Also, petition of the Gouring Krehbul Mercantile Co. and 10 others, of Moundridge, Kans., favoring H. R. 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Hanlin Sheep Mercantile Co. and 21 others, of Newton, Kans., favoring H. R. 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Ira G. Wilson and 7 others, of Canton, Kans., favoring H. R. 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of R. C. Strahm and 17 others, of McPherson, Kans., favoring H. R. 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Communications from the railway employees' department of the American Federation of Labor, the Pennsylvania State Federation of Labor, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Chauffeurs of America, the Retail Clerks' International Protective Association, the International Seamen's Union of America, and the New York State Federation of Labor, all favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, telegram from the San Francisco Labor Council, and communications from the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers and the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of A. Lenteneker, of Chicago Park, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of Star of Hope and other Polish societies of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of Mrs. J. R. Fletcher and others, of Hill City, Idaho, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of 53 citizens of Hawley, 72 citizens of Lewisville, 17 citizens of Kratka, citizens of Ottertail, Richville, and Thief River Falls, all in the State of Minnesota, favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 790 American citizens, favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WEAVER: Memorial of the Shawnee (Okla.) Trades and Labor Assembly, urging the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of railway employees' department of the American Federation of Labor, urging the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America, urging the Congress to pass the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, urging the passage by Congress of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Pattern Makers' League of North America, urging the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *February 4, 1915.*

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thy name is above every name. Thy authority alone is supreme in all the universe. Thou art the Supreme Judge of men. There is no revoking Thy order; no appeal from Thy decree. Thou dost rule us by Thy power and Thy love. We bless Thee that Thou hast revealed unto us the infinite tenderness of Thy love; that Thou dost refine our spirits more and more; that by the gentle influence of Thy grace we are enabled more and more to know the infinite tenderness of the love of God.

Grant us this day to return love for Thy love and obedience to Thy will, that we may be in subjection to the great God of heaven to do the will of our Father which is in heaven. For Christ's sake. Amen.

ALBERT B. FALL, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, appeared in his seat to-day.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not want it to be supposed that I am going to make a habit of discussing the Journal. I have always felt that the reading of the Journal was a ceremony to be disposed of rapidly and dispensed with as far as possible. But "absence makes the heart grow fonder," and I am beginning to feel some attachment to a Journal which we do not get except at intervals, perhaps, of 10 days or more, when it is presented to us in a large and more or less inaccurate mass.

I do not wish to speak about this Journal of yesterday which has just been read, but in connection with the Journal of Tuesday which, by unanimous consent, went over for revision. I wish to correct an error into which I think I may have fallen myself in what I said about the Journal of Tuesday. On last Friday—I think it was last Friday, but since we have abandoned the Gregorian calendar, which is in general use among mankind, and devised a new calendar of our own, I may not be perfectly accurate—but last Friday, I think, was the occasion when we had some great movements here in the field of parliamentary law; it was my misfortune—and I regard it as a very great misfortune—that I was not present to listen during that period, for it is very interesting to see parliamentary law in the making, and that evening we not only revised a good many rules of the Senate, but we made some wholly new parliamentary law never conceived or thought of before.

I was reminded in that connection of an old story which everybody has heard. When some one said in the House of Commons to Henry Labouchere that the story he had just told was neither true nor new, he said he did not in the least object to being told that his story was not true, but he did object to being told that it was not new; he was sure it was new because he made all his stories himself. Whatever may be said of the rulings that evening, they were certainly new; and that is why I was anxious for a better revision of the Tuesday Journal.

I now refer to the most important ruling made that night—I think it was the most important—in regard to the use of the ordering of the yeas and nays as a previous question. I said on Tuesday that it was a decision of the Chair. I had taken the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I had noted that on page 2587 at the bottom it said:

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JAMES in the chair).

I read it along to page 2590, where the rulings occurred in the first and second columns, and I assumed that they were made by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES], for there was no statement that the Senator from Kentucky had left the chair. When the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] said that he thought I was mistaken in saying it was a decision, I felt sure it must be a decision, because the Senator from Kentucky never doubts or hesitates; and I was certain that he could not be accused of having made a tentative decision, which was to me a new and ingenious phrase.

I have heard it stated, though it does not appear in the RECORD, that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] made the ruling in question, and the Senator from Georgia, with the natural feeling we all have when we see a friend floundering in the water or trying to escape from a fire, naturally came to the defense of the Senator from Virginia, and said his decision was a "tentative" ruling.

Mr. President, this one fact illustrates the need of a revision of this Tuesday Journal. According to the RECORD, the Senator from Kentucky was in the chair; but the Senator from Georgia, who was an eyewitness, evidently considered that the Senator from Virginia was in the chair. This illustrates the confusion and certainly shows the need of a careful revision of the Journal.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I will yield in a moment.

Now, Mr. President, I think I was not mistaken in the impression conveyed to the Senate by these rulings. The Presiding Officer, according to the RECORD, was the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES]; according to eyewitnesses, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]; and I, of course, do not wish to take any sides in the contest as to who made those now celebrated rulings. I have heard that both the distinguished Senators to whom I have referred claimed the honor of making those rulings, and since then that, in a spirit of generous rivalry, they are each trying to yield to the other the honor of having made the brilliant discovery of the order of the yeas and nays

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

as a kind of mongrel previous question. But here is what was said:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair is mistaken, he would be very glad to hear any Senator who dissents from the decision of the Chair; but the Chair is satisfied that no amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida is in order until the yea-and-nay vote has been taken.

Now, that has every appearance of a decision.

However, the Chair understands that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire is to perfect the original text, which would be voted on prior to the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida, under Rule XVIII, and it being the general parliamentary law that the original text must be perfected before a substitute is voted on. The ordering of the yeas and nays will prevent any amendment being offered to the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida.

Of course, that may be called a tentative decision, but it reads to me very much like a plain decision. Then he said further:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is willing to hear any decision to the contrary, but the Chair is of opinion that if the yeas and nays have been ordered on a proposition if it is modified the yeas and nays would have been ordered on a different proposition if an amendment were made.

There is the ingenious reason for a decision which is not a decision clearly given.

If the mover of a resolution, under the rules of the Senate, can not modify it after the yeas and nays are ordered, it would seem to the Chair that any proposition upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered would be of equal dignity.

I am not going to enter into the obvious proposition that the admission of an amendment to the original bill would change the situation just as much as a perfecting amendment to the substitute. This goes to the merits of the question, and with the merits of the question I am not now concerned. Such, then, are the "tentative" rulings.

The Senate on both sides, I think, understood that the question had been determined when the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] on Monday—I believe I am again right in reference to the calendar day—moved to recommit the bill. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], in charge of the bill, who is a Senator of long service and an experienced parliamentarian, following, of course, closely the decisions that had been so recently and brilliantly made, said:

Mr. President, I make the point of order that that motion is not in order. The Senate has decided to take a vote on the pending question and the yeas and nays have been ordered. No other motion is in order until that is decided. The Senate has determined that, and I make that point of order.

So the impression on the mind of the senior Senator from Florida as to the tentative decision was the same as the impression upon my mind and, I think, upon those of all the Senators around me that the question had been determined by the Senator from Virginia.

Thereupon, as we all know, the question came to the Senate and the Senate decided that the new ruling was not correct and returned the body by their decision to the old, and, as I believe, only sound, ground, which is that ordering the yeas and nays; that is, determining the method of taking a vote when a vote is reached, is not in the nature of ordering the previous question on amendments, although not on debate, and that decision of the Senate, of course, stands until the Senate reverses it or until some one occupies the chair who has forgotten it. This Friday ruling was a very important one. It had a brief life from Friday night until Monday afternoon, but it was beautiful and pleasant in its life, and while it existed we all wondered and obeyed. Now, it has been ruthlessly disposed of by a Senate vote.

Mr. President, I call attention to these facts in order to correct my own error, if I was wrong in my opinion as to the Friday night ruling. I also call attention to it so that those who have the Journal in charge may make certain who was the Senator in the chair who made that ruling. I think we ought to know, and I wished to call attention to it before the Friday Journal is finally approved.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, when the Senator from Massachusetts called attention—the Senator from Massachusetts yields?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I have yielded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. When the Senator from Massachusetts called attention to the action of the Senate on Friday night last, by his consent I sought to correct him at the time and to suggest that he was in error when he supposed that the Presiding Officer on Friday last ruled that an amendment could not be entertained to a pending proposition after a call for the yeas and nays. The Senator from Massachusetts referred to the manner in which the Senator from Virginia when in the chair handled this question, and I called to his attention the fact that the Senator from Virginia in the chair did not rule on it, that he expressed a tentative opinion and refrained from ruling.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Then I understand the Senator thinks that those two rulings—rulings as they seem to me—were made by the Senator from Virginia and not by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No rulings were made by either on this subject.

Mr. LODGE. We will not dispute about terms.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The language referred to was by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LODGE. The two statements that I read were made by the Senator from Virginia, not by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The statements were by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. LODGE. Exactly; and then the RECORD is wrong.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The RECORD is wrong.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One moment. I do not yield for the present, if the Senator from Kentucky will allow me to finish answering the Senator from Massachusetts. The RECORD fails to show the place at which the Senator from Kentucky ceased to preside. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows the Senator from Kentucky in the chair and later on shows the Senator from Kentucky on the floor raising a point of order without showing at any place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD when the Senator from Kentucky ceased to be in the chair and when the Senator from Virginia took the chair.

What I rose for was to emphasize the suggestion that I made to the Senator from Massachusetts when he brought this subject to the attention of the Senate before. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] did not rule that the amendment to the substitute was out of order upon the ground that the yeas and nays had been called for. He could not have ruled it out of order, for no amendment to the substitute was at that time presented.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Just one moment, please.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The amendment offered was to the original text; and the Senator from Virginia held that, as it was to the original text, it was in order. He went on, however, and expressed tentatively his views. There was no opportunity for an appeal from the decision of the Chair, because there was no decision, there was no amendment offered on which an appeal could be based. So it in no sense takes the form of a ruling of the Chair affecting the procedure of the Senate, but is merely an expression of an opinion by the Presiding Officer upon a subject that was not before him.

Just one moment further now. A little prior to that time when the subject was up, the Senator will find, on page 2589, that the Presiding Officer said:

It is not now in order—

That is to say, to offer an amendment—

because a motion to lay on the table has been made by the Senator from Utah. It is not in order until that motion is disposed of.

That was after the call for the yeas and nays. So upon that same Friday afternoon we hear the Chair indicating clearly that after the disposition of the motion to lay on the table an amendment might be offered to the substitute, although a call for yeas and nays had been made.

Mr. President, my view was very pronounced upon this subject. I believed that an amendment could still be made; I believed that the rules specifically permitted the amendment; I believed, and I still believe, that Rule XV expressly authorized a motion to recommit until final action upon the bill; I have no doubt about that myself. Of course, as I claim the privilege of my own opinion, I concede most heartily to others their opinion. I only wish to prevent the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] from strengthening the authority against the right to offer an amendment after the yeas and nays were called. I wish to remove the suggestion that any ruling on Friday last was authority against the right to move to recommit after the yeas and nays were called, for there had been no formal ruling on the subject in the Senate on Friday from which an appeal was taken.

I do not desire to occupy the attention of the Senate just now, but at a little later time I may present to the Senate a short statement with reference to Rule XV and with reference to the constitutional provision and the history of the constitu-

tional provision on the yeas and nays, which to me conclusively sustains the opinion that the yeas and nays are only intended as a means of recording the vote, to furnish the status of each Senator to the public, and not to give a minority the privilege of segregating a question and preventing the majority from shaping it as they wish to shape it before they finally vote on it.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat I wish to suggest that it is hardly necessary for me to say that I agree with him absolutely in his view as to the yeas and nays and their uses, and my vote shows that. What I want to ask him is—for I am trying to learn as we go on here developing our parliamentary law——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I shall be glad to give the Senator from Massachusetts the benefit of any information I have.

Mr. LODGE. I want to ask the Senator this: Does the Senator hold that the Chair can not make the ruling unless he rules and opens the opportunity for appeal? Over and over again, both in the Senate and in the other House, I have seen Senators and Members of the House rise and ask the Chair if an amendment or a motion would be in order, and the Chair would say "the motion is not in order," and the motion would never be offered; there would never be an opportunity for an appeal; but the Chair would rule on the right of the Member or his request to offer the amendment. It has always been taken as a ruling.

The Senator from Georgia says that this was a tentative statement. It seems to me, on reading it pretty carefully, to be about as explicit, with the reasons, as a ruling can be made.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator from Massachusetts asked me a question, and I suppose he wished me to answer it?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I know that it is customary for Senators and Members of the other House and of other parliamentary bodies to rise and inquire of the Chair what the Chair's view would be on a subject, but I do not consider answers to such questions by the Chair as rulings in any way binding upon the body. I do not think the Chair could make a ruling that would be binding upon the body unless a question was submitted to him from which the right of appeal would exist. I do not think that from a tentative expression of an opinion of that kind an appeal could properly be made. I would regard it rather as the expression of an opinion by a judge on a subject that was not before him.

Mr. LODGE. My point is that the opportunity for an appeal is not necessary to constitute what the Chair declares a ruling. It can be a ruling without it. I am not saying that the Senator asked, "Would it be in order?" He asked, "Is this amendment in order?" And the Chair said, "No; it would not be in order at this time," or, "It would not be in order." I have seen that done again and again. That, in my judgment, is a ruling of the Chair.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I should look upon that rather as advice by the Chair to the one making the inquiry; and if I were interested in the matter, it seems to me I would rather tender my motion or tender my amendment and go through the various parliamentary stages of insisting upon my rights, unless I wanted simply to act upon the advice of the presiding officer.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think that——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. One moment. Referring also to the expression of the Senator from Virginia, when he was in the chair, he expressly stated before he finished his remarks, as I recall them, that he did not intend to rule upon the subject; that it was not then before him; and he did not say that he would not entertain an amendment if it was offered. The Senator from Virginia, however, is now in his seat, and is better capable than am I of discussing what he said.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the merits of the ruling. I am afraid I am beyond change on that. But I want to ask the Senator from Georgia one other question. Is it not true, as is shown by the statement of the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] which I read, that he regarded the question as determined by the Senate—he used that phrase—and that is what I regard it, as determined? I mean that was the idea certainly in the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was present in the Senate at the time when the expressions by the Presiding Officer were made; I knew that I differed from some of my colleagues in my opinion about the subject, and I was watching it pretty constantly, intending myself to insist upon my own view of the rule if the occasion required. With all deference to the views of my colleagues, I had such a pronounced view upon the subject that I could not yield it, and if the ruling had been made it had been my own purpose, most courteously and, of course, deferentially, to appeal from the ruling, because I regarded it as a matter of the utmost importance to preserve the permanent right of Senators to perfect measures before them and to prevent a ruling which would allow one-fifth of the Senate the opportunity to segregate a question and force it to a vote to the exclusion of the desire of four-fifths to put it in the shape in which they desired finally to vote upon it before they did vote. My views were so strong upon that subject that it was well known that I intended if necessary to appeal from any ruling to the contrary and to submit it to the Senate.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, there seems to be some dispute as to when I took the chair and just at what point in the proceedings I left it. I was in the chair when the yeas and nays were being called on the motion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] to adjourn, as shown on page 2587. I remained in the chair until the substitute offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] was read. Then the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] took the chair, and was in the chair when the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] addressed the Chair, on page 2589.

I make this announcement not for the purpose of seeking to avoid any responsibility that may attach to the ruling which is now criticized. I voted to sustain the ruling of the Vice President. I think that vote was right, and I have no apology to make for it. I should gladly cast the same vote again.

Of course I recognize that as the situation has somewhat changed and the leadership has passed from this side of this body to the other side, we are in some degree now at the mercy of the alliance, but nevertheless I merely wanted to make this statement to show that if I had been in the chair I should have ruled as the Vice President of the United States did.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. I rise not for the purpose of taking part in any discussion as to the ruling, or as to whether there was a ruling, but because other days will come, other sessions, other bills will be before the Senate, and many and many a time the best, sometimes the vital, interests of the country will depend upon the protection of due and orderly parliamentary procedure in this body.

Now, sir, we have the Journal which covers the proceedings of last Friday night before us, its approval suspended for further consideration. We have heard different Senators, whose opinions are unquestionably sincere, differing as to whether rulings were made or were not made, and we have the ascertained fact that the RECORD contains at least one serious error in carrying the impression, an erroneous impression, upon the very important fact as to who occupied the chair.

In making up the Journal it is the duty of the Journal Clerk to translate the voluminous record into a statement of his own as to what in fact was the effect of what was done, and, inasmuch as the Journal Clerk has to translate and state the effect of what was done while the Senate itself is in doubt, in dispute as to what was done, and inasmuch as the RECORD, upon which the Journal Clerk has to proceed, has in it at least one manifest error, it seems to me that if there is ever an occasion for the approval of the Journal by the Senate there is now occasion that the Senate shall know what it is doing when it passes upon the Journal. It is plain that the Senate can not pass upon the Journal upon the rapid reading which we have already had, for none of us can remember what was contained in that paper as it was read, nor can any rapid reading from the desk carry a correct idea.

I ask, sir, therefore, that that part of the Journal which relates to the proceedings of last Friday evening be printed before approval and placed in the hands of Senators, in order that they may consider the correctness of the Journal Clerk's statement of the effect of what was done. I do that, sir, in the hope, in the expectation, that when we have that paper before us Senators, all of whom desire that there shall be an accurate record and that the future proceedings of the Senate shall not be embarrassed, will be able to agree upon the correct statement.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a suggestion in relation to that matter before the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] proceeds?

Mr. ROOT. Certainly.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator has asked that that portion of the Journal referred to by him be printed. Would it not be well to have it printed in the RECORD?

Mr. ROOT. That is immaterial, Mr. President. My idea was that it should be printed before approval, so that it would practically be equivalent to circulating a proof, that we may go over it, and undoubtedly we can agree upon what it ought to be. I do not care, however, where it is printed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Very well; I do not care to insist if the Senator does not want it that way.

Mr. ROOT. I think it would be better, sir, that it should not be printed in the RECORD until after there has been an agreement. It might be very misleading in the future.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, the only mistake I see in the RECORD during the time when I was presiding is that the reporter failed to note when I returned to the chair. I had that omission corrected the next day, so far as it could be corrected, to indicate when I returned to the chair. I have not had time to read the minutes, nor did I make any correction of the record as furnished by the reporter. I desire the record to stand as it is, absolutely without change. I am willing to abide by any decision I made and by every interpretation given. The record speaks for itself, and I see no occasion for anyone on this side—and certainly not the Presiding Officer at that time—to have any agreement as to what the Journal shall indicate. Let the Journal speak for itself; let the decisions speak for themselves. There is no decision that I rendered, no ruling that I made, that I am ashamed of, that I desire to apologize for, or that I would not make again. If any decision I made was not agreeable to this body, it had the authority to appeal. It is a majority of the Senate that determines what its rules are and their just interpretation.

When the yeas and nays were ordered they were ordered in pursuance of the policies adopted by the other side. The question was propounded to me—I have not had time to read the Journal or the record as made up by the reporters—but the Senator from Michigan asked me, inasmuch as the yeas and nays were ordered, whether I considered that an amendment could be offered to the substitute. It was a parliamentary inquiry. It was not in order at the time, and I said in answer to the parliamentary inquiry that I could tell him what were the views of the Chair; that I thought that it could not be amended for the simple reason that there are two rules which provide that a mover of a resolution can not withdraw it or modify it after the yeas and nays are ordered. He can modify it before then. Why? Because of the constitutional right to vote on a question which is pending. It is the same way in connection with the preamble of a bill. My idea was that under the Constitution one-fifth of the Members had a right to be recorded on a specific proposition. If that can be withdrawn and denied, then a majority can deprive one-fifth of that right by changing it. If the yeas and nays are ordered on a specific question, and it is amended and changed, when the time comes to vote it might be an entirely different proposition from that on which the yeas and nays were ordered, and they might not desire to order them. Still they would have to vote.

That was the view I entertained. I stated specifically that it was no time to pass upon it then, but that, as a parliamentary inquiry was made by the Senator from Michigan, I felt inclined to rule that way, but would be very glad, if I should be in the chair, to hear the question discussed pro and con, as I had not reached a definite conclusion. I voted to sustain the Vice President. I am satisfied that the Vice President's decision was correct and that to change it simply means to nullify the Constitution, which gives a man the right to vote on any question that is pending. It is a specific question, and if it can be changed entirely a man can be deprived of a vote on that question.

In a decision before this body it has been decided otherwise. The Senate has decided that an amendment is in order. That is the only decision I know of that has been rendered. I should have been very glad to have rendered that decision, if it had come to me as a specific question, unless authorities could have been produced otherwise. I find a decision in the House of Representatives, by Mr. Reed, where an effort was made to withdraw an amendment, which was permissible under the rules of the House, on the ground that the mover had a right to do so. Mr. Reed said it could not be done; that a man had a constitutional right to vote on the question, the yeas and nays having been ordered.

I was not in the Chamber when any other criticisms were made of the rulings Friday night. It seems to me the entire trouble with those rulings is with the Senators on the other side. I am willing to have the country understand the proceedings that were had here that night—an effort to thwart the will of a majority in this assembly, an effort to prevent a vote, a filibuster—and, as far as I am concerned, I do not desire any change from the notes made by the Official Reporters. I am willing to let those be inserted in the Journal, which is the right thing to do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have taken no part in the discussion pertaining to this matter and will say only a word.

I confess that I was greatly astonished at some of the rulings that were made on Friday evening. I had supposed that I knew something about the rules of the Senate, having given special attention to them some time ago, and when certain rulings, or suggested rulings, were made I wondered exactly what was happening in the Senate of the United States.

On the bottom of page 2576 it will be observed that I took an appeal from the decision of the Chair on a matter different from that now under discussion. That was alluded to at least half a dozen times—perhaps oftener—in the next hour, but that appeal was never submitted to the Senate.

Mr. SWANSON. What appeal was that?

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator will find it at the bottom of page 2576.

Mr. SWANSON. Who made the appeal?

Mr. GALLINGER. I made the appeal.

Mr. SWANSON. What was it on?

Mr. GALLINGER. It was on the point of order made by me against the ruling that the Presiding Officer could recognize any Senator, whether he had first addressed the Chair or not. I called attention to the rule that requires that the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator first addressing the Chair. Now, I am not criticizing——

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, the Senator had moved to lay a motion on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; the Senator is wrong.

Mr. SWANSON. I ruled, which is proper, that under the rules recognition belongs to the Chair, and that no appeal could be made from a decision of the Chair with reference to recognition. That is included in Jefferson's Manual.

Mr. GALLINGER. Jefferson's Manual says that in the Senate the decision of the Presiding Officer is without appeal, which is a wrong statement. I am not familiar with the rule to which the Senator from Virginia alludes.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator hold that an appeal can be made from recognition?

Mr. GALLINGER. That is not the point I am discussing. I took an appeal, which was recognized by the Chair, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] moved to lay the appeal on the table. The question was never submitted to the Senate on the motion to lay the appeal on the table; but I am not finding fault with the Chair. There was a great deal of confusion, and I simply call attention to that fact to justify something that occurred afterwards.

I offered certain amendments to the original text. I do not say that I would have offered them to the substitute had not a tentative ruling been made that they would not be in order; but I understood that the Chair held that no amendments could be offered to the substitute, from which view I very widely differed in opinion. I did not take an appeal from that tentative ruling, if we may call it such, but I did say this at a subsequent time:

> I think I have a right to ask that the rule be read, which I now do. The rule has been understood and never departed from in 24 years, to my knowledge. If we are to have the rules revolutionized, we ought to know what they are.

I did not take an appeal, because the former appeal I had taken had not been disposed of.

I read that for the purpose of showing that I regarded some of the rulings as most extraordinary.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to ask the Senator what rulings they were.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator can look them up for himself.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to know. If they were so extraordinary, it ought to be very easy to point them out.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not going to engage in any controversy with the Senator from Virginia, who says that he stands by the rulings he made. He knows what they were. The most important one having been reversed by the Senate, I do not think it need be discussed.

I wish simply to say, and it is all I care to say, that I looked upon the rulings as being not only extraordinary but absolutely revolutionary, and I agree with those who hold that the matter ought to be looked into very carefully, and that the Journal ought to be corrected in many particulars. I hope, Mr. President, that hereafter we will be very careful in the observance of the rules of this body, which to my knowledge have been very scrupulously observed in the past.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. I want to say that as far as I am concerned I shall oppose any change of the Journal except as it is disclosed by the record of the Official Reporters.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California.

Mr. WORKS. The purpose of the Journal, of course, is to record accurately what was done by the Senate, including the Presiding Officer. It can make no difference in making up the Journal whether it is satisfactory or unsatisfactory to the Senator from Virginia or any other Member of this body; and certainly the Senate would not undertake to change or modify what is said in the Journal, except to make it speak the truth. Any effort to modify the Journal in order to change any ruling that might have been made by the Senator from Virginia certainly would not be justified. My position with respect to it is that we should be careful always to see that the Journal does accurately set forth just what was done by the Senate at any and all times.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. For several days, ever since Monday, I have desired to present the reasons which controlled me in my vote sustaining the right of a motion to recommit the shipping bill, and I have been waiting for a suitable time. Since the discussion has gone as far as it has this morning, I believe perhaps this is the best time I can find.

Before proceeding to call attention to the rule of the Senate which I think controlled this matter and the constitutional provision on the subject, I ask the attention of the Senate to the status the shipping bill would have occupied if we had adhered to the ruling that the call for the yeas and nays precluded amendment. It is known that if the Fletcher substitute must go to a vote just as it is written, it will be defeated. It is understood that if it is amended a majority of the Senate will vote for it. Now, should that one-fifth have had the right to segregate this substitute just in the language which it used, and thus preclude the majority from the privilege of perfecting the substitute and adopting it?

I go one step further. It is claimed that they had the power, not the privilege, to segregate that substitute just as it was printed, and deny to the majority of the Senate the privilege of amending it, and thereby force the Senate to vote upon a proposition when a majority of the Senate would vote against it, and yet when it is understood that with some not very important amendments a majority of the Senate will vote for it.

Why, the friends of this measure who insisted upon the proposition that the call for the yeas and nays eliminated amendment, if they had been sustained, would have been left in a position where the substitute would have been beaten; and it is the defeat of the ruling which precluded the privilege of amending the substitute after the call for the yeas and nays that still makes it possible to perfect and pass this measure.

On Friday, January 29, the Senate had under consideration the shipping bill, to which an amendment in the nature of a substitute had been offered by the Senator from Florida. On this amendment a call was made for the yeas and nays and the presiding officer announced that "evidently a sufficient number have seconded the demand."

On Monday following, while the same subject was before the Senate, a motion was made that the "pending bill and all amendments be recommitted to the Committee on Commerce."

When the motion to recommit was made the senior Senator from Florida made the following point of order:

> Mr. President, I make the point of order that that motion is not in order. The Senate has decided to take a vote on the pending question and the yeas and nays have been ordered. No other motion is in order until that motion is decided. The Senate has determined that, and I make that point of order.

The Chair sustained the point of order and an appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair, and the Senate by a vote of 46 to 37 refused to sustain the ruling of the Chair.

Rule XV, paragraph 2, of the rules of the Senate provides that "it shall be in order at any time before the passage of any bill to move a commitment."

This rule is clear. It does not state that a motion to commit can be made at any time before a call for the yeas and nays, but it declares that "at any time before the passage of a bill" the motion shall be in order. To exclude a motion to recommit at any time before the passage of the bill is to override this express rule of the Senate.

There is nothing in the language of Rule XV that permits a construction preventing a motion to commit after the yeas and nays are called for. There is nothing in any other rule of the Senate which, taken in connection with Rule XV, would justify such a construction.

On the contrary, where the rules of the Senate contemplate that the ordering of the yeas and nays shall prevent action otherwise allowed by the rules it is so expressly declared, and this is done in only two instances. Under Rule XXI it is expressly declared that a motion or resolution may not be withdrawn or modified by the mover after the ordering of the yeas and nays without leave, and Rule XXIII provides that the mover can not of his own authority withdraw a preamble to a resolution when the yeas and nays are ordered.

These are the only two instances in which, under the rules, a call for the yeas and nays interferes with what otherwise would be the procedure of the Senate, and in these two instances the effect given to the yeas and nays is expressly declared by the rule. So that we have Rule XVI authorizing the motion to recommit at any time before the final passage of the bill, and thereby declaring that it can be made and will be in order after a call for the yeas and nays.

But it is contended that paragraph 3 of section 5 of the Constitution gives the right to call for the yeas and nays and to permit the motion to recommit after the call is made would interfere with a constitutional right. The language of the Constitution reads:

> Each House shall keep a Journal of its proceedings, and from time to time publish the same, except such parts as may, in their judgment, require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal.

It will be observed that this paragraph of the Constitution does not say that one-fifth of those present may single out a question and force a vote upon that question without amendment and without change, but it gives to one-fifth the power to require the vote entered on the Journal.

This provision of the Constitution was not intended to give one-fifth of the Senate the power to prevent a majority from perfecting a measure by amendment or by recommitment. Such a power would enable one-fifth to defeat legislation by keeping it in an objectionable shape if originally presented in an objectionable shape, and thereby preventing the measure from being put in shape where the Senate would be willing to vote for it. It was intended solely as a guaranty that a minority might force publicity when a vote was had.

To give one-fifth the power to segregate a proposition and deprive the other four-fifths of the privilege of amending and perfecting it would be destructive of the rights of the majority of the Senate.

The practice of calling for the yeas and nays is an American practice. For the history and reason of the rule see Cushing's Law and Practices of Legislative Assemblies, sections 405 to 414, inclusive. See also Story on the Constitution, sections 840 to 842, giving the history and reason for that section of the Constitution.

Substantially this provision was a rule of the Continental Congress. That Congress held its sessions in secret. The rule, however, of the Continental Congress permitted any one Member to call for the yeas and the nays that a record vote might be had, and require the vote to be entered on the Journal and given to the public. It was not in the power of the one Member of that Congress to segregate a proposition and force a vote on it, excluding from the balance of the Congress the power of amending or of recommitting, or any other power that might be required to perfect the subject matter before a vote was actually had. It was solely intended to place within the power of any one Member the opportunity to cause publicity of a vote actually had.

The records of the Constitutional Convention show that this provision of the Constitution was first submitted in the following language:

> The House of Representatives and the Senate, when it shall be acting in a legislative capacity (each House) shall keep a Journal of its proceedings, and shall, from time to time, publish them, except such parts as, in their judgment, require secrecy; and the yeas and nays of the Members of each House, on any question, shall be entered on the Journal, at the desire of any Member. (Farrand's Records of the Federal Convention, vol. 1, p. 156. Also, see p. 166, same volume; also, p. 180, sec. 7; also, p. 568, sec. 7; also, p. 592, sec. 5, subsec. b; also, p. 653, sec. 5, par. 3.)

The records of the convention show that the object of adopting this provision was to make it possible to cause publicity of a vote, and nowhere was it suggested that one-fifth were to have the power of forcing the four-fifths to act upon a measure before that measure was perfected. The language of the Constitution, the history of the provision, and all facts connected with it negative the suggestion that it was intended to do more than that which the language shows, to require placed upon the Journal a vote, that the position of each Senator might be made public, and neither the language nor its history places this provision of the Constitution in conflict with Rule XV of the Senate.

Returning to Rule XV of the Senate, it expressly authorizes the right of recommitment at any time before the passage of a bill. It therefore authorizes the motion to recommit after the call for the yeas and the nays.

Those entertaining this view of the situation could not refrain from voting to overrule the decision of the Presiding Officer. They saved the Senate from a ruling which would permit one-fifth of the Senate who opposed a pending measure from killing it by stopping any effort to perfect——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has requested——

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. LIPPITT. Just one second before the question is put on the request of the Senator from New York. I do not want at this time to discuss at all the proceedings that occurred on Friday evening, but I do want to say to the Senate that in addition to the question which has been brought up and discussed here this morning there was also a controversy in which I was somewhat engaged and which, I think, also goes to a very vital point in regard to the interpretation of the rules. I did not at that time, as some Senators may remember, find any enthusiastic desire on the part of the Senate for me to explain my position, and I am not going to do so now; but when this matter finally comes up for consideration I shall want to say a word or two on this other point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York has asked that the portion of the Journal which has to do with the proceedings of last Friday night be printed for the use of the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. LIPPITT. What was the description of the matter the Senator from New York wishes to have printed? I think it should cover all of Friday night.

Mr. ROOT. It does cover Friday night.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The calendar day of Friday night.

Mr. GALLINGER. The evening session.

Mr. ROOT. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That portion of the Journal which embraces the proceedings of the Senate on Friday, the 29th of January, will be printed and laid on the desks of Senators for their examination to ascertain whether the Journal shall or shall not be approved. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If there be no objection, the Journal of yesterday's proceedings as read will be approved, subject to future corrections.

The foregoing order was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That the Secretary be, and hereby is, directed to have printed 200 copies of that portion of the Journal which embraces the proceedings of the Senate on Friday, the 29th of January, which shall be laid on the desks of Senators for their examination, to ascertain whether the Journal shall or shall not be approved.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, for the payment of claims for personal injuries sustained by certain persons and for damages done to other property through being run down in the streets of San Antonio, Tex., by a section of Battery B, United States Artillery, from Fort Sam Houston, Tex., on April 25, 1913, $8,000, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, stating that the balance sheet for the year ended December 31, 1914, and other information required by the Public Utilities Commission of the various utilities under its jurisdiction which have been received prior to this date have been submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The communication will lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD.

The communication is as follows:

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, February 3, 1915.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In accordance with paragraph 14 of section 8 of an act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913, which reads as follows:

"That the accounts shall be closed annually on the 31st day of December and a balance sheet of that date promptly taken therefrom. On or before the 1st day of February following such balance sheet, together with such other information as the commission shall prescribe, verified by an owner or officer of the public utility, shall be filed with the commission and a copy thereof transmitted to Congress."

I have the honor to inform you that the balance sheets for the year ended December 31, 1914, and other information required by the Public Utilities Commission of the various utilities under its jurisdiction which have been received prior to this date have been submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatves.

Very respectfully, C. W. KUTZ, *Chairman.*

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. OWEN. I present the credentials of Hon. THOMAS PRYOR GORE, chosen as his own successor by the electors of the State of Oklahoma for the term beginning March 4, 1915.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19545) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. LANGHAM managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20562) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. LANGHAM managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 16477. An act to conduct investigations and experiments for ameliorating the damage wrought to the fisheries by predaceous fishes and aquatic animals;

H. R. 18685. An act to repeal penalties on foreign-built vessels owned by Americans;

H. R. 18686. An act to provide for provisional certificates of registry of vessels abroad, and for other purposes;

H. R. 20107. An act to amend sections 4421, 4422, 4423, 4424, and 4498 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and section 12 of the act of May 28, 1908, relating to certificates of inspection of steam vessels;

H. R. 20281. An act to provide for the appointment of certain assistant inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, at ports where they are actually performing duty, but to which they are at present detailed;

H. R. 20282. An act to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10; and

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to postpone the sale of fur-seal skins now in the possession of the Government until such time as in his discretion he may deem such sale advisable.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 655) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to survey the lands of the abandoned Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation and open the same to settlement, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I have here three short statements from prominent members of the National Grange and the National Farmers' Union indorsing the joint resolution introduced by me to investigate certain personal rural-credit bills. I ask to have them inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL HOTEL,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1915.

Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the National Grange, I wish to thank you for introducing your resolution for an investigation of a bill or bills for the establishment of a sound system of personal rural credit. It should appeal to the judgment of every thoughtful person in this country.

I am inclosing herewith copy of a resolution adopted by the legislative committee of the National Grange, of which I am ex officio chairman, indorsing your resolution.

Believing you will do all you can to secure the passage of your resolution at this session of Congress, so as to enable the American farmers to reap the benefits of the proposed legislation in the near future, and thanking you for your efforts in this direction, I am,

Yours, sincerely,

OLIVER WILSON,
Master National Grange.

WASHINGTON, *February 3, 1915.*

The legislative committee of the National Grange, composed of Oliver Wilson, master National Grange and ex officio chairman legislative committee, Peoria, Ill.; T. C. Atkeson, master West Virginia State Grange; and H. J. Patterson, president Maryland Agricultural College and past master Maryland State Grange, adopted the following resolution indorsing the resolution introduced in the Senate to-day by Senator SHEPPARD, of Texas, authorizing the Agricultural Committees to appoint a subcommittee to investigate such personal rural-credit bills which may be presented to it with sufficient authoritative backing. The resolution reads as follows:

"*Be it resolved*, That we, the members of the legislative committee of the National Grange, hereby indorse the Sheppard joint resolution authorizing the Committees on Agriculture of the Senate and House to investigate, through a subcommittee, the subject of personal rural credit in a judicial manner."

OLIVER WILSON.
T. C. ATKESON.
H. J. PATTERSON.

NATIONAL HOTEL,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1915.

Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Your resolution for an investigation in a judicial manner of such bills for a personal rural-credit system as may be presented to a subcommittee of the Committees on Agriculture which may be presented by persons who, in the committee's opinion, have sufficient authoritative backing has my hearty approval and indorsement. My past experience as chairman of the legislative committee of the National Farmers' Union convinces me that the method of investigation proposed by your resolution is a vast improvement over the old method for a purely scientific subject like credit.

The Government has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars within the past few years investigating monetary and credit institutions and subjects; yet not one of them ever drafted a bill on this subject. So it strikes me that a further investigation of the subject is a thing of the past, and Congress should authorize an investigation of bills on the subject.

I am inclosing herewith a resolution adopted at a conference held in this city, which organized the Rural Credit League of America. I was elected a member of the executive committee of that league at that conference, and I wish to thank you for introducing your resolution, and trust you will use your best efforts, as I know you will, to secure its enactment at this session of Congress.

Yours, sincerely, S. H. HOBBS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of North Carolina, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD without reading and referred to the Committee on Claims.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Resolution 13.]

Joint resolution requesting our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use all reasonable effort to induce Congress to dispense with the requirement of an oath of loyalty to the Union during the late War between the States from those holding claims against the United States and wishing to prosecute them for payment.

Whereas there are now on file and pending before the Congress of the United States and before the United States Court of Claims many claims of citizens of North Carolina for supplies taken and used by the Army and Government of the United States during the late War between the States; and

Whereas these claims are just and meritorious, but our citizens can not present and prove them because they are required to make oath that they were loyal to the Union during the late War between the States: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to use all reasonable effort to induce Congress to dispense with the requirement of an oath of loyalty to the Union during the late War between the States from those who have claims to present for supplies taken and used by the Army or Government of the United States during the late War between the States, and to use all reasonable effort to assist our citizens in bringing such claims before the proper tribunal for a hearing upon their merits.

SEC. 2. That our secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to furnish each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress a copy of this joint resolution.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified this the 29th day of January, 1915.

E. L. DAUGHTRIDGE,
President of the Senate.

E. R. WOOTEN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Examined and found correct. Inscoe, for committee.

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Raleigh, February 2, 1915.

I, J. Bryan Grimes, secretary of state of the State of North Carolina, do hereby certify the foregoing and attached two sheets to be a true copy from the records of this office.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal.

Done in office at Raleigh, this 2d day of February, A. D. 1915.

[SEAL.] J. BRYAN GRIMES,
Secretary of State.

Mr. GALLINGER presented the petition of Thomas O'Brien, of Berlin, N. H., praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. O'GORMAN. I file certain letters and telegrams and request that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, *February 3, 1915.*

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Allow me, on behalf of this congregation, to express thanks and admiration for your courageous stand against iniquitous ship-purchase bill, which is unadulterated socialism and international folly.

E. T. HARGROVE,
Chapel of the Comforter, 10 Horatio Street.

BOSTON, MASS., *February 2, 1915.*

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

As lifelong Democrats who rejoice in the several great constructive measures enacted by the present Congress we commend every legitimate effort to defeat the Alexander shipping bill. Opposition to it deserves the gratitude of the entire Nation, in every section of which it is condemned by experienced business men, regardless of party, as well as by the people at large, who earnestly desire avoidance of all possible international friction. No more effective means could be devised for completely destroying private enterprise upon which successful development of a wisely encouraged American merchant marine depends.

ROBERT M. BURNETT.
JAMES M. CURLEY.
THOMAS B. FITZPATRICK.
JEROME JONES.
GEOFFREY B. LEHY.
EDWARD F. MCSWEENEY.
JAMES J. PHELAN.
BERNARD J. ROTHWELL.
JOSEPH B. RUSSELL.
JAMES J. STORROW.
JOHN A. SULLIVAN.

SOUTHAMPTON, LONG ISLAND, N. Y., *February 2, 1915.*

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

As one of your constituents I respectfully urge you to vote against infamous ship-purchase bill. With our undermanned Navy sunk from second place to fourth, battle practice neglected, gunnery deteriorated, and our State Department a byword and laughingstock all over the world, this is no time to play party politics by a flagrant breach of neutrality, risking national humiliation or war with England, France, Japan, and Russia.

W. SCOTT CAMERON.

AUGUSTA, GA., *February 2, 1915.*

Senator O'GORMAN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

I venture to send my hearty congratulations on what seems to me to be a patriotic and courageous stand. New York, I am convinced, is with you in opposing the present shipping bill. Regards and best wishes.

AUSTEN G. FOX.

NEW YORK, *February 3, 1915.*

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.:

Almost unanimous opposition here to ship-purchase bill as wrong in principle and highly dangerous in practice. Urge you to maintain your courageous attitude of opposition.

JOHN F. B. MITCHELL,
33 Pine Street, New York City.

YONKERS, N. Y., *February 2, 1915.*

Senator JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

Country owes you and Senators CLARKE of Arkansas, HARDWICK, BANKHEAD, VARDAMAN, HITCHCOCK, and CAMDEN debt of gratitude for statesmanship in opposing governmental ship-purchase bill. Gold is contraband. England rightly opposes exchange of Germany's interned and therefore useless ships for very sinews of war. Elusive hope of gaining few dollars by purchase and trade is nothing compared with becoming involved in war, or even losing friendly neutral relations with England, France, and Russia. Please show this to the others.

JAMES B. MURRAY.

NEW YORK, *February 3, 1915.*

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Through you we wish to express our strong disapproval of the so-called ship-purchase bill, and hope our views relative to this matter agree with your own and those of the majority of your constituents to permit of your voting against this measure.

Yours, respectfully,

WHITALL TATUM CO.,
H. V. BRUMLEY, *Secretary.*

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., *February 1, 1915.*

Senator O'GORMAN, *Washington, D. C.*

SIR: I wish to appeal to you as a citizen of your State to do all in your power to defeat this dangerous shipping bill, at present before the Senate.

I trust you realize that thoughtful opinion is distinctly against the placing upon our statute books of a bill which has been hastily thrown together, which is in nowise demanded by the people, and which may very conceivably bring us into controversy, with many friendly nations.

I am, sir,

Yours, very truly, ALEXANDER PHILLIPS.

8 CLARK STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y., *February 3, 1915.*

Hon. JAMES A. O'GORMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I can not refrain from thanking you and your six friends for the stand you have taken against the ship-purchasing bill. The entire nature of the bill is against neutrality as well as the best inter-

ests of the middling classes of this country. It is urged by a body of selfish men for personal gain, regardless of the trouble its passage would give us with other nations. Honest neutrality is our only safeguard. Should we get into trouble, what a nice opportunity for Mexico and Japan.

I am greatly surprised at the action of our President.

Again thanking you and your friends, I remain,

Sincerely, yours,

CHARLES S. S. LENNOX.

FEBRUARY 3, 1915.

Hon. J. O'GORMAN.

DEAR SIR: The stand you have taken against the shipping bill is so pleasing I can not refrain from expressing it. There is no good reason for passing such a measure.

The laws restricting the shipping companies should be changed so we can compete with foreigners. As they are to-day we can not hope ever to build a large mercantile marine. These laws have kept us for years from developing our shipping, and until corrected will continue to do so.

It does not seem as though we could take the position to which we are entitled by our people and resources without a large mercantile marine.

We also need an Army and Navy strong enough to protect us from the horrors which poor Belgium is enduring to-day.

Again expressing my satisfaction at your stand, I am, sir,

Yours, truly,

O. A. COOK,
108 West Eighty-fourth Street, New York City.

Mr. O'GORMAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kingston, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I present a memorial from the Journeymen Barbers' International Union of America upon the immigration bill. I ask that it may be read.

There being no objection, the memorial was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

JOURNEYMAN BARBERS' INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA,
Grand Rapids, Mich., February 2, 1915.

Hon. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Local No. 8, Journeyman Barbers' International Union of America, of Grand Rapids, feeling that President Wilson has done all laboring men an injustice at the time he vetoed the immigration bill, H. R. 6060, we request you to use your best efforts to pass same over his veto.

Trusting you will give this your earnest consideration and awaiting a reply stating your position in this matter, we are,

Yours, respectfully,

LOCAL NO. 8,
Per A. J. KEECH, *Secretary.*

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented petitions of the German-American Alliance of Middletown and Seymour, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the exclusion of certain matter from the mails, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented petitions of sundry citizens of Burns, Sheridan, and Leo, all in the State of Wyoming, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NORRIS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kearney, Nebr., remonstrating against the exclusion of certain matter from the mail, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. ROBINSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Batesville, Ark., praying that an appropriation be made for the construction of seven locks and dams on the Upper White River, in that State, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented the petition of Rev. E. W. Wilder and sundry other citizens of Granger, Wash., praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Narcisse Grange, No. 301, Patrons of Husbandry, of Stevens County, Wash., praying for the Government ownership of the telephone and telegraph lines, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Augustana Synod, Tacoma district of the Columbia Conference, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 8904. An act to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station at the mouth of the Siuslaw River, Oreg. (Rept. No. 961);

H. R. 18745. An act in relation to the location of a navigable channel of the Calumet River in Illinois (Rept. No. 960); and

H. R. 20977. An act to provide for the establishment of a life-saving station in the vicinity of Duxbury Reef, Cal. (Rept. No. 962).

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17330) to authorize the sale and disposal of an island in the Coosa River, in the State of Alabama, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands, which was agreed to.

Mr. OWEN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 4876) to amend section 41 of the national-bank act, being renumbered as section 5144 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 963) thereon.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 366) authorizing the Secretary of War to use any allotment made under the provisions of an act approved October 2, 1914, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," for the improvement of East River and Hell Gate, N. Y., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 959) thereon.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19078) granting the consent of Congress to the Cleveland Yacht Club Co. to construct a bridge across the west arm of Rocky River, Ohio, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 957) thereon.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT MEMPHIS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 20933) extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn., authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," approved August 23, 1912, and I submit a report (No. 956) thereon. I direct the attention of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] to the report.

Mr. SHIELDS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

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

ST. LOUIS RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I report back from the Committee on Commerce favorably without amendment the bill (S. 7535) authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin, and I ask the attention of the Senator from Minnesota to the report.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

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

Mr. LA FOLLETTE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 7535 was passed this morning. It is the bill authorizing the county of St. Louis to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The RECORD will disclose the noting of the motion.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FLETCHER. By direction of the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 20189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors,

and for other purposes, with a brief statement attached. I ask leave to make a fuller and more formal report later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar and leave will be granted.

Mr. GALLINGER. May I ask the Senator from Florida a question, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. Does the Senator from Florida intend to call up in the near future the bill he has just reported?

