as above described; any person whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown that such person does not belong to one of the foregoing excluded classes and that said ticket or passage was not paid for by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign Government, either directly or indirectly; all children under 16 years of age unaccompanied by one or both of their parents, at the discretion of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor or under such regulations as he may from time to time prescribe: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of an offense purely political, not involving turpitude: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section relating to the payments for tickets or passage by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign Government shall not apply to the tickets or passage of aliens in immediate and continuous transit through the United States to foreign contiguous territory: *And provided further*, That skilled labor may be imported if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this law applicable to contract labor shall not be held to exclude professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denominations, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants.

This section debars many undesirables, but it needs further amendment.

Even under its provisions there reaches the shores of our country every year in the neighborhood of 1,000,000 alien immigrants, from 30 to 40 per cent of whom can neither read nor write.

The question is not the excluding of immigration entirely; the question is not as to the excluding of desirable immigrants; but the question is, Shall this country be flooded each year with some 250,000 ignorant immigrants from the old country? The character of citizenship of any country in the world determines the character of its civilization, the character of its institutions, and the character of its government. Will the dumping of 250,000 foreign immigrants into the United States yearly who can not even read and write add to the standard of American citizenship? If they will do it, then this bill and all that pertains to it is wrong in principle. If, upon the other hand, the bringing into this country and dumping upon our shores yearly 250,000 people who know nothing of American institutions and who are incapable of learning much about American institutions and American life will injure the character of American labor and American ideals, then this bill ought to be supported by every man who wants to elevate the standard of American citizenship, because the purpose of it is to exclude this character of foreign immigration.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] in his remarks but a few moments ago said that this country owes much of its greatness to those who come to our shores from Europe and other countries. That is unquestionably true; but the gentleman ought to remember that away back yonder in 1869 there was less than 1 per cent of the character of immigrants which this bill proposes to exclude that came to this country. This bill in its operation will exclude the north Italians—those of them who can not read—and the south Italians, and the Poles. And in the year 1869 there was less than 1 per cent of this character of immigants coming to America, while 75 or 80 per cent of the desirable immigrants—the English, the Scandinavians, and the others—at that time constituted the large part of the immigration coming into this country. But year by year the north Italians and the south Italians, and the Poles, and the Slavs increased in number, and from year to year the desirable immigrants decreased in number, until in 1911 about 80 per cent—I am not exactly sure as to the accuracy of the percentage—but, in the neighborhood of 80 per cent of the immigrants coming to this country were immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, composed of the north Italians, south Italians, Poles, and Slavs.

The argument has been made here that the Southern States—Alabama, Tennessee, Kentucky, and others—ought to be the last States in the world to protest against illiterate immigrants coming into this country, for the reason that a high degree of illiteracy exists in all those States, and that the negroes of these various States, and especially the people living in the mountain sections of them, are known to possess a good deal of illiteracy.

I desire to say that no section of this Union has brainier or better people than live and dwell in the mountains of old Kentucky. There is there this day the purest reservoir on the American Continent of pure old Anglo-Saxon blood. They may fall a little below the people of certain other sections of the Union on technical book information—they have not had the advantages of some other sections—but in education, in the true sense of the word, they are inferior to none.

They are educated in hand and educated in heart, educated in honesty and educated in industry. In homely virtues they have no peers. In strength of manhood and purity of womanhood they have no equals. I will enter no further defense of the people of the mountains of Kentucky. They need none. They are destined to control the affairs of the State politically and financially.

It comes with bad grace from these gentlemen to prate about the illiteracy of the colored people in Kentucky or elsewhere. Ground down with the chains of slavery for 250 years, denied—aye, forbidden—to read a printed page, no wonder there exists some illiteracy among them now.

But few races in the world have made more progress than the colored people since the master's lash was taken from their bare backs and they given an opportunity to make some strides along educational and other lines.

But if it be true, as contended here by gentlemen opposing the literacy test for immigrants, that there is a high degree of illiteracy in the South, and that for that reason we ought not to insist on an educational test for immigrants, my answer is that that is all the more reason why we should insist upon it.

If there is much illiteracy in the South, why add more to it by admitting a horde of illiterate foreigners? Should it not be our duty rather to get rid of what we already have by educating our own people? If the education test had been applied to foreign immigrants years ago, no negro slaves would have been brought from Africa. There would have been no negroes in the South. We would not have had any Civil War, and there would not to-day be 30 or 40 per cent of uneducated negroes in the South, as stated upon this floor. But I am digressing. I have just laid the foundation for a discussion of this question of immigration, and before the Burnett bill finally passes this House I shall ask the indulgence of the House for a more extended discussion of this question.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. CURRY] is recognized.

Mr. CURRY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill and intend to vote for it. It should be amended in two or three particulars by elimination and insertion. I very much regret that the committee did not see its way clear to include the exclusion of Asiatics and Hindus in the measure. I know that Mr. HAYES, Mr. RAKER, and Mr. CHURCH have introduced bills to exclude Asiatic and Hindu laborers, but I doubt very much that this House will be given an opportunity to vote on any of them at this session, and for that reason I hope this bill will be amended so as to include them in the excluded class.

The question is not so well understood in the East as it is in the West. The Pacific coast is the frontier between occidental and oriental civilization.

The activities of the people of our Western States have so far held in check that tide of immigration from India, China, and Japan that would flood our country if given the opportunity. And right here I wish to express my absolute conviction that Asiatic coolieism is a direct menace not simply to our economical and industrial prosperity and to the well-being and material advancement of our people, but it strikes at the very source of the strength and integrity of American civilization.

The constitution of California declares:

ART. XIX, SECTION 1. The presence of foreigners ineligible to become citizens of the United States is declared to be dangerous to the well-being of the State, and the legislature shall discourage their immigration by all means within its power. Asiatic coolieism is a form of human slavery, and is forever prohibited in this State, and all contracts for coolie labor shall be void. All companies or corporations, whether formed in this country or any foreign country, for the importation of such labor, shall be subject to such penalties as the legislature may prescribe.

This is part of the organic law of California. It was embodied in her constitution as the result of bitter experience. It was the conclusion, not of an academic discussion, but of the menacing problems of a reality. It was a protest against an insidious attack upon our ideals, of morals, and of living, and of health in the field, the farm, the shop, and the home.

The constitution of California provides further:

ART. XIX. SECTION 1. The legislature shall prescribe all necessary regulations for the protection of the State, and the counties, cities, and towns thereof, from the burdens and evils arising from the presence of aliens who are or may become vagrants, paupers, mendicants, criminals, or individuals afflicted with contagious or infectious diseases, and from aliens otherwise dangerous or detrimental to the well-being or peace of the State, and to impose conditions upon which such persons may reside in the State, and to provide the means and mode of their removal from the State upon failure or refusal to comply with such conditions.

This section reflects the serious endeavor of our people to guard themselves against oriental aggression, however plausibly it may be attempted. This section was made part of the organic law of California that Californians might voice their inflexible insistence upon occidental and not oriental standards of right living and morality. What was true when this section of the constitution was adopted is true now. Our patriotism in this regard begins in defending the sacredness of our homes and ends in upholding the honor of the Nation of which we are a part.

I am emphatically in favor of the exclusion of Asiatics.

American labor is dignified, intelligent, and progressive. In the last analysis it is the great constructive energy of our Republic. Its ideals of private conduct and of public life are those of healthy citizenship. It is an imperative duty of every patriotic American, therefore, to protect as far as he is able American labor from competition with inferior peoples. And it is infinitely more necessary for the Government to enact laws to protect American workingmen from the evil of a personal direct rivalry with the representatives of a civilization which, in everything of importance, is the very antithesis of our own. American prosperity is built upon the well-being of all the tremendous elements which contribute to rational progress, and an assault upon one should be the concern of all.

It is a traditional right of a nation to prohibit aliens from acquiring property within its boundaries. The common law has justified this right, and the reasons for its exercise are obvious. The lands of a nation belong to its own native-born citizens and to those to whom is granted the privilege of becoming citizens by naturalization. To all others a nation or a State owes it to itself to deny the rights of ownership. Particularly is this so in connection with an alien race with whom we resist either association or an impossible assimilation.

The Legislature of California at its last session passed a very mild alien land law. The provisions of that law are not nearly so stringent as are the Federal statute and the laws of a number of the States and of most foreign countries. For instance, aliens are not allowed to enter the schools of Japan; they can not own real estate in certain districts or engage in mining. An alien laborer must procure a license, and this is not granted if the job he seeks is wanted by any Japanese laborer. Besides, foreigners residing in Japan are assessed double what the natives are for personal property. If they attend a theater, they must pay double, and in other things it is the same.

Japan recently enacted a law that permits aliens to hold real estate who come from a country that permits Japanese to enjoy a like privilege. Whether or not that law has been promulgated I do not know. I have been informed that it has not.

The California statute is short, and for the information of the House I will insert it here:

An act relating to the rights, powers, and disabilities of aliens and of certain companies, associations, and corporations with respect to property in this State, providing for escheats in certain cases, prescribing the procedure therein, and repealing all acts or parts of acts inconsistent or in conflict herewith.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. All aliens eligible to citizenship under the laws of the United States may acquire, possess, enjoy, transmit, and inherit real property, or any interest therein, in this State in the same manner and to the same extent as citizens of the United States, except as otherwise provided by the laws of this State.

SEC. 2. All aliens other than those mentioned in section 1 of this act may acquire, possess, enjoy, and transfer real property, or any interest therein, in this State in the manner and to the extent and for the purposes prescribed by any treaty now existing between the Government of the United States and the nation or country of which such alien is a citizen or subject, and not otherwise, and may in addition thereto lease lands in this State for agricultural purposes for a term not exceeding three years.

SEC. 3. Any company, association, or corporation organized under the laws of this or any other State or nation, of which a majority of the members are aliens other than those specified in section 1 of this act, or in which a majority of the issued capital stock is owned by such aliens, may acquire, possess, enjoy, and convey real property, or any interest therein, in this State in the manner and to the extent and for the purposes prescribed by any treaty now existing between the Government of the United States and the nation or country of which such members or stockholders are citizens or subjects, and not otherwise, and may in addition thereto lease lands in this State for agricultural purposes for a term not exceeding three years.

SEC. 4. Whenever it appears to the court in any probate proceeding that by reason of the provisions of this act any heir or devisee can not take real property in this State which but for said provisions said heir or devisee would take as such, the court, instead of ordering a distribution of such real property to such heir or devisee, shall order a sale of said real property to be made in the manner provided by law for probate sales of real property, and the proceeds of such sale shall be distributed to such heir or devisee in lieu of such real property.

SEC. 5. Any real property hereafter acquired in fee in violation of the provisions of this act by any alien mentioned in section 2 of this act, or by any company, association, or corporation mentioned in section 3 of this act, shall escheat to and become and remain the property of the State of California. The attorney general shall institute proceedings to have the escheat of such real property adjudged and enforced in the manner provided by section 474 of the Political Code and title 8, part 3, of the Code of Civil Procedure. Upon the entry of final judgment in such proceedings the title to such real property shall pass to the State of California. The provisions of this section and of sections 2 and 3 of this act shall not apply to any real property hereafter acquired in the enforcement or in satisfaction of any lien now existing upon or interest in such property, so long as such real property so acquired shall remain the property of the alien company, association, or corporation acquiring the same in such manner.

SEC. 6. Any leasehold or other interest in real property less than the fee hereafter acquired in violation of the provisions of this act by any alien mentioned in section 2 of this act, or by any company, association, or corporation mentioned in section 3 of this act, shall escheat to the State of California. The attorney general shall institute proceedings to have such escheat adjudged and enforced as provided in section 5 of this act. In such proceedings the court shall determine and adjudge the value of such leasehold, or other interest in such real property, and enter judgment for the State for the amount thereof together with costs. Thereupon the court shall order a sale of the real property covered by such leasehold or other interest in the manner provided by section 1271 of the Code of Civil Procedure. Out of the proceeds arising from such sale the amount of the judgment rendered for the State shall be paid into the State treasury and the balance shall be deposited with and distributed by the court in accordance with the interest of the parties therein.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be construed as a limitation upon the power of the State to enact laws with respect to the acquisition, holding, or disposal by aliens of real property in this State.

SEC. 8. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The white and yellow races are unassimilable. The idea of marriage between whites and Asiatics is revolting. It shatters the very keystone of occidental civilization. It is demoralizing in morality and menacing in problems of a mongrel racial degeneracy. It brings into being dangers of manifest evil to American homes and institutions. I conceive that we would be unworthy of our heritage if we gave countenance to the prostitution of what we honor as the most sacred contract under the law.

According to our standard, the Asiatics are not immoral; they are unmoral. The size of Japan is about half that of California and contains a population of about 75,000,000. Women are not highly regarded. Daughters are sold without shame for immoral purposes, and it is estimated that there are 2,000,000 prostitutes in that country. In men loose morals are universal and in women are uncondemned. Such a condition is usual and is regarded as natural and not wrong. And Japan is the most advanced of Asiatic nations. All Asiatics regard themselves as enjoying a civilization superior to ours. They do not want to adopt our ethical and moral standards. What they do want is our trade and the opportunity to peacefully occupy our country by immigration. And, by the way, so far as trade is concerned, the United States is Japan's best customer. We buy from her about one-third of the total exports of the Empire, or about $75,000,000 worth a year, and export to her about $40,000,000 a year, thus leaving a balance of trade in her favor of about $35,000,000. Her national debt is about $1,500,000,000, and is an awful burden for her miserably poor and struggling people to bear.

We solved the Chinese question by the enactment of the Geary and subsequent acts. We have no Geary Act to keep out the Japanese and Hindus. On the Pacific we know the results of Asiatic competition. The Japanese are not an inventive people. They originate nothing, but they are great imitators of other people's inventions. The advantage they have over our people is their lower and cheaper standard of living and the fact that their men, women, and children work incessantly from early morning to late at night for small remuneration. They are driving our citizens out of every avenue of industry in which they succeed in securing a foothold.

Everyone will admit that there is not a lazy bone in the body of the average American farmer. The Japanese are driving the American farmer out of business in California.

About 70 per cent, or $7,000,000 worth, of the vegetables raised in the southern part of California are produced by Japanese truck gardeners.

In my own district they farm by ownership or lease of the land a large portion of the rich delta land of the Sacramento and the San Joaquin. About 4,000 acres of that land is owned by one Japanese, and he farms under lease other tracts. By production and manipulation he controls the potato market around San Francisco Bay.

The Japanese secured a foothold in the thriving farming community of Florin, in Sacramento County. They now own practically all the land in that vicinity and all but one business house in the city. The only store run by a white man in that town is owned by the postmaster, and as soon as his successor is appointed he will have to close up shop.

The Hindus, if permitted to continue to come to this country, will soon be a greater menace than even the Japanese. The Stockton Record of December 6, 1913, published the following

statement, which I will insert here and make a part of my remarks:

[From the Stockton Daily Evening Record, Dec. 6, 1913.]

WHAT HINDUS SENT OUT OF STOCKTON.

International (foreign) money orders to the amount of $26,282.82 were sold by the Stockton post office during the month of October. Of this amount $18,489.27 was sent to British Indian offices.

It was the Hindu.

Three-fourths of all the money sent from Stockton to foreign countries went to India.

Formerly it was thought that the Japanese, among all aliens, absorbed the most money, spent the least, and sent the most home. But during October the Japanese "sent home" only $3,909, or about one-sixth as much as the Hindus; and the Japanese in this part of the State outnumber the Hindus 10 to 1.

The small amount—$150—which the Greeks forwarded through the office is likewise a surprise.

The October sales of international orders were not exceptionally large. The total is a low average. Twelve such monthly totals mean easily $315,000 and more. And if the Hindus do not fall of their prosperity during the closing two months of the year, they will probably have sent $213,000 to their native land. Most of this money will have been earned in the vicinity of Stockton. It is gone—gone far—lost to the community.

A study of the full report of international money-order sales for the month of October as compiled by Myra Ellsworth, superintendent of the money-order division of the Stockton office, is worthy of attention. The report shows money-order sales as follows:

Great Britain	$358.01
British India	18,489.27
Germany	303.93
Italy	1,628.00
Greece	150.25
Sweden	105.00
Japan	3,908.00
Norway	97.00
France	81.01
Austria	853.10
Russia	86.75
Switzerland	39.00
Denmark	110.00
Turkey	15.00
Azores Islands	50.00
Hungary	3.50
Holland	5.00
Total	26,282.82

The Hindu is a problem, and no doubt about it.

It took our branch of the human race thousands of years to develop to the government-by-the-people stage of civilization. It was a long, hard climb from barbarism to American civilization. It would be but a short step backward from the highest civilization to semibarbarism. The Good Book tells us that "evil communications (or association) corrupt good manners (or morals)."

The individual liberties of the people and the stability of the institutions of a republic depend primarily on the mental, moral, and physical health of the people, and are best secured by its people being homogeneous, speaking the same language, and occupying contiguous territory. The miscegenation of the white with the yellow race always results in the production of a hybrid mongrel, mentally, morally, and physically inferior to both races, inheriting the mental and physical defects and vices of both parents. It does not elevate the yellow race and does deteriorate the white race.

It is the duty of our Government to protect itself and its citizens against foreign invasion and commercial and industrial exploitation, whether they come in the shape of bombarding men-of-war and devastating armies or in the shape of passenger and freight ships carrying cheap labor and cheap goods.

Japan is the only Asiatic nation that has evidenced any desire to adopt the civilization of the Occident, and she only wishes to borrow our science and mechanical inventions. Her leading statesmen do not hesitate to say that Japan has no use for our literature, our religion, our morals, and our ethics of life, on which our civilization is founded.

The Mongolian, Tartar, and Hindu—Asiatics—ought to be excluded from American soil. Even a small number of them sprinkled through our population has a tendency to reduce the American standard of wages and to lower the morals and degrade the habits of those brought in close social contact with them. It is essential that the blood of the American-Europeans of this country, who, together with their ancestors, developed civilization to its present state, should be kept pure and free from the taint of the decadent orientalism of China, Japan, and India. We have no quarrel with those people. We wish them well in their own countries, but we do not want them in ours.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] is recognized.

[Mr. KENT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support this bill. I recognize very fully that the prosperity of the country and its rapid growth and development in times past have depended very largely upon the number and the character of the immigrants that have come to our shores. From the very beginning of our history to the present time foreign immigrants have been a very valuable element in our population. I believe that we still need the foreigners, and we probably need a good many of them; but we need the very best that we can get, and it is for that reason that I shall support this literacy test.

It is a little bit hard to realize what the figures mean when we are told that a million foreigners have come to our country in one year, or that twelve hundred thousand have come, or the even larger numbers reached in one or two years. It is hard to know what a million means or to translate it into the terms of human life and human experience. For that reason I have examined the conditions in the twenty-fourth district of Pennsylvania. It is a smaller unit by a good deal than the whole country, and the figures are much more easily realized. That is the district that I have the honor to represent, and I can speak of it with some degree of familiarity. It is made up of three counties—Beaver, Lawrence, and Washington—and in the year 1910 it had a total population of 292,065 persons. Of these 93,468 were set down in the census as males of voting age. Of those men over 21 years old 54,956 were native whites, 35,998 were foreign-born whites, and 2,459 were negroes. Let me repeat, these figures are not for the total population. They cover only men who are more than 21 years old. In the twenty-fourth district of Pennsylvania there are enough men of voting age to make 93 regiments of a thousand men each. Thirty-six of those regiments could be composed exclusively of foreign-born whites. Taking up the matter by counties the showing is interesting.

In Lawrence County, in 1910, there were 22,636 men over 21, of whom 13,896 were native whites, 8,457 were foreign-born whites, and 248 were negroes. Of the native whites, 140, or 1 per cent, were unable to read and write; of the foreign whites there were 1,861, or 22 per cent; of the negroes there were 41, or 16.5 per cent. The percentage of illiteracy for the combined classes increased from 6.5 in 1900 to 9 in 1910.

In Beaver County, in 1910, there were 25,769 men over 21, of whom 16,760 were native whites, 8,594 were foreign-born whites, and 395 were negroes. The number who could not read and write were: Of the native whites, 197, or 1.2 per cent; of the foreign-born whites, 1,841, or 21 per cent; of the negroes, 44, or 11.1 per cent. The percentage of illiteracy for the combined classes increased from 5.2 per cent in 1900 to 8.1 per cent in 1910.

In Washington County, in 1910, there were 45,063 men of voting age. Of these, 24,298 were native whites, 18,921 foreign-born whites, and 1,816 negroes. The number who could not read and write were: Native whites, 543, or 2.2 per cent; foreign-born whites, 3,904, or 20 per cent; negroes, 263, or 14½ per cent. If, for convenience in counting these men, we should set them off in groups of 1,000 men each, we would have 45 such groups in the one county. If the various classes were equally distributed, there would be in each group of 1,000 539 native-born whites, 420 foreign-born whites, 40 negroes, and 1 Chinese or member of some other race. In the 539 native whites there would be 12 illiterates; in the 420 foreign-born whites there would be 84 illiterates; in the 40 negroes there would be 6 illiterates.

These are interesting figures. They show that we have work to do in the education not only of foreigners, but of our own native-born people as well.

Personally, if there were any way by which we could pick them out, I should be willing to admit every foreigner of good character who had deliberately chosen America from among the countries of the world to be the land of his allegiance—to be his home and the home of his children. Such aliens, especially those of them who could read and write, would in a reasonable time become familiar with our institutions and our laws and conform themselves to our ways if they should find our ways better than their own.

The problem of immigration is not so much a problem of numbers as of assimilation, and it is an enormous problem. A great literary genius of our day, himself a foreigner and a Hebrew, has called America a melting pot in which men of all nations are to be fused in order that a higher type may be produced. A partial list of the nationalities of foreigners resident in the twenty-fourth district of Pennsylvania will indicate how com-

plicated the blend must be if this country is to be such a melting pot.

Among the people that live in the twenty-fourth district are native Americans, Irish, English, Scotch, Welsh, Germans, Italians, French, Norwegians, Swedes, Danes, Russians, Hebrews, Greeks, Poles, Magyars, Czechs, Bulgarians, Servians, Montenegrins, Croatians, Slavonians, Dalmatians, Bosnians, Herzegovinians, Ruthenians, Slovaks, Lithuanians, Roumanians, and other nationalities. Like the list of those that heard the preaching of the apostles on the day of Pentecost, it seems to be made up of men from every nation under heaven.

Our problem is to assimilate these people. The public schools accomplish wonderful things for the coming generation, but our problem has to do with the present as well as the future.

I know very well that the ability to read and write is not a test of moral character or even of real mental capacity. I have known men who were not able to read and write who were men of keen perception, good judgment, and trustworthy character, and yet no one would deny that education—even a very little education—would make such men more efficient, more valuable members of society, more useful than they are without education.

I am fortunate enough to number among my personal acquaintances and friends a good many men of foreign birth, including professional men, merchants, and men in other walks of life. I am convinced that it is for their interest, for the good of the whole country to select from the large number of immigrants who would come to our ports, those who can most easily adapt themselves to the conditions that prevail in this country.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MAHAN].

Mr. MAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill, and shall vote against it because of the literacy provision in it.

Mr. Chairman, do you realize what that provision means to the business life of this country? Do you know that you can not get men of education to work as laborers with pick and shovel? If you want your railroads built; if you would till the soil, dig ditches for canals or irrigation; if you would dig the foundation for your public or private buildings, you must depend upon the foreigner to do the rough work.

What are the facts? From 1850 to 1890 came that great tide of immigration from England, Ireland, and Germany. These immigrants worked at all kinds of manual labor. How about the children of these foreigners who were denied the privileges of education in their native country? They are found among the skilled workmen in your shops and factories. They are to be found in all the learned professions—doctors of law, medicine, and divinity, professors, and teachers in our schools and colleges. I might give you a concrete example by calling your attention to the fact that 25 per cent of the present membership of this House are the sons of immigrants.

We are told that further immigration will tend to lower the standard of American wages. What are the facts? It is admitted that for several years 1,000,000 immigrants have come to this country every year—to be exact, during the fiscal year that closed June 30 last, 1,079,439 immigrants came to our shores and were admitted—yet, it is a fact that wages for all kinds of manual labor have advanced from 25 to 50 per cent during the last 10 years.

The United States is to-day a great exporting Nation, the balance of trade in our favor for the last fiscal year being $653,000,000. If we would maintain our supremacy in competition with the countries of Europe, we must for the future, as in the past, have the benefit of the new and best blood from the countries of the Old World.

Mr. Chairman, the attempt to prevent the foreigner coming into our country is no new thing in legislation. From the very dawn of the Republic there has been hostility and opposition to the coming of immigrants to our shores. It has been said upon the floor of this House to-day that the illustrious Jefferson, Randolph of Virginia, and Henry Clay were opposed to the admission of immigrants into the country. It was the English, the German, and the Irish that they would have kept out. You who now favor the passage of this bill are good enough to admit that the prediction of ruin then made has not yet materialized. Jefferson, Randolph, and Clay were wrong then, and you are just as wrong now.

Speaking for my own district and State, I wish to deny that the foreigners coming to our shores are undesirable citizens. More than 27 per cent of the population of our State are foreigners. We have the Jew, the Italian, the Norwegian, the Swede, the Frenchman, the Englishman, and the Irishman, and all of these are honest, God-fearing citizens, as good as you or I.

Our State, although the third smallest in area, ranks, I believe, eighth in the value of her manufactured products. We need the immigrants to cultivate our soil, to work in our shops, our mills, and our manufacturing establishments.

This is practically the same bill that has been vetoed by two Presidents—Cleveland and Taft—and should this bill pass may we not hope for another veto?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE].

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, almost from the foundation of the Government we have had among us those who were opposed to immigration. The same arguments that we hear to-day against admitting foreigners to our shores have been made repeatedly for a century. Time and again have the exclusionists and restrictionists pointed out the dangers to our institutions by reason of the great influx of aliens. If the advice of these extremists had prevailed, our country would be but scantily populated, our industries would be undeveloped, the Nation would not hold the place it does among the Nations of the world, and many great men and women who have rendered invaluable service to the people would never have graced the pages of our history. We are essentially a Nation of immigrants, and the adoption now of an unsound and unreasonable standard of admission is in total disregard of the traditions of the country and a violation of true democratic principles.

The literacy test proposed by the framers of this bill can not be sustained except as an arbitrary rule, which will exclude many who, under every rational, reasonable, or scientific test, would be admissible. It seems to me that inability to read a few words does not stamp an immigrant as undesirable. That one may not have an education does not mean that he is not honest, industrious, or capable of understanding our institutions. Gentlemen say our immigration to-day is so different from what it was in the good old days when it came from western and northern Europe. Yet if the standard now proposed had been applied in the days of the old immigration, it would have excluded millions who entered our country and have become some of our best citizens. These immigrants who were bitterly attacked and assailed by the restrictionists of their day are now held up as models by the present-day restrictionists.

During the course of the debate a statement was made showing that in the State of Alabama, the home of the chairman of the committee, the percentage of illiteracy among the native-born whites of native parentage was exceedingly high; in fact, almost five times as high as the percentage of illiteracy among the children of foreign or mixed parentage in the same State. The chairman very eloquently pointed out that his people had suffered greatly by reason of the Civil War; that his people for years after those terrible days suffered every trial and privation. We all realize the truth of what he has said, and yet, while he pleads this as an excuse—and it is an excuse—for a certain amount of the illiteracy in his State, he is not willing to take into consideration even worse conditions that have prevailed and still prevail in the countries from which our immigrants come. He is not willing to hold out a helping hand to those unfortunates who come of a people oppressed and downtrodden for centuries. He will not distinguish between a man who has had every opportunity to acquire an education and an unfortunate alien reared in an environment and in a country which not only do not afford educational facilities, but where oftentimes education is discouraged.

The statistics and reports furnish us with convincing proof that our foreign-born inhabitants, given the opportunity to secure an education, not only take advantage of it themselves but almost invariably see that their children receive an education. The last census report shows that, notwithstanding the number of illiterates that are supposed to be coming into this country, there were in the United States in 1910 a total of 788,631 foreign-born illiterates over the age of 21 years. The statistics further show that in the population 10 years of age and over the percentage of illiteracy in the United States among native whites of native parentage was 3.7 per cent, while among whites of foreign or mixed parentage it was 1.1 per cent.

Instead of our aliens being unappreciative of our institutions and not in sympathy with them, these figures indicate an eager and patriotic desire to take advantage of every means afforded to better their own and their children's condition. It is a sufficient answer to those who say the alien is not in sympathy with our institutions.

Many statements have been made here that would indicate that our recent immigration was wholly undesirable for various reasons. We have heard much about the old immigration and the new immigration, but we have received no definite information as to just when the old immigration ceased and the new immigration began. Repeated statements have been made on the

floor that in my judgment are not warranted by any facts or figures that have been produced. Even the majority report does an injustice to the recent immigrants, in my opinion, when a partial statement from the report of the Immigration Commission in regard to crime is set forth. From this statement it might be assumed that the commission found that the greater portion of our new immigrants, on landing in this country, immediately resorted to homicide, blackmail, and robbery. The quotation is given as one of the reasons for the literacy test, yet when we examine the report of the commission on the same page from which the majority report quotes, we find the following statement:

It is impossible from existing data to determine whether the immigrant population in this country is relatively more or less criminal than the native-born population. Statistics show that the proportion of convictions for crimes, according to the population, is greater among the foreign born than the native born. It must be remembered, however, that the proportion of persons of what may be termed the criminal age is greater among the foreign born than among the natives, and when due allowance is made for this fact it appears that criminality, judged by convictions, is about equally prevalent in each class.

It might not be out of place to examine other portions of that report. Under the heading "Immigration and pauperism," on page 35, the commission says:

At the present time, however, pauperism among newly admitted immigrants is relatively at a minimum, owing to the fact that the present immigration law provides for the admission only of the able-bodied or dependents whose support by relatives is assured. The number of those admitted who receive assistance from organized charity in cities is relatively small. In the commission's investigation, which covered the activities of the associated charities in 43 cities, including practically all the large immigrant centers except New York, it was found that a small percentage of the cases represented immigrants who had been in the United States three years or under, while nearly half of the foreign-born cases were those who had been in the United States 20 years or more. This investigation was conducted during the winter of 1908–9, before industrial activities had been fully resumed following the financial depression of 1907–8, and this inquiry showed that the recent immigrants, even in cities in times of relative industrial inactivity, did not seek charitable assistance in any considerable numbers. Undoubtedly conditions would have been otherwise had it not been for the large outward movement of recent immigrants following the depression; but however that may be, it is certain that those who remained were for the most part self-supporting.

Surely, if the new immigrants are so undesirable, it can not be because they lack industry, thrift, or ability to support and maintain themselves by their own efforts.

In the course of this debate attention has been called to the number of insane of foreign birth in the institutions of the State of New York. The majority report contains a statement made by one of the officials of that State as to the number of this class of insane. I agree, if insane are being admitted, some more certain system of medical examination must be resorted to, but I doubt very much if a literacy test would have excluded a single one of those who afterwards became insane. In these reports we have no statement as to the percentage of those admitted to asylums for the insane who belong to the new immigration. We do find, however, in the report of the Immigration Commission a remarkable statement of the result of investigation as to the health of the recent immigrants as contrasted with the old immigration. On page 35 of the report we find the following:

The commission included within the scope of the investigation the study of cases admitted to Bellevue and allied hospitals in New York City. These hospitals are public charitable institutions, and a sufficient number of persons are treated there to warrant some conclusions relative to the existence of disease among the poorer classes of the foreign born. While it appears that a considerable number of immigrants are treated at these hospitals for various causes within a comparatively short time after their admission to the United States, it does not appear that the number is sufficiently large or the diseases for which they are treated are sufficiently serious to warrant the conclusion that diseased persons are being admitted in any considerable numbers. A study of these cases, however, permits an interesting and significant comparison between immigrants of the old and the new class with regard to alcoholism. Among the foreign born this treatment was confined almost entirely to the races of the old immigration, such as Irish, Scotch, English, and Germans, while relatively very few southern and eastern Europeans were treated for that cause. A striking difference between the old and new immigration in this regard was also apparent to a greater or less degree in many industrial communities included in the commission's general investigation. Some complaint was made that drunkenness interfered with the industrial efficiency of some southern and eastern Europeans, but these cases were comparatively rare.