Mr. FLETCHER. As soon as we can get to it. I do not know just when that will be, but the very moment we can get to it I desire to call it up.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am very glad to know that we may perhaps have it before the Senate in the near future.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am sorry I can not be more definite.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 7554) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgages, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to provide a method of applying postal savings deposits to the promotion of the public welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 7555) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Suwanee River, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 7556) granting a pension to Delia May Prempert; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 7557) for the relief of Frank J. Manning (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 7558) for the relief of Simon Caro; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 7559) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Wells (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7560) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Mullins (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENSON:

A bill (S. 7561) granting an increase of pension to John McEathron (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 7562) granting a pension to Ellen Hammond Clark; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH:

A bill (S. 7563) granting an increase of pension to Frank S. Mildram; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 7564) granting an increase of pension to John Evans (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. O'GORMAN:

A bill (S. 7565) granting an increase of pension to Ernest Dichman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate for its second reading the bill introduced yesterday by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE].

The bill (S. 7552) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, was read the second time by its title.

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

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture, upon such terms as he may deem proper, for periods of exceeding 20 years to permit responsible persons or associations to use and occupy suitable spaces or portions of ground in the national forest for the construction of summer homes, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 20415), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted an amendment proposing to amend the act of June 25, 1910, relating to the reissuance of Treasury drafts, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. O'GORMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

THE TREASURY DEFICIT.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have an interesting article by United States Senator elect ROBERT F. BROUSSARD, of Louisiana, on the question, "How to wipe out the Treasury deficit." I ask, without reading, that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO WIPE OUT THE TREASURY DEFICIT—UNITED STATES SENATOR ELECT BROUSSARD ANALYZES THE SITUATION—A FALSE CRY REGARDING "PORK-BARREL" LEGISLATION HAS BEEN RAISED TO DECEIVE THE PUBLIC—DEFICIT DUE TO MISCALCULATION BY THE FINANCIAL BRANCH OF THE ADMINISTRATION AND IS NO FAULT OF CONGRESS.

The resolution introduced by me contemplates the suspension of the free-sugar clause of the Underwood bill, which provides for free sugar after May 1, 1916. It is probable that, with the congested condition of the congressional calendars, it may not be possible to consider this resolution in this Congress.

It is fair to those upon whom rests the responsibility of reinstating a deficient Treasury, as well as to those who favor free sugar, that the efforts which I contemplate making in the next Congress should be made known to them; hence the introduction of the resolution at this time. It is my purpose to renew these efforts immediately upon the convening of the next Congress, whether in an extra or a regular session.

These efforts, if successful, will to a large extent obliterate the deficiency that confronts the United States Treasury.

We are informed that there is practically an $80,000,000 deficit, despite the enactment of a war tax in times of profound peace.

The defenders of our present financial policy have ascribed the pending $80,000,000 deficiency to what they are pleased to term "pork-barrel" appropriations by Congress.

No one cognizant of the existing situation is at all disturbed over that statement. The uninformed alone are misled by this false cry. When called upon to explain what is meant by "pork-barrel" appropriations one is referred to appropriations for the improvement of our rivers and harbors and the construction of post offices and other necessary buildings for the proper transaction of the public business.

DEFICIENCY NOT DUE TO THESE APPROPRIATIONS.

It is not true to say that this deficiency grows out of any such appropriations, because during this administration no public buildings have been provided for by Congress; and the appropriation for rivers and harbors was during the life of this Congress reduced from a normal appropriation of $50,000,000 to a $20,000,000 lump appropriation, to be used, in the discretion of the United States Engineers, in continuing projects already under way.

Even if this twenty million were charged to the legislative "pork barrel," it can not possibly account for a hole in the Treasury of eighty millions.

As a matter of fact, it can be demonstrated that this deficiency grows out of an entirely different situation, which situation precludes absolutely the use of the words "pork barrel" in connection with it.

It is not difficult to ascertain just how this deficiency occurred. In the first place, when the Underwood bill was under discussion in the House, Representative HULL, of Tennessee, was in charge of the income-tax section of that bill. I have every reason to believe that the Ways and Means Committee, and Mr. HULL in particular, sought every avenue of information for the enactment of an equitable and just income tax.

Mr. HULL, in his opening address on the floor of the House, stated that the income-tax provision as written in the Underwood bill would produce $70,000,000. Such was the estimate furnished him.

INTERNAL TAXES FALL FAR BELOW ESTIMATES.

The returns, however, of the income tax show a total receipt of $28,253,534.85, a deficiency from the estimate of Mr. HULL of nearly $42,000,000, which miscalculation accounts for more than half the pending Treasury deficit.

When the war-tax measure was reported to the House out of conference Leader UNDERWOOD made the statement to the House that the information he had was to the effect that it would yield one hundred and five millions. When it passed the Senate it was estimated to yield one hundred and seven millions. When it came out of conference he said it was presumed to yield more than ninety millions. Collections thus far made indicate this estimate far too high; in fact, the Secretary of the Treasury himself now estimates that the war tax will approximately yield fifty-four millions for the fiscal year of 1915. From the collections already made this estimate seems reasonably accurate. Therefore, taking the lowest figure for the war tax given by Mr. UNDERWOOD, that of ninety millions, and subtracting the estimate now being made by the Secretary of the Treasury, there results a deficiency of thirty-six millions in that item alone.

The revenues from these two sources are in nowise affected by the European war. If the termination of the war causes any increase in our custom receipts, this increase can not entirely make up the deficit, but Congress will have to look elsewhere for the most part to recoup the Treasury.

By adding these two deficiencies—the one resulting from the income tax and the other from the war tax—we have almost the exact amount of deficiency reported in the Treasury of the United States.

In other words, if the estimates furnished Congress as to these two revenue acts had been correct, there would now be no deficiency, as the shortage in the results from the estimates precisely equals the Treasury shortage.

Why look to extraneous things when, through erroneous calculation, these two new methods of taxation account for practically every dollar in the present deficiency?

Now, this is a statement of facts, and the war-tax measure is soon to expire, so that the fifty-four millions yield for 1915 will shortly disappear and the eighty millions deficit must, consequently, be increased by that sum in the near future.

On the 1st of May, 1916, unless my resolution shall become law, practically $52,000,000 more now derived from the sugar duty must be also added to the present deficiency.

To summarize: Should the same deficiency occur in 1916 as is pending now, there will be added to the eighty million deficiency the further deficiencies due to the expiration of the war-tax law, yielding fifty-four millions, and a still further deficiency after May, 1916, of fifty-two more millions derived from the sugar duty.

AN APPALLING SITUATION THAT MUST BE MET.

This situation is appalling. It can not be shirked; it must be met. And the question is, How are we to meet it? There are several ways in which it can be done. The simplest, but probably the most obnoxious, would be to issue bonds. Another would be to reenact the war-tax act in times of profound peace, when possibly Europe itself will be at peace, and increase that tax. Another, still, would be to readjust the income tax by decreasing the exemption and increasing the rate; or, again, to revert back to the old practice of collecting money from a duty on sugar.

And why should not the last-named course be followed? The refiners told Congress, and Congress believed the refiners, that if the duty on sugar were reduced, the consumer would receive the advantage of the reduction. On March 1, 1914, Congress reduced the then existing duty by 25 per cent, and for not a single moment from that day to this has the consumer paid as little money for his sugar as he paid before the reduction. He is now paying practically twice as much as he did before the reduction.

The American consumer and the United States Treasury both have suffered from the reduction, and the only beneficiary has been the refiner, commonly known as the Sugar Trust, which has absorbed the entire reduction and multiplied the price of sugar to the consumer.

Under the old rate, which went out on the 1st of March by virtue of the Underwood bill, the Treasury of the United States would have collected to date more than fifty-eight millions in duty instead of forty-three millions, so that the Sugar Trust has absorbed in the 10 months since the reduction was made nearly $15,000,000. At this rate, by the end of 12 months, as the result of this 25 per cent reduction, fully eighteen millions will have been absorbed by the trust and will have been lost to the Treasury.

SUGAR TRUST IS AGAIN ATTEMPTING TO DECEIVE THE PUBLIC.

All understand that the Sugar Trust is again engaged in its old practice of deceiving the public, and in this instance it asserts that the high price of sugar is due to the European war. That is not true. It is merely a subterfuge resorted to by the trust to deceive the American public while it is engaged in absorbing the tariff reduction, which it had promised the American consumer should receive.

I make this statement for the reason that at this very hour the refiners of the country are engaged on the American market in selling sugar to Europeans for consumption in Europe at a lower price than the same sugar is being sold by them on the same market to the American consumer.

The war could not lift the price of sugar in the United States, at peace with all the world, when sold to an American consumer, and not raise it equally to a European engaged in this same war. Yet this war, far from our shores, is invoked as a reason to lift sugar prices to the American consumers beyond the price charged Europeans.

To put the question squarely to Congress and the American people, I ask, Shall we indefinitely suspend all expenditures for the improvement of our rivers and harbors and the construction of necessary public buildings? And shall we reenact the war tax and increase its burdens? And shall we reduce the exemption clause of the income tax and increase the tax itself to meet this deficiency? Or shall we issue bonds in preference to all this? Or shall we, as I suggest, return to the time-honored system of collecting taxes on articles that can bear the duty, particularly when the remission of the duty does not cheapen their price to the consumer, as is the case with sugar?

Congress must soon answer these questions.

FEDERAL AID TO GOOD ROADS.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed for the use of the Senate document room 4,000 copies of the report of the Joint Committee on Federal Aid in the Construction of Post Roads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE SENATE MANUAL.

Mr. OVERMAN. I offer a resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 535) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules be instructed to prepare a new edition of the Senate Manual, and that there be printed 4,000 copies of the same for the use of the committee, of which 250 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Is that designed to be published as a manual?

Mr. OVERMAN. There are only 15 copies of the Manual left. There will be a new Senate and a new Congress coming in, and a similar resolution has been passed every few years for 50 years past.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I think, as we have the misfortune of spending two-thirds of the time of the Senate in the discussion of the precedents, and they are out of date, if we issue a new edition, and the same practice prevails here, we shall have no time to attend to the business of the people. I move to lay the resolution on the table.

Mr. OVERMAN. This is not for the printing of the Book of Precedents but of the Rules and Manual brought down to date.

Mr. THOMAS. It is not the Book of Precedents?

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all.

Mr. THOMAS. If it is nothing but the rules, without the multitudinous instances of their construction, reconstruction, and destruction, I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York.

Mr. ROOT. I think the continual reprinting of copies of this Manual is a hoary old abuse. My home in New York and my home here are cumbered with copies of the Manual. There has not been any change; it is the same old volume, and I object to the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. OVERMAN. Very well, let it go over until to-morrow, and I shall call it up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution goes over.

DIRECTORS OF REGIONAL RESERVE BANKS.

Mr. LEWIS. I submit a resolution and ask to have it read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The resolution (S. Res. 536) was read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board of the United States shall, if not incompatible with public service, report to the United States Senate the names of the directors of the regional reserve banks which were chosen as representatives of the United States Government; and the names and business of those recommending them, and what are the positions occupied by the said members of said regional banks, and in what banks and business and corporate institutions the said members are directors; also what are the names of the directors of the regional banks selected in any other manner than by the Government, and what position as directors either of these hold in any banks, business establishments or corporations.

PURCHASE OF VESSELS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution coming over from a previous day.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution 528, submitted by Mr. BURTON on the 2d instant.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the resolution may go over for the day without prejudice, the Senator from Ohio being absent from the Chamber for a few moments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the resolution goes over without prejudice.

Mr. BRANDEGEE subsequently said: I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Ohio, who has now arrived, to the fact that Senate resolution 528 has gone over by unanimous consent and to ask him whether he cares to recur to it.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to bring it up, if it is in order to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has gone over by unanimous consent, but it can be taken up.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] wants to be present when it comes up.

Mr. BURTON. Very well; let it go over.

COMMITTEE ON THE REVISION OF THE LAWS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the notice of an amendment to the rules coming over from a preceding day.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 534) submitted by Mr. ROBINSON, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be a standing committee of the Senate known as the committee on revision of the laws, to be composed of five Senators elected in the same manner as the members of other standing committees, which shall have power to act jointly with the same committee of the House of Representatives, and to which shall be referred all matters relating to the revision and codification of the statutes of the United States.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules.

The motion was agreed to.

OHIO RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask unanimous consent that House bill 20818, now lying on the table, be taken up and considered. A similar bill has already been reported from the Senate committee, is now on the calendar, and is ready for passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 20818) to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Brunot Island Bridge Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania, is hereby authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge, with approaches thereto, across the back channel of the Ohio River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, from a point on the southwesterly shore of Brunot Island, near the Duquesne Light Co.'s power plant, in the twenty-seventh ward of the city of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa., to a point between Telford Street and the Ohio connecting railroad bridge on the opposite side of said back channel of the Ohio River, in the twentieth ward of the city of Pittsburgh, Allegheny County, Pa., 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 VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the 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 a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. OLIVER. I move that the bill (S. 7266) to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River, being a like bill and now on the calendar, be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 19545) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SHIVELY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. SHIVELY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MCCUMBER conferees on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 20562) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. SHIVELY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. SHIVELY, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. MCCUMBER conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 18686. An act to provide for provisional certificates of registry of vessels abroad, and for other purposes;

H. R. 20107. An act to amend sections 4421, 4422, 4423, 4424, and 4498 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and section 12 of the act of May 28, 1908, relating to certificates of inspection of steam vessels;

H. R. 20281. An act to provide for the appointment of certain assistant inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, at ports where they are actually performing duty, but to which they are at present detailed; and

H. R. 20282. An act to provide for the appointment of 11 supervising inspectors, Steamboat-Inspection Service, in lieu of 10.

H. R. 18685. An act to repeal penalties on foreign-built vessels owned by Americans was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The following bill and joint resolution were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Fisheries:

H. R. 16477. An act to conduct investigations and experiments for ameliorating the damage wrought to the fisheries by predaceous fishes and aquatic animals; and

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to postpone the sale of fur-seal skins now in the possession of the Government until such time as in his discretion he may deem such sale advisable.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION—VETO MESSAGE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the first veto message of the President of the United States is that of the immigration bill. It ought to command the serious attention of Congress. I am wondering whether those Senators who have hitherto preached the doctrine of absolute fidelity to the President will now break away from their allegiance and loyal support upon a proposition which the President regards as so vital that he has interposed this his first veto. I am also wondering whether Democrats will at one and the same time vote to overthrow the President and the policies of the Democratic Party as expressed in its platforms on this subject from the days of Thomas Jefferson to this blessed hour. If Senators will give me their attention, I shall undertake to illustrate both of the propositions I have advanced.

The President in a very clear and powerful veto message states his objections to the immigration bill, which may be epitomized thus:

First. The bill embodies a radical departure from the traditional and long-established policy of the country.

Second. It seeks to all but close the gates of asylum to political refugees.

Third. Literacy is not a test of character or personal fitness, but of opportunity.

I propose submitting some remarks in support of the veto of President Wilson.

I shall also undertake to reply to the arguments advanced by the proponents of the bill. I am confident that each argument can be answered and demonstration made, both of the falsity of its premise and the fallacy of its deduction.

I shall first give attention to certain of these arguments. During the course of my remarks I shall desire to submit various statistical tables, which I now ask leave to print as a part of my remarks without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REED. I now desire to call attention to the following questions:

Is the immigrant patriotic?

Does he love liberty?

Is he attached to our institutions?

The foregoing questions are answered in the affirmative by every page of our country's history.

First. Nine signers of the Declaration of Independence were born in foreign lands.

Second. Alexander Hamilton and Albert Gallatin were born in the West Indies.

Third. Several of the most distinguished officers of the Revolution were foreigners, who out of pure love of liberty came here to assist us. Without their assistance the cause of the patriots might have failed. Among these are:

Lafayette, whose story is upon the tongue of every schoolboy.

Casimer Pulaski, Polish exile and patriot, could not had it been the law of 1776 have been admitted under the terms of this infamous measure, who would have been arrested at Castle Garden because he stood charged with the crime of fighting for his country.

Pulaski distinguished himself at the Battle of Brandywine; was made brigadier general by act of Congress; raised the Pulaski Legion; successfully defended Charlestown; and yielded his life in the cause of the young Republic at the Battle of Savannah.

Thaddeus Kosciusko rendered such valiant services at Yorktown and the siege of New York that he was promoted by Washington to chief of Artillery and was rewarded with the Order of the Cincinnati, made an American citizen, and was granted a pension and estates.

Paul Jones, whose naval victories gave luster to our arms upon the sea and whose genius and fortitude did much to win our national independence, was a foreigner.

He had taken up his residence in this country but a few months when he was called to the assistance of the Colonies. He was appointed a member of the naval committee. Not only was Paul Jones of foreign birth, but he secured aid in fitting out his vessels from foreigners.

His victories thrilled and heartened every patriot of the land.

He rose to the rank of rear admiral, and in 1792 was appointed United States consul to Algiers.

The list is long and need not be recited. The statues of these great foreigners, memorials in bronze of our inextinguishable debt of gratitude stand to-day in the Capital of the Nation they helped establish.

In yonder gallery is the bust of Pulaski in marble, and no man has ever gazed upon it who has not been impressed with the nobility of character expressed in the classic features.

Heitman gives a list, which he concedes is incomplete, of 437 French officers who served with the American Army, many of whom were promoted for gallantry on the battle fields of the Revolution.

The War of the Revolution was not fought by native-born sons alone. Standing elbow to elbow with them was the immigrant of that day. He crowded into the irregular column of Washington's army, he was with him in every battle, and from the days when our banner was first unfurled on Bunker Hill until it rose in glorious triumph at Yorktown. The immigrant stood in the trenches, walked in the snows, and died in the swamps as bravely and as valiantly as the native sons of that day.

In the War of 1812 again the immigrant responded to the call of duty. He was present when the first shot was fired and he was with Jackson back of the cotton bales when the last rifle spoke defiance to the veterans of the British Army.

The immigrant was with Scott and Taylor as they marched across the plains of Mexico. He followed them with glorious heroism to the heights of Chapultepec. He stood with them in the sieges and battles and bloody days of that great conflict.

In the War of the Rebellion the immigrant again responded to the call of his adopted country. He served under the battle flags of Lee and Jackson, and he marched beneath the standards of Grant and Sherman and Sheridan. He divided his allegiance as the people of this country divided theirs, being guided by the spirit of the State and the people among whom he lived.

I want to read just a word or two that I hope will sink into the hearts of some of our Republican brethren.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, yes; there is.

Mr. REED. I read from a work by Mr. Higginson:

> Who that recalls the war for the Union does not remember how we all, from President Lincoln downward, played upon the string of "the open doors of this Nation," its being "a home for all oppressed mankind"— How fearlessly we then appealed to the Germans, the Irish, the Swedes, the Scotch within our borders, and how well they responded. Even the green flag of Ireland, now forbidden to be displayed from our city halls, * * * was then welcomed with cheers on battle fields when it was borne to front, amid decimated regiments, under shouts of "Faugh a Balagh"—"Clear the way."

Mr. President, did these immigrants respond in the days of the Spanish War? I saw the Fifth Missouri Regiment mustered in; I saw our immigrant citizen standing in line waiting the privilege of signing the muster roll; I saw him frequently only poorly clad. He was leaving his wife and his children but scantily provided for. In his eyes there was the battle fire that is lighted only by love of country. In that war he served as bravely as did the native born.

A few days ago I read the names of the heroic dead who gave their lives at Vera Cruz, whose blood drops, yet damp upon the banner of our country, are its latest baptismal.

Among the dead were Jews, Polacks, Irish, Bohemians, and other nationalities.

Mr. President, whence does this spirit of proscription and hate come? Why has it suddenly arisen? What new danger is at our gates? What shadow of fear has fallen upon the native-born American? It was not so at first. The fathers knew how the immigrant had fought to establish our liberties; so in 1790 they passed a statute providing for naturalization after five years. This country was proclaimed to be the land of refuge and sanctuary for the oppressed of the earth. Foreigners flocked to our shores; population doubled; the frontiers of civilization were pushed westward; the strength of the country was made secure.

But the old Federalist Party was in power. Alexander Hamilton was its dominant spirit. He distrusted all of the common people, whether they were born in this land or beneath foreign skies. He did not regard them as fit for self-government. He was naturally of an aristocratic turn; he was a born proscriptionist. He ought to be here to-day, the author of this bill. There had been no discussion; there had been no agitation; there had been no issue made; but the Federalist Party, in the pride and arrogance of its power, passed the alien and sedition law. That law increased the naturalization period from 5 to 14 years. It authorized the arrest and deportation of turbulent and dangerous aliens without trial, at the discretion of the President. It was rushed through without being submitted to the people, as this bill is rushed through without having been submitted to the people. Hamilton felt strong enough and the Federalist Party felt strong enough to put the bill through Congress. They dared not submit it to the electorate. You who father this bill are trying similarly to force it through, although no political party now living has ever dared sanction its vicious principles in its platform.

What happened when the Federalist Party perpetrated that outrage? A protest arose in every part of the Nation. Its rumblings were heard in forest and in city. It found expression in the resolutions of State legislatures and of civic societies. The Democracy, headed by Thomas Jefferson, sprang into power upon this distinct issue. The Democratic Party was cradled in the national protest against proscriptive legislation. I shall come back to that. I shall quote you Jeffersonian Democrats the words of Thomas Jefferson; I shall compel you to admit that you are repudiating the traditions of your party and the long and illustrious record made by its great men.

I desire just now, however, to proceed to another question. The President has said "literacy is not a test of character but of opportunity." That sentence ought to go down in history as the tersest statement of a great fact that has been made in many years—"literacy is not a test of character but of opportunity."

In support of the proposition to which I have just referred, I want now to compare early and later immigration. I challenge attention to facts abundantly sustaining the proposition.

In point of literacy the new immigration surpasses the old at the time of the influx of the latter.

Twenty-six per cent of the German male immigrants above 16 years of age who came to Pennsylvania in the first half of the eighteenth century could not write their names. (Barnes, p. 45.)

EARLY POPULATION ILLITERATE.

In point of fact the present immigration is more literate than were the native inhabitants of this country at the period of the Revolution.

A painstaking investigation of the degree of illiteracy among the seventeenth century Virginians shows that 46 per cent of the jurors made their marks and that 40 per cent of the men making deeds and depositions could not write their names. Seventy-five per cent of the women were illiterate. (Barnes, p. 45.)

In Suffolk County, Mass., including Boston, two volumes of published deeds were examined for the years 1653–1656 and 1681–1697, in which it was found that in each period 11 per cent of the men made their marks. Of the women, 58 per cent in the first period and 38 per cent in the second period made their marks.

Mr. President, was literacy or illiteracy a standard of character? Why, sirs, I doubt not that the men in coonskin caps who rallied at Lexington, who later made their stand at Concord near the little bridge immortalized by the lines of Emerson:

> By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
> Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
> Here once the embattl'd farmers stood,
> And fired the shot heard round the world.

I doubt not, sir, that many of the men whose eyes that day fearlessly glittered along rifle barrels could not have read the pages of a printed book. Yet, I repeat, these men knew how to die for liberty, for they had read the pages of a larger volume, the book of nature. In forest fastness, in mountain dells, in bending skies they learned the legend, "All men are born free and equal." So, in defense of that liberty they rallied, they fought and died, immigrant and native born, literate and illiterate, side by side, that you and I and all of us might have the blessings of liberty. Yet many of these early Virginians and men of Massachusetts were illiterates.

Literacy was not then a test of character. The best test in that hour of trial was how the man at the end of the gun behaved.

Again, I call attention to the fact that literacy is not a test of character but of opportunity.

Mr. President, in 1799 an Irish colony sought to establish itself in Massachusetts. Ninety-six per cent of the whole number could write their names. After this came bitter oppression and poverty to the Irish people. The opportunity to obtain education grew constantly less; they were robbed; they were driven from their homes; they were hunted like wild beasts; they were murdered. Under such disadvantages education waned. Accordingly, the later immigrant was denounced as ignorant, unlettered, bestial; yet his lamentable condition was only the result of a lack of opportunity. Opportunity is the test. Have men had opportunity? When you answer they have not you have destroyed the value of the literacy test.

The Jew! Let us think of him for a moment. The Jew of the Middle Ages was the most learned man in all Europe. He maintained many great institutions of learning in which the ancient lore and medieval philosophy were taught. A period of merciless persecution followed and the race was forced into a condition of illiteracy and ignorance. But when the hand of the oppressor was taken from his throat even for a moment he again began establishing seminaries of learning and educating his race, and he has continued that policy wherever permitted so to do. One of his bitterest complaints against the Russian Government is that he is denied the opportunity of education.

The Italian! The Italian immigrant, particularly from the southern Provinces, is frequently illiterate; but since the establishment of an improved system of education in Italy the people are crowding into the schools and illiteracy is decreasing to a marvelous degree. Again, education is shown to be merely a matter of opportunity.

Let me digress a moment to call the attention of those who denounce the Italian to the fact that that great race never sank into barbarism. When the light of learning had faded in all the other lands of Europe, Italy still kept the torch held high in her hand. Her wonderful works of art, her marvelous poetry, her great architecture exist to-day as evidence of the fact that the Italian people have within them still the old Roman blood, the old spirit of empire. Shall Americans turn against the Italians? Why, it was the genius of an Italian blazing amidst the darkness and ignorance of the fifteenth century that disclosed the path across the Atlantic which followed by a mariner would lead to the undiscovered shores of this continent. An Italian gave America to the Old World. Ah, Mr. President, whatever others may do, let us not denounce the Italian.

The Balkan! These people are illiterate to a considerable degree, but what is their story? For hundreds of years they have battled with the "unspeakable Turk" for their very existence. They have been crucified upon crosses; they have been impaled upon stakes; their cities have been burned; their wives have been outraged; their children have been stolen; their daughters have been dragged into slavery; and so they have not had much time or opportunity to attend school. They are, nevertheless, a great race. Ah, when their battle flag at last was raised the world looked on in astonishment that the little Balkan people should dare assail the great armies of Turkey; and yet what a spectacle the world was destined to behold. It saw a race that could muster its entire population upon the field of battle—boys of 11, grandsires of 80. It saw the women driving oxcarts that carried provisions and munitions of war to the men who were fighting the battles. It saw the untrained citizens upon bloody fields battling with deathless courage and unalterable resolve. It saw them standing in trenches half filled with water, bivouacking in drifts of snow, wading through swamps; fighting, always fighting, for that liberty which every oppressed son of God upon this earth hopes and prays may yet be his. The world saw them emerge in victory, and lovers of liberty all over the earth hope and pray that the sunlight of peace and prosperity may soon smile upon that valiant race of men. A race of men that can fight so well in war can live well in peace.

Mr. President, there is a conclusive proof that literacy is but a test of opportunity, not a test of character. Here is an answer that will appeal to every candid man, to every man who has not locked the door of his mind and thrown away the key of reason. It is that as soon as these immigrants come to our shores they embrace every opportunity of education with more avidity than our native born. This, sir, is the final answer, the opportunity having been given they have seized it. The demonstration is complete that the President spoke wisely when he said, "education is a test of opportunity and not a test of character."

But, Mr. President, the argument has been advanced here that while illiteracy in former days was not a test of character it is so now, because the doors of opportunity have been opened.

Mr. President, that is a very unfortunate argument for an American citizen to make. It is a very unfortunate argument for the people of the State represented in the Senate by the Senator who uttered it upon our floor, and why? The children of immigrant population in many States, including that of the Senator who is the author of the argument, possess a higher degree of literacy than the children of the native born. This is not only the case to-day, but it has been, I regret to say, the case for many years.

In 1870 the Bureau of Education was established upon a substantial basis. The commissioner, Edmund Lee, reviewed the educational conditions from 1840 to 1870, and said this:

> Besides, our illiterate are, most of them, native born. In 1860, according to the census, there were, of our illiterate adults, but 346,893 of foreign birth, while there were 871,418 native born. These figures, of course, exclude the negro population.
>
> Thus it appears that this immense evil, our weakness and our disgrace, extends among our native population as well as among those of foreign birth; in the North as well as in the South, both in the East and in the West; in the old States and in the new, from Maine to Georgia, as well as from Maine to California.
>
> It has been also a growing evil; it has grown with the growth of the population. Indeed, from 1840 to 1850 it grew faster than the population. Not only did the gross numbers increase from 550,000 to nearly a million, but the per cent of illiterate increased from 9 per cent in 1840 to 11 per cent in 1850. So far, the facts have been given simply as they stand in the census.

The author adds:

> But it is well known to those who have investigated the subject that these are far below the truth, because many who can not read would not like to be so set down in the census.

Mr. President, shall this race of ours, with all its opportunity for education for 100 years, finding itself still less literate than the children of the foreign-born population, dare to set up a literacy test? What becomes of the argument of the Senator who stated that literacy is a test of character when it is accompanied by opportunity? For if that be true, what a sad reflection it is upon our native-born population, before whose feet the door of opportunity stands open.

Mr. President, I am coming now to a theme to which I invite the attention of Democrats. I wish there were more of them present. I especially wish the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], whose patron saint is Thomas Jefferson, might be in the Chamber. I purpose showing that the Democratic Party was born of a protest against the restrictive legislation that had been enacted by the Federalist Party; that out of the protestants against the Federalist restrictive legislation Thomas Jefferson was able to construct a triumphant Democracy. The victory then won placed our party in power for nearly 60 years.

The theme I am now discussing is—

> Shall we depart from our traditional policy and close the gates of asylum which have hitherto been open?

A pregnant sentence from the message of the President. Is the President correct when he states that this has been our traditional policy?

I answer "yes," and offer the following observations in support of it:

First. Ninety per cent of our early immigrants were refugees from the tyranny of church and state.

Second. Ninety per cent of all of our immigrants, early or late, were forced to these shores either by intolerable Governments or the unbearable physical conditions of life.

Third. The doctrine which is written largest upon the page of our national policy is that "this country, created by the oppressed of earth, shall forever remain the harbor and place of refuge for those who suffer wrong." Especially has this been the creed of the Democratic Party; and now, Democrats, those of you who are not ready to recant the ancient creed I challenge your attention to what I am about to read.

Jefferson, in his first inaugural address, said:

> Shall we refuse the unhappy fugitives from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe? * * * Might not the general character and capabilities of a citizen be safely communicated to everyone manifesting a bona fide purpose of embarking his life and fortunes permanently with us? (Jefferson's Works, vol. 3, p. 338.)

Writing to Mr. Dumoulin, in 1816, after thanking him for a copy of a treatise on naturalization, Mr. Jefferson stated:

> We can not but think alike, and I permit myself to doubt whether there is a man in the world who thinks otherwise, provided he has thought at all on the subject, has turned inwardly on himself, and ascertained whether he has not there found the same innate feeling of right to live on the outside of an artificial geographical line as he has to live within it; whether he finds there any stronger sentiment of right to use his own faculties at all than of that to use them in whatever place he can do it to the greatest promotion of his own happiness; whether he feels any obligation to die by disease or famine in one country rather than to go to another where he can live. (Jefferson's Works, vol. 19, p. 336.)

Ah! That strikes the very kernel of it all. It is the human right, the right that every human being has to seek his happiness, upon which Jefferson bottomed his immortal doctrine.

I could quote much further from this great man, but I pass on.

Democrats, I come now to the consideration of the Democratic doctrine as expressed in your platforms. I seek to sustain the statement of the President that the granting of asylum is "our traditional policy," and his further statement that you are undertaking to set it aside without having submitted it to the people of the United States or suggested to a single voter that you intended so to do. On the contrary, like the old Federalist Party, you get into power and then employ your power against the people to whom you would not dare submit the issue. The Democratic platform of 1840 is the oldest one of

which I could find a copy; but I have read you Jefferson's words, and now I ask you to listen to the platform:

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS.

The Democratic Party of 1840, paragraph 9, is as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the liberal principles embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence, and sanctioned in the Constitution, which makes ours the land of liberty and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the Democratic faith, and every attempt to abridge the present privilege of becoming citizens and the owners of soil among us ought to be resisted with the same spirit which swept the alien and sedition laws from our statute books." (Hopkins Political Parties, p. 260.)

That plank, Mr. President, was readopted in 1844; it was readopted in 1848; it was readopted in 1852; it was readopted in 1856, and the following added:

Whereas since the foregoing declaration was uniformly adopted by our predecessors in national conventions an adverse political and religious test has been secretly organized by a party claiming to be exclusively American, it is proper that the American democracy should clearly define its relation thereto, and declare its determined opposition to all secret political societies, by whatever name they may be called.

Resolved, That the foundation of this Union of States having been laid in, and its prosperity, expansion, and preeminent example in free government built upon entire freedom in matters of religious concernment and no respect of person in regard to rank or place of birth, no party can justly be deemed national, constitutional, or in accordance with American principles which bases its exclusive organization upon religious opinions and accidental birthplace. And hence a political crusade in the nineteenth century and in the United States of America against Catholic and foreign born is neither justified by the past history nor the future prospects of the country, nor in unison with the spirit of toleration and enlarged freedom which peculiarly distinguishes the American system of popular government.

In 1860 the Douglas Democratic platform reaffirmed the platform of 1856.

Again in 1876 the Democratic Party, in its platform of that date, took up the immigration question, and after denouncing the policy of the Republican Congress for allowing the immigration of Mongolian people, and for stripping our fellow citizens of foreign birth and kindred race across the Atlantic of their rights to become citizens of the United States, stated as follows:

We denounce the policy which thus discards the liberty-loving German and tolerates the revival of the coolie trade in Mongolian women imported for immoral purposes, and Mongolian men held to perform servile labor contracts, and demand such modification of the treaty with the Chinese Empire and such legislation within constitutional limitations as shall prevent further importation or immigration of the Mongolian race. (Hopkins, p. 332.)

In accordance with this doctrine the United States has since adopted immigration regulations which practically excluded the Mongolian races from this country on the theory that they can not be assimilated by the Caucasian race and therefore are not desirable citizens.

In 1884 the Democrats were still of the Jeffersonian belief in regard to the rights of the foreigners in this country.

This will be shown by the following paragraph of the political platform of that date:

Asserting the equality of all men before the law, we hold that it is the duty of the Government in its dealings with the people to meet out equal and exact justice to all citizens of whatever race, color, nativity or persuasion, religious or political. (Hopkins, p. 365.)

The platform of 1884 expressly reaffirmed the entire platform of 1856, which in turn reaffirmed the platform of 1840, which in turn was but a crystallization of the declaration of Thomas Jefferson made in his first inaugural address, which in turn was but a condensation of the battle cry of the Democracy as it rallied for its first great contest.

In 1888 we reaffirmed the platform of 1884, and in 1892 we reaffirmed allegiance to the principles of the party as formulated by Jefferson and exemplified by the long and illustrious line of his successors in Democratic leadership from Madison to Cleveland. Later in the platform is this language:

We condemn and denounce any and all attempts to restrict the immigration of the industrious and worthy of foreign lands.

As late as 1896 we said this:

We reaffirm our allegiance to those great essential principles of justice and liberty upon which our institutions are founded, and which the Democratic Party has advocated from Jefferson's time to our own.

That, sir, was once more a declaration to the foreign-born citizens of this country that we did not propose to indulge in any restrictive legislation.

The platform then denounces the importation "of foreign pauper labor." The fair construction of the two clauses is that our liberal immigration policy was to be pursued, but that contract and imported labor were to be barred. (Hopkins, pp. 428-431.)

Upon the platform of 1892 Grover Cleveland was nominated and elected President. He vetoed, on March 3, 1897, an immigration act containing substantially the same literacy test found in the present bill.

He said:

A radical departure from our national policy relating to immigration is here presented. Heretofore we have welcomed all who came to us from other lands, except those whose moral or physical condition or history threatened danger to our national welfare and safety. Relying upon the jealous watchfulness of our people to prevent injury to our political and social fabric, we have encouraged those coming from foreign countries to cast their lot with us and join in the development of our vast domain, securing in return a share in the blessings of American citizenship.

A century's stupendous growth, largely due to the assimilation and thrift of millions of sturdy and patriotic adopted citizens, attests the success of this generous and free-handed policy, which, while guarding the people's interests, exacts from our immigrants only physical and moral soundness and willingness and ability to work.

A contemplation of the grand results of this policy can not fail to arouse a sentiment in its defense; for however it might have been regarded as an original proposition and viewed as an experiment, its accomplishments are such that if it is to be uprooted at this late day its disadvantages should be plainly apparent and the substitute adopted should be just and adequate, free from uncertainties, and guarded against difficult or oppressive administration.

So conclusive were the reasons given by Grover Cleveland, and so thoroughly was the question being settled, that it has not since been specifically referred to in Democratic platforms. The question of contract labor has, however, been dealt with. The doctrine expressio unis exclusio alterius applies.

No political party since Know Nothingism went to its dishonored grave has ever dared write the doctrine of proscription into its platform or go to the people upon that issue.

This bill was rushed through without its principles having been in any form submitted to the people, much as the alien and sedition laws were rushed through by the Federalist without previous notice or discussion.

The political party writing this miserable doctrine into its creed will never win an election in the United States. You can not carry a single one of the great doubtful States if you do it. It is an act of betrayal, because you have turned your backs upon your own party history from the days of Jefferson to this blessed hour, and because, having obtained office without notice, you now propose to reverse a century-old policy which you dare not submit on the hustings two years from now.

Mr. President, let me go back to the Know-Nothing Party a little bit. I am talking to some Members of the United States Senate who come nearer belonging to the Know-Nothing Party than they do to any other party, and I do not speak offensively. The term "Know-Nothing Party" was one which was applied to the so-called American Party, and I am employing it simply in that sense. What I mean to say is that, in my opinion, the doctrines of know-nothingism are so firmly graven upon the hearts and so fully exemplified in the prejudices of plenty of Senators here that the old Know-Nothing Party ought to be revived, and they ought to join it. It made its appearance in 1837 as an offshoot of the Federalist Party. I think the Republican Party was originally a kind of cross between the Know-Nothing Party and the Abolition Party, and I think the two parents were also closely related.

In 1837 some gentlemen got together and organized what they called the American Party. By the way, I never yet have seen a man about to do a mean, contemptible, and selfish thing but that he immediately grabbed the American flag and wrapped it around him and struck a patriotic attitude. When the Republican Party, in the days of its corruption and infamy, in the blackest hours of its history, was being brought to book and challenged upon the hustings, every speaker who rose to defend its infamous record came on the platform with an American flag in each hand and cried out, "Will you tear down Old Glory?" That and a bloody shirt which he kept concealed somewhere about his person, and which he frantically waved, constituted his sole stock in trade and his appeal to the people. So, of course, a party like the Know Nothing Party would seize the name "American," and here was one of their declarations. Listen! How much it sounds like the arguments of the proponents of this bill. It is a better statement of their case to-day than any one of them can make. They have not enough talent to reproduce it:

1. That Europe is industriously ridding herself of an excess population, now becoming burdensome to her; and whom does she send? Her paupers, her convicts, the outpouring of her almshouses and jails. Even lately has a would-be regicide been landed upon our shores by a national vessel. * * * These immigrants from Europe leave there filled with all the requisite materials to spread among our citizens immigrant radicalism and liberalism.

They have been shouting "anarchist" for mighty nigh a hundred years now.

2. That the foreigner had become the tool of the political wirepuller; that the naturalization laws had become a dead letter; that the foreign vote had become a decisive factor at election; that the foreigner, especially the Irish, was willing to obtain office and power by any means.

What was the matter with these fellows? What is the matter with some of you gentlemen? What is the matter with those

who push this bill? Are you, like the old Know Nothings, afraid that the Irish will beat you in the game of politics? Well, your fear is well founded, because the Irish, whom the old Know Nothing Party declared were the offscourings of the jails and almshouses, have, under God's free sky, blazed a path of glory and progress that but few races of men can follow. But how narrow that declaration was! It sounds like the snarl of a wild beast in the jungle of ignorance. It is selfishness indescribable when uttered by one who, having himself, or through his ancestors, escaped to a free country, now denies the same privilege to those who were left behind.

But the point I make is that this charge is as old as our country for it was made even before the days of the Know-Nothing Party. It was made when the Federalists passed the alien and sedition laws.

Now, I want to analyze these attacks upon immigrants. I want to compare the ancient attack with the present attack. Hearken to me as I try to do so.

Ancient and modern attacks upon immigration are identical. I have already nearly demonstrated that. But let me proceed.

First. The declarations of the Know Nothing Party, just quoted, are similar, only more extreme than any now proposed.

Second. The complaint that foreigners congregate in cities was made with even greater vehemence 100 years ago than at present. I have already produced the evidence of this in previous speeches, in which I quoted contemporaneous newspaper articles, the reports of civic societies, and so forth.

Third. The charge that the foreigner is overrunning this country and crowding out the native population was made over 100 years ago by Benjamin Franklin, who asserted in substance that the Germans would soon absolutely dominate the government of Pennsylvania and transform it into a German province. I have hitherto quoted from Franklin in extenso.

Fourth. The charge that the foreigner is illiterate has been made for more than 100 years.

Fifth. The charge that the foreigner pollutes our electorate is as old as the Nation.

Sixth. The charge that the foreigners herd together in great numbers in tenement districts was as true 100 years ago as it is at this hour.

Seventh. The claim that Europe is dumping her paupers and undesirables upon our shores was made by Franklin in 1753, who said of the Germans, "Those who come here are generally the most stupid of their own nation; unless the stream of importation can be turned from this to other colonies, even our Government will become precarious."

I said before, when I read this declaration of Franklin, it was the only great question upon which, to my knowledge, that wonderful philosopher was seriously mistaken. But no man is gifted with prophecy, no man is without his faults and shortcomings, and Franklin made this one great mistake. Witness the mighty Commonwealth the foreigners he denounced builded. Witness the fact that to-day no man dares stand to challenge the greatness of the race he said was pouring its undesirables into Pennsylvania and about to overthrown our civilization.

Similar charges were then, and ever since have been, brought against all other races of immigrants.

I want to challenge your thought to this.

Eighth. Prior to the Revolution various countries had established their colonies so that, to a large extent, the colonies were but an aggregation of different nationalities.

All of the foregoing complaints against foreigners were made with reference to what is now termed the early immigration, to wit: Germans, Irish, Norwegians, Welsh, Danes, and French, with the same fierceness they are now leveled against what is termed the present undesirable immigration.

The Senator from Colorado stated that in the mines of Colorado there were some 15 or 20 different languages spoken by the employees. Let me call his attention to the fact that if you had assembled in the early seventeenth century typical residents from each one of the American Colonies, you would have heard about 12 or 15 languages spoken by those representatives. This country from the first was not a country of one race but of many races.

Now, Mr. President, I take up the cry that immigrants are congested in cities. It seems to me it had some effect upon the minds of Senators. Let us stop a few moments and analyze it.

The cry has been raised since 1817.

Nearly 100 years ago the "Society for the Prevention of Pauperism in the city of New York met to devise ways and means for the transportation of able-bodied foreigners into the interior to labor upon the soil."

In 1857 the "Association for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor, New York, declared that the Irish had an utter distaste for felling forests and turning up the prairies for themselves. They preferred to stay where another race would furnish them with food, clothing, and labor, and hence were mostly found loitering on the lines of public works, in villages, and in the worst portions of the large cities, where they competed with negroes for the most degrading employment." (Hourwich on Labor and Immigration, p. 67.)

If these alarmed gentlemen had had their way in 1819 New York City would yet have been a village. The charge brought against the Irish of that day was just as true as the charge that is being brought to-day against the present-day immigrant, and both of them are false. They said the Irish congregated in the cities and would not work on railroads, yet everyone knows that it was Irish picks and Irish shovels and Irish brawn and Irish courage that laid nearly every tie of the railroads that span this country. What we need is a committee to suppress public slanderers who get into high places.

But it is argued that the recent immigrant will not move to the farm. Now let us analyze that, not by vain mouthings and wild assertions, but in the light of the cold facts taken from the official statistics.

These gentlemen support their statements that the recent immigrant will not move to the country by an array of figures showing the rapid proportionate increase of the urban over the suburban population. From this fact the opponents of immigration deduce two conclusions:

(a) That the congested conditions of cities are due to the large influx of immigrants.

(b) That the immigrant is unwilling to live in the country.

Both of these arguments are unfounded and misleading.

First. As a country increases in age the proportion of its urban population invariably increases.

Second. This fact is especially manifested throughout our entire history, although it is admitted, notwithstanding the lamentations of the associations I have just quoted, that the so-called early immigrant went largely to the country.

I present a table showing increase of urban population in the United States since 1790:

Table showing percentage of total population living in cities from 1790 to 1910, inclusive.

[Taken from United States census of 1880, vol. 1, p. 29, and from the Census Abstract of 1910, p. 55.]

1790	3.3	1860	16.1
1800	3.9	1870	20.9
1810	4.9	1880	29.5
1820	4.9	1890	36.1
1830	6.7	1900	40.5
1840	8.5	1910	46.3
1850	12.5		

NOTE.—The urban population is in the above table to the year 1880 based upon cities of 8,000 or more inhabitants; from 1880 to 1910 they include all cities over 2,500. There should therefore be a slight increase in the earlier percentages.

But these figures do not at all demonstrate that the increase in the proportion of the urban population is due to immigration. On the contrary, an analysis of our immigration shows that from 1861 to 1870 only 17.6 per cent of the immigrant population engaged in agricultural pursuits, while from 1901 to 1910 the percentage had risen to 24.3 per cent. (Hourwich, p. 67.)

So it may truthfully be said that substantially one out of every five immigrants coming to this country settles upon the farm and tills the soil.

If the immigrants had all settled in the cities, it would necessarily have tended to decrease removal from the farms by increasing the demand for farm products. Its tendency, therefore, would have been to retain upon the farms those who were already there.

On the other hand, if there was, as there is, a large percentage of the immigrants who settle upon farms, the result would be an increase of the farm population to a greater extent than would have resulted merely from the natural increase of population.

Notwithstanding this fact, there has been an actual numerical decrease in the farm population of many of the best agricultural States in the Union.

These facts absolutely demonstrate that the reason more of the immigrants do not settle upon our farms must be identical with the reasons which sent our native population from the farms to the cities.

What are these reasons?

There are doubtless many, but two controlling facts stare us in the face.

First. Men will, invariably, go to the place where they can earn the greatest amount of money and procure the greatest advantages.

Second. Every labor-saving agricultural implement increases the ability of the farmer to dispense with employees. Accordingly, one man becomes able to cultivate a larger body of land.

In no branch of industry has the progress in labor-saving inventions been more rapid or revolutionary than agriculture.

Within the memories of men yet living, the farmer has progressed from the hand sickle to the cradle; from the cradle to the reaper; from the reaper to the self-binder. From the moleboard plow scratching the surface of the land to, in some places, traction engines drawing gang plows which turn 8 to 10 furrows at a time.

The sickle has given place to the mowing machine; the handrake to the horserake; the hoe to the cultivator; the flail to the steam thrashing machine; the saddlebag to the motor truck.

The weary tramp over dirt roads of great distances has become a memory.

The railroad now transports the farmers' goods to every part of the world. The packing house slaughters his hogs and cures his meat.

Clothing that were once woven by the tired fingers of the housewife are now created in the looms of great cities. Hence, the concentration of people in cities and a proportionate diminution of farm population.

By actual investigation it is shown that in many of the best States in the Union there has been not only a proportionate decrease, but an actual loss of farm population. I present a table showing the decrease in certain States from 1900 to 1910.

Table showing numerical and percentage decrease of rural population in certain States.

[Census Abstract, 1910, p. 57.]

	Number.	Per cent.
New Hampshire	10,108	5.4
Vermont	8,222	4.2
Ohio	28,105	1.3
Indiana	82,127	5.1
Iowa	119,869	7.2
Missouri	68,716	3.5

The above figures do not at all indicate that the States named are going backward.

I give, in simple illustration, the State of Missouri. Its rural population decreased 3.5 per cent, while its city population increased 22.3 per cent. This does not mean that the farmers of Missouri or the other States named are not prosperous. It does mean that improved farm machinery has enabled the farmers to cultivate larger bodies of land, and hence the farm population is emigrating to other States or going to the large cities.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President——

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the discussion of the relative growth of the cities and the losses which have come to the rural communities during the last 10 years. While this bill was before the Senate and during the discussion the Senator from Missouri and myself held some difference of opinion in relation to the matter, and afterwards I took pains to examine the census reports to see what is the fact.

What the Senator has stated is undoubtedly true about the trend of population from the rural communities to the cities. In New England, I think, the census of 1910 shows that during the 10 preceding years our cities had increased a million in population while the country districts had decreased something like 25,000. But that increase in the city population was not altogether from the country; the larger proportion of it was from immigration. I wanted to cite right here the official figures, if the Senator will permit me to do it.

Mr. REED. I wish to ask the Senator, when he states the increase is very largely from foreign immigration, do you not raise any children of your own in the cities of the East, and does not that tend to increase the population?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. A few; but I examined the census of 1910 and I found that the per cent of immigrants in the native white and foreign white population in the 10 largest cities in the country for the decennial period from 1900 to 1910 was as follows:

In New York native whites increased 30 per cent, foreign-born whites 52.9 per cent.

In Chicago, increase of native whites 25.5 per cent, of foreign-born whites 33.4 per cent.

In Philadelphia, increase of native whites 15.5 per cent, of foreign-born whites 30.3 per cent.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I thought the Senator rose to ask me a question, and I am willing to answer——

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I ask the Senator if he will not permit me to give the exact figures on that question, taken from the census? If the Senator objects, I will do it in my own time.

Mr. REED. Is it very long?

Mr. DILLINGHAM. No; I have taken the 10 principal cities of the United States.

Mr. REED. Very well; read it in.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. In St. Louis the increase of native whites was 20.6 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 13.3 per cent.

In Boston, increase of native whites, 17.5 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 23.5 per cent.

In Cleveland, increase of native whites, 41.7 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 57.4 per cent.

In Baltimore, increase of native whites, 9.7 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 13.4 per cent.

In Pittsburgh, increase of native whites, 16.3 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 22.3 per cent.

In Detroit, increase of native whites, 63.5 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 63 per cent.

In Buffalo, increase of native whites, 23 per cent; of foreign-born whites, 13.9 per cent.

So it appears that the increase in population among the foreign born in the largest cities of the country has been very much greater than the increase of the native born. The three exceptions are St. Louis, Detroit, and Buffalo. In the case of Detroit the difference is not appreciable. I think that explains the true situation regarding the movement of population during the last 10 years.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. REED. I have called attention to the statistics compiled by the Government which show that for the decades preceding this the percentage of foreign born who went into the country was about 17, and that the percentage has risen in the last decade to 24. The truth is the same law that drives the boy born on the farm to the city keeps the foreigner from going to the farm. If conditions in the city are so much better than they are on the farm that the boy born on the farm will insist on going to the city, then, of course, the conditions do not permit the man who is born in the city or immigrates to this country to go to the farm. That is all there is to it.

Whenever labor becomes better paid upon the farm than in the city, whenever prices for farm products have risen so that farming is more profitable than other occupations, the immigrants will nearly all go to the farm, just as did your ancestors and mine.

I desire to put in these figures. I was calling attention to the increased use of farm machinery. The figures are startling.

In 1850 the total amount expended for farm machinery in the United States was $151,587,638. In 1910 we expended in farm machinery $1,265,149,783. That means that machines are doing the work human hands formerly performed. In this fact we ascertain the reason foreigners stay in cities. It is because they have to live, and they have to stay where work is.

But I pass on. I desire to discuss the question of low wages. I give way to no man in my desire that wages shall be kept at a high standard in this country. It is the best method of distributing wealth that there is. If we could have a high wage everywhere, we would begin distributing the wealth where we should—down at the bottom, to many men—instead of allowing it to be concentrated at the top in the hands of a few men. I am in favor of high wages.

But how are we to obtain them? In the great world of competition labor still has to meet its own members in the bitter strife for existence, and, upon the other hand, it must contend with the cupidity, the avarice, and the cruelty of the employer. It is true that foreigners coming to this country must get work, and that if they can not get work at $2 a day they will work for a dollar and a half. They will accept the smaller wage because they must take it. But, Mr. President, is there anything alarming in that situation? That, as I shall undertake to show, is the exact complaint that has been made at every stage of our country's history against every race of men who have ever come to these shores.

It was charged against the early German, Swede, Irishman, and Scotchman, as it is now charged against the more recent immigrant.

A moment's consideration of the facts daily confronting us, a slight knowledge of human nature, and the employment of a little common sense annihilates the argument.

No human being prefers hardship to ease, hunger to plenty, poverty to wealth. The desire to improve his condition and escape from the exactions of toil is an innate faculty of the human mind.

These men, therefore, work for low wages only until they can secure a higher wage.

The immigrant who has been here for a few years invariably refuses to work for less money than the native born secure. Who any longer brings the charge against the Irishman that he cuts wages? If you think the Irish are engaged in keeping down wages in this country, try to hire one of them to work on your farm or in your factory. Try to hire an Irish girl to work in your home. If you think the Swede is any longer cutting down wages, try the same experiment with the Swede man or the Swede woman. If you claim that any of these races are really cutting down wages so that they have materially affected the general wage level of this country, then I reply you are mistaken; you will learn the effect is confined to a few spots, and the remedy for those spots is not to be found in prohibiting men from entering our country, but in proper legislation, humane treatment, and sensible advice.

Rest assured that just as soon as a foreigner obtains a sufficient amount of capital so that he dare protest his rights he will protest them. Accordingly they sometimes strike, and when they do their action is discussed as though striking by immigrants were the worst of crimes. It is all right for the American citizen to strike, but very wicked for the foreigner to imitate his adopted brother. However, if the foreigner does not strike you heap maledictions upon him, because he is too truculent and continues to work for small wages.

The fact is that the circumstance of the foreigner striking is the very best evidence that he is unwilling to work for a low wage, and that as soon as possible he will insist upon and secure a higher and a better wage. If there is violence done sometimes, I reaffirm what I said a few days ago, it is not as likely to be committed by the foreigner as it is by the native-born son, because the foreigner more fears the law.

The chief argument in favor of the literacy test is that the large influx of unlettered foreigners increases the general average of ignorance and constitutes a menace to our country.

The force of the contention is greatly weakened by the following considerations:

First. A very considerable percentage of adult immigrants never become naturalized; hence their lack of education does not affect the intellectual average of the electorate.

Second. The period of life of adult immigrants is necessarily limited. Therefore their lack of education must soon cease to be a factor.

The vital question is, Are the children of immigrants the equals of our native population in education, intelligence, and patriotism?

If the foregoing question can be answered in the affirmative, then restrictive legislation is not only unnecessary, but a serious mistake.

I present herewith statistical tables which constitute a complete answer to all of the contentions raised by the advocates of this restrictive measure.

The tables referred to are as follows:

TABLE No. 1.—*Per cent of children 6 to 14 years of age attending school compared with the per cent of foreign-born population in each State.*

[This table confined to the white race for the year 1910. (Census Abstract, pp. 86 and 228.)]

WHITE.

States.	Per cent of foreign-born whites in 1910.	Per cent of native parentage.	Per cent where one or both parents are foreign born.	Per cent of foreign-born children.
Alabama	0.9	70.0	78.1	70.2
Arizona	22.9	80.4	72.1	61.6
Arkansas	1.1	74.7	81.2	55.8
California	21.8	87.4	88.1	82.3
Colorado	15.9	86.4	88.4	81.7
Connecticut	29.5	92.6	92.6	89.2
Delaware	8.6	83.4	83.4	75.9
Florida	4.5	72.1	76.1	63.5
Georgia	.6	74.8	84.5	76.0
Idaho	12.4	82.0	84.1	76.2
Illinois	21.3	88.2	88.0	83.8
Indiana	5.9	88.4	87.6	80.6
Iowa	12.3	90.8	90.8	82.0
Kansas	8.0	88.3	89.1	76.7
Kentucky	1.7	76.3	87.1	83.8
Louisiana	3.1	68.4	69.7	50.7
Maine	14.8	90.3	88.4	81.0
Maryland	8.0	83.3	80.0	75.5
Massachusetts	31.2	93.9	93.1	88.1
Michigan	21.2	91.3	90.6	86.8
Minnesota	26.2	88.8	89.2	86.0
Mississippi	.5	84.2	82.9	44.0
Missouri	7.0	85.5	86.7	80.7
Montana	24.4	83.5	86.0	76.1
Nebraska	14.8	90.1	90.8	85.1
Nevada	22.0	86.3	88.8	76.7
New Hampshire	22.4	92.2	91.3	85.5
New Jersey	25.9	89.6	88.7	83.8

TABLE No. 1.—*Per cent of children 6 to 14 years of age, etc.*—Continued.

WHITE—continued.

States.	Per cent of foreign-born whites in 1910.	Per cent of native parentage.	Per cent where one or both parents are foreign born.	Per cent of foreign-born children.
New Mexico	6.9	76.9	75.1	56.6
New York	29.9	89.9	90.6	88.3
North Carolina	.3	75.7	84.0	64.8
North Dakota	27.1	82.7	81.5	70.0
Ohio	12.5	90.3	89.2	84.0
Oklahoma	2.4	82.2	85.5	75.8
Oregon	15.3	85.1	87.3	82.7
Pennsylvania	18.8	88.1	84.8	79.6
Rhode Island	32.8	91.2	89.0	82.4
South Carolina	.4	72.1	81.4	72.2
South Dakota	17.2	84.1	84.6	72.9
Tennessee	.8	75.2	83.6	78.9
Texas	6.2	74.3	60.3	38.4
Utah	17.0	85.4	87.9	83.5
Vermont	14.0	93.1	93.3	89.3
Virginia	1.3	73.2	80.0	71.3
Washington	21.1	85.9	86.9	83.9
West Virginia	4.7	83.0	82.9	66.1
Wisconsin	22.0	90.8	89.7	84.1
Wyoming	18.6	84.9	85.9	76.4
United States (total)	14.5	83.5	88.0	82.3

School attendance of children 6 to 14 years of age in the United States of all classes, both native and foreign born parentage and foreign born, 81.4 per cent.

Per cent of foreign-born population compared with the per cent of illiterates 10 years of age and over and the per cent of prisoners serving sentence in each State of the United States.

[This table confined to the white race for the year 1910.]

WHITE.

States.	Foreign-born whites, population (Census Abstract, 1910, p. 86).	Illiterates 10 years of age and over (Census Abstract, 1910, p. 245).	Per cent prisoners in penal institutions Jan. 1, 1910, serving sentence (Statistical Abstract, 1912, p. 75).
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	
Alabama	0.9	22.9	0.17
Arizona	22.9	20.9	.31
Arkansas	1.1	12.6	.08
California	21.8	3.7	.18
Colorado	15.9	3.7	.15
Connecticut	29.5	6.0	.13
Delaware	8.6	8.1	.14
Florida	4.5	13.8	.24
Georgia	.6	20.7	.26
Idaho	12.4	2.2	.08
Illinois	21.3	3.7	.09
Indiana	5.9	3.1	.10
Iowa	12.3	1.7	.06
Kansas	8.0	2.2	.14
Kentucky	1.7	12.1	.12
Louisiana	3.1	29.0	.14
Maine	14.8	4.1	.09
Maryland	8.0	7.2	.16
Massachusetts	31.2	5.2	.19
Michigan	21.2	3.3	.09
Minnesota	26.2	3.0	.07
Mississippi	.5	22.4	.12
Missouri	7.0	4.3	.10
Montana	24.4	4.8	.25
Nebraska	14.8	1.9	.05
Nevada	22.0	6.7	.35
New Hampshire	22.4	4.6	.11
New Jersey	25.9	5.6	.11
New Mexico	6.9	20.2	.12
New York	29.9	5.5	.13
North Carolina	.3	18.5	.06
North Dakota	27.1	3.1	.06
Ohio	12.5	3.2	.08
Oklahoma	2.4	5.6	.10
Oregon	15.3	1.9	.09
Pennsylvania	18.8	5.9	.10
Rhode Island	32.8	7.7	.13
South Carolina	.4	25.7	.11
South Dakota	17.2	2.9	.04
Tennessee	.8	13.6	.12
Texas	6.2	9.9	.11
Utah	17.0	2.5	.10
Vermont	14.0	3.7	.11
Virginia	1.3	15.2	.15
Washington	21.1	2.0	.16
West Virginia	4.7	8.3	.12
Wisconsin	22.0	3.2	.07
Wyoming	18.6	3.3	.19
United States (total)	14.5	7.7	.12

Vote on Thomas amendment modifying literacy test. (Congressional Record, p. 767.)

States.	Yeas.	Nays.	Not voting.
Alabama		White	Bankhead.
Arizona		Ashurst, Smith	
Arkansas		Robinson	Clark.
California	Perkins	Works	
Colorado	Thomas, Shafroth		
Connecticut		Brandegee, McLean	
Delaware			du Pont, Saulsbury.
Florida		Fletcher, Bryan	
Georgia		Smith, Hardwick	
Idaho	Borah		Brady.
Illinois	Lewis		Sherman.
Indiana	Kern		Shively.
Iowa		Cummins	Kenyon.
Kansas		Bristow	Thompson.
Kentucky		James	Camden.
Louisiana	Thornton, Ransdell.		
Maine			Johnson, Burleigh.
Maryland	Smith, Lee		
Massachusetts		Lodge	Weeks.
Michigan	Townsend		Smith.
Minnesota	Clapp	Nelson	
Mississippi		Vardaman, Williams.	
Missouri	Reed		Stone.[1]
Montana	Walsh, Myers		
Nebraska	Hitchcock, Norris		
Nevada	Pittman		Newlands
New Hampshire		Gallinger	Hollis.
New Jersey	Martine, Hughes		
New Mexico			Catron, Fall.
New York	O'Gorman	Root	
North Carolina		Simmons, Overman	
North Dakota		McCumber, Gronna.	
Ohio	Pomerene	Burton	
Oklahoma		Gore	Owen.
Oregon	Chamberlain, Lane		
Pennsylvania		Oliver	Penrose.
Rhode Island		Lippitt	Colt.
South Carolina		Smith	Tillman.
South Dakota		Sterling	Crawford.
Tennessee			Lea, Shields.
Texas	Culberson	Sheppard	
Utah		Smoot, Sutherland	
Vermont		Dillingham, Page	
Virginia		Swanson	Martin.
Washington		Jones, Poindexter	
West Virginia			Chilton, Goff.
Wisconsin	La Follette		Stephenson.
Wyoming			Warren, Clark.

[1] Paired for the amendment.

Table 1 shows—and I challenge the attention of some southern Senators to what I am now about to say—Table 1 shows:

1. That those States which possess the smallest percentage of foreign-born people are the strongest advocates of the bill, while many of the States having a very high percentage of foreign-born population are opposed to the bill.

2. That a majority of the States advocating the literacy test are:

(a) In point of literacy below the general average of the rest of the United States.

(b) In point of literacy below the foreign-born immigrant children.

(c) The percentage of literacy among the foreign-born immigrant children is higher than the general average of the United States.

(d) The percentage of literacy of children, one or both of whose parents are foreign born, is far above the general average of the United States.

Mr. President, if I can make good those propositions I shall have destroyed the last argument of those who voted for this restrictive, un-American, and undemocratic bill.

I. THE STATES WHICH POSSESS THE SMALLEST PERCENTAGE OF FOREIGN-BORN PEOPLE ARE THE STRONGEST ADVOCATES OF THIS BILL, WHILE MANY OF THE STATES HAVING A HIGH PERCENTAGE OF FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION ARE OPPOSED TO THE BILL.

The following States have less than 2 per cent of foreign-born people:

	Per cent.
Alabama	0.9
Arkansas	1.1
Georgia	.6
Kentucky	1.7
Mississippi	.5
North Carolina	.3
South Carolina	.4
Tennessee	.8
Virginia	1.3

The following States have more than 2 and less than 5 per cent of foreign-born population:

	Per cent.
Florida	4.5
Louisiana	3.1
Oklahoma	2.4
West Virginia	4.7

It is a significant fact that all of the Senators, with the exception of Louisiana, representing the above-named States, either voted against any modification of the literacy test or failed to vote on that question.

The author of the bill is a Member of the House from Alabama, which has a foreign population of but nine-tenths of 1 per cent. The chairman of the committee of the Senate, who has been most forcibly pushing the bill, comes from South Carolina, the foreign-born population of which is only four-tenths of 1 per cent.

The following States have a large foreign-born population:

	Per cent.
New York	29.9
Minnesota	26.2
New Jersey	25.9
Montana	24.4
Wisconsin	22.0
Illinois	21.3
Michigan	21.2
Colorado	15.9
Oregon	15.3
Nebraska	14.8
Idaho	12.4

The Senators representing the above-named States, by a large majority, supported an amendment in favor of modifying the literacy test.

It is a noticeable fact that the State of Illinois, which possesses a foreign population of 21.3 per cent, is represented here by Senators of opposite political faith. Yet both of these Senators oppose the literacy test. They do so because they are intimately acquainted with the immigration problem. The great State of Illinois contains a foreign population of approximately 1,201,019.

I pause now to ask why it is that Senators coming from States where substantially no immigrant population exists, which can not have suffered from it, which can not be well acquainted with it, are so keen in their insistence upon forcing their restrictive policy upon those States which are acquainted with the problem? If this question were left to those States which are acquainted with the problem this restrictive legislation never would have been passed.

Mr. President, I next call attention to this proposition:

II. THE LITERACY OF CHILDREN OF IMMIGRANTS IS HIGHER THAN THE GENERAL AVERAGE OF THE UNITED STATES.

Table No. 1, which I present, shows the following somewhat startling facts:

A. The total percentage of foreign-born population in the United States to be 14.5 per cent.

B. The percentage of children between the ages of 6 and 14 of native white parentage who attend school to be 83.5 per cent.

C. The percentage of children of all classes between the ages of 6 and 14 who attend school to be 81.4 per cent.

D. The percentage of whites between the ages of 6 and 14 who attend school, where one or both parents are foreign born, to be 88 per cent.

E. The percentage of foreign-born white children between the ages of 6 and 14 who attend school to be 82.3 per cent.

It therefore appears that the percentage of school attendance by children, one or both of whose parents came here as an immigrant, exceeds that of the children of white natives by 4.5 per cent.

The table also shows that the school attendance among children of foreign birth exceeds the general average of school attendance for the whole country by nine-tenths of 1 per cent.

The figures just quoted demonstrate, therefore, that the degree of literacy of children of foreign birth is above the general average of the native born and also above the average of the population of the country taken as a whole.

The figures also prove beyond peradventure that the offspring of the immigrant does not remain illiterate, but that he pursues learning with an even greater avidity than our native-born children.

I advance this proposition:

III. THE STATES HAVING THE LOWEST PERCENTAGE OF IMMIGRANT POPULATION ARE LOWEST IN LITERACY.

The men who stand here to represent the States having the smallest foreign population also represent States having the lowest average of literacy of the country. The States that cry "Shut out the illiterate" are themselves the most illiterate.

I present herewith Table No. 2, which compares the degree of illiteracy among children of school age between five great States containing a very large percentage of foreign population with the degree of illiteracy among children of school age found in the five States containing the smallest percentage of foreign-born population.

The comparison is distinctly unfavorable to the States possessing the smallest percentage of foreign-born people.

The figures I now give embrace all of the white children between 6 and 14 years:

Rhode Island: Immigrant population, 32.8 per cent; school attendance, 91.2 per cent.

South Carolina: Immigrant population, four-tenths of 1 per cent; school attendance, 72.1 per cent.

Massachusetts: Immigrant population, 31.2 per cent; school attendance, 93.9 per cent.

North Carolina: Immigrant population, three-tenths of 1 per cent; school attendance, 75.7 per cent.

New York: Immigrant population, 29.9 per cent; school attendance, 89.9 per cent.

Mississippi: Immigrant population, five-tenths of 1 per cent; school attendance, 84.2 per cent.

Connecticut: Immigrant population, 29.5 per cent; school attendance, 92.6 per cent.

Georgia: Immigrant population, six-tenths of 1 per cent; school attendance, 74.8 per cent.

North Dakota: Immigrant population, 27.1 per cent; school attendance, 82.7 per cent.

Tennessee: Immigrant population, eight-tenths of 1 per cent; school attendance, 75.2 per cent.

When we include the colored population the contrast is even more unfavorable to the States possessing a small foreign population.

Note also that States containing a very low percentage of foreign population are, in the point of literacy—

(a) Far below the general average of the United States taken as a whole.

(b) Far below the general average of children of foreign birth, taking the United States as a whole.

What an astounding thing it is to find the representatives of these States, whose population in literacy is far below the average of the children of foreign birth, whose States contain but few people of foreign birth, here clamoring that the foreigner shall be excluded from this country on the ground of illiteracy!

I next assert, Mr. President, that immigration is not inimical to education.

That immigrants favor education is shown by the fact that those States where they are most numerous and potential have uniformly dealt more generously with the public schools than have those States which are completely dominated by native-born people. In support of the foregoing statement I submit Table 2:

TABLE No. 2.—*Comparative statement showing the five States which have the largest percentage of foreign born compared with the five States which have the smallest percentage of foreign born.*

States.	Per cent of foreign-born whites in 1910 (Census Abstract, p. 86).	Per cent of school attendance 6 to 14 years, all classes (Census Abstract, p. 228).	Per cent of school attendance 6 to 14, native white (Census Abstract, p. 228).	Per cent of school attendance 6 to 14, of whites having one or both parents foreign born (Census Abstract, p. 228).	Per cent of school attendance 6 to 14, of foreign-born whites (Census Abstract, p. 228).	Per cent of negroes 6 to 14, attending school (Census Abstract, p. 228).	Expenditures for public schools, 1879 (Statistical Abstract, 1880, p. 155).	Expenditures for public schools, 1911 (Statistical Abstract, 1912, p. 118).	Value of all property in 1904 (Statistical Abstract, 1912, p. 650).	Population in 1880 (Statistical Abstract, 1880, p. 149).	Population, 1910 (Census Abstract, 1910, p. 24).	Area in square miles (Statistical Abstract, 1912, p. 28).	Date when admitted to the Union (Statistical Abstract, 1912, p. 21).
LARGEST PERCENTAGE OF FOREIGN BORN.													
Rhode Island	32.8	88.8	91.2	89.0	82.4	87.7	$597,000	$2,360,000	$799,000,000	276,000	542,000	1,000	1790
Massachusetts	31.2	92.9	93.9	93.1	88.1	92.0	4,994,000	22,502,000	4,956,000,000	1,783,000	3,366,000	8,000	1788
New York	29.9	90.0	89.9	90.6	88.3	87.1	10,464,000	52,328,000	14,769,000,000	5,083,000	9,113,000	47,000	1788
Connecticut	29.5	92.3	92.6	92.6	89.2	90.5	1,375,000	5,426,000	1,414,000,000	622,000	1,114,000	4,000	1788
North Dakota	27.1	80.7	82.7	81.5	70.0	.....	.....	5,184,000	735,000,000	.....	577,000	70,000	1889
SMALLEST PERCENTAGE OF FOREIGN BORN.													
South Carolina	0.4	62.6	72.1	81.4	72.2	56.1	$319,000	$2,168,000	$585,000,000	995,000	1,515,000	30,000	1788
North Carolina	.3	71.7	75.7	84.0	64.8	64.0	337,000	3,140,000	842,000,000	1,400,000	2,206,000	48,000	1789
Mississippi	.5	72.2	84.2	82.9	44.0	63.7	641,000	2,726,000	688,000,000	1,131,000	1,797,000	46,000	1817
Georgia	.6	65.6	74.8	84.5	76.0	55.4	465,000	4,390,000	1,167,000,000	1,539,000	2,609,000	58,000	1788
Tennessee	.8	72.1	75.2	83.6	78.9	60.1	710,000	5,083,000	1,104,000,000	1,542,000	2,184,000	41,000	1796

I also present Table 3, which compares the amounts of money expended for public schools in the five States containing the largest percentage of foreign population with the amounts expended in States containing the smallest percentage of foreign population.

The table referred to is as follows:

TABLE No. 3.—*Money expended for public schools.*

	Population.	Expended for public schools.	Per capita expended.	Per cent foreign born.
North Carolina	2,206,000	$3,140,000	$1.42	0.3
Rhode Island	542,000	2,360,000	4.35	32.8
South Carolina	1,515,000	2,168,000	1.43	.4
Massachusetts	3,666,000	22,502,000	6.13	31.2
Mississippi	1,797,000	2,726,000	1.51	.5
New York	9,113,000	52,328,000	5.74	29.9
Georgia	2,609,000	4,390,000	2.07	.6
Connecticut	1,114,000	5,426,000	4.87	29.5
Tennessee	2,184,000	5,083,000	2.32	.8
North Dakota	577,000	5,184,000	8.98	27.1

The average amount of money expended on public schools in five States showing highest percentage of immigration per capita — $5.96

The average amount expended in the five States showing the lowest percentage of immigration per capita — 1.54

The above figures prove that a great influx of foreigners has not led to a policy of stinting the public schools; also, that if it be true that foreigners exercise the potential influence in politics ascribed to them, then they have well manifested that interest by liberal taxation for educational purposes. If the figures I have quoted were reversed, what a frightful deduction these proscriptionists, who are the residuary legatees of the Know Nothing Party, would draw.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. WALSH. Is it the deduction of the Senator, accordingly, that the real reasons for pressing forward this legislation are some that have not been disclosed?

Mr. REED. That is my opinion—reasons so unpleasant that I hesitate to mention them; but I shall perhaps touch closer upon that question a little later.

Mr. O'GORMAN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. O'GORMAN. No Member of this body has given more careful consideration to the questions involved in this legislation than the junior Senator from Missouri; and it does seem to me, if he has information which would inform his colleagues and the country as to the real motives underlying this proscriptive policy, that it is his duty to give that information here and now.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, before I conclude my remarks I think I shall be able to satisfy all of the Members of the Senate that I have dealt with this question with considerable frankness; but lest it might be later forgotten, and lest it might be thought that I am avoiding an answer, I have to say that I believe the most potential, constant, and determined force back of this restrictive legislation is that spirit of religious proscription that is as old as our country; that organizations and societies have been pushing this legislation, and that these societies raise against one of the great branches of the Christian faith the hand of proscription, if not of absolute persecution.

I desire to proceed now. I was saying that I laid down further the proposition that the increase of population and wealth in those States having the largest foreign population has

been the greatest in this country, and I should like to challenge the attention of the Senators who are present to Table 3, which I have presented.

Now, a preliminary word.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. If it will not interrupt the Senator, I should like to call his attention at this point to one phase of modern immigration which had much to do with the vote which I cast in favor of the measure just vetoed. It is the importation—I think that is the proper word to use—of large bodies of men into this country by great corporate interests, such as the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co. in my State, from the different nationalities of Europe, parceled out among these nationalities in somewhat regular lines of division, and employing them in their mines, so that on account of disparity of language and nationality there can be neither community of action nor concert in any social way, in consequence of which the places of American workmen are taken by that class of people, who afterwards, becoming dissatisfied with their condition, which to say the least is an undesirable one, break out into opposition and insurrection and strikes, and commit disorders for which American workmen, both native and naturalized, and who are entitled to the protection and the privileges of our laws and of our institutions, are blamed.

To give the Senator a cogent illustration of the situation which results from the possibilities of carrying out such a purpose, in 1904 there was a strike in southern Colorado. The governor of the State, at the instance of the mine owners, declared martial law; and the militia, at the behest of those in authority, loaded into box cars, without form of law or process of law, the men who were displeasing to the managers, whether they had been engaged in the strike or whether they had been merely suspected of wrongdoing or wrong purpose, and dumped them onto the plains of Kansas and New Mexico. Their places were filled by men imported directly from southeastern Europe, and the men who were imported in 1904 from that section were naturalized before they had been in the State three months and herded at the polls and voted like sheep. It was these men who in 1913 went on strike—a strike which has become historic on account of its gravity and the extent to which it reached.

I also want to emphasize the fact that when the President of the United States, responding to the call of the governor, exercised his constitutional power by taking possession of the disturbed area of the State with the troops of the United States Government, he issued a proclamation commanding all those who had arms in their hands and all who were otherwise unlawfully disposed toward the Government, to disperse and go to their homes within a certain time, and that proclamation had to be translated into 22 different languages in order that its contents might be properly understood and carried to the minds of something like five or six thousand of the men supposed to be upon strike.

I submit that that is a condition which is undesirable in any country, and one which no well-regulated immigration law would permit. It is one which has been the fruitful cause of much of the social, political, and industrial disturbance in my State, and one to which the real workingmen and citizenship of my State naturally desire to put an end, if possible.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Colorado break completely in on the thread of my discourse.

Mr. THOMAS. I am very sorry I interrupted the Senator, if that is the case.

Mr. REED. That is all right, and I therefore will depart from the thread of my discourse for a moment to give them consideration.

The Senator himself introduced an amendment to this bill seeking to modify the literacy test, and I believe if that amendment had been placed upon the bill the President would not have found it necessary to interpose his veto. I supported that amendment. It was an amendment which exempted from the literacy test those who come here to escape race persecution and who come to escape political persecution; but the authors of this bill were so desirous of restricting immigration that they—I say it without meaning to be offensive—stubbornly refused to yield a single inch, and insisted upon excluding from this country those who flee here seeking refuge from the tyranny of other lands.

I make the further observation that if labor is being imported into the State of the Senator from Colorado by the Colorado Fuel & Iron Co., or any other corporation or any individual, the present Federal statutes are sufficient to punish drastically those guilty of the offense. But if the laws need strengthening in that respect I will go as far as the Senator from Colorado can go, or as any other man can go, to stop the importation of contract labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri has not lost the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have repeatedly made the statement during the course of this debate which I have just made—the difficulty that in a bill which contains some good and wholesome propositions were thrust these propositions to which the President has expressly called attention, every one of which is unsound and all of which are a repudiation of the doctrines of the Democratic Party, of the teachings of Thomas Jefferson, of the principles of justice and of equity, of the very system under which civilization in this land was first established.

As for the statement of the Senator from Colorado that various languages are spoken in the Colorado mines, let me call his attention to the fact that only 20 years after the discovery of Manhattan Island it is recorded there were then 14 different languages spoken on its soil. There is nothing new about different people speaking different tongues or of the fact that people of different tongues come to this land and work at the same place.

Let me remark as I am passing, that if I know anything of the history of the strikes of Colorado, bad as was the conduct of the striker, the conduct of some of the officials, particularly the military officers, was probably a worse offense against the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights of this land than was the act of any one of the strikers who ventured to raise his arm against oppression.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I fully concede that one injustice was the offspring of the other. I merely wish to say that I make no point upon the disparity of language taken in itself. What I intended to emphasize was the fact that when men are brought here deliberately because they speak a different tongue and are separated lest they acquire either a common tongue or the English language, when, after they have been here for a period of 10 years, the only language which they know is the language which they brought here, and that that is the consequence of the method of oppression upon a large scale, it is a condition which to my mind is not only undesirable but appalling.

Mr. REED. Ah! But, Mr. President, I call the attention of my friend from Colorado to this, that the authors of that outrage of importation were American citizens, who thereby violated the laws of the land. I also call his attention to the fact that the cruel system of herding these people together in communities so arranged that various languages were spoken was born in the brain of some native-born corporation manager. If these people were so herded and so treated, is it any wonder they finally rose to strike? Was not that rather an evidence of their manhood and of their fitness for citizenship than proof to the contrary? And having been brought here and herded, as the Senator states, is that any excuse for the officers of a State trampling upon the Constitution and setting up a pretended condition of war, and arresting these people, confining them like cattle in prison pens without trial, and denying to them the writ of habeas corpus?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. There certainly is no excuse whatever for the things which the Senator has just mentioned. My fundamental objection, and there are many, is that when these people were brought there each one of them took the bread out of the mouths of an American workman, his wife and his children, and they were turned adrift not only to seek employment elsewhere but to meet the drastic competition in lower wages consequent

upon the importation of this large body of men as their substitutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, importation is utterly abominable and importation is now criminal. If the authorities of Colorado, the native-born people, the educated and literate people, the learned people, permitted the laws of the United States to be trampled under foot they themselves have a responsibility for which they must answer.

As for the question of wages and driving out American workmen, I shall discuss that a little later, because it is in the course of my remarks. I propose now to go on with my demonstration.

The next point I make is that a comparison of the material progress and wealth of States having a large foreign population with States having a small foreign population shows that the former have far outrun the latter in every line of industry and attainment.

COMPARISON OF MATERIAL PROGRESS AND WEALTH.

Now, a preliminary word.

The wonderful progress of our country can be largely attributed to the liberal immigration policy hitherto pursued.

When the War of the Revolution ended, our civilization was confined to a narrow strip of land along the Atlantic coast. The population was in the neighborhood of 3,000,000.

In less than a single decade the population had doubled. It had begun pushing its way into the interior. It drove back the Indians; built cities, schoolhouses, churches, and homes.

In a few years the new Republic had more than doubled its strength, its wealth, and its power among the nations of the earth.

That policy has been pursued ever since, with the result that our land has outstripped all the nations of history.

That our progress is largely due to the generous influx of foreign blood is abundantly illustrated by the contrast existing between the progress and development of those States having the highest percentage of foreign population with the States having the lowest.

Again, I call attention to the 10 States I have just referred to:

RHODE ISLAND AND SOUTH CAROLINA.

Rhode Island and South Carolina came into the Union at substantially the same time.

South Carolina has thirty times the territory of Rhode Island and only three times the population, while the wealth of Rhode Island exceeds that of South Carolina by $214,000,000.

Rhode Island has 32.8 per cent foreign population; South Carolina has four-tenths of 1 per cent.

Contrast Rhode Island with South Carolina. You can put 30 States like Rhode Island within the territory of South Carolina, yet little Rhode Island has nearly one-third of the population of South Carolina; little Rhode Island has more wealth than South Carolina, and little Rhode Island has outrun her in progress, yet little Rhode Island has 32.8 per cent of foreign population while South Carolina has four-tenths of 1 per cent.

Mark you, I have not selected States that just suit my purpose. I have here the five States showing the highest percentage and I am contrasting them with the five States showing the lowest percentage of foreign population. The percentage of the other States intermediate will bear out the results I am now giving to a greater or less extent.

LET US CONTRAST MASSACHUSETTS AND NORTH CAROLINA.

Both States were admitted into the Union at substantially the same time.

North Carolina has six times the area of Massachusetts. Massachusetts exceeds North Carolina in population by 1,160,000, and has almost six times as much wealth, the figures being Massachusetts, $4,956,000,000; North Carolina, $842,000,000.

The foreign population of Massachusetts is 31.2 per cent; North Carolina, three-tenths of 1 per cent.

What a blessing it would have been to South Carolina if she could have had an infusion of the blood that helped build the great State of Massachusetts.

NEW YORK AND MISSISSIPPI.

The age and area of these States are substantially the same. New York has over five times the population of Mississippi and over twenty times its wealth, the exact figures being New York, $14,769,000,000; Mississippi, $688,000,000.

The foreign population of New York is 29.9 per cent; Mississippi, five-tenths of 1 per cent.

CONNECTICUT AND GEORGIA.

These two States were admitted into the Union in the same year.

Georgia has over fourteen times the area of Connecticut and nearly double the population, but falls below Connecticut in point of wealth, the exact figures being Connecticut, $1,414,000,000; Georgia, $1,167,000,000.

Connecticut has a foreign population of 29.5 per cent; Georgia, six-tenths of 1 per cent.

NORTH DAKOTA AND TENNESSEE.

North Dakota was admitted into the Union nearly 100 years after Tennessee.

North Dakota has made marvelous material advancement. Owing to her youth the population is comparatively sparse, yet with less than 25 per cent of the population of Tennessee she already has over 66 per cent of her wealth. In both population and wealth she is rapidly overtaking her elder sister.

The foreign population of North Dakota is 27.1 per cent; Tennessee, eight-tenths of 1 per cent.

The above figures absolutely demonstrate the following propositions that immigration has not:

(a) Increased the average of illiteracy.

(b) Has not injured the public schools.

(c) Has not withheld material advancement.

On the contrary, the States containing a heavy foreign population show a distinct superiority in the matter of literacy.

In material advancement they have far outstripped the States containing a small foreign population.

Under these circumstances it is a little astonishing that an attempt should be made by States with but a small percentage of foreign population to force their policy upon States with a large percentage, the representatives of many of which desire to continue a policy of liberality.

I now inquire if crime increases by immigration. This question is answered in the negative by both statistics and authority. I present Table 4.

The table referred to is as follows:

TABLE NO. 4.—*Comparing the percentage of persons confined in penal institutions in the 10 States having the largest percentage of foreign population with the percentage of persons confined in penal institutions in the 10 States having the smallest percentage of foreign population.*

States.	Percentage foreign-born white.	Percentage of prisoners under sentence in penal institutions.
Rhode Island	32.8	0.13
Massachusetts	31.2	.19
New York	29.9	.13
Connecticut	29.5	.13
North Dakota	27.1	.06
Minnesota	26.2	.07
New Jersey	25.9	.11
Montana	24.4	.25
New Hampshire	22.4	.11
Wisconsin	22	.07
Average		.125
North Carolina	0.3	.03
South Carolina	.4	.11
Mississippi	.5	.12
Georgia	.6	.26
Tennessee	.8	.11
Arkansas	1.1	.17
Virginia	1.3	.15
Kentucky	1.7	.12
Oklahoma	2.4	.10
Louisiana	3.1	.14
Average		.131

Mr. President, the table shows that the average criminality in 10 States having the largest percentage of foreign-born population is less than exists in the 10 States having the lowest percentage of foreign-born population.

Here are 20 great States placed in contrast; the 10 States that have not been polluted by foreigners at all with 10 States having a large population and also large cities, in which, it is charged, there is a congestion of population caused by immigration, and that thereby crime is bred. Yet the average criminality in the States having the highest percentage of foreign population is materially less than the average shown by the States having the lowest foreign-born population.

The Immigration Commission can not be charged, Mr. President, with a prejudice in favor of the immigrants, because it has seemed to me to appear as a special pleader against him throughout. The Immigration Commission nevertheless makes this statement:

As to whether or not immigration increases crime, there is not sufficient evidence to predicate a conclusion.

I have produced very substantial evidence from the official statistics by the comparison of the 20 States above named. The Immigration Commission has displayed animosity toward the immigrant. Its statement therefore is tantamount to an admission that the enemies of immigration have not been able to make a case.

POLITICAL REFUGEES.

The President has sharply challenged attention to the fact that this bill refuses asylum to political refugees.

In this respect the bill repudiates our national traditions as they have existed from the first. It was, as I have shown, the initial reason for much of the early immigration to our land. Our parent stock sought refuge in the forests of North America from the executioners of kings.

The doctrine was proclaimed by Jefferson that the War of 1812 was fought in the defense of the rights of immigrants.

Again, in 1853, Marin Koszta, a Hungarian refugee, was rescued from an Austrian warship by the captain of the United States sloop *St. Louis*, who backed his demands with the cannon of his vessel.

As I have said, the War of 1812 was fought in defense of the rights of our naturalized citizens. They were good enough in those days to go to war for, but in this day it is proposed to exclude them. The doctrine of protection of political refugees has been written in the creed of every political party entitled to live and that has lived.

Mr. President, we stand in the presence of the greatest war ever waged. Its termination may not be prophesied, but when it is over the map of Europe doubtless will be rewritten. Provinces, perhaps entire countries, will become the spoil of the victors. Bitter reprisals will inevitably follow.

It is humanely probable that thousands of men whose only offenses have been love of country, devotion to home and native land will be obliged to flee to escape the prison and the scaffold.

Shall we, in this hour of the world's history, reverse the policies of our Nation and deny sanctuary to those our fathers would have welcomed to their hearts and their homes? I present that question to the thoughtful and humane consideration of Senators.

Who are these immigrants who are coming with outstretched hands at the present day? Mr. President, they are our own kith and kin. Hart, in his American History, states (vol. 26, p. 42) that considerably more than one-half of the white people in the United States can not go back two generations without striking a foreigner.

It is safe to say that if they go back three generations 80 to 90 per cent of our people will strike an immigrant.

We are already a composite race. But few men born in America can truthfully say there does not mingle in their veins the blood of several European races. Yet we justly maintain that we have here developed a race superior to all of its forbearers.

DO THE IMMIGRANT RACES POSSESS THE QUALITIES OF GREATNESS?

No race produces superior men, unless the race itself contains the elements of greatness.

Measured by this standard, every European race has demonstrated not only its right to live but its capacity for the highest attainment. We are yet compelled to go to Europe for our ideals in architecture, painting, sculpture, poetry, and literature. What nation of Europe has failed to enrich the treasury of art and knowledge with the jewels of genius.

But European countries have unfortunately overburdened the great mass of their people. The common man, finding his opportunities at home too circumscribed, in answer to the longings of his soul seeks a country of freedom and equality. It is proposed by the authors of this bill to refuse him admission at our gates.

IS THE FOREIGNER CAPABLE OF CITIZENSHIP AND ACHIEVEMENT?

Shall we consider the Jew?

Seek the source of the century-old horrors he has endured and you will enter the caverns of ignorance where dwells the serpent of superstition and its pestilential offspring, persecution.

The Jew has been, and in some places still is, an outcast simply and only because he has steadfastly refused to abandon the God of his fathers.

For this, 3,000 years ago were his burdens in Egypt made greater than he could bear; for this were his cities burned, the walls of his capital razed, his temples destroyed, his altars desecrated, his people slaughtered; for this was he carried into captivity by Syrian and Babylonian despots, his land reduced to a desert sown with the bones of murdered millions. Yet, in spite of all, for fifteen hundred years the Jew clung to the horns of his altar, cherished his temple, and reverenced his God.

For fifteen centuries the world was enveloped in the night of bigotry, ignorance, and terror—a night illumined by a single torch of truth, held aloft by the hand of the Jew.

The Jew alone during all that period of terror, vice, tyranny, despair and loathsome idolatry taught the doctrine of one Supreme God. He alone followed a code of laws which embraced every principle essential to liberty, morality, and religion. His laws and his religion were to those of the other nations of the earth as a star of indescribable glory shining through the clouds of a storm-rent sky upon a sea of blood.

Then came the dawn of Christianity, but its glory fell first upon the land of the Jew. The God mother was a Jewess. The Twelve Disciples were Hebrew fishermen who spread their nets along the shores of the sea of Galilee.

From this race we get our religion, from its sacred writings our morals. It preserved the greater part of our knowledge of ancient history. The sublimest examples of sacred poetry and the tenderest expressions of exalted devotion fell from the pens of inspired Jews.

Obliterate the work of the Jew before the Christian era and you destroy the old Bible and the Ten Commandments. Strike out the work of the Jew of the Christian era and you obliterate the New Testament.

Your religion, the fundamentals of your laws, your ideas of virtue, your precepts of morality—all these you get from the Jew. From the lips of the son of a Jewess came the sublime command, "Do unto others as you would they should do unto you."

If you say some of the Jews crucified the Savior, I answer it was also Jews who followed Him to Calvary. It was a Jew who drew the nails from the cross. It was Jews who reverently bore the body to the sepulcher. It was Jews who awaited the glory of the resurrection. It was Jews to whom He appeared; with whom He walked and talked.

It was these same Jews who went into all the world teaching His word. They were beaten; they were imprisoned; they were fed to wild beasts by those they came to save. They gave their lives to the propagation of Christianity. The race has ever since been persecuted by those whom a part of the race converted.

But as civilization has progressed, as the light of reason has penetrated the night of ignorance, as man has emerged from the jungles of barbarism and approached the sun-lit plains of civilization, persecution of the Jew has lapsed or ceased. Only Russia and one or two others of the tardy nations continue the diabolic practice. Let us not become either assistants or parties to the infernal policy.

If you were to name the 10 greatest statesmen of the century, you would be compelled to include the elder Disraeli, an English Jew.

If you were to name the 10 greatest judges, you would include in the list a Jew, Rufus Daniel Isaacs, lord chief justice of England.

If you were to think of great lawyers of the century, your mind would call up the name Judah P. Benjamin, attorney general of the Confederacy, and remember him as a Jew.

If you were asked to name the foremost actress of the world, you would instantly think of Sarah Bernhardt, a French Jewess.

If you were asked to call the name of a master of music, you would remember Anton Rubenstein.

If you were to pursue your inquiry, you would find that in law, medicine, literature, science, philanthropy, art, and in business the Jew has held his own with competitors of every race.

Let me quote you the words of Joaquin Miller:

Who taught you tender Bible tales
Of honey lands, of milk and wine?
Of happy, peaceful Palestine?
Of Jordan's holy harvest vales?
Who gave the patient Christ? I say,
Who gave your Christian creed? Yes; yes;
Who gave your very God to you?
Your Jew! Your Jew! Your hated Jew!
(Joaquin Miller in "Russia's Ingratitude.")

Shall we speak of the Polander? I have heard him referred to here in a derogatory way. Ah, before you do that, Americans, think of the two great Polacks who came here to serve in the War of the Revolution; gaze, if you will, upon the marble bust of Pulaski, to which I already have called attention, standing in yonder gallery, and remember that the blood poured from his veins to give you liberty. Is the Polack fit to hold his place in the world's progress? I have spoken of Pulaski and Kosciuszko. Let me mention Copernicus, that great astronomer who exposed the mistakes scientists had for a thousand years made,

who revolutionized the theory of the universe, whose genius blazes down the centuries as the sun at high noon upon the earth.

What lover of music has not stood entranced by the divine melodies of Chopin or sat enthralled by the Polac'- Paderewski, m ster of the piano?

The soil that still can produce beautiful flowers will also bring forth useful grains. The sons of genius do not spring from an inferior race of men.

Shall we condemn the Italian? Ah, my friends, I have called attention to the fact that since schools have been established in his native land the Italian is rapidly gaining in education. But shall you condemn him? He alone successfully fought back the tidal wave of barbarism that engulfed Europe in the Dark Ages; he alone, although often overrun and often conquered, preserved his great libraries; he alone kept his temples of art and preserved the masterpieces of the ancients even though compelled to bury them to prevent their desecration by the barbarians. These people, sirs, still have in their veins the masterful blood of the Romans; they only lack opportunity.

If now you were to name the two foremost discoverers in the field of electricity, next to Edison you would speak of the Italian, Marconi.

Sir, at no period has Italy permitted her civilization to die. When all the world was dumb Italian poets were still singing their wondrous songs; her artists were preserving on canvas and in marble the marvelous visions of grace and beauty their souls conceived. The vulgar rich of this country seek to gain reputation for good taste by displaying in their homes the immortal works of the immortal geniuses who sprang from that race some of you would exclude from our shores.

Shall I speak of the German? Sir, he was denounced in his early immigration, but now criticism is silenced. The schoolhouse, I almost may say the schoolhouse of the world, is Germany; there music and art and culture make their homes. I pass on.

Do you denounce the Bohemian? Remember that in 1348 he established the university of Prague, at which there speedily gathered over 6,000 students. Remember that largely because of it learning was revived in Europe. Remember also that that race of men have suffered upon the battle field for liberty, and that it boasts a higher degree of literacy than the native sons of America.

Ah, shall we condemn the Greeks? Yes; they come here poor; they are shoemakers pounding at their benches, and bootblacks. I confess that as I used to look at them it seemed to me that possibly the poet was wrong when, in speaking of the Greek revolutionists many years back, he ascribed to them the spirit of Thermopylæ and Marathon. But, sir, when the Balkan War was on I stood upon the streets of my city and saw my bootblack friend transformed and transfigured. The blood mounted to his dark cheeks, the light of battle gleamed in his eyes; I saw him and his neighbors bid good-by to their wives and their children, and, almost to a man, leave their adopted homes and return to Greece to help break the chains their oppressors had riveted upon their native land. Then I knew that the spirit of Thermopylæ was alive, and then I knew a race so patriotic would make good citizens of this Republic.