This statement is in marked contrast to the general assertion that the new immigrants are overflowing our eleemosynary institutions and becoming a great burden to the taxpayers of the various States.

We all agree that if necessary more stringent regulations should be adopted which will insure the exclusion of immigrants who are physically, mentally, or morally unfit, those who have criminal records or criminal tendencies, as well as those who would become public charges. Any amendments to our laws tending to make more certain the exclusion of these undesirables should be welcomed, and it is to be regretted that an opportunity to vote for these amendments is not afforded those of us who oppose this bill because of the literacy test. I am opposed to the literacy test for the reasons previously given. There are many provisions in this bill I would like to vote for, but my opposition to the literacy test is so strong that I shall have to vote against the bill.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAMILL].

[Mr. HAMILL addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BURNETT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I have been amused at some of the arguments made by gentlemen who think that they are representing a large per cent of our people in opposing this bill. My friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] has shown us a literal fulfillment of the Scriptures, that "A little child shall lead them." He has told us of the children of his district waving the American flag and singing, "My country, 'tis of thee." I commend their example to the gentleman from New York, and I commend their song to him. [Applause.] I heard the gentleman for 35 minutes to-day speaking against the best interests of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, has worked faithfully and persistently for the passage of a measure that will protect the American people from the evils of indiscriminate immigration. [Applause.] He has prepared and had reported to this House by his committee a bill that will put a stop to the practice of allowing undesirable and unfit foreigners to come in droves into this country. [Applause.]

I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama that for his able and patriotic service in this regard he is entitled to the lasting gratitude of the American people. [Applause.] The people whose ancestors came here long ago and those who have come in recent years, who have at heart the best interest of our country, should rejoice that their chosen home has determined to safeguard its civilization and exercise some care and consideration in keeping out people who will not be helpful, but distinctly hurtful, to the highest and best interest of our country. [Applause.] If there are those already here who have no regard for the future well-being of America—who want to throw open our doors to the criminal hordes of other countries—the sooner we let them and the world know that they do not constitute the dominant force in America and do not speak for the great body of American citizens who would protect the life of this Nation from the dangers that threaten it, the better it will be for our country. [Applause.] In the name of all that is dear to the American people I protest against the foolhardy and suicidal course that some would have us pursue—that of throwing our doors open and permitting all classes and conditions to come into our country. The foreign citizen who has cast his lot in our midst for the purpose of bettering his condition and supporting our institutions and contributing to the strength and glory of this Government ought not to allow himself to be used by those who advocate unrestricted, free-for-all immigration, for in doing so he is striking at his own, his children's, and his country's best interest. [Applause.]

Let us say to the steamship companies and their hired agents, who trump up the scum of the earth to dump upon our shores in order to furnish traffic to the steamship companies, that their unholy and dangerous work shall stop; that they shall not destroy our civilization and ruin this Government. [Applause.]

The Farmers' Union of the United States and the Farmers' National Congress and the Federation of Labor—in fact, every patriotic order in the country—have indorsed this bill.

Thousands of foreigners come here, not to pay allegiance to this country, but to accumulate money and return with it to their former home. They carry back about $150,000,000 a year. Thousands of them are here in competition with American laborers who have never been naturalized and who do not support our institutions. Last year, when their native lands were involved in war, thousands went home, carrying what money they could and fought in the wars of foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, something must be done to restrict immigration. The fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, 1,400,000 had come to America. For the last four months 600,000 have come, and at that rate, unless something is done to prevent it, this year will find 1,800,000 foreigners landing upon our shores. The time has come to call a halt. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH].

[Mr. SMITH of Idaho addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, if I am not mistaken, I have 12 minutes remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LONERGAN].

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill we should adhere to first principles. Since the year 1620 foreigners have come to our shores in greater or less numbers. We are all descendants of foreigners, but none the less true Americans. Men from different European countries not only blazed the way as pioneers and established themselves and reared and educated families, but they or their descendants were instrumental in the establishment of a different form of government. It was they who substituted a popular form of government for a proprietary form of government. It was they who furnished large numbers to go to the front in time of need, and thereby exemplified their patriotism and their love for their adopted country. An examination of statistics will show in what large numbers they entered the service in all American wars. They also displayed their patriotism in other effective ways.

We, as representatives of the people of this country, should take cognizance of what is incorporated in the Declaration of Independence, when it is stated among other things in enumerating the grievances against the King of Great Britain:

> He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

If the Democratic Party is built upon anything, my friends, it is built upon the Declaration of Independence. It is the corner stone upon which the party is founded. Our party has a great opportunity—an opportunity to defeat this pending legislation. However, partisanship ought not to enter into the bill under consideration, and our friends on the other side of the House should join in its defeat.

We find on investigation that there are 711,980,000 acres of undeveloped public land in the United States. We can accommodate a population of 500,000,000 people. Is it not necessary to have men come to our shores in order that this land may be developed and that they may contribute toward the material upbuilding of the country? Let us go back, if you please, to 1840, and consider what was done by the immigrants who came from 1840, say, to 1870 or 1880. Were not these men the ones who were employed in the construction of our railroads, telegraph lines, telephone lines, and other public utilities? Were they not the men who built and worked in our factories and settled upon the farms in the great West? May we not classify them as constructionists? We need such men; somebody must do the manual labor, which does not appear to be attractive to the American born. Unskilled labor is necessary to skilled labor.

What we must determine is whether a man or woman is honest and healthy, and not whether he or she is able to read 40 or 50 words to the satisfaction of an inspector. I am opposed to the bill on account of the literacy test. Illiteracy is not necessarily a lack of education, in that all education is not derived from books. Are we not placing a penalty on those who had no opportunity for schooling, which was the case with hundreds of thousands who came to America and who contributed so materially to the welfare of the country? Why should we permit a man of criminal instincts who can read and write to enter this country, and place a barrier before the honest and healthy person who does not have those attainments? The economic value of a citizen should be taken into consideration. The foreigner is a producer and a consumer, and he is also thrifty. To those who say we have too many immigrants now coming let us remind them that a large number return. Canada promotes immigration.

In the State of Connecticut, which I have the honor in part to represent, the population is 29.6 per cent foreign, and the men who have adopted that State as a permanent place of abode are among our best citizens. They represent the blood of different countries of Europe. They are industrious, enterprising, law-abiding people, who raise large families, and who become, and whose children become, vital forces in the upbuilding of communities in the Inventive State of Union. They are mindful of the duties of citizenship.

In the Nutmeg State, among those who attend the evening schools are to be found a very large percentage of foreign born, both men and women, and that is true of those against whom complaint seems to be especially directed in the discussions on this floor. They are ambitious in every way to better themselves. They strive by every honorable means to give their children better advantages than those they enjoyed. Some of the foreign born are among our leading business men, and those of the second generation hold a prominent place in many walks of life.

America is recognized the world over as the land of opportunity, the melting pot of all nations, the asylum of the oppressed, where merit is the measure of men. The foreigner knows that here may be found not only tranquillity, peace, happiness, and general success in life but good government.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to that provision of the pending immigration bill which would subject every alien seeking admission to this country to an educational test. An immigrant should not be denied admission to our shores if he is morally, physically, and mentally sound. The ability of a man to read is not a fair measure of his moral worth nor of his economic value nor of his mental capacity; in other words, it is not a fitting test of a man's honesty nor of his capacity to work with his hands nor of his ability to learn. Experience has proven that moral soundness—simple honesty—is independent of intellectual culture; many men are morally sound notwithstanding their ignorance, and many others are morally unsound in spite of their education.

Ability to read is not a fair measure of a man's economic value, because experience proves that a man's capacity to earn a living is not necessarily dependent on intellectual culture. Many immigrants coming to our shores come from countries where, owing to proscribed laws, the opportunity to acquire an education has been unjustly denied them. This is particularly true of Russia and Roumania. I believe it is more important that the applicant for admission to our shores should be made to show by the calloused palms of his hands that he is accustomed to work than to show by glibness of tongue in meeting a literacy test. In the actual development of our country it would have been impossible for us to have accomplished what we have in the construction of railroads, in the development of our farms, and in the establishment of our industries, had we not had the brawny, muscular, and healthy immigrants who have to come to us from different parts of the world. At the present time there is a scarcity of labor in this country to develop our natural resources, and the natives are unwilling to do the work which the alien comes over to do.

Our country is in great part a Nation of immigrants, sons and grandsons of immigrants. It must be borne in mind that our only true native American is the Indian. The illiteracy test, had such a law been in existence a generation ago, would have robbed this country of some of its strongest and greatest men. Some of our ablest lawyers and the best and most progressive men of to-day are the progeny of parents who when they came to this country could neither read nor write. Are those who have not had the advantage of an education in the countries from whence they came to be denied the opportunities held out in this country? Many immigrants are unfortunately illiterate, without any fault of their own, and without lacking intelligence and character which will make them useful and peaceable citizens of this Republic. Most of these who come here are industrious and thrifty and a large proportion are desirous of learning and of having their children educated.

When a man came to American shores in the steerage of a vessel 150 years ago he was "a settler" or "a colonist," but to-day he is called "an immigrant." No one ever proposed that "a settler" or "a colonist" wishing to land on American soil should be denied the right of admission to this country because he could not read or write.

The healthy and brawny immigrant is America's man of all work, and his destiny is working itself out with the destiny of the country. Eighty-five per cent of all labor in the slaughtering and packing industries is done by alien laborers. They mine seven-tenths of our bituminous coal. They do 78 per cent of the work in the woolen mills, nine-tenths of all the labor in the cotton mills, and make nineteen-twentieths of all the clothing. Immigrants manufacture more than half the shoes in the country. They turn out four-fifths of our furniture, half the tobacco and cigars, and nearly all our sugar. In the iron and steel industries immigrants share the greatest risks.

The proposition to exclude foreigners is not new. During the administration of John Adams, when this Republic of ours had but completed the first decade of its existence, the same sentiments as I have heard uttered on this floor to-day were uttered against the foreign born. The period of naturalization was extended from 5 to 14 years in the year 1798 in order to discourage immigration, and during the same session of Congress the obnoxious alien and sedition laws were passed, which conferred upon the then President of the United States the power to exclude at his will any foreigner found upon American soil. It is

to the honor of our institutions and to the glory of this Republic that the shame and infamy of that legislation was wiped out when the Democrats of this country elected Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency. In his proclamation concerning foreigners, relative to immigration Jefferson said:

It has been the wise policy of these States to extend the protection of their laws to all those who should settle among them, of whatsoever nation or religion they might be, and to admit them to participation of the benefits of civil and religious freedom; and the benevolence of this practice, as well as its salutary effects, renders it worthy of being continued in future times.

In the Declaration of Independence, as drawn by Jefferson, concerning immigration he said:

He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States, for that purpose obstructing the laws for naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

From time to time in every succeeding generation there have been those who were opposed to the admission of the foreign born to this country. The same arguments were used then as are used now. This continent is not crowded, and the admission of each healthy, able-bodied immigrant adds that much more enrichment to the country. We all agree that the criminal, the insane and mentally defective, the pauper, the morally unfit, and those who are incapable of earning a livelihood should be debarred; but homeseekers, otherwise admissible, should not be excluded, even though illiterate, for such are needed to develop the abandoned farms, to open our mines, and to build our roads, aqueducts, tunnels, and canals. A strong and rigid educational test, however, should be applied when application is made for citizenship.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman has used three minutes.

Mr. SABATH. That leaves me four minutes. Will the gentleman from Alabama or the gentleman from Pennsylvania use some time?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to be notified, Mr. Chairman, when I have used 15 minutes.

In an introductory way I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. BURNETT of Alabama] upon the parliamentary excellence of his management. I may not agree with him about the literacy test, which is the chief feature of this bill, but I do agree in this, that as a skillful manipulator in the committee and on the floor of this House he has no superior in the Halls of Congress. He gave two days in which to bring witnesses from all over the country to hearings in the committee, and on the second day he held us solidly and continuously until 2 o'clock in the morning. And now his influence in this House is so strong that he is able by a rule, which is a cloture measure, to put this bill through with only seven hours of general debate, notwithstanding it affects the misery and happiness, the hopes and the aspirations of at least a quarter of a million souls, and all who are interested in them. I do not blame him, because he believes in what he has undertaken to do. Strong pressure has been brought to bear upon him. I will not speak of lobbys, because I do not know. Men have the right to represent organizations and institutions and to speak to Members of Congress about legislation in which they are interested, but in my judgment the gentleman from Alabama has had such pressure upon him that he is induced to accelerate this measure, and, indeed, it may be found politically expedient to push it through.

FOR AND AGAINST THE BILL.

Two elements have sought the immediate passage of this bill: The representatives of certain patriotic orders and the representatives of certain labor organizations. Opposed to the bill were those who believed that "American institutions" included the right of a haven to those who sought to establish themselves in the "land of the free and the home of the brave."

They pointed to the early settlers generally, who had come to the new country and helped to make it what it is. The German-American National Alliance, the Jewish societies, representatives of the Italians, the Poles, and other nationalities identified with the upbuilding of America, also protested against the bill.

The main point about which all parties contended was the so-called literacy test—that provision of the bill which sets up the ability to read as a qualification for admission to the United States. This test, which is rather against the learning than the manhood or character of the immigrant, is conceded to be sufficient to keep out of the country at least 250,000 men and women every year. From the standpoint of those who are advocating the bill this is desirable; but those who oppose the bill believe such arbitrary and wholesale exclusion would be unjust, unnecessary, and inhumane. Personally I have no objection to the other main features of this bill because in all essentials it is merely a reenactment of existing law, but I do oppose the literacy test, a new provision which proposes that the men of labor and of brawn who seek a home in this country, like all of our forefathers sought a home here, shall be turned back to the conditions of misery and deplorable hopelessness from which they sought to raise themselves, simply because they have not acquired the art of reading. There is a wholesome belief that we need honest labor in this country; and that while we do not need immigration that is criminal, or vicious, or disturbing, there is a place for honest labor, even though it be uneducated. We raised no such club as an educational test over the heads of our Pilgrim forefathers, or the Cavaliers, or the German, or Irish, or Swedish settlers who aided in the upbuilding of our country, and now that they have come in, and we are in, it seems a travesty upon our boasted institutions of liberty that we should say to others, who, in good faith seek a haven here, "You can not come in."

EXCLUDING THE UNDESIRABLES.

Some of the gentlemen favoring this measure have declared that this is a white man's country and that only white men should be admitted. That statement so obviously presumes a prejudice against the Japanese, the Chinese, and the negro that it may not be seriously answered at this time. If such a prejudice prevails, it ought not to be used as a bar against the Italian, the Russian, or the Roumanian Jew, or any of the other southern Europeans who are believed to be marked for exclusion in this bill.

Other gentlemen contend for the preservation of the Anglo-Saxon race. They throw compliments at our German and Irish ancestors, but think the time has come to put up the bars against those whose present purpose in coming to the United States is to obtain homes and grow up with the country. The Anglo-Saxon argument is an exclusion argument pure and simple. It was answered by President Cleveland in his immigration veto message of 1897 and by President Taft in his veto message of 1913. It has also been answered by utterances favorable to honest immigration by the present President of the United States.

I can not cover the points raised in this debate in 15 minutes, but I wish to refer briefly to the urgency of this measure as represented by some of the patriotic orders. They want the bill passed to preserve American institutions, to uphold the public-school system, and to encourage a respect for the Stars and Stripes. They do not want the United States made a dumping ground for anarchists, or criminals, or other undesirables. In these things they are to be commended, but, except for the literacy test, which is leveled against labor rather than against crime, so far as it may be, Congress has provided for all these things by existing law.

The latest bulletin of the Bureau of Immigration shows that we do turn back the undesirables, and that for the year ending June 30, 1913, we turned back nearly 20,000 of them—to be exact, 19,938. They included idiots, epileptics, beggars, paupers, contract laborers, criminals, anarchists, prostitutes, and persons afflicted with tuberculosis, or loathsome or contagious diseases, and persons likely to become a public charge. Since the existing law covers these and other undesirables, it is a question if what the patriotic orders want (except the inclusion in this bill of the literacy test) is not efficiency in administration rather than additional legislation.

LABOR UNIONS IN OPPOSITION.

Now, another element which has to a certain extent stood behind the chairman of this committee and the proponents of this bill, is certain leaders of labor organizations, notably the American Federation of Labor. We had before the committee representatives of the railway orders. Mr. Wills, of the Locomotive Engineers, was one of the witnesses. He advocated the passage of this bill. He admitted that illiterates did not come into any very direct competition with the body that he represented, but he cited a controversy over the rate of wages on one of the western railroads where, in the event of a strike, the vast army of unemployed men, which he said existed, would be regarded as a menace. Mr. Clark, vice president of the Order of Railway Conductors, took substantially the same ground. He stated that immigrants did not take the place of conductors, but insisted that, in the event of strikes, their influence would be felt. He explained that it takes about three years for a man to pass through the grades to become a conductor, and that

then he has to be a pugilist, a diplomat, and a Chesterfield combined. These surely are three qualities that are not generally possessed by the illiterate laborer, against whom the present bill is directed. I want to say in this connection that these gentlemen were asked whether the educated American youth was prepared to go into the mines, do the drudgery in the trenches, in the sewers, or upon the farms; and, except as to the farm, they had few, if any, cases in point. The American youth, as one of them said, was cut out for higher things, and the question as to who was to do the dirty work, who was to do the drudgery, dig the sewers and trenches, and go down in the mines, when we stop the crude foreign labor, was left an open one, except as it might be solved by increased wages and effective organization.

THE IMMIGRANT WHO GOES BACK.

The chief spokesman for labor before the committee—and I have every respect for him as a man and an advocate of organized labor—was the associate of Mr. Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, namely, its secretary, Mr. Frank Morrison. When discussing this question of illiterate labor, Mr. Morrison, in answer to my colleague, Mr. MANAHAN, summed up as follows:

What I complain about, is that steady stream of people coming in—the unskilled foreigners who come here and work for a few years and go back, so that they can not be organized, and who have made no effort to secure better conditions. They do not assimilate with our people, they do not join with the union, and it is very difficult to retain the wage scale.

Mr. Morrison found fault with the uneducated immigrant because he did not readily yield to organization, but other witnesses at previous hearings had explained that this labor of which he complained, this drudge labor which the American youth considers beneath him, accommodated itself to the economic conditions in this country, came and went as it was wanted, working here at the American wage, and returning, to the relief of American labor, when there was no longer necessity for foreign labor. I intend to quote Mr. Morrison more fully if I have the time, but to clear up some misconceptions of fact about the immigration that is supposed to overrun this country I call attention briefly to the manner in which crude foreign labor does adjust itself to American economic conditions. In 1911, according to the latest report of the Bureau of Labor, it appears that the immigrants admitted were 1,030,300.

The number that left the country—and these are never taken into account by the opponents of immigration—was 518,215, or nearly half as many left the country as came into it. In the year 1912, 1,017,155 came in and 615,292 went out.

Now, in the course of the few minutes reserved to me I shall undertake to make it plain that a man who comes into the United States to do the work of the plodder, to till the soil and do the ugly work which the educated youth of America disdains to do, does not discredit American labor, nor displace it, if the work remains for him to do and he does it at an American wage. There is a vast difference between protecting ourselves against human life and blood of foreign birth that works at the American wage standard after it is admitted to this country, and protecting ourselves against the manufactures of foreigners working for a foreign wage. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time indicated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I shall use the remaining four minutes now, and, because I may overlook it later, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FOREIGN WAGES AND AMERICAN WAGES DIFFER.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, in the course of his statement Mr. Morrison was asked in particular about the garment workers and the miners. I am going to put this in the RECORD, because it is the only way, under this rule, that we can get this evidence before the House and before the country. In regard to the garment workers he admitted that most of them were foreign. He stated that there were substantially 200,000 of them; that in this country they work for the American wage, and that when abroad they worked for a lower foreign wage, and that clothing was cheaper in this country by reason of their being here.

With regard to the miner he admitted substantially the same thing; that whereas a miner got one-half or one-third in Wales or Belgium or England what he got in the United States, yet when he came over here he went to work at the American wage, and that the minimum union wage of the miner in Pennsylvania, for instance, was $2.56 a day.

I can not go into that any further now, but I want to say that the foreigner who comes into this country is a consumer as well as a producer; that he makes a market for the farmer the moment he comes here, and he brings within his own skin a customer for about 93 per cent of products of the United States. We can not discredit the foreigner on the ground that he is neither a producer nor a consumer. He is both the moment he enters our ports.

I shall put a little more of this in the RECORD. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. MOORE. Then, Mr. Chairman, in those two minutes I shall take up another side of this question very briefly.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman consume all of his time?

A HUMAN SIDE AND A SAVINGS SIDE.

Mr. MOORE. I had two minutes left when the Chairman's gavel fell.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is a human side to this question. I have here a letter signed by Mr. Herbert Parsons, a former Member of this House, appealing to this House in behalf of the downtrodden Jews in Russia and Roumania against whom this bill is leveled; and among the friends of these unfortunates, appealing to us for the freedom of the Jew in Russia, are some very distinguished gentlemen who favor American exclusion, including the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT], who spoke a little while ago; and in this particular instance no less a humanitarian than Mr. Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here is another important phase of the question. I have before me a report of the Philadelphia Savings Fund, one of the greatest savings banks in the United States. Its deposits, amounting to more than $120,000,000, are invested in the securities of railroads and industries throughout the whole country, aiding in the employment of labor everywhere. During the year 1912 they took on depositors to the number of 43,337, of whom one-half were foreigners; and those foreigners, along with the native Americans, laid by, in deposits, approximately $25,000,000, thus indicating that they were not carrying their money out of this country, but were investing it here to build up our railroads and our factories and our other great industries and to give us the benefit of that circulation which represents the result of their honest toil. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

THE PRESIDENT CLEVELAND VETO.

Mr. MOORE. Then, Mr. Chairman, availing myself of the privilege of extending my remarks, I shall refer to the influence the laborer who comes to the United States has upon the wage condition here. In a speech delivered to the House December 14, 1912, my Democratic colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], engaged in a controversy with some of his colleagues on this subject. I quote from the RECORD as follows:

Mr. SABATH. I have before me a copy of a message that was sent to the House of Representatives on March 2, 1897, by that great leader of Democracy, the first Democratic President since the war, Grover Cleveland, in vetoing a similar bill. Time does not permit me to read his message, but he, together with thousands upon thousands of intelligent Americans, after a careful study of this momentous question, has gone on record against this unfair legislation.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Is it not true that at the time Mr. Cleveland vetoed that bill the entire immigration to this country was not as much as the Italian and Greek immigration is now?

Mr. SABATH. In proportion to the population of our country, the immigration to-day is not any greater than it was then.

Mr. LOBECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. LOBECK. Was it not also a fact that at that time the price of labor in this country was so low that immigration did not come and there was not the demand for labor that there is now, and that was one of the reasons why they did not come?

Mr. SABATH. I think that is true; but right here I desire to say that from all the information I have and from all the information I can secure and from all the statistics I have studied, I can not find wherein immigration has even reduced the price of labor, but, on the contrary, you may go over the immigration figures from year to year and you will find that whenever the immigration was large wages were higher.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SABATH. I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. POWERS. Is not it true that the foreign wages of immigrants from foreign countries have mostly driven out the American wage earners in all of western Pennsylvania, and is it not a fact that three-fourths of the wage earners in the basic industries are foreigners? And is not it further true that they get 42 cents a day less than the American wage earners in the Middle States employed in the same occupations?

Mr. SABATH. I can not agree with the gentleman. I desire to say that they have supplanted them as common laborers, but they have provided for the American laboring men higher and better employment,

and the statistics again will show that, due to immigration, the American laboring man has been advanced to a higher position.

Mr. MOORE. And is it not also true that the average American boy does not want to work as a common laborer?

Mr. SABATH. Of course, that is true, and they are acting as foremen, bookkeepers, timekeepers, superintendents, and so forth.

LABOR, ORGANIZED AND UNORGANIZED.

I now invite attention to an extract from the testimony of Mr. Frank Morrison, Secretary of the American Federation of Labor, who was before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at the famous midnight session of December 11–12. This statement, as will be seen, has to do largely with the wage question as it relates to native and foreign-born labor.

Mr. MOORE. As a prelude to the questions I wish to put to you, I want to make it understood that I favor the organization of labor, and that I also favor the maintenance of the American wage standard. As one who believes in protection, of course I could not take any other stand. I also agree with you in undertaking to take care of people here in this country. I will base my questions very largely upon that line of thought. * * *

The members of the American Federation of Labor, under their constitution and by-laws, are law-abiding, and believe in the operation and maintenance of the laws of the land, and their amendment or correction by due and legal process. I think that is a fair statement, is it not? That is the attitude of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. MORRISON. That is their attitude.

Mr. MOORE. And you believe in the rule of the majority?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes, sir. We practice it. We not only believe in it, but we practice it.

Mr. MOORE. Without intending to take any advantage of you at all, and believing in labor organizations fairly and justly and lawfully conducted, I want to ask how many wage earners there are in the United States, organized or unorganized, if you can tell me?

Mr. MORRISON. There are supposed to be about 29,000,000 people in gainful occupations. That includes everybody that works for wages.

Mr. MOORE. For convenience, will we approximate it at 30,000,000?

Mr. MORRISON. Probably that would be all right.

Mr. MOORE. That was stated by Mr. Wilson when he was a Member of Congress—I refer to the present Secretary of Labor.

Mr. MORRISON. The federation has paid members, as I said, 2,071,000. There are about 300,000 people that are on the books that we do not get paid for; that is, there are strikes in the organizations and the internationals do not pay for the members on strike.

Mr. MOORE. They would respond to the jurisdiction of the federation?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes. Then there are 400,000 or 500,000, perhaps, organized outside of the federation, in the brotherhoods and the bricklayers, making it 2,800,000 at the present time.

Mr. MOORE. The Knights of Labor do not figure very much?

Mr. MORRISON. No; there is nothing left except about one member, I guess.

Mr. MOORE. And a newspaper?

Mr. MORRISON. That is not regular. It comes out spasmodically.

Mr. MOORE. Three million would be a fair statement of the membership, men and women, of the American Federation of Labor and of organized bodies to-day, would it not?

Mr. MORRISON. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE. So that the majority of wage earners is against the organized body; that is to say, there are more unorganized than there are organized?

Mr. MORRISON. More in gainful pursuits.

Mr. MOORE. And the mission of the federation would be, and is, to organize that great mass of unorganized wage earners in the United States?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE. In your statement, if I did not misunderstand you, you said that amongst the members of the American Federation are 400,000 mine workers, most of whom are foreigners.

Mr. MORRISON. That is, in the miners?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON. I think so; the majority, at any rate.

Mr. MOORE. In answer to questions, you have since stated that miners in the Westmoreland district and at McKees Rocks——

Mr. MORRISON. That is, the steel men, who make the steel cars.

AMERICAN WAGES OF FOREIGN MINERS.

Mr. MOORE. I will leave them out. I want to confine it to miners solely. You have stated that the conditions were deplorable where they were not organized, and that in Westmoreland the unorganized mine workers work for as low as $1.85 a day?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; that was the statement that was read to me by the chairman, a statement made by Mr. Gompers, and my recollection is that that is as accurate as we could get.

Mr. MOORE. That would be the minimum wage, of which you would complain as being unfair?

Mr. MORRISON. There is no minimum wage usually. That is the minimum wage paid, but in unorganized mines they hire the people and pay them whatever they want to.

Mr. MOORE. Let us take $1.85 as the unorganized wage, to which the federation takes exception, and then let me ask what is the wage of the miner who is organized in Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORRISON. I think $2.56 is the minimum there for eight hours.

Mr. MOORE. Then, so far as $2.56 per day is concerned for the organized miner at eight hours a day, the federation has done its best in fixing the wage?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; to the United Mine Workers, through organization.

Mr. MOORE. Through the affiliated organization?

Mr. MORRISON. And they are working, of course, against great odds to secure better conditions.

Mr. MOORE. If that is the case, then $2.56 is the wage paid to the foreign immigrant worker in the mines in the United States who has joined the organization?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

FOGEIGN WAGES OF FOREIGN MINERS.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask what wage that same foreign mine worker would have obtained in Belgium or in Wales?

Mr. MORRISON. I have not those figures.

Mr. MOORE. Would it have been one-half of $2.56 a day?

Mr. MORRISON. I might be able to get that information and give it to you later.

Mr. MOORE. Would it have been one-third, do you think, in Belgium?

Mr. MORRISON. That is a low-wage country.

Mr. HOLDER. The Welsh minimum is 30 shillings a week.

Mr. MOORE. Without regard to hours?

Mr. MORRISON. Eight hours there.

Mr. MOORE. Then it is a fact that the miner who works abroad does receive less than the miner who works in Pennsylvania, who receives $2.56 a day. Is that the fact?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; that is a self-evident thing.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that the mine workers are organized in Wales and in Belgium?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Then, is it due to organization there that the wages are as low as they are, and is it due to organization here that the wages are as high as they are?

Mr. MORRISON. It is due to organization in Wales that they are as high as they are.

Mr. KEY. May I ask a question there? I would like to ask Mr. Morrison right along that line of thought if he takes into consideration the purchasing power over there?

Mr. MOORE. I am perfectly willing he should answer that, but I was going to ask that very question in a moment.

Mr. KEY. Pardon the interruption, then. I think it is fair that that should be brought out.

Mr. MOORE. I have no objection to your answering that question now, Mr. Morrison, if you wish. Mr. Key would like to know whether the living conditions there are different from what they are here.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN LIVING CONDITIONS.

Mr. MORRISON. We hold that the living conditions of our organized workers here in many industries are better than they are in Europe.

Mr. MOORE. The living conditions?

Mr. KEY. I had reference to purchasing power.

Mr. MORRISON. What we are trying to do is to prevent people coming over here to destroy the conditions we have established.

Mr. MOORE. I understand your position, but I am trying to get at the cause, and I do not think there is any very great difference between us as to the cause except that it be political. Mr. Gompers, in those celebrated letters of his after his tour of Europe, said in one of them that "in no city in Europe did I find rents any cheaper, wages considered, than they run in Philadelphia, Baltimore, Louisville, or in the New England towns."

Mr. MORRISON. Wages considered.

Mr. MOORE. But he spoke of wages as being vastly lower than they were in the United States.

Mr. MORRISON. In proportion, wages being considered.

Mr. MOORE. Yes; he said rental conditions were as high there as they are here.

Mr. MORRISON. That would be in proportion, as I understand it, to the wages received.

Mr. MOORE. I grant that the labor union does aid in reduction of hours of labor, does aid in improvement of labor conditions, does aid in improvement of factory conditions, and all those local conditions where the State has jurisdiction over the factory or over the worker or over the mine; but I have not yet got it clear in my mind how you can claim for the labor union the increase in the daily wage of the miner when he is organized abroad as well as and perhaps better than he is here, and receives there one-half or one-third what he receives in the United States.

Mr. MORRISON. Let me give you a little object lesson in organization. There was a strike in one of the steel mills at Cambridge, Ohio——

Mr. MOORE. I wish you would confine it to miners for the present.

Mr. MORRISON. This has reference to miners.

Mr. MOORE. I am coming to steel in a moment, and I have not much time.

WAGES OF FOREIGN-BORN GARMENT WORKERS.

Mr. MORRISON. I want to show the organization. The steel men were unorganized. They were getting $1.56 a day, 10 hours—or $1.60 a day, 16 cents an hour. The miners of the same nationality and same intelligence were organized. The miners were working 8 hours and getting $2.56 for 8 hours; one organized, the other unorganized. If they had not been organized, they would have been getting the same as the steel workers and working probably the same hours.

Mr. MOORE. Was there any difference in the hazard of the work which those two relative establishments performed?

Mr. MORRISON. The way they ran the steel mills I think the hazard would be in favor of the mines, almost. It would be safer in the mines than in the steel mills.

Mr. MOORE. * * * Let us pass from miners now and take up garment workers. You say there are 200,000 garment workers organized and affiliated with the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. MORRISON. Seventy-four thousand and one hundred and thirteen thousand.

Mr. MOORE. It is approximately 185,000?

Mr. MORRISON. One hundred and eighty-seven thousand, to be accurate, paying members, and there is no question but there are on the books nearly 250,000 members.

Mr. MOORE. And most of those are foreign, most of them are Hebrews?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I think you have conceded, in response to other questions, that their condition to-day is better than it was 10 years ago?

Mr. MORRISON. Oh, yes.

Mr. MOORE. Do you know Joseph Barondess?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. He lead the garment workers several years ago in the great strike in New York?

Mr. MORRISON. He led them to victory every year.

Mr. MOORE. You are aware he was before this committee a year ago?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. And that he did not favor the passage of a bill containing the illiteracy test?

Mr. MORRISON. I did not know that.

Mr. MOORE. He did. I think the older members of the committee will sustain me.

Mr. SABATH. He appeared in opposition to the illiteracy test, and very strongly urged opposition on our part.

WAGES HIGHER AND CLOTHING CHEAPER.

Mr. MOORE. And frankly he differed from Mr. Gompers and Mr. Morrison on that question.

I want this mentioned at this time to show there is a difference in labor circles on this proposition.

Mr. MORRISON. He also has an efficiency system. He was working on that, was he not?

Mr. MOORE. That is outside of the inquiry, however. He was the leader of the garment workers at New York, and he did appear before this committee and did take issue with Mr. Gompers and yourself on the question of the passage of this bill, and opposed it because of the illiteracy test.

May I ask, with regard to the garment workers, who are largely foreign, as you have indicated, whether clothing is not cheaper to-day, manufactured as it is, than it was in the days of your boyhood, when it was made very largely by hand or by custom tailor, or by dear old mother, who operated the spinning wheel?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; you can buy a suit cheaper now than you could years ago.

Mr. MOORE. You can buy clothing cheaper in the United States now than you could then?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE. And there is more clothing than there was then?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. The old spinning wheel has been dispensed with and the old custom shop has been dispensed with, whether for good or for ill?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. It is also true, is it not, that while clothing has become cheaper the wages of the garment workers have steadily increased in the United States?

Mr. MORRISON. They have increased since they stopped their yearly strike under the leadership of Mr. Barondess and formed a leadership under the Federation. They entered into a cooperative agreement or protocol, and they have stopped this striking, and they adjust their grievances, and they meet in conference and get better conditions, and they have improved and organized under these methods without striking, and they have these conditions solely as a result of their organization. If it were not for the organization and this agreement, they would be just in the condition they were for years and years—strike every year, get their conditions, go back to the former conditions in a year, and then strike again. It is just the ordinary trade-union movement that has been able to get this agreement and to sustain it.

THE DIFFERENCE IN WORKING HERE.

Mr. MOORE. Suppose we concede all you say on that subject without going into the political side of it at all, which I want to avoid. Let me ask what would have been the condition in the United States with regard to the cheaper clothing and the higher wages if these foreign garment workers had remained on the other side, making garments over there for the American trade? They would have been receiving the foreign wage, would they not?

Mr. MORRISON. They would have been receiving the foreign wage; yes.

Mr. MOORE. And we would have been purchasing their clothing as made in foreign countries, would we not?

Mr. MORRISON. If we could not manufacture it here.

Mr. MOORE. Do the Americans engage in the clothing trade to any extent—sewing women, cutters, etc.?

Mr. MORRISON. They did years ago until the immigrant came in in this particular trade and took it up and gradually drove everybody else out.

Mr. MOORE. If they drove anybody out——

Mr. MORRISON. What I mean is that by coming in and doing the work the wages were low and the conditions poor, and the Americans looked out and endeavored to secure work in other lines.

Mr. MOORE. We will accept that statement and then I will ask you this: Do you know of any educated young Americans to-day who will go into the steelworks, with the harrowing conditions which you have described there, or into the mines of Westmoreland, and take the places of these foreigners who are working there to-day at an American wage?

Mr. MORRISON. Do you mean for 15 or 16 cents an hour?

Mr. MOORE. No, sir; I mean for $2.56 a day in the mines.

Mr. MORRISON. Oh, in the mines?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; or for $25 or $30 a week, as some of the garment workers earn?

Mr. MORRISON. I think there are lots of men who will go in if they can get employment; yes.

Mr. MOORE. Do you find in the American Federation of Labor that you have or can lay your hands on 200,000 men who would take the places of these foreign garment workers in New York and do that work?

Mr. MORRISON. Do you mean now?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON. Two hundred thousand?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. MORRISON. I would not like to feel there were 200,000 garment workers out of work. You would have to take them out of some other industry.

THE AMBITION OF YOUNG AMERICA.

Mr. MOORE. You spoke a little while ago in favor of brain, not as wholly against muscle, but for the recognition of the brain power as against mere brute force, and I am bringing that home to you now, merely to find out if you have in mind brainy men who have the education which they acquired in the American schools, who will go down into the mines and do the work these foreigners do to-day?

Mr. MORRISON. If the young men felt there was a future—I think when a young fellow has his choice at all, he figures out what he would like to be. I think the youth that has not ripened and looked over the labor field and realizes that somebody ought to do the world's work, that he ought to do a share of it himself, wants to be a minister, or lawyer, or doctor, or enter into business.

Mr. MOORE. You have sons, have you not?

Mr. MORRISON. I have one little fellow.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Clark was good enough to mention his son a while ago and to say he was on the farm, and when asked if the boy would go into the ditch, he said no, he could do better. Is not that the real spirit of the average American citizen?

Mr. MORRISON. I want to say this that I have worked hard and I hope I will live to see that my son shall go on the farm.

Mr. MOORE. So do I as to mine. I agree with you thoroughly.

Mr. MORRISON. I have a daughter, whom I was able to educate until she was 19 years of age. I wanted to give her a university education, but she wanted to learn to be a nurse, and she is now at Orange, N. J., learning to be a nurse. I said to her she might go if she wanted to do so, but I did not want her to quit school. I feel, however, if she puts in three years learning to be a nurse, she will be worth something to society, and I will be proud of her.

Mr. MOORE. That is very commendable, indeed. I will not press this any further with regard to the mine workers and garment workers, except to note the fact that you concede that these men and women, when organized in the United States, do work for an American wage, the best that can be obtained in this country.

Mr. MORRISON. The best that can be obtained.

Mr. MOORE. And they do not work for the low foreign wage, such as is paid in Great Britain, Germany, Belgium, or Italy?

Mr. MORRISON. There is no question about that. We not only concede that, but we admit it.

WAGES IN THE COTTON FIELDS.

Mr. MOORE. A great deal has been made here of the question of the Steel Trust, and you have quoted from a report with regard to the works at Bethlehem. I am not going to champion that works or any other corporation that employs labor except to express the general hope that we may always have employers of labor, so that labor can have employment. In view of the fact that you referred to the conditions that prevail there without citing any particular wage conditions, as I recall it, and the chairman of the committee having also referred to Bethlehem and having particularly referred to conditions at Westmoreland, I want to ask if you are familiar with the wage conditions in the cotton fields.

Mr. MORRISON. Only in a general way, and to know that the wages are low.

Mr. MOORE. It was testified not long ago before the Ways and Means Committee, by Mr. John Cawifield, of Stockdale, Tex., that the laborers who actually produce the cotton do not receive on an average of more than 75 cents per day for men, and for women and children 37½ cents.

Mr. MORRISON. That was in Texas?

Mr. MOORE. That was reported as coming from Texas. That statement is found in the reports of the old Ways and Means Committee at page 4455. Do you know whether that is the wage that prevails in the cotton fields?

Mr. MORRISON. I have not the facts only in a general way, except that wages are low everywhere they are unorganized.

Mr. MOORE. This witness said that men receive on an average of not more than 75 cents per day, women and children 37½ cents per day, and he added that the children of these families of scholastic age do not attend school on an average of more than two months in the year, which the enrollment and daily attendance roll will show. Are you familiar with those conditions at all, or do you believe them to exist?

Mr. MORRISON. Oh, yes.

Mr. MOORE. You do not believe them to exist?

Mr. MORRISON. Oh, yes. They do exist in the mills. Down in Texas we have an organizer in El Paso. There has been a great deal of trouble there on account of Mexicans coming over. The claim is they want them there to work for the railroads. The railroads want cheap men, and always did.

FOREIGN ILLITERATES AND NATIVE ILLITERATES.

Mr. MOORE. Gentlemen take very great pleasure in constantly referring to conditions in Pennsylvania, and they pick out the Bethlehem Steel Works, and Westmoreland in particular, because strike troubles have occurred there, and they ring changes on them, indicating that Pennsylvania is particularly lax in the industrial world, although it is the greatest industrial State of this Union and perhaps gives more employment to industrialists than any other State. Are you familiar with a book called "The Child that Tolleth Not"?

Mr. MORRISON. No; I have never read it.

Mr. MOORE. By Thomas Robinson Dawley, jr., a book description of some conditions in the South?

Mr. MORRISON. No.

Mr. MOORE. You have not read the book?

Mr. MORRISON. No.

Mr. MOORE. Have you made a study of Southern States at all?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; we had a representative down there a number of years ago, and found conditions very poor in the textile mills.

Mr. MOORE. Did you find that the operatives in the textile mills were foreign or native born?

Mr. MORRISON. They were people from the mountains. I do not know that there are very many foreigners who have been able to get down there.

Mr. MOORE. Very early settlers, were they not?

Mr. MORRISON. The people that moved in from the mountains are people who are accustomed to live on very little. They went in with their families and worked in the mills, which has not been a benefit to them.

NOT MUCH ORGANIZATION SOUTH.

Mr. MOORE. How did you succeed in organizing the millworkers of the South?

Mr. MORRISON. We have not been successful in organizing them.

Mr. MOORE. Have you any branch organizations of any consequence in Texas?

Mr. MORRISON. We have among the trades, but not of the textile workers.

Mr. MOORE. What would you say your membership is in the State of Texas?

Mr. MORRISON. I do not know. We have not figured it up by States, but they are located at Fort Worth, San Antonio, El Paso, and Waco.

Mr. MOORE. In the cities, mostly?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Not in the country at all?

Mr. MORRISON. No.

Mr. MOORE. Not amongst the farmers at all?

Mr. MORRISON. The farmers are organized.

Mr. MOORE. None amongst the planters at all?

Mr. MORRISON. No.

Mr. MOORE. Have you any organization in Alabama or Mississippi?

Mr. MORRISON. Only in the cities.

Mr. MOORE. Is your organization very extensive there?

Mr. MORRISON. In the cities we have organizations established and central bodies.

Mr. MOORE. How is it in Georgia.

Mr. MORRISON. The same—in the cities.

Mr. MOORE. Do you have any strikes in the South?

Mr. MORRISON. There has been a textile strike in Georgia, about 16 or 17 years ago, in a little place a couple of hundred miles from Atlanta.

Mr. MOORE. A hosiery mill?

Mr. MORRISON. No; it was a textile mill. There is a large textile industry in that part of the State, and they had a strike there.

Mr. MOORE. Do you regard your organization work in the South as satisfactory?

Mr. MORRISON. Oh, no.

Mr. MOORE. You have paid very little attention to organizing the South?

Mr. MORRISON. Oh, yes; we pay attention all over. There was a man who left headquarters the other day to go South. He will be in Atlanta, Ga., in about three weeks, and is going to this point, the name of which escapes my memory. It is quite a large place——

Mr. MOORE. Augusta?

Mr. MORRISON. That is it—Augusta.

Mr. MOORE. Do you remember the old slogan, "Eight hours for work; eight hours for sleep; eight hours for what you will"?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes; I know all about eight hours.

Mr. MOORE. You have made the eight-hour question a specialty for many years?

Mr. MORRISON. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask how the eight-hour question appeals to the farmer?

Mr. MORRISON. Short hours never appeal very strongly to the average employer.

FARMERS' WAGES AND THE EIGHT-HOUR QUESTION.

Mr. MOORE. I am confining this to the farmer. I want to know whether the farmers' unions have specifically indorsed or approved the eight-hour proposition?

Mr. MORRISON. I do not know.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not a fact that they oppose it?

Mr. MORRISON. The eight-hour day? I would not say that it is a fact that they do.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not true that the eight-hour law is made to operate almost exclusively in the industries and is not effective as to the farmers?

Mr. MORRISON. I will say this—that in my early youth a man worked from daylight to dark; but the average farm hand now starts to work about 8 and quits about 6, and if they do not let him do that he goes off into town, where he can have shorter hours and where they are paying more. A man will go where he can get good conditions. There is another thing about the farm laborer that appeals to me: When a man hires a man, he just hires that man. The average man wants to get married and settle down and have a home; and there is very little chance for home life for a man working on a farm part of the time or all the time.

Mr. MOORE. Do you know of any journeyman farmer anywhere who makes $2.56 a day, which is the wage paid to the union miner in Pennsylvania?

Mr. MORRISON. I imagine there are lots of men working for farmers who, when you take into account their board and everything they get, would be receiving equal to that and more.

Mr. MOORE. Would not that account very largely for the fact that the garment worker, the Jewish garment worker who is making $25 a week over on the East Side, would prefer to stay there rather than go out on the farm?

Mr. MORRISON. Of course, that is work he has been accustomed to do. A man does not change rapidly from one employment to another.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, through Mr. Morrison we have the Federation of Labor view of the immigration problem. He stands for the right to unionize the laborers who are already in the United States and against the admission of others who may not assimilate with the unions. He admits the industry and thrift and wage-earning power of the newcomer, but thinks the bars should go up against him until those who are already here shall be thoroughly organized.

AN OPPOSITE LABOR VIEW.

On the other hand, associations like the German-American National Alliance, numbering 2,000,000 members, take a wholly different view. Here is an expression from the German-American State Alliances of Ohio and Kentucky. It shows that there is another side to the question.

The German-American State Alliance of Ohio and the German-American State Alliance of Kentucky, in joint session assembled, representing 60,000 American citizens, emphatically protest against the adoption of the Burnett immigration bill, now pending before the House of Representatives, as it is detrimental to the welfare of this country. The passage of this bill would exclude hundreds of thousands of workingmen, who are absolutely necessary for the development of this country in their capacity as workers in mines, on streets, railways, buildings, farms, etc. The immigrant is a blessing for this country and not a burden, but he carries the heaviest burden of common labor and represents a comparatively large portion of the Nation's wealth. The immigrant does 85 per cent of the work in all slaughter and packing houses; he brings forth seven-tenths of all coal mined in the United States; he manufactures four-fifths of all house furnishing goods; 78 per cent of all work in the wool factories is done by immigrants and nineteen-twentieths of all garments and more than half of all shoes are made by them; the immigrant refines nineteen-twentieths of all sugar and manufactures more than half of all cigars and one-half of all gloves, shirts, and collars. He is a willing and always welcome worker on farms, which he can run successfully without any educational test. We are of the opinion that the men and women engaged in the labor of producing and upbuilding the wealth of our Nation do not require an educational test. What we need are physically well-built men and women—desirable immigrants, who, on account of their moral worth, would improve the citizenship of our country. These people ought to be welcomed in this land of liberty, instead of being excluded for not passing the test provided in the Burnett bill. We know that a class of very undesirable immigrants are easily able to pass the required examination set forth in this bill—every anarchist or agitator of un-American doctrines contrary to the welfare of this great Republic, for whom we have no room in this country, is educated and well informed. The existing immigration laws, which are now rigidly enforced, are sufficient protection against any undesirable element.

THE RETURNING IMMIGRANT AS AN UPLIFTER.

That societies even older in patriotic and fraternal endeavor, may be considered in this discussion, I quote from the annual address (December, 1913) of the president of the New England Society of Pennsylvania, Mr. Alba B. Johnson, who is a large employer of labor as well as a student of economic problems.

Said Mr. Johnson:

The ideals of those who have sought our Atlantic and our Pacific shores have been far removed from those of the Pilgrim Fathers whose landing we celebrate to-night, and as our population has grown, the process of assimilation has grown. The desire to share our fertile acres, our opportunities for lucrative employment, and our better social conditions have attracted foreigners in great numbers. These came first from the more enlightened countries of northwestern Europe, whose civilization was akin to our own, but later from the less civilized and less developed countries of southern and southeastern Europe.

It is true also that of late, when conditions have not been favorable for profitable employment here, the tide of emigration has been reversed, and those who for a time have lived amongst us have returned to their native European villages, to carry back some portion of American standards of living and American ideals. Thus, nearly all the countries of central and northern Europe have many workmen who are more enlightened and more efficient by reason of having worked in America. They have carried with them higher standards of living, higher efficiency as workmen, and a demand for higher wages, all of which tend to bring the scale of living in those countries nearer to our own.

We need these people to hew our wood and draw our water. We need their aid in developing our resources and in operating our industries. Any legislation tending to exclude them for other reasons than physical or moral incapacity is therefore contrary to our interests, and the same liberal laws that have so long governed their admission should be continued.

PLENTY OF FARM LAND FOR TOILERS.

In this debate, Mr. Chairman, gentlemen have argued that immigrants overrun the country and tend to degrade American labor. They go so far as to complain of their crowding the land, as if our resources were fully developed. It is something of a coincidence that during the last few days the Director of the Census should have given us his bulletin on agriculture in the United States for 1910. What does he say about farm lands in the United States? That we have over 878,000,000 acres, of which 478,000,000 only are improved. Think of it, those of you who fear the toiling immigrant will eat up our resources!

Over 400,000,000 acres of farm and wooded land remain unimproved in the United States. Nearly half of all our land is waiting for some one to till it. But this is not all. Let us consider the farm statistics for the area of the 13 original States. Notwithstanding the intensity of our population in this small area east of the Appalachian chain we still have 78,000,000 acres of unimproved land out of a total of 161,000,000. The Dismal Swamp is in that area. If cleared up and drained it would make a rich farming country. If such a project should ever be undertaken it would require labor. Would it be the labor that can read and write?

MONEY VALUE OF THE IMMIGRANT.

Another point which ought to have consideration before this bill is disposed of relates to the money value of the immigrant. The report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for 1913 shows that the immigrants who came to the United States during the year preceding brought with them $40,890,197 in cash. That was a tidy sum to enter into our circulation, and answers to a certain extent the oft-repeated assertion that the immigrant carries away our money and does not give us a fair equivalent. It is safe to say that those who brought so large a sum into our country were generally law-abiding and industrious men and women, and that their purpose in coming to the United States was praiseworthy. It is also fair to assume that whether some of them could read or write or not, they were fully as desirable as the educated and clever schemers who expected to live upon their wits in the United States and who would spurn to do the honest manual labor we need to have done here, the reading test to the contrary notwithstanding.

THE SPIRIT OF HUMANITY.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, it is noteworthy that the Commissioner General of Immigration, who is hedged about by those who advocate restriction, withholds a positive indorsement of the educational test and suggests that the real test should be physical and moral; in fact, a manhood test, rather than one based upon educational qualifications. Inability to read is not a crime; it is a misfortune; but even so it does not prove that the heart and fiber of him who can not read are not as pure and true as those of the greatest scholar. With the educational test included, this bill may satisfy the prejudices that have grown up with the immigration problem, but it is doubtful whether it will respond to the economic conditions which its proponents hope to bring about. It will exclude a certain class of human beings in favor of certain other classes, contrary to the spirit which heretofore has permeated American institutions. Of the total number of 1,197,892 reported admitted up to June 30 last, it would turn back 269,988 who were entered illiterate. This bill does not propose that the 1,197,892 immigrants who may knock for admission in 1914 shall be turned back, nor does

it say that only a percentage of that number will be welcome during the year. It declares that 269,988 of that total shall be turned back. Why? Not because of any crime committed; not because they would not honestly labor here, but because they can not read. If we are to admit 927,904 who can read and who may aspire to active competition with the skilled or professional labor of the United States, it does not appear that either patriotism or labor in the United States will gain much by the transaction. On the other hand, the exclusion of the 269,988 who can not read reverses our national policy, and closes the door of hope and opportunity to the downtrodden and oppressed, who may, after all, be the most deserving of our helping hand and the spirit of human kindness we have extended to others.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. BURNETT. I yield, Mr. Chairman, seven minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CHURCH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I am more in favor of this bill restricting immigration than I have been of any bill that has been before this House since I have been a Member of Congress. The only objection I have to it is that it is not broad enough to exclude Japanese, Hindus, and other Asiatic laborers. The people of the East do not yet realize the importance of this matter, because they have not come in contact to any extent with this strange people from across the water. California, being on the shores of the Pacific, seems to be a dumping ground for the undesirable from Asia, and I assure you the Hindu and the Japanese is a problem and the greatest plague we have in the West. Japanese are very spirited and proud fellows who consider nothing too good for them. They locate in the garden spots of the State, bringing their customs and manner of living, of course, with them. Consequently as they come in the refined American, with his ideals, goes out. It matters not whether it be city lots or country property, the land adjacent to Japanese habitations continually decreases in value from the standpoint of an American purchaser. These people know no standards of honor, and figure everything as to whether it will bring dollars and cents to them. They should be excluded at once.

You may be surprised when I say the influx of Hindus into the West threatens to be even a greater menace than the immigration of Japanese. Hindus are now going to the Pacific coast by the thousands. They are an odd, inferior people, bound down by strange traditions and religious fanaticisms. They ever present the appearance of slothfulness, stupidity, and pity. They appear to be oblivious to the sensations of either pleasure or pain. The Hindu is as tough as whalebone, and instead of eating when hungry, simply takes up another notch in his belt. It is impossible for the American laborer to compete with the Hindu laborer. The Hindu will wear the clothes which the American discards, eat the food the Americans will not use, and can work 20 hours a day if necessary.

Some time ago I filed a bill asking for the exclusion of these strange specimens of humanity. When it comes before the House I am sure every man who understands the true condition will vote for it. They must be excluded sooner or later, and why not now? Every dollar the Hindu gets is sent to his native land, with which to pay the traveling expenses to this country of his cousin, and it is very discouraging when we take into consideration they all seem to be cousins, and millions of them anxious to come.

As I said before, I am in favor of this immigration bill. Each year from ten hundred thousand to eighteen hundred thousand foreigners come to our shore. Of this number it is estimated 250,000 can neither read nor write in their own language. When we take into consideration this great influx of densely ignorant and undesirable people we are forced to the conclusion that greater restriction is necessary.

Many years ago we found it necessary to restrict immigration, so we excluded those whom we considered would be the least desirable to our country—idiots, imbeciles, insane, people afflicted with infectious diseases, and so forth—but we find to-day we are still getting more foreigners than we can assimilate, regardless of the exclusions we have already made. Thus we are driven to the necessity of excluding some other class, and the question is, "What class shall we exclude?" Really there are but two other classes to choose from, the literate and the illiterate, so being forced to make further restrictions we are forced to make a choice between these classes, and in making our choice we have but to decide as wise men which, as a class, would make the most desirable citizens. I submit anyone with as much sense as a vegetable oyster would decide in favor of the class who can read and write in their own language, for the reason such would be more apt to understand our form of government and aid us in our patriotic endeavors to make this country the light of the world.

Gentlemen tell us those who can not read their native language are unfortunate, poor, and needy. Such is doubtless the case with a great majority of foreigners who come to this country. Being unable to assist all of the unfortunate, poor, and needy, are we not given the privilege to decide who shall be the recipients of our bounty? Unfortunate, poor, and miserable people pass the door of each Member of this House daily. Do you take them in and warm, feed, and clothe them? No; you decide according to your best judgment, and aid the ones whom you consider are most apt to be worthy. As a class the foreigner who can not read in his own language is an idler, spendthrift, and has no capacity or desire to learn. There are thousands of exceptions, doubtless, to this rule, but what I have stated is the rule.

At least, you will admit the illiterate class has a greater percentage of people who would not make good citizens here than the class which is composed of people who have had energy, opportunity, and capacity to acquire a little intelligence at home. We would not, however, want it to be understood we favor excluding the ignorant people because our hearts do not beat in sympathy with them, but being obliged to exempt another class from the benefits of this country, we consider it wise and just to decide in favor of the intelligent class as being most desirable to us and, as a class, being the most deserving. By making this choice we decide in favor of intelligence and learning, and thus impress upon the people of the world the value of knowledge, and in this way we impress upon the ignorant people of all lands the fact that the human race is developing and that all must keep apace with the times.

The most important matter pertaining to immigration is to keep from our shores all who continue to lower our national standards. The hand that brings down the standards of a nation is an instrument of sure destruction. You might as well take the warmth from the sunbeams of heaven or innocence from the heart of a child as to take away the ideals of a people.

A tidal wave may sweep over a land, wash down its buildings, and change the face of the country, but by and by the sun and time will do its work, the land will become dry and be restored; earthquakes may shake down a city and leave yawning fissures everywhere, but after a while rehabilitation will do its work, and the effect of the earthquake will be no more; famine, gaunt and hungry, may hover for years above a fruitful land, but by and by years of plenty will come, and the nation will still live and prosper; but when the ideals and standards of the people are gone they are gone forever, and destiny has decreed that nation shall cease, and it matters not the size of her standing army or the number of her warships on the sea, "Thou art weighed in the balance and found wanting" is written high upon the wall. Mr. Chairman, I object to promiscuous immigration, because it lowers our national standards.

First. It lowers our standards as to labor. When the American laborer, educated, cultured, and possessed of high ideals, is obliged to work by the side of a man, or a number of men, who can not read or write, and who do not know whether Napoleon Bonaparte was once the Emperor of France or the captain of a whaling vessel on the Northern Sea, it has its effect on labor, and causes a man of spirit to feel that he is too good a man to do no higher grade of work than such fellows are capable of doing. What would a young wife think of her husband if he persisted in working with such a band of human scarecrows? The presence of these ignorant workmen brings down the American standard of labor.

Second. They bring down the standard of wages as well as the standard of labor. If there are 25,000,000 people in this country who want a job and there are 25,000,000 jobs in this country, each can be accommodated, but send a million more men, making 26,000,000 who desire a job, and they will compete with each other, bringing down the standard of wages and after all a million of them will be obliged to remain idle. Thus will be lowered the standard of American wages.

Third. The standard of living and the standard of morality of our people are lowered by the arrival of this ignorant and immoral horde from across the sea. I tell you whatever lowers the moral standards of our people strikes at the very heart of this Republic.

Fourth. Intelligence is another one of our great standards. When the immigrant comes to this country, while yet far out at sea, he sees the great monument, the Statue of Liberty—Liberty enlightening the world. From this he gets the idea, first, that we are a liberty-loving, patriotic people; and, secondly, that we are an enlightened people, each of which is true. We

love to think we are the most enlightened Nation. We love to think the United States of America is the intellectual light of the world. Every person in this country who has a piece of property as large as an oyster shell is taxed to maintain our public-school system. We claim this system to be the best there is in the world. We have hundreds of millions of dollars invested in public schoolhouses, in colleges, and universities of learning. We have State laws compelling children to be sent to school.

In California, my State, every child under the age of 14 years must go to school. If the parents will not send him, the parents are arrested and punished. If the parents are not able to send their children to school, our local authorities will do so; and, as a result, in the great State of California there is not one native son or daughter who arrives at the age of 18 who has not a fair knowledge, at least, of the grammar course. I presume the same condition prevails in the other States of this Union. If they do not now, I am sure in the near future they will, because intelligence is one of our national standards. We do not thus compel a child to attend school simply for the benefit of the child, but we do it to keep up our standards.

I want to ask you gentlemen who are opposed to this bill if you think it would be right, in view of all this, to permit 2,000,000, 1,000,000, or a half a million of full grown men and women, intellectually as dark as night, incapable of reading a word in their native tongue, to come to this country, associate with our children and our people? Will you dare tell me such would not debase the intellectual standard of our people?

Fifth. Unrestricted immigration lowers the standard of patriotism in our country. In considering this phase of the subject let us forget for a moment all other effects which it produces, for they are as nothing compared to this. Labor may be considered a disgrace, wages reduced to a minimum, our schoolhouses and colleges may become inhabited by owls, yet nationally we may live as long as we respect our Constitution and enforce our laws and the fires of patriotism continue to burn. Every man who comes here who does not love this form of Government lowers the standard of patriotism. How can a person love this form of Government who knows nothing about it, and how can a man know anything about this form of Government who has not taken interest in his own to the extent that he can neither read nor write in his native language? After such a one comes to our shores and begins to learn and think, his early environments and naturally debased tendencies may drive him to anarchy and revolution. I like your tariff laws, your banking and currency act, your project to build a railroad into Alaska, all laws calculated for the financial betterment of this country and its people, but these are nothing compared to keeping up the standard of our citizenship. We may lose much of our wealth and yet be prosperous; lose standing among the nations of the earth and yet succeed; but when a large proportion of the people of this country are not in love with our Constitution and laws, we are marked as a lamb for the slaughter.

Gentlemen seem to figure that this Nation, because it is named the United States of America, will endure forever; an unwise conclusion, I assure you. Nations, like everything else, have their morning, their noon, and their night of life, and the only way we can stay the lengthening shadows of this Nation to-day is by keeping our people in harmony with its fundamental principles and desires. When this Nation shall go the way of the other nations of the earth it will not be because some hostile foe has come across the waters and sunk our ships. It will not be because our valiant Army has been defeated upon the shore, but it will come in the form of revolution; come from within and not from without. When that sad day shall come to curse the earth, and this Republic of freedom and liberty shall go down to wreck and ruin, a mighty tower should be erected out on the great highways of the earth, and in that tower the bells should never cease to toll, and on it should be written in letters of black, as an emblem of sadness and warning:

The Government of the United States of America was lost by reason of the lack of patriotism of her people.

[Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KINDEL].

Mr. KINDEL. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the Members of the House and Senate of the United States can not, in justice to themselves, to the people they represent, or to the principles of democracy for which they stand, pass the Burnett immigration bill as it now stands.

There is much in this bill that is objectionable, but the chief bone of contention, as we all know, is the clause concerning the so-called illiteracy test.

Much has already been said on the subject, and I can but add my convictions in the matter.

The Burnett-Dillingham bill has for its object the restriction of immigration to our country, and with this object in view its authors have proposed a test of the literacy of those applying for admission to our shores. We all know that our Nation is a Nation of immigrants; immigrants were our first colonists; immigrants, those strong, sturdy people who fought for the freedom of our country and whose sons have kept that freedom intact ever since its gaining. Were these people literate or illiterate? No one stopped to ask that question. Immigrants to-day form the bankbone of our Nation, yet we talk of excluding these seekers of homes and new opportunities on the grounds that they are unable to read or write. Can this be a just test of any man's ability to become an honest, industrious, and law-abiding citizen?