So I followed the history of their war; it was a glorious story. The bootblack immigrant stood in the red line of battle and fought like the veteran of a hundred wars, and then when the war was over and Greece emerged victorious the immigrant returned to his humble occupation. But it will not be for long. Each year I see these people graduate into a better employment. Sometimes I wonder whether in genuine culture they do not surpass the average of our own people. From their homes come wonderful music. There is a song upon their lips we can not reproduce. The mystery of harmony is in their souls, and wherever you go in the humblest cottage, or the hovel, you will find, if not a marble, at least a plaster counterfeit of some great work of art. Why, sirs, they are but poor as were our ancestors, but this race must not be condemned and will not be save by the narrow or by the confused.

And now, Mr. President, a word about the immigrant. He always has looked the same. He never has been a pleasant spectacle when he arrives. His women wear no $50 bonnets; their faces are not adorned with cosmetics; their lips are not incarnadined out of a paint pot; their clothes are very cheap. Of course, they are poor and so were our ancestors. The rich do not come here; the wealthy do not crowd our shores, and those who come from the nobility we generally either have to send to jail or marry to a foolish American girl. [Laughter.]

But what of the character of these men who come? Why, sirs, I say without a single doubt or hesitation that the great common people of Europe are infinitely the superior portion of that country. If you wanted now to start an empire in the wilderness, would you rather have the immigrant as he arrives at the dock or would you choose a wife-hunting nobleman? I will take the immigrant, and I will tell you why. If you put the two men together, the noble and the immigrant, the man reared in the lap of luxury and the man who has toiled in the mill of hardship, and strip them both naked and turn them loose to fight the battle of life, the immigrant will live, while the other fellow will die. The immigrant is the better citizen, and let me tell you why. It is hardship, it is oppression, it is wrong, it is battle that develops a race of men, and nothing else can do it. Why, sirs, the knotted muscle of this immigrant contains the strength of a long line of ancestors who have also toiled. There is not a single drop of noble blood in his veins, as we use that term, yet he is the best raw material out of which to make a nation.

First, because the immigrant is always the bravest man in his community. A sponge never migrates; it is born and dies upon the same rock; but the game fish finds its way to the headwaters of every creek and river of earth.

Second. His generations-old contact with hardship and toil has given him the ability to surmount difficulties and withstand hardships.

Third. In the breast of such a man is a deathless ambition to better his state in life.

Fourth. He has that love of liberty which always glows hot in the heart of the man who has felt upon his neck the heel of the oppressor.

There is not an immigrant of the common people who comes to our shores who does not love liberty with a fervor we ourselves scarcely possess. He loves it and appreciates it because he has been denied it.

Mr. President, before we adopt this new national policy of proscription and of isolation let us consider a little the pages of history. The peoples who have prohibited or discouraged immigration have degenerated or disappeared from the face of the earth—China, Java, Hindustan, Turkey, and back of these Egypt, Persia, Media. And yet, I pause to remark, your literacy test would not keep out one Chinaman, for all can read and write, to the last one. But these races have degenerated or disappeared, and why? Because, just as no man can grow or even live without contact with his fellow men, so nations degenerate and die without the infusion of new blood and contact with other races.

The countries which have progressed most rapidly have generously opened their doors and invited foreign blood or have had it forced upon them by arms.

The invasion of the Franks awakened ancient Gaul from the lethargy of barbarism. The invasion of the Normans raised her to the first nation of Europe.

Ancient Brittany gained her early forward impulses from the example of the Roman Conqueror and the admixture of Roman blood. She took her place among the nations of the earth after Norman blood had been mixed with the Saxon.

Spain rose to the pinnacle of her greatness after the Moors conquered her cities and built the Alhambra.

Even the invasion of the Huns was, in the end, beneficial to Europe.

Germany is herself a conglomerate of many tribes and bloods.

It is the transfusion of blood, the inspiration of new ideas, the creation of higher ambitions which results from the contact and mingling of races which produce the superman.

Mr. President, our national progress illustrates this better than the history of any other nation. When I shall have called attention to it I shall yield the floor.

Our national progress has surpassed that of all the nations of history. To what shall we ascribe this wonderful achievement? Who seeks the truth will find its roots deep-seated in the fact that here is a race commingling the best bloods of all the world. Here gathered the oppressed of every land. The man whose back had felt the oppressor's blow; whose arms had borne the manacles of tyranny; who, in his heart, felt the hot flame of protest against centuries of wrong; whose soul aspired for liberty; whose eyes were strained to catch the glorious light of hope's bright star.

Beneath their ragged garments were thews of steel; within their brains the dreams of empire.

The Huguenot, the English Dissenter, the Jewish refugee, the Scotch Covenanter, the Irish Catholic, and, alike, the Irish Protestant, the Dutch and German Lutherans, the Polish patriot, the Bohemian revolutionist, the Italian peasant, flocked here by thousands to escape religious, race, or class persecution.

Some had insisted upon praying according to the dictates of their own conscience.

Some had lifted brave arms to assail the thrones of kings. They struck because they were more patriotic and courageous than were the common crowd.

They were the supermen of their countries. The bravest of the brave; the pioneers of progress; the champions of independence. They were the Bayards of civilization; the Cœur de Lions of enterprise.

When these refugees met here they mingled their ideas, traits, and blood. Each gained from the other in intellectual strength. Their offspring embraced the talents and genius of the mixed parentage.

Within one century of time the children of these oppressed and expatriated sires produced orators whose words of flame could fire a nation's blood with patriotic ardor that will last while liberty shall be a holy name; poets whose words will still be read as long as men shall love the music of our tongue; artists who could transform the dull and inexpressive canvas to a glorious harmony of color, light, and shade, and "paint the rainbow's wondrous hues and magic tints"; soldiers who could stand with Washington at Valley Forge and write the story of their patriotism in bloody footprints on the forests' winter snows; sailors who, following the intrepid Paul Jones, could lash their sinking vessel to the triumphant British man-of-war, and leaping like tigers on her bloody decks wrest victory from triumphant enemies; women who could stand within the cabin door, rifle in hand, and keep the home while the husbands served in the red line of battle at the front. We brought forth statesmen with the sublime courage to deny all the ancient tenets of government, to demolish all the idols of the past, to supplant the doctrine of the divine rights of kings with the divine doctrine of the rights of man; statesmen whose prophetic vision swept the horizon of the future, whose hands laid the foundations of the temple of liberty so broad and so secure that the countless millions to come after them could find within its ample walls a place to dwell.

In those good days the patriots still remembered their fathers were the oppressed of earth and held out arms in invitation of the brothers left behind. And they have come a mighty host and brought with them the hopes, the inspiration, the industry, the love of liberty our fathers had. Beneath their sturdy strokes the forests have been felled, the mountains tunneled, the rivers bridged, the iron bands of steel laid down that tie the Atlantic to the golden shores. Better than all natural advancement, higher than all commercial and industrial achievements, towers the great fact that we have created ideals for all the earth and made our flag the emblem of universal liberty and peace.

And now it is proposed that we shall selfishly deny to others the liberties for which our fathers longed and prayed, that we shall turn our backs upon the policy which has made of us the foremost Nation of the earth.

As well the eagle spurn the rock in which it makes its nest, the child deny its parents, or the lake refuse the offerings of the springs that keep its waters fresh and pure!

Fused in her candid light,
To one strong race all races here unite.
Tongues melt in hers; hereditary foemen
Forget their sword and slogan, kith, and clan.
'Twas glory, once, to be a Roman;
She makes it glory now to be a man.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States or of a State thereof or of the District of Columbia to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. HARDWICK. If I may have unanimous consent to do so without yielding the floor, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CAMDEN. Mr. President, I would like to state my reasons for voting to recommit this bill. I consider it undigested, half baked, and full of fallacies, and thoroughly undemocratic in principle and theory. Already it has been amended six times by its framers.

OBJECT TO GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP.

To my mind there are several serious objections to the enactment into law of this bill, almost any one of which would be sufficient in itself to compel me to cast my vote against it. Viewed from the standpoint of time-honored Democratic doctrine and principle, it is most alarming, objectionable, and dangerous. I feel that I do not exaggerate when I say that the policy of true Democracy will be fundamentally changed by the passage of this bill. If it becomes a law, the Democratic Party will be irrevocably committed to the theory of a paternal form of government, which, freely translated, means state socialism. This is the entering wedge for Government control of other forms of trades and industries. Personally I am far from convinced that the Democratic Party of this Nation is prepared for this great leap into the dark. And I do not feel that this country should be committed to this new and radical policy without having it thoroughly discussed before and digested by the rank and file of the party and the people and have their seal of approval or, at least, their indorsement of the undertaking before they are irrevocably committed to this doubtful governmental ownership and operation of a merchant marine.

President Wilson, in his message to Congress on January 28 vetoing the immigration bill, recently passed by both Houses, and which passed the Senate by a vote of 50 to 7 and the House by a vote of 284 to 14, said:

> If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests, and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant, and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

This terse and facile language of the President expresses my views of the shipping bill so much clearer and more emphatic than I could that I take pleasure in adopting and applying it to this bill. If it be true that the literacy test of the immigration bill would "so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before," what reversal of policy do we find in this shipping bill, which commits the people unheard, consequently without an opportunity to make up their minds or render their verdict on an undertaking so revolutionary that the business world must stand aghast? "Has any political party ever avowed a policy on this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled offhand or in any other way." Mr. President, I am willing to be guided by the wish of the people when expressed on this great fundamental question and even surrender to the will of the majority my "clear conviction," but I am not willing to surrender that conviction and my sense of duty until the people have spoken. For these reasons I participated in none of the so-called conferences, afterwards denominated caucuses, by which it was sought to bind Democratic Senators to support this bill, which is in no sense a party-platform measure.

CONTRARY TO DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM.

I can find nothing in the platform utterances of the Democratic Party that in any way commits Democratic Senators to its support or even countenances this proposed measure, but, on the contrary, as I read the merchant-marine plank of the Democratic platform of 1912, it clearly condemns such a procedure as is here contemplated. That plank reads:

> We believe in fostering, by constitutional regulation of commerce, the growth of a merchant marine, which shall develop and strengthen the commercial ties which bind us to our sister Republics of the South, but without imposing additional burdens upon the people and without bounties or subsidies from the Public Treasury.

As I understand the purposes of this bill, it does not attempt to be in harmony with this platform declaration to regulate or to "foster by constitutional regulation of commerce the growth of a merchant marine," but, on the contrary, it proposes for the Government to jump full-fledged into the business itself and simultaneously create and conduct a merchant marine, and does it in open and flagrant violation of the platform declaration, because in doing so it is not regulation but operation; and, besides, it is manifestly imposing "additional burdens upon the people" by using forty millions of the people's money in a hazardous venture, and that, too, at a time of great public stress, when the Treasury needs every dollar to avoid further

taxation of the people. It is strikingly inconsistent that the President and certain Democratic Senators can repudiate a plank in the Baltimore platform—exemption of canal tolls—and yet when certain other Democratic Senators decline to support a measure that is not authorized by the Baltimore platform, and is un-Democratic on the face of it, they are denounced as bolters.

DOUBTFUL BUSINESS VENTURE.

This is no time for doubtful business ventures or experiments. Individuals, guided by experience, are cautious; why should the Government be otherwise? Are we true to our constituents' interests or to our oaths of office if we commit the Government to a business venture so fundamentally unsound and unwise, in which we as individuals would not embark, convinced in advance, as every business man must be, that it will be necessarily a losing investment? No country has tried Government ownership for a fundamental reason. They realize that it places the conduct of its foreign business in the realms of international affairs and complications. There is nothing in the experience of those countries which have tried, or are trying, Government ownership of railroads or other public utilities that would recommend it to us as a success. The wasteful and unbusinesslike manner in which the Government conducts its affairs, State and Nation, is of itself sufficient to discourage and to condemn such an experiment, especially at a time when our revenues have decreased to such an extent, owing to the foreign war and the shrinkage in imports. If I could, under ordinary or normal conditions of our country's existence, give my consent to try this most basic change of party principle and policy, I would certainly feel it a reckless tempting of fate if I agreed to an experiment in the world crisis that is in the balance now.

PEACE SENTIMENT—ITS POPULAR HOLD ON THE PEOPLE AND DANGER OF WORLD COMPLICATIONS.

Probably the one sentiment more than any other act of this administration that has gained the confidence and affection of the American people for the Democratic Party is the feeling that it has kept this country at peace.

Disregarding for the moment these serious objections of Government ownership, it looks to me like madness to jeopardize the peace and happiness of this Nation for an assumed and doubtful commercial advantage. I feel that if this Government engages now in the ocean carrying trade it is a certain invitation to disaster. To my mind we inevitably will be entangled in the world conflict now raging. During our Civil War we exercised the right of search of vessels of friendly nations consigned from one neutral port to another; but we confined that search only to merchant vessels of other nations and not to naval vessels. Would ships owned and operated by the United States Government in times of congested trade, but so designed in ordinary conditions to be used as auxiliaries in the Navy—would those be naval ships or not? What would be the status of a merchant marine owned and operated by the United States Government? As it stands now, according to international law merchant ships under convoy of a neutral warship are exempted from visit and search. Will the American people think it advantageous for our Government to go into trade at this time and forfeit the advantages now enjoyed by its naval vessels?

At present belligerents claim the right to search all vessels carrying the United States flag if contraband is suspected. The American people are willing to submit to seizure, search, and detention of vessels owned by private capital and to await the decision of international courts; but could or would they submit to apparent indignities offered to the United States Government in the form of one of its vessels? It is not only an unneutral act but practically a declaration of war for any Government to furnish a belligerent with supplies. Can this Government dissociate itself from that position in the eyes of the warring nations if it embarks in the carrying trade at this time? If this bill does not undertake to embark the United States Government, in its sovereign capacity, in the purchase, construction, and operation of vessels in ocean trade, then I must confess that I do not understand the English language.

The analytical minds of distinguished lawyers may be able to split hairs or dissociate the Government from this undertaking by reason of the formation of the artificial person called a "corporation," but I can not. As far as the purchase or construction of the vessels is concerned, section 3 of the bill provides:

> That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable, in the judgment of the shipping board, for the purpose of such corporation, with a view to transferring them to such corporation.

It is here unmistakably provided that the United States shall either purchase or construct suitable vessels for this corporation, and here is where our Government would take a bold chance of reversing its policy of strict neutrality to an entanglement and probable participation in this world war by the purchase of vessels owned by some one of the belligerent powers. If vessels are to be purchased, it necessarily must be vessels of this character—those which are unable to participate in commerce because interned at the outbreak of hostilities. All other vessels are too profitably engaged to be bought now at any reasonable price.

VIEWED WITH ALARM.

Is it possible that we are not to view with alarm or feel any concern if the United States, through this shipping board, purchases these vessels with the view of subsequently turning them over to this corporation, in which it must own 51 per cent of the stock, and, in fact, will own a hundred per cent? Is it an evidence of timidity to take this rational view? The very discussion of this bill and the possibility of its complications by learned lawyers on either side of this Chamber, and the opinion of eminent lawyers representing the Government, holding, as they do, so many divergent views on the right to purchase vessels of belligerents, and the presumption prevailing when they were purchased before the outbreak of hostilities and after the outbreak of hostilities, and whether or not they were purchased in good faith, whether the good faith of the vendor or the purchaser is to prevail, and whether a controversy arising between nations over such purchase is to be determined by the rules and laws of the captor country or whether the declaration of London, which has not been ratified and accepted, is to prevail.

I say if these gentlemen, so eminent and learned in their profession, disagree about these international questions, experience teaches us what we may expect, because when lawyers disagree the courts must decide. It will then not be a court of this country, but of the captor country that will have jurisdiction; then I, for one, become timid and view with deep concern the possibilities of serious complications, if not war. Why are we to take all of these chances and assume all of these risks, fraught with so much concern to the people of this country? Because we are told that there is a scarcity of vessels engaged in the ocean trade and the freight rates are high and it is believed that these conditions may be remedied in this way. I do not subscribe to this theory and do not believe for a moment that the suggested plan will prove efficacious; but, granting that it will, are we justified in taking such a hazardous step for a mere commercial advantage?

Mr. President, every day brings forth new angles, a stronger and clearer light with which to view this momentous question. New situations are revealed. The morning papers of this country are all quoting an editorial from the London Daily News of February 3, headed "President Wilson's problem." At first there was great hostility in the average British mind against this shipping bill. This editorial was written for the purpose of disabusing that idea, for what reason is here revealed. I quote the last paragraph of the article:

> We do not here discuss the bearings of this matter on our interests, but there is one point we ought not to overlook, and that is that the submarine has become in this war a serious peril to our food supplies. It will dominate our position unless science discovers an effective weapon of defense. Should it threaten our shipping with destruction and ourselves with starvation it will not be an unimportant fact that a great neutral country possessing a mercantile marine of its own can send its ships into our ports unmolested and unafraid.

WARNED TO BE CAUTIOUS.

Democratic Senators, I solemnly warn you that it is madness to push this bill to embark our Government upon this perilous and uncharted business sea. Does not Britain well know that if one of this country's boats should be sunk by a floating mine—in an accidental way—we might say, then, we would be not only feeding Britain, but we would find ourselves fighting for her, which she well knows. We have seen how treaties are regarded by nations that are fighting for their existence. All international law and precedents are upset and made chaotic by this holocaust now raging. Any of the belligerents who felt that their adversaries were securing a genuine advantage and their success in the war injured or jeopardized by the entrance of this Government into the carrying trade might regard whatever understanding they may have had with us, as did the Germans the Belgian treaty—"merely a scrap of paper." They would brush aside as trivial this legal fiction of a "corporation" set up by the lawyers of this Government.

EMERGENCY MEASURE.

The promoters of this bill, which has been amended six times, tell us that it is an emergency measure, designed mainly, if not

solely, to relieve the congested condition of over-sea traffic at the present time, but they studiously avoid fixing a definite time for disposing of these purchased ships and of getting out of business.

How, then, is this emergency proposed to be met? Either interned boats owned by belligerents must be purchased with all the attendant complications or they must be built, because all other vessels are carrying their full capacity, and to purchase those already engaged in service would in nowise benefit or remedy conditions. If it is not the policy of the Government under this bill to purchase these interned vessels of the combatants, and if it be true that the rates are so excessively high, then necessarily the owners of all the vessels now engaged in the traffic must be reaping harvests so rich that none of them would care to sell at a fair valuation if the Government sought to purchase. The only course, then, left open to the Government, would be to have them built. I am informed that it would require at least 16 months for the shipbuilders to fill the order. The $40,000,000 to be invested under this plan would give our Government a merchant marine of about 80 ships ready for service, say, in about one year and a half. Under normal conditions it requires on an average of about 60 days for a ship to be loaded at the home port, make the voyage, be unloaded in the foreign port, to take on cargo, make the return voyage, to unload, to be reloaded, and ready for another voyage, one vessel thus making about six trips a year. Under present congested conditions, however, the number of trips would probably not exceed four or five, if vessels were available now. Then, if the purpose of the Government is actually to relieve this immediate congested business condition, is this not a pitiable, and, viewed solely from a practical standpoint, a futile effort? Any emergency which may now exist will have passed vessels provided either by purchase or construction.

The number of vessels which could be provided by the capital of this proposed Government corporation would furnish about 3 per cent of the total cargo tonnage of the vessels now in use. Nothing could better demonstrate the utter futility and short-sighted policy of this measure if its object is to reduce freight rates by competition. It would be like a little boy with his toy wagon attempting to unload a grain elevator.

ECONOMICALLY UNSOUND.

As a business proposition this measure can not be defended. It must be conceded—in fact, it is conceded—that as such it is a failure, and would be doomed to bankruptcy but for the backing of the Federal Treasury. So apparent is this that it is freely admitted that private capital can not be induced to take the 49 per cent of the stock, or, in fact, any part, for which it is permitted to subscribe, and the Government will be compelled to go it alone, take all the stock, furnish all the money.

If the Government corporation undertakes to purchase the vessels required by it at this time, when, owing to the war, freight rates have advanced so rapidly, the price paid must be correspondingly higher, and doubtless from 50 to 100 per cent in excess of what they could be purchased for under normal conditions, unless it is proposed to tempt fate and throw discretion to the winds and purchase interned ships owned by the warring nations. This Government-owned corporation would then begin business by investing its capital on a rising market in vessels at enhanced prices and be compelled to sell on a declining market. Having purchased these vessels at exorbitant prices, when the war is over and the law of supply and demand bring freight rates down to the ordinary level, then, if it be contemplated for this corporation to retire from business and turn its vessels over to private concerns, as the sponsors of this bill aver is the expectation, are we not sure to have a repetition in the disparity of the purchase price and selling price as was experienced with the vessels purchased by the Government during the Spanish War, with which we are all familiar, when many of such vessels sold for less than 5 per cent of the purchase price, and this deficit which this Government-owned corporation will sustain, and from which the shipper and exporter alone will benefit, will have to be supplied by the taxation of the whole people. This difference between the purchase and selling price which the Government will supply, is it anything more than a subsidy in disguise?

Am I, as a representative of the people of Kentucky, authorized to vote to tax my people to raise these millions which will only benefit the exporters? Nearly every bushel of grain and pound of cotton or farm produce is now out of the hands of the producer and in the hands of the exporter, or will be shortly. The freight is paid by the purchaser on the other side, not by the farmer.

GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT NEVER ECONOMICAL.

It is well known—and a practical demonstration of the fact is brought to our notice every day—that Government management and operation is vastly more expensive than private management. No sensible person will for a moment contend that a corporation managed by Cabinet officers, with no especial adaptation or technical skill or knowledge in shipping, can conduct its business in competition with a company or corporation managed by men who have given a lifetime study to its mastery and are familiar with every detail of the business. Besides, Government ownership always will have more or less politics and favoritism injected which of itself will largely detract from, if not practically destroy, its efficiency.

If, then, the expense of conducting this Government-owned corporation exceeds the expense under private ownership, one of two conditions must necessarily result: Either the freight rates must be higher than private-owned and managed vessels, thus defeating the object of the bill, or the vessels must be run at a loss, and the last is evidently contemplated. This loss will have to be supplied by the Government out of the Treasury, which means ultimately out of the pockets of the people by way of taxation. Wherein, I again ask, would this differ from a subsidy?

DOCKS NEEDED.

One essential point in these calculations seems to have been completely overlooked by the framers and advocates of this bill, who seem to think that ships were all that is needed to carry cargoes, and that is terminal facilities. Terminals are as necessary to ships as to railways. Steamships can not pull up at any landing and unload their cargoes on the bank. Deep harbors, especially constructed piers and docking facilities, and huge warehouses must all be provided beforehand. These abnormal world conditions have congested and overtaxed all the harbors of Europe almost beyond imagination. The war drain upon men has depleted the ranks of stevedores and dock hands. On account of these delays it is said that it requires 11 vessels now to do the work of 5 under normal conditions. The English ports are congested largely because of the scarcity of labor; and in France they have been compelled to use the German prisoners to unload the ships and clear the quays and docks. It is not clear, as a business proposition, how a few more Government-owned vessels can relieve this situation or emergency. The Government would first be compelled to purchase, construct, or lease more terminal facilities before it can relieve existing conditions, and thus divert a large part of the capital of this corporation from the purchase of ships.

A recent editorial in the New York Times very aptly illustrates this proposition. It says:

> It is especially fatuous to provide Government shipping or private shipping with Government aid when the necessity of the case is not so much shipping as facilities for loading and unloading. To the facts on this fact as given by carriers' spokesmen on this side of the ocean may now be added incontestable evidence from the other side. Twenty-one vessels arrived in Liverpool last Thursday and not one of them was able to get a berth to discharge its cargo.
>
> It would be idle to add to such congestion by providing more ships. The trouble is not one of trade, but of war. Some ports are closed, throwing more business upon others than they could do in favorable times. Many dock laborers have enlisted and others are earning such high wages that they are independent. Commerce is not running in accustomed lines. Strange boats are on unfamiliar routes and require more attention than liners running on routine. If any Government should intervene, it is not ours. We are shipping full volumes of goods at our own prices, and the freight is paid by the buyer. They should worry, not we. We should worry only if those who are more eager than wise should thrust us into an experiment which is not only unnecessary in a commercial sense, but is obnoxious politically.

The same objections for the same reasons existed at the other ports. The papers state that on the same day over 50 vessels arrived at London, and also at Genoa, Italy, and were unable to unload for lack of docking facilities.

Not only would this bill, in my judgment, fail to relieve the situation for which its promoters claim that it is designed, but it would have a tendency to paralyze personal initiative and prevent private capital from entering the field and investing in a merchant marine in competition with the Government-owned corporation, which is exempt from taxation and insurance and where all losses are recouped from the Public Treasury.

Investigation has shown that it costs 50 to 100 per cent more to build ships in this country than it does abroad, and that it costs about $17,236 more a year to operate a ship of 3,000 tons under the American than under the British flag. These disabilities under which our foreign trade now labors must be removed before one can hope to establish a merchant marine that will thrive and grow and hold its own with that of the other nations of the world. Mr. President, I shall vote to have this bill recommitted, because I hope and believe that there is enough patriotism and statesmanship in this august body to handle this vital question in the wise and right way and not from the viewpoint of petty and partisan politics. My suggestion to the Commerce Committee, which will have the redraft-

ing of this bill, if recommitted, is to so revise our foreign navigation laws as to place our merchant marine on an exact equality with the merchant marine of Great Britain, France, Germany, Holland, Italy, and other countries. This will not be in the form of a protection or subsidy, but will appeal to the best efforts of American ability, which has never yet failed, and thus enable American shipowners to meet the competition of the other nations of the world and actually foster and encourage a real American merchant marine.

OTHER BILLS MORE IMPORTANT.

I am opposed to giving up all of the present session of Congress to the consideration of this shipping bill, which, in my judgment, is so unwise and will become so obnoxious to the people generally when fully understood, when we have other measures of real merit awaiting consideration, and in which the masses of the people are so vitally interested. The appropriation bills essential to the proper running of the Government must be passed. There is the rural-credits bill which might be discussed and passed at this session, and which affects the real interests of thousands of farmers and merchants of this country. I can not see wherein this bill is in the interest of the farmer or the producer, as is contended by some; his grain and cotton and other products have practically all been sold and are now in the hands of the exporter who purchased them, and if this bill would benefit anyone at this time it would be the exporter. These enormous freight rates will not be paid by the farmer, but by the purchaser across the ocean.

I am a farmer, and have recently sold my cattle and wheat at better prices than I have sold them for in years. The war is the immediate cause of these high prices—the high price of wheat as well as the high price of shipping. Wheat is to-day quoted at $1.65 per bushel. Would this fact justify the Government in investing the public funds in vast acreage in the West and to raise wheat in competition with the farmer in order to reduce the present enhanced price? While this may be far-fetched, what concerns us most is to determine where Government ownership and competition with the individual is to stop. Where is the line to be drawn if we once embark upon the project? I am opposed to establishing any such precedent.

Mr. President, I have endeavored to make plain my objections to this bill, and in a manner in keeping with the dignity of this body. I have not impugned the motives of anyone, realizing that it is a measure regarding the merits of which Senators may differ and are entitled to express their honest convictions. No Senator has a monopoly of wisdom and virtue that authorizes him to criticize and condemn another who differs with him as to what is for the best interests of the people of this country nor to read him out of the party because he will not violate his "clear convictions" at the behest of a conference, subsequently called a caucus, in which he did not participate. Ill-advised and ill-tempered remarks never won a cause, and I deprecate their use in this Chamber.

It is rather inconsistent for those who profess to be leaders here and to speak for the administration to criticize Democratic Senators for conferring with Republican Senators on this measure when President Wilson immediately calls into conference three Senators from that side of the Chamber.

Mr. President, in this connection and under the heading of "Rights of the States," I want to quote this plank from the Democratic platform of 1912:

> We believe in the preservation and maintenance in their full strength and integrity of the three coordinate branches of the Federal Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial—each keeping within its own bounds and not encroaching upon the just powers of either of the others.

I am convinced, and do not hesitate to state that, from my personal knowledge, quite a number of the Democratic Senators are at heart opposed to this bill, and but for the interference and pressure of the Chief Executive the measure would have been abandoned long ago.

It is highly inconsistent for the same leaders to criticize me because I will not violate my "clear convictions" and support a measure which I deem undemocratic and socialistic, and upon which the people have not passed, when the President vetoes a measure which passed the Senate by a vote of 50 to 7 because it is opposed to his "clear convictions." I honor and admire him for his courage; but is it possible that a Senator is not entitled to the same privilege? Must he surrender his "clear convictions" on a measure vastly more important, more revolutionary, and upon which the people have not rendered their verdict?

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HARDWICK. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I merely want to call the attention of the Senate to a matter which will take but a moment.

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator, Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CAMDEN], who has just addressed the Senate, called attention to an editorial recently appearing in the London News concerning which some editorial comment was submitted yesterday. The article being rather important as reflecting the prevailing sentiment upon the important question of the purchase of belligerent ships, I send to the desk a copy of the morning Washington Post, which gives the editorial, and I ask that the editorial be made a part of the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. I believe the same matter was put in the RECORD last evening.

Mr. WALSH. I have examined the RECORD, and I find that all that was put in the RECORD was some brief editorial comment on the matter in the Washington Star. I send to the desk the editorial itself, which is copied in this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from Montana now refer to the editorial in the Washington Post or to the report from London?

Mr. WALSH. I refer to the London dispatch giving the editorial in the London News, which, as I have stated, is copied at length in the Washington Post of this morning.

Mr. SMOOT. I thought it had been inserted in the RECORD on yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Montana is agreed to.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

WANT SHIPPING BILL PASSED—LONDON PAPER DECLARES PURCHASE MEASURE IS INTENDED TO MEET PRESSING INTERNAL EMERGENCY—NOT AIMED AT GREAT BRITAIN—SUBMARINE ATTACKS ON ENGLISH OCEAN COMMERCE CITED AS PERIL.

LONDON, *February 3.*

The Daily News, in an editorial headed "President Wilson's problem," discusses the ship-purchase bill and says:

"So much misapprehension exists on the subject in this country that it may be useful to indicate the motives behind the President's action. That that action is intended to be inimical to our interests is a suggestion that may be dismissed as absurd. The whole purpose of the ship-purchase bill is to meet an internal situation of great seriousness. The United States, like this country, is suffering from a sudden and unparalleled lack of transport facilities. It has been chiefly dependent for its shipping on the mercantile marine of this country and Germany, and now the war has revealed the grave consequences of this dependence on foreign-owned shipping.

HAS EYE TO FUTURE ALSO.

"President Wilson's measure is not only an expedient to meet the present emergency, but a means for preventing a similar disaster in the future. Since it is clear that private enterprise can not meet the case and the method of subsidies is repudiated, he purposes to establish a State-owned merchant service and purchase ships for that purpose.

"There are obvious objections to the scheme, of course, especially in a country so individualistic in spirit and traditions as the United States. It is a development of State socialism that is without precedent, and could obviously not be conducted on lines which would make it directly profitable; but, as far as one can see, it is the only means by which the United States can recover its place in the world of shipping and protect its commerce against the consequences of dependence upon foreign shipping.

OPPOSITION NOT DISINTERESTED.

"The opposition which Mr. Wilson is encountering is, of course, not wholly disinterested. The Republicans are naturally attached to their own policy of subsidies, which fits in with the aims of very powerful interests, but the plain fact is that either State ownership must be adopted or the United States must remain without an effective shipping trade.

"We do not here discuss the bearings of this matter on our interests, but there is one point we ought not to overlook, and that is that the submarine has become in this war a serious peril to our food supplies. It will dominate our position unless science discovers an effective weapon of defense. Should it threaten our shipping with destruction and ourselves with starvation, it will not be an unimportant fact that a great neutral country, possessing a mercantile marine of its own, can send its ships into our ports unmolested and unafraid."

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President——

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

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

Mr. VARDAMAN. I desire to announce, Mr. President, that immediately after the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Georgia to-morrow I shall submit a few remarks on the unfinished business.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. JAMES. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Georgia in yielding to me; and I desire to say that after the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Georgia and the

speech of the Senator from Mississippi I shall try to make a few observations upon the pending measure.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, it seems to me that on yesterday the Senate of the United States and the people of the United States were treated to the most remarkable spectacle of incompetent leadership that has been exhibited on the floor of either House of the American Congress by any political party in many decades. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], the author of the pending bill, or its original author—who is its author in its present form no mortal man can say, for we have had at least four different and distinct revelations of the pure and undefiled doctrine in this one bill since it began its course in this Chamber—the Senator from Missouri, the author of the original proposition, one of its most ardent champions on this floor and a reputed spokesman of the administration of the party in power in respect to this particular matter, finding himself confronted with a situation that threatened at least a temporary delay or defeat of the measure in its present form that may have meant at least its delay and possibly its substantial amendment, because certain of his party associates on this side of the Chamber had grave objections, constitutional and otherwise, to the measure in its present form, and at least some of them considered themselves under direct and specific pledges to the constituencies which sent them here, had evidenced by their conduct a purpose to support the motion made by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE] to recommit this bill to the Committee on Commerce—confronted, I say, by that situation, the Senator from Missouri, finding this division in sentiment and in thought upon his own side of the Chamber, engaged in the exceedingly diplomatic and conciliatory course of attempting to set himself up as a censor morum and to read out of the Democratic Party Senators who are just as good Democrats, to put it conservatively, as the Senator from Missouri ever was.

I do not know whether or not such methods as that can be adopted with success in Missouri, but, unless I mistake both the character and the temperament of my colleagues, I think I can assure this great leader of our party that no such methods as that will be successful in the Senate of the United States; that Senators of the United States, who act under a solemn oath of office and who represent on this floor States just as great and constituencies just as great as does the distinguished Senator from Missouri, are not to be browbeaten, bulldozed, or intimidated by any rough-hand methods in this matter. Sad will be the day for the people of the United States and sadder still the day for this illustrious body when Senators who sit on either side of this Chamber are to be browbeaten in any such manner as this, and certainly it seems to me that if the Senator from Missouri possessed the very first element of leadership he would have left most of his speech of yesterday unsaid.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to add to the already bitter feeling that has been engendered by this controversy and by this situation; it is far from my purpose to do so. I think those of my colleagues who know me best, who live closest to me, and who are best acquainted with me and with my life and character and career, understand full well that it is with extreme regret that I differ from any Democratic colleague in this body on any important matter. Certainly it is not my desire to add to the discord existing on this question; certainly it is not my desire to put the party in worse shape than that in which I found it when I came here, or by my speech to make the situation worse than it was before the speech was made. So that while I expect to answer with some frankness some observations of both the distinguished Senators from Missouri about this matter, I do not expect to go so far as these distinguished Senators have seen fit to go in their criticism of me and of certain other Senators on this side of the Chamber for the awful crime of having disagreed with them and certain others of our associates about a great question.

But the Senator insists that I and other Senators have been recreant in party fealty because of a so-called Democratic conference or caucus about this measure—which term ought to be applied to the meeting or meetings I am quite uncertain. In the beginning, being a new Member of the Senate, I was informed by certain of my colleagues that for many years Democratic conferences in this body had been held, without any precedent to the contrary, which did not seek to bind Senators, who were here as the ambassadors of sovereign States, to vote against their convictions on any of the great questions that might be pending. That was the information that I had originally on this subject; and I remember that at the first conference which I attended of Democratic Senators, in a spirit of harmony and good will, without the slightest jar or friction between any members of the conference, it was suggested and unanimously assented to, just after the President had made his opening address at the beginning of this session, that we should first of all, so far as the Democratic conference was concerned, make it our program to pass the great supply bills that were necessary for the maintenance and support of the various departments of this Government, and then, after that work was done, we would proceed, as far as we could, to try to carry out the program recommended to us by the President of the United States, so far as we might find ourselves able to agree and assent thereto. Unless my memory serves me incorrectly, that was the unanimous verdict of a Democratic conference, with not a voice raised in dissent.

Then this measure came on, offered originally, if I am correct, in another body, by a distinguished Representative from the State of Missouri, brought here by him, given—judging only by the fact that the language is identical—to the senior Senator from Missouri, and introduced by him and referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce. A conference of Democratic Senators was called to consider this subject, and it soon developed that it was the purpose of at least some Senators to attempt to make this conference a thing that it had not been in 13 years, without a break—a binding caucus—and to commit us to that policy, without even reading the bill.

For certain reasons that I will explain to the Senate and to the country in a later portion of my address, I felt impelled to object to that form of procedure. We then undertook to take up the bill in detail and read it in sections. During the preliminary stages of the conference I was attending, hoping that the measure might be modified in conference to meet the views that I entertained and the pledges that I had made on this great question, so that I might be able to confer with the balance of my Democratic brethren about the matter and finally support some kind of a shipping bill.

Senators, and particularly Senators on this side of the Chamber, I appeal to you. Unless I am incorrectly informed about the happenings in this body, not since the year 1903 has an attempt been made to hold what might be technically and accurately termed a caucus of Democratic Senators, and to bind Democratic Senators to vote, whether against their convictions or not, for public measures. Yet even the very resolution which was invoked as the basis of this action, as the warrant for this authority, on its very face and in its very terms affords justification for the action that each one of the seven Senators who sit on this side of the Chamber and expect to support the motion to recommit has taken. I will read it.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. KERN. I desire to make a motion for an executive session.

Mr. HARDWICK. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KERN. 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 20 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 5, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 4, 1915.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Blair E. Hoar, of Orofino, Idaho, to be receiver of public moneys at Lewiston, Idaho.

ASSAYER IN CHARGE.

Ed Ryan, of Goldfield, Nev., to be assayer in charge of the mint of the United States at Carson, Nev.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

William E. Stevens to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps.

Anderson C. Dearing to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

Ensign Ernest J. Blankenship to be a lieutenant (junior grade).

POSTMASTERS.

ARIZONA.

G. Lindley Gollands, Chandler.
E. F. Thompson, Kingman.

ARKANSAS.

Henry Clay Maples, Green Forest.
M. E. Sherland, McGehee.
John B. Thompson, Sulphur Springs.

CALIFORNIA.

Charles B. Fair, Lindsay.
Ralph P. Giddings, Turlock.
Luella Mann, Boulder Creek.
Johnnie L. Murphy, Madera.
C. D. Radcliffe, Merced.
E. W. Wilson, Fowler.

CONNECTICUT.

Charles F. Greene, Bridgeport.

FLORIDA.

F. Bartow Swearingen, Fort Meade.

GEORGIA.

Frank L. Asbury, Clarkesville.
Julien V. Frederick, Marshallville.
Josephine M. Gray, Adairsville.

IDAHO.

Patrick T. Sweeney, St. Maries.

ILLINOIS.

Emil J. Hess, Mendota.

INDIANA.

Frank Billings, Morocco.
Thomas C. Dowling, New Haven.
Eugene Kelley, Waterloo.
Charles K. Lewis, Russiaville.
William L. McMillen, Brook.
Winfield S. Sanders, Westport.

KANSAS.

J. A. Carson, Erie.
Michael A. Frey, Junction City.
Harlan W. Marmon, Barnes.

LOUISIANA.

Burnside Capers, Arcadia.
Ulysses J. Marcotte, Cottonport.
Joseph P. Trosclair, Opelousas.

MAINE.

Guy H. Hunt, Newport.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Josiah W. Earle, Cohasset.
George W. Jones, Falmouth.
George H. Olivier, New Bedford.
Sidney M. Towle, Duxbury.

MICHIGAN.

Julius C. Armbruster, Sebewaing.
Charles Davidson, Richmond.
John C. Downing, Vermontville.
William F. Hemmeter, Saginaw West Side.
Charles A. Johnson, Pinconning.
Edward G. Scott, Iron River.

MINNESOTA.

John Haas, Lamberton.
Andrew Rotegard, New Richland.

MISSISSIPPI.

Walter E. Dreaden, Lambert.
Susette E. McAlpin, Bolton.
Joseph E. Saucier, Bay St. Louis.

MISSOURI.

Harry B. Adkins, Weston.
Thomas C. Bassore, Rogersville.
Samuel T. Breckenridge, Bosworth.
John Gable, Browning.
George P. Hicks, Callao.
Samuel J. Jamison, Rich Hill.
Horrell Johnson, New Madrid.
Nesbert W. Lemasters, Oak Grove.
John H. Taylor, Chillicothe.
Francis M. Traughber, Centralia.
Robert K. Wilson, Jackson.

MONTANA.

William C. Bernard, Harlem.
Mary Bonham, Ismay.
Jefferson D. English, Big Sandy.
George C. Milburn, Darby.
Hans A. Nelson, Joplin.
Stephen J. Rigney, Cut Bank.

NEBRASKA.

Anton J. Glodowski, Platte Center.
Frank Howard, Ravenna.

NEW JERSEY.

Hunn Livingston, Allentown.
William T. Nash, New Egypt.
Marcellus Parker, Manasquan.
David A. Power, Metuchen.
Addison Robbins, jr., Hightstown.
Alexander H. Sibbald, Park Ridge.
Carl Shurts, Lebanon.

NEW YORK.

George F. Cornell, Rosebank.
H. Blake Stratton, Monticello.

NORTH CAROLINA.

W. M. Goodson, Marion.
C. F. Mitchell, Winton.
N. Henry Moore, Washington.
Thomas J. Orr, Matthews.
Christopher H. Peirce, Faison.
William J. Roberts, Shelby.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Frank Argersinger, Forman.
James F. Cannon, Tioga.
A. O. Dahl, Plaza.
Frank E. Ellickson, Regent.
T. J. McCully, Sheldon.
Henry W. O'Dell, Reeder.
Bernhard Ottis, Wyndmere.
Henrietta Rooks, Linton.
M. J. Gurnett, Balfour.

OHIO.

Louis N. Gerber, Middleport.
J. E. Halliday, Gallipolis.
Grover Cleveland H. Hipp, Grover Hill.

OKLAHOMA.

Dorothy L. Avant, Avant.
Lee B. Fitzhugh, Sand Springs.
C. D. Snider, Waurika.

OREGON.

John W. Hughes, Fossil.

PENNSYLVANIA.

B. Stiles Duncan, Duncannon.
Winifred Hughes, Tioga.
P. G. Katz, Verona.
Leslie C. Lockerman, Cheswick.
John B. Shea, Eldred.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Micheal P. Healy, Navy Yard.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

A. J. Johnson, Murdo.

TENNESSEE.

John L. Nowlin, Sparta.
J. T. Patten, Dickson.

TEXAS.

Andrew Barton, Kilgore.
B. G. Edwards, Forney.
Sam H. Little, Eagle Lake.
B. H. McKinnon, Canton.
C. C. Powell, Clarendon.
W. A. Smith, Gatesville.
W. B. Stradley, Paducah.

WASHINGTON.

Freeborn S. Lewis, Port Angeles.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Margaret McGugin, Ravenswood.
George H. Merchant, Cairo.
Hayes Sapp, Newburg.

WYOMING.

Thomas W. Keenan, Pinebluff.
W. H. Wolfard, Encampment.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *February 4, 1915.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, in response to the invitation revealed in the written word and in the law of our being, we come asking that we may receive, seeking that we may find, knocking that the chambers of Thy councils may be opened unto us, that righteousness, truth, and justice may prevail in all our hearts that Thy purposes may be fulfilled in us; and we will praise Thy name forever. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 20933. An act extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn., authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Arkansas & Memphis Railway Bridge & Terminal Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Mississippi River at Memphis, Tenn.," approved August 23, 1912; and

H. R. 20818. An act to authorize the Brunot Island Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the back channel of the Ohio River.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report (No. 1368) from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I take it that it is not necessary to read the report.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to have the report read.

Mr. MANN. It will be read in the gentleman's time. The report is not privileged.

Mr. BURNETT. There has been, Mr. Speaker, a time agreed upon for debate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama is entitled to an hour's time on his report.

Mr. HEFLIN. What is the agreement as to time?

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman from Alabama should have the agreement as to time settled in the House.

Mr. BURNETT. And then have the report read, but not taken out of the time agreed upon?

Mr. MANN. I do not care about that.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I think the question is not before the House until a motion is made to accept the report. I think it is in order for the gentleman to have the report read in his time and then make the motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 6060. An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States.

Mr. FIELDS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. FIELDS. Considering the importance of this matter, Mr. Speaker, I think there should be a quorum present, and I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman will not do that; there will soon be a quorum here.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the report on the bill H. R. 6060, and move that the House pass the bill, the veto of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House, on reconsideration, pass the immigration bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, we have agreed upon 5 hours and 20 minutes for debate. One-half is to be given to the side of the proponents of the bill and one-half to those opposed to the bill; 1 hour and 20 minutes is to be controlled by myself and 1 hour and 20 minutes by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. For those opposed to the bill, 1 hour and 20 minutes is to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and 1 hour and 20 minutes by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. SABATH. One hour and twenty minutes is to be controlled by me and one hour and twenty minutes by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this bill shall be limited to 5 hours and 20 minutes—one-half on one side and one-half on the other; that one half of the time for those in favor of the passing of the bill over the President's veto be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] and one half of the time in opposition to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the other half by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MANN. And at the end of that time——

Mr. BURNETT. I shall ask for the previous question.

The SPEAKER. And at the end of 5 hours and 20 minutes the previous question shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. HEFLIN. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask if out of that time I can have 10 minutes. I want to discuss this question, as it is a very important one, and I want at least 10 minutes of time.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, the committee desires most of the time, and I can not agree to the gentleman's request, but I will agree that he shall have 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANTHONY. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if the gentleman from Alabama would have any objection to fixing the time for a vote. I think the House is entitled to know when it will vote.

The SPEAKER. It will vote at the conclusion of 5 hours and 20 minutes plus such little time as may be lost in the usual process of debate.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. MOORE. I am a member of the Committee on Immigration, and I rise to reserve my right to object in order that I may ask the gentleman from Alabama a question. The gentleman from Alabama has stated that an arrangement has been made by which 5 hours and 20 minutes are to be accorded to debate. He proposes that the time shall be divided between himself and the gentleman from Masssachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], who stands on all fours with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], and that then a Democratic member of the committee shall divide the rest of the time. I would like to know whether the members of the committee on all sides of this question have been consulted with regard to the division of time?

Mr. GARDNER. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania totally misunderstands the question. The gentleman from Alabama very fairly asked me what I would agree to on the Republican side, being on the same side. I said that one-quarter of the time should be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE, on the Republican side.

Mr. MOORE. Was "the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE," consulted?

Mr. GARDNER. No; he was not; he was not here——

Mr. MOORE. Oh, "the gentleman from Pennsylvania" has been here regularly.

Mr. GARDNER. We did it this morning, and we thought it was exceedingly liberal, inasmuch as the preponderance of the House is not only Democratic, but also in favor of the bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] gets exactly the same treatment that the chairman of the committee himself gets.

Mr. MOORE. Without consultation on the part of the gentleman who is presumed to represent the minority Republican side of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that representing the minority of the Republicans on this committee I will get an hour and 20 minutes in this debate?

Mr. BURNETT. That was so stated by Judge SABATH, the ranking member of the minority of the committee, who is opposed to the bill.

Mr. MOORE. And who is not a Republican.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Alabama is that there be 5 hours and 20 minutes of debate.

Mr. MOORE. My question is, Do I get an hour and 20 minutes of that time to divide among Republicans who are opposed to the bill?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. That was my statement.