The contention has been made that we compel our native-born children to attend the public schools before attaining citizenship, and we should require the foreigner to possess some substantial education before admitting him to enjoy a part of our country's benefits. It has been observed that many of the people who come to our shores are illiterate because opportunities have been denied them. They have no opportunities to learn to read or write, and in coming to our country they are really trying to free themselves from the conditions which have so restricted them. They are eager to learn and to give to their children that which has been denied them. Therefore I say, Mr. Chairman, our doors should be open to all those who are of good character, healthy and strong, and desirous of earning a good living, and if a literacy test must be made it should be applied at the time of naturalization, when sufficient time has elapsed to give the immigrant an opportunity to prove his purpose by taking advantage of the opportunities here offered him.

Again, the argument is advanced of overcrowded conditions in certain of our cities, caused by this influx of humanity from foreign shores. According to this bill, we are willing to spend, perhaps, more than a million of dollars in increasing the force of immigration officers so as to take care of the immigrants after the manner provided for in the bill. I say, why not use this money to establish a bureau which will have for its purpose the advising and directing of the immigrant, shielding him from impositions, and, instead of allowing all newcomers to settle in these few congested districts, aiding in distributing them in those parts of the country where we most need their help.

There can be no doubt that we have great need of such labor as these people who are coming to our land can and will do. Our native-born citizens are seemingly too far advanced to do the manual labor which our immigrants perform willingly and well, for the mere fact that a man is illiterate does not imply that he is unable to work efficiently and faithfully.

We are right in excluding the morally or physically unfit from our land, but until it can be said that all our territory is filled and that we have no more need of manual labor in the further development of the land, we will not only be doing an injustice to future immigrants, but to our own citizens as well, by refusing admission to voluntary immigrants who come here in the hope of realizing their ideals of freedom and who hope to find here the opportunities for advancement denied them in their mother countries. So much has been said on this subject that I conclude my brief remarks by referring to and indorsing the able argument of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN], appearing in the RECORD, page 2601.

Mr. SABATH. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, in view of the expressed sentiment in favor of restriction of immigration, I sincerely hope that sentiment is not based in any way on the fact that the present Connecticut delegation is made up of KENNEDY, DONOVAN, LONERGAN, MAHAN, and REILLY. [Laughter and applause.]

I am opposed to this bill principally because of the illiteracy test. In the name of 35,000 citizens of Italian birth or parentage; in the name of 10,000 people of Polish birth or parentage; in the name of 10,000 people of French-Canadian birth or parentage; in the name of 10,000 people of Jewish birth or parentage; in the name of 50,000 people of German birth or

parentage; in the name of 70,000 people of Irish birth or parentage in the district I have the honor to represent, I protest against this bill. In the name of all people who still believe that this is the land of the free, I protest against this un-American measure. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I might have referred to these people as Jewish-Americans, as Polish-Americans, as German-Americans, as French-Americans, as Irish-Americans, if I saw fit, but I do not believe in a hyphenated Americanism. [Applause.] We are all Americans as soon as we come here and assume the duties of citizenship.

The test of character, as has been well said, is not education. The fundamental principles of good citizenship are good character and good health. Yet this bill will keep out those of good character and good health, but will allow the mental crook, the educated rascal, to come in. [Applause.]

This is not a fair and honest bill. If it were, it would come out in the open and declare what it really means, namely, complete restriction of immigration. Why, then, put in a literacy test? Why not restrict without trying to dodge behind this mental examination, this literacy or educational knowledge?

There has been no general demand for this bill. Two Presidents have seen fit to veto a similar bill, and I sincerely hope that a third President will do likewise. I am not authorized to speak for him, and I do not believe the gentleman from Mississippi was yesterday authorized to speak for him when he said he would sign it. I simply hope that the President will veto this legislation that is so absolutely un-American in its illiteracy test. If the test of Americanism were to be direct descendency from Plymouth Rock, few would be found to meet it, and if the permanency of American institutions were to depend on that there would not be a rush to take out a longevity insurance on them. [Laughter.] If this test had prevailed 50 or 60 years ago, how many of us would be here to-day? I am sure I would not be, because my father, through no fault of his, but because of conditions he could not control in the land of his birth, was not able to read when he came here. But he learned soon after, and he saw to it, poor, hard-working man though he was, that his children also learned to read and write, and they received the benefit of a common-school education, the best his means afforded. If this bill had been a law half a century ago a great portion of the best citizenship of the United States would not be in evidence to-day.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] says he is in favor of Americans "creating their own immigration." It is a good thing the perpetuity of the Republic does not depend solely upon American propagation—American in the sense the advocates of this bill talk. The genial gentleman from Alabama, who defends this bill with its literacy test, has one child; there are seven children in the Reilly family. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen have made all kinds of pathetic appeals and have harked back to the days of Know-Nothingism and resorted to every possible harsh and prejudiced argument for the purpose of trying to defeat this bill.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE], with tears in his voice—and I noticed the tears were responded to by some gentlemen near him who thought as he did—pictured the awful conditions of some of the poor aliens if not permitted to come to this country. Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention and the attention of this House to a picture nearer home.

Mr. Morrison, secretary of the Federation of Labor, when he was before our committee the other day in support of this bill, referring to the native Americans and old immigrants that once worked in the mines and other industries of a district in Pennsylvania, gave us this picture:

> I was through that district a number of years ago, when the strike was on and the fight was made, and I saw conditions there that I wish the members of the committee could have seen. The strike was on for many months. The coal barons, men on horseback, to my way of viewing it, incited trouble by riding through the men who were marching, clubbing them, shooting in the air, and doing other things that would cause the strikers to either say or do something that would bring them within the pale of the law. I do not want to give you a gruesome picture, but I put in one of the saddest hours of my life when I went to the camp where those people had been on strike. It was after a rainstorm which had happened the night before. The water soaked through the tents into the beds and the floors where the tents were cast were nothing but mud. I saw hundreds of women there in bare feet, without shoes. I saw little children cold and crying on their mothers' breasts. As I say, I am Scotch, and I have been taught, since I was big enough to stub my toe, that any man that shows any feeling or sheds a tear is unmanly; but I want to tell you that I choked when I saw these people suffering in that way and was informed that the coal barons desired to drive them out of that district.

Mr. Chairman, by whom were they displaced? By the very element that this bill will keep out. Men of America, whether you be foreign born or not, these men were of your blood. They are of our people; they are of our blood; they are of the kind that the gentleman from Colorado spoke of the other day as the old immigrants driven out by recruits from southern Europe. They are the kind that are being driven out in Michigan by these imported grasshoppers who come and leave year by year. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], it seems to me, weakened his case when he referred to the hundreds of thousands that go out from here every year and return to their own countries. They are the kind we object to; they are birds of passage, that come here and beat down the wages and break down the standards of living of the American laborer, and then fold their tents like the Arabs and silently steal away, and steal everything else they can lay their hands on. [Laughter.] These are the men the bill seeks to provide against. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] says that the law that we have is all-sufficient, and he and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] recite its various provisions. Gentlemen, does the law keep them out when six hundred and twenty thousand came in during the last four months? When fourteen hundred thousand came in during the last 12 months, does it keep them out? Does it work the purpose that this bill seeks to do—that is, keep out the men who break down the price of labor and contaminate the very fountains of our civilization and demoralize the moral conditions of our country?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield, because I have only a short time, and I must decline to yield.

Mr. Chairman, this test is fair, and it is certain. The law excluding those liable to become a public charge, referred to by gentlemen on this floor, is of such a character that the immigrant does not know whether he will be declared a public charge until he gets here, but every man before he leaves the other side knows whether he can read his own language or dialect, and the steamship companies, who say that they do not know whether people are insane or diseased, can easily know whether these people can read their own language or dialect, and they will see to it that they are kept out if they can not read.

It has been said by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] that this test would do nothing, as the steamships would simply substitute the literate alien for the illiterates. If the steamship companies do not think there are teeth in this bill, why is it that their agents with gum shoes are going through this Capitol and through the Office Building trying to thwart the passage of the bill?

Mr. Chairman, I have here, but I will not take time to read it, a letter from a representative of an Irish organization in Brooklyn, sent last year, directed to Mr. Sulzer, when he was here, stating that he, Mr. Sulzer, was misrepresenting the Irish people of that district when he contended that they were against this bill. I have a letter from Louis W. Dongres, an editor of Chicago, who states that, notwithstanding the contention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to the contrary, the Bohemians of that city and of this country are in favor of this bill. I have here, Mr. Chairman, petitions from 14,000 people in New York City asking for the passage of this bill, and, as Mr. Morrison said when he was before our committee, many of them are aliens themselves, who believe that this thing has gone far enough and that there ought to be some check put to it. I have here petitions with several thousand names from the city of New Orleans, represented by able and distinguished gentlemen, appealing to them to protect the workingmen of that city against the crowd of immigrants that is coming into our country.

Gentlemen have sought by what seems to me harsh and unjust attacks upon me and my State to try to create a prejudice against this bill. Mr. Chairman, if I can secure for the people of my country in the South immunity from the conditions that pervade so many sections of the North, I am willing to be the goat at whom these gentlemen may level their little flings if they desire to do so. Gentlemen on this floor have tauntingly referred to illiteracy in Alabama, and especially in my district, but they were not fair enough to look up the literacy among the younger white people of my State and district between the ages of 10 and 20, but take the illiteracy of all my people generally. Perhaps they do not know, though some of us do who were children during that terrific fratricidal war which bedewed my country with the blood of brave men who wore the blue and of brave men who wore the gray—perhaps they do not know the conditions that prevailed then and for many years after that awful war. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] somewhat unfairly taunted the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], who, at my solicitation, sits at my right, to aid in securing the passage of this bill, with the fact that he had defended the South more than he—Mr. MURRAY—had heard any New England man do in regard to the Civil War,

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has often been South and has learned of the fearful conditions that once prevailed there. He has learned of the poverty and distress that once enshrouded my people of the South, and though he is of a party different from that which controls in the South, he is brave enough and fair enough to do us justice. Would that some Democrats could do the same.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield; I have not the time to spare. I do not want to be diverted from this proposition. Mr. Chairman, the old Confederate soldiers came home from that war to devastated and ruined fields. They came to find their property gone. They came to start anew to rise Phœnix-like from the ashes of their adversity. Those were men of courage, those were the days that tried men's souls. I was one of the boys then myself, and perhaps you were, Mr. Chairman—I do not know—but 60 milestones have just passed behind me, and I remember those dark days; I remember when my countrymen scarcely had bread upon which to live. Those were the days when the illiterates in my country came up, and it is unkind and unjust in gentlemen, for the purpose of trying to excite prejudice in the minds of men from the North, to make such unkind flings at a devastated country and at a ruined people, who were overthrown by superior numbers. [Applause.]

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield. I have already stated that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen have referred with great glee to the literacy of the children of the foreigners, but are not fair enough to tell you that in a large majority of cases that high percentage is by reason of the fact that those are the children of literate parents. The illiterates that this bill strikes down are people a majority of whom do not bring their wives to this country. Most of those at whom this bill strikes come from southern Italy and are men who leave their wives behind them and have no children here. Hence their argument falls, because the bill does not cut out many of those whose children show such educational strides in this country.

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen have referred to the fact for the purpose of trying to excite a prejudice, that great cardinals and great prelates have inveighed against this bill. Against that argument, Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to the fact that a gentleman who appeared before our committee, P. J. McNamara, vice president of the Locomotive Firemen and Trainmen's Association, who himself is of the church to which these prelates and cardinals belong, said:

> Representing labor, as I do, knowing and understanding what labor needs, I appeal to this committee as the representative of more than 100,000 firemen.

And he said that in that organization and the organization of the railway conductors and trainmen more than 100,000 of them belong to that same church.

I wish I had time to say a little about a Mr. Scharf, who has been going through the offices trying to play that same kind of politics and get up a religious scare. I will read just one extract from what that splendid Catholic gentleman and gallant Knight of Columbus, Representative BEN JOHNSON, of Kentucky, has said about Emil Scharf, Ph. D., and so forth, and so forth, who has been trying to frighten Members of Congress into voting against this bill. Scharf had been lobbying for a certain bill and trying similar methods to secure its passage to those he is now using to try to defeat this bill. Mr. JOHNSON said:

> I wish to warn this House against a lobbyist, a man who is lobbying for the passage of this bill that is now up, and who lobbies for various other bills that come along, and then in the meantime offers to deliver to any candidate who will pay him a monetary consideration the Catholic vote and the vote of the Order of the Knights of Columbus in the United States, which I know he can not do. In justice to the membership of this House I wish to make this statement.

But the day of such lobbyists as Scharf has passed, and his threats fall impotent at the feet of those against whom they are leveled.

Mr. Chairman, most of the taunts and flings that have been hurled at me I have borne in silence unless they were such that no self-respecting gentleman could fail to fling back. But when my people are ridiculed because of the illiteracy for which they are not responsible, I would be recreant to the trust that they have reposed in me did I not defend them. They want this legislation because they hope that the scum of southern Europe may be turned back before their sons and daughters see the red flag of anarchy erected in their midst. We are told that the illiteracy test will not keep out the Black Hand leaders. It will not; but there are other sections of the bill that will, and the illiteracy test will keep out thousands of those who are pliant tools in the hands of Black Hand leaders. It will keep out those who at Lawrence, Mass., a few months ago, followed the flags on which were emblazoned: "No God, no law, no master."

A gentleman representing the Order of Railway Conductors recently told me that he and his sister 20 years ago worked in the textile mills at Lawrence, and that it was then perfectly proper for respectable girls to work there. But he said that since the low class of foreigners had driven the Americans and the old Europeans from these mills it had become the breeding ground for the white-slave trade and that few decent girls want to live within that contaminating atmosphere.

Gentlemen have said in this debate that Americans would no longer do the class of work that the immigrant from southern Europe does.

Mr. Chairman, this is not true. Go with me to the hills of north Alabama and I will show you thousands of white men, honest, brave, and true, working in the mines, on the railroads, at the furnaces, on the farms, and at all the honest avocations of life.

As I have had occasion to say before, if you will go with me to Alabama City and to Pell City, two beautiful little cotton-mill cities in my district, I will show you girls and women working in the mills whose characters are as pure as the driven snow. Only a few weeks ago I had the honor of speaking to an audience of four or five hundred men working at the car shops in my home town. They were my neighbors and my friends, and I was proud to call them such.

There was not a Greek or Italian face in the crowd, and Mr. Portner, the superintendent, a splendid Irish gentleman himself, told me with pride that he did not and would not employ a dago in all that plant. The great and splendid Farmers' Union United American Mechanics ask for it. I was made happy to-day by receiving the following telegram from a council in my home town:

GADSDEN, ALA., *February 4, 1914.*

JOHN L. BURNETT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Gadsden Council, No. 14, Junior Order United American Mechanics, indorses immigration bill and urge you to use utmost effort to retain literacy test.

JUNIOR ORDER No. 14.

The great labor organizations urge it. Thousands of farmers, mechanics, laborers, business and professional men have urged me to pass it. A few months ago a large meeting of farmers and business men in my home city unanimously adopted a resolution commending me for refusing to give up the chairmanship of the Committee on Immigration to take the chairmanship of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

In the famous Mulhall lobby investigation by Congress last summer it was testified that I was one of seven Members of Congress singled out by the lobbyists for defeat. I have no doubt but that the steamship companies were behind this conspiracy to bring about my destruction. I have felt the keen edge of their opposition at every step in the progress of this bill. Their emissaries are in the galleries to-day watching every move that we make. When we defeat them in this House they will concentrate their forces against the bill in the Senate. When the bill passes that body they will lay siege upon the White House. God grant that their wicked schemes may be thwarted and that the voice of the people may triumph.

Mr. Chairman, I had rather be known as the father of this bill than of the currency or the tariff bills, for I feel that the very foundations of our Republic are being endangered unless this legislation prevails.

Right must and will triumph, and if I can give to my children and children's children the heritage of the good name that this bill will entitle me to I can say, "Lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, since I have seen the salvation of the Lord."

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the word "alien" wherever used in this act shall include any person not a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States; but this definition shall not be held to include Indians not taxed or citizens of the islands under the jurisdiction of the United States. That the term "United States" as used in the title as well as in the various sections of this act shall be construed to mean the United States, and any waters, territory, or other place subject to the jurisdiction thereof, except the Isthmian Canal Zone; but if any alien shall leave the Canal Zone and attempt to enter any other place under the jurisdiction of the United States, nothing contained in this act shall be construed as permitting him to enter under any other conditions than those applicable to all aliens. That the term "seaman" as used in this act shall include every person signed on the ship's articles and employed in any capacity on board any vessel arriving in the United States from any foreign port or place.

That this act shall be enforced in the Philippine Islands by officers of the general government thereof designated by appropriate legislation of said government.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the semicolon after the word "States," on line 5, page 1, and insert a comma, and after the comma insert the words "or one who has not resided continuously in the United States for a period of at least five years."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted, and I hope it will be, it will eliminate the hardships which, if this bill passes in its present form, will be imposed upon thousands and thousands of our people who have resided in this country for many, many years. As I stated yesterday on the floor of this House, under the definition of the word "alien" appearing in this bill it would be absolutely impossible for people who are not native-born or naturalized citizens, though they may have resided here for many years, to enter our shores again after returning from what may have proven to be their last earthly visit to father, mother, brother, or sister, who reside abroad, without being subjected to all of the drastic provisions of this bill. I do not think it was intended that we should impose these hardships upon people who are part and parcel of us. We know the conditions here, and we also know that frequently they can not be changed. Many of these people have resided in our country, as I have said, for 10, 15, or 20 years, and due to the conditions existing in the sections of our country where they have resided it has been absolutely impossible for them to become naturalized.

It is for these deserving people that I am pleading, and I hope that the chairman of the committee, as well as the rest of you gentlemen, will vote in favor of this amendment. As you will observe, I provide that they must reside here at least five years before they shall have the same privileges as a naturalized citizen or one of native birth as far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I will.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Would that deny the right of voting under a declaration of intention?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, yes. This will deny the right of anyone who is not a naturalized citizen to vote; but that question does not enter into this matter. What I am trying to bring out is that unless this amendment is adopted these people who have not become naturalized will be unjustly discriminated against when they seek to return to this country after a short visit to their native land, for they will be forced to comply with all of the drastic regulations of this bill, and I maintain that this is not fair and equitable.

I do not think it was the original intention of the committee to go as far as they did.

Mr. MADDEN. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MADDEN. It would be a good plan, in addition to what my colleague has already stated in his amendment, to add:

Those who have resided in the United States for five years and have declared their intention to become citizens.

Mr. SABATH. I am willing to accept that amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. I think that is what ought to be in here.

Mr. SABATH. I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer to amend the amendment to that extent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GARDNER. I raise the point of order that the gentleman has not the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] yielded to his colleague [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. GARDNER. Not for the purpose of offering an amendment. I wish to be heard in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman yielded to his colleague for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. Then he must yield the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. But I wish to be recognized under the rules to reply. Under the rules he must be recognized for five minutes, and then whoever first obtains the floor to reply is recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Am I recognized to offer my amendment now?

The CHAIRMAN. Not until the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has gotten through.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, so far as the definition of the word "alien" is concerned, this bill does not change existing law except as to verbiage. For years the law has been interpreted to mean that any alien, no matter how long he may have lived in this country, if he sees fit to travel abroad, must on his return be subjected to just the same examination as any newly arrived alien. In other words, we do not propose, except in the case of our own citizens, to allow men to go abroad and then, on their return, escape the salutary safeguards which we have thrown around the influx of aliens.

It is true that this question of the rights of resident aliens has been a matter of dispute. A number of times it has been brought before the court to decide whether or not a resident alien, on his return to this country, should be held to be subject to the rules which govern the admission of immigrant aliens. Many persons have claimed that an alien who has resided here 10 years has the right to journey abroad without being subject to any restrictions as to his readmission. In other words, it has often been claimed that an alien of the kind described has, so far as admission to the United States is concerned, the same rights as an American citizen. However, the Supreme Court of the United States has decided that resident aliens, if they desire to go abroad without having taken the previous precaution of becoming naturalized, must do so at their own risk.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me call your attention to another result which would ensue from the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. If his amendment is adopted, we can not deport prostitutes or procurers after they have resided here for five years. As the law stands at present, procurers or prostitutes may be deported so long as they are aliens. If this amendment is adopted, it will be impossible to deport any alien when more than five years subsequent to his arrival have elapsed, because by the terms of this section he will have acquired the privileges of an American citizen, so far as the immigration law is concerned.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman means the deportation of those prostitutes, and so on, in accordance with an act which we passed, which I, together with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNETT], succeeded in passing in the Sixty-first Congress. Is not that true, I will ask the gentleman?

Mr. GARDNER. That is right.

Mr. SABATH. And the same proviso was drafted by me.

Mr. GARDNER. It is in section 19 of this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to his colleague?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to have any amendment put through that will permit the permanent residence of prostitutes and procurers; but the gentleman knows that there is real hardship in admission to citizenship through the naturalization courts on the part of many aliens who sincerely desire to become citizens. Can not the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] meet the objection in regard to prostitutes and procurers that my colleague makes, and if it can not meet that objection, why can it not?

Mr. GARDNER. Of course, the gentleman's suggestion is an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that females can not apply for citizenship.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, yes, they can; and so can the procurers.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Then why not expressly say, "excepting the prostitutes and procurers"?

Mr. GARDNER. No; I think that would be dangerous.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. We will join with you in remedying that defect. Will you not join with us on the rest of it?

Mr. GARDNER. No; of course I shall not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which the Clerk has in his possession.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of the amendment the words, "and has declared his intention to become a citizen," so that the amendment to the amendment will read, "or one who has not resided continuously in the United States for a period of at least five years and has declared his intention to become a citizen."

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say, in respect to this amendment, as suggested to be amended, that if a person comes to this country and declares his intention to

become a citizen and is for any reason called out of the country within the five-year period there ought not to be anything in the law which would prohibit him from reentering the country unless there was something in his life which justified his exclusion. It would be unfair to say that a man who has declared his intention to become an American citizen and has lived here during the period of five years and was unable to complete his citizenship during that period and happened to be called out of the country before he had been able to complete his citizenship ought not to be permitted to enter this country. It would be a great hardship, a great injustice, and there is no reason, if we want to be fair in the enactment of the law that we now have under consideration, we should make the fullest possible provision to protect men who do want to become citizens of the United States and have declared their intention to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "ayes" seemed to have it.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division. I did not know that the gentleman was through. I wanted to be heard on the amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama be heard on the amendment.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has the right to be heard.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I ask, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, at the end of the amendment, the words "and has declared his intention to become a citizen."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is recognized.

Mr. BURNETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard in opposition to that, because it seems to me it makes it ridiculous.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The House has voted, or, rather, the committee has voted, and a division was demanded. I make the point of order that the only thing before the House is the division on the vote, on the declaration of the Chairman, on the amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. The negative had not been put.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; it had.

Mr. GARDNER. I leave that question to the Chair.

Mr. MADDEN. The Chair declared the amendment carried.

Mr. MANN. Where a division is asked after a viva voce vote and debate has not been closed, debate is in order until the negative is put on the division. If the gentleman from Kentucky will think for a moment, he will remember that to be the fact.

Mr. SHERLEY. I have no memory of anything of the kind. When a vote is had, in the absence of a division the Chair states the result of the viva voce vote, and that determines the result. Now, to say that a division can be demanded and thereby open up the debate is a proposition I never heard of before.

Mr. MANN. That is the parliamentary rule which the gentleman will find in Jefferson's Manual, because when a division is demanded there is no final vote until the negative is taken on that division. Of course if debate had been closed, that would be another proposition, but debate had not been closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert between the words "United States"——

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman can offer a substitute.

Mr. BURNETT. A division had been ordered.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now the gentleman is taking the other side of his own point of order. The gentleman wanted to open the matter up in order to debate it and I wanted to close it.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts rises to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GARDNER. Is this a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois on my right [Mr. SABATH] or a substitute for the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois on my left [Mr. MADDEN]?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. This is a substitute for the matter before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands this is offered as a substitute for the two pending amendments.

Mr. GARDNER. Has the Chair considered the parliamentary effect of that?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has a right to offer a substitute.

Mr. GARDNER. He has a right to offer a substitute for either one of the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has a right to offer a substitute for the two amendments.

Mr. GARDNER. I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks otherwise. Of course the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] can be perfected first before the substitute is put, but that does not prevent the gentleman from New York from offering a substitute for the whole matter. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert between the words "United States" and the word "That," on line 7, page 1, the following: "Nor shall it include anyone who has continuously resided in the United States for a period of five years and who has, under the naturalization laws, declared his intention of becoming a citizen of the United States, and who is not subject to deportation or exclusion for any immoral or criminal act, as in this act provided.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I have heard some criticism from the gentleman from Alabama upon the amendments that have been offered. To meet such criticism, I have offered this substitute. The effect of the substitute will be that if one who declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States and who resided continuously in the United States for a period of five years, and who has not committed, either on the other side or this side of the water, any immoral or criminal act for which he could have been either excluded or deported under the law, then the term "alien" as used in this bill shall not apply.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I want to ask the gentleman if he uses the word "continuously" or "continually" in his amendment?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. "Continuously." Those who were admitted into this country, took up their habitation here, remained in the United States for five years, committed no act on the other side which would have subjected them to exclusion, or immoral or criminal conduct, and who did not commit any crime or immoral act for which they could be deported, ought not be subjected to the hardships that frequently come to aliens who have not gone through such five years' actual residence in this country and are free from all immoral or criminal taint.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman from Missouri rise to oppose the amendment?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I do not.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard in opposition to the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a misconception as to what the amendment will do to existing law. What the gentleman proposes to do is to amend the law as we have had it for many years. As the law stands to-day if a man comes here and lives with us for 10 years and then goes back to Italy, before we readmit him to the United States we have the right to ask him, "Are you a contract laborer? Are you diseased? Are you a pauper?"

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield? The Supreme Court has simply said that that is the law and not that it ought to be the law; and we are simply trying to write a milder law than the present law.

Mr. GARDNER. I have not said anything to the contrary.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. The gentleman is referring to this as the existing law and bringing in a Supreme Court declaration, saying that it ought to be the law.

Mr. GARDNER. I do not think the gentleman has listened to what I said.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. That is one thing that I did do.

Mr. GARDNER. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed. I was trying to explain to the House that under existing law, if an alien goes abroad to-day, he goes at his own risk. When he comes back we say, "Are you diseased, are you a contract laborer, are you a pauper?" Now comes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE], who proposes that we shall no longer be permitted to question the returning alien. He insists that we must give an alien who has for a few years resided here the same privileges as we accord to a citizen of the United States returning homeward. If the alien is diseased, if he has tuberculosis, if he is a contract laborer, we must nevertheless admit him to our shores.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GARDNER. That is the whole effect of your amendment. You remove resident aliens who may travel abroad from the operation of this law. Obviously you remove them from the operation of section 3, which seeks to exclude diseased aliens and contract laborers. American citizens have the right to enter this country whether they are diseased or not and whether they are contract laborers or not. You seek to give resident aliens the same privilege as American citizens.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I am sure that even the advocates of this bill will vote for the proposed amendment if they could all understand what it really contemplates. Let us take a concrete case. An immigrant who has taken every legal step to become a citizen of this country by having filed his application in the proper court is called abroad for some reason before he can complete the process of becoming a citizen, and while abroad contracts innocently some sort of a disease. He may be run over by a railroad train while traveling abroad, and when he gets back to our country, unless this amendment is adopted, he would be excluded because physically defective, although he may have established a business in this country, and although his application for citizenship is pending in the courts. Therefore, unless this amendment be adopted, it would be a great hardship for many who really need our protection. I hope sincerely that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that the discussion of this proposed amendment does not reach the real question involved. For instance, this is a definition of the word "alien":

That the word "alien" whenever used in this act shall include any person not a native-born or naturalized citizen of the United States.

Then the substitute proposes to take out of the definition of an alien a person who has lived here "continuously" for five years and who has made an application for citizenship. Certainly such definition of an "alien" should include any individual who is not a citizen. All persons who are not citizens should be regarded as "aliens," and therefore, as it reaches the question of definition, I do not think the amendment should be adopted, because when a man becomes a citizen under the Supreme Court decisions you can not limit that citizenship unless it is upon some act performed by the person. So that citizenship is in the nature of a vested right, and yet you give such vested right to a man who is not a citizen, either naturalized or natural, but you give him that vested right because he has resided here for five years.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Oh, no—and who has declared his intention to become a citizen.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Wait until I get through—and who has declared his intention to become a citizen. Certainly you ought not to take out of the definition of what an "alien" is a man who does not meet all of the obligations of citizenship.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. In some States of the Union men who have declared their intention to become citizens are permitted to vote. Is not that true?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. That is true in some States.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. In a moment. The question of State law relating to the matter of suffrage, where one is presumed to come from some other State, and who does come within the immigration law, is an entirely different question. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that an immigrant can file his declaration to become a citizen the day he lands?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I rather believe he can.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. If he does file it the day he lands, is he not likely to become a pretty good citizen?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. That does not necessarily follow.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. If he is keen enough to become a citizen the first day he lands, and makes application on that day, is he not made of the right kind of stuff to make a good citizen?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. But he should not be included within the class of citizens referred to in the definition of an alien. This section relates only to the definition.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Surely.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. It does not relate to the question of exclusion, but to the question of definition, and you ought not to upset all of the decisions of the courts for years in order to affect the question of exclusion. If you are in favor of any exclusion at all, if you are in favor of any legislation that will distinguish between a foreigner or an alien and a citizen, you certainly ought not to have the substitute offered here anyway.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman will recollect that this definition applies only to this act.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. It is a definition of an alien and a citizen.

Mr. SABATH. It is for the purpose of this act alone, and for no other purpose at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to make a statement. A few moments ago the Chair made a ruling on a point of order made by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. The parliamentary situation was this: The Chair had put the affirmative side of a question, and also the negative side, and the Chair had announced the vote, the Chair stating that he thought after having done that it would be proper to recognize gentlemen to further debate the question which had been put. The Chair upon examination finds this authority, and this is the only authority he does find. In Jefferson's Manual, section 39, it is said:

After the Speaker has put the affirmative part of the question, any Member who has not spoken before to the question may rise and speak before the negative be put, because it is no full question until the negative part be put.

The Chair thinks, under that authority, the Chair was in error in overruling the point of order made by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MANN. Before the Chair makes the ruling to that effect, permit me to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that when a division is demanded and a viva voce vote is taken and vacated and the question has to be resubmitted, the rule has been—and it has been annunciated more than once from that chair—the viva voce vote having been vacated, debate is in order then until the negative is put.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois furnish the Chair the authority for that?

Mr. MANN. I am not sufficiently interested to take the time to look it up, I will say to the Chair.

Mr. BURNETT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURNETT. What is the parliamentary status of the question? I asked for a division.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] offered an amendment, to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] offered an amendment, to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] offered a substitute. The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MADDEN) there were—ayes 55, noes 68.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the gentleman who proposed this amendment as to what it will do if adopted, and I am very sure the gentleman would not wish this adopted if he fully understood what it will accomplish. Turning to page 8, the literacy section, if this amendment is adopted it will prevent any alien under the present definition, a man who has lived here five years, and declared his intention to become a citizen—will prevent him from sending abroad for any member of his family if such member of his family can not comply with the literacy test. That section reads:

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language, or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish.

And then a proviso is made in favor of any alien or any alien heretofore or hereafter legally admitted, or any citizen of the United States, permitting him to send for his family, but where would it leave this man that you are now trying to protect? He would be neither an alien nor a citizen, and the proviso would not apply to him.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. Why can not we attend to that when we reach that particular provision?

Mr. LENROOT. I am speaking of the definition.

Mr. SHERLEY. But we will reach that.

Mr. LENROOT. This is only one of the results that would happen from the bill.

Mr. SHERLEY. The bill has not been passed. We can not reach them all at one time.

Mr. LENROOT. That is true, I will say to the gentleman, but I do not believe these gentlemen would care to press the amendment and take the chance on doing grievous injury to hundreds of thousands of aliens under the present definition of the law. I do not think they would take the chance that that would be remedied later on, because if it was not remedied it would cut them out from the protection given by this bill itself as it now stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. May I ask the gentleman in reference to just what this means concerning the Philippine Islands? What will be the effect? The bill states this act shall be enforced in the Philippine Islands by officers of the general government thereof designated by appropriate legislation of said government. I assume——

Mr. BURNETT. That is existing law.

Mr. MANN. I assume that means the Philippine Legislature, not the United States Government.

Mr. BURNETT. That is my understanding, and that is the way it has been construed, as I understand, by the department.

Mr. GARDNER. That is the act of February 6, 1905.

Mr. MANN. What will be the effect, then, if the Legislature of the Philippine Islands does not provide appropriate legislation? I take it this in effect is intended to leave to that legislature the determination whether this bill, if enacted, shall be enforced.

Mr. BURNETT. My understanding is we have provided for it, and that it is in effect now in the present law; and I should think it would continue in effect, just as it is now, in this law.

Mr. MANN. That may be. I asked for information.

Mr. BURNETT. That is my opinion.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That there shall be levied, collected, and paid a tax of $5 for every alien, including alien seamen regularly admitted as provided in this act, entering the United States. The said tax shall be paid to the collector of customs of the port or customs district to which said alien shall come, or, if there be no collector at such port or district, then to the collector nearest thereto, by the master, agent, owner, or consignee of the vessel, transportation line, or other conveyance or vehicle bringing such alien to the United States, or by the alien himself if he does not come by a vessel, transportation line, or other conveyance or vehicle. The tax imposed by this section shall be a lien upon the vessel or other vehicle or carriage or transportation bringing such aliens to the United States, and shall be a debt in favor of the United States against the owner or owners of such vessel or other vehicle, and the payment of such tax may be enforced by any legal or equitable remedy. That the said tax shall not be levied on account of aliens who have in accordance with law declared their intention of becoming citizens of the United States or on account of aliens who shall enter the United States after an uninterrupted residence of at least one year immediately preceding such entrance in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Cuba, or the Republic of Mexico, nor on account of otherwise admissible residents of any possession of the United States, nor on account of aliens in transit through the United States, nor upon aliens who have been lawfully admitted to the United States and who later shall go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory: *Provided*, That the Commissioner General of Immigration, under the direction or with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, by agreement with transportation lines, as provided in section 23 of this act, may arrange in some other manner for the payment of the tax imposed by this section upon any or all aliens seeking admission from foreign contiguous territory: *Provided further*, That said tax, when levied upon aliens entering the Philippine Islands, shall be paid into the treasury of said islands, to be expended for the benefit of such islands: *Provided further*, That in the cases of aliens applying for admission from foreign contiguous territory and rejected, the head tax collected shall upon application be refunded to the alien: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to aliens arriving in Guam or Hawaii; but if any such alien, not having become a citizen of the United States, shall later arrive at any port or place of the United States on the North American Continent the provisions of this section shall apply.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 15, strike out the words "including alien seamen."

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very unfair to charge a poor sailor, who enters a port and stays there for a week, $5. When he comes into the port of New York or any other port of the country he spends his money. Why should we prevent him from doing so by imposing a tax of $5 on him? That is a plain question. I think that such a provision is unfair to those who go out to sea, and upon whom we all depend so much. When he comes into port we should let him spend his $5 instead of taxing him that amount.

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman entirely misinterprets the proposition. It is not intended to tax seamen who merely come off of a vessel temporarily with the expectation of returning to the vessel. It does not do that.

Mr. LEVY. This says so.

Mr. BURNETT. No. We have a provision further on in the bill for that. It has been found that ships have been actually engaged in bringing aliens over as sailors. And it has been held by our courts that an alien seaman would escape the examination and escape the head tax and escape all the restrictions the law threw around other aliens. Now, this is for the purpose of remedying that. We have several sections toward the end of the bill requiring either ship lists or manifests of all the crew, those given the protection required from the steamships against this kind of desertion. Now, they may be admitted, however, just like any other alien who appears regularly, and this is for the purpose of guarding against the desertion from ships, and levying and collecting a tax of $5 for every alien, including every alien seaman regularly admitted, as provided in this act. That is all. This requires that a man who gets in and gets in to stay will be required to pay just like anybody else.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, lines 3 to 6, inclusive, strike out the proviso.

Mr. MOORE. This is offered for the purpose of perfecting the bill. I did not notice it before. There seems to be no necessity for that proviso, because it applies to aliens who are not admitted, and of course no head tax would be levied upon an alien who is not admitted. All that is provided for in the earlier part of section 2, lines 14, 15, and 16. The proviso in this instance seems to be without meaning.

Mr. BURNETT. I did not catch the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment again.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. MOORE. The point is, there is no meaning to that proviso, since no head tax would be charged against an alien who is not admitted, that being provided for in the early part of the section.

Mr. GARDNER. Aliens are admitted into Guam and Hawaii.

Mr. MOORE. The proviso that is to be stricken out, as mentioned in the amendment—and I am offering it more for the purpose of perfecting the bill than otherwise—is:

Provided further, That in the cases of aliens applying for admission from foreign contiguous territory and rejected, the head tax collected shall, upon application, be refunded to the alien.

There will be no head tax imposed upon such an alien.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman is mistaken. The head tax is a lien on the vessel or other transportation company which brings that alien. In the case of railroads on this continent the tax is paid by the alien to the transportation company as part of his fare. The amount received by the railroad company is paid to the United States, whether the alien is admitted or rejected. On the recommendation of the Bureau of Immigration we have provided that when an alien comes here by land he shall get his $5 back again provided he is rejected.

Mr. MOORE. To whom would the alien who is rejected pay the $5?

Mr. GARDNER. He would have already paid it to the transportation company which sold him his ticket.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman think it ought to be made necessary for the alien

to ask for that money? I notice you have the words "upon application." Should not that money be paid back to him as a matter of fact, so that he would not have to depend upon his knowledge or lack of knowledge of the law?

The alien who knows he can get it on application may get the $5, but the alien who does not know—and most of them are not likely to know about it—will never get it back; and surely, it seems to me, those words, "upon application," should be stricken out even if the section should not go out.

Mr. BURNETT. That is for the convenience of the Government employees. Otherwise the Government would not know where he is.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Give it to him when you are deporting him, when you are ordering him back.

Mr. BURNETT. Suppose that money were paid into the Treasury and the man has gone.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. The Government knows where he is when it is deporting him. It is not fair to take his money away and not let him in.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the language of section 2, page 2, lines 14, 15, 16, and 17. Beginning with line 17, it says:

> The said tax shall be paid to the collector of customs of the port or customs district to which said alien shall come, or, if there be no collector at such port or district, then to the collector nearest thereto, by the master, agent, owner, or consignee of the vessel, transportation line, or other conveyance or vehicle bringing such alien to the United States, or by the alien himself if he does not come by a vessel, transportation line, or other conveyance or vehicle.

Now, the question raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] seems to be very pertinent, because if the tax goes into the Treasury I contend it will not be refunded at all if the man is required to hunt up the collector, or if there should be no collector to hunt up the master, the agent, the owner, or the consignee of the vessel or conveyance. He would have great difficulty in getting it.

Mr. GARDNER. The law does not say that the tax shall be collected *from* every alien, but that it shall be collected *for* every alien, and that it "shall be paid to the collector of customs of the port or customs district to which said alien shall come." The amount is a lien against the transportation line.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Does it not make it any easier to pay it back to him without his application?

Mr. GARDNER. The two gentlemen are talking about two different things. In a minute I shall take up the question as to the necessity of requiring that the rejected immigrant must make an application as a prerequisite to the return of his head-tax money.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman explain how it would operate in the case of an alien who comes from contiguous territory and is required to pay the head tax? In the event of the money being paid into the customhouse, how will it be refunded to him?

Mr. GARDNER. It will be refunded to him by the Government. Please listen while I read the recommendation of the Department of Commerce and Labor on this subject. The department submitted a draft for a new immigration law two years ago. The explanation accompanying the draft contained these words:

> A provision is inserted also for the refund of head tax exacted on account of aliens applying at the land boundaries; this to avoid complaints which arose under the act of 1903 from the collection of head tax on aliens who were rejected at the land boundaries, etc.

We have adopted the exact words recommended by the department, unless I am mistaken, in its draft of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts move to strike out the last two words?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is recognized in his own right.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. GARDNER. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE. The money having been collected by the steamship company or the railroad company, and having been paid into the Treasury of the United States, would the applicant for that $5 to be refunded apply to the Treasury or to the Department of Labor? Because if he has to apply to the Treasury he will have a difficult process to go through. If he has to apply to the Department of Labor the thing might be simplified. The question I put to the gentleman is this: If this money goes into the Treasury, this $5—a small amount paid by an alien residing at a distance—will he not have little chance to get it back without an act of Congress?

Mr. GARDNER. The head tax is paid to the collector of customs at the port or customs district to which the alien shall come, and the law provides that "if there be no collector at such port or district, then to the collector nearest thereto."

Mr. MOORE. Will the Treasury agent pay that money back without some authority?

Mr. GARDNER. We assumed that the law officers of the department drew the proper language for accomplishing their purpose, and we adopted their exact language.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I want to answer my other colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] first. He has waited patiently, and he has brought forward the question as to why the alien should be required to make application to have his money refunded. I am a little puzzled how to reply. Frankly, I say to the gentleman that it is impossible for anyone to keep in mind the reason for the insertion of each clause in this bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. As an original matter——

Mr. GARDNER. One moment. In conference last year, when this change was suggested, we took the matter up with Mr. Parker, law officer of the Immigration Bureau. Inasmuch as Mr. Parker originally drafted this provision, we questioned him about it. I have totally forgotten his answer.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Then let us treat it independently as a matter of right and wrong.

Mr. GARDNER. As a matter of right and wrong I should prefer to trust to the decision of the conference committee and Mr. Parker, after they had given the matter thought, rather than trust to the insufficient consideration of Members of Congress who never heard of this particular provision until this afternoon.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Yes; but it is our business to write this law. It is not our business to follow blindly the Solicitor of the Department of Labor.

Mr. GARDNER. That is very true.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Let us try it out independently as a matter of right and wrong. Is it right to give back the head tax to an immigrant who happens to know he can get it back upon application, and to withhold it from an immigrant who does not know he can get it back upon application?

Mr. GARDNER. I can not tell the gentleman whether he is correct or not. I am willing to admit that I find some difficulty in answering questions as to the reason for every word in a bill of 57 pages. I remember distinctly that this question was raised a year ago in the conference between the Senate and House on the immigration bill which President Taft later on vetoed. We had plenty of time to examine the matter. We consulted with the department, and some reason was given us for inserting those words. I confess I can not remember what that reason was, but I shall not vote to strike out those words solely because on their face they seem to be superfluous.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Massachusetts who has just taken his seat a question for my information. Apparently the paragraph now under discussion treats an alien from foreign contiguous territory differently from an alien coming from territory not contiguous. I should like to ask the gentleman why the distinction is made with regard to the refund of the tax?

Mr. GARDNER. The reason is this: Aliens coming by rail pay their head tax in addition to their fare. Aliens coming from Europe pay their head tax as part of their fare. Under the present law the tax is refunded, as I understand it, to steamship companies, who claim a refund in the case of rejected aliens for whom they have paid the head tax. When a steamer arrives in New York it has on board a great many aliens as well as a great number of citizens of the United States. The steamship companies average the passage price, and aliens and citizens pay the same amount. You or I coming into the United States by sea would pay the same passage money as an alien would pay. For each alien the steamship company would pay a head tax into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SABATH. Four dollars.

Mr. GARDNER. Four dollars.

Mr. SABATH. And under this new law it will be $5.

Mr. GARDNER. Four dollars, and under the new law it will be $5. Now, the committee believed that the European immigrant is not specifically charged with this head tax, and, moreover, it is impossible to ascertain how much in reality the European immigrant pays for head tax, inasmuch as he pays no greater steamship fare than the returning citizen of the United States.

We felt that the immigrant coming by sea direct from Europe stands upon a different footing from the immigrant coming by rail. We therefore accepted the suggestion of the department and confined this new provision for repayment to those who had specifically paid their $4 extra in addition to their railroad fare.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman a further question solely for information. If a railroad train is crossing the boundary, either on the north or south, it probably has on board passengers who are citizens of the United States and passengers who are aliens. Is there any difference in the fare those passengers pay on the railroad trains for the same accommodation?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; unless the alien has been domiciled one year in Canada or Mexico, in which case he is exempt.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Why should he be exempt for that reason?

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. How is that fact ascertained? For instance, I myself have been across the Canadian line, and when I came back no questions were asked me.

Mr. GARDNER. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I was not aware that I paid any more or less railroad fare than any other passenger.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman is mistaken. There are printed lists of questions. I myself came across the Canadian line very recently. There are printed blanks that have to be filled out.

Mr. SLAYDEN. With the permission of the gentleman from Massachusetts who has the floor, I want to say that I have crossed the border from Mexico a hundred times or more, and I have never failed to respond to a printed list of interrogatories as to my nativity, citizenship, and so forth.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. I will state that the last time I came from Canada to this country no such questions were presented to me or to any of the others in the party.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the words "upon application," in line 5, page 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 4, in line 5, by striking out the words "upon application."

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make it so that the head tax will be refunded to all aliens who may be deported. The bill, as reported by the Committee on Immigration, provides that in cases of aliens applying for admission from foreign contiguous territory and rejected the head tax collected shall, upon application, be refunded to the alien.

Some aliens may know about this provision of the law and be wise enough to apply for the $5 head tax to be refunded, but a good many aliens will not know about the provision. They will not know anything except that they are being examined for admission and rejected. I have asked my colleague why it is that a discrimination of that sort is allowed to continue in this law. The only thing I can find out as a reason is that the solicitor of the Department of Labor, who apparently drafted this bill, says that it ought to be in there. As one of the Representatives in this Chamber, I am not willing to abdicate my legislative function and allow the solicitor or anybody else to exercise that function. If there is some good reason that can be advanced why this provision should be made, I may be willing to withhold my amendment to strike it out. I say to you that the only argument I have heard is that the solicitor of the Department of Labor says that the words ought to be in, and that last year the conferees would not agree to strike out these words.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Does not the gentleman think the words might be left in in order to make up a good record?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. What does the gentleman mean?

Mr. OLDFIELD. When a man is refunded his money if he asks for it, there will be an application for its return——

Mr. MURRAY of Massachuetts. Then let him sign a receipt.

Mr. OLDFIELD (continuing). So that the officer may know that he is entitled to a return of the money.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. The gentleman is confusing a receipt with the application for a refund. The gentleman knows the difference, does he not?

Mr. OLDFIELD. It seems to me that they might as well apply for a return of it as not to apply; and why should they not?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Let us suppose a case. The gentleman and I are immigrants and we are both rejected. Let us suppose he knows about this law and I do not, because he knows so many things that I do not.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. He will admit that. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Of course he will admit it. [Laughter.] The gentleman knows the law and so will get back his $5. I do not know the law and I go off without mine. Does the gentleman think that is fair?

Mr. OLDFIELD. No; it is not fair.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. That is what happens under the law as it is now.

Mr. OLDFIELD. Does not the gentleman think that the money would be refunded unless an application is made?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Oh, the gentleman gets a lot of money paid him that he does not apply for. A man that owes him money sends him a check.

Mr. OLDFIELD. They do not send me a check; they usually send me a bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. And especially, as the gentleman near me suggests, they do not send it to him if he does not know that they owe it to him.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. May I suggest an amendment which I think would cover the objection urged by the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I would be willing to agree to an amendment.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. To provide for an application which must be furnished to him, and then there will be a record, and at the same time the immigrant will not be buncoed by this generous Government of ours?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. I do not care how it is done. I would rather have it done by the committee than to do it myself, for then I would know that it would be done. But now all they say is that the Solicitor of the Department of Labor says that these words ought to remain in. The conferees said that they ought not to be stricken out, and my colleague says that he does not know anything more about it than that. That is not a fair statement of the case. The gentleman and I as fellow Representatives have our share of the responsibility of drafting this legislation and putting it through in a proper way. We can not go back to our districts and say that that might be an injustice, but the Solicitor of Labor wanted it that way and we had to leave it so. Our people will not accept that excuse. This is a provision in the law to pay one man because he knows that it is the law and to withhold the payment from the other man because he does not know it is the law.

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts. These words were put in the bill for a purpose. That purpose is to relieve the Government from the unnecessary burden and expense of running after aliens who have been rejected and sent back to a foreign country.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCKSON. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Do they have to run after them at the time they are deporting them? They are in custody, are they not?

Mr. BROCKSON. The money might not be where he could get it at that time.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Let them give it to him at the time he is in custody.

Mr. BROCKSON. Will the gentleman ask a question, if that is what he desires to do?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. My question is, Do they have to run after the immigrant while he is in custody to be deported?

Mr. BROCKSON. The man that has him in custody does not have the money in his possession.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. He could have it in his possession, could he not?

Mr. BROCKSON. No; the deputy marshal is not a cashier.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. The deputy marshal does not deport him; it is the immigrant official that deports him.

Mr. BROCKSON. The deputy marshal?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachuetts. Do not the immigration authorities deport them?

Mr. BROCKSON. They do.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. And could not the Immigration Department pay the extra $5 at the time of deportation?

Mr. BROCKSON. It could do a great many things. Has the gentleman another question?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Yes; I have that question still unanswered.

Mr. BROCKSON. What is that?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Whether or not the Immigration Department could not pay back this money at the same time it was deporting the aliens?

Mr. BROCKSON. It might, if it collected the money and kept it in hand at the same place for that purpose.

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Very well.

Mr. BROCKSON. I am not willing to assume that this Government is going into the business of robbing unfortunate aliens of $5 who come into this country.

Mr. GORDON. That is what they are trying to do now, is it not?

Mr. BROCKSON. No; they are not. Undoubtedly, if a man is deported the Government will pay back the $5 to every man deported if he can be found at the time. The Government will give him an opportunity to request the payment. It will not try to shirk that duty; but, on the other hand, the Government officials will undertake to seek the man to pay him. Take the case of some fellow who rushes off and goes back to the other country and this $5 is left in the hands of an officer, then you would impose upon the Government the duty of keeping the $5 and seeking him out at the expense, perhaps, of many more dollars.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCKSON. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Could not the Government devise a blank upon which the immigrant could place his name and his place of residence, where the money could be sent in case of refund?

Mr. BROCKSON. It could, undoubtedly, and he would get his $5. There would be no difficulty about that.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The department has no authority to pay back, save on application. That is in existing law. That is in the proposed bill. Why not make it plain, so that the Secretary of the Department of Labor may provide a blank such as was suggested, and which the gentleman says would be all right, and then the Government, in the event of refund, could send the money to the alien at the address specified in the blank.

Mr. BROCKSON. When he had done that he would have complied with all the requirements. This bill does not require him to make a written application, but any application in person or through a friend would be sufficient.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. But why put the burden upon the alien to get back his money through a formal application, when he may not know that he is entitled to get it back?

Mr. BROCKSON. Why put the burden on the Government to search after the alien?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It might all be regulated by a printed form.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCKSON. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Suppose, on page 4, after line 5, after the word "application," these words were inserted "upon a blank which shall be furnished him," so that it would read:

The head tax collected shall, upon application upon a blank which shall be furnished him, be refunded to the alien.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] has just been to the telephone to ascertain the views of Mr. Parker, the solicitor of the department, upon this question, and he has just returned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON] has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, if I may have five minutes, I think I can explain what the Immigration Department desires.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama that he be permitted to proceed for five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Alabama begins, the intention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] is no doubt very good, but the difficulty is that the language which the gentleman seeks to employ will not reach the trouble that I think we all must concede exists.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Why not?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Not the form which is now suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts. The intention of the gentleman is to correct the evil.

Mr. SLAYDEN. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts is that there shall be provided and handed to the rejected alien at the time he is rejected——

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Oh, that is all right.

Mr. SLAYDEN. A blank form on which to prepare his application, which is notice to him that his money will be refunded.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. If you put it that way, I am content.

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is precisely what the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts means.

Mr. BROCKSON. But the alien may be rejected because he can neither read nor write, and that would be imposing upon him an additional burden, which would be unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have just called up the attorney for the Immigration Bureau, and he says, as the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON] was saying as I went out, substantially, that the reason for that was a matter of bookkeeping as much as anything else.

Along the borders of the other side we have ports of entry where these people come in. We have an arrangement with the railroad companies to collect this head tax and then the alien comes in. The railroad companies sometimes do not settle up for some time, make returns, and make their statement. Now, for the purpose of getting at the alien, thinking that they might lose him in the shuffle, they require him to make application, and I inquired further whether there was any objection to requiring that this blank be furnished the alien, and he said none whatever, so that the suggestion of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY], if it is satisfactory all around, can be agreed to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, some gentlemen are under the impression that the aliens themselves pay this tax to the different authorities. This is not so. This tax is really paid by the immigrant to the steamship company, and the steamship company then settles with the Government. This section of the bill provides, too, that the tax shall be paid to the collector of customs of the port or customs district to which said alien shall come. Now, that money is to be paid to the collector of the port. These aliens, as a rule, are within the port, but they are denied admission to our country; therefore this provision for a head tax applies to all aliens who are rejected as well as those who are admitted. Last year there were nearly 20,000 rejected, and I venture to say that the steamship companies have had returned to them by the Government every dollar that they paid in as a head tax on these aliens; but how are we to know how many or how few of these rejected immigrants really had refunded to them by the steamship companies the amount of this head tax? Now, what we are interested in is that the money shall not be kept by the steamship companies, but that it shall be returned to the unfortunate immigrants who are denied admission. Frequently they have expended practically their entire savings to purchase a ticket to this country, and then, after undergoing many hardships, they reach the end of their journey only to be turned back, often without cause or justification.

They should at least have returned to them this head tax which they have been obliged to pay, and which to them means a great deal. I do not believe we should legislate in favor of leaving it to the steamship companies. Surely, in justice to these aliens they should not be deprived of the amount they have been forced to pay as a head tax, when in fact they have been denied admission, It is for the reasons that I have stated above that I believe the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, as well as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island, should be adopted.

Mr. GORMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I will.

Mr. GORMAN. If it is a fact that this money is paid by the alien to the transportation company, why should we legislate on that matter at all? Is it not a matter of contract between the alien and the steamship company, and is it not up to him to see that he gets his money back from the steamship company, and is it not a matter with which this Congress should not have anything at all to do?

Mr. SABATH. As a rule the alien is informed that the $4 head tax goes to the Government. In a great many instances, however, he is not so informed and he does not know enough to make application for this refund. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that it is our duty to protect these people and make it as easy as possible for them to receive that which is theirs, that which they are entitled to, and which often means much to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the statement of the gentleman from Illinois shows that the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts ought not to be adopted. From the very statement it shows that the alien paid to the steamship company as part of his passage the extra $5. Now, there is no record of that except he has paid out his money to enter the United States. Where is there any record that he is going to get his money back; and, as stated by the gentlemen, why should we legislate and put in a special provision? We say the steamship company requires an extra $5 from the alien when he imports him and that we want to legislate to have him get that $5 back.

And is it not for the sole protection of the alien that this amendment is engrafted upon this bill, that when he makes his application on the ground that he has been rejected, there is the rejection, his application for admission, and here is his application for the return of the $5, and he will get his money without any question if this law is adopted as it is, rather than to turn it over to the steamship company to handle? And this applies particularly to those who come here, as provided in the bill, from contiguous territory. Contiguous territory of the United States only applies to Canada and Mexico, so far as the bill is concerned, and when coming from Canada ought they not to be able to make their written application for the money when undoubtedly they live over there, and so can receive their $5? It is paid at one place and the record is made of it, and when it is returned it comes from another source. There must be some bookkeeping in regard to this matter, and it ought to be done. It is a clean and clear protection of the alien, assuring him that he may get his money back, and certainly that is no hardship. Certainly the man coming from Canada will know that he is entitled to have his $5 when he is rejected, and the same is true with the man from Mexico. It seems to be a sympathetic argument that is being made here that because we require the $5 fee for the purpose of keeping up the system the alien ought not to be provided for and the Government ought to send out agents to hunt him up to give him his $5 back.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 5, after the word "application," insert the words "upon a blank which shall be furnished and explained to him."

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I may say that substitute is entirely satisfactory to me, because it does the very thing that I want to have done.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment?

Mr. MURRAY of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. BURNETT. It is satisfactory to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MURRAY] withdrawing his amendment? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission into the United States: All idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, epileptics, insane persons, and persons who have been insane within five years previous; persons who have had one or more attacks of insanity at any time previously; paupers; persons likely to become a public charge; professional beggars; vagrants; persons afflicted with tuberculosis in any form or with a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease; persons not comprehended within any of the foregoing excluded classes who are found to be and are certified by the examining surgeon as being mentally or physically defective, such mental or physical defect being of a nature which may affect the ability of such alien to earn a living; persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude; polygamists, or persons who admit their belief in the practice of polygamy; anarchists, or persons who believe in or advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or of all forms of law, or who disbelieve in or are opposed to organized government, or who advocate the assassination of public officials; persons who are members of or affiliated with any organization entertaining and teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government, or who advocate or teach the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either of specific individuals or of officers generally, of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character; prostitutes, or women or girls coming into the United States for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons who procure or attempt to bring in prostitutes or women or girls for the purpose of prostitution or for any other immoral purpose; persons who are supported by or receive in whole or in part the proceeds of prostitution; persons hereinafter called contract laborers, who have been induced, assisted, encouraged, or solicited to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment, whether such offers or promises are true or false, or in consequence of agreements, oral, written or printed, express or implied, to perform labor in this country of any kind, skilled or unskilled; persons who have come in consequence of advertisements for laborers printed, published, or distributed in a foreign country; persons who have been deported under any of the provisions of this act, and who may again seek admission within one year from the date of such deportation, unless prior to their reembarkation at a foreign port the Secretary of Labor shall have consented to their reapplying for admission; persons whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come, unless it is affirmatively and satisfactorily shown that such person does not belong to one of the foregoing excluded classes; persons whose ticket or passage is paid for by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign Government, either directly or indirectly; stowaways, except that any such stowaway may be admitted in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor; all children under 16 years of age, unaccompanied by one or both of their parents, at the discretion of the Secretary of Labor or under such regulations as he may from time to time prescribe; persons who can not become eligible, under existing law, to become citizens of the United States by naturalization, unless otherwise provided for by existing agreements as to passports, or by treaties, conventions, or agreements that may hereafter be entered into. The provision next foregoing, however, shall not apply to persons of the following status or occupations: Government officers, ministers or religious teachers, missionaries, lawyers, physicians, chemists, engineers, teachers, students, authors, editors, journalists, merchants, bankers, and travelers for curiosity or pleasure, nor to their legal wives or their children under 16 years of age who shall accompany them or who subsequently may apply for admission to the United States, but such persons or their legal wives or foreign-born children who fail to maintain in the United States a status or occupation placing them within the excepted classes shall be deemed to be in the United States contrary to law, and shall be subject to deportation as provided in section 19 of this act.

That after four months from the approval of this act, in addition to the aliens who are by law now excluded from admission into the United States, the following persons shall also be excluded from admission thereto, to wit:

All aliens over 16 years of age, physically capable of reading, who can not read the English language, or some other language or dialect, including Hebrew or Yiddish: *Provided*, That any admissible alien or any alien heretofore or hereafter legally admitted, or any citizen of the United States, may bring in or send for his father or grandfather over 55 years of age, his wife, his mother, his grandmother, or his unmarried or widowed daughter, if otherwise admissible, whether such relative can read or not; and such relative shall be permitted to enter. That for the purpose of ascertaining whether aliens can read the immigration inspectors shall be furnished with slips, of uniform size, prepared under the direction of the Secretary of Labor, each containing not less than 30 nor more than 40 words in ordinary use, printed in plainly legible type in the various languages and dialects of immigrants. Each alien may designate the particular language or dialect in which he desires the examination to be made, and shall be required to read the words printed on the slip in such language or dialect. No two aliens coming in the same vessel or other vehicle of carriage or transportation shall be tested with the same slip. That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the illiteracy test, to wit: All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States solely for the purpose of escaping from religious persecution; all aliens in transit through the United States; all aliens who have been lawfully admitted to the United States and who later shall go in transit from one part of the United States to another through foreign contiguous territory: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of an offense purely political, not involving moral turpitude: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act relating to the payments for tickets or passage by any corporation, association, society, municipality, or foreign Government shall not apply to the tickets or passage of aliens in immediate and continuous transit through the United States to foreign contiguous territory: *Provided further*, That skilled labor, if otherwise admissible, may be imported if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country, and the question of the necessity of importing such skilled labor in any particular instance may be determined by the Secretary of Labor upon the application of any person interested, such application to be made before such importation, and such determination by the Secretary of Labor to be reached after a full hearing and an investigation into the facts of the case; but such determination shall not become final until a period of 30 days has elapsed. Within three days after such determination the Secretary of Labor shall cause to be published a brief statement reciting the substance of the application, the facts presented at the hearing and his determination thereon, in three daily newspapers of general circulation in three of the principal cities of the United States. At any time during said period of 30 days any person dissatisfied with the ruling may appeal to the district court of the United States of the district into which the labor is sought to be brought, which court or the judge thereof in vacation shall have jurisdiction to try de novo such question of necessity, and the decision in such court shall be final. Such appeal shall operate as a supersedeas: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this law applicable to contract labor shall not be held to exclude professional actors, artists, lecturers, singers, ministers of any religious denomination, professors for colleges or seminaries, persons belonging to any recognized learned profession, or persons employed strictly as personal or domestic servants: *Provided further*, That whenever the President shall be satisfied that passports issued by any foreign Government to its citizens or subjects to go to any country other than the United States, or to any insular possession of the United States or to the Canal Zone, are being used for the purpose of enabling the holder to come to the continental territory of the United States to the detriment of labor conditions therein, the President shall refuse to permit such citizens or subjects of the country issuing such passports to enter the continental territory of the United States from such other country or from such insular possessions or from the Canal Zone:

Provided further, That nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent, hinder, or restrict any alien exhibitor, or holder of a concession or privilege for any fair or exposition authorized by act of Congress, from bringing into the United States, under contract, such alien mechanics, artisans, agents, or other employees, natives of his country, as may be necessary for installing or conducting his exhibit or for preparing for installing or conducting any business authorized or permitted under any concession or privilege which may have been or may be granted by any such fair or exposition in connection therewith, under such rules and regulations as the Commissioner General of Immigration, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, may prescribe both as to the admission and return of such persons: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to accredited officials of foreign Governments, nor to their suites, families, or guests: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall exclude the wife or minor children of a citizen of the United States.

During the reading of the above the following occurred:

Mr. TOWNER. Could we by unanimous consent agree that we might take up separately these provisions? This is a very long section and refers to very many different matters. I am quite sure it would suit the convenience of many of the Members if by unanimous consent these clauses could be taken up instead of waiting until the whole section is read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] asks unanimous consent to read the section by paragraphs. Is there objection?

Mr. BURNETT. I prefer that the entire section be read first.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] objects, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the section.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYES, Mr. GREGG, Mr. SABATH, Mr. BURNETT, and Mr. WALLIN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will first report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, amend by inserting after the word "officials," in line 8, the following:

"Or who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, was the gentleman from Alabama going to make any request or suggestion about the debate on this section?