Mr. MOORE. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for one-quarter of that time.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 18 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of advocating the passage of this bill, the veto of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

I sincerely regret I am compelled to part company with the President on this important question. For almost two years I have followed him religiously, supporting by voice and vote each and every administration measure presented to this House. I recognize and appreciate his splendid ability, his unquestioned honesty, integrity, and sincerity, as well as his earnest desire to give to the country the best legislation possible.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I believe Woodrow Wilson is the greatest President this country has had since the pen dropped from the hand of Thomas Jefferson and the sword from the hand of Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.] Through his leadership Congress has given to the country more constructive legislation in the interest of the American people than had been given them during the past 50 years. Generations to come will be under everlasting obligation to Woodrow Wilson for the great service he has rendered in preserving peace, in protecting the rights of the individual, in bringing the day of special privilege to an end, and in fixing the doctrine of equal rights in national policies as well as in the hearts of mankind. [Applause.] But, sir, no man ever lived or ever will live who was absolutely infallible. Thomas Jefferson made his mistakes; Abraham Lincoln made his; and Woodrow Wilson will make his. The President in his veto message has expressed his honest convictions. I honor and respect him for so doing, but I know the President well enough to believe he will honor and respect me for voting my honest convictions, even though I disagree with him. In fact, in my judgment, no Member of Congress who either has no convictions or who does not have the courage to sustain his convictions will ever command the respect of any President of the United States or the confidence of the American people. I believe the safety of our Republic and the perpetuity of our institutions rest upon the combined judgment of all our people, and that any tendency toward the surrender of this individual, God-given right to think and act for ourselves will undermine the foundation upon which our Government rests. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, having been a member of the Committee on Immigration for eight years, having given a great deal of thought and time to the study of this question, having voted for this bill twice in the House, and having voted to pass it over the veto of President Taft, if I were now to reverse myself and vote to sustain the veto of President Wilson I would be ashamed to face my constituency. What reason could I assign or what excuse could I offer for voting to sustain a Democratic President when I refused to sustain a Republican President upon the same question? I can not, Mr. Speaker, even for party advantage, put myself in such a ridiculous position before the country.

Now, let us consider briefly the objections offered by the President in his veto message. First, he says:

> The bill embodies a radical departure from the long-established policy for this country, and would close the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of man.

So far as this objection is concerned, outside of the literacy test, the bill under consideration only emphasizes what is already existing law. In fact, the President says in his message—

> that this bill is in many important respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable.

He also says:

> I believe its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates.

Mr. Speaker, I see but little force in the first objection offered by the President, as that objection relates to the present law as well as this bill. His second and main objection goes to the literacy test, and I am aware of the fact that much can be said against this particular kind of a test. I am also aware of the fact that many men of foreign birth who were uneducated came to this country in an early day and have made good citizens and have contributed their part toward the development of our country. I do not contend that education is a test of morality or character, but I do say there is far less excuse the world over for being unable to read than there was many years ago. I have no objections to immigration that will not lower our standard of living, and I recognize the fact that much of our progress and many of our achievements are due to the ability, the capacity, and progressiveness of many citizens of foreign birth. I am proud of their achievements in both business and professional life. Their loyalty to our country and devotion to our flag have attracted the attention and won the admiration of all our people. But that is not the question. What we must decide upon is the best method of restriction. We all agree that immigration is coming faster than it can be assimilated; that we already have a surplus of unskilled labor; that American workmen of both native and foreign birth are being driven out of employment by the influx of thousands of illiterates from southern Europe, who are willing to live and do live in box cars or under the crudest kind of shelter, at an expense of 10 or 15 cents per day, and who, as a matter of course, eventually lower the standard of American wages and the standard of American living. You can not tell me that the dumping of 250,000 illiterates from southern Europe annually on our shores will not lower the standard of American citizenship. If this be not true, then our boasted system of schools is a failure and we are annually wasting millions of dollars of the people's money in their maintenance.

The test proposed does not require them to read the English language. It only requires them to read in the language or dialect of the country from which they come.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is not only in the interest of all American citizens, both of native and foreign birth, but I also believe it is in the interest of illiterate foreigners who expect at some time in the future to make this country their home. It will have a tendency to stimulate and develop a better system of schools the world over, and will result in causing thousands of foreigners who desire to become American citizens to prepare themselves for admission.

Again, the President in his veto message says:

> Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction? Does this bill rest upon the conscience and universal assent and desire of the American people?

Mr. Speaker, in my humble judgment no legislative matter has ever received so much attention and discussion at the hands of the American people as the question of restricting immigration. It has been a prominent issue before the people for 15 years. It has been discussed for years by 30,000 labor organizations scattered throughout the country, representing a membership of 2,500,000, and all of these organizations have passed resolutions favoring the passage of this bill. It has been discussed for years by thousands of farmers' organizations, representing a membership running into the millions, and all have passed resolutions favoring this legislation. The President asks if any political party ever made a declaration upon this subject. As far back as 1896 the Democratic national committee made a platform declaration as follows:

> 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.

The Republican national committee platform of the same year contained a plank 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.

And we all remember that President McKinley was elected on that platform. Let us go still further, and see whether this is a new question.

In 1896–97 the House and Senate passed a bill containing the literacy test, which bill was vetoed by President Cleveland. The House passed the bill over the President's veto, but in the Senate it failed by a few votes.

In 1898 the Senate passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test, but the bill got no consideration in the House because of the Spanish-American War.

In 1902 the House passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test.

In 1906 the Senate again passed a bill containing the literacy test. The House substituted a bill creating the Federal Immigration Commission.

In 1913 the Senate and House both passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test recommended by the commission, which bill was vetoed by President Taft. The Senate passed the bill over the President's veto, but it failed in the House by a few votes.

In 1914–15 the House and Senate passed, by more than a two-thirds vote, the bill before us, which contains a literacy test.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the consideration given this question by both branches of Congress during the past 18 years, it can be truthfully said that the chosen representatives of the people knew the sentiment of the districts they represented when they passed by overwhelming majorities the numerous bills I have mentioned.

Again, the President says:

> I am not foolish enough to profess to know the wishes and ideals of America better than the body of her chosen representatives know them.

Yet, by this veto he overrides the judgment of the House and the Senate, both of which expressed their approval of this bill by overwhelming majorities.

Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for the judgment of the President, and recognize the fact that he is within his rights under the Constitution when he exercises the veto power; but, so far as I am concerned, I would rather accept the judgment of 434 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate than to accept the judgment of any one man. The Federal Immigration Commission, appointed by Congress, spent four years studying this question both at home and abroad, and here is what that commission says about labor conditions:

> The investigation of the commission shows an oversupply of unskilled labor in the basic industries to an extent which indicates an oversupply of unskilled labor in the industries of the country, as a whole, a condition which demands legislation restricting the further admission of such unskilled labor.

Mr. Speaker, eight out of nine members of the commission recommended the literacy test as the most feasible single method of accomplishing the desired restriction. While this test may be regarded by some as a selective measure, the commission recommended it as a measure of restriction, the purpose, as indicated, being to relieve the harmful pressure of immigration on an already overcrowded unskilled-labor market. That the judgment of the Congress coincided with that of the commission is shown by the fact that in 1912–13 the House favored the literacy test by a vote of 178 to 52, and the Senate by a vote of 57 to 8, and on the bill now before us the vote in the House was 252 to 126, and in the Senate 50 to 7.

This overwhelming vote in both the House and Senate reflects not only the judgment of the representatives of the people, but it also reflects the judgment of the people themselves. We who occupy seats here come fresh from the people. We know the wishes of those we represent, and if we fail to carry them out we will not, and should not, represent them longer.

Even in districts where the population is largely foreign born, as it is in the district represented by Judge GOLDFOGLE, of New York, the sentiment against restriction is changing. No man on the floor has been more active against the literacy test than the gentleman from New York. He has never failed to manifest, during his entire congressional career, his intense interest and solicitude for foreign-born citizens, both in committee work and on the floor of the House, yet he was defeated for reelection, which indicates that the people he represents, who are 90 per cent foreign born, are beginning to realize that some restrictive measure is necessary.

This bill will not affect to but little extent, if any, the Scandinavian or the German or the Canadian or the Englishman or the Scotchman or the Irishman, as practically every adult in those nations can read and write. It might touch a few of the old folks from those countries, but we have provided a clause by which they can enter whether they themselves can read or not, so long as a single member of the family can do so. The bill also provides that all those who are fleeing from religious persecution, whether they can read or not, can be admitted. In fact, practically all who will be excluded under this bill are a few of the Sicilians and some of the Italians from southern Italy. It is not by any means a radical measure. While personally I am not wedded to the reading test, but no one has suggested a better one, and as it is the only method proposed which will protect our laboring men from being thrown out of employment, I feel it my duty to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is worthy of our support. I believe it is in the interest of America and American institutions. I believe it is in the interest of the illiterate foreigner who in the future desires to make this country his home. I believe it is in the interest of American workingmen, both native and foreign born, who are now being crowded out of employment by an oversupply of unskilled labor, and, believing this, I shall vote to override the veto of the President.

Let us be men. Let us not only show we have convictions of our own, but also show that we have the courage of our convictions. I appeal to you as the direct representatives of the American people to write this bill into law, and establish what Abraham Lincoln said should be, that this is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my approval of the message of our President on this bill, and I hope that this Congress will stand with him to-day. What I can not understand about the attitude of a majority of the Members of this House, who up to the present time have insisted upon the passage of this bill with the literacy test, is that they seem to make the fundamental blunder of forgetting that character, which is the only test that an immigrant ought to be obliged to meet, is not necessarily secured by education, but, as I have said in this Chamber on another occasion, if a man naturally bright has immoral tendencies the education which he has may, by the very fact, be used for the purpose of training these tendencies to the detriment of the community in which he is going to live.

We have a great public-school system in this country. America is called the melting pot, and our own Emerson has called it only another name for opportunity. If the inhabitant of a foreign land, prompted by the inspiration to improve his condition, turns his eyes longingly to America, are we going to deny him entrance simply on the ground that he is unable to read and write? If this is the test which you are about to impose to-day, how can you, in fond contemplation of the institutions that were builded so firmly by the fathers of this Republic, say that they builded better than they knew? [Applause.] And yet what were they? Men of character in most instances, but what kind of education did they have? I leave it, Mr. Speaker, to your own knowledge of the history of origins in this country to answer this question. What it is that makes foreign immigration a positive acquisition to our country is that no man wishing to come to this country does so except under the impulse of a disposition to improve his condition. He is dissatisfied with conditions in his own land. He is blessed with a wholesome discontent and this wholesome discontent is, so far as I know, the only measure of ambition. If an immigrant brings here a strong body, an acute mind, and fine moral sensibilities, we need have no fear of the influence of his presence upon our institutions. Nay, we may rather rejoice to think that he has those qualities which, found in the fathers of the Republic, enabled them to build a land which I verily believe is to endure as long as humanity has ambition to improve. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, let it never be said that within less than 150 years of the Declaration of Independence a Congress of the United States, so far forgetting the foundations of our own America, gave the lie to the hopes and to the aspirations of people struggling under the absolutism of Europe and other countries and who, yearning for opportunities for improvement for themselves and those that came after them, found closed upon them the doors of a country which in the providence of God had been reserved as a haven for the struggling aspiring manhood wherever found on earth. [Applause.] "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." All men are His creatures. Shall we dare to say that man, the image of the Creator, shall not have a share in the fruits of the fairest land which the sun shines upon?

Why it was to these shores, Mr. Speaker, that Kossuth, the Hungarian liberator, came as a triumphal here on a vessel of the United States squadron offered by Congress to him and his fellow exiles who had surrendered to Turkey. They escaped their greatest danger, threatened extradition to Russia in accepting this offer of Congress—this same Congress which is now closing the doors to the oppressed and the unhappy of other lands. In gratitude Kossuth wrote, on March 27, 1851:

> May your example, noble Americans, be to other nations a source of social virtue; your power be the terror of all tyrants, the protector of the distressed, and your free country ever continue to be the asylum of the oppressed of all nations.

[Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I beg the Members of this House to recall the story of other days and to consider again the history of this country. Ask yourselves whether this bill is not really a step backward. Surely, sir, this is no partisan measure. Two Presidents of the United States have already expressed their dissatisfaction with the literacy tests. Another, a great scholar himself, after most careful consideration, has followed their example. Our duty, as it seems to me, is absolutely clear in the premises, and I sincerely hope that the Members of this House, of whatever party, however much they may have hesitated up to the present moment, may consider the reasons assigned by the Chief Executive of this Nation compelling his veto of this bill, and that America, through its Congress, will declare to the aspiring immigrant, and through him to the world, that it is national character alone that makes a nation,

and that it is not intellect but morality that is a test of character. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I can see influences back of this proposed legislation other than those exercised and controlled by organized labor; I can see influences which dare not come out into the light of day, but which, under the cover of an inky, slimy darkness, masquerading in the guise and garb of so-called "*patriotic*" orders, are ceaselessly endeavoring to divide the great body of American citizenship along lines of racial and religious prejudice. I ask every fair-minded man in this body to listen to this extract from one of these so-called "patriotic" publications; and when you have heard it, ask yourselves whether there be even the shadow of truth in its base references to "Rome and its lobby."

This paper said in its last issue:

On January 14 the Senate agreed to the conference report on the Burnett immigration bill without a record vote. Senator REED, of Missouri, after four weeks of talk and filibuster in opposition against this meritorious measure, finally tired of talking and allowed the Senate to take the vote resulting in agreement.

Among other things inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of his remarks on the subject were telegrams and letters from Cardinal Gibbons; Edward Cummins, S. J. (supreme Jesuit); John Cavanaugh, C. S. C., president of the Roman Catholic University at Notre Dame, Ind.; John J. Glennon, archbishop of St. Louis; and the like. See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 14, pages 1606 and 1607.

From this it is apparent who pulled the string that kept Senator REED'S tongue in motion day after day under the endless-talk privilege by which a Senator may talk a measure to death.

Rome's spokesman in the House seems to have been RUFUS HARDY, of Texas. HARDY'S speech in the House (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1531) contains HARDY'S declaration that he is against this bill and against all kindred legislation. We are informed that his remarks on the floor were more severe and harsh than they appear as revised in the RECORD.

The 60-page bill, containing the reading test and 300 other additional amendments to existing immigration laws, went to the White House January 15. The President has 10 legislative days, excluding Sundays and the day he received it, in which to sign the bill or return it to the House without his signature. Failure to do either results in the bill automatically becoming a law.

It is expected that President Wilson will veto the measure; but it can be passed over the veto if all the supporting Senators and Congressmen are present and counted on the final vote. Rome's lobby is there in force, and friends of this bill should not delay in writing their Congressmen and Senators and urge them to do their duty at the critical moment.

Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of this House that *it would* be well worth the time of those who seek the light to read some extracts from an article from the pen of Rev. Washington Gladden, recently published in Harper's Weekly. It represents the viewpoint of a broad-minded, courageous, and well-known Congregational clergyman. Dr. Gladden writes:

THE ANTIPAPAL PANIC.

It is evident that we are in for another fierce anti-Catholic crusade. These visitations are periodic; the term has not perhaps been calculated, but we shall be able one of these days to give the formula. The period is probably a little longer than that of the 17-year locusts. Whether the pupa of the Cicada papaphobiana burrows in the earth during the time of its disappearance is not known; there are those who think that it goes deeper.

* * * * * * *

To those to whom the happiness and peace of their native land is dear these visitations of religious rancor and intolerance are most unwelcome. An epidemic of smallpox or yellow fever is a light affliction compared with these seasons of religious contention and suspicion and enmity. What we are going to see during the next few months is something like this: The great mass of the Protestant Christians of this country arrayed against the great mass of the Roman Catholic Christians, each party thinking and saying hard and bitter and violent things about the other; each party cherishing the worst suspicions about the motives and purposes of the other; each party believing that the other is plotting to take away its liberties, and perhaps to exterminate it by assassination or carnage. Not all the Protestants and not all the Roman Catholics will give room in their hearts to such dark thoughts and fears and enmities, but most of them will; and the mob mind, which always dominates these epidemics, will reduce to silence the majority of those who know that this is mainly insanity.

The first mutterings of this eruption of mud and slime are audible already. Those of us who have passed through this misery two or three times know what to expect. It is being whispered now in Protestant circles that the Catholics are meeting by stealth from night to night in the basements of their churches to drill for the impending insurrection. If the church has no basement, it matters not; the story is just as freely told and just as readily believed.

* * * * * * *

Here is the program of "Six Sunday evening lectures on Roman Catholicism" recently delivered in a church in the heart of the best residence district in my own city:

"1. Why preach against the Roman Catholic Church? (A shotgun load.)

RIFLE BALLS.

"2. Popedom. This lecture will expose the most palpable fraud of human history.

"3. The priesthood. Testimony of history, ex-Catholics, and first-hand information.

"4. The auricular confession. An iniquity that ought to be prohibited by law.

"5. Rome's bloody hands. No man-eating tiger ever thirsted for blood as has the Roman Catholic Church.

"6. Romanism and American institutions. If red blood flows in your veins the Pope's ambition to rule our beloved country and reduce it to the level of Italy and Spain will set your nerves atingle and cause you to engage in the great fight that is on."

This is the sort of entertainment sheet which will soon be offered in many American cities.

Rumors will be heard of consignments of arms being delivered by night to Roman Catholics; they are apt to come in coffins.

Forged documents of various sorts will be printed and privately circulated—documents purporting to have been issued by the Roman Catholic hierarchy, giving instructions to the faithful, in which they are authorized and instigated to commit various crimes against their Protestant employers and neighbors, and intimating that mother church will absolve them from the guilt of all such offenses.

Old bulls and decretals of the dark ages will be dug up and exploited, and it will be insinuated, or perhaps boldly asserted, that the policy indicated in them is still ruling the Roman Catholic Church. In the last of these epidemics a forged papal encyclical, with all the formal phrases belonging to these documents, and signed by the name of Pope Leo XIII, was kept standing for weeks in the columns of many of the papers representing the anti-Catholic crusade and was published in leaflet form and circulated broadcast. In this stupid fabrication Pope Leo was represented as saying:

"We proclaim the people of the United States to have forfeited all right to rule said Republic, and also all dominion, dignity, and privileges appertaining to it. We likewise declare that all subjects of every rank and condition in the United States and every individual who has taken any oath of loyalty to the United States in any way whatever may be absolved from said oath, as also from all duty, fidelity, or obedience, on or about September 5, 1893, when the Roman Catholic Congress shall convene at Chicago, Ill., as we shall exonerate them from all engagements; and on or about the feast of Ignatius Loyola, in the year of our Lord 1893, it will be the duty of the faithful to exterminate all heretics found within the jurisdiction of the United States."

* * * * * * *

It is an astounding fact that such a fiendish document could be forged and published by Protestant Christians in the United States of America; it is more astounding that they should believe that it would impose on any considerable number of Americans; it is most astounding that thousands and thousands of the members of our Protestant churches, including many ministers, should accept it as genuine and aid in its circulation. In Toledo, Ohio, the "councils" of the secret anti-Catholic orders united in ordering several hundred Remington rifles to protect themselves against this threatened slaughter; on the night named in the "encyclical" numbers of them were up all night in the engine houses, waiting to give the alarm by which the Protestant hosts were to be rallied to resist the massacre. In the meantime their Roman Catholic neighbors were sleeping soundly in their beds, all unaware of the carnage which was expected of them.

In how many other places such vigils were kept I do not know; but in Toledo there was a dispute about the payment of the bill for these Remington rifles, which brought the business into court, and the facts related above are a matter of court record.

Such hysterical fears will soon be agitating hundreds of thousands of breasts in this enlightened land. It is quite impossible for anybody to forge a tale of horror or treachery or villainy which will not be eagerly believed by millions of Christians in this country concerning their fellow Christians, when these religious lunacies begin to be epidemic.

* * * * * * *

The demand for instances of the enmity of our neighbors becomes inappeasable, and imagination is busy inventing them. Most of these harrowing tales will come from other communities; the dreadful things that are happening in your own community you will learn about through letters of inquiry from distant places. Intelligent persons from other towns in Ohio wrote me 20 years ago that the report was current among them that all the police in Columbus and all the school-teachers and all the county officers were Roman Catholics; the truth at that time was that 5 out of 20 county officials, and 45 out of 112 policemen, and 12 out of 349 school-teachers were of that faith. But Columbus at the same time was believing similar tales about many other towns and cities.

* * * * * * *

The fact is that we have got to learn to live together in this country—Protestants and Catholics. If either party should undertake to exterminate the other, the process would be somewhat difficult. The only question is whether we shall live together in peace or in enmity. If we are to have peace, we must study the things that make for peace; each party must be ready to see the good side of the other; must learn to put the best and not the worst construction on the words and deeds of the other; must avoid all bitter and uncharitable judgments; must put away all thoughts of domination. We must be friends, Protestants and Catholics. No other relation is conceivable. And there is no worse enemy of Christ or of his country than the man who seeks to inflame and poison the minds of either Protestants or Catholics with suspicions and fears and resentments and enmities toward the other.

* * * * * * *

This conflagration of hate is already well-started, and it will probably sweep over the land. No argument could extinguish it. There are millions of Protestants who are incapable of believing anything but evil of Roman Catholics. Traditional rancor colors all their vision wherever the name of the Pope is mentioned. But there are a good many other Protestants, I trust, who are capable of reason and justice, and to them I venture to make two or three suggestions:

1. Whenever you hear any of these harrowing tales about the sinister and sanguinary plots of the Roman Catholics never let one go unchallenged. Insist that the narrator give his authorities and furnish his evidence. See that the matter is thoroughly investigated, and publish the facts with the names of those who have reported the charges.

2. Take every opportunity you can get to talk with your Roman Catholic neighbors and friends about the relations of the churches. Don't shun them or cast suspicious glances on them when you meet them; don't treat them as if they were spies or emissaries of some malign power; shake hands with them; get acquainted with them and talk over the whole situation in a friendly way. We may have some difficult problems to settle in our relation with them, but let us meet them not as enemies, but as friends.

3. Instead of listening to horrible tales of what the Catholics are doing in distant places sit down and make out a list of all the Catholic men and women you know in business, in professional life, in the philanthropies, in society, in the shops and factories, in the kitchens; put down their names and think them over, and see whether you will be able to convince yourselves that these men and women are capable

of doing the kind of things which these tales attribute to them. How many of these people, do you think, are plotting to rob you of your liberties or to murder you in your beds? These are Roman Catholics, the Roman Catholics not of the dark ages of the sixteenth century, but the Roman Catholics of to-day. And whenever you talk about Roman Catholics in public or private remember that these are the people you are talking about.

* * * * * * *

4. It might be well for people who are capable of putting two and two together to remember that the danger of the clerical domination of this country, whether by Congregationalists or Catholics, is not imminent. The last Roman Catholic paper I opened alleged that there are 75,000,000 of non-Catholics in the United States. That would mean that there can be no more than 20,000,000 or 25,000,000 of Catholics. In any attempt to impose clerical rule the Protestant forces would find themselves strongly supported by the great majority of the secret orders and by the entire socialistic contingent of our population. There does not appear to be any adequate reason why 75,000,000 should be shuddering with fear that 20,000,000 are about to subjugate or exterminate them. The mood which yields to such a panic is the reverse of heroic.

* * * * * * *

Now, Mr Speaker, I want to read here the appreciation of an eminent Catholic layman, Prof. Condé B. Pallen, who recently carefully and honorably analyzed Dr. Gladden's article in the Columbiad. Prof. Pallen says, among other things:

We have but to read over the program of the "Six Sunday evening lectures on Roman Catholicism," quoted by Dr. Gladden, as recently delivered in a church in the heart of the best residence district of his city (Columbus, Ohio), to appreciate the character of the people for whom they were intended and the turpitude of the expounder. Their folly, their falsehood, their viciousness would seem incredible, were not the damnable evidence vouched for by Dr. Gladden himself, and were not similar evidences scattered broadcast throughout the land in a number of periodicals through the United States mail, whose officials seem impotent to rectify so flagrant an abuse of a great national agency, whereby 15,000,000 American citizens are daily vilified and calumniated.

* * * * * * *

That this anti-Catholic agitation is widespread and maliciously active is evident enough. Is its influence as a disturber and disrupter of the peaceful relations between Catholics and Protestants and of the amity, which sane and liberal men entertain toward each other as citizens of the same fatherland, as malign and weighty as Dr. Gladden predicts? Will it bring about that mutual suspicion and distrust, that hard, bitter, and violent feeling which Dr. Gladden depicts and deplores?

It is here that we take issue with Dr. Gladden. We believe that the vast majority of American citizens are above the sinister influences of a propaganda so vile in its methods, so base in its principles, so contrary to the basic character of our Constitution, so flagrantly stupid in its accusations, and so wanton in its purpose. Our faith in the integrity and intelligence of the American character is based upon the history of the past. The American people, as a whole, have triumphantly resisted such vicious agitation for the past 125 years, and this when they were much less better prepared to yield to the iniquitous influence than at the present day. In the decade between 1850 to 1860 it manifested itself in its most virulent form and crystalized in the Know Nothing Party, which went down to shame and a just oblivion under the sturdy repudiation of the American people. The noxious growth could not live in the open air. Under the form of APAism in the nineties, the scorched reptile again raised its venomous head to be crushed again under the heel of real Americanism. APAism was repudiated by the great political parties, and evoked strong denunciations from prominent leaders, such as Theodore Roosevelt; Speaker Henderson; United States Senators Hoar, Vest, Hill, and Vilas; Gov. Peck, of Wisconsin; Gov. Altgeld, of Illinois; and Gov. Stone, of Missouri. Its influence was limited to a few localities and that evanescent. By the year 1900 the A. P. A. agitation had practically ceased, and as a political factor disappeared from the horizon.

* * * * * * *

Each successive manifestation of anti-Catholic bigotry in this country has shown itself weaker and weaker, and with good reason: Catholicity has constantly demonstrated itself as in perfect congruity with American principles and institutions. Non-Catholics have mingled with Catholics in every-day life, and learned that the latter have neither Government of the United States to a feeble old man in the Vatican, horns nor tails. There have been no Catholic conspiracies to seize the Government and place it under the domination of the Pope. The often-reiterated charges against them have proved silly bogies. They have never stored arms in the basements of churches with which to massacre their Protestant fellow citizens. The accusations against them have invariably evaporated in their own weltering silliness. There is even a certain sense of humor in the situation. To imagine that a small minority of citizens even contemplated turning over the who has neither army, navy, nor funds, is more bizarre than opera bouffé, and ought to move wild laughter in the throat of death. What must be the mental condition of the people who are prepared to swallow such a concoction of bedlam?

Beyond all this, Catholics have been living side by side with their non-Catholic fellow citizens for a century and a half, engaged in the same pursuits and enterprises, and have been clearly discerned to be ordinary, normal human beings. In the professions they have, just as others, left their mark and demonstrated their achievements; in business they have contributed their quota of success and failure as others around them have done. In the Army and the Navy, both in rank and file, they have served as others have served, and their record has been clear. They have rallied to the flag when occasion required it, and shed their blood as freely as others have done. In the fields of industry, invention, and enterprise they have not been laggards; in short, they have been citizens as others have been and just as human as others have been. The others have recognized all this, and with American sanity and honesty seen for themselves that Catholics are just as keen for their country's welfare and glory as they themselves are; just as ready to defend it, work for it, and shed their blood for it as any in the land. The others have realized all this by constant daily intercourse, and as they are not fools, they are not going to swallow the foul and silly accusations against Catholics by which fanatics and knaves would destroy the mutual trust and understanding between citizens of a common country and with a common cause.

* * * * * * *

We do not believe that there is any reason for alarm. Dr. Gladden's apprehension that the present anti-Catholic agitation is going to lead to bitterness, estrangement, and mutual misunderstanding has no justification on the Catholic side. We Catholics are not going to cherish the worst suspicion about the motives and purposes of our Protestant fellow citizens. We never did and we are not going to begin now, for we know that the vast majority of our Protestant fellow citizens are level-headed enough to see through a doughnut, especially when it is a political doughnut. There are, of course, the agitators and their deluded followers; these we pity or despise. But they are a constantly diminishing minority. They are fewer and count less and less in value year by year, and the American public has grown tired of bogus encyclicals and false oaths, which would strain the credulity of imbeciles. Our civic and social and business integrity has become too well established to be injured by a propaganda of lunacy. Dr. Gladden believes that "there are millions of Protestants incapable of believing anything but evil of Roman Catholics." We hesitate to estimate so many of our fellow citizens at so low a grade of intelligence and honesty. At any rate we believe that there are tens of millions of Protestants whose mentality is still sound and whose hearts are in the right place. We harbor no suspicion against them, and the bigots are not going to rouse us to recrimination, resentment, and enmity. We are not going to be made fools by the folly of some fools nor malicious by the malice of some knaves. We believe with Dr. Gladden "We must be friends, Protestants and Catholics. No other relation is conceivable."

* * * * * * *

Far be it from me, Mr. Speaker, to charge any Member of this House with being under the thumb or under the heel of these "patriotic" organizations which are spreading the gospel of hatred and religious anarchy. But every man within the sound of my voice has been either petitioned or threatened by these very organizations or their agents or their publications that their action on this immigration bill will be watched and their political future has been dangled before their eyes should they dare to incur the wrath of the "antipapal" press—this press, Mr. Speaker, which has so wickedly, yes, so foully, within the recent past given wide circulation to a most heinous, ungodly, un-Christian, yes, a murderous and illegal oath as the one required by the Knights of Columbus from its members. It is an attack against the Catholic and his church, a creation of Know Nothings, A. P. A.'s, and their allies and successors.

Bigots have read this foul libel and gloated over its expected destruction of the Knights of Columbus; they have passed it to others, circulated it, approved it.

Some honest men have read it and been sorely troubled in consequence. It seemed unlike the Knights of Columbus they knew as honest men; yet would men dare publish such a thing if it were untrue? If untrue, would not the Knights of Columbus prosecute their defamers?

What, then, was the duty of the society to itself, to its members, to the host of men who were in doubt?

Mr. Speaker, permit me to quote from a recent publication issued by the commission on religious prejudice of that great, truly American order just what actions have been taken to expose these libels. May I ask the Members of this House to give these lines most careful consideration?

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Before giving the history of the various prosecutions and activities above referred to for criminal libel in printing or publishing or defaming by means of the alleged oath, we want to answer the foul charge intimating that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States is authority for its genuineness.

Much has been printed by those circulating the bogus "oath" tending to mislead the public into the belief that in some way Congress had found it to be true. So they have referred to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1913, for proof of the genuineness of this "libel."

THE FACT.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 15, 1913, pages 3215 et seq., appears a report of the Committee on Elections No. 1 on the contested-election case of Eugene C. Bonniwell *v.* Thomas S. Butler. The contestant had alleged that the circulation of the "oath" against him was libelous, and a use of means not to be recognized, etc.

A FALSE AND LIBELOUS OATH.

After reciting the "oath," which decency and respect for our order forbid reprinting, the committee in its report says:

"This committee can not condemn too strongly the publication of the false and libelous article referred to in the paper of Mr. Bonniwell, and which was the spurious Knights of Columbus oath, a copy of which is appended to the paper. It also condemns the publication of editorials to excite religious prejudice in a political campaign. No man should be persecuted for his religion, whether he be Catholic or Protestant."

PHILADELPHIA CASE.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AGAINST CHARLES MEGONEGAL AND CLARENCE H. STAGE.

Over a year ago (to be exact, February 20, 1913) two men were held in bail for appearance in court to answer charges made by local Knights of Columbus. Charles Megonegal, a printer of 4201 Brown Street, was charged with printing and causing to be printed libelous matter (the bogus Knights of Columbus oath) willfully and maliciously exposing the Knights of Columbus as a body; Charles B. Dowds, upon whose affidavit the arrests were made; James A. Flaherty, the supreme knight; and Philip A. Hart, master of the fourth degree, to public hatred, contempt, and ridicule, to their great damage, disgrace, scandal, and infamy.

Megonegal and Clarence H. Stage, a barber, were charged jointly with conspiracy to defame and oppress the aforesaid members and others of the order by causing said matter to be circulated.

At the hearing it was elicited from Megonegal that he had bought copies of the bogus oath in bulk from the Menace before starting to print it on his own account.

A THREAT.

In its March 1, 1913, issue, the Menace, after reproducing a press dispatch reporting the result of the hearing before the magistrate, at which the accused were held for trial, said:

"Further than what is given here we do not know the particulars in this case, but we do know that these men are American citizens, and that they will be defended in their constitutional rights of free speech and free press. The press dispatch, as usual, lies when it says the Menace has printed the so-called Knights of Columbus oath, as the files of our paper will show. But if the Knights of Columbus want to start anything with the Menace for what it really has printed they have our permission to do their worst, as we are ready to defend every utterance we have ever made about the Knights. And if they don't want their complete ritual and secret work printed and distributed to a million men in this Republic they had better leave the Menace out of this controversy."

THE TRIAL.

On Friday, January 30, 1914, in the quarter sessions court, before Hon. Robert N. Willson, appeared Megonegal and Stage to answer the true bills of indictment found against them by the grand jury. Joseph Taulane, Esq., assistant district attorney, appeared for the Commonwealth; Owen J. Roberts, Esq., and Joseph P. Gaffney, for the private prosecutors; Peter F. MacLaren, Esq., for Megonegal; and Leroy N. King, Esq., for Stage.

The trial judge, the assistant district attorney, in charge of the prosecution, the senior counsel for the private prosecutors, and both attorneys for the defendants are non-Catholics.

James A. Flaherty, Esq., supreme knight of the Knights of Columbus, having been sworn, testified as follows:

"This alleged oath is a tissue of falsehoods from the first word to the last—absolutely false. This prosecution was brought simply to vindicate the Knights of Columbus on account of the wide circulation given to this vile and scurrilous circular, the purpose of which was to breed strife and arouse religious bigotry. The alleged oath is absolutely baseless, and of such a flagrant character that it is indeed surprising that anyone would give it the slightest credence. It was so persistently circulated that the Knights of Columbus were compelled to take some steps to refute it, and we thought criminal prosecution would be the best way to do it."

GUILT ADMITTED, SENTENCE SUSPENDED.

Megonegal having pleaded guilty and Stage nolo contendere, which means that the truth of the charge is not contradicted, the district attorney stated that the prosecution was willing that sentence be suspended.

Attorneys MacLaren and King, counsel for the defense, joined in this request to the court, pleading good faith on the part of their clients, who, they said, had received the "oath" from the Menace, of Aurora, Mo.

As evidence that their clients had been deceived, they presented to the court a copy of a letter sent to the Menace by Mr. King, asking the paper's aid in the defense of Megonegal and Stage, and the original of the reply received from the Menace.

The text of Mr. King's letter follows:

PHILADELPHIA, *February 27, 1913.*

MENACE PUBLISHING CO., *Aurora, Mo.*

GENTLEMEN: Mr. Peter M. MacLaren and myself are associated in the case of libel and conspiracy brought by the Knights of Columbus against Clarence H. Stage and Charles Megonegal, of this city.

We notice in your issue of March 1 that you are prepared to print and distribute the complete ritual and secret work of the Knights of Columbus, and we desire to obtain an authentic copy of said ritual and secret work for use in the trial of our clients, since the prosecution alleges that there is no oath taken by candidates for any of the Knights of Columbus degrees. Can you supply us with what we desire and need?

Our clients have no knowledge of the authenticity of the Knights of Columbus oath, having received them in the first instance from your company, and they naturally rely upon you to aid them in their present difficulty.

An early reply will be greatly appreciated.

Yours, very truly, LEROY N. KING.

The answer of the Menace was as follows:

AURORA, MO., *March 5, 1913.*

Mr. LEROY N. KING,
Philadelphia, Pa.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your letter of February 27, we wish to state that we are not in possession of the ritual and secret work of the Knights of Columbus, but we believe we are in fair way to get it; and the statement in a recent issue of the Menace which led you to believe that we had it in our possession, while somewhat of a bluff on our part, was based on the fact that we know that it can be had. You will note that we printed in our No. 99 the ritual and secret work of the Hibernians, and we are positive that it is authentic. The alleged oath which your clients in Philadelphia were arrested for distributing was circulated in practically every State during the late campaign, and the demand upon us for this document was something great, and we had received copies of them from so many sources we simply printed and handled them as we would any other job of printing—to supply the demand—and while we have no apologies to make for so doing, we do not have any evidence that the oath is the one which is taken by members of the Knights of Columbus.

We feel sure that it would be folly for you to undertake to base your defense on the authenticity of this document.

We note that some of the officials are claiming that it is not an oath-bound order, which, of course, is a subterfuge and untrue. You can depend on them resorting to any method which they can contrive to bluff away their critics, and if they are so bent on vindicating themselves, why not ask that they present in court the obligations which they do take. This would be the quickest way to clear the matter up in the minds of the people.

We are filing your letter and will be on the lookout for anything which we think will aid in the defense of these men.

Trusting that this will be satisfactory, we beg to remain,

Yours, sincerely,

THE MENACE PUBLISHING CO.

STATEMENT FROM THE COURT.

Agreeing to the proposal that sentence be suspended, Judge Willson, who is one of the most prominent Presbyterian laymen in Philadelphia, said:

"I think that these cases have reached a very proper conclusion, and it is, in my judgment, quite suitable that, in accordance with the desire of all the parties concerned, sentence should be suspended in the cases.

"Great care ought to be taken that no injustice should be done by written or spoken words to either individuals or institutions. It is not at all strange that the prosecutors in these cases should not have been willing that the opprobrium which would naturally arise if the publications complained of had been founded in truth should be allowed to exist.

"I am personally glad to hear from the head of the order or society referred to what he has said in regard to the matter.

"Though not of the same faith, I realize fully and without reluctance that the church with which that society is affiliated accomplishes a vast deal of good. Its activities should be protected from misrepresentation.

"I may add that my personal acquaintance with Mr. Flaherty, the head of the order in question, leads me to accept his statement without hesitation."

ANOTHER CASE.

STATE OF MINNESOTA AGAINST A. M. MORRISON AND GARFIELD E. MORRISON, EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS OF THE MANKATO (MINN.) MORNING JOURNAL.

A trial of the greatest interest to Knights of Columbus and to the Catholics of this country and of Canada, as well as to non-Catholics—and among them, to none more than to the small band of loud-mouthed bigots who rail against the church—was held in Waterville, Minn., Wednesday, July 29, 1914. This was an action of criminal libel brought by E. M. Lawless, editor of the Waterville Sentinel, against A. M. Morrison and G. E. Morrison, father and son, editors and publishers of the Mankato Morning Journal, of Mankato, Minn. The libel consisted in the charging of Lawless with having taken the bogus Knights of Columbus oath, which has been so largely circulated in this country and in Canada during the past year and a half. We will not attempt to reproduce this oath, but suffice it to say that it has been published as the Knights of Columbus oath and as the fourth-degree oath and is, in letter and insinuation, one of the foulest libels imaginable. It is in some respects a revamp of the old hoax which has for many years passed muster in the press of bigots as the Jesuit oath.

OBLIGATION PUT IN EVIDENCE.

The outcome of this trial is of more than local interest. It is of national and international importance. The Knights of Columbus have often been accused of taking an alleged oath which, if the charge were true, would forever condemn them to the merited execration of their fellow men. But this was the first time that an individual knight was directly charged with the offense. It furnished the order the first opportunity it has had to put the real obligation of the fourth degree in evidence and make it a matter of court record which any citizen may read for himself. Herein lies the importance of the case which establishes a precedent in the history of the order.

Knights of Columbus and Catholics generally have been astounded at the conditions which make possible the publication and circulation by millions of copies of this foul libel. Well-meaning non-Catholics have been shocked by these accusations against Catholic men and Knights of Columbus whom they knew to be high-minded citizens and ideal neighbors. The bigots working in the darkness, as of old, have pressed on the accusation and argued that if the "oath" was not true the Knights of Columbus would soon, by prosecution or otherwise, prevent its further circulation.

A SENSATIONAL TRIAL.

The fact is that the trial was a most sensational one from many points of view. It was presided over by Judge George J. Dressel. The district attorney who prosecuted the case was Francis J. Hanzel, of Montgomery, prosecuting attorney for Le Sueur County, who was assisted by Attorney Thomas Hessian, of Le Sueur. The defendants were represented by Owen Morris, of St. Paul. The small country court room was crowded to the very limits of its capacity, and the spectators filled every available inch of space, having come in from the surrounding country to hear the case tried. A jury was finally selected, and it is of more than passing importance and a matter of gratification to the order, as it is a compliment to him, that the Rev. Thomas Billing, the resident Methodist minister of the town, was chosen on the jury and was not challenged by the complainant, and, as the result showed, voted with the other 11 men to convict the two defendants.

The jury in this case were: William Callies, Emil Hehl, John W. Gish, Thomas McGovern, Vince Roessler, Rev. Thomas Billing, Joseph Miller, jr., H. J. Luther, V. R. Wood, Chris. Ruedy, Steve Hoban, Ed. Zinbrich.

The proceedings were taken down in shorthand by C. G. Bowdish, court reporter of the judicial district.

After each juror had been questioned in turn, the defendants waived any challenge.

The following witnesses were called by the State: P. J. Gutzler, Rev. H. E. Chapman, pastor of the Congregational Church; I. N. Griffith, deputy postmaster of Mankato; E. M. Lawless, Dr. E. W. Buckley, supreme physician of Knights of Columbus; William J. McGinley, supreme secretary of Knights of Columbus.

SUPREME OFFICERS PRESENT.

The surprise of the trial to the Knights of Columbus themselves and to all those whose curiosity had whetted their appetite to learn some of the secrets of that great order, was the calling of two of the supreme officers as witnesses. The first was the supreme physician, Dr. E. W. Buckley, of St. Paul, who testified in effect that Mr. Lawless had received initiation in the fourth degree under his direction as master. Upon cross-examination Dr. Buckley was asked as to the nature of the "oath" administered in the fourth degree, and most emphatically denied then, as he did in answering subsequent questions of the defendants' counsel, that the order had any oath in any part of its ceremonial or degree work. He freely admitted that the order had a pledge or obligation which is administered to candidates. To the great surprise of all present, however, when interrogated as to the nature of this obligation, Dr. Buckley very fully answered the question and gave the substance of the obligation as administered to candidates on being initiated in the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus.

William J. McGinley, of New Haven, Conn., supreme secretary of the Knights of Columbus, also testified as to the nature of the obligation, as the official custodian of the original manuscripts and of all matters pertaining to the ceremonial of the society. He placed a copy of the obligation in evidence, and it was made part of the records of the trial. He emphasized the fact that the Knights of Columbus was not an oath-bound society, and that no member was asked to take more than an obligation which any gentleman might take. Both Dr. Buckley and Mr. McGinley testified in no uncertain words that

the bogus oath which was the subject matter of the prosecution, was, neither in letter nor in spirit, a part of any of the ceremonial of the Knights of Columbus in any of its degrees.

The following is a portion of the direct and cross examination of Dr. Buckley and Mr. McGinley:

"Direct examination by County Attorney Hanzel.

"Cross-examination by Attorney Morris.

"Q. Your name is Edward W. Buckley?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. You are a practicing physician and surgeon in St. Paul, are you not?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Now, you are also a Knight of Columbus?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. Member of the Knights of Columbus, and a member of the fourth degree?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. On January 27, 1907, did you hold any position in the order?—A. I was master of the fourth degree for Minnesota and North Dakota.

"Q. As such master did you have charge of the giving of that degree?—A. I did.

"Q. Did you have charge of the giving of that degree on January 29, 1907?—A. What date?

"Q. January 27, 1907.—A. I did.

"Q. That was the time that Mr. Lawless said he took that degree; do you remember of his taking it?—A. Well, he says he took it, and I think I remember his taking it, but I had 160 candidates in that class from Minnesota and North Dakota; I feel pretty certain Mr. Lawless took it at that time.

"Q. Did you hear me read and have you heard that purported oath credited to the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus read here in court?—A. I did.

"Q. Did any of those candidates, including Mr. Lawless, take such an oath as that?—A. Not that I know of.

"Q. Is there any such oath in the order?—A. There is not.

"Q. Is there any oath in the order?—A. There is not.

"Q. What do the members take in the order?—A. They take an obligation in the degrees—first, second, third, and fourth.

"Q. Do you know the obligation of the fourth degree?—A. Well, I know what it is in a general way. Now, the master doesn't give any part of the degree; he has charge of it and the degree team under him, and he is supposed to give to each one of the members of the degree team the special charge belonging to their office; and one of the officers of the degree—it is the duty of one of the officers of the degree to give the obligation; and, in a general way, of course, I remember what it is. I am not master now, and haven't been for some years.

"Q. You are the supreme physician of the order?—A. I am supreme physician, medical director, of the order.

"Q. Well, give us your general idea of that fourth-degree obligation.—A. The fourth degree is a patriotic degree; it exemplifies patriotism, and the candidate affirms that he will support the Constitution of the United States and the constitution of his own State; that he will protect the purity of the ballot; and that he will remain a good member of the Catholic church. He also agrees to remain a good, law-abiding citizen of the United States.

"Q. Is there any part of the degree work that resembles anything like that that appeared in that article that has been read here?

"(By Mr. Morris.) Objected to as calling for the opinion or conclusion of the witness. The proper way to do is to tell what they have and then put this beside it, and let the jury say whether there is any resemblance.

"Objected to as incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial, calling for a conclusion.

"Q. Is there any such oath taken in any of the degrees?—A. No, sir.

"Cross-examination by Mr. Morris:

"Q. Are there obligations taken in each of the degrees?—A. In each one; yes, sir.

"Q. Are each of the four obligations different one from the other?—A. Yes, sir. There are only two principal obligations, the one following at the third degree and the other in the fourth.

"Q. Is there anything in those oaths—— A. Which oaths?

"Q. Well, we are all wrong about calling them oaths; we all mean the same thing.—A. That is right, if you mean it, but I can't answer the question with the word oath in it.

"Q. Well, I'll try to call it obligation.—A. All right.

"Q. You stated that in some of those oaths there is a requirement—or in some of those obligations there is a requirement to remain members of the Catholic Church?—A. No; was that my wording?

"Q. That's the way I took it down.—A. That's the intent, but that's not the wording. Well, yes, I'll take it back; they do really insist they must remain members of the Catholic Church in order to retain membership in the fourth degree.

"Q. Yes; of the Knights of Columbus?—A. Yes.

"Q. That's true as to each one of the obligations?—A. Well, it isn't so specifically stated; but the constitution and by-laws of the order provide that.

"Q. Is there anything in those oaths—— A. Again.

"Q. Oh, those obligations—which has a denunciation of others of other denominations—which was—— A. Nothing.

"Q. Will not spare age, sex, or condition; anything of that kind in any of the oaths?—A. No, sir.

"Q. Is the word 'spare' in any of the oaths?—A. In what? Well, now, is that done purposely?

"Q. It is not.—A. Well, I take it as an insult, because you are trying to trap me into saying 'oath.'

"Q. Well, it isn't intentional; I inform the court and jury it isn't intentional at all. Is the word 'spare' in any of the obligations?—A. In the sense that you mean, spare somebody from injury?

"Q. Well, the word 'spare'?—A. Well, it might be; I don't recall, but in the sense of sparing anybody, or not sparing, no, sir.

"Q. Which has the sense of not sparing?—A. There is no such word nor no such sense in it.

"Q. Are the words 'these infamous heretics,' or words of that import, in any of the obligations?—A. No, sir.

"Q. Doctor, you say one officer gives the obligation. You yourself, now, couldn't give verbatim any one of the four obligations, could you?—A. No, sir; I wouldn't attempt to.

"Q. Is that oath written or unwritten?—A. I don't understand your question.

"Q. Oh, is that obligation written or unwritten?—A. It is printed.

"Q. And can you tell me where I may procure, where a copy of that obligation can be procured; give me the name and address of the person in whose custody one is?—A. Yes, sir. Now I understand; you ask two or three questions there together. I can tell the name of the person in whose custody the ritual of the order, the unwritten work and the written work of the order, is kept.

"Q. Well, you may do so.

"By Mr. HESSIAN. Well, I object to that as immaterial and incompetent. What has that got to do with this case?

"By Mr. MORRIS. Well, if we find the oath as printed, we can compare it with this.

"A. Compare with what?

"Q. The obligation.—A. You mean, I think, to use that word purposely. It isn't my first time on the witness stand. I know when an attorney is asking a witness questions fairly and when he isn't. Now, I object to the word 'oath,' because it would charge us inadvertently with having taken such an obligation.