Mr. BURNETT. I thought we would adopt the committee amendment before we did so.

Mr. MANN. If it can be done at all, it can be done now as well as at any other time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Illinois that no amendment is pending except the committee amendment.

Mr. MANN. But the committee amendment is debatable, and I have the floor, I will say to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Undoubtedly.

Mr. MANN. I just made the inquiry. I thought there might be some arrangement.

Mr. BURNETT. In regard to the literacy test, I should like very much to reach an agreement with the gentleman if I could. Of course it is regarded by gentlemen on both sides as the most important matter in the bill. For that reason I should not think it would be fair or just for me to attempt to take any advantage to cut off reasonable debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that after the amendment is offered the gentleman can arrange about the time.

Mr. MANN. I do not know how many amendments may be offered to this section, but I wondered whether it would be practicable to agree upon a time for debate on the section.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I would have to object to that.

Mr. BURNETT. I would agree to that.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does the gentleman mean to agree upon the total time to be expended on that section?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Then if that is done, would not the time spent upon these amendments be in the nature of a new general debate?

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOWLER. I make the point of order that the discussion is not germane to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. This discussion relates to "unlawful destruction of property," and that is what the amendment is about—unlawful destruction of talk. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think the discussion is germane.

Mr. MANN. Of course, if the gentleman objects, I shall not continue.

Mr. BURNETT. Has there been objection made by the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOWLER] makes a point of order, and the Chair will have to sustain it. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 5, insert in line 16, after the word "character," the following: "or who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next one.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 7, in line 4, insert after the word "chemists" and before the word "engineer" the word "civil."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, or anybody connected with the committee, why he singles out civil engineers, and not electrical or mining or other engineers? As reported, it says "civil engineers." Why make the exception as to civil engineers when mining and electrical engineers are of the same grade and efficiency and are as much needed in this country as civil engineers?

Mr. BURNETT. The application was general before as to all engineers, and by that general application it would have admitted locomotive engineers and engineers of that class, and, as they were laboring people, we thought that would permit those to come into competition with the men who were earning their living in that line of business, and we thought it ought not to be general for that reason.

Mr. STAFFORD. But, as I understand the gentleman, he has not answered my question at all. In fact, he has emphasized the need of having the language of this amendment extended. There is no reason whatsoever why you should single out civil engineers and not extend it to technical and mining engineers, and electrical engineers, and mechanical engineers.

Mr. BURNETT. Does not the gentleman think they would be embraced under the general terms "civil engineers"?

Mr. STAFFORD. No. No one would construe the words "civil engineers" as covering electrical or mining or mechanical engineers.

Mr. BURNETT. I see no objection to an amendment of that kind. It was proposed with a view to protecting the locomotive engineers. That is the reason we put that limitation in.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the word "civil." My purpose is to eliminate that, because I do not see any need of singling out any one class of engineers.

Mr. BURNETT. I object to that, because that would let in locomotive engineers.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. I was going to make the suggestion that it would accomplish that purpose by saying "engineers other than locomotive engineers."

Mr. BUTLER. That might include stationary engineers.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee or the members of the committee whether the words "technical engineers" would still keep out the class that the chairman of the committee objects to?

Mr. BURNETT. I think it would; although perhaps it might let them in. If you say "technical engineers," I am afraid of that term. I am afraid it might include a locomotive engineer or a stationary engineer, who might be regarded as a technical engineer. I do not know how that word would be construed.

Mr. TOWNER. Might the object the gentleman suggests be reached by using the word "graduate" instead of "civil" engineers? That would obviate all the difficulties and allow that class to come in.

Mr. STAFFORD. The suggestion is made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] to use the descriptive word "graduate" engineers.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is seeking to amend the provision which is said to be designed to exclude Asiatics other than Chinese.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was not so advised.

Mr. GARDNER. If the gentleman will cast his eye upon line 22 he will find the words—

Persons who can not become eligible under existing law to become citizens of the United States by naturalization.

No one except a black man or a white man can be naturalized. This proposed amendment would enlarge the scope of the clause excepting certain classes of men of other colors. These exceptions correspond substantially with the exceptions included in the Chinese exclusion act. The word "graduate" engineer would not describe the status of a man educated as an engineer in India. Perhaps it would be appropriate to amend by the insertion of the word "professional" before the word "engineer." I do not know whether it would or would not be appropriate. I suggest this amendment because I find that the Bureau of Immigration, which prepared the list of professional occupations to be excepted from exclusion, suggested the inclusion of "engineers," with the following explanation:

The term "engineer" is here used, of course, in a professional sense.

The committee felt that there was a doubt whether the word "engineer" would be interpreted as being used in the professional sense. So we inserted the word "civil." Would it not be possible to specify the kind of engineers whom we might admit as exceptions to the clause excluding all persons who can never become naturalized Americans?

Mr. STAFFORD. I should think the word "professional" would still include locomotive engineers.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, no.

Mr. GARDNER. Why not have it "electrical, mechanical, mining, or civil?"

Mr. STAFFORD. I offer an amendment to insert after the word "civil" the words "electrical, mechanical, and mining."

Mr. BURNETT. I do not like the word "mining."

Mr. PETERSON. Do you not want to strike out the word "civil"?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after the word "civil," the words "mechanical, electrical, and mining."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of the adoption of this amendment, any more than I am in favor of the exemption of a number of those who are especially relieved from the operation of this law by this paragraph. What do we propose to do, now, if we pass this amendment? We propose to enlarge the scope of the professional men who may be admitted to this country as against common laborers. We propose to cater, now, to the tutored man, the instructed man, the college man, who can pass any kind of a literary test that this Government assumes to set up. What need have we in this country for any more civil engineers or mechanical engineers or electrical engineers than we have to-day? What need have we in this country to-day for any of them?

If you are going to bar common labor that goes into the trenches, what need have we for any more ministers, religious teachers, missionaries, or lawyers? Great Scott! We have enough lawyers in this country now to do all the law business for the next 400 years. We have enough lawyers in this House to keep this country in turmoil to the end of time, if Congress continues in session. [Laughter.] Why do we want any more teachers, students, authors, editors, journalists, merchants, or bankers? The Lord knows we have a surfeit of them now. If you bar the doors to those who would come here to do the drudgery, why open the doors to men from the colleges—educated men, professional men—and ask them to come and take a front seat and tell us how to run our Government and conduct our business and all our affairs? I do not think we want to widen the field to the professional men. I think we have done enough of that in this paragraph already. If the committee will pardon me for a breach of committee confidence, I myself am responsible for having stricken out the word "journalist." I am a newspaper man, or used to be, and practiced the newspaper business. In those days a "journalist" was a man who lived up to the reputation of a newspaper man, but he did not work at it. He was a man who fattened upon the work of the active newspaper man. We do not need any more professionals in the United States. We have plenty of them now.

Mr. BROCKSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROCKSON. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania favor admitting into this country all Chinese and Japanese laborers?

Mr. MOORE. I hope the gentleman will not press that question just now, because the gentleman from California has distinctly said that he does not want that issue brought into this discussion, and I will not add to his confusion by accommodating the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. BROCKSON. Then the gentleman refuses to answer my question?

Mr. MOORE. I refuse to add to the confusion of the gentleman from California and embarrass the Democratic administration that has enough trouble on its hands now besides this particular question.

Mr. BROCKSON. I am not asking about the Democratic administration. I am asking the gentleman for his views.

Mr. MOORE. The President and the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Labor have all they want to do now to settle that question.

Mr. BROCKSON. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania has more than he wants to do to answer the question.

Mr. MOORE. I do not want to embarrass the administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was lost.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama to the language on lines 15 and 16, page 4, of the bill. It is enumerating the excludable classes. It says, "persons who have been insane within five years previous," and then it says, "persons who have had one or more attacks of insanity at any time previously." What is the use of the five-years' limitation if persons are excluded who have been insane at any time previously?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the difference is this: Insane persons are those who are insane when they come here. That is the class that is intended to be kept out there. The other is to reach those who have had spells of insanity at different times.

Mr. COOPER. But the word "previously" is used in both classes, and applies to the time before they arrive here. Five years is the first time, and then it says "at any time previously."

Mr. HAYES. I think that is in the present law.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I think that is a misprint. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. The existing law says "persons who have had two or more attacks of insanity recently," which would explain the discrepancy. I think it is a misprint, but I will look up the last year's bill to make sure.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 7, line 5, strike out the words "editors, journalists, bankers."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was considered and agreed to.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all words that appear on page 7 from line 15 to 25, inclusive, and all that appear on page 8 from line 1 to 23, inclusive, and also the word "Territory," in line 24, the same composing the so-called literacy or educational test.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, before proceeding to discuss the amendment——

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman from New York yield in order to see if an understanding can be had as to time allowed for debate on this amendment?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. My object in addressing the Chair was to ascertain what time we would take for the discussion of the amendment, which really appears to be the crucial question.

Mr. MOORE. That is what I wanted to get at.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It was stated by the chairman of the Committee on Immigration, the gentleman from Alabama, that, after all, the literacy test is the principal feature of the bill on which discussion ought to be had and a liberal time allotted. That I understand to be the attitude of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BURNETT. I think we have had a pretty liberal discussion—seven hours. I said that I would not undertake to avail myself of the privilege to move the previous question until after we had had more than the usual time. I would agree to one hour.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I do not think that that is quite enough.

Mr. MOORE. I think we ought to have half an hour on this side. There have been a number of requests on this side for time.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. There have been a number of requests on this side, too.

Mr. MOORE. May I ask whether the arrangement for time will deal only with the literacy test or the whole section?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The amendment to the literacy test?

Mr. BURNETT. No; to the whole section.

Mr. STAFFORD. I want to say to the gentleman that there are other provisions in this section to which we wish to offer amendments.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this motion is intended to strike out certain language. Under the parliamentary rules we have a right to perfect the provision before the language is stricken out. I therefore offer an amendment to perfect the text.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman offers an amendment, would it not be well to have an understanding as to the time that will be occupied upon the literacy-test provision?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. But this does not refer to that at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will indulge gentlemen until they can agree on an amount of time, and then he will recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be now reported for the benefit of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 8, line 16, after the words "to wit" strike out all words down to and including "persecution," in line 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"All aliens who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States to avoid religious persecution, whether such persecution be evidenced by overt act or by discriminatory or oppressive laws or regulations."

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I assume that that is not offered as an amendment to the amendment that I offered. I understand that to be the pending amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. We have to perfect the text of a provision before an amendment to strike it out is in order. The gentleman moves to strike it out, and the portion stricken out includes all that language down to line 23, and I offer this in order to perfect the text.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, not having been able to follow the reading very closely, I will ask the gentleman whether his amendment covers my amendment to strike out?

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. It is an amendment within the language to strike out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma proposes an amendment to perfect the text of the bill and the gentleman from New York moves to strike out. It would be in order to perfect the text, the Chair thinks, before the motion to strike out is in order.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which, I believe, is substantially that offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma, and I would like to have the amendment again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, it will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. GREGG. That is exactly my amendment.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I thought that we yielded in order that the gentleman might have an amendment pending, until we could reach an agreement as to time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama and other gentlemen to the rule which provides that there shall be seven hours of general debate, and that afterwards the bill shall be considered under the five-minute rule. The Chair would like to hear the gentleman from Alabama on the question of whether or not he thinks the committee has a right to change a rule made by the House. The Chair does not think so.

Mr. BURNETT. The rule provides that the bill shall be read under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Let the gentlemen agree on time, and not take it out of the five minutes that I am to have on my amendment.

Mr. BURNETT. Would that mean that we would have to follow the rule as to the five-minute debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. BURNETT. Whatever agreement we may make as to time would not conflict with that, that each speech should be limited to five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman would better ask unanimous consent that debate on this particular amendment offered by the gentleman from New York be confined to such time as may be agreeable.

Mr. BURNETT. That was the purpose that I was trying to get at.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the rule does not change the general rules of the House at all so far as the consideration of this bill is concerned, but we are to follow the same practice that is usually followed in the consideration of bills under the five-minute rule, and that is the practice followed in the consideration of any bill in the Committee of the Whole?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will submit his request for unanimous consent.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, we are trying to agree upon a time.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma may be again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I hope my time is not going on.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. The discussion under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY], of course, will not come out of any time that will be agreed upon, I hope, between the gentleman from Alabama and this side.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been no agreement yet made, and therefore it is impossible to take any time out.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. If there are, Mr. Chairman, two principles above others in the theory and principle of our Government, it is that it is an asylum to protect every creed and faith, and along with that is the doctrine that every creed and every religious faith shall keep its hands out of the Treasury and no church or creed shall be favored by governmental administration. This provision of my amendment is merely to change the verbiage of the bill submitted by the committee in this, that the committee's provision would leave much in the discretion of the immigration officer. Certainly in matters of religion as little discretion as possible should be permitted in an officer who may himself have religious prejudices. This provision, if construed in the light of the committee's intention, would admit to this country the Jews, the Mennonites, and the Armenians. I for one do not want any immigration officer to possess a discretion whether those people shall be admitted.

I regret that in the discussion of this bill much religious feeling has been attempted to be used both for and against it. All that we as legislators should have to do with religion or that we should consider is its effect upon civilization, and under that we might include as wholesome to civilization every Christian creed or sect or church, and we must also include Judaism and the doctrines of Zoroaster, Buddha, and Confucius. We would not include Brahmanism or Mohammedanism. But, Mr. Chairman, when we consider from this standpoint these sects that would possibly be admitted by reason of persecution in Europe, I wish to call attention to the fact that the Jewish religion may not suit the most of us, but it is certainly a religion that looks toward a betterment of mankind. When Spain, in 1492, drove out of her country upward of 300,000 Jews, it then being the greatest country in Europe, it resulted in the deterioration of that country ever since. Whenever you find many Jews in a town you will find a live town. When they leave a town its prosperity, its thrift, its business energy and push is over. We have among the Jews less number in the poorhouse, the almshouse—less paupers; less number in the penal institutions and less anarchists, a more self-sustaining, self-governing citizenship than any other sect, creed, nationality, or race. Therefore I am for the Jew [applause] as an immigrant to this country. The Mennonites live unto themselves. They never disturb the country; they never encumber the courts. They add greatly to the sum of production, are self-sustaining, and make good citizens. The same may be said of the Armenian, and I want to make the language of this bill so clear that their admission will be beyond a question of a doubt. I do not want, as I said before,

any discretion lodged in the mind of the immigration officer. I want this country to be truly an asylum for every religion that is wholesome to our civilization. I want it to be truly one established to protect and defend the liberty or the religion of every man. I want it at the same time to see that no man's religion gets its hand into the Public Treasury or receives favoritism at the hands of public officers or receives governmental favoritism.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment puts a great deal more——

Mr. GREGG. Who did the Chair recognize?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Texas, but the gentleman from Massachusetts is a member of the committee and has begun——

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in opposition to the amendment. The amendment suggested by the gentleman from Oklahoma puts a great deal more discretion in the power of the immigration inspector than the clause which he seeks to supersede. The amendment which he offers is substantially that which was presented to the committee by Mr. Marshall, president of the American Jewish Society, except in one respect. The amendment of Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma makes no provision for political refugees, whereas the amendment offered by Mr. Marshall, president of the American Jewish Society, included them. What does the gentleman from Oklahoma propose? He proposes that if an immigrant can prove to the Secretary of Labor or to the proper immigration officer—look at the discretion there—that he is coming here to avoid religious persecution of any kind, then he shall be admitted. Furthermore, the immigrant inspector is bound to regard alleged overt acts as well as alleged discriminatory or alleged oppressive laws or regulations as religious persecution.

Now, who is to determine whether the immigrant who is seeking to come in here had an overt act of persecution committed against him or not? Obviously the immigrant inspector, to whom the alien tells his story of that overt act. Why it seems to me that, instead of lessening his discretionary powers, you are putting unlimited discretion into the hands of the immigrant inspector. Under the proposed amendment he must determine not only whether laws are, in fact, discriminatory or whether, in fact, oppressive, but also whether the acts complained of by the alien seeking admission into this country were, indeed, overt acts of oppression for religious reasons.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the real difference between the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma and the committee provision consists of just one word. The committee requires that the men who wish to plead that they are fleeing from religious persecution must prove to the proper authorities that that is their sole motive for coming to the United States. Now, that is the only practical difference between the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] and the bill as it stands. We require that the would-be immigrant must show that he is solely fleeing from persecution. When this exception in behalf of those fleeing from religious persecution was first suggested eight years ago next June, at the time of the atrocious persecutions in Russia, it was proposed on the floor of this House by Mr. Littauer, of New York, speaking for the Jewish people. He proposed to apply the English statute and to except those fleeing from religious persecution.

If I recollect rightly, I called the attention of the House to the fact that the English law which was spoken of contained the word "solely." I regret to say that the Jews regard that word as destructive to the whole purpose of the exemption. To my mind it is a necessary safeguard. Any immigrant can come here and say to the inspection officer, "I fled from religious persecution." According to some people there is religious persecution going on in Bulgaria and elsewhere to-day. So long as religious persecution can be alleged to exist in his neighborhood, it is the easiest thing in the world for an immigrant to say that it was persecution which drove him over here. Stiff immigration laws are just as much in the interest of Jewish Americans as of anyone else. This whole discussion is proceeding on the supposition that Jews are asking special exemptions. I do not believe that they want any different treatment from what everyone else gets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG] is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have prepared an amendment substantially the same as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY], and I now desire to make a few remarks in support of the latter.

The law as it now reads is:

That the following classes of persons shall be exempt from the operation of the literacy test, to wit, all persons who shall prove to the satisfaction of the proper immigration officer or to the Secretary of Labor that they are seeking admission to the United States solely for the purpose of escaping religious persecution.

Now, this amendment changes that, and the first important part of the change is to leave out the word "solely." The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] says that when a man comes from a country where it was claimed there was religious persecution it would be a very easy matter for him to say that he came because of that religious persecution. Why would it not be just as easy for him to say that he came solely because of that persecution, if he is going to perjure himself?

Why say, "solely for the purpose of avoiding religious persecution"? If he comes partly for that purpose and partly for the purpose of benefiting himself, and becoming a good citizen of this country, and partly to enjoy the freedom, both religious and political, thrown around the citizens of this country, why should he not be permitted to come? If he has in his mind any other purpose, if he comes partly because he loves this country, partly because he wants to breathe the free air of America, it would not be solely to avoid religious persecution, and he would have to be turned back, as the bill is now.

Then the next change is this——

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield just for a moment?

Mr. GREGG. Yes, sir.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Is it not farcical to say that a man comes solely on account of religious persecution? Does it not follow that he comes to live here?

Mr. GREGG. It sounds ridiculous to say that he should be excluded because he comes partly for other purposes. That is what occurs to me.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I agree with you.

Mr. GREGG. Now, then, what do you mean by religious persecution? They persecute in different ways in different countries, some in one way and some in another, and this amendment simply enlarges the provision and the scope of the law so as to include every device and every means by which religious persecution is practiced.

In some countries or sections religious persecution is evidenced by overt acts, and if they want to flee from that they should be admitted here.

In other countries or sections they persecute by discriminatory and oppressive laws and regulations. If they come from a section where that method of persecution is resorted to, then our doors should be open to them. America has always been the asylum for the oppressed of earth. I have no patience with political intolerance. All good citizens abhor political persecutions. Let us say to the people of the world: "If you are religiously persecuted, by whatever means, we open our arms to you and offer to you an asylum of protection." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] would be a most dangerous one. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY] said it would let in Assyrians, and that I am sure would be one of the worst lots that could be admitted. The gentleman's amendment simply allows an exemption from the illiteracy test. I suppose the gentleman had reference to those whom we call "Syrians"—the pack peddlers who are roaming all over our country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we were to strike out that word "solely" from the pending bill, that would open it up so that every mean peon in Mexico could escape the illiteracy test in coming here, because he would say there is a regulation in some little State—the language of the amendment is "discriminatory laws or regulations"—he can say there is some little neighborhood or some little State in Mexico in which is a regulation which says that no Protestant or that no Catholic shall be allowed to do such and such things. You can see how easy it will be to pick almost any kind of a pretext, the smallest kind, for the purpose of emasculating the very provision that we want to pass in order to keep out that Mexican and Syrian crowd and all that class of people. The bill as it is framed amply protects those fleeing from religious persecution without the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. But I am for your bill.

Mr. BURNETT. I know it; and I am glad that the gentleman is for it, because the gentleman is nearly always right. But he is dead wrong when he attempts to extend the provision in regard to religious persecution that we already have in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma will not help the Jewish people, and they are the ones, I reiterate again, that I especially desire to hold out open gates for more than any other people who are oppressed for religion's sake. Almost every single Jew over 16 years of age coming to this country can read the Yiddish Bible, and we put that provision in this bill and specified "Yiddish or Hebrew" in order to aid him to come in.

I believe it would be most hurtful and most dangerous to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma, because it would let in a class of people along the American border in Mexico of whom 90 per cent are illiterates and who would be kept out by this bill. They are the very class of people that the railroads in the Southwest are bringing in by trainload lots to beat down the price of wages all over the country. That situation recently became so acute in Kansas that some of the labor people wrote me from Topeka and called my attention to the fact that one railroad company within the last few months had brought in several trainloads of Mexicans to work on some new road that they were building.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. I regret that I have not the time.

Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma. I want to correct the gentleman about Mexico. There is nothing in that. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURNETT. Oh, yes; there is something in it. These labor people said the railroads were bringing them over in trainload lots, and that in violation of the contract-labor law.

I complained to Secretary Nagel about it, and he said our inspectors there could not detect the violations of the contract-labor law. I went over and talked with the Commissioner General of Immigration, and he sent an inspector who is a gentleman in whom I have the utmost confidence, both as to his ability and his integrity. This inspector assured me that there was some kind of a collusion between those people, but it was hard to detect it. He stayed there for several months and studied the situation, and said he believed that they were coming in in violation of the contract-labor law, but the inspectors were not able to get proof sufficient to exclude them.

Now, if we make this provision, as to fleeing from religious persecution, more liberal than it is, we shall find those people from that border swarming in here and we will be unable to keep them out. We will find hundreds of Syrians coming in, claiming that there is some kind of religious persecution in their country, and that that is a part of the reason why they come. Although the main reason for their coming is to get better wages and take some other man's job away from him, yet if a part of the reason is because there is a little local persecution, or because there are some rules or regulations or laws that they do not like, they will say it is on account of their religion and come in, if the amendment prevails. It is a dangerous amendment, Mr. Chairman, and I hope it will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MURRAY].

The question being taken, on a division, demanded by Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma, there were—ayes 65, noes 77.

Mr. SABATH. I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma and Mr. BURNETT.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 73, noes 89.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I make the point of order that there is an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to hear the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania before he can pass on the point of order.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I did not understand that the amendment was offered to the amendment offered by me, and unless it is——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not tell what the amendment is until he hears it read. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after the period in line 3, page 8, section 3, the following:

"*Provided further*, That any man 35 years of age or more, accompanied by his wife and one or more sons or daughters under the age of 16 years, presenting evidence that he seeks to enter the United States with the intent to become a citizen of the United States and establish here a permanent home, shall, if otherwise admissible, be permitted to enter, whether able to read or not."

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I make the point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Pennsylvania is endeavoring to perfect the section of the bill, and that he has the right to do that before the amendment to strike out is voted on.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, in this bill there are 27 reasons assigned for which any person seeking to enter our ports may be excluded. There is no doubt at all that as to the persons—the insane, the pauper, the criminal, and all the others—who are excluded by operation of those 27 reasons pretty much everybody will agree. But in order to still further restrict immigration another cause is assigned, and that is the "literacy test"; and I suspect that is the crux of this whole situation. I suspect that public policy is not the end in view, but rather to restrict; and I regard the "literacy" test as a poor test of character and the qualities desirable in persons seeking citizenship.

Everybody knows that there are thousands of people who come into this country every year without the intention of becoming citizens. They can not be shut out for any of the 27 reasons, and the fact that they can read adds nothing to their qualifications. They are, as has been suggested, "birds of passage." These men enter into competition with American labor. They herd in camps, in tenements, handled in droves in a system of peonage, living as American labor can not live, and American labor is injured by that competition, and it is most natural that American labor should come to an American Congress in order to get relief from conditions that should not exist. These swarms of undesirable people who are coming over to this country, who can not be excluded under the 27 reasons, you seek to exclude under the twenty-eighth reason, because they can not read. But the rule goes too far. It does not exclude an undesirable who may be able to read and it does exclude honest, desirable persons who can not read. I do not believe it is in the heart of the American workingman to exclude any other honest-hearted man who comes of an assimilable race, and who, pulling up his stakes in the old country with the intent to cast his lot here and become an American citizen, brings his family with him—I say I do not think it is in the heart of the American workingman to exclude an honest-hearted, stalwart, and industrious man of that sort simply because he can not read.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULINGS. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER. Has the gentleman examined, at the foot of page 7, the exceptions which permit an alien to bring his father or grandfather, his wife, mother, grandmother, or his unmarried or widowed daughter?

Mr. HULINGS. Yes; the alien can do so if he himself can read and if he is otherwise admissible.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; but if the daughter can read she can bring in her father if he is over 55 years old.

Mr. HULINGS. The gentleman does not seem to quite catch the idea that I intend in presenting the amendment. There are thousands of men who ought to be excluded because they are not valuable additions to our citizenship, but they are not paupers or criminals and so you can not exclude them, and you seek to exclude them because they can not read. Literacy is no test of character. Scholarship does not even imply honesty or sobriety. Your bill lets in the smart rogue and shuts out many an honest man. For among those who can not read there are many who would make valuable additions to our citizenship. My amendment proposes to allow an honest man, who may be 35 years old, accompanied by wife and children, coming here with the intent to become citizens, to come in and build his home here under the American flag.

Mr. Chairman, I do not object to reasonable restrictions upon the numbers of immigrants. They should not be allowed to come in faster than they can be assimilated, and the fact that in all our great cities they are segregated in Italian quarters and Jewish quarters and Slav and Hungarian quarters, maintaining the same habits and modes of living that they brought with them, shows they have been coming too fast. The facts show, too, that our laws have been too lax, admitting people of bad character.

But while I believe that as a matter of prudence we should restrict the number, I believe also that we should scrutinize more carefully the character of those admitted, and I do not believe that a mere "literacy test" will properly restrict the number nor furnish any sufficient guaranty of the character of those admitted.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this amendment ought to be adopted any more than I do the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, Judge SABATH. I move that all debate on this amendment now close.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, line 12, strike out the second "the" in the line and insert in lieu thereof the word "a" and transpose the other words so that the line shall read: "the words printed in such language or dialect on a slip."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, it has been brought to my attention that this language might be misinterpreted by the administrative officers, in that they might hand the immigrant slips printed in a series of languages, to the confusion of the immigrant, and he might get the slip containing the language which he was unable to speak.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the committee will probably accept that amendment.

Mr. BURNETT. I think that amendment is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 8, line 12, strike out the second "the" and insert in lieu thereof the word "a" and transpose the other words so that the line will read: "the words printed in such language or dialect on the slip."

Mr. MOORE. I submit to the gentleman that this perfects the paragraph in view of the amendment already adopted. The slip to be handed to the immigrant is intended to be a slip in the language designated by him and not such a slip as would contain a variety of languages.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I think this time the gentleman from Pennsylvania is mistaken. I think it becomes clear now what is meant. The bill as we have it now provides that the 40 words must be printed in plain, readable type in some one of the various languages, and so forth. And then it goes on to say that the alien shall be required to read the words printed on the slip in such language—that is, one of the languages he might select.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct, and I will not press the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws his amendment.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 8, in lines 18 and 19, strike out the words "are seeking admission to the United States" and insert "emigrated from the country of which they were last permanent residents."

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment relates to those aliens who shall be exempted from the literacy test. As the bill now reads exemption is made of aliens who prove that they are seeking admission to the United States solely for the purpose of escaping from religious persecution. Strictly speaking, and I do not know but broadly speaking, it would be impossible for any alien to make such a showing, namely, that he was seeking admission to the United States solely for the purpose of escaping from religious persecution, because the whole world might be open to him except the country from which he emigrated, and therefore if that were so it would be impossible for him to prove that he was seeking admission to the United States solely for the purpose of escaping from religious persecution. He might go to England or South America if he chose. The amendment I propose would strike out the words "seeking admission to the United States" and in lieu thereof insert "emigrated from the country of which he was last a permanent resident."

Mr. GARDNER. I suggest to the gentleman that he should strike out the word "are."

Mr. LENROOT. I think that is in the amendment.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman did not so state it just now.

Mr. LENROOT. So if he is emigrating from the country of which he was last a resident on account of religious persecution the literacy test shall not apply. It seems clear that that was the intention of the committee, and I sincerely hope the committee will accept the amendment I have suggested.

Mr. BURNETT. Did the gentleman use in his amendment the word "immigrate" or "emigrate"?

Mr. LENROOT. "Emigrate."

Mr. GARDNER. Suppose the immigrant did not say he emigrated from any country, but was simply a refugee for temporary purposes.

Mr. LENROOT. This only exempts him from the literacy test; all other provisions of the bill would apply. That is all this does in any event.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my colleague how a man at the port of New York could prove any more satisfactorily that he emigrated from any country because of religious persecution solely than he could prove that he came to this country solely for that purpose?

Mr. LENROOT. Because the one thing he would have to prove in case my amendment be adopted is that he emigrated from that country for that sole purpose. As the language now stands in the bill it is necessary for him not only to prove that, but that he seeks admission to this country for that sole purpose.

Mr. COOPER. In either case the motive of the man is something exclusively within his own consciousness, and the ability to prove it or not to prove it is just as difficult in one case as it is in the other. It is a hidden secret motive, known only to himself.

Mr. LENROOT. But that argument goes not to the amendment, but to the subject itself, and my amendment certainly removes one element of proof that is now necessary for him to make under the paragraph as it stands.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman who offered the amendment whether that would not still leave the word "solely" in the bill?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes, it would; but it would limit it to proof that he emigrated from a country solely for that purpose, and it would not compel him to prove that that was his sole purpose in seeking admission to the United States. In other words, it is largely in favor of the immigrant.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, the desire of the committee, of course, was to allow those admission who were fleeing from their country on account of religious persecution. My judgment is that the expression used by the committee would be so construed; but in order to have no doubt about it, as far as I am concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 17, after the word "stowaway," insert the words "if otherwise admissible."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the reason for this amendment is that if the bill passes as it is written it will give to the Secretary of Labor an extraordinary discretion in the matter of stowaways. His sympathies might be worked upon in certain cases where the stowaway is "not otherwise admissible." A stowaway, of course, ought not to be admitted to the country without scrutiny. A stowaway comes clandestinely, and he should not be permitted to enter without undergoing the same examination that other immigrants have to undergo. It might be possible that one not otherwise admissible having gotten in on a ship contrary to the regulations, could work on the sympathies of the Secretary of Labor and be admitted. It seems to me the Secretary ought not to have this discretion, and that the same lawful conditions that hold with regard to other immigrants should be applied to the stowaway.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman suggests that language after the second word "stowaway"?

Mr. MOORE. That is correct; after the second word "stowaway." The language I suggest is "if otherwise admissible." That would remove some of the discretion that perhaps the Secretary himself would not enjoy.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, we will accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE].

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, having occupied the floor during general debate on this bill and discussed at some length the objectionable literacy-test clause, I will not now detain you with extended remarks on the amendment I have proposed, It brings us squarely to the real issue involved and it presents the crucial question in this immigration measure.