"Q. We don't charge you with it.—A. You do by using the word 'oath,' and then comparing it with some other oath. We take no oath.

"Direct examination of William J. McGinley:

"Q. Your name is William J. McGinley?—A. Yes.

"Q. Where do you reside, Mr. McGinley?—A. New York.

"Q. In New York—in the State of New York?—A. City of New York.

"Q. You are a member of the Knights of Columbus?—A. I am.

"Q. Do you hold any position in the Knights of Columbus?—A. I do.

"Q. What is that position?—A. Supreme secretary.

"Q. Supreme secretary of the Knights of Columbus?—A. Yes, sir.

"Q. As such secretary, are you custodian of the written and other work of the order?—A. I am.

"Q. The ritual. You know of the obligations that are taken in the four degrees of that order?—A. I do.

"Q. You have heard this purported oath read here in court, have you not?—A. I have.

"Q. Do they take any oath?—A. They do not take any oath. Our society is not an oath-bound society; in fact, can't hardly be called a secret society. It is a society of Catholic laymen, recognizing the authority of the Catholic Church in matters spiritual.

"By Mr. MORRIS. Objected to as not responsive to the question.

"By the COURT. I will sustain the objection to that part of it.

"A. I am leading up to it, your honor.

"Q. What is the purpose of the Order of the Knights of Columbus?

"Mr. MORRIS. Objected to as incompetent, irrelevant, and immaterial; the question here is whether Lawless took an oath as stated in that complaint. The purpose of the order will throw no light on whether he did or didn't.

"By the COURT. He testified there is no oath taken; objection sustained.

"Q. Have you a printed copy of that oath, of that obligation?—A. I have.

"Q. Will you produce it?

"(Marked 'State's Exhibit D.')

"Q. What is State's Exhibit D?—A. State's Exhibit D is an official copy duly attested under the seal of the Order of the Supreme Council of the obligation taken by all members initiated in the fourth degree of the order.

"Q. And you are the custodian of this?—A. I am official custodian of the ritual and ceremonies of the order and the laws of the order under seal of the order.

"Q. And let's see; have you stated that is the one taken by the fourth-degree members?

"Mr. HESSIAN. Yes.

"Mr. HANZEL. Now, we offer this in evidence.

"Mr. MORRIS. One question. I notice 'M., or F. N.' at the head of this Exhibit D; what does that represent?—A. 'Master, or faithful navigator,' title of one of the officers of the degree.

"Q. Is that the only obligation of the fourth degree?—A. The only obligation.

"Q. Contains the only obligation in anyway connected with the fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus?—A. Yes.

"(State's Exhibit D read to the jury by Mr. Hanzel.)

"State's Exhibit D is as follows:

"'M., OR F. N.

"'I swear to support the Constitution of the United States.

"'I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and Knight of Columbus, to enlighten myself fully upon my duties as a citizen and to conscientiously perform such duties entirely in the interest of my country and regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot and to promote reverence and respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion openly and consistently, but without ostentation, and to so conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon our holy church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God.

[Supreme Council seal.]

"'A true copy.

"'Attest:

"'(Signed) WM. J. MCGINLEY,
"'*Supreme Secretary.*'"

"Cross-examination by Mr. Morris:

"Q. Mr. McGinley, references have been made here to the word 'oath' and the word 'obligation,' and apparently exception has been taken to the use of the word 'oath' as describing the thing we are thinking of. Will you tell us the difference between oath and obligation?—A. An oath, as I understand it, is a pledge or obligation or affirmation wherein or in connection with which God is called upon to witness, or the Deity; and an obligation is a pledge or undertaking of a kind in which the Deity is not called upon to witness. That is the distinction, I believe, between an oath and a pledge. I would suggest the word 'pledge' rather than 'obligation.' It is easier to say.

"Mr. HANZEL. Just a question. Ought there not to be inserted there also: Isn't an oath something that would be administered by proper legal authority? Ought not that to be a part of the explanation?

"Q. I notice that you have these printed on little slips. What is the object of having them printed in that way, loose?—A. For the convenience of the ceremony in the fourth degree of the order, whereby annually, at the first meeting of the fourth degree, assembled in January of each year, all the members of the fourth degree renew that obligation. That is what is known as the annual meeting, and for the purpose of supplying the officers with their parts, for convenience' sake it is arranged in that form.

"Q. Dr. Buckley, in his testimony, stated there was something in the obligation requiring members to remain members of the Catholic Church. Is that true?—A. That is a constitutional, fundamental law of the order. Well, toward the end there he promises to remain a member of the Catholic order, in there by implication, if not expressed.

"Q. I will ask you is this all the obligation of the fourth degree?—A. That is our obligation in the fourth degree.

"Q. Do any of the other obligations—first, second, or third degrees—have reference to non-Catholics in any way, directly or indirectly?—A. None whatever.

"Q. You have heard this purported oath in the criminal warrant read, have you?—A. Yes; I have.

"Q. Have you seen that elsewhere?—A. I have."

The defendants testified and also called Mr. Lawless, who had testified for the State. They were not cross-examined by the county attorney.

It is unnecessary to go into the recital of the other evidence in this case. Suffice it to say that the defendants made no attempt to establish the authenticity of the bogus oath, but threw themselves on the mercy of the court and tried to show that there was no intentional libel on Mr. Lawless.

DEFENDANTS FOUND GUILTY.

The jury returned a verdict of guilty, which was read by the foreman, Rev. Thomas Billing, and the court imposed a jail sentence of 30 days on each of the defendants, from which they took an appeal to the district court on the following day, each giving a bond of $500, with H. B. Oblinger and W. Knaack as sureties.

Referring to the foregoing trial, we set forth below the correspondence between the Rev. Mr. Billing and Hon. Fred Bierman, of Decorah, Iowa, who, we believe, is the publisher of the Decorah Journal:

DECORAH, IOWA, *August 14, 1914.*

Rev. THOMAS BILLING,
Pastor of Methodist Church, Waterville, Minn.

DEAR SIR: I have noted with interest that you were a juror in the prosecution of A. M. and G. E. Morrison, of Waterville, for criminal libel by E. M. Lawless, of the Waterville Sentinel.

The reports are that the jury unanimously voted for the conviction of A. M. and G. E. Morrison. May I not ask you to write me a line or two, stating whether or not this report is a fact? And also give me any bit of information that may be of interest in the case.

This anti-Catholic agitation, in my judgment, is very discreditable to all the Protestant churches that do not seek in the spirit of Christian charity to quiet it. Furthermore, it is a menace to the best conduct of political affairs and breeds a very regrettable bitterness and suspicion among people who otherwise would be friends.

If you have no objections, I should thank you very much for the privilege of publishing your reply in the Journal.

Sincerely, yours,

FRED BIERMAN.

—

WATERVILLE, MINN., *August 15, 1914.*

Mr. FRED BIERMAN, *Decorah, Iowa.*

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 14th received. And while I do not care for publicity, must admit that either by the irony of fate or by the hand of Providence I found myself upon the jury empaneled to find a verdict in the E. M. Lawless criminal libel case against A. M. and G. E. Morrison, of the Mankota Journal. I did not know until I reached the court room of the case. Had I known what awaited me that day, I would probably have been absent when the sheriff came three-quarters of an hour before the trial to summon me. But when summoned did not inquire how or learn for what purpose. However, never having run away from anything that looked like duty, and not being challenged by either party, I stood my ground, and notwithstanding much adverse local criticism am glad to have had the privilege of helping to nail down so ugly and diabolical a lie as the pseudo oath so widely published and attributed to Ed. Lawless was proven to be.

Furthermore, my district superintendent and other of my ministerial brethren (all of whom I have hitherto met) have expressed themselves as being perfectly at one with me.

The case was very simple.

1. The publication of the so-called oath in the defendant's paper was proven.

2. Its diabolical character was proven.

3. Its circulation in Waterville was proven by Rev. H. P. Chapman, pastor of the Congregational Church of that city.

4. Its utter and complete falsity was proven by two witnesses of the highest standing in the order, viz, Dr. Buckley, of St. Paul, by whom or in whose presence the fourth degree was conferred on complainant Lawless; and also by William J. McGinley, of New York, supreme secretary of the order, and custodian of all the written and oral work.

The first ballot stood 9 to 3 for conviction. The second ballot stood 10 to 2 for conviction, and the third was unanimous for conviction. The verdict was followed by a sentence of 30 days for each of the defendants in the county jail. The case, however, is appealed to the district court in September.

The case was the result of an anti-Catholic spirit (which has had other deplorable results), stirred up by the advent of Annie Lowry, the pseudo nun, whose trail across the State is quite visible, and certainly not enviable. Such things exhibit the strange anomaly of a religion of love producing the keenest haters and a gospel of peace engendering strife and animosities more bitter than the disputes and rivalries of the most profane.

Yours, for the peace of Zion,

(Rev.) THOMAS BILLING,
Foreman of Jury.

THANKS FOR LETTER.

DECORAH, IOWA, *August 17, 1914.*

Rev. THOMAS BILLING,
Waterville, Minn.

MY DEAR SIR: I thank you very much for your letter of August 15 and for the promptness of your reply.

I want to compliment you on the position you take in the matter, and to say that, in my opinion, if the Protestant clergymen in general took this position they would be held in higher esteem by the general public.

If I can do you a favor at some future date, I hope that you will not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely, yours,

FRED BIERMAN.

ANOTHER PROSECUTION.

Another case was tried in St. Johns, Newfoundland, on February 18, 1913.

The defendant was Charles A. Swift.

This trial was held in the central district court, before Judge Knight.

The defendant was charged with criminal libel in publishing and circulating the same oath described in the foregoing pages.

The complainant was Charles O'Neill Conroy, for himself and the Knights of Columbus.

Mr. A. B. Morine, K. C., was counsel for the complainant and Mr. F. A. Mews for the defendant.

The witnesses for the Government were William Bowden, Kenneth Barnes, William F. Coaker, Charles O'Neill Conroy, John Fenelon.

The defendant testified, admitting the charge, and concluded his testimony as follows:

"I should now like to express my very deep regret to Mr. Conroy and Mr. Fenelon and the whole Council of Knights, in St. Johns and elsewhere, that I should have been led to believe through false representations that this was the oath of the Knights of Columbus, and I wish to make an apology to all concerned, saying I sincerely regret having caused any pain or ill feeling to the members, and I wish this apology to be as complete as possible. I may add that in January last I did not know any of the members of the Knights of Columbus as such."

Mr. Morine then made the following statement to the court:

"This proceeding was taken for the purpose of showing the bogus nature of this alleged oath. If the accused had justified his conduct or attempted in any way to set up the truth of the alleged oath, the prosecution would be pushed to the greatest possible extent. There was no desire to persecute or even to punish where punishment was deserved. Mr. Swift having explained and given proper information, the complainant is satisfied that Mr. Swift was a victim, that he had no actual malice, and that he sincerely regrets his part in the circulation of the defamatory matter. This being so, the prosecutor's object has been achieved, and he desires that these proceedings go no further against this particular accused. He will, however, prosecute for any further circulation of this same or similar matter, and reserves his ordinary denial, their clear and deliberate assertions being made on oath in a properly constituted court. In exercising clemency the Knights will have won respect and admiration; but after this ample vindication it should be a solemn duty on the part of members of the order and their friends, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, to take steps to assure the severest punishment the law provides to any who may make similar charges. It is an old story, this oath business, and the Knights of Columbus is not the only society that has suffered similarly in the past. What made the offense more atrocious was an evident desire on the part of some to revive those displays of sectarian hatred which were buried, it is hoped forever, a quarter of a century ago."

ACTION IN SEATTLE, WASH.

In Seattle, Wash., a public statement was made on September 1, 1912, in the course of which it was alleged that this same "oath" was the oath taken by fourth-degree members of the Knights of Columbus. As a result of this statement the knights in Seattle voluntarily decided to submit to a committee of Protestant gentlemen the printed ceremonial containing the actual obligation taken by fourth-degree members of the order. The following newspaper extract gives the result of the investigation:

"The gentlemen to whom this obligation was submitted are H. C. Henry, railroad contractor and president of the Metropolitan Bank; J. D. Lowman, president of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce; J. E. Chilberg, vice president of the Scandinavian-American Bank of Seattle. The signed statement of these gentlemen follows:

"COMMITTEE FINDINGS.

"Honorable Catholic gentlemen of this city have placed for examination in the hands of the undersigned two papers—one the actual fourth-degree obligation taken by each person upon becoming a member of the Catholic organization known as the Knights of Columbus, the other a printed circular purporting to be the above-mentioned obligation. This latter is a blasphemous and horrible travesty upon the real oath, and as fair-minded citizens of this city we can not allow an atrocious libel upon the large body of our public-spirited Catholic fellow citizens to stand undisputed. We declare, further, that the obligation taken by the fourth-degree Knights of Columbus is one of loyalty and patriotism to our flag and Nation, and that the said obligation binds those who assume it to the exercise of the highest type of American citizenship.

"Signed at Seattle, Wash., this 31st day of October, 1912.

"H. C. HENRY.
"J. D. LOWMAN.
"J. E. CHILBERG."

We beg to submit all of the above as evidence of the fact that we have been the objects of a malicious slander at the hands of a disturber of the public peace.

T. J. GORMAN,
Past Vice Supreme Master of the Fourth Degree.
JOHN D. CARMODY,
State Deputy of Washington.
J. C. FORD,
Past Grand Knight, Seattle Council.

RESOLUTION PASSED.

Mr. JOHN D. CARMODY, *Seattle, Wash.*

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was passed by the Olympian Clericus, an organization composed of all Episcopal clergymen in the State of Washington west of the Cascades:

"Our attention has been called to a circular which has been rather widely distributed purporting to be a copy of the oath taken by the members of a certain religious order or society. We desire on behalf of ourselves to express our deep regret that such an attack should have been made on the members of a religious body. We disclaim any desire to judge others, but feel most deeply that the interests of true religion can never be served in such a way."

SIDNEY T. JAMES, *Secretary.*

ALL SAINTS' RECTORY, SEATTLE.

LOS ANGELES INVESTIGATION.

The following letters need no explanation:

Hon. PAUL J. MCCORMICK,
Courthouse, Los Angeles.

MY DEAR JUDGE: I take pleasure in handing you herewith the findings of the committee of Freemasons to whom you exhibited the ceremonials and pledges of the Order of Knights of Columbus.

I am very glad that I have been able in a measure to secure this refutation of a slanderous lie which has been widely circulated and which has been disseminated in many cases by well-meaning, credulous, and deluded persons.

I shall see to it that this report has wide circulation among Masons, and you may use it in any way you deem best to bring about an understanding of the truth among men who, above all controversies

and contentions, desire to know and to follow that which is right and true.

Yours, cordially, W. R. HERVEY.

OCTOBER 9, 1914.

We hereby certify that by authority of the highest officer of the Knights of Columbus in the State of California, who acted under instructions from the supreme officer of the order in the United States, we were furnished a complete copy of all the work, ceremonies, and pledges used by the order, and that we carefully read, discussed, and examined the same. We found that, while the order is in a sense a secret association, it is not an oath-bound organization and that its ceremonies are comprised in four degrees, which are intended to teach and inculcate principles that lie at the foundation of every great religion and every free State. Our examination of these ceremonials and obligations was made primarily for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not a certain alleged oath of the Knights of Columbus which has been printed and widely circulated was in fact used by the order, and whether, if it was not used, any oath, obligation, or pledge was used which was or would be offensive to Protestants or Masons or those who are engaged in circulating a document of peculiar viciousness and wickedness. We find that neither the alleged oath nor any oath or pledge bearing the remotest resemblance thereto in matter, manner, spirit, or purpose is used or forms a part of the ceremonies of any degree of the Knights of Columbus. The alleged oath is scurrilous, wicked, and libelous, and must be the invention of an impious and venomous mind. We find that the Order of Knights of Columbus, as shown by its rituals, is dedicated to the Catholic religion, charity, and patriotism. There is no propaganda proposed or taught against Protestants or Masons or persons not of Catholic faith. Indeed, Protestants and Masons are not referred to, directly or indirectly, in the ceremonials and pledges. The ceremonial of the order teaches a high and noble patriotism, instills a love of country, inculcates a reverence for law and order, urges the conscientious and unselfish performance of civic duty, and holds up the Constitution of our country as the richest and most precious possession of a knight of the order. We can find nothing in the entire ceremonials of the order that, to our minds, could be objected to by any person.

MOTLEY HEWES FLINT (33°),
Past Grand Master of Masons of California.
DANA REID WELLER (32°),
Past Grand Master of Masons of California.
WM. RHODES HERVEY (33°),
Past Master and Master of Scottish Rite Lodge.
SAMUEL E. BURKE (32°),
Past Master and Inspector of Masonic District.

RECENT PROSECUTION IN SANTA CRUZ, CAL.

The Santa Cruz News, of Santa Cruz, Cal., published the following under date of October 28, 1914:

SOCIALIST EDITOR BOUND OVER—NO TESTIMONY PRESENTED BY DEFENSE.

"H. S. Turner, editor of the World Issue and charged with libeling the fourth-degree members of the Knights of Columbus through the publication of a false oath attributed to the organization, was bound over to the superior court by Justice of the Peace Bias this morning under $300 bonds, following a very interesting preliminary examination in which the most noticeable incident was the ingenuity of Attorney Ralph H. Smith in the defense of his client, the defendant.

"The little court room above the fire house was completely filled when the case opened this morning. Assisting District Attorney Knight was John H. Leonard, the local attorney and a prominent Catholic."

The complainant was Charles Gillen, who testified with Joseph J. Rosborough, of Oakland, and Eugene F. Conlon, San Francisco. No evidence was offered by the defendant, and after argument by his attorney, Mr. Smith, Judge Bias held that there was sufficient evidence to hold the defendant for the higher court.

BUSINESS MEN OF INDIANAPOLIS PROTEST AGAINST THE CIRCULATION OF THE FAKE OATH.

The business men whose signatures appear below are all Protestant; they can not comprehend how any Christian can lend himself to the further circulation of the monstrous lie.

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS "FAKE OATH."

We the undersigned citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., beg to make public the following statement of facts, the truth of which is established by thorough investigation, regarding the circulation in Indianapolis and Indiana of a "fake oath" as being the true fourth-degree oath of the Knights of Columbus.

It will be unnecessary to reproduce the fake oath here on account of its vile character. Ordinarily charges of such vile nature should go unnoticed, but good citizens of all creeds owe it to themselves to pillory before the public those circulating this literature as un-American.

The true oath of the fourth-degree members of the Knights of Columbus as hereinafter shown in the court proceedings is as follows:

"I swear to support the Constitution of the United States.

"I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and Knight of Columbus, to enlighten myself fully upon my duties as a citizen and to conscientiously perform such duties entirely in the interest of my country and regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot and to promote reverence and respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion openly and consistently, but without ostentation, and to so conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon our holy church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God."

Appended to the "fake oath," which is being circulated anonymously, is this notation:

"Copied from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Washington, D. C., volume 49, part 4, February 15, 1913, page 3216."

By referring to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD quoted it will be found that this "fake oath" is filed as an exhibit by Eugene C. Bonniwell, of Pennsylvania, in his charge against THOMAS S. BUTLER, before the Committee on Elections No. 1, in Congress, growing out of an election contest. Mr. Bonniwell, the contestant, in his protest, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, says:

"Messengers in the employ of supporters of THOMAS S. BUTLER traveled the district, having in their possession and circulating a blasphemous and infamous libel, a copy of which is hereto attached, pretended to be an oath of the Knights of Columbus, of which body the contestant is a member. So revolting are the terms of this document and so nauseating its pledges that the injury it did, not merely to the contestant but also to the Knights of Columbus and to Catholics in general, can hardly be measured in terms." (Copied from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 49, pt. 4, p. 3216, Washington, D. C., Feb. 15, 1913.)

Mr. BUTLER, in his defense, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, says:

"I apprehended with alarm the use of such a document in a political campaign or at any other time. I did not believe in its truthfulness, and so stated my judgment concerning it on November 4, 1912, as soon as complaint was made to me of its general circulation. Inasmuch as I did not wish to give this document, which I judged to be spurious, any notoriety whatsoever, I refrained from its public condemnation until the time when a general complaint was made to me, and I thought it my duty to publicly condemn it." (Copied from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 49, pt. 4, p. 3219, Washington, D. C., Feb. 15, 1913.)

The congressional committee to which the matter was referred reported in part as follows:

"The committee can not condemn too strongly the publication of the false and libelous article referred to in the paper of Mr. Bonniwell and which was the spurious Knights of Columbus oath, a copy of which is appended to the paper." (Copied from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 49, pt. 4, p. 3221, Washington, D. C., Feb. 15, 1913.)

This shows that the "fake oath" is a fake, and it explains how it got into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In addition to the reference made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing up this "fake oath," its false and malicious character was shown in two court proceedings, one in Waterville, Minn., tried on July 29, 1914, and one in Philadelphia, Pa., tried on January 30, 1914.

The Waterville case was a criminal libel brought by E. M. Lawless, the editor of the Waterville Sentinel, against A. M. Morrison and C. E. Morrison, father and son, editors and publishers of the Mankato Morning Journal, of Mankato, Minn.

The libel consisted in the charging of Lawless with having taken the "fake" Knights of Columbus "oath," which is the same "fake oath" so largely circulated in Marion County.

The trial was presided over by Judge George J. Dressel. The district attorney who prosecuted the case was Francis J. Hanzel, of Montgomery, prosecuting attorney for Le Sueur County, who was assisted by Attorney Thomas Hessian, of Le Sueur. The defendants were represented by Owen Morris, of St. Paul.

A jury was selected, and the Rev. Thomas Billing, the resident Methodist minister of Waterville, was chosen on the jury.

At the trial reputable citizens gave evidence that the "fake oath" was a vile fake, and that the obligation above set out is the true obligation of the Knights of Columbus.

The defendants at the trial made no attempt to establish the authenticity of the "fake oath," but threw themselves on the mercy of the court and tried to show that there was no intentional libel on Mr. Lawless.

The jury returned a verdict of guilty, which was read by the foreman, Rev. Thomas Billing, and the court imposed a jail sentence of 30 days.

In the Philadelphia case two men, Megonegal and Stage, were charged jointly with conspiracy to defame several members of the Knights of Columbus by causing the "fake oath" to be circulated.

At the hearing it appeared that the "fake oath" had been bought in bulk from the Menace in the beginning, but afterwards Megonegal had done the printing on his own account.

The Menace was called upon by counsel for these two men to give them some assistance, and it replied in a letter, dated March 5, 1913, and addressed to Leroy N. King, attorney for the defendants:

"We do not have any evidence that the oath is the one which is taken by the Knights of Columbus. We feel sure that it would be folly for you to base your defense on the authenticity of this document."

The case came on to trial at the quarter sessions court in Philadelphia on January 30, 1914, before Judge Robert W. Wilson. The district attorney was Joseph Taulane, who was assisted by Attorneys Owen J. Roberts and Joseph P. Gaffney. The defendants, in addition to Mr. King, had Peter F. MacLaren. Evidence was introduced that the "fake oath" was utterly false, and that no Knight of Columbus ever took it.

Megonegal pleaded guilty and Stage pleaded nolle. Whereupon, at the request of the plaintiffs, the sentence was suspended.

Knowing that the "fake oath" is false, we hold that all good citizens will join us in denouncing its circulation in Marion County and in Indiana, to the end that people of all creeds may dwell in peace and harmony as becomes the highest ideals of true and patriotic American citizenship.

Alex C. Ayres, attorney; H. C. Parker, physician; Aquilla Q. Jones, attorney; John G. Williams, attorney; Hugh McK. Landon, capitalist; Frederick M. Ayres, president L. S. Ayres & Co.; L. O. Hamilton, president Hamilton, Harris & Co.; Linneas C. Boyd, capitalist; Gustave A. Schnull, of Schnull & Co.; Albert P. Smith, attorney; J. M. McIntosh, president National City Bank; August M. Kuhn, treasurer Aetna Trust & Savings Co.; John Rauch, clerk Marion circuit court; G. A. Efroymson, president H. P. Wasson Co.; Chester P. Wilson, president Interstate Public Service Co.; Frank S. C. Wicks, minister; Henry M. Downing, attorney; Henry H. Hornbrook, attorney; Frank E. Gavin, attorney; Dick Miller, broker; Hugh Dougherty, vice president Fletcher Savings & Trust Co.; J. W. Stickney, general manager Central Union Telephone Co.; Thomas A. Wynne, vice president and treasurer Indianapolis Light & Heat Co.; Louis Newberger, attorney; Henry Lawrence, manager Claypool Hotel; Otto N. Frenzel, president Merchants' National Bank; Frank Wheeler, of Wheeler & Schebler; John J. Appel, real estate agent; C. G. Sander, of Sander & Recker; John W. Minor, secretary and treasurer Sentinel Printing Co.; Evans Woolen, vice president American National Bank; William Fortune, president Indianapolis Telephone Co.; J. D. Forrest, general manager Citizens' Gas Co.; Chalmers Brown, president Reserve Loan Life Insurance Co.; F. F. Hutchins, physician; Wilson S. Doan, attorney; Edward E. Gates, attorney; Oscar Schmidt, president Old Town Co.; Elmer E. Stevenson, attorney; Samuel O. Pickens, attorney; Sol Meyer, president Meyer-Kiser Bank; Linton A. Cox, attorney; Frank T. Edenharter, attorney; John F. Robbins, attorney; Thos. J. Owens, secretary Meridian Life Insurance Co.; George J. Marott, shoe merchant.

The above appeared in the Indianapolis News October 17 and in the Star October 18. All signatures are those of prominent non-Catholic men of the city.

Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of this House to the stenographic report of the hearing before President Wilson which was held in the East Room, White House, January 23? The hearing was given in response to the request of many gentlemen, both proponents and opponents of the bill now under consideration. I shall read here the arguments of those representative men and women who asked our President to veto this measure.

When the hour of 10 o'clock arrived, President Wilson, rising from his seat, spoke as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to devote two hours and a half to this discussion, and in order that it may be conducted in as satisfactory a manner as possible we have arranged to divide the time equally between the two sides, those for the signing of the bill and those against it. It has been arranged that the time of those in favor of the bill should be allotted under the supervision of Mr. Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, an hour being devoted to that side. The next hour and 15 minutes will be devoted to those who wish the bill vetoed, this time to be arranged by Representatives GALLIVAN, SABATH, and GOLDFOGLE; and then, at the conclusion of the 2 hours and 15 minutes which would be thus used up, the closing 15 minutes will be given to those who favor the bill, this time to be allotted as the other.

I am not informed as to who is to speak first in favor of the bill.

FOR THE OPPONENTS.

Representative GALLIVAN. Mr. President, Messrs. GOLDFOGLE, SABATH, and myself have agreed to divide our time equally. We have 1 hour and 25 minutes. The closing 15 minutes will be assigned to the Hon. W. Bourke Cockran. Because we have so many who have come from different sections of the country who will be unable to talk on account of lack of time, with your permission, Mr. President, I am going to ask all those who are opposed to the pending legislation to rise.

The PRESIDENT. No; not now, please.

Representative GALLIVAN (to the audience). Never mind; do not do that. We do not desire to disappoint people here without letting them know that we have not the time to give them, and for that reason I thought that if they could show their numbers that would be an expression of opinion on their part. But we are profoundly grateful to you for this opportunity to be heard.

The PRESIDENT. Whom shall we hear first?

Representative GALLIVAN. I am going to ask Representative J. HAMPTON MOORE, of Philadelphia, to speak for two minutes.

Representative MOORE. Mr. President, the German-American Alliance, which claims a membership of 2,000,000, protests against this bill and is directly opposed to the literacy test. The Federation of Italian Societies of Pennsylvania, numbering about 50,000, also protest against the bill. The Jewish societies unitedly protest against the bill, and Mr. Louis E. Levy, of Philadelphia, the head of these societies, I hope may be heard from for a moment or two a little later on. The United Polish Societies are also opposed to this bill, and they are a very numerous part of our citizenship in Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I shall ask to file some papers voicing the sentiments of these societies, and shall ask their consideration at your hands. It has been said by some of those who have already spoken, in scholarly fashion, that we must conserve the brain power of the Nation. I agree to the conservation of the brain power of the Nation, but I question whether the conservation of the brain power of the Nation should be conducted at the expense of the conservation of the brawn and the muscle of the Nation. We may be overdoing the conservation of the brain power and leading unconsciously to a race suicide that is entirely unlooked for. We must conserve the brawn and the muscle of the Nation. We must admit those who have committed no crime against the Nation save that of being unable to read to those same conditions which were granted to our forefathers from the beginning of our Nation's history.

It has been said that the insane are increasing in our institutions in this country. That may be true. Some startling statistics have been given with respect to the insane. But I question, Mr. President—I am on the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, and have been dealing with this question for years in Congress—I question whether any more law upon the subject of naturalization and immigration will improve this condition. The law which we now have, the act of February, 1907, provides in the second paragraph for the exclusion of the insane. Section 2 reads 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.

Mr. President, there is ample law to-day for the exclusion of this class of citizens. Will more law help the situation? It is a matter of administration, as we have been told on former occasions. It is a matter of administration now.

May I have the privilege, Mr. GALLIVAN, of presenting Prof. M. D. Learned, of the University of Pennsylvania?

Representative GALLIVAN. You may. I will say that Prof. Learned has been given eight minutes.

Prof. LEARNED. Mr. President, gentlemen, while I have been requested by two organizations to speak on this occasion, what I have to say comes rather from a man who has studied it from an independent point of view. It has been my lot for the past 10 or 15 years to follow the history of immigration to this country with more or less care and with particular reference to the early immigration. I have also examined with great care the million-dollar output of the Immigration Commission—42 volumes, I think, in all. I will not swear that I have read them from cover to cover. Now, this report, to which reference has been made to-day, is presumably the basis upon which the committee and Congress have formulated the immigration bill before us. I wish to say one word about this report. It begins practically with 1819, at a time when our statistics begin to flow rapidly and freely. It was a convenient place to begin, because the good members of that commission did not have any difficulty in reconstructing the unwritten statistics back of that period. We all know that that is the great crux in the statistics of the United States—the period before the First Census, in particular.

Mr. President and gentlemen, it is precisely this neglected period in this report which vitiates the results of the report. The fact is that the period of the making of this Nation was the period before the First Census of the United States. It was the formative period, in which all these nationalities were grouped together in various parts of the country and the process of assimilation was going on. And what were the elements of that population? If we should see them moving down Pennsylvania Avenue to-day, with their packs on their backs, in many cases in their bare feet, and their tatters and rags, we should be ashamed to acknowledge that they were our ancestors. We can not judge from the immigrants what the output of this country is to be. We must remember that from these great stress periods, periods of religious persecution, periods of depletion by war, we have drawn the very best elements of our population. I need to cite only one example to show that—the example of the immigration of the Palatines in 1709 and 1710 and following years to this country, admittedly one of the best elements we have ever added to our population. And yet those Palatines were homeless, roofless, without clothes in many cases, foodless. They had to live upon the mercy of the English people when they were camped about London, and had to be actually shipped by others to this country. And hundreds and thousands of them could not read a word—had absolutely no ability to read.

This brings me now to this reading test and the present question. What is the class that will be affected by the reading test, that will be eliminated by the reading test? The class to be eliminated by the reading test will be largely the agricultural class and the artisan class of the lower grades in those countries and cities where popular education does not exist; a test that does in no wise signify or bear upon the character of the individuals; and we all know that. We all know that this particular form of test was selected—at least, we may suspect that this particular form of test has been selected—because the committee went on the plan, perhaps, of the fisherman, the happy fisherman. He takes his net and he says, "It won't catch them all, but it will catch a lot, and it is the best thing I have to fish with." And that was about the size of it with the committee that formulated this reading test.

Now, you have got to get a much larger net, and you have got to get a much smaller mesh before you can catch all of the ineligibles that were in the minds of this committee. We know that the tendencies and temptations in the Congress of the United States are all fraught with the interests of separate, distinct organizations, and separate economic and other interests of the country. We know that; and we know that Congress has to deal with all those conflicting interests; and we know that this legislation, like most of the legislation of Congress, is tied up with these special interests; and, Mr. President, I think, for us, one important fact to remember is that in this legislation we are not legislating for to-day or to-morrow. We are legislating with a view to the great future, with a view to those elements which are to come to us, and which are to give to us their brain and their brawn, because you need not tell me that in these peasant regions of the East, the uneducated regions of Russia and Bulgaria, and the other countries of the East, in Italy as well—you need not tell me that that brain which has been lying dormant for centuries, when it once catches the touch of education, will not, like a virgin power, rise up and give a new element to this civilization of ours. That is what the educational test is going to cut off—just that virgin brain that has not had the opportunity yet which our old ancestors had when they came to this country.

Representative GALLIVAN. Mr. President, I want to present Mr. David A. Lourie, representing the New Century Club of Boston, an organization of professional men. Mr. Lourie will speak for three minutes.

Mr. LOURIE. Mr. President, as I heard some of the arguments here this morning it reminded me of the history of immigration as it has been discussed for the last 100 years. Away back in 1814, arguments were advanced for the restriction and exclusion of immigration, similar to those that have been advanced here to-day. Had those arguments been listened to, and those ideas translated into law, what would the development of this country have been to-day? The first speaker asked the question, Do we want to Russianize the people over here? I say, "No"; and the fact that we do not want to Russianize the people over here is the reason that we are opposed to the literacy test. What does Russianize mean? It means autocratic officialdom, tyranny, and everything that is bad in public life. Now, what does this principle of a literacy test, reduced to its lowest terms, mean? It means that a man subjects himself to examination by one official. Is there any standard by which this official can say whether the immigrant can read well or badly enough to admit him or to deport him? It is left entirely to his discretion, to his whim, to his caprice; and it is for this reason, among others, that we are opposed to this un-American principle of one-man power, to be able to decide whether a man is able to read well enough to come in here; we are absolutely opposed to this literacy test.

The gentleman tells you that the Farmers' Union is in favor of the literacy test. Why should they be? We know that it is for the interest of the United States of America to get as many of our immigrants out on the farms as is possible, to develop our agricultural resources. Secretary Nagel, in his letter to ex-President Taft, upon which ex-President Taft's veto was based, made a clear and careful study of the immigrant's relation toward the agricultural problem; and in that letter he says that it is these illiterate immigrants who have been coming here in the last 15 or 20 years who are greatly reclaiming the abandoned farm lands of the West and of New England.

Representative GALLIVAN. Mr. President, I will give two minutes to Mr. Michael Leveen, grand master of the Independent Order of King Solomon, of Newark, N. J.

Mr. LEVEEN. Mr. President, I give way to Mr. Saul Cohn to represent us as spokesman.

Mr. COHN. Mr. President, it is very difficult for a youngster to add anything to what has been said by those opposed to the literacy test by such men as President Eliot and the President of the United States and a great many other gentlemen who have had the opportunity, and a part of whose duty it has been to study this brand of legislation. The words of the second gentleman who spoke in regard to the fact that the immigrant desired to be excluded catches almost as though a burning torch were applied to him, the ability to take advantage of our institutions, are absolutely true. It has been shown that there is a greater percentage of illiteracy in the children of native-born parents than there is in the children of foreign-born parents.

Mr. President, I do not desire to go into a detailed statement of the reasons for which we oppose the literacy test. I only desire to bring a homely illustration to the gentlemen present, in that those of us who lead professional lives know of our own knowledge that very frequently in our experience—I know it has been in mine—we find gentlemen who come to this country who can not read or write; who sign their notes and their deeds with a cross; who have brought up large families in decency; have given them every advantage that American institutions will permit; who have risen to stations of opulence in our communities; who have made excellent citizens, excellent fathers, and excellent busi-

ness men; and I am quite positive that from those experiences the proposed test has no foundation in truth and in justice.

Representative GALLIVAN. Mr. President, I will ask Capt. Samuel H. Borofsky, representing the largest Jewish congregation in New England, to speak for two minutes.

Capt. BOROFSKY. Mr. President, I am personally foreign born. I came here when a boy of 14. I have lived amongst the foreign born of all classes—Jews, Italians, and others—in the city of Boston, and I want to say right here, Mr. President, that this country would have a great deal less trouble with the foreign-born element if all of them came here uneducated. The man who comes here and imbibes his education in the American schools imbibes something the value of which he realizes and which he appreciates more than those who have had the best education from the universities where revolution is rampant and where tyranny prevails, because our institutions are good. And, Mr. President, I want to say one more word with regard to many of us who come from those foreign countries. We have many ties there. A war is going on, devasting all of Europe, where fathers and brothers are being slaughtered on the field of battle. A man may bring his child of 14 years of age—I believe 16—a father may bring in his wife and his children up to that age; but if my father is killed there, and I have got a sister in the old country who can not read, who did not have the opportunity, no matter what my wealth in this country might be I would not under this bill be permitted to take my unfortunate sister from the old country and give her a shelter in my home. Just think, if I had a sister over there and she had a young girl of 14 or 16 or 18 years, with no parents after this war, absolutely destitute, with all my means I would be unable to bring her to this country and give her a shelter. Is this Americanism? Is this the true spirit of Americanism, Mr. President? I certainly submit, Mr. President, that the American people of this country, if they only realized how far this provision goes, would never for a minute consent to its enactment into law.

Representative GALLIVAN (addressing Mr. Sol B. Kantor, of Boston). How much time have we remaining, Mr. Kantor?

Mr. KANTOR. About eight minutes.

Representative GALLIVAN. Mr. President, we have here some representatives of Boston opinion on this bill; they have come from the city of Samuel Adams, of William Lloyd Garrison, of Wendell Phillips, and of thousands of many splendid immigrants of all races who could not have entered this country under a literacy test. They have come to protest with voice and mind and heart against this un-American measure that now threatens. They believe that such a test would not bar from our shores the arrogant, the brutal, the vicious, the selfish, the hateful, the uncharitable, the unwanted, but that it would close our doors against the unfortunate, the oppressed, the victims of brutalism and repression in Old World misgovernment.

Mr. President, I rise to speak chiefly against the literacy test in this bill, because I believe that, based on the experience and history of this and every other country, literacy is not a measure of character or a test of fitness for citizenship. It is a convenience, not a necessity, in the life of a people. It neither adds to nor diminishes the native ability and virtue of any people, and it is the simplest commonplace to say that no nation was ever saved, no people ever freed, no government ever established by the pen of the writer and the book of the scholar; the vigor, courage, intelligence, and strong arms of men that accomplish these great ends were the endowment of those who were able to make history, even if they could neither write nor read it.

If there is one thing that stands out more imposingly in our national life—yes, far more than any other—it is that literacy has not been the source of American liberty or the cause of American greatness, and our lack of a commanding literature has sometimes been a cause of national reproach.

I believe it was Emerson who said that the farmer, laborer, artisan, fisherman, and chopper are the Commonwealth, not the lawyer, the scholar, and the penman. Too many of us make the mistake of confounding and confusing the terms of illiteracy and ignorance, and our great President hardly needs to be told that lack of letters and lack of knowledge are two entirely different things.

Mr. President, it is important to remember that this alleged stream of alien immigrants has been flowing into America since the early days of the seventeenth century. Its fanciful dangers have begun to dawn on us in the twentieth. Those who favor this bill seem to forget that only the other day their ancestors were alien, the sons of England, France, Ireland, Italy, Scotland, Poland, Germany, Russia, and other lands; and though that stream of fresh and revivifying blood has ceased to flow into some sections of our country, it still continues to renew the energies and courage of the North and the West as ever. Wherever the immigrant has come his energy, courage, fidelity, and brains have made the regions wherein he has cast his fortune blossom like the rose. Wherever he has gone schools have sprung up, industries have flourished, trade has increased, wealth has multiplied, prosperity has bloomed, and patriotism, peace, law, order, intelligence, and happiness follow in his footsteps.

Mr. President, we know that a literacy test will bar from our land its most vital necessity—strong, vigorous, simple, God-fearing peasants, who come here to find homes and to make the wilderness blossom into fertility. But will a literacy test keep out a single criminal whose record and antecedents we are ignorant of? You will find some illiterate criminals who have been guilty of crime of sudden passion, of violence, men who united ignorance with illiteracy; but it is everlastingly true that the crimes most injurious to society, most detrimental to business, commerce, finance, are never the work of illiterates.

The forger, the conspirator, the crooked promoter, the business defaulter, the blackmailer, the bank thief, the political grafter, and all that class of criminals, outside of and outnumbering the criminals of passion and violence, are literate. They read and write, for these vicious talents must be supplemented by literacy to make them profitable. Vicious talent sharpened and developed by letters is the most serious problem society has to deal with. Yet this absurd literacy test will admit the dangerous European criminal of the continental cities and bar out the honest and hard-working and badly needed peasant—farmer and laborer—whether he be English or Irish or French or German or Hebrew or Polish or Italian or Lithuanian.

In evey crisis of the country's history these alien classes have stood loyally by the Republic that gave them asylum and home.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that literacy is not a test of character, manhood, or civic fitness. It is a trap to catch the unwary; it is contrary to American principles and practices. Give us honest men and women for our immigrants and the educational problem will not stagger us. Mr. President, hopefully and pronouncedly we ask for your veto.

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I regret that I will not be able to yield as much time as I should like to the many prominent and distinguished gentlemen that come from the city of New York. I present, Mr. President, Mr. Oswald Villard, of the New York Evening Post, to whom I yield four minutes.

Mr. VILLARD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Friends of Russian Freedom, our national society, and as the son of an immigrant who came to this country as a result of the revolution in the Palatinate in 1848, in which three members of his family earned the highest sentence for treason, I desire earnestly to protest against the exclusion by the bill under consideration of aliens who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property, against the provision of section 19, that any who within five years after entry shall be found advertising or teaching the unlawful destruction of property shall be deported; and against the last paragraph of section 28, subjecting to fine and imprisonment, or both, as for a misdemeanor, anyone who knowingly aids or assists any such alien to enter the United States.

These prohibitions against those advertising or teaching the unlawful destruction of property, contained in the present law, mark a new and important departure in our national policy. Those who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property are to be excluded; but advocate how? Through books? Through discussion among a small company of friends? This comes too near continuing the folly already in the immigration law of legislating against a state of mind, against those who believe in polygamy, or, like Prince Kuropotkin, possibly, in no organized government. Mr. President, I myself am never in favor of force to settle any difference of opinion between individuals or nations, and neither are the officers of this organization, which includes some of the most persistent workers in the cause of peace that we have in this country, such as Bishop Greer, George Kennan, Seth Low, Louis Marshall, Hamilton Holt, Paul Kennedy, and others; but in the opinion of the bulk of humanity force often must be applied to bring about reform in lands where no adequate provision is made for the peaceful declaration of the popular will. Before and since our Boston "tea party" the annals of history are full of cases where advertising and teaching the unlawful destruction of property have led men and women to come to freedom, to democracy, and to a better common life. As long as forcible revolution is regarded as legitimate the world over, it would be monstrous to say that we should deny an asylum to foreigners who might sit together on our territory and dream dreams of tyrants' yokes broken at home and foreign despots driven from their shores. Shall we set a premium upon the spy and the informer? Shall we brand the exiled patriot as one to be watched, because, sitting in his room with his family about him, he may talk over possible deeds of arms? Perish the thought. The shades of a thousand revolutionists—men like Blanqui, Sigel, and Carl Schurz—would rise to protest. Plotting for freedom is precisely what has always been done in this country and in England.

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I yield four minutes to the former lieutenant governor of the State of New York, the Hon. Robert F. Wagner, who represents, among other institutions, the Tammany Society, or Columbian Order, a society which was formed for patriotic purposes and has stood for liberty and freedom for over a hundred years.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, perhaps I can get through in less than four minutes; but I have the honor, as chairman of a subcommittee appointed by the executive committee of the Tammany Hall organization of the county of New York, to present this resolution for your consideration, in which we express our opposition to this measure, and also the hope that you will disapprove it. [Handing paper to the President.]

There was one thought that came to me, Mr. President, while this discussion was going on, and that is, What is the matter with our country now that this extraordinary literacy test should be imposed upon our immigrants? In the city of New York we have a population 80 per cent of which consists either of foreign born or the children of foreign born, and yet I submit that we have one of the greatest cities, if not the greatest city in the world, and our illiteracy rate is lower to-day than it ever was in the history of our country. We have there a free college—the College of the City of New York—with which your Excellency is no doubt well acquainted, and of which I have the honor to be a graduate. And, by the way, I am a foreigner—a foreigner in the sense that I was born in a foreign country and came here as a young boy. In the College of the City of New York we have at least 90 per cent children of foreign born, and of that 90 per cent, I take it, 40 per cent at least are the children of illiterate foreigners who have come to our country to seek freedom and an opportunity to work out an existence under happier conditions. Now, no one, it seems to me, can contend, in view of this experience within our own city, that this foreigner, illiterate though he may be, is a menace to our institutions. On the contrary, he is interested in them; he works in our industries to help build up our industries; and wants to give his children the best education possible, so that he may, if possible, become part of our institutions.

So we feel that this proposed law is un-American; it is undemocratic; it is in violation of the fundamental principles upon which our Government was built; and we feel that if this literacy test should be imposed at this time it is not a test of character, it is not a test of intellect, for illiteracy does not necessarily mean ignorance; nor does it mean that the individual will not be useful in the community where he may resides; and it will deprive our country in the future of men the like of whom in the past have helped to build us up and make us great.

In conclusion let me just say this: There are a number of refugees, no doubt, who will seek our shores just at this time, when their country is in turmoil and strife, where they are being oppressed, and they want to come to this country because we are enjoying peace and happiness and brotherly love, and largely due, entirely due, to your own efforts. [Applause.]

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I present Mr. Louis Marshall, president of the American Jewish Committee, and yield to him seven minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, this is the third time that an immigration bill containing a literacy test has been presented to the President of the United States for consideration and action—first to President Cleveland, who vetoed it in a vigorous message; next to President Taft, who vetoed it; and now it is presented to your Excellency.

I feel that if this bill, as now prepared, should become a law it would be taking a step backward in our American civilization. It would make a decided change in the policy of our Government. Our Nation, which has been in the past the asylum of the oppressed of all countries, would no longer possess that proud distinction which has made it the home and cradle of liberty. The literacy test has been evolved after many years of labor on the part of the restrictionist as the touchstone which shall determine whether or not an immigrant shall be received into this country.

The arguments which have been presented hereby Prof. Fairchild and Prof. Ross are not arguments in favor of the literacy test, but in favor of the prohibition of immigration altogether. I have heard no argument presented by them which in any way indicates that the literacy test has any value whatsoever. Those who are opposed to its adoption and to restriction are not so unpatriotic as to say that our doors should be kept open to the immoral, to the defective, to the insane, to those who would be a menace to our country. As good citizens, we subscribe to the principle that our Government has the right to keep out those who by virtue of their bad character or other equally undesirable qualities should not be admitted. But before we adopt a test of exclusion it is important to understand whether that test means anything; whether it tests anything. After all, what do we want in this country? We want men and women—men and women of character, of principle; people who are industrious and who are willing to devote their energies to the upbuilding of the country.

The gentlemen who are in favor of this test seem to act on the theory that this is a country in which we have the right to be selective, to divide people into groups, and say, "You shall come, and you shall not come"; "you from eastern Europe must be excluded; we are perfectly willing to take you from western Europe." But that is un-American, and that would be injurious to the best interests of this country. This is a land of immigrants. Two hundred years ago there were very few people in this country, and all who were here were immigrants at that time. In 1790 there were about three and a half million people in the United States, and a very large percentage of these people were immigrants. We have now grown, in the last 125 years, from 3,500,000 to nearly 100,000,000, and a very large percentage of those are the children of immigrants or immigrants themselves. I also have the proud distinction of being the son of immigrants, and I feel, from my acquaintance with immigrants from my earliest days, which I have continued down to the present moment, that there is no better part of our population than that which has come to this country from foreign lands during the past 60 years, and who are coming day after day, when the spirit moves them to come, and to cast their lot with the welfare of this country.