That the literacy test has been placed in the bill as a means for restriction is a fact now conceded. That it is not a test of character has been to an extent also admitted. Its enactment would controvert our country's boast that this is the land of opportunity. It would give bold contradiction to the profession America has made that this land affords a refuge to the down-trodden and oppressed who, worthy of our considerate sympathy, knocks at our gates for entrance. It would penalize men and women who were denied educational advantages because of inequalities existing among the people of their native land, or because of oppressive and proscriptive laws in the countries from whence they come.

You would by this educational test exclude the physically, mentally, morally sound immigrant merely because he could not read, while at the same time the clever schemer, the cunning rascal, or the viciously inclined might be able to gain admittance because he could read and write. In short, the test of reading determines nothing to establish worth or character.

I undertook this morning under general debate to show you briefly what immigration has done for this country for its upbuilding and the promotion of its welfare. Experience has demonstrated the fact that an illiteracy test will tend to keep out many who are well deserving and who make decent, well-behaved, and industrious dwellers in the different communities in which they happen to settle or to dwell.

The denunciation leveled by so many of the advocates of the bill against immigration was, as you were told, directed in years gone by against the immigration which now very rightly and justly receive praise as a good, peaceful, industrious people, whose citizenship is most worthily born by them and whose civic and patriotic duties they have with fidelity discharged. Now, however, your attacks are directed mainly against the Italians and against the Russian and Romanian, Hungarian and Galician Jews, against Poles and Slavonians, and some Germans, too, who, if they happen unable to pass the reading test you would bar from entrance to our shores.

Against such narrowness of vision—against what I must after yesterday's and to-day's debate conclude is an ill-conceived prejudice and antagonism against a class of people whose character, whose worth and industrious qualities many of the supporters of the bill do not and can not understand. I must enter my serious and emphatic protest. We still need those who will do the hard, sometimes rough manual labor that no longer the man who can read and write seems willing to do. We still require the hands who are willing to work the farms and till the soil the American boy rapidly abandons for the alluring life of town and city. We still want to further develop the resources of our country. We must preserve inviolate American ideals and live up to the principles of justice, humanity and fair play upon which after all this Government was founded—principles which this very test would violate. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that my amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

[Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I would not take up the time now to address this House upon the proposition contained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE], to strike the literacy test from this bill, were it not for some remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Immigration, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], which I quote from the RECORD as follows:

> But, Mr. Chairman, this bill strikes at those who come here for the purpose of beating down the price of labor, who come here for the purpose of establishing low standards of morals and living, and to drive out those who desire to make an honest living and maintain their families in decency and self-respect.

I deny that that statement is accurate or true. I know that the great immigration that has come to this country did not come for this purpose at all. The immigrants come for reasons that have already been expressed on this floor during the seven hours of debate; they come here because they are driven from their homes for religious and political reasons; they come here for the purpose of bettering their condition. They do not come here for the purpose of lowering the standard of living or for the purpose of reducing the wages of the American workingmen.

Mr. Chairman, I represent in part the greatest immigration city in the civilized world. There are more immigrants in New York City and in New York State to-day—and I think I am correct in the statement—than there are in the whole of the United States outside. The standard of civilization in New York is as high as the standard of civilization in any city in this country. And the people who come from abroad and are employed in the workshops and the mercantile establishments of my city are as happy and as prosperous a people as you can find anywhere within the borderlands of this country. There is not this great idleness that has been referred to on this floor. There has been no great demand for this bill from New York. Almost a solid delegation upon this floor from that State is opposed to this bill. Every newspaper in New York State of any influence or power, without regard to party politics, is opposed to it. If the standard of civilization had been lowered in New York, if this large immigration had the effect of reducing the wages of American workmen in New York State and New York City, do you not suppose that protests would go up from the laboring organizations there, or from the newspapers, or from some of our civic societies? I have not received a single petition from New York City except one, and that was from the Junior Order of American Mechanics, in favor of this bill.

Every request that has been made and every petition that has reached me has been opposed to this measure, and for two reasons: First, because they do not believe the literacy test should be the qualification for admission to America; and, secondly, because this word "solely," contained in the measure, puts an arbitrary power in the commissioner of immigration, and can be used to nullify the bill, and could serve the purpose of keeping illiterates out who come here because of religious persecution in their native land. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we have in New York City this large immigration; we have not the percentage of illiteracy that they have in other parts of the country.

I realize that the South passed through a devastating period, and I realize also that it will be some time before it can recover from the effects of the Civil War, but while the South is recovering from those effects it might engage for a time, at least, in educating its illiterates. There is one county in Kentucky that is devoting itself to that proposition. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CANTOR] has expired.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SLAYDEN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] is recognized.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, if these gentlemen have finished with their questions I will undertake to make the few remarks that I have expected to address to the House on this question of the restriction of immigration. When the bill was before us a year ago and on other occasions prior to that I addressed the House rather fully, and it is not necessary now that I should make an elaborate speech to explain why I am in favor of a restriction of immigration.

In the course of this debate much has been said about the necessity of a homogeneous people if we are to continue a free, representative, republican government in the United States. Diversity of races, training, and opinions, when that diversity of opinion is deep-seated and the result of training under other political conditions, make an unfavorable environment for the maintenance of the sort of government we received from our fathers, and which some of us hope to hand unimpaired to the next generation.

When one takes a general survey of the governments of the world, he discovers that not a very great many people have manifested peculiar fitness for self-government. In a few countries like England, France, Switzerland, Holland, the Scandinavian countries, and Germany that fitness for self-government has manifested itself in some form. But outside of these there is little to indicate that in the last hundred years the people have developed encouragingly in a political way. In Russia, a very large and important part of the world, we still find an autocracy. A few years ago the people were granted a constistitution and a parliament, but the stormy and unimportant career of the Russian Parliament seems to suggest that it was prematurely given to the people of that country. At least, the legislature of that Empire has not made itself felt in an important way in the affairs of government. China has converted itself into a government which has been officially called a republic, but which is really ruled by a dictator, who is nominally a president, and who as soon as he had a difference with the Parliament of that country ordered it to disperse, and it

promptly effaced itself. The Turkish effort for free government is not promising. Even in Germany, where the people are unquestionably fit for almost any form of government they may undertake, a military autocracy is still largely in control, and recently in a conflict between the civil and military authorities the power of government in favor of the latter was invoked in a harsh and effective way.

It is reasonable to assume that people who have not adopted our system of Government, or one which approximates it, either lack sympathy with it or a sufficient acquaintance with our methods to adopt them. If they lack sympathy certainly they can add no strength to this Republic when they become American citizens. If they lack knowledge of how to adjust themselves to it they can certainly add no political strength to our Government. Looking behind the handicap of an oversupply of pauper labor from Europe to the political effect of unlimited and unregulated immigration it takes no prophet to see a great danger to American institutions. I will not deny, few men would be rash enough to deny, that in time, that after the birth of another generation, these people may be able to adjust themselves to American institutions, but certainly until that adjustment shall have been made there is danger in the situation and it is one of such importance that prudent men would like to avoid it.

Wage earners in this country are seriously alarmed at the prospect of an increasing number of competing laborers from Europe. They have appealed to Congress to relieve them from this great and real danger.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CANTOR] has complained at the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on Immigration [Mr. BURNETT] that the effect of this unrestricted immigration will be to beat down the social, moral, and wage standard in the United States. He seems particularly to object to that part of the statement made by the gentleman from Alabama that the moral standard will be lowered by excessive immigration. In that connection I may be permitted to say, I hope, that the criminal records of the northeastern States, where the bulk of this immigration has settled, thoroughly sustains the position taken by the gentleman from Alabama, although I think that in discussing the question the chairman of the committee particularly had in mind the wage scale.

More than one Representative from the State of New York has said in the course of this debate that that great State has invested the tremendous sum of $36,000,000 in the care and support of alien insane. It could hardly be denied that a large part of this insanity embraces the class we commonly refer to as the criminal insane. In the heat of debate exactness of speech is not always found, and, while the idea of the gentleman from Alabama is, in my judgment, perfectly sound in every respect, I think in the speech complained of he was referring more to the scale of wages than to anything else, because in support of his idea he referred to the attitude of the associations of organized labor, the Grange, farmers' unions, and other associations of wage earners on this question of restriction, and their argument has been specially addressed to the economic features.

Mr. CANTOR. I quoted the gentleman's exact language.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Possibly; yet no one will deny, I fancy, that competition does have the effect of beating down prices. And if real competition always has that effect—and it certainly has—when an unlimited number of immigrants come into the country seeking employment they necessarily compete with those who were here before them, and it must have an effect upon the wages paid for labor. Of course in a country with resources like ours, with a great and expanding commerce and a steadily expanding agriculture, it does not have the same effect it would have in a country that is at a standstill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have only a little time, and I prefer not to.

Mr. CRAMTON. Very briefly?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Very well, go on.

Mr. CRAMTON. Does the gentleman not think the same effect as to our standard of living here may be secured by bringing from abroad without restrictions the products of cheap labor in those countries?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I am not here now for the purpose of discussing the tariff, but the bill we have before us.

I believe absolutely in the declaration of Mr. Frank Morrison, secretary of the Federation of Labor—that in the consideration of this bill our prime duty is to the Americans; the Americans who are, not the Americans who may be, and the purpose that I have in view in taking my position on this question is to benefit them. With me it is not a measure of hostility to people who reside in other countries. It is no lack of interest in their welfare at all, but, if you please, a selfish interest in Americans who are here. It is discriminating legislation, but it discriminates in behalf of our own people, and if that be selfishness, then I submit, sir, it is enlightened selfishness.

My friend from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT], whom I esteem highly but do not always agree with, made the statement this morning that if all the people in the United States were moved into the State of Texas they would not crowd that State more than is now the situation in the Kingdom of Belgium. Heaven forbid that they should all be moved into the State of Texas, and heaven forbid that we should ever have conditions in Texas such as he and I have seen in the Kingdom of Belgium. I have been all over that little country, as he has, from one side to the other—north, south, east, and west—and I have never been in a city of Belgium where I have not seen teams engaged in transportation, teams engaged in making a living for families that were composed of women and dogs hitched side by side. That has never happened and I hope never can happen in the State that I have the honor in part to represent in this House. I am pleased to say that in Texas we confine such service to the ordinary beasts of burden.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman will be brief, I will yield.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Have you in Texas an immigration bureau supported by the State?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No; we have not.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I wish to inform the gentleman that the State of Minnesota spends thousands of dollars a year trying to get Democrats to take up our lands.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman tell us how it was that the city of Galveston, in Texas, donated to the Government of the United States the land upon which was erected an immigration station, which they very much wanted in the State of Texas?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois knows as well as I do that any community in the country seems to be glad to have a Federal appropriation for the construction of a public building in that community; but the city of Galveston does not represent public sentiment in the State of Texas on this question of immigration.

The city of Galveston is made up of pushing, energetic citizens who do all they can to develop the commerce and importance of that city, and who in the face of adversity, almost without parallel, have made it the second port of the United States in the value of its exports and a commercial center of which every citizen of my State feels proud. But the problems which confront the city of Galveston are not the problems which concern the people of the interior, and they do things differently.

Getting back to my argument, Mr. Chairman, I will say that, in my judgment, this bill is in the interest of every resident American, no matter what country he came from, whether of European, Asiatic, or African origin. It is for resident Americans at this time that I speak. I admit no call to legislate for the people of any other country, not even those who expect to come to the United States at some future time. I want to avoid the crowded conditions that obtain in many sections of Europe, because wherever you find people densely packed together you find difficult problems arising out of that density which we have not yet been compelled to try to solve here in the United States. Belgium, for example, has intense economic conditions, low wages, general unrest, strikes, and riots. Men have multiplied more rapidly in Belgium and in other centers in Europe than the opportunities for remunerative employment. Gentlemen who discuss these questions have sometimes permitted their minds to become confused, because they fix their attention on aggregate values and commerce rather than on details. A country may have a great balance sheet in international trade. It may export huge quantities of manufactured produce, and yet individual prosperity may not be high. It is the individual for whom I plead, the human unit in which I feel an interest.

Low wages and dense population invariably go together. In China and Japan, where density of population is greatest, we find the result of such crowding. The people there can hardly be said to live; they merely exist. And Japan has made great sacrifices of men and money to find a home for her surplus population, because she can not take care of them at home, and for that reason she has extended her control to Formosa and Korea and has set the eye of covetousness on Manchuria.

Gentlemen say that it is a far cry from present conditions in the United States to such as exist in Japan, or even in the overcrowded countries of Europe. That is true; but I want the possibility of it put still further away. I want to make it forever impossible in America. We are charged with selfishness in taking this position, but I much prefer to have that charge hurled at me rather than to do anything which in 2, 5, or even 10 generations will bring to this country the conditions which we all know to exist in the older parts of the world. I want to keep the lands of Texas, the lands of the whole United States, in fact, for Americans and for their descendants, and I am confident that there will be plenty of them to need it all.

Statistics show an alarming increase in the number of tenant farmers in the United States. I regard that as a very great misfortune, and if we can only legislate so as to reduce the number of tenant farmers in our country to the vanishing point we will have done something for which future historians will praise us as wise statesmen. Nothing will do more to promote the stability of government and the continuance of our political institutions as set up by the fathers of the Republic than the universal ownership of land.

One of the Representatives from New York, Mr. GOLDFOGLE, said in the course of this debate that we must have these imported laborers to reduce the cost of living; that without them we can not produce greater crops and thus lower the value of farm produce, for which he and other Representatives of the great cities are so persistently clamoring.

Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to find a method of reducing the prices farmers get for their crops. I want to see the prices of farm products kept at a remunerative basis. My commission as the representative of a district composed of producers, of farmers, was not given me with the idea that I would legislate against their interests, as the gentleman from New York virtually says I would be doing if I opposed this bill. I would much prefer to legislate in such a way that it would increase the prosperity of the farmers, give them more comforts and gradually bring to the wives and daughters of the men who produce those things we eat and wear a degree of luxury. They are equally entitled to the refinements of life and they have just as much right to share the luxuries as the people who live in the great cities.

The argument for the immediate development of the whole country makes no special appeal to me. If we make haste slowly there will be fewer blunders, fewer errors to correct. The country is now developing more rapidly than any other ever did in the history of the world and, unfortunately, along some lines that do not commend themselves always to men of prudence. We ought to be willing to leave something for future generations to do. We ought to make provision for the future in such a way that succeeding generations will have an opportunity to own part of the soil of the country to which they will owe allegiance. The opponents of this bill say that we should not limit immigration; that we should throw our gates wide open and admit freely all the millions who are "fleeing the poverty and scorn" of the Old World. They want us to continue a policy which will finally crowd our own country to suffocation and in some future time will compel Americans to seek other parts of the world to escape conditions that now admittedly exist in Europe and Asia. But where will they go?

The unoccupied parts of the world are being rapidly taken up. Is it not immeasurably better to protect these future generations against such conditions by saving for them the conditions which now exist rather than undertake to compel them to meet problems which will be harder to solve hereafter?

I will now quote from a circular letter which came to me in December, and which was probably sent to other Members of the House:

> Our country needs the labor of the toiler who is willing to work our mines, highways, and railroads. The farmers, cattle and fruit ranchers of South and West are hungering for labor to do the work which our native born and the older immigrants refuse to engage in. Properly directed by an efficient bureau of distribution this immigration, even though illiterate, will be bound to add to the country's wealth and well-being, to the end that the present high prices of farm and mine products may be materially decreased. Our prosperity, which should not only secure higher wages but also maintain the buying power, depends largely upon the continuance of the stream of immigration to which we owe our past growth.

I specially invite attention to that part of this quotation in which these words are found:

> To the end that the present high prices of farm and mine products may be materially decreased.

I do not know how miners may relish the idea of having the value of their products reduced, but an argument of that sort can not be expected to have much weight with the representative of a farming constituency.

From another part of the same letter I quote these words:

> You are therefore most earnestly requested to aid in its defeat, to vote and to work against it, and to help along the cause of reduction of the prices of our life's necessaries, not by restricting but by encouraging production where it is most needed.

Apparently the writers of the letter did not want us to forget the fact that the competition from Europe would reduce the value of farm products, for it is repeated in a very emphatic way.

If I did not know that my position on this bill reflected the views of an overwhelming majority of my constituency I would still be willing to appeal the matter to them on these two statements found in this one letter, in which the defeat of the bill is recommended.

Mr. Chairman, this question has been debated for so long that every possible point of view has been presented, and it is not necessary or useful to prolong the discussion, and I shall close my remarks by quoting an editorial that recently appeared in the San Antonio Express, one of the great dailies of the State of Texas:

> THE LITERACY TEST.
>
> No question before Congress is going to arouse more or keener interest during the weeks that may intervene before President Wilson acts upon the expected legislation than that affecting the immigration of foreigners into the United States. Within a day or two, at the most, the Burnett bill, prescribing and enforcing a literacy test for all aliens who wish to become residents of this country, will probably have passed the House of Representatives. In all its essential features this measure nearly became a law a year ago. It passed both the Senate and the House of the Sixty-second Congress by overwhelming vote, and, when vetoed by President Taft, was sent through the Senate by a constitutional majority of two-thirds. In the House the presidential veto was sustained, because four or five Democrats, among them the present Postmaster General, Albert S. Burleson, voted with the President.
>
> Since that time the movement for a Federal statute that will have the effect of greatly retarding immigration, even of cutting its numbers, at least, in half, has not been allowed to lag. The American Federation of Labor has again gone on record as demanding the enactment of the Burnett bill into law. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union, said to represent 3,000,000 tillers of the soil, has passed a resolution favoring the passage of the bill and even threatening those who oppose it with a hostility that will not end until Members of Congress who work against it are driven from public life. Numerous other organizations from Portland to Los Angeles have called on Congress to undo the disapproval of William H. Taft.
>
> Fate of the Burnett bill rests largely with President Wilson. There is little reason to doubt that, left to itself, Congress would lose no time in enacting an immigration bill even more stringent than the original Burnett measure. The exact attitude of the President is not known—may not be known until the Senate takes up the Burnett bill after its passage in the House. It is believed he is striving to find some middle ground satisfactory to all concerned—that is, one that will meet with a reasonable degree of satisfaction. It is admitted the issue is filled with all sorts of political possibilities, and there are those even who predict the President will lose his hold on his party should he see fit to interpose too many objections to the proposed legislation.
>
> It is charged by farmers and by labor leaders generally that the great trusts, heavy employers of labor, are furnishing the sinews of war for the fight being made against the Burnett bill. There are other questions creeping in. An Associated Press item containing information that the natives of New England are being driven from their land by an increasing horde of soil tillers who are more accustomed to rigid economy than the descendants of the Pilgrims has not softened the wrath of the members of the Farmers' Union.
>
> In its issue of January 15, the National Field, organ of the organized farmers of the country, uses language in contending for the passage of the Burnett bill that would set well on July 4 for fervidness and heat. It says: "What they (the trusts) want is plenty of cheap laborers. After trustifying the industries through special-privilege legislation on one hand and pauperized labor on the other, they are now turning to the 'blessed vision' of trustifying agriculture. Corner any of these big-business rascals on the immigration problem and he always talks of 'putting them on the land'—land they can not buy, land from whose homesteading and desert-claim privileges they are excluded as unnaturalized citizens for a period of five years, land they can not rent, even. The process is very simple. Let capitalists buy up whatever tracts they have not already scooped, and herd these immigrants on the land like serfs in fee simple. And then? The farmer who owns his land, the farmer who is trying to own his, can no more compete with the agricultural trust than the proverbial village blacksmith can compete with the Steel Trust."
>
> This business of being in charge at Washington is not so simple as being the minority party. It carries greater glory and it is also freighted with responsibility. The literacy test for immigrants raises an issue that, it would seem, the Democratic Party must meet and determine without equivocation or evasion.

Mr. BROWN of New York rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BROWN] is recognized.

Mr. BROWN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I would not oppose the adoption of the literacy test if I were not prepared to offer substitutes which I believe to be both just and adequate.

In the permission given me yesterday to extend my remarks in the RECORD I endeavored to show that an enormous proportion of crime, pauperism, and degeneracy in men, with its invariable equivalent of harlotry in women, is the direct result of inherited mental defect.

Mr. Chairman, I went further in my argument yesterday. I endeavored to show that since the year 1910, when the Immigration Commission reported to Congress, on whose recommendations this illiteracy clause is based, it has been proven beyond the question of a doubt that these inherited mental defects fol-

low the known law of biology, the Mendelian law, and it is now possible to predict with reasonable accuracy the kinds of children you would get from any known union where one or both of the contracting parties were afflicted in any way with a mental defect.

Mr. Chairman, I scarcely expect the members of this committee to follow me in this argument unless they shall be familiar with the operation of the Mendelian law as applied formerly to plants and animals and lately to the color of the hair, albinism, brachydactylism, and other phases of human development; but I trust that the committee will realize that we are to-day in a sense acting as the cradle of the Nation, endeavoring to see to it that future generations shall be born sane, industrious, virile, and desirable, according to the provisions which we incorporate in the bill. Children arrive in this country by but two routes, and the steamship route is one of them. Over the other route Congress has but very little control. [Laughter.]

Mr. ASHBROOK. Has it any?

Mr. BROWN of New York. Over the steamship route it has exact and absolute control. Therefore I urge upon members of the committee to remember that everything they put into this bill will react for good or for bad, for generation after generation, until the end of time. [Applause.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] was on the floor the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] wanted to know why, if the State of Texas was opposed to immigration, Galveston had sought to have established at its port an immigration station. I venture to predict that if the people of Texas offer inducements to immigrants, they will have the experience of South Carolina.

In 1904 there were but 5,500 foreign-born persons in the State of South Carolina. Some gentleman, prompted, doubtless, by the best of motives, conceived the idea of establishing an immigration bureau. Thirty thousand dollars was spent in an effort to induce settlers from abroad to come to South Carolina to secure employment in the cotton mills and on the farms of that State, and in 1906 the *Wittekind* sailed into Charleston Harbor with about 450 steerage passengers. They were a carefully selected class of immigrants. I do not believe that to-day one of those 450 is in the State of South Carolina, and certainly I know that the immigration bureau is not there. It would be difficult to find the man who first suggested its organization. Our experience with that carefully selected cargo resulted in the legislature at its next session abolishing the immigration bureau and going even to the other extreme and prohibiting any State official attempting, directly or indirectly, to induce immigrants to come into the State of South Carolina.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that in your mills in South Carolina, where you employ native-born citizens, the wages are lower than they are in the mills of Massachusetts, where these same foreigners or their cousins are employed?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No; I do not think so; at least not for the same class of work.

Mr. KEATING. I thought it was so.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Gentlemen who come from the State of New York seem unable to make an argument on this question without referring to the percentage of illiteracy in the South.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What is the percentage of the foreign-born population in South Carolina?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Now?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Very small. I do not know the exact figures. There were about 5,500 in 1906.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. It does not reach 1 per cent?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. No.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. What is the percentage of illiteracy in South Carolina among the whites?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The percentage of illiteracy among the whites that my friend loves to refer to is due to the unfortunate conditions existing just after the close of the war, and criticism comes with ill grace from you, because it is due to the fact that the people of your section saw fit to so devastate our country in the days of reconstruction that it was not until the last few years that we have been able to recover. I am glad to say that with improved financial conditions our educational system has developed, and now practically every white child in the State of South Carolina of school age is in the schools of the State. And not only the white children, but we are sending to school in South Carolina to-day more negroes than white children. Ten years from now you will not ask the percentage of illiteracy, because the effect of what the people from your section of the country did to us during reconstruction will have disappeared.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman answer one more question?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Do you think that the illiterate whites in your State are a detriment to your community?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. The illiterate native-born South Carolinian can not be compared with your illiterate immigrant, because the native of South Carolina, even though he be illiterate, has inherited a love for American institutions.

Even though poverty has denied him the blessings of an education, it has not taken from him his love of the country for which his ancestors in many cases gave up their lives. He is of the soil and will remain to assist in the development of the country. But this is not true of the immigrant who will be excluded by the terms of this bill. Your immigrant does not come to stay. He knows nothing of our institutions and cares less. His sole desire is to stay long enough to save some money, when he will return to his native land to spend it among his own people. By reason of his habits he can underlive the American, and therefore works for less, beating down the price of labor. We had an experience years ago with the importation of laborers. In order to develop the cotton-growing industry negroes were imported into our State. The industry developed, but the trouble that that imported slave labor has given us has made it the dearest labor any country ever secured. Now, in our own way our people are doing their best to solve this vexed question, but we would have little hope of solving it if there were dumped upon us a class of immigrants such as are now coming to our shores from southern Italy, Greece, and Turkey. They have no capacity for assimilation with our white people. They must have some society, and we fear they would turn to the negro race, mingle with them, and so aggravate our race problem as to make it hopeless.

In favoring the restriction of immigration I am not unconscious of the fact that it was through immigration that our own country was developed years ago, but when gentlemen refer to that fact they fail to refer to the difference in the class of immigrants then and now. In the early part of the last century South Carolina offered inducements to settlers and home seekers from abroad, and as a result the English, German, Irish, and Scotch-Irish came to our State, but to-day we receive little or no immigration from these countries. Southern Italy is furnishing the largest percentage, and now the Asiatics are threatening to come to drive American workingmen out of employment. J. Ingram Bryan, a professor in the Imperial College of Japan, in an article appearing in Munsey's Magazine of August, 1913, says, among other things:

> The man of the East has proved his capacity to adapt himself to all circumstances and therefore his fitness to live. He can underlive, and therefore can outlive, any occidental.

Again, he says:

> The occidental—
>
> Which covers the Caucasian race—
>
> can not live save at a cost sufficient for the maintenance of 20 oriental lives.

There is an oversupply of unskilled labor in the country to-day, and consequently the workingman is in favor of restricting in some way the tide of immigration. Last year there were admitted 1,427,227 immigrants, and the figures indicate an increased number this year. Where years ago the employees of the Steel Trust were English-speaking people, it is claimed that to-day 90 per cent are foreigners. In some manufacturing plants few native-born persons are employed, and it seems that they have concluded that they can better control the uneducated foreigner and that he can be driven to work longer hours for less pay.

The annual report of the Commissioner of Immigration for the port of New York for the year 1911 contains the following:

> The new immigration, unlike that of the earlier years, proceeds in part from the poorer elements of the countries of southern and eastern Europe and from backward races with customs and institutions widely different from ours and without the capacity of assimilating with our people as did the early immigrants. Many of those coming from these sources have very low standards of living, possess filthy habits, and are of an ignorance which passes belief. Types of the classes referred to representing various alien races and nationalities may be observed in some of the tenement districts of Elizabeth, Orchard, Rivington, and East Houston Streets, New York City. Such immigrants differ also widely from the earlier ones in respect of their occupations and the localities to which they go. Contrary to what was formerly the case

a large proportion are unskilled laborers who go to the manufacturing and mining centers where the Immigration Commission recently found that there existed an oversupply of unskilled foreign labor. Over three-fifths remain in five Eastern States, while an undue proportion are pouring into the congested areas of our large cities, where they begin their American life amongst unfavorable surroundings, and exposed to many evil influences. They often herd together, forming in effect foreign colonies in which the English language is almost unknown. Miserable economic and sanitary conditions exist in many of these colonies; witness, for instance, in New York City the frequency with which the State factory inspectors are compelled to attach the red "unclean" tag to articles made in shops and factories where aliens are employed, the threatened use of this tag constituting often the best means at their disposal of compelling the maintenance of even a semblance of cleanliness in such places.

Repeatedly the new immigrant obtains his job at the expense of an older employee, who loses his. Certain employers seek new immigrant labor in preference to other and more efficient labor, of which there may be an abundance, because of the willingness of the new immigrants (or "greenies," as they are termed) to work at the outset unduly long hours or at unduly low wages, or both, and perhaps also to pay the foreman or padrone a bonus. Later, as they become more proficient and demand higher wages, they are discharged and their places filled with immigrants who have arrived more recently.

Restrictive legislation is demanded by the people. The American Federation of Labor and the labor organizations of various States have urged that the literacy test be prescribed. It is favored not only by them and by the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, but by the National Farmers' Union, the Grange, and other agricultural organizations. Several States have memorialized Congress to prescribe this test, and it was recommended by the Immigration Commission after an investigation of four years, costing nearly a million dollars. It has heretofore been approved of by both the House and Senate and would to-day be the law had it not been vetoed by President Taft. Whom would it keep out? The distinguished chairman of this committee, who has carefully studied the statistics, says:

It would not keep out the splendid German people that come to this country, the magnificent Scandinavians, who have built up the great Northwest. Not one in a thousand of these would fall under the ban of the reading test. It would not keep out the English or the Irish, the Welsh or the Scotch. The record shows that less than 1 per cent of those great nationalities would fall under the rule and be excluded. It would not keep out 2 per cent of the Germans or the Hollander, it would not keep out 1 per cent of the Bohemians, it would not keep out the Frenchman or the Switzer; but, Mr. Chairman, it would strike down fifty-odd per cent of those from southern Italy, from along the borders of the Mediterranean Sea, from Sicily, and the islands of the Mediterranean.

* * * * * * * * *

* * * It would keep out those who, at Lawrence, Mass., during the strike last year, were following the flag of Black Hand leaders, the followers themselves unable to read their own language—those who had inscribed upon the banners by the leaders they blindly followed "No law, no God, no master." That is the class at which this bill is leveled. It would keep out about 30 per cent of the Poles, about 40 per cent of the Greeks, some 60 or 70 per cent of the Turks, and the other day I received a letter from Dr. Wightman, of Providence, R. I., who, I believe, is at the head of the State medical officials there, and an alienist, which letter I shall put in the RECORD, in which he says that recently hundreds of Turks and Kurds—and in reply to an inquiry of mine as to what the Kurds were, he said they were the people from Kurdistan, and similar to Turks—were coming there while hundreds of good men were out of employment, taking the jobs of men who wanted to toil, but who were not willing to labor at the standard of wages paid to those people, and he says the literacy test would not only keep them out now, but it would do so for the next thousand years.

There seems to have been a consistent effort to organize the Jews in opposition to this measure, but this bill is not aimed against them. The Jew who can read either in Hebrew or Yiddish will be admitted, and there is hardly an adult Jew who can not read his Bible. Furthermore, the man who can prove that he is fleeing from religious persecution is admitted, and the provisions as to the admission of relatives are liberal.

I am satisfied that the gentlemen who oppose the bill in the House are prompted by the sincerest of motives, but I fear that some of the protests we are receiving in the mail are inspired by those who have selfish interests at stake. I can well believe that it will be a severe blow to the great steamship companies, considerably reducing the profits they receive from their passenger traffic, but it is time to enact this legislation. The people demand it, and I am confident that if this bill passes the House and Senate at the hands of President Wilson it will not meet the untimely fate that befell it during the Taft administration.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES] who has just taken his seat. I am a resident of Fall River, Mass., the largest cotton manufacturing city in the United States. I resided there first in 1844, when nearly all the operatives in the mills were Americans, and to-day the operatives are nearly all foreigners or descendants of foreigners. I am willing to compare figures with the gentleman from South Carolina as to the rate of wages paid in both places, and I would remind him that women and minors under Massachusetts laws can not work more than 54 hours per week nor after 6 o'clock at night, and I would also inform him that the wages in the city of Fall River are from 20 to 30 per cent higher than they are in the State of South Carolina.