Now, Mr. President, what is there in this literacy test which is of the slightest value. Does it indicate that because a man can read these cabalistic 30 or 40 lines which are to be presented to him under conditions of excitement and stress—that if the man can read them he is to be admitted, and if he can not read them he is to be rejected? Does that indicate that the man has character, ability, intelligence? I have known college graduates who have been able to speak six languages and who starved in each of those six languages. [Laughter.] They were unable to make a living. I have known graduates from the Sorbonne and from Heidelberg and from Cambridge and from Oxford who, in this country, lived on their wits and were a menace and an injury to this country. Those who believe that people who preach against American institutions are an injury to this country will find that among them those who are most able in their denunciation of constitutional government are those who are highly educated and who would not be excluded from this country because of their lack of the ability to read and to write. [Applause.]

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I yield two minutes to Mr. Alexander I. O'Rourke, of New York.

Mr. O'ROURKE. Mr. President, in the two minutes I have to be brief. I am going to assume, sir, that your mind as yet has not been made up, either to sign or veto this bill, because, if it were, you would not call this meeting to discuss it. I am going to assume, secondly, sir, that prior to your election as governor of the State of New Jersey you, by reason of your great association with the intellectual institutions of this country, had come to believe, as I, as a graduate, that the education of the people of this country is to be desired. But there is a literacy test imposed here, sir. Literacy does not make for the good of this Nation; and while we are discussing, Mr. President, the literacy of our people, we are forgetting the fundamental principles upon which this country was founded. The colonists said, when they founded this country, that a man was entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This Nation has stood as a beacon light to all the nations of the world, saying that here all peoples, of all classes, irrespective of education, should have the opportunity to pursue the happiness that they believed they were entitled to. They came from lands wherein they were persecuted. Religion, politics, and other things drove them here, and they came here thankful to this country for offering them an asylum; thankful to this country, whose foundation principles, upon which it was built, granted them this place as an asylum. Therefore they came here with hearts open to us; and we, the sons of these immigrants, realizing what this country has done for our parents, are prepared to sacrifice everything for this country because of its goodness to our parents and because of the advantages it has given to us. In the words of the psalmist, the immigrant and his son will say to you, sir, "If we forget thee, O Columbia, may our tongues cleave to the roofs of our mouths and our right hands forget their cunning." [Applause.]

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I present former Judge Leon Sanders, of New York City, president of the Hebrew Sheltering Immigrant Aid Society. I yield to him three minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, as a Russian by birth, an immigrant by compulsion, and an American by choice, I am here to-day in the name of the Independent Order of B'rith Abraham, a fraternal organization that has 200,000 paying members, and as president of the Hebrew Sheltering Immigrant Aid Society, an organization which spends considerable sums of money for the Americanization of Jewish immigrants, and for the purpose of preventing congestion in the larger cities, to protest against this attempt that is being made in the passage of this immigration bill before you for consideration, to reverse the time-honored policy of this Nation. We believe that the greatness of this country has been produced in a large measure, and almost in every respect, by the immigrants who have sought opportunities here denied to them at home. Many have come here fleeing from religious persecution; others have come here fleeing from political persecution. Whatever their motives have been, they have come here and have assimilated with Americans; have taken part, in time of peace, in building up this Nation to what it is; and have been every ready to shed their blood whenever this Nation called them to the front.

Mr. President, not only is there an attempt to adopt the literacy test but there is something new injected into the law, of which even the lawmakers themselves who have passed it are unable to explain the meaning. "Persons of constitutional psychopathic inferiority" are to be sent back. [Laughter.] I have been looking carefully over all the medical books; I have consulted men of science, men who have given this subject careful thought, and not one was able to give me a definition. How are we going to expect an inspector, getting perhaps $1,200 a year, to define this beautiful sentence, upon the strength of which people abandoning their homes abroad are to be sent back perhaps thousands of miles home? [Laughter and applause.]

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I yield one minute to my colleague, Hon. GEORGE W. LOFT, Representative from the State of New York.

Representative LOFT. Mr. President, I come before you with 179,000 names [handing a petition to the president] of citizens of the State of New York, of men who are the heads of families. We give you this book that we show you now and ask you to veto this measure. [Applause.]

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I yield one minute to Mr. Marcus Braun, of New York.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, in order to avoid repetition I have taken the liberty to sign my statement [handing a paper to the President].

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, I yield one-half minute to Mr. J. A. Shiplikoff, of New York City.

Mr. SHIPLIKOFF. Mr. President, on behalf of a quarter of a million organized Jewish working men and women I beg to present their opinion that it would be detrimental to the interests of this country to have this bill restricting immigration passed. I beg to call your attention to the fact that the standard of living has been raised within the last 35 years considerably, since the bulk of immigration from Europe has started, and if anything can lay claim to that it is organized labor, and organized labor in this country consists greatly of immigrant labor. Fully 65 per cent of the American Federation of Labor consists of immigrants, such as I am. [Applause.]

Representative GOLDFOGLE. Mr. President, through the kindness of my colleague [Mr. SABATH], I have been yielded just a few minutes, and I will take those for a few comments by myself.

I desire to say that while much has been expressed in Congress by those who favored restriction as to the desire to exclude the illiterate, the great city of New York, part of which I have the honor to represent, has never been afraid of the immigration problem over there. We realize in that great city, as I think the people througout the whole country realize, that many of the illiterates who have come to this country have, as has been remarked this morning, made a desirable acquisition in the communities in which they settled, and through the means of our educational institutions and opportunities presented in this great land have been enabled to obtain an education, and in time become worthy and desirable citizens.

We realize, as I think you do, Mr. President, that there are many of the great resources of this country still to be developed. The hand of toil is still necessary. The American farm boy, as has been so frequently remarked, has left the farm, has been lured to cities and towns, and we still need the hand that will work in the tilling and the cultivation of the soil, the tunneling of the mountains, the building of the railroads, the doing of the thousand and one things that are required in the development of the great resources of the land.

Now, if you examine, as unquestionably the departments under you have examined, the records of the savings banks and the other institutions of this country, you will find that the immigrants have added to the welfare and contributed to the prosperity of the land. I wish to say on behalf of the great city of New York, and on behalf of the many institutions of which I am a member and a director, that we emphatically protest against the imposition of this literacy test. We believe it to be unjust; we believe it to be unfair; it is undemocratic; it is un-American. [Applause.]

Representative SABATH. Mr. President, in behalf of the people of the great city of Chicago, with its many civic and social organizations, I have the great pleasure of presenting Miss Grace Abbott. [Applause.]

Miss ABBOTT. Mr. President, it seems to be necessary to present one's forbears as a part of the introduction. I want to say that I come of Puritan and Quaker stock, and come here representing a very large group of old native Americans, who believe that the present test is a step backward in American idealism. I am aware that a great deal of the discussion in regard to this test is based on the narrow ground of race and religious prejudice. That, I take it, is unnecessary to discuss here; but that the advocates of the literacy test should believe in it because they think that a curtailment of the number of those who are coming will be of assistance in the solution of a great many of our difficult social and political and economic problems is the question that I want especially to speak on this morning in the few minutes that I have.

At the first conference of charities and corrections which I ever attended, a young sanitary engineer who had been making a study of typhoid fever in the city of Pittsburgh had made the discovery, he thought, that typhoid fever and similar epidemics usually began in our foreign neighborhoods, and spread from there to other parts of the city. His conclusion further was (and I do not want to vouch for anything excepting his line of reasoning) that this was due to the fact that the immigrant was accustomed to a purer water supply at home than the native American, who represented a sort of survival of the fittest, so far as the struggle against impure water was concerned. His further conclusion was that in the interests of public health in Pittsburgh and other cities with large foreign population we ought to be able to work out some kind of test by which we could exclude those who were liable to fall victims to impure water, and so protect the American public. [Laughter.]

Now, that is, of course, the general line of reasoning of those who are discouraged at the slow progress that we are making in the line of pure water, to the better industrial and social conditions, and a more healthful and normal life for us all. They find the discouragement in the way of pure water in Pittsburgh more than they can face, perhaps, and so they say, "Well, let us get rid of some of the group that are suffering from this situation." That is, of course, a kind of short cut which is not going to help us in those problems in which I am more interested than any other; those which mean better control of the conditions under which men and women work, better wages, and better living conditions all around. It is therefore perfectly futile to devote ourselves to this test in the expectation that we are going to change the large group of the people in the community who are opposed to better living conditions for the workingman and better wages for the workingman. The presence of the immigrant is not responsible for that attitude of mind. And so it seems to me that, throughout, the discussion of the question of a literacy test brings us round to the question of where we should devote our strength and our efforts and our hopes; and it is not in this direction.

I want to say that I feel very strongly that the immigrants who are coming and who have come in the past have been very distinctly a democratic asset. We have pronounced to the world certain big fundamental propositions in regard to the equality of rights and opportunities. To those we are only struggling to live up, little by little. But the last arrival who comes in the expectation that we are going to make good in these directions has been a real democratic

asset that is going to help us to live up to the larger ideals that we have preached to the world, and which I, as one of the earlier ones, want to join with him in making a reality. [Applause.]

Representative SABATH. Mr. President, in behalf of people that have demonstrated that they are good and law-abiding citizens, in behalf of people that have made good, I desire to present Father John Sobieszczy, representing the Polish-American Catholic Union.

Father SOBIESZCZY. Mr. President, I will not take much time, for all the arguments pro and con are known to all those who are interested. But still, with all those arguments, just because we appreciate and love this country and this Government, and everything that has made the name of the United States so glorious amongst the nations, voicing the sentiments of the organization that I represent, numbering 80,000, and at the same time voicing the sentiments of all the Polish people, who for the most part are a laboring class, I protest and protest strongly against this literacy test; for it is unjust, unfair, undemocratic; and we believe it aims at the foundations of American liberty and liberality. [Applause.]

Representative SABATH. Mr. President, the Polish citizenship of this country is represented here by Mr. Adam S. Gregorowicz, representing the Polish National Alliance of America.

Mr. GREGOROWICZ. Mr. President, on behalf of the Polish National Alliance, which aggregates about 125,000 members, I concur in everything that has been said against the literacy clause, and in addition, without taking up much time I would like to lay stress upon one argument that has appealed to me very forcibly and which I have not heard mentioned here by anyone present, and that is this: That while this literacy clause strikes the man who can not read and write, although he may be healthy and otherwise admissible, the same law bars out his children and the children's children, and thereby dooms them to suffer the conditions from which the parents sought to escape; and it is therefore legislation against one generation to the prejudice of the descendants of that generation, while the mentally weak and unfit aliens are barred out under other conditions of the law. Their descendants have in no way the same chance as the descendants of healthy immigrants who would be excluded.

I have also been asked by another Polish delegation which is here—and I suppose they will not have the opportunity to express themselves—the representatives of the Polish American Citizens' League of Pennsylvania, to register their protest against this proposed literacy test.

Representative SABATH. I have a petition here which I desire to present to you, Mr. President. [Handing a paper to the President.]

Now, Mr. President, permit me to present to you the representative of the Polish Women's Alliance of America, Miss Napieralski.

Miss NAPIERALSKI. Mr. President, this I deem will be the greatest honor of my life. As an American born, it is the first and perhaps the last privilege to come before the President of the United States and before a large body of learned men, and because my time is limited I will confine myself to just a few words.

Mr. President, the mother of one of the greatest Presidents in American history signed her name with the sign of the cross, and yet her son was the greatest emancipator of man, whose memory is sacred to all of us—Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.] As the representative of the Polish women of America I have come here to protest against this unjust, un-American, and unconstitutional bill.

I thank you, Mr. President. [Applause.]

Representative SABATH. Mr. President, my time has been taken away by others, therefore I am deprived of the pleasure of presenting to you other gentlemen who are here to address you. But permit me to say that in behalf of the Bohemian and other foreign-born people of Chicago and of Illinois and in behalf of the foreign-language newspapers of the United States I am asking that you should veto this bill. They have requested me to do so. I regret very much that I am deprived of the privilege of calling upon them, but I am doing the very best I can. My time is up, and I hope that you will take into consideration the plea of these millions of honest foreign-born citizens who are hoping that you will veto this unfair bill.

Representative GALLIVAN. Mr. President, as the closing speaker for the protestants against the pending legislation I desire to introduce, for the 15 minutes left to us, the Hon. W. Bourke Cockran, of New York. [Applause.]

Mr. COCKRAN. May it please your excellency: Listening here to everything that has been said since the opening of this discussion, I think I may assume there is one point on which we will all agree, and it is that the policy which this pending measure aims to abandon—nay, completely to reverse—is as old as this Nation itself. I do not think anybody will dispute that it has been the distinctive policy of this country, and if it is to be judged by the results that it has produced I do not think any in the history of mankind has ever been so triumphantly vindicated. Certainly nobody can dispute that during the period of its enforcement, now stretching over 125 years, this country has reached a measure of prosperity entirely without precedent in human experience. But at the same time the influence that it has exercised throughout the world has been simply incalculable. I do not think it is an exaggeration to say that the light of hope it has kindled among the oppressed and the suffering in every quarter of the globe has been a constellation in the firmament of civilization that has worked the chief influence in accomplishing the uplift in human conditions that has marked this last century beyond all the centuries that have preceded.

And yet, Mr. President, I quite agree with the gentlemen who have spoken here. Perhaps I would go even further and say that the merits of this measure should be considered entirely by the effect it will produce on this country. Your Excellency and the other officers of this Government are bound to defend the interests of this land. To that you have sworn. You are pledged to loyalty; you are not pledged to anything else. If the effect of this measure shall be beneficent to all the world we may rejoice at the universal good that it works. But though it should benefit every man in every other country throughout the world, if it should work injury to our own citizens its abandonment and its reversal, prompt and immediate, becomes a duty that is imperative and inescapable.

Now, that being so, Mr. President, I ask your attention for a moment to the character of the arguments that are being advanced here in favor of the bill, for I think you will agree with me that where a policy unbroken since the establishment of the country, whose benefits nobody here questions, is sought to be reversed the affirmative lies with the proponents of the measure. I have followed very carefully everything that has been said here, and I can find not a single evil that has actually occurred to this country which is charged against the immigration. The most vehement of the orators on the other side, and the most eloquent, anticipate dangers from it, but none has pointed to a single evil consequence yet. For I take it that the distinguished scientist in lunacy who told us about the spread of insanity throughout the world does not charge that to immigration. But even if he did, a literacy test would be no particular measure by which we could determine whether a man was either crazy or approaching lunacy. [Laughter.] I take it that may be considered negligible.

Now, I am repeating that we must consider the measure solely from the point of view of its influence upon this country. I want also to state that the proponents and the opponents of this bill have no issue as to the precautions which should be taken against the exclusion of the undesirable; that is to say, of the vicious, of the incapable, or of the diseased. There are no measures sufficiently drastic to suit us in that respect. But, on the other hand, we believe that men and women—laborious, meritorious, virtuous—seeking this soil for the chance to cultivate it loyally, anxious to establish homes under the protection of our flag and to rear their children in reverence for our Constitution and our laws, far from being a danger, actual or potential, to this country, are the most valuable contributions to its well-being that can pass through our seaports. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. President, let us test just what the effect of this measure will be. First, I assume that the literacy test can be disregarded as a serious test in itself. Its purpose is to shut out immigration. As one of the speakers said, it is the most effective method that can be employed. The gentleman who represents the Locomotive Brotherhood I do not think was particularly sensitive about the literary quality of these immigrants. He wants them shut out because 350,000 boys, as I think he described them, expected your Excellency to do it. [Laughter.] Now let us see what the effect of that would be. As far as the literacy test is concerned I will say this: That from what your Excellency has heard, I do not think that you would regard with particular favor a measure that distinguished against the laborious and in favor of the loquacious. [Laughter.] I do not think that the literacy test in itself proves any merit whatever except a certain glibness of utterance which might well be dispensed with in favor of expertness in labor. I believe that a calloused hand, a hand calloused by labor, should be a better passport through our customhouse than a tongue supple in several languages. I do not think this country needs linguists; I do think it greatly needs laborers.

Now, in addition, the labor of the country is, I suppose, really at the base of the opposition which comes from gentlemen who are associated with organized labor. I am perfectly willing that the consequences of continuing immigration shall be determined by its influence on the rate of wages to be paid to labor. I know of no test that can establish the prosperity of the country except wages of labor. Now, then, it is absolutely unbelievable that wages can be high unless production is abundant, and that production can be abundant unless prosperity is general. Now, how would this affect labor? These gentlemen seem to think that every man who comes to this country displaces somebody else. They forget the entire structure of our industrial system. No man can work except as somebody gives him an opportunity to work. The man who casts seed upon a western field would be perfectly senseless unless he employed another man to reap, another to transport his grain, another to mill it, and still another to distribute it among the consumers. Would there be any sense in mining ore from the earth if other laborers were not employed to transport it and transmute it into steel? Every man who works creates an opportunity for labor instead of depriving it of an opportunity, and that is especially true with reference to skilled labor. Now, I wonder if these gentlemen realize that skilled labor can not be employed upon the earth, but only on some product of it, and that product must be drawn from the earth by unskilled labor. Can the carpenter ply his trade before he is furnished with lumber, and can he be furnished with lumber until the tree is cut down by the hand of an unskilled workman? Can a bricklayer be paid $6 a day for laying brick if some unskilled workman is not found to carry his bricks? Does anybody suppose he could be paid at that rate if he had to carry his own bricks? Is there any skilled laborer in the world that can work until the raw material of his product is furnished to him as the theater in which his craft must be exercised? Yes; the immigrant does displace the native labor, for this basic labor must be employed before any industry is possible. The immigrant performs that basic labor which is the fountain of all industry. He does displace the native laborer there; but how? He takes the native laborer on his back and lifts him up to a higher plane, where he gets better wages. [Applause.] And as the immigrant straightens himself under the influence of the better conditions he is enjoying he is lifting the native skilled labor higher and ever higher, to better conditions and higher wages.

Mr. President, what other objection is made to this policy that would justify us now in abandoning it? Why, without this stream of immigrants coming in here the supply of commodities would be so diminished that not merely would skilled labor be deprived in a large degree of the materials on which it exercises its craft; but generally, throughout the whole world, there would be a diminution of the supply of commodities, so that the cost of living would go still higher, while the rate of wages would necessarily go lower. This work must be performed or all industry must end; and this laborer, this immigrant, is coming here in streams to perform it so that the native laborer may gain higher wages. He is, Mr. President, the Helot of this age. As the Helot of Sparta gained admission to citizenship by service on the battle field, he comes here to gain citizenship for his children and for himself by more meritorious service still upon the industrial field.

Now, is there any objection on the score of political expediency? If there be corruption in politics throughout this country—and very great corruption has been found in certain localities—they have not been those where naturalized citizens were in the great majority. But, Mr. President, this is not a question of citizenship; this is a question of admission to our population. You speak of tests that should be applied to a man coming into this country, and you say that he must be brought up to the test you exact from your own. Let me ask, Is any test exacted at the ballot box, where the supreme act of sovereignty is exercised by the citizen? Do you exclude men from that greatest of all functions that have ever yet devolved upon the common man because they can not read and write? You are here trying to apply a higher test to the man who comes here to work for you than you apply to the man who governs you. Mr. President, there may be some reasons for applying a literacy test to the exercise of the suffrage. That is not before us now. But the man who comes here to work with his hands must produce more than he consumes, otherwise there would be no profit in employing him. He is a contributor to this land, to its material prosperity, to its wealth, and, I believe, judged by all history, to its stability. He takes from it in return the admission to this life, the greatest boon that can come to a man upon this earth. There is not an unreserved grant on either side. There is service on both sides; and that mutual service has produced what? This people,

Will any of those professors who are so much afraid of the influence of these immigrants upon our labor tell us that there is a people in all the world can compare with us now? And what are we? Why, the product of a commingling of blood—those who live here and those who are constantly coming here. There has not been in the world a population like this, and this population is produced through that free access of all members of the Caucasian race and the commingling of their blood. They are always the best who come, for none but the best would be capable of the determination and the enterprise that would bring them away from home, sacrificing the associations of a lifetime and of the generations that preceded them, facing all the discomforts of an ocean voyage, landing upon this soil with nothing in the world but the capacity to labor. They are the men that we want. We can not have too many of them. We should not put the slightest barrier in their way, but we should ask them to come, that this stream of prosperity of which they have been in a large degree the source, of which they have been in the highest degree the tributaries, shall continue undiminished while this land remains peopled by us and by those who shall follow us.

Mr. President, I might almost say that it would be a very extraordinary thing that this measure should be proposed, if it were not, after all, but another appearance of a tendency old as human nature.

The spirit that is against this immigration under this bill is one form of a conflict that has been waging ever since civilization began. It is a blow against our civilization. Mr. President, there are but two forms of civilization. One might be called the civilization that trusts humanity, the other that distrusts it; one that builds institutions under the conception that if all men be given equal voice in the control of the Government its powers will be exercised for the protection of everyone, and the other which holds man so depraved that if he be trusted with power it will be abused; so that the majority—the poor, who are always a majority—would exercise their political functions to plunder the rich, who are always a minority. These two systems of civilization have been now on trial before the world. Ours is vindicated by the most glorious fruits that a political system ever bore, and it is now sought to change the policy of this country and enact this legislation, conceived in distrust and dislike of humanity. Substitute for that legislation a broad confidence in human kind that has blessed this land as no land ever was blessed before. It is, Mr. President—and I say it with all respect to these gentlemen, for I do not think they quite suspect themselves the real motives and forces that govern them—it is a revival of that savagery which finds a strong exemplification in the desperate war now ravaging foreign lands. This,too, springs from that distrust of humanity which made each nation arm, under the impression that all other nations coveted its territory, and could only be restrained from assailing it by the force that could be organized to resist it. This country conducted its Government on another plan, and now behold, all the countries that took armed precaution against war, based upon distrust of humanity, are being massacred by a dreadful machinery which already has cost the lives of the flower of their youth; and this country, which has trusted entirely in that spirit of humanity that will not assail unless it is assailed, and that will trust where it is trusted, is now in the enjoyment of perfect peace and of a prosperity, not equal to that which was its own when it traded freely with the countries whose industries were throttled, but still without a single building ruined, without a single city attacked, without a field ravaged, without a man killed. Now, the very same spirit that is back of this bill wants that policy abandoned, sir. Nay, they want to put your office in commission. They propose to create a commission of nine to give the Congress and the people information about our armed condition, because we are unprepared. But the Constitution makes you the authority who should furnish that information, and it creates that authority that the peace of the world may be preserved. And you have been faithful to that trust. You have stood against every storm of criticism that would be calculated to move even a man in your exalted place. The same spirit has checked that manifestation, and insists that this country shall remain unarmed, following out this old policy at least until it can be seen whether the result of this war will enable the world to come and adopt ours, before we should even consider being driven to adopt theirs. We earnestly hope that this spirit of distrust exemplified in this bill shall be defeated, and that those features of your policy which this and other measures propose to change, and which I think are the most valuable that this country has ever enjoyed in a great crisis of civilization, shall be upheld. The defeat of this measure will mark the triumph of our civilization, the security of this Government, the continued stream of immigration that will feed the springs of our production and continue our prosperity at least at the level that it has attained, and probably carry it higher than ever; whereas if this measure passes, it not only will impair our prosperity, not merely cloud our credit, but it will darken the prospects of humanity throughout the world.

Mr. President, I am glad that I can couple the prayer of humanity with the demands of this people. This people have a right to ask that a policy tried by 125 years of success shall not be lightly altered. The whole human family look with eyes of unuttered longing to the action that you shall take here, and which shall decide whether this light of hope shall be extinguished forever, an extinction which I believe would be a loss to humanity greater even than the war that is now ravaging a large part of Christendom. [Applause.]

Mr. EDWARD T. CAHILL. Mr. President, I desire to present, as a citizen of the United States, my plea for the nations of Europe and their children. [Handing a book to the President.] I feel that in presenting this as a citizen I am reechoing the sentiments that you reecho. Only those can speak who can feel. In this argument I tell the history of the alien laws; I tell the growth of our country as illustrated in your own acts and your own history; I connect that with our present acts down to date, and bring out a new theory, namely, the right of locomotion, etc.—the right of the people to move from one place to another; and I furthermore bring out all the treaties with reference to that and bring out the further ideal, as our friend from New York said, of you being the great peacemaker of the world. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT. There is a gentleman present, a Mr. Russell, whom I would like to hear for a minute or two.

Mr. CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL. Mr. President, I thank you for kindly allowing me to be heard on this subject.

Some limitation and restriction of immigration is undoubtedly necessary and salutary. We are opposed to this measure because the provision of the literacy test would be unscientific, unsound, and extremely difficult to enforce. Consequently it would not reach the purposes aimed at in the bill. No provision, perhaps, could be more easily evaded than the literacy test.

Next, when there are at least two other tests, two other measures, that would reach the end sought, and that would not be open to the objection of the literacy test, is it not unfortunate that we should adopt this test, which is open to objection on so many grounds and which in all probability can not be enforced?

In behalf, therefore, of the Socialist Party, which I represent here, I offer this protest against the bill, and on one other ground, for I have sat here this morning and have been amazed to note that but one speaker has called attention to what is, in my judgment, the most deadly defect in the measure. Are we aware, Mr. President, of the fact that if this bill becomes a law we have abolished the right of political asylum in the United States? We have done it without a question. Take the provisions in section 12 and in section 28 and the only effect of them will be to utterly destroy the right of political asylum. Who are we, Mr. President, in this country that we should pass judgment upon the measures used by patriots in other countries to effect their liberty? We do that in advance in this provision in regard to the unlawful destruction of property. It is one thing, Mr. President, in a country that has universal suffrage, that has the right of free speech, free assembly, and a free press, it is one thing; but in a country that has none of these rights with respect to agitation for liberty it is a totally different thing. Only those who, like myself, have been engaged in the fight to preserve this right of political asylum in the United States can know how difficult it has been, and how increasingly difficult. This bill proposes finally to abolish that right. Are we ready to take that step? That is the greatest question of all involved in this bill—the right of political asylum. Bear in mind that if we had had this bill as a law in years gone by not one of the eminent refugees that have come here in the last century could have been admitted. Garibaldi, Sigel, John Mitchell, the grandfather of the present mayor of New York, Carl Schurz, every distinguished refugee from a foreign country who had agitated for political freedom would have been excluded if this act had been in force. If we put this law upon the statute books finally, we have abolished that right which has been so difficult to maintain.

In behalf, therefore, of the 1,000,000 Socialists of this country whom I represent I petition you, Mr. President, to veto this bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, to save time, I hope the gentleman from Alabama will ask that all Members who speak on this veto message may have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I make that request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who speak on this veto message be allowed to extend their remarks for five legislative days in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like for the gentleman from Alabama to include other Members also.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I make that request, that all gentlemen be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman modifies his request and asks that all gentlemen have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. If nobody wants to speak—— [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON]. Mr. Speaker, I will occupy the floor myself, to be taken out of my time, until Mr. NORTON is ready to proceed. It is only a matter of getting some papers.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, for more than three centuries the territory included to-day in these United States has been a haven toward which the downtrodden, oppressed, and persecuted of other lands have turned with wistful, longing eyes. Thousands of them have braved the most terrifying dangers of sea and land seeking a home and a better life on this new continent.

The Government which you men on that side and we on this side to-day enjoy was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the cardinal principles of equality and unrestricted opportunity to all men.

For more than a century our Constitution, our laws, and our people have invited and welcomed immigrants to our shores. The unceasing tide of immigration that has flowed from Europe into this Nation for a hundred years has never endangered or menaced its stability. On the contrary, it has enabled us to bring forth to the world out of a wilderness of forests, prairies, and mountains and firmly establish on this continent a Nation incomparably richer in material wealth and richer in the happiness, the contentment, and the political and religious freedom of its people than any nation the hand of God has ever blessed.

With this record of national development and achievement before us under a distinctly American immigration policy, a policy older on this continent than the Nation itself, the proponents of this bill aim to overturn this policy and adopt instead a policy of rigid restriction and exclusion which, in its operation, will debar from admission to this country a large number of poor and unfortunate, honest, healthy European immigrants and will not at all tend to keep out the educated gambler, society

crook, or common rascal who, as an immigrant, comes to us to live by his wiles and his wits and to become an addition to the already large number of parasites feeding off the toil and labor of our honest working class.

The thought impresses me that it would be a very great mistake to now place an embargo on willing hands and brawny muscles. Would it not be much better to increase the efficiency of our existing methods and machinery for distributing arriving aliens so that they might readily reach our vast and scattered demands?

Some of the gentlemen from the South, representing States where the good red blood of honest, healthy European immigration is strikingly conspicuous by its absence and where the greatest illiteracy among native white citizens in this country is to be found, who are most eager for and insistent upon the enactment of this legislation, recall to my mind two pictures I have seen. The first is that of a large lifeboat containing a few apparently well-cared-for and well-groomed professional men, business men, and officers struggling in the billowy waters of the sea. Surrounding the lifeboat are a few poor sailors, with tearful eyes uplifted, beseeching safety in the lifeboat. The occupants of the boat observe the unfortunates in the sea, but give no aid, because they have concluded that the admission of these men to the boat might crowd or inconvenience themselves in some way. The other picture shows the same large lifeboat, with the same occupants, dashed upon the rocks and being lost in the angry waves of the sea for lack of sufficient brawn and muscle to man her oars.

The proponents of the provisions of this bill in a narrowness of vision seem to have lost sight of the birth, the purposes, and the history of this Nation. They who to-day set up the cry that European immigration is the greatest menace to the welfare and well-being of the people of this Nation overlook the underlying principles of this Republic. This cry against honest, healthy, able-bodied immigrants with ready hands and willing hearts to work is not a new cry. It is the same old, narrow, self-centered, selfish complaint that was made by narrow-visioned Americans even in the days when the Nation was in its infancy. In the second annual report of the managers of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism in New York City, published in 1819, we read the following conclusions:

> As to the emigrants from foreign countries, the managers are compelled to speak of them in language of astonishment and apprehension. Through this inlet pauperism threatens us with the most overwhelming consequences.

On page 21 of the same report we find this calamitous complaint:

> For years and generations will Europe continue to send forth her surplus population. The winds and the waves will bring needy thousands to our seaports and this city continue the general point of arrival. Over this subject we can no longer slumber. Shall we behold a moral contagion spreading and expanding with the most inveterate ravages amid the ranks of our growing population without endeavoring to arrest its progress? Shall this mass of immigrants be suddenly identified with ourselves and our children, inculcating their habits and their principles without an effort on our part to stay the impending calamity? Why attempt to exclude the ravages of sickness and disease and suffer the fatal ravages of moral desolation to stalk in triumph among us?

We read from an article published in 1835 entitled "Imminent Dangers to the Institutions of the United States of America Through Foreign Immigration":

> Then we were few, feeble, and scattered. Now we are numerous, strong, and concentrated. Then our accessions of immigration were real accessions of strength from the ranks of the learned and the good, from enlightened mechanic and artisan and intelligent husbandman. Now immigration is the accession of weakness, from the ignorant victims of the priest-ridden slaves of Ireland and Germany, or the outcast tenants of the poorhouses and prisons of Europe.

In the report of the meeting of the delegates of the Native American National Convention held in Philadelphia on July 4, 1845, the following is found in one of the addresses delivered at the meeting:

> It is an incontrovertible truth that the civil institutions of the United States of America have been seriously affected, and that they now stand in imminent peril from the rapid and enormous increase in the body of residents of foreign birth, imbued with foreign feelings, and of an ignorant and immoral character.
>
> The almshouses of Europe are emptied upon our coast, and this by our own invitation, not casually or to a trivial extent, but systematically and upon a constantly increasing scale.

And so this cry against immigration has been made since from almost the birth of this Nation to the present time by those blinded by a narrow selfishness and prejudice, refusing to read or recognize the pages of our country's history, that is so grandly emblazoned with the patriotic deeds and marvelous achievements of thousands of immigrants who reached our shores in deepest poverty and distress, but with the bright hope burning in their breasts that these United States would give the honest labor of their hands and their intellects opportunity to win and enjoy a quiet and peaceful home and a new and a better life.

At first the threatened menace of immigration was from England. Next it was the Irish; then the German immigrant, who was heralded as endangering American institutions. More recently the Swede and the Norwegian immigrant was the subject of attack as being an undesirable addition to our citizenship. To-day we are told the threatened danger lies in immigration from southern Europe and from Poland and Russia. While reading in the library a few days ago I came across a paragraph in an article in the National Geographic Magazine for November, 1914, which is interesting in this connection. The National Geographic Magazine is not, as you know, a political magazine. The paragraph I refer to appears on page 519 of the copy of the magazine I hold in my hand.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a few minutes' additional time.

Mr. MOORE. I yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. NORTON. On this page is a picture of an interesting group of men and women—Russian immigrants to Siberia. Under the picture is the following:

> Such people as these undoubtedly will prove to be the progenitors of a race that will compare with our own sturdy farmers in the Northwest. A group of Russian peasants emigrated to Siberia with nothing but the clothes on their backs, a little flour, some home-tanned leather, and a few tools for carpentry and blacksmithing. The first day they made two sets of ovens out of brick they prepared from a clay bed near by, and the men burned charcoal, while the women made bread. Within two days after their arrival they had six blacksmith's forges going, and inside of 10 days they had built themselves rude houses, made wagons, manufactured spades by the dozen, and reshod their horses, all the iron used being forged on the ground.

And the paragraph concludes with—

> Yet none of them could read or write.

Has the time arrived in this country when we should debar men and women of this kind and character from making homes in this country, which has an area so great that our population could be increased tenfold, and then it would not be as dense as the present population of Germany. I do not think it has. In 1910 we had in the United States but 30.9 people to the square mile of our area, while Germany has 312 and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland 374 to every square mile of area.

We should not allow our better selves and our better senses to be blinded by the blare of the supporters of this shocking measure to the debt we owe to past and present generations of splendid men and women, who came to us from foreign lands knowing nothing of education but knowing everything of honest toil, clean living, and loyal and lasting devotion to their adopted country. We should not forget our duty to open the door of hope to every sincere, honest man, whether he knows how to read or write. We should not pass this bill, for its enactment into law clearly places lettered scoundrelism above untutored industry and virtue.

The action of President Wilson in vetoing this bill and the action of President Cleveland and President Taft in vetoing immigration bills containing the same indefensible, un-American provisions included in this bill has been and will be commended and approved everywhere by those having a proper conception of American ideals and American aspirations. In returning the immigration bill without his approval President Cleveland, in his message to the House of Representatives on March 2, 1897, has well said in reference to the literacy test contained in the bill, the following which in every way applies to the bill we are now considering:

> A radical departure from our national policy relating to immigrants is here presented. Heretofore we have welcomed all who came to us from other lands, except those whose moral or physical condition or history threatened danger to our national welfare and safety. Relying upon the zealous watchfulness of our people to prevent injury to our political and social fabric, we have encouraged those coming from foreign countries to cast their lot with us and join in the development of our vast domain, securing in return a share in the blessings of American citizenship.
>
> A century's stupendous growth, largely due to the assimilation and thrift of millions of sturdy and patriotic adopted citizens, attests the success of this generous and free-handed policy which, while guarding the people's interests, exacts from our immigrants only physical and moral soundness and a willingness and ability to work.
>
> A contemplation of the grand results of this policy can not fail to rouse a sentiment in its defense, for however it might have been regarded as an original proposition and viewed as an experiment, its accomplishments are such that if it is to be uprooted at this late day its disadvantages should be plainly apparent and the substitute adopted should be just and adequate, free from uncertainties, and guarded against difficult or oppressive administration.

The policy and purpose of this bill are indefensible. It is more afraid of illiterate fathers than it is gratified by their educated children. The last census reports clearly show that

the smallest proportion of illiterates is found in this country among the children of our immigrants. Among children of 10 to 14 years of age born of our native white stock 44 in 1,000 can not write. Among the children of our immigrants of the same age only 9 in 1,000 can not write. This bill looks in a nearsighted way, very narrowly at the present, and is blinded to the future. It means well, but it acts without foresight or reason.

Because the literacy test contained in this bill is neither a test of moral character nor a test of intelligence I shall vote against the bill. Because I am not blinded to the fact that the literate children of illiterate immigrants have done many million fold more good for this Nation than any harm that has come to it from immigrants who were unable to read or write I shall vote against this bill. Because the bill in several of its provisions is unreasonable, unfair, and un-American I am opposed to it, and I hope the action of this House will defeat its objectional provisions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in his message vetoing H. R. 6060, the bill to restrict immigration of aliens, the President of the United States says the bill—

> seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men.

The President offers that objection in addition to his objection to the literacy test.

Mr. Speaker, I shall devote the time allotted to me to a discussion of sections 3 and 19, which are the paragraphs to which the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom and other organizations most bitterly object and are the paragraphs to which one of the President's objections applies. Section 3 denies admission to various persons, including—

> persons * * * 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.

Mr. Speaker, that clause, with the exception of the words "who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property," is current law. (Sec. 38, act of 1907.)

Asylum for political refugees is clearly established in the words of the first proviso of section 3 of the present bill, as follows:

> *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of or legally charged with an offense purely political, not involving moral turpitude.

Now, then, a word as to section 19 of the Burnett bill. This section reads as follows:

> That at any time within five years after entry any alien who at the time of entry was a member of one or more of the classes excluded by law; any alien who within five years after entry shall be found advocating or teaching the unlawful destruction of property, or advocating or teaching anarchy, or the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States or of all forms of law or the assassination of public officials * * * shall be deported.

Objection is made to this clause, although most of it is now current law, the new part being:

> Any alien who within five years shall be found advocating or teaching the unlawful destruction of property.

Mr. Speaker, these clauses, in my opinion, make the whole bill worth while and more than overcome any sentimental reasons or "on-first-thought" objections to the so-called literacy test.

"Shall we abolish asylum to those who seek political freedom?" shout those who want still more nostrums of the Old World taught to those who have come here as workers and toilers and who hope to rise through individual effort. And we answer, "Shall we have no redress against those who are flocking to this country to teach sabotage and to inflame and incite those who are here in the hope of bettering their conditions?"

I invite your attention while I read a few paragraphs from an article recently published in the International Socialist Review. This publication can be found, by the way, in nearly all of our public libraries. I have found it nearly always on the tables of libraries of towns of from 10,000 to 25,000 population, and I am informed it is sent to those libraries free of charge. High-school pupils, asked by their teachers to debate socialism, go to the libraries and find such statements as the one I am about to read, which, permit me to say, are not indorsed by all Socialists. The article in question is entitleld "How to make work for the unemployed." It declares that 5,000,000 persons in the United States are in need of work, and says:

> Some writers propose to "organize with the unemployed"; that is, to feed and house them in order to keep them from taking the jobs away from the employed workers. Others, again, want to organize a gunmen defense fund to purchase machine guns and high-powered rifles for all union men, miners especially, that they may protect themselves from the murderous onslaughts of the private armies of the master class. Very well; these tactics may be perfectly good, but the question arises, Who is going to pay for all this?
>
> What the working class needs to-day is an inexpensive method by which to fight the powerful capitalist class, and they have just such a weapon in their own hands.
>
> This weapon is without expense to the working class, and if intelligently and systematically used it will not only reduce the profits of the exploiters, but also create more work for the wage earners. If thoroughly understood and used more extensively it may entirely eliminate the unemployed army.

To illustrate what he calls the "efficacy of this method of warfare"—which is sabotage, pure and simple—the writer cites an incident which occurred in the district I have the honor to represent. He says:

> Some time ago the writer was working in a big lumberyard on the west coast, where nearly all the work around the water fronts and lumberyards is temporary.
>
> The writer and three others got orders to load up five box cars with shingles. When we commenced the work we found, to our surprise, that every shingle bundle had been cut open—that is, the little strip of sheet iron that holds the shingles tightly together in a bundle had been cut with a knife or a pair of shears on every bundle in the pile—about 3,000 bundles in all.
>
> When the boss came around we notified him about the accident, and, after exhausting his supply of profanity, he ordered us to get the shingle press and rebundle the whole batch. It took the four of us 10 whole days to put that shingle pile into shape again. And our wages for that time, at the rate of 32 cents per hour, amounted to $134. By adding the loss on account of delay in shipment, the "holding money" for the five box cars, etc., we found that the company's profit for that day had been reduced about $300.
>
> So there you are. In less than half an hour's time somebody had created 10 days' work for four men who would have been otherwise unemployed, and at the same time cut a big chunk off the boss's profit. No lives were lost; no property was destroyed; there were no lawsuits; nothing that would drain the resources of the organized workers. But there were results. That's all.
>
> This same method of fighting can be used in a thousand different ways by the skilled mechanic or machine hand as well as by the common laborer.

The article goes on to give further instructions as to how to practice sabotage in all lines. This is a new thing, comparatively, in this country, although it has been growing rapidly during the past three or four years. It has come from abroad, along with the teaching and preaching by clever agitators that individualism has played out in the United States—that opportunity is gone. These teachings are coming right along with the influx of more than a million aliens a year. The more illiterate of the aliens, once here, quickly absorb the teachings. Some of the worst of our recent strikes can be attributed, in part, to these things.

Gentlemen, I tell you frankly that that is why the American Federation of Labor is for the provisions of this bill. Their leaders know the disorder such preachings bring about. That organization has had to stand against such agitators. Sometimes I think that great employers of labor have been so busy fighting organized labor that they have not had time to see just how the newly arrived alien labor is organizing and what kind of riot it must produce in time.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt but that the article, "How to create more work for the unemployed," has been printed in a dozen languages in this country. I have seen similar and even worse printed in nearly all of the languages. Personally, I went over to Paterson, N. J., during the Industrial Workers of the World strike in the silk mills, and heard such stuff preached to the foreign workers, the majority of whom had not been in the United States two years. I heard it translated to them in their various languages. I heard the poor foreigners told that they had lost the strike, but if they would go back to the mills and secretly ruin as many bolts of silk as possible they would win the next strike. They were told to drop threads and let dyes run, and that the time would soon come when they would themselves run the mills and factories. And they believed it.

Mr. Speaker, if I had my way I would not only restrict immigration, but for the present would suspend it. [Applause.]

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Were not those statements made and those teachings given by men who could read and write; every one of whom could stand this literacy test?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Of course; and they were teaching them to aliens, many of whom could neither read nor write, and who had not found overnight the opportunities they had been misled to believe exist in the United States for all who come.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this clause in this bill does not stop those who are seeking political freedom, but it does say that those who shall be found, in five years after entry, advocating or teaching unlawful destruction of property shall be deported, and it is pretty generally agreed that they should be deported. I can point out to you to-day any number of foreign-born editors, editing publications of this class, who have not even sought naturalization, and, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BURKE] says, of a highly educated class, teaching those newcomers the very things that will destroy this Government if not checked.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The gentleman evidently has not caught my question. He has not debated it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have answered the question, I think. Remember, I am not discussing the literacy provision of the bill. I have not time. I am addressing myself to what I think is far more important. In my opinion, the matter of the literacy test—that is, the ability to read, and not write, 30 to 40 words of one's native tongue or jargon—is a minor matter and will create no such heartbreaking or distress as some imagine. Neither will it restrict as heavily as I wish it would, but it will do something, and should be enacted into law. The best estimates show that about two or three hundred thousand of the poorest class of immigrants might be stopped.

The gates of the United States will be open to nearly all who want to come. Those in far-off lands who know of the free institutions of the United States, and who would like to come to us but who are detained through ignorance and inability to read the simplest words in their language, still will have the great hope that their children or their children's children may come here and be of us. [Applause.] Let us hope that they will not find a country brought down to the level of their own.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

ACTION OF STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I desire to add to my remarks a resolution recently adopted by the Washington State Federation of Labor, assembled in annual convention at Olympia, Wash., January 18 to January 22, 1915, as follows:

Whereas the present industrial crisis in the State of Washington demands remedy, and it is apparent that the Immigration Service is seriously handicapped for the lack of funds to properly enforce the present existing laws; and

Whereas statistics shows that 1,400,000 immigrants entered the United States during the last fiscal year; and

Whereas the Immigration Service is the only department of our Government that is self-supporting, a head tax of $4 per head being required from every immigrant entering this country, and, as Government figures show, during the last fiscal year $6,700,000 expended in the administration of existing immigration laws, and it appears that immigrants in large numbers are crossing the boundary line into Washington, with but little inspection because of the parsimonious attitude of the Federal Government: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Washington State Federation of Labor call upon the State's Representatives in Congress to demand that the money acquired for the purpose of administration of existing immigration laws be expended for that purpose.

I desire to add also a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, as follows:

House joint memorial No. 2.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, respectfully petition that—

Whereas during the year ending January 30, 1910, Government statistics show that more than 1,000,000 aliens landed in the United States, of which number more than 600,000 came from southern and eastern Asia, the most undesirable immigrant known; and

Whereas the effect of this alien deluge is to depress the wages and destroy the employment of thousands of American workingmen: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House and Senate of the State of Washington, That the Congress of the United States be requested to pass such restricted legislation as will put a stop to this enormous influx of the most undesirable foreigners, whose presence tends to destroy American standards of living; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted to each Senator and Congressman from the State of Washington for their use in endeavoring to secure the passage of such restricted legislation.

Passed the house January 19, 1911.

HOWARD D. TAYLOR,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the senate January 24, 1911.

W. H. PAULHAMUS,
President of the Senate.

The Washington State Legislature of 1915 is now in session, and to-day—just now—I received a telegram. Both house and senate urge the passage of this bill over the President's veto. The telegram follows:

OLYMPIA, WASH., *February 4, 1915.*

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States the Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill; and

Whereas the same is to be brought up for action on the President's veto Thursday, February 4, 1915: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, That the secretary of state of the State of Washington be, and he is hereby, directed to telegraph to each Member of the delegation in Congress from this State a request that he vote for the passage of the said Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill over the President's veto.

I. M. HOWELL, *Secretary of State.*

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the argument just made by the gentleman who preceded me [Mr. JOHNSON of Washington] convinces me that he is on the wrong tack. It is not the illiterate immigrant who is a menace to this country, according to his argument, but it is the educated foreigner who comes to these shores. I, for one, would gladly vote for this bill or any other bill to keep that kind of immigrants out. I have as little use, as he has, for those foreigners who come here to preach the doctrines of anarchy and destruction of property. They are a menace to our institutions. But they are the products of their education, some of them, no doubt, hold university degrees. My objection to this bill is the so-called literacy test. The literacy test will keep out a class of men who have had no opportunity to become educated in their own countries and who want to come to this land of opportunity in order to better their condition in life. No question is raised as to their character, their manhood, their physical ability to perform that hard manual labor which the educated man will not perform. But this question of emigration into the United States is not a new one. In every stage of the country's history we have read and heard of the efforts to keep out foreign elements. Thomas Jefferson in his first annual message to Congress made this statement:

And shall we refuse to the unhappy fugitives from distress that hospitality which the savages of the wilderness extended to our fathers arriving in this land? Shall oppressed humanity find no asylum on this globe?

I have not always been able to agree with the President of the United States in his policies, but in his veto message to this House on this bill he hit the nail squarely on the head when he said, in effect, that the literacy test tends to deprive a man who had not had opportunities in his own land from getting the benefit of the opportunities that this country would afford.

Away back in 1797, in the Fourth or Fifth Congress, the question of immigration and naturalization was up, and I was greatly pleased a few moments ago to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] express the liberal views he did on this floor on this question, for this is what a Massachusetts Representative said on the subject of immigration back in 1797. I read from McMaster's History of the People of the United States, volume 2, page 332:

The door for immigrants was open too wide. It would be wise to close it a little. Too many foreigners came to the States. Already they were out of all proportion to native citizens. When the country, said Otis, was new, it may have been good policy to admit all. But it is so no longer. A bar should be placed against the admittance of those restless people who can not be tranquil and happy at home. We do not want "a vast horde of wild Irishmen let loose upon us."