Mr. BRYNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I decline to yield; I have only five minutes. I wish to further state that I have lived among the foreign born all my life practically, for I went to Fall River when I was but 3 years of age. I will read to you what the United States Census figures of 1910 show in the official statistics relative to the population of the city where I reside. The statement follows:

There was a French population of 32,236; English (England, Canada, Scotland, Wales, and Newfoundland), 26,498; American, 16,296; Irish, 15,104; Portuguese, 13,334; Austrian, 3,953; Russian, 3,467; Italian, 1,624; Atlantic Islanders, 1,304; Turks, 540; Germans, 533; Swedes, 171; Greeks, 138; Danes, 83; Finns, 60; Norwegians, 52; Roumanians, 52; Dutch, 6; Hungarians, 6; and all others 3,668, making a total of 119,225. That comprises more than one-half of the population of the district which I have the honor to represent on this floor, and many others of foreign birth or parentage live in the city of Taunton and many of the towns of the district.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. I can not yield. I desire to state that I have lived among these people all my life and I know something of their characteristics. I know how energetic they are, and how they have built up the communities in which they live, and how orderly and peaceable they are.

In 1904 there was a six months' strike in my city, the result of which was that 111 cotton mills were closed for six months. There was not a single case of disorder arising from the strike that was brought before the court. The strike was peaceably settled at the end of six months. I want to say to you further that in the month of December last the operatives of my city asked for an increase of wages. As a matter of fact, every union in the city asked for it. It is as well unionized as any city in America. All the unions met and asked for an increase of wages.

The manufacturers met them in a proper spirit, as they have for many years, and I challenge you to find another city in the United States where the mill owners meet the operatives in a better spirit than they do in the city in which I live. They met the labor leaders and held conferences with them. They finally made answer why they could not give the increased wage that was asked. The unions met to receive the answer of the manufacturers, and only in the case of one union did the majority of them vote to strike. They have a very good rule, which is that they will not order a strike unless a two-thirds vote in favor is cast by the union. All the other unions voted by majority not to strike. As I have stated, I am pretty well acquainted with the labor situation of my own city. I have not the scale of wages here, but I can furnish it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

[Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts received permission, by unanimous consent, to extend his remarks in the RECORD.]

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Naturally, with so large a population of foreign birth and parentage in the fifteenth congressional district of Massachusetts, I have frequently been interested in behalf of my constituents who have friends and relatives in the countries from which they came who seek an opportunity to enter the United States.

I find the restrictions in the existing law and rulings by department officials debar many persons from entering here. These restrictions are reenacted in the pending bill, and I do not object to the physical and mental tests in general therein provided.

But I have always opposed the illiteracy test as a specific measure, because long experience has convinced me that it is entirely unnecessary and might prove harmful rather than beneficial. In every instance when this issue has been presented since I became a Member of this body I have voted against this proposition, and I shall vote against this bill. I could cite many cases that have come to my knowledge of children of illiterate foreign-born parents, educated in our public schools, who have acquired distinction in civic, university, political, and business life in harmony and in competition with those who claim American ancestry.

The patriotism shown by those who come from abroad and their loyalty and devotion to the Government of their adoption, added to the training their children obtain in the public schools, inculcate in the minds of the entire family the true spirit of American citizenship. This spirit precludes the possibility of antagonisms, which the proponents of this bill seem to fear are liable to arise unless the illiteracy test is applied at the ports of entry.

In Massachusetts every voter since the year 1857 has been required to read a portion of the Constitution and write or print his name on the registry book in order that he may be entitled to vote. The only other requirement is that he shall be native born or possess a final certificate of naturalization. I have known during my career in municipal life many persons to whom this test of reading is a hardship and embarrassment.

To persons coming to a strange country, and amid new surroundings, such a test, I believe, would be a much greater embarrassment and hardship, and that it would prove highly detrimental in shutting out worthy and otherwise qualified persons from contributing their energies to the upbuilding and perpetuity of our Nation.

I can testify from actual knowledge of the prejudice that existed against the immigrants more than half a century ago. But these immigrants have assimilated with and strengthened the purposes of the early settlers. It must be admitted that the illiteracy test will not debar the anarchist.

Labor unionism did not originate in the United States. Many of its most active and efficient officials and a large proportion of the membership of labor organizations in this country will, I am quite sure, be found to be either former immigrants or their direct descendants. I refer to this matter only as it seems to me it is an effective answer to the charge that immigration, under existing law, is or has been detrimental to the cause of organized labor.

When President Jefferson proposed the acquisition of the lands west of the Mississippi River known as the Louisiana Purchase the citizens of Boston in public meeting assembled protested strongly against the project.

They, like those who now take the narrow view on the question of immigration, feared that we could not assimilate the people of this vast territory. Their fears have been proven groundless in the light of our earlier and later experiences. In view of the experience the country has already had with the immigrants who have come to our shores our powers of assimilation ought to prove that they are not detrimental to our best interests. For nearly three centuries the United States has taken under its sheltering wings emigrants from the lands across the seas. These persons have helped to make the United States great and prosperous. They helped us to acquire our independence. Their wisdom and patriotism formulated our Constitution and created a Nation which has been the marvel of the civilized world. Those coming to us in later years have builded our railroads and developed our resources in times of peace and helped us fight our battles and preserve our Union in times of war. If we are to take a new departure and create new conditions, let us hope that the result may not prove as detrimental as many of those who oppose the literacy test believe.

If this test proves detrimental after trial, if it should be adopted, the Congress of the future may reverse our action in this respect.

Mr. DERSHEM. Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill, and I am heartily in favor of every one of its provisions.

It is said of us that we as a nation are less patriotic than of yore; that if conditions similar to those which preceded the Revolutionary War, when the hand of the oppressor was grievous and hard to bear, prevailed to-day, there would be no revolution, because patriotism burns but dimly in our breasts, and that day by day, as a people, we care less for our country and its institutions.

A writer gives as his reason for this supposed condition the number of immigrants coming to this country, without a spark of love for the homeland and even less for the country to which they come. These alien people gather in our larger cities, and by precept and example debauch and degrade our citizens. They are here but a few years when they are allowed to vote for city officials, members of the State legislature, Members of Congress, governors, judges of our courts, and President of the United States. Their influence reaches far into the very life of our Government and is certainly not uplifting.

Personally I am sure where the foreign born are not a large part of the population our people love our country and revere its flag as much or more than in the days gone by.

Be this as it may, this I know: When our forefathers came here the very best and most patriotic people of Europe were coming to our shores, with zealous hearts, longing for a country in which they might find peace, prosperity, and happiness. But now conditions have changed, and of the million or more immigrants coming to our country every year at least 80 per cent are of a very low type of humanity, who care very little, or not at all, for the welfare of this Nation, and by association and amalgamation with our people lower the standard of our citizenship. The healthy, strong, intelligent foreigner I would welcome to our land, but I am opposed to making this country an asylum for the undesirables of all the world. We say within ourselves that conditions may improve, but instead they are rapidly getting worse.

The deplorable political and financial conditions of the eastern and southern countries of Europe, coupled with the prosperous condition of the United States, creates a large natural emigration to our shores. The most convincing proof in the eyes of the people of these countries of the exceptional prosperity of our country is the large sums of money, almost unprecedented to them, which annually arrive from friends and relatives residing in the United States. Besides this natural emigration, however, we are burdened with a dangerous and most injurious unnatural emigration which from year to year assumes larger proportions. This unnatural emigration consists of paupers and assisted emigrants, and is induced and brought about by the unscrupulous and greedy activity displayed by a large number of agencies and subagencies having well-established connections in the United States and abroad, apparently unknown to the steamship companies, which activity manifests itself in the peddling of steamship tickets and prepaids on the installment plan, both here and abroad, the constant agitation and offers of inducements by subagents in Europe, occupying semi-public positions, who, in order to earn commissions, play upon the ignorance and susceptibility of the plain peasant, frequently inducing him to sell or mortgage all his belongings for the purpose of raising the necessary traveling expenses, which latter transaction is also turned to profit by such agent.

In my own State the foreign-born criminal and insane cost the State of Pennsylvania, every two years, more than $4,000,000. This does not include the foreign-born poor confined in our poorhouses and jails. The Pennsylvania Legislature for the two years ending June 30, 1913, appropriated to the various State, semi-State, and private institutions $15,578,553.78. Twenty-seven per cent of this amount, or about $4,000,000, were expended for the maintenance of the foreign born who were in the various institutions of our State. On December 31, 1911, there were in the eastern penitentiary 1,350 and in the western penitentiary 980 convicts, making a total of 2,330. About 28 per cent of these were foreigners. The criminals confined in Pennsylvania's four penal institutions cost annually about $1,600,000. If 25 per cent of this amount is charged to the foreigners, the amount is $400,000. We can readily see by these figures that more than 25 per cent of the entire appropriation to State, semi-State, and private institutions goes to maintain the foreigner, and the foreign-born criminal and insane cost the State of Pennsylvania every two years more than $4,000,000.

The average weekly cost per capita in the five State hospitals for the insane in Pennsylvania is $4.35, although only about one-half of the insane in Pennsylvania are cared for in these five institutions. This is a fair and, I am inclined to believe, a low average rate. The total number of foreign born confined in the insane institutions in Pennsylvania May 31, 1911, was 4,577. This number, at the average cost of $4.35 per week, reaches the enormous sum of $1,035,317.40 per year.

EDUCATIONAL TEST.

In many cases this provision may work some hardship, and as a matter of theory it possibly is unfair. In practice, however, you would find it would be the means of keeping out the class of people we are now hoping to keep out in some other way. It is quite probable something could be done, as has been suggested by a former Commissioner General, in the way of distributing immigrants throughout the West to prevent congestion in the seaboard cities. We ought to check the evil at the outset; however, and keep out the worst aliens, so that we would have to distribute only the better classes. If men are undesirable, the more you distribute them the worse off you are.

The percentage of illiteracy is enormously greater among the undesirable nationalities than among those we have always been glad to welcome to the United States. But is not the ignorant man as good a workman as one who knows how to read and write? Ought one to put up the bars against poor people whose illiteracy is the fault of the country where they were born, and who, perhaps, come to the United States as much to get an education for their children as for any other reason? There is the sentimental argument. Of course, we ought to be generous about our own advantages, but there is no God-given right by which men can come to this country and expect us to educate them. The fact of the matter is that the uneducated foreigner, who can neither read nor write in his own language, can not be reached by our educational institutions. He remains in a condition of hopeless ignorance, and while he may be a good

workingman he is not a good citizen. We might take his children, if he has any, and keep him out, except for the inhumanity of such a proceeding, but it is an undeniable fact that the grown man, who comes here illiterate, seldom or never rises sufficiently to be reached by our American institutions. These ignorant people can not meet the competition of the educated men of their own nationality. They are too ignorant to know where the conditions are best for them, and they herd together in the cities. They can not be reached by our schoolteachers or the missionaries, and they are the ones who first go to the hospitals and the poorhouses, because they can not bring themselves to learn anything from their own people or from their American neighbors. I believe we can institute a practical educational test which will work well and which would not be more unfair than is any other test.

To our own very heavy burden of defectives and degenerates we are adding every year thousands of aliens, whose presence here will result, because of their own defects and those of their offspring, in lowering the physical and mental standards of the American race. We have much still to learn about heredity, but we know enough to be sure that if the quality of our race is to be preserved there must be a far more careful selection of our immigrants than we have ever attempted to make. The need is indeed imperative for applying eugenic principles in our legislation, but the greatest, the most logical, the most effective step that we can take is to begin with the proper eugenic selection of the incoming alien millions.

We hear much of the conservation of our natural resources, but the conservation and improvement of the American race is vastly more important than all other conservation. The real wealth of a nation is the quality of its people. Of what value are endless acres of forests, millions of tons of coal, and billions of gallons of water if the race is not virile and sane and sound?

[Mr. LANGLEY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. BARTON, by unanimous consent, was given permission to extend remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moves that all debate on this section and amendment close in 30 minutes.

Mr. HAYES. The gentleman means on this amendment to the literacy test?

Mr. BURNETT. I mean to this paragraph, and that is the only amendment.

Mr. OGLESBY. I hope the gentleman will extend that time.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman from Alabama refers only to the amendment offered by me to strike out the educational test.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands the gentleman from Alabama. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOLDFOGLE) there were 62 ayes and 61 noes.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statements of my friend from Texas, Mr. SLAYDEN, and I cordially reciprocate the sentiments of friendship which he has expressed. I want to go further than he has, however, and say that I agree with him on nearly all questions save this one. I was interested in his remarks, not because of what he said about conditions in Belgium, and so forth, but because of the State which he so well represents on this floor. I remember the time when Representatives of the great State of Texas stood upon this floor protesting against the National Government undertaking to regulate the question of immigration, for the reason that while conditions in the North—in New York and Pennsylvania and the other crowded sections of the country—might justify legislation to exclude foreigners, such justification did not exist in the State of Texas, and for that reason they expressed a preference for the sovereign right of the State to regulate a question of that kind according to its own sweet will; and while it is true that the question of immigration is national, yet the Representatives from that great State at that time made the argument that the National Government was doing something against which they were bound to protest on account of the conditions existing in their State. What might suit New York might not and did not suit Texas, they said, and because of the difference of conditions they demanded different treatment.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I have only five minutes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does the gentleman say that the State of Texas has the right to prevent the handling of the immigration question by the National Government?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Oh, no. These seasoned lawmakers understood that they had no such right, yet they protested against the regulation of the question by the National Government as an iniquity and injustice to their State, a State which they said needed immigration, and the Lord knows it needs it just as much to-day as it needed it 20 years ago, because Texas has more land and less people than any other section of the country.

I am opposed to the literacy test, for three reasons: First, because it is insincere and hypocritical. It is proposed in the name of education, while in reality you merely want to restrict, and you propose here to coin hypocrisy into American law, and against that I protest. Secondly, I am opposed to it because it punishes a lack of opportunity. Think of it, the land of opportunity is to go on record before the civilized world as punishing the lack of opportunity of those poor people who could not get the necessary education at home in order to pass this test.

Do you know that every one of the men and women, in order to be admitted, under existing laws must well-nigh be an angel? Look at these laws and the drastic restrictions you have placed around the poor immigrant. He must be physically sound and mentally sound. If there has been blot on his character in the past, he can not say, like our friend from Mississippi, the Hon. John Allen, "Never mind the past, but I point with pride to my spotless future." [Laughter.] No; his good intentions for the future avail him nothing. Before he can pass the gate it is necessary for him to point to spotless past in the first place. Why, persons, male or female, who succeed in getting by the inspectors at Ellis Island would be good enough to be readily admitted into heaven, whether they can read and write or not; but in order to be admitted into this free country they must be able to read. In other words, our restrictionists propose to set up a test more stringent than that which would easily entitle an immigrant to eternal bliss.

My third objection is that an educational test is no test of character—in fact, is no test of the fitness of an immigrant at all. From a practical standpoint it would be better to exclude educated classes and admit those who have not had the benefit of a school training, because the latter we really need for our rough work, while we have an ample sufficiency of the former class in our own country. As honest and self-respecting legislators we can not and should not depart from the truism that character is the only test of a man's worth. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTHOLDT, Mr. TAYLOR of New York, and Mr. LOFT were granted leave to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I realize the opposition there is to very large immigration to our country, and I question the desirability of having too large a number of immigrants coming into this country. No one would question the fact that we do not desire immigration more rapidly than we can properly assimilate it, but, Mr. Chairman, I have never yet been willing to judge of the honesty of a man or of his capacity, morally, mentally, or physically, by the test of whether he could read, when he had been brought up without the opportunity to learn to read. [Applause.] I think it is perhaps a reflection upon a citizen of the United States, born and raised here close to free public schools, if he has taken no advantage of his opportunity and learned to read, but I can not believe that it is a reflection upon a citizen of a foreign land who has not had the same opportunity of free public schools in which he might learn to read. And we all know that if in the history of our country those who were not able to read had not been permitted to be pioneers of the country, the country would still remain unsettled, and if those who were not able to read had not been permitted to come into the country we still would be a desert land.

I can not bring my conscience to the point where it enables me to judge of the desirability of a foreigner becoming an American citizen, with the right to rear his children here, by the test of whether, without the opportunity, he has been able to learn to read. There ought to be other tests which will enable us to properly restrict immigration. I do not believe that this land of ours, held up as the hope of the ignorant everywhere in the world, held up as the hope of the oppressed throughout the lands of the world, that here we can afford to say, No matter how willing you are to become a good citizen, no matter how industrious you may be, no matter how economical you may be, no matter how willing to work you may be, yet you can not become one of us except by the arbitrary test of whether, without the opportunity which we had, you have learned to do that which we have learned to do, namely, to read. I hope we will never reach that point. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the committee rose, and Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 6060 and had directed him to report that it had come to no conclusion thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House meet at 11 o'clock on Monday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 11 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. DONOVAN. To ask a question—is it 11 o'clock a. m. or p. m.?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Alabama what the understanding is, if there be one, whether this bill has the right of way on Monday or whether the Unanimous Consent Calendar will be called?

Mr. BURNETT. If we meet at 11 o'clock of course this bill will have the right of way from 11 to 12, but what the ruling of the Speaker will be on that question I do not know, but we shall ask for the right of way that day.

Mr. MANN. The right of way, of course, would not depend upon the House meeting at 11; that would not be the test, of course. I do not know whether there was any understanding.

Mr. BURNETT. No; there is not.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that many of the Members of the House, this being Saturday night, will probably go away to spend Sunday with their families. Now, they may not be able to get here as early as the gentleman from Alabama suggests, if the House meets at 11, so I suggest to the gentleman that he ought not to press his request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. I withhold that motion for one minute for the gentleman from Washington.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGE AND APPROACHES ACROSS COLUMBIA RIVER, VANCOUVER, WASH.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table and pass the bill S. 4094, an act providing for the erection of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Columbia River at or near Vancouver, Wash.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate bill 4094.

Mr. MANN. It does not require unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there a similar bill on the House Calendar?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; and a favorable report from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 4094. An act authorizing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Columbia River at or near Vancouver, Wash.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, has not the stage of business gone for the gentleman to take it from the table?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman asked unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It has, except by unanimous consent; but the gentleman asked unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. Let the bill be reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Multnomah, in the State of Oregon, the county of Clarke, in the State of Washington, or the said counties of Multnomah and Clarke, acting jointly, be, and they or either of them are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Columbia River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Vancouver, Wash., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like for the gentleman to give an explanation of this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill authorizing the building of a bridge to cost nearly $3,000,000 between the two States, and is to be paid for by the people of the two counties named. A favorable report has been made by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House and the bill has passed the Senate.

Mr. GARDNER. Is a similar bill now on the House Calendar?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; and reported favorably.

Mr. GARDNER. And reported unanimously?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m) the House adjourned until Monday, February 2, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Key West Harbor, Fla., with a view to construction of a harbor of refuge and a safe anchorage for vessels (H. Doc. No. 680), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HOUSTON, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill (S. 48) to authorize the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 204), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 12740) to provide for compensation for mechanics, generally known as machinists and toolmakers, employed by the United States Government; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 12741) to provide for and encourage the prospecting, mining, and treatment of radium-bearing ores in lands belonging to the United States, for the purpose of securing an adequate supply of radium for Government and other hospitals in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12742) to improve the efficiency of Marine Engineers of the United States, and to create a grade of certificates to be known as "Apprentice engineers' certificates"; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 12743) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to cause to be erected a suitable building or buildings for marine-hospital purposes on the present marine-hospital site at San Francisco, Cal., and to remove all or any of the present structures on said site; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 12744) requiring the Secretary of War to manufacture certain supplies for the Army in the quartermaster's depot at Jeffersonville, Ind., and making an appropriation therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 12745) permitting seeds, cuttings, bulbs, roots, scions, and plants to be placed under parcel-post laws and regulations; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 12746) to provide for the establishment, operation, and supervision of a cooperative national farm-land bank system in the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MONTAGUE: A bill (H. R. 12747) authorizing the Secretary of War, in his discretion, to deliver to the city of Richmond, Va., a bronze cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 12748) fixing the annual salary of clerks of circuit courts of appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 12749) to increase the compensation of the register and receiver of the Juneau (Alaska) land office; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McCOY: A bill (H. R. 12750) relating to procedure in United States courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 12751) for the relief of the St. Croix Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FALCONER: A bill (H. R. 12752) for the erection of a monument to the memory of John Ericsson, inventor of the *Monitor*, at Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 12753) for the erection of a memorial building at Fort Amanda, Allen County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 12754) to create a waterways commission and a board of river regulation to promote interstate commerce by the development and improvement of the rivers and waterways and water resources of the United States and the coordination of and cooperation between rail and water routes, and by providing a fund for the regulation and control of the flow of rivers and for the maintenance at all seasons of a navigable stage of water in waterways and for the connection of rivers and waterways with the Great Lakes and with each other, and as a means to that end to provide for flood prevention and protection and for water storage and for the beneficial use of flood waters for irrigation and water power and for the conservation and use of water in agriculture and for the protection of watersheds from denudation and erosion and from forest fires and for the cooperation in such work of Government services and bureaus with each other and with States, municipalities, and other local agencies; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 12755) for the establishment of a farm-credit bureau in the Department of Agriculture, to reduce the rate of interest of farm mortgages, and to encourage agriculture and the ownership of farm homes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAYLOR of New York: A bill (H. R. 12756) providing for the completion of the Tarrytown Harbor, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 207) providing for a commission to contract for finishing the historical frieze in the Rotunda of the Capitol; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FINLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 208) providing for the printing of the roster of the officers and enlisted men of the Union and Confederate Armies; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 12757) granting an increase of pension to August H. Strains; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 12758) granting a pension to Dora R. Boyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12759) granting an increase of pension to William A. Barber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 12760) granting a pension to William H. Ratcliff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12761) granting an increase of pension to C. E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12762) to correct the military record of George W. Hall; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 12763) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Steward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 12764) granting a pension to Charles F. Mow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 12765) for the relief of John W. Wischmeyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12766) granting a pension to James S. Kensler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDMONDS: A bill (H. R. 12767) for the relief of John Holly Wilkie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FALCONER: A bill (H. R. 12768) to amend the military record of John Morrow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 12769) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12770) granting a pension to Allie E. Stillwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 12771) for the relief of the legal representatives of John Fletcher and Harriet A. K. Fletcher, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOEKE: A bill (H. R. 12772) granting an increase of pension to John W. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELVERING: A bill (H. R. 12773) granting an increase of pension to Michael H. Dibert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12774) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Halley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12775) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hutchison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12776) for the relief of Frederick A. Holden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULINGS: A bill (H. R. 12777) granting an increase of pension to William Eastlick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12778) for the relief of W. D. Stoyer, administrator of the estate of Henry S. Stoyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 12779) to correct the military record of William Vanover; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAZARO: A bill (H. R. 12780) to provide for the payment of the claim of J. O. Modisette for services performed for the Chickasaw Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 12781) granting a pension to George H. Cope; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12782) granting a pension to David Good; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 12783) granting a pension to William H. Crawford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12784) to reimburse Saunders Lewis, jr., for expenses of the office of clerk of the circuit court of appeals for the third circuit; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 12785) granting a pension to William G. Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12786) granting a pension to Stephen House; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12787) to add to the records of the War Department the name of James B. Partin, and to grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAGGART: A bill (H. R. 12788) to correct the military record of Alfred Rebsamen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 12789) granting a pension to Henry Webb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12790) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Haines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12791) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Rightmire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHALEY: A bill (H. R. 12792) for the relief of Mrs. Thomas G. Prioleau and others, heirs at law of Thomas G. Prioleau, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 12793) granting an increase of pension to Gideon W. Carmichael; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 12794) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of sundry citizens of Philadelphia Branch, No. 430; Workmen's Circle of Cleveland, Ohio; Lodge No. 281, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, of Rochester, N. Y.; and Newark (N. J.) Young Men's Lodge, No. 154, Independent Order B'rith Sholom, protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of the Paul Revere Branch of the American Continental League, of Leominster, Mass., protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Henry Heckman and 10 others, of Newark, Ohio., protesting against Federal prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Silver Star Council of Daughters of Liberty, of Newark, Ohio, favoring more stringent immigration laws; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, favoring investigation of the Menace; to the Committee on Rules.

Also (by request), petition of German-American Alliance of Johnstown, Pa., against House joint resolution 168; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: Memorial of the Wisconsin State Conference of Brotherhood of Painters and Paper Hangers, favoring House bill 1873; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Kewaskum (Wis.) Branch of German-American Alliance, against House joint resolution 168; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Joshua Sharpless, favoring an investigation of the publication called The Menace; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of the Daughters of Liberty of Berwyn and Chester, Pa.; Edgmont Council, No. 833, Order of Independent Americans, of Gradyville, Pa.; and sundry citizens of the United States, favoring the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of citizens of New York, favoring House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of South Brooklyn (N. Y.) Lodge, No. 174, Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, against House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Maritime Association of the port of New York, favoring House bill 3328; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARLIN: Papers to accompany House bill 12678; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Milwaukee Aerie, No. 137, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168 and Senate joint resolutions 88 and 50, or any other prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLANCY: Petition of sundry citizens of Camillus and Jordan, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 5308, relative to mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petitions of Flower City Lodge, No. 281, Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, of Rochester, N. Y.; American-Jewish Committee of New York City, and the Polish National Alliance of the United States, against House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of Beresford, S. Dak., protesting against the passage of the Sabbath observance bill (H. R. 9674); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Jefferson, N. Dak., relative to aid for Enright's place against the ravages of the Missouri River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DYER: Petitions of citizens and organizations of Missouri, against House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of St. Louis (Mo.) Council, No. 1, Junior Order United American Mechanics, and citizens of St. Louis, Mo., favoring House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of the Italo-American Democratic Club of Hoboken, N. J., protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EDMONDS: Petition of the George Rogers Clark Branch of the Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Council Branch, No. 47, Order of United American Mechanics, favoring House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of National League of Commission Merchants of the United States, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Santa Margherita Belici, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against passage of bills restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, relating to use of Kentucky stone in the erection of the Lincoln Memorial Building at Washington; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the Hide and Leather Association of New York, favoring change in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of New York State Fruit Growers' Association, of Penn Yan, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the McKellar cold-storage bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Utica Association of Credit Men, relative to flood protection; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the board of directors of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, favoring the passage of House bill 3328, relative to construction of four new revenue cutters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of the Hebrew Socialist Club, Brockton, Mass., and Plymouth Rock (Mass.) Lodge, No. 289, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, against House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Papers to accompany House bill 12692; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany House bills 12693 and 12694; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Order of Independent Americans of Pennsylvania, favoring House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington: Petitions of J. G. Jenkins, Elmer Wittie, and C. H. Hart, of Bellingham, Wash., favoring a two-battleship program; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of the Polish National Alliance of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of House bill 6060 restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Utah: Petition of D. H. Morris and 38 others, of St. George, Utah, favoring the passage of House bill 8947, extending the free delivery of mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Petition of Aberdeen (Wash.) Central Labor Council, favoring seamen's bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of members of the Grand Army post at Bonaparte, Iowa, protesting against the passage of the Towner bill, for paying soldiers' pensions each month; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of Providence (R. I.) Lodge, No. 591, Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Branch No. 25, United National Association of Post Office Clerks of the United States, of Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of House bill 10827, relative to increase in salary; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Papers to accompany bills for pensions to George R. Robinson and Jessie Byerly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Georgia: Papers to accompany House bill 12154, a bill granting an increase of pension to John Loughmiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEVY: Petitions of the Workmen's Circle of New York City and sundry citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of C. Tennant, Sons & Co., of New York City, relative to treatment of European governments as to the tariff on cottonseed oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against the passage of Bartlett-Bacon anti-injunction bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the New York Wholesale Grocers' Association, at Utica, N. Y., favoring the right to make resale price by manufacturers of goods; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of N. L. Carpenter & Co., William Meyer & Co., Ignaz Strauss & Co., Weingarten Bros., all of New York City, favoring the passage of the Ransdell-Humphreys bill, relative to flood control; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Northern New York Development League, relative to deepening of the St. Lawrence River where necessary, etc.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of R. C. Williams & Co., of New York City, protesting against the passage of House bill 9833, relative to labels bearing the year of packing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr LINDQUIST: Petition of citizens of Carson City, Vickeryville, Butternut, Coral, and Shepherd, all in the State of Michigan, favoring the passage of the Lindquist pure fabric and leather bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Andrew Macombe Post, No. 141, Grand Army of the Republic, relative to flag; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petitions of the Polish National Alliance of Chicago and the American-Jewish Committee of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Boston Fish Bureau, protesting against the passage of the McKellar cold-storage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of Palestina Lodge, No. 273, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of General Sumter Branch of the American Continental League, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the "One hundred years of peace celebration"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAGE of North Carolina: Petitions of citizens of Ontario and Wayne Counties, N. Y., favoring the amendment to the Constitution relative to sale, etc., of intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALMER: Memorial of Palestine Lodge, No. 273, Independent Order B'rith Abraham, protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of Polish National Alliance, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Boston Fish Bureau, of Boston, Mass., protesting against the passage of the McKellar cold-storage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: Memorial of veterans of Civil War, in reference to House bill 9324; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of German-American Alliance of Middlesex County, N. J., protesting against the passage of House joint resolution 168, for Federal prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petition of the Polish National Alliance, of Chicago, Ill., against House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Centennial Council No. 7, Daughters of Liberty, of Pueblo, Colo., favoring House bill 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of John Olgorkeke, of Picton, Colo., against House joint resolution 168; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. M. C. SMITH: Petition of the Amalgamated Electric and Street Railway Employees of Kalamazoo, Mich., favoring Bartlett-Bacon bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of Michigan, favoring free press and free speech; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Papers to accompany House bill 12530; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: Statement of Jay Fowler, carrier on rural route No. 1, of Slingerlands, Albany County, N. Y., showing actual cost of necessary equipment and maintenance of same, to properly serve his route during the year 1913; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, statement of George W. Latta, carrier on rural route No. 1, of Delmar, Albany County, N. Y., showing actual cost of necessary equipment and maintenance of same, to properly serve his route during the year 1913; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, statement of Calvin Bushnell, carrier on rural route No. 1, of Altamont, Albany County, N. Y., showing actual cost of necessary equipment and maintenance of same to properly serve his route during the year 1913; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of the Workmen's Circle of New York and citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, against the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Northern New York Development League, favoring deepening of St. Lawrence River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of Merchants' Association of New York, against House bill 1873; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Utica (N. Y.) Association of Credit Men, favoring completion of Mississippi levee system; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the New York Wholesale Grocers' Association, favoring legislation giving the independent manufacturer of trade-marked goods the right to make the resale price on his own products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Twenty-second Annual Convention of the National League of Commission Merchants of the United States, favoring House bill 4322; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of farmers of Garvin County, Okla., favoring the passage of a bill for rural credit system; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Polish National Alliance, of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the passage of House bill 6060, restricting immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *February 2, 1914.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Oh Lord our God, Thy kingdom ruleth over all. We can not by any means take ourselves out of the jurisdiction of Thy law. Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom. All forms of human endeavor and all the activities of organic life must come within the province of Thy kingdom and within the jurisdiction of Thy law.

We pray that we may be inspired with a sense of God's right to rule and with responsive love to Thee for all Thy goodness to us, so that every act of our life may be brought into conformity to Thy will and that we may act as the stewards of God, commissioned of Thee to perform a great work for Thy people, and that we may constantly receive the blessed benediction of our Father in heaven. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

REPORT OF THE CAPITAL TRACTION CO. (H. DOC. NO. 682).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Capital Traction Co., of the District of Columbia, for the year ended December 31, 1913, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF THE WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO. (H. DOC. NO. 683).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Gas Light Co., of the District of Columbia, for the year ended December 31, 1913, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO. (H. DOC. NO. 687).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., of the District of Columbia, for the year ended December 31, 1913, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN & TENNALLYTOWN RAILWAY CO. (H. DOC. NO. 685).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown & Tennallytown Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1913, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.