[Laughter.]

At that time it was the Irishman; a little later it was the German; then, still later, it was the Scandinavian; and now it is the immigrant from southern Europe. Mr. Chairman, it is a remarkable thing that opposition to illiterate immigrants comes from those sections of the Union to which the smallest percentage of the immigrants migrate and where illiteracy among native whites and children of native white parentage is greatest. [Applause.] "Physician, heal thyself." Teach your own children how to read and write; teach your own people how to read and write; and when you have done that, then begin to talk about literacy tests in an immigration bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, one plank of the labor section of the Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore, July 2, 1912, reads as follows:

The expanding organization of industry makes it essential that there should be no abridgment of the right of wage earners and producers to organize for the protection of wages and the improvement of labor conditions to the end that such labor organizations and their members should not be regarded as illegal combinations in restraint of trade.

In his speech of acceptance of the presidential nomination by the Democratic Party, Hon. Woodrow Wilson took occasion to make the following declaration:

The working people of America—if they must be distinguished from the minority that constitutes the rest of it—are, of course, the backbone of the Nation. No law that safeguards their life; that improves the physical and moral conditions under which they live; that makes their (the working people of America) hours of labor rational and tolerable; that gives them freedom to act in their own interest; and that protects them where they can not protect themselves can properly be regarded as class legislation or as anything but a measure taken in the interest of the whole people, whose partnership in right action we are trying to establish and make real and practical. It is in this spirit that we shall act if we are genuine spokesmen of the whole country.

The declarations of the Democratic platform and the language of Mr. Wilson's letter of acceptance of the Democratic nomination for President were an assurance to the labor world that in the Democratic Party and Mr. Wilson it would find its true friends and loyal advocates. Believing in the assurances of the Democratic Party and accepting it at its written word, the labor leaders and labor organizations and the laboring people generally throughout the country, some 2,000,000 in number, went pell-mell into the Democratic camp and became among the most loyal and enthusiastic supporters of the candidacy of Mr. Wilson. They went the length, at least in voice and vote, in putting their supposed friend and champion in the White House. After President Wilson had been inaugurated President of these United States and after the overwhelmingly Democratic House and Senate had settled down to business and undertaken the work, supposedly at least, of carrying out the Democratic pledges to the country, labor was anxious and soon expected to realize the fruition of its dreams in the fulfillment of the Democratic pledges and promises to it. Labor thought it had succeeded in less than 90 days in having the first one of its list of grievances carried in the sundry civil appropriation bill of June 23, 1913, and which reads as follows:

Enforcement of antitrust laws: For the enforcement of antitrust laws, including not exceeding $10,000 for salaries of necessary employees at the seat of government, $300,000: *Provided, however,* That no part of this money shall be spent in the prosecution of any organization or individual for entering into any combination or agreement having in view the increasing of wages, shortening of hours, or bettering the conditions of labor, or for any act done in furtherance thereof, not in itself unlawful: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the prosecution of producers of farm products and associations of farmers who cooperate and organize in an effort to and for the purpose to obtain and maintain a fair and reasonable price for their products.

The sundry civil bill, with this proviso, passed both the House and the Senate and was sent to the President for his signature. After much hesitation he finally signed it, with the following statement attached thereto:

I have signed this bill because I can do so without in fact limiting the opportunity or the power of the Department of Justice to prosecute violations of the law, by whomsoever committed. If I could have separated from the rest of the bill the item which authorizes the expenditure by the Department of Justice of a special sum of $300,000 for the prosecution or violation of the antitrust law, I would have vetoed that item, because it places upon the expenditure a limitation which is, in my opinion, unjustifiable in character and principle. But I could not separate it. I do not understand that the limitation was intended as either an amendment or an interpretation of the antitrust law, but merely as an expression of the opinion of the Congress.

I can assure the country that this item will neither limit nor in any way embarrass the actions of the Department of Justice. Other appropriations supply the department with abundant funds to enforce the law. The law will be interpreted in the determination of what the department should do, by independent and, I hope, impartial judgments as to the true and just meaning of substantive statutes of the United States.

The President says, as forcefully as English can put it, that if he could have separated the item in the bill which provides that no part of the $300,000 therein appropriated should be used in the prosecution of any organization or individual from entering into any agreement or combination for the betterment of their conditions, he would have done so.

I would have vetoed that item—

He says—

because it places upon the expenditure a limitation which is, in my opinion, unjustifiable in character and principle.

The President continues:

I do not understand that the limitation was intended as either an amendment or interpretation of the antitrust law, but merely an expression of the opinion of Congress.

That is to say that Congress was not engaged in attempting to write a law or interpret one on this subject, but merely expressing its opinion as to what ought to be done in the premises. Congress! Congress! What a senseless and useless body, from the President's viewpoint. But the President further says:

I can assure the country that this item will neither limit nor in any way embarrass the actions of the Department of Justice—

in dealing with these labor fellows and their organizations. After the President had thus delivered himself labor had an awakening, but hoped for better things. So by and by the so-called Clayton antitrust bill came before Congress. Labor wanted Congress in this bill to do more than "merely express an opinion" on what it thought its rights under the law ought to be; so it insisted, and insisted strenuously, that there should be some real "labor exemptions" put in that bill and not mere empty words or expressions of opinion. The Judiciary Committee and the Democratic leaders refused to incorporate into the bill the provision desired by labor. A fight with the administration was imminent. It looked like there was going to be a regular knockdown and drag-out battle. The situation was interesting. A good deal of hotfooting went on from Capitol Hill to the White House. Numerous conferences were held in the hope of reaching an agreement. Finally there was incorporated in the so-called Clayton antitrust bill this provision:

Nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations instituted for the purposes of mutual help and not having capital stock or conducted for profit, or to forbid or restrain individual members of such organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof; nor shall such organizations, or the members thereof, be held or construed to be illegal combinations or conspiracies in restraint of trade under the antitrust laws.

It will be remembered that the Supreme Court had held that the Sherman antitrust law did not exempt labor organizations from its operation. The court held in the Danbury hatters' case that such organizations were combinations in restraint of trade and therefore unlawful and liable for threefold damages. Labor wanted its organizations taken out from the operation of the Sherman antitrust law. Whether the provision as incorporated in the Clayton bill meets labor's grievance is a question for the courts to decide. The President says that it "grants no privilege not already enjoyed." One paper said, speaking of the provision:

It was frankly stated at the White House yesterday that the compromise provision was not an exemption provision; that, in other words, the labor unions would not be exempted from prosecution under the Sherman law.

When the President's views as to this provision in the Clayton bill became known to labor and the farmers, they wondered if they had not been handed a gold brick. That the President's position was hostile there seemed no further room to doubt.

THE EVILS OF UNDESIRABLE IMMIGRATION.

But this by no means tells the entire story. For many years organized labor, among others, has insisted that there was too much cheap labor being imported into this country; that the number ought to be greatly curtailed. Those favoring legislation to this end have practically agreed that what is known as the reading, or literacy, test is the best adapted for this purpose. There have been seven record votes in the House and five in the Senate on this question. On an average the House votes stood 192 to 73 favoring the reading test, while the average of the Senate vote was 52 to 19. As recent as January 15, of this year, this House sent this illiteracy-test bill to the President on the decisive vote of 227 to 94, although it was known by this House at the time that the President was opposed to the reading test for the admission of immigrants to this country.

The Senate has spoken in equally emphatic terms, having passed the bill after four weeks' fight by a vote of 50 to 7, notwithstanding the President's known opposition to it. The President has returned the bill to the House without his signature, accompanying it with a veto message. It is openly stated that the patronage whip has been suspended over the heads of Members in the hope of lashing them into line to support the President's veto. If the Clerk here should now begin to call the roll of this House, the A's on the Democratic side would not be passed before there would be found men with whom this matter had been talked over at the White House and their support of the President's veto earnestly insisted upon, notwithstanding the fact that they have committed themselves for it, voiced their convictions for it, and expressed the wish and will of their constituents by previously voting for it. And why the President should now disapprove the literacy test is, as I remarked at the outset, passing strange. As a private citizen, as an author and writer of books, aye, even as a presidential candidate, it seems that he entertained different views from the ones now absorbing his mind, and no doubt by his historical writing and campaign speeches induced confiding constituencies to entertain the expectation that this

needed legislation would meet a different fate at his hands. In his History of the American People, volume 5, page 212, we find this language, speaking of the character of immigrants that now come to this country:

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 this country or else men of the Latin-Gallic stocks of France and northern Italy, but now there came multitudes of men of the lower 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.

He says, from the character of immigrants that have recently been coming to our shores, that it looks—

as if the countries of the south of Europe were disburdening themselves of the more sordid and hopeless elements of their population—the men whose standards of life and of work were such as American workingmen had never dreamed of hitherto.

And the President, by his veto of the immigration bill, is refusing to close the door to the admission of the very class that he condemned. He says that they are a "coarse crew" that come "crowding in every year at our eastern ports." He had a chance to stop this "coarse crew" from crowding in each year at our eastern ports, but he has failed to avail himself of that opportunity. In its national platform, as far back as 1896, the Democratic Party said:

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.

The Democratic platform upon which President Wilson was elected declared unequivocally for the rights of labor and its protection.

Not only as a teacher, professor, and historian did Woodrow Wilson advocate and represent that he was a restrictionist, but as a candidate for the Presidency he gave the people of this country to understand that he stood for the very legislation contained in this bill. This identical measure passed the Senate April 19, 1912; was reported to the House by the House Committee on Immigration June 7, 1912; and therefore was pending before the House during the campaign, being an issue. Not only was it pending before the House, but the Democratic leaders of the House had announced that the bill would be put through the first thing in December, a special rule having even been agreed on. Candidate Wilson's immigration speech in New York City, September 4, 1912, contained among other things the following paragraph:

If we can hit upon a standard which admits every voluntary immigrant and excludes those who have not come of their own motion, with their own purpose of making a home and a career here for themselves, but have been induced by steamship companies or others in order to pay the passage money, then we will have what we will all agree upon as Americans. I am speaking to you as also Americans with myself, and just as much American as myself, and if we all take the American point of view, namely, that we want American life kept to its standards, and that only the standards of American life shall be standards of restriction, then we are all upon a common ground, not of those who criticize immigration, but those who declare themselves Americans. I am not saying that I am wise enough out of hand to frame the legislation that will meet this idea. I am only saying that it is the ideal, and that is what we ought to hold ourselves to. * * * Of course, if the immigrants are allowed to come in uninstructed hosts and to stop at the ports where they enter and there to compete in an oversupplied labor market, there is going to be unhappiness, there is going to be deterioration, there is going to be everything that will be detrimental to the immigrant.

That was his declaration on the stump and in New York City before the editors and sympathizers of the so-called American Association of Foreign Language Newspaper Editors, who were attacking him almost daily as a restrictionist. Brave words. Note his language, saying that the "Standards of American life *shall* be the standards of restriction." With this very bill passed the Senate and pending on the House calendar, and with our State compulsory school-attendance laws and public-school system as one of America's fundamental institutions and standards, there is only one thing such language could mean to the average voter, and that was that Candidate Wilson stood for requiring as much of foreigners as we compel of our own native-born in the way of an elementary education, in order to better fit them for earning a living, worshiping God according to the dictates of their own conscience, and intelligently participating in our public affairs.

What a shock this veto must be to the friends of this bill who were misled into thinking that Woodrow Wilson was a restrictionist! What a revelation it must be to them to read and hear that the President feels himself "pledged" to veto this splendid measure! And how roughly handled they must feel when they read accounts such as that in the Boston Evening Transcript of January 28 last, stating that "it is charged even by Democrats that the administration is 'picking off' men from the ranks of the friends of the bill, and the opponents of the literacy test declare that this 'teamwork' in the Cabinet * * * will be successful." But it is not a "long way to" the next presidential election, and the voters' hearts are "right there."

The Boston Transcript in a recent editorial had this to say:

The somersault of Mr. Woodrow Wilson on the immigration plank should surprise no one. It is only the latest illustration of the politician reversing the position of the historian. For 20 years as teacher and writer of history he wrote against "the alien invasion" and brought to bear the heaviest guns of his rhetoric against this "menace." After two years of silence in the White House, which no committee of Congress was able to break, the President has finally announced his opposition to the immigration bill, which has passed the House and is before the Senate, on the ground that it carries a literacy test. Before deciding to pass the enactment up to the President for his veto, we hope the Senate will sound the White House with a view to ascertaining what form of restriction the President would suggest, or whether his somersault on the subject is so complete that he to-day favors a continuance of unrestricted immigration.

The President by his veto says he favors the continuance of unrestricted immigration; for in his opposition to the literacy test, he opposes the most feasible method of restricting immigration.

It will be remembered that a few years ago Congress created an Immigration Commission to investigate this whole subject, and particularly the feasibility of the literacy test. This commission, after an extensive investigation both in this country and in Europe costing $1,000,000 and covering a period of four years, made a voluminous report covering 42 volumes, and in that report among other things said:

A majority of the commission (8 out of the 9) favored the reading and writing test as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration.

This commission composed of both Republicans and Democrats, unanimously recommended to Congress that immigration be restricted. The commission unanimously agreed and reported that there was "an oversupply of unskilled labor in the basic industries of this country." Congress and the country both agree that the influx of undesirable immigrants to this country ought to be stopped.

In the last 18 years, either the House or the Senate has 19 times emphatically declared for the reading test. In the years 1912–13 the House of Representatives favored the literacy test by a vote of 178 to 52, and the Senate by a vote of 57 to 8.

The bill that the President has just vetoed because of the literacy test was passed by the House by a vote of 252 to 126, and by the Senate by a vote of 50 to 7. We have heard a good deal said by the Democratic Party in recent years about letting "the people rule." They have gone before the country seeking its suffrage with that as a slogan. President Wilson has himself boasted much of that principle as one of his virtues, yet the fact remains that the principles embodied in no measure have been so long before the American people; have been so well understood by them; or have been indorsed by so many of them as the principles embodied in the immigration measure vetoed by the President. If this measure is not indorsed by the body of the American people and their Representatives in Congress, no important measure that ever became a law has ever been.

President Wilson in vetoing the immigration bill said:

If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so.

The American people have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants daily coming to our shores, but I deny that in so doing they are reversing "the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them."

Let us look first into the question as to whether or not the American people have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants that yearly crowd our shores, over 1,000,000 in number. Away back in 1896, nearly 20 years ago, when the evils of immigration were not so great and not so well understood 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. In the Republican national platform of 1900 we find this language:

In the further interest of American workmen we favor a more effective restriction of the immigration of cheap labor from foreign lands—

And so forth.

In his first message to Congress in 1901, ex-President Roosevelt said:

The second object of a proper immigration law ought to be to secure a careful and not merely perfunctory educational test.

The Republican national platform of the 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.

And I want to say that a Republican Congress promptly after the election of 1896 passed an illiteracy test bill, which was vetoed by a Democratic President, Grover Cleveland, and that such a bill would now be law if proportionately as many Democrats as Republicans would vote or had voted for the measure.

The Democratic Party—the party of the President—in its national Democratic platform in 1896, said:

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.

The Democratic platforms of 1900 and 1904 both demand more stringent immigration laws of one sort or another, and yet after all this the President is not advised as to what the American people want, and asks in his short veto message of this long bill: "Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction?"

After that part of the immigration bill to which the President objects has been favorably acted upon divers times by both branches of Congress, and by overwhelming majorities, still the President says he is not advised as to the desire of the American people upon this subject. If the representatives of the American people in this and previous Congresses have properly reflected the views of their constituents by their votes on this question, the President ought to be advised.

Now let me answer, if I can do it, the President's second proposition, namely, that in its insistence upon the literacy or other arbitrary tests Congress is "reversing the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before." I take issue with that statement of the President. With due deference to him and his great learning, I say that he is wrong.

From the first settlement of this country down to about 1838 immigrants came here as a matter of course. This country had no policy upon the immigration question up to that time. In that year the House of Representatives 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. Then and there we took steps against admitting paupers and vagabonds.

If we had any policy of admitting them up to that time, it was then reversed. In the meantime a number of the States had begun to pass laws restricting immigration, notably, New York, Massachusetts, California, and Louisiana. These States saw most of immigrants and immigration and were the first to see and feel its evil effects. But their laws differed one from another. Each State had its own peculiar notion as to who ought to be debarred. It was soon apparent that the problem was too big for the individual States to handle; that it was national in its scope. The constitutionality of a number of the State laws reached the Supreme Court of the United States for final decision, and on March 20, 1876, that court, in a very unusual decision, said:

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.

Then came efforts of the States to restrict immigration until such was held unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court, since which day Congress has been passing one immigration bill after another, and each of them has been more stringent and more exclusive of immigration than the preceding ones.

The law of August 3, 1882, among other things, provided that each immigrant to this country should pay a head tax of 50 cents; that "lunatics, idiots, convicts except for political offense, and persons likely to become a public charge" should not be permitted to land. Another reversal of our traditional policy, Mr. President.

The law of February 26, 1885, forbade the importation of contract labor to this country. The law of February 23, 1887, gave the Secretary of the Treasury the 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.

The act of March 3, 1891, added to the list of aliens heretofore excluded the following: Those "suffering from a loathsome or contagious disease," "polygamist," and those "whose ticket or passage is paid for with the money of another, or who is assisted by others to come," with certain exceptions. Steamship companies were forbidden by this act to solicit or encourage immigration. I wonder if the President would regard this as the reversal of a policy or the establishing of one?

In 1894 Congress passed an act raising the head tax of immigrants from 50 cents to $1 each.

On March 3, 1903, Congress passed another act raising the head tax to $2, and made it unlawful to assist in the entry or naturalization of alien anarchists.

On February 20, 1907, Congress passed another law further restricting undesirable immigrants. This is the last important law passed by Congress and signed by the President. It adds very materially to the classes of immigrants to be excluded. Not including those heretofore mentioned, it says the following, among others, shall be excluded: "Feeble-minded persons," "epileptics," "insane persons," "persons likely to become a public charge," "professional beggars," "prostitutes, or women or girls coming into the United States for the purpose of prostitution or other immoral purposes." With but one single exception, every law passed by the Congress of the United States from the day and hour that it began to legislate upon the subject of immigration has been a law of restriction, and each law adding to the excluded classes of immigrants. The single exception, to which I have referred, was the law passed in 1864. It was a law passed to encourage the importation of contract labor; but it was repealed, however, in 1868, four years after its passage. In the face of this record and these facts, how can the President say that in adding the literacy or reading test we are reversing the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before us? We are not reversing their policy, but sustaining their policy, in further excluding some 250,000 of the 1,000,000 or more immigrants that are annually coming to this country. Few there be, I think, who will contend that further restriction of immigrants is not desirable.

I will not go into the voluminous 41-volume report of the Congressional Immigration Commission further than to briefly answer the arguments of those who maintain that existing immigration law is sufficient by quoting what the commission, which employed trained experts, expended a million dollars in a searching inquiry, and spent four years gathering together indisputable proof of the following conclusion of the commission, says in its first partial report, namely, House Document 1489, under the heading, "The Immigration Law and Its Administration":

It is generally admitted by those acquainted with the subject that, notwithstanding the fact that the present law proposes to provide for the exclusion of every undesirable immigrant, *many undeniably undesirable persons are admitted every year.* The commission's inquiries concerning defective and delinquent classes show this fact very clearly and in a way which, it is believed, will be thoroughly understood and appreciated. In theory the law debars criminals, but in fact many enter; the law debars persons likely to become public charges, but data secured by the commission show that too many immigrants become such within a short time after landing. The same is true of other classes nominally, at least, debarred by the law. In short, the law, in theory, so far as its exclusion provisions are concerned, is exceptionally strong, but in effect it is in some respects *weak and ineffectual.* The commission has discovered several sources of this weakness; it is its purpose to find the others and to recommend some effective remedies.

I have here the New York World of February 1, 1915, which contains a long editorial, entitled, "Over 8,000 alien insane," and which declares that these 8,000 alien insane "represent a burden from which" the taxpayers of the Empire State are "entitled to be relieved." The World estimates that these alien insane impose an annual financial burden on the taxpayers of New York State of about $2,000,000. New York State officials have testified before committees of Congress that it is about $4,000,000, or, in other words, that about one-sixth of all the taxes levied in New York for State purposes are levied for the care and keep of insane. This bill would lift millions of dollars of taxes from the shoulders of the taxpayers of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and other Northeastern States, and tend to prevent the dumping of mental and physical degenerates upon this country, whose progeny will simply water the lifeblood of this country, as well as overburden our taxpayers.

The two dominant political parties in their national platforms have for years been pledging to the American people more stringent immigration laws. The Immigration Commission, after four years' investigation, both in this country and in Europe, unanimously reported in favor of further restricting immigration to this country, declaring: "The commission as a whole recommends restriction as demanded by economic, moral, and social considerations, furnishes in its report reasons for such restriction, and points out methods by which Congress can attain the desired result if its judgment coincides with that of

the commission" (Vol. I, p. 48). Congress has frequently so declared itself, and more than one attempt has been made to pass such bills over Executive veto. And if it be admitted that further restriction is desirable, ought it not in all fairness be applied to the least desirable element of our immigration? In this immigration problem we have got to deal with classes and not individuals. To say that an illiterate class of citizens is more desirable than an educated class gives the lie to the favored boast of Americans that we are an educated and enlightened citizenry. If ignorance is better and more preferable in our citizens than enlightenment, we had better tear down our institutions of learning and abolish our boasted public-school system in America. If to fit our own American boys and girls for proper and efficient American citizenship we expend annually on them in tuition alone some $500,000,000, have we not a right to demand that immigrants coming to this country who are over 16 years of age shall at least be able to read some language or dialect? The American citizen who can not even read or write, but who has been reared in America, surrounded by Americans, and who has observed the workings of its Government, caught the spirit of its institutions, imbibed its lofty ideals, and inherited its progress and freedom is infinitely better prepared for wholesome American citizenship than any illiterate foreigner possibly could be.

The bill the President has vetoed makes 200 changes in the immigration laws, 50 of which are big changes. The President recognizes the force and value of these, for in his veto message he said:

This bill is in so many respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable. Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates.

Why should the President destroy, so far as in his power lies, a bill which he concedes to be a good one. He admits that "the bill is in many respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable," and yet he vetoes it! He says he does it because it reverses a "policy of generations that have gone before." Instead of Congress "reversing the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them," has not the President reversed their policy? Has not he also reversed the policy of his own party? The Democratic Party, in its national platform of 1896, said:

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.

That declaration of principles of the Democratic Party has at no time been recalled or reversed. It is the policy of the Democratic Party to-day, if its declaration of principles in national convention assembled mean anything. A majority of the Democrats in both House and Senate voted to redeem their party's pledge, but the President, exercising his constitutional right, says, "No."

I believe it was Louis XIV of France who once said: "I am the State." The President expresses it differently when he says: "I am the captain of the team." And I agree that the President is "the captain of the team." When he tells the boys to "play ball," they usually "play ball."

BROKEN PLATFORM PLEDGES.

The Democratic platform upon which President Wilson was nominated and elected said:

We favor national aid to State and local authorities in the construction and maintenance of post roads.

It is said that Hon. DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD, of Missouri, the present chairman of the Roads Committee of the House of Representatives, wrote that plank of the Democratic platform. Mr. SHACKLEFORD was in earnest about it. He really thought that the Democratic Party intended to carry out that pledge to the country. He went ahead and passed a bill through the House many, many moons ago looking to that end. It would be embarrassing to ask the gentleman from Missouri what has become of his bill? He would hate to tell you that the President had put the cold hand of death upon it. Mr. SHACKLEFORD's good-roads bill has not been passed by the Senate. It will not be. Did not the President tell Senator SWANSON that they did not have the money for the roads legislation? Yet the Democratic Congress has at the President's suggestion passed a law whereby the United States Government is to spend $40,000,000 in railroad building in Alaska, and now he is trying to jam through a bill appropriating $50,000,000 with which to buy ships for the shipping interests; now, and in these times when the people are forced to pay war taxes when their country is at peace with the whole world.

The Democratic platform upon which the President was elected did not call for these expenditures, but it did call for Federal aid to State and local authorities in the construction of good roads. The lost Shackleford good-roads bill called for $25,000,000 for this purpose. The Democratic administration did not have $25,000,000 to spend on good dirt roads here in the several States, but did have $40,000,000 to spend on railroads in Alaska.

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS.

But these are not the only broken promises of the Democratic Party to the American people. They said in their Baltimore platform:

We favor the exemption from toll of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the canal.

This is what Democracy in its national platform declared for in 1912, and is what President Wilson stood for before he was elected President. I shall read the President's speech made to the 2,500 farmers at Washington Park, N. J., on August 15, 1912:

One of the great objects in cutting that great ditch across the Isthmus of Panama is to allow farmers who are near the Atlantic to ship to the Pacific by way of the Atlantic ports, to allow all the farmers on what I may, standing here, call this part of the continent, to find an outlet at ports of the Gulf or the ports of the Atlantic seaboard, and then have coastwise steamers carry their products down around through the canal and up the Pacific coast or down the coast of South America.

Now, at present there are no ships to do that, and one of the bills pending—passed, I believe, yesterday by the Senate as it has passed the House—provides for free toll for American ships through that canal and prohibits any ship from passing through which is owned by any American railroad company. You see the object of that, don't you? [Applause.] We don't want the railroads to compete with themselves, because we understand that kind of competition. We want water carriage to compete with land carriage, so as to be perfectly sure that you are going to get better rates around the canal than you would across the continent.

It will be remembered that the Democratic House of Representatives had passed the Panama Canal tolls bill before the Democrats met in national convention at Baltimore in July, 1912. The Democratic national convention indorsed what the House had done by inserting in its platform the Panama Canal tolls plank to which I have made reference. The day before the President made his speech to the 2,500 farmers at Washington Park, N. J., on August 15, 1912, indorsing what the Democratic House had done and what the Democratic national convention had declared for, the Senate also passed the bill, and the President indorsed that. But after the President was elected he came hat in hand up on Capitol Hill one day where the House and Senate was in session and said: "Boys, we've got to take her back. Acting under your oaths as legislators, you said that American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the Panama Canal should not pay any toll. The Democratic platform upon which I was nominated and elected declared for the same thing. I declared for the same thing in my speeches before election. I have not forgotten what I said to those New Jersey farmers and the country before election, but we've got to take it all back. I can not tell you why this is so, but I have reversed myself on the question of tolls of American ships passing through the canal, and you must reverse yourselves. You have already jumped through the hoop and passed the law. I shall have to ask you to jump back through the hoop again and undo what you have done. I shall have to ask you to pass a law to make American ships pay tolls." The law was passed. The "crow" was eaten, but few, if any, of the legislators have ever known why it was necessary.

RURAL CREDITS.

But this is only a part of the story. The Democratic platform upon which President Wilson was elected said:

Of equal importance with the question of currency reform is the question of rural credits, or agricultural finance. We favor legislation permitting national banks to loan a reasonable portion of their funds on real estate security.

The Democratic Party promised the farmer that if elected and given power to legislate this law should be passed. The farmer, among others, did help to put the Democratic Party in power. They thought they were going to get some genuine rural-credits legislation, but they have not gotten it. The President says he favors such legislation. He said on December 2, 1913, in his message to Congress:

I present to you, in addition, the urgent necessity that special provision be made also for facilitating the credits needed by the farmers of the country; what they need and should obtain is legislation which will make their own abundant and substantial credit resources available as a foundation for joint, concerted local action in their own behalf in getting the capital they must use. It is to this we should now address ourselves. We must add the means by which the farmer may make his credit constantly and easily available and command when he will the capital by which to support and expand his business. We lag behind many other great countries of the modern world in attempting to do this. Systems of rural credit have been studied and developed on the other side of the water while we left our farmers to shift for themselves in the ordinary money market. You have but to look about you in any rural district to see the result—the handicap and embarrassment which have been put upon those who produce our food.

And at the very time the Federal reserve bill was being perfected by the House Committee on Banking and Currency did not certain members of it—particularly Representatives NEELEY of Kansas, WINGO of Arkansas, and RAGSDALE of South Carolina—insist that a provision be inserted in the Federal reserve bill carrying out the pledge in the Democratic platform as to rural credits, and did not the President send the majority leader, the gentleman from Alabama, OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD, to those men to assure them that if they would not insist in incorporating rural-credits legislation in the Federal reserve bill that he would help them and those interested in the question to pass it in a separate bill? So far it has not been passed, and I see no prospect of early action. Every one here says and knows that the President is now opposed to putting the Government back of rural credits and will not approve a bill that puts the Government back of freeing and making available the farmers' credit to the same extent that the Federal reserve act puts the Government back of the business man's and banker's credit.

The Democrats passed the currency law, and in their platform they said:

> Of equal importance with the question of currency reform is the question of rural credits, or agricultural finance.

But the farmers have to wait. They have waited for about two years, and how much longer they will have to wait no one knows.

HIGH COST OF LIVING.

The last national Democratic platform pledged the Democratic Party to reduce the "high cost of living" if intrusted with power. The Democratic platform said, and the Democratic orators said, that the high cost of living was due to the "robber protective tariff" that the Republicans had foisted upon the country to fatten the rich and rob the poor. The Democrats have taken that "robber protective-tariff law" from the statute books, and in its stead have substituted one of their own, and the cost of living has been getting higher day by day ever since.

The Washington Post, a Democratic newspaper, on yesterday said that May wheat is selling in Chicago at $1.65 per bushel, the highest price recorded in Chicago for years, and that "stale bread, known as the poor man's loaf, which has hitherto retailed at 5 cents for two loaves, to-day advanced to 3 cents a loaf."

REPUBLICAN EXTRAVAGANCE.

The Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore said:

> We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses.

And yet the appropriations made by the Democratic Party since it came into power have exceeded in amount anything that the Republicans had ever dreamed of. And notwithstanding the Democratic income-tax law and the so-called "war-tax" law—both direct-taxation money raisers—it is said that the Democratic Party will run this Government in the "hole" by the 1st of June of this year about $80,000,000, and the appropriations will exceed those of any previous Congress.

TERM OF PRESIDENT.

It is not necessary to proceed further with the broken pledges of the Democratic Party. But I can not refrain from speaking of at least one more.

The Democratic platform upon which President Wilson was elected said:

> We favor a single presidential term. * * * We pledge the candidate of this convention to this principle.

It is in the power of the President to keep inviolate at least one of the pledges of the Democratic platform upon which he was elected. He can refuse to be a candidate for reelection. But he is going to break that plank. "His hat is already in the ring," say his close friends and political advisors. He is now an avowed candidate for reelection. He will be nominated by his party and defeated at the polls. He can not survive the record made by himself and party. They have made and broken too many promises. In their Baltimore platform the Democrats said:

> Our platform is one of principles. * * * Our pledges are made to be kept when in office as well as relied upon during the campaign.

On August 15, 1912, during the campaign the President said:

> Our platform is not molasses to catch flies. * * * It means business; it means what it says.

The American people will not soon again intrust with power the party and its candidate that have to their credit so many betrayed trusts and broken promises. [Applause.]

A traveling man down in my district not long ago looked over his half-filled order book at the end of a hard day's work and said:

> The Democrats may be honest men, but I'll be d—d if they've got sense enough to run this Government.

[Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may need to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr SWITZER]. Call it two minutes, and he will yield back what he does not use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER] is recognized.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Speaker, I have always favored protection to American industry, in the belief that it resulted in protection to American labor. Holding such a view and keeping in mind the fact that one of the great objects sought in granting protection to American industry is to give indirect protection to American labor, I feel that as a protectionist I should support all legislation that will give reasonably direct protection to the laboring classes of this country.

I voted to pass a similar bill over the veto of ex-President Taft, and I intend to vote to pass this bill over the veto of President Wilson. [Applause.]

The need of diversified industries in order that we may be self-supporting and independent of other nations is now being accentuated because of the war raging in Europe.

The object of a protective tariff is to build up, diversify, and maintain American industries, and give to the American laborer an opportunity for employment at a wage sufficiently remunerative to enable him to maintain our standard of living and lay something by for a rainy day.

A protective tariff law has always increased the opportunity to obtain employment, resulting in increased wages, and has always brought thrift and prosperity to the people; and a free-trade tariff law has always produced the opposite result—closed factories and mines, depressed business, and created an army of the unemployed stretching across the country from ocean to ocean. At least such has been the actual working out of these two opposing policies during the past 25 years of our history.

I am therefore thoroughly convinced that the products of American factories, mines, forests, and the farm should be protected from free competition with like products of low-paid foreign labor by the imposition of reasonable tariff duties on the imported article, to the end that American labor may readily find employment and that such employment be fairly safeguarded.

The pending measure seeks to directly protect labor, and what is particularly denominated common labor, from the unrestricted influx of unskilled labor from Europe, and especially from the eastern and southern parts of Europe. While the bill carries many provisions increasing in innumerable ways our present protection against the insane, physically and mentally defective, the diseased, the pauper, contract labor, and against the degenerate, immoral, and criminal classes, its primary object is to afford some additional protection to the laboring classes of our country by providing the "literacy test," requiring all immigrants to pass an examination in reading before they shall be allowed to enter our gates. It is claimed by those who have given the subject careful study that the past enforcement of the "literacy test" would have barred from this country yearly at least 300,000 of the great horde of immigrants that have been landing on our shores during the past few years, a class which has come into direct competition with the common labor of this country.

While I dislike very much to discriminate against the man who can not read, as he frequently makes an excellent citizen, and is usually a hard-working and honest man, still the Immigration Commission after a long investigation and research have been unable to discover a better method for restricting this great stream of immigrants which has been pouring into our country year after year until their increased numbers have crowded out of employment the American laborer and augmented the army of our unemployed by the hundreds of thousands, contributing to the want and distress from which our laboring classes are now suffering.

Our country has been the asylum for the oppressed of all lands. We have been generous to the distressed of all countries, whether the result of religious persecution, war, famine, pestilence, or other calamities that have overtaken them, and we have given bountifully of our substance and have frequently extended over them the protective arm of our Government, and our enlightened sympathies and high sense of duty to humanity will cause us to quickly and amply respond to such demands in the future; but we must look to the safeguarding of our own household in order to insure our future ability to respond to such demands by adopting those policies which will promote thrift and prosperity and save American institutions from the slough of decay through an overassimilation of the uneducated and in many instances un-American notions of civil liberty.

The perpetuity of a representative government depends upon the intelligence of its citizenship, and we therefore spend millions of dollars for the cause of education and in building up our great public-school system, and it seems to me that so long as

we have thousands of laborers unemployed and who are clamoring for work at even a living wage we ought to attempt to check that stream of immigration which not only adds largely to this army of the unemployed, but which tends to offset the benefits derived from our public-school system, and which lowers the standard of intelligence of the American electorate.

The percentage of illiteracy in certain European countries is much higher than in the United States, while in some it is considerably lower. According to the census of the United States for 1910, of the entire population of 10 years of age and over, 7.7 per cent were illiterate; of the whites, 5 per cent were illiterate; and of the negroes, 30.4 per cent. Among the foreign-born whites 12.7 per cent were illiterate, as compared with 3 per cent among the native whites.

The report of the Immigration Commission published in 1911 discloses that in 1900 Austria's per cent of illiterate was 23.8; Belgium, 21.9 per cent; Hungary, 41 per cent; Portugal, 75.1 per cent; Servia, 83 per cent; Spain, 63.8 per cent; Italy, 48.5 per cent in 1905; Roumania, 61.4 per cent in 1899; and Russia, 72 per cent in 1897.

The "literacy test" is aimed at the streams of immigration coming from the large illiterate populations of the eastern and southern European countries.

By excluding "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, with certain exceptions," we expect to check the avalanche of immigrants that has been pouring in upon us during the past few years.

Ex-President Taft based his veto of the Burnett-Dillingham immigration bill on the reasons set forth in the letter of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, Mr. Nagel, which accompanied his veto message. Mr. Nagel contended that the "literacy test" would be difficult of enforcement and would entail a considerably increased expense on the part of the Government, and he further contended that—

> We need labor in this country, and the natives are unwilling to do the work which the aliens come over to do.

He evidently believed that we were in no danger of an oversupply of laborers, for in the conclusion of his letter he says in part, referring to the "literacy test," that—

> It is based upon a fallacy in undertaking to apply a test which is not calculated to reach the truth, and to find relief from a danger which does not really exist.

While industrial conditions under the administration of ex-President Taft were so prosperous as to lead him, as well as his Secretary of Commerce and Labor, to feel that we were in no danger from an oversupply of labor, no one will claim that these conditions obtain to-day. President Wilson, while vetoing the present bill because of the "literacy test," has been compelled to seek other reasons for his action than those set forth by ex-President Taft. He states that it is a radical departure from the traditional and long-established policy of this country, and that—

> In this bill it is proposed to turn away from the tests of character and quality and impose tests which exclude and restrict.

The primary object in enacting the proposed legislation is to protect the American laborer from direct competition with the foreign laborer. I know of no way of doing this except by some method which will exclude or restrict the foreigner from coming into this country. All protective measures must be to some extent arbitrary in their application.

President Wilson states if this country desires to adopt an arbitrary policy of restriction that we have a perfect right to do so. But he seems to doubt that there is a universal sentiment throughout the Nation for such a policy. This proposition has been before the American people for the past 20 years, and has been the subject of thorough investigation by a commission appointed by Congress, whose work extended over a number of years, with the result that this test was recommended by a majority of the commissioners. It has been considered time and again by the thousands of farm, labor, and patriotic organizations throughout the country, and has been universally indorsed by these bodies. It carried by more than a two-thirds vote in the Senate of the last Congress over the veto of President Taft, and lacked but a few votes of receiving a two-thirds vote in the House. It received more than a two-thirds vote in the House at this session of Congress, and practically a unanimous vote in the Senate, the vote being 50 for and 7 against the proposition. I know of no better index of the sentiment of the people upon this question than the overwhelming majorities cast in its favor during this and the last Congresses. It does not seem to me to be possible that so large a number of the Senators and Representatives of these two Congresses could be mistaken as to the sentiment of their respective constituencies. I feel sure that there is an overwhelming sentiment in my district in favor of the passage of this bill, as I have had numerous letters of individuals and resolutions of patriotic and labor organizations urging its enactment, and not a single letter or remonstrance, verbal or written, to the contrary. I shall accordingly cast my vote to pass the bill over the veto of the President, believing that such a law will tend to bring some relief to the depressed labor conditions throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman yields back half a minute.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. To make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. SABATH. Will not the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I withdraw the point.

Mr. MOORE. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN].

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not persuaded by the suggestions just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] that labor organizations all over the country have petitioned this Congress to pass this bill over the President's veto. I am aware of the fact, however, that a large number of officials of labor organizations have worked up quite a sentiment in favor of the bill and in favor of overturning the President's veto. I presume that every Member of the House has had telegrams and letters from the officials of labor organizations to the effect that it was the duty of Congress to pass this legislation in the interest of labor.

But I beg to suggest, as every Member of the House knows, that it is very easy for one of the officials of the Federation of Labor here in Washington, by a few telegrams and letters on his part to subordinate officials over the country, to obtain this flood of telegrams and letters, which mean nothing so far as the sentiment of the rank and file of labor is concerned.

I do not hesitate to say, as one who has battled a long time for the cause of labor, that this illiteracy test does not reflect the judgment or the wishes of the rank and file of the toilers of this Nation deliberately formed. [Applause.] It does not reflect the cause of labor, which is more important. It does not reflect the best interests of labor, which is still more important.

How men in earnest, as I know men are, who have been leading the cause of union labor in this country can ever come to the unsound conclusion they have regarding this bill is beyond my comprehension. Their conclusion shows that they have not studied and do not understand the great underlying causes that have made the lot of the toiling man so hard to bear. They think, forsooth, that if they can pass some sort of legislation that will close the doors to competitors in labor that they thereby benefit the cause of labor. How foolish that idea is. Just as though the toiling man's wage is ever fixed by the number of toiling men willing to take the job. Do not men know that the wage of the laborer is not measured in such a way at all, but is measured by those fundamental laws that control the distribution of wealth and that divert the streams produced by labor and by land, those great laws regarding trusts, corporations, and transportation, and grain exchanges, all these great fundamental movements of commerce—those are the laws that congest into a few hands the wealth of the Nation and take unjustly from those who produce it; and the man is in the kindergarten class of politics and statesmanship who does not see and who does not understand that the cause of labor is measured, influenced, and controlled by the great laws of distribution of the products of labor, and reflect the wisdom or lack of wisdom of the laws controlling corporations and monopolies, laws measuring the tax imposed by transportation companies and marketing exchanges of the country, and not by the number of competitors.

Why, gentlemen, is it not clear to every thinking man that the welfare of labor is measured by how much of the products of labor the toiling men are able to hold as their reward for toiling? Is not that clear? Now, it is obvious that the wealth of the Nation is made by the toiling men altogether. Is it not equally clear that if you increase the number of toiling men by immigration you increase the aggregate wealth created for dis-

tribution? More men means more wealth produced; more toilers mean more necessities of life brought into existence to feed hungry men, to clothe shivering men.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Is it not true that every man who creates wealth consumes the products produced by other toilers of the country, and thus is useful in two ways?

Mr. MANAHAN. An obvious thing; and yet the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows that many men in this House are swayed by such an intolerant, narrow, and selfish point of view that they can not really comprehend that simple proposition of economics. Do not these intolerant men with prejudiced minds realize that if a million toiling men came in the next 10 years, this million toiling men will produce a mighty accumulation of what? Of the things that the laboring men need for their prosperity and comfort of life; food to eat, clothing to wear, shoes to wear, and houses in which to live.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman assumes that the million men will always be at work and all the others, also.

Mr. MANAHAN. I say in reply to the gentleman from Washington that he is not fit to sit as a representative of his constituents in this body if he does not realize that a wise Government would see to it that every willing man in the United States would have work to do, and plenty of it, if the great wealth of this Nation was not controlled by selfish, greedy men, and if the great opportunities of this Nation were opened up to the toiling men of the Nation. [Applause.]

The gentleman knows that in his own State of Washington there are acres and acres of valuable timber to be cut, hundreds of mines to be opened, dams to be built, bridges to be constructed, and with that unlimited field of human opportunity he has the effrontery to stand up and ask the question, Would it not be necessary for the Government to find employment for immigrants coming to our shores? What kind of statesmanship is it in this great arena that we possess in this country that allows so many men to remain out of employment? Why, gentlemen, in the State of Washington alone there are untold resources sufficient to give employment to every man who with wistful eyes in Europe turns this way hoping for an opportunity to make a home for himself and family.

If men coming in, or now here, fail to find opportunity to make homes for themselves the fault lies in our lack of statesmanship, in our lack of intelligence, in our lack of far-seeing patriotism that fails to open these opportunities to these men anxious and willing to work. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, of course, understands that there are a great many hundreds of thousands of men out of work now. What I want to know is how it will improve the conditions to add more to the already unemployed list?

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANAHAN. That is two at once.

Mr. McKENZIE. My question will be short. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think the laboring men of America are competent to decide what is for their best interest; and, if so, why do they not oppose this legislation? [Applause.]

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the laboring men of America, if given a fair opportunity to have the question put up to them, are competent to decide, but I answer the gentleman by saying that it never has been put up to them. There is not a laboring man in the United States who will take issue with the fundamental statements that I have been making. There is not a laboring man in the United States who will not agree with me that the trouble with labor is not in the number of competitors, but in the selfish greed of big business that takes from him the fruits of his toil; there is not a laboring man anywhere on earth, in labor unions or outside of them, who does not know that he needs food to eat that must be grown by the toil of other men, that he needs clothes to wear that must be made by the toil of other men, that he needs a place in which to live that must be constructed by the muscle of fellow laboring men, and how does he think that he can get more food to eat or better clothing to wear or better houses in which to live by keeping from this country laboring men who are willing to grow food, make clothes, and build houses for him?

Coming to the question of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], which asked how it would improve the condition of laboring men to have others come, I say this, that I thought I was making it clear that what laboring men needed was opportunity to work, and the man who says that in this country of ours there is not an opportunity for laboring men had better go back to the kindergarten and study elementary geography. [Applause.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. What laws would the gentleman suggest that would bring this opportunity to the laboring man? We would like something specific on that score.

Mr. MANAHAN. That is a very simple proposition, and I am surprised that the gentleman from Kentucky would ask a question so elementary [laughter]; yet I ought not to say that I am surprised.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan rose.

Mr. MANAHAN. Oh, let me answer one question at a time. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] asked me for some suggestions, and I said at first that I was surprised that he should, but when I consider that he comes from a constituency where something in the neighborhood of 30 per cent of the people are illiterate I am not surprised. [Applause and laughter.] I should not have mentioned this argument, because, in a way, it is an argument in favor of the literacy test.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Would not a little Republican legislation also help?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. [Laughter.] The gentleman has no right to interrupt a speaker without first addressing the Chair.

The SPEAKER. That is true; but the gentleman from Minnesota has a right to yield if he desires; and if he does not desire to yield it is his business to indicate it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. Yes.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the gentleman, inasmuch as this is the only intelligent address we will have here, to take the floor and keep it, so that we may hear it fully.

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to answer the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] as to the remedies that will give employment to the laboring men of this country. I will have to be very brief, but I say, first, that the full enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law would be one step in that direction. The destruction of monopolies in this country and the prevention of great corporations from exploiting the public by stock-watering manipulation of assets and indirect graft by their officials would be another step. Still another would be the lowering of freight rates instead of raising them [applause] and the squeezing out of the water in the stock of all public-service, and especially all transportation, companies. Another stupendous step would be the freeing of great market places from the intolerable monopolies that now control them and the encouragement of agriculture by placing the burden of taxation upon unused and undeveloped land. All of these would be steps in that direction. Another would be the opening up of the great natural resources of the country by the Government itself for the benefit of all the people. Why, this Government could put a million men to work building roads in this country—roads that would make the cost of living less to every toiling man; roads that would make the channels of commerce busy with the activities of both labor and capital; roads that would stimulate every line of industry; great roads over which could be hauled cheaply the fruits of the earth and the products of toil—not only roads, but the Government could construct great dams and public works of reclamation, irrigation, and drainage, where countless millions of men could work in the production of food and other necessaries of life for the common good of all and every man willing to work could get work. But, you say, would not that increase the taxes?

I have heard men ask foolish questions like that. I have heard Congressmen who considered themselves quite intelligent ask the simple question, How can the Government give laboring men employment without adding to the tax burden of the people? apparently unable to comprehend the simple proposition that every man who toils, whether he works for the Government or an ordinary employer, produces more wealth than he gets, and the whole Nation is richer by his toil, whether he works for the State or for private capital. If a million men come to this country and toil here for the next five years, whether they work for the Government on public works, or for railroads in transportation, or on the farms in raising crops, no matter where, they will increase the wealth of the country, the food supply for laborers, as well as increase the market for the manufactured product made by other toilers.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANAHAN. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman suggests that the building of good roads throughout the country would greatly aid laboring men. I would ask the gentleman if it is not true that this House has already passed a measure of that character, which is now in the Senate, and that the President has put the cold hand of death upon it?

Mr. MANAHAN. I have no custody over the President's cold hand of death; I do not know anything about it. [Laughter.] But I can suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky and to the Democratic Members of this House that if nothing worse can be said about the President's record than by reference to this veto he is fortunate indeed as Chief Executive of this Nation, because I think that he has approached the highest point he has yet attained as President of the United States when he put the stamp of disapproval upon this un-American bill. [Applause.]

This phrase reminds me that there are in the United States quite an aggregation of men who style themselves patriotic orders of one sort or another, who have deluged the Congress by petitions and letters to pass this on the theory that everything but the old stock is un-American, arrogating to themselves a higher conception of American nationality than that held by men of foreign birth and their children. I know I dignify more than they deserve the bigoted leaders of these organizations by referring to them at all in this debate, but there are men in this House who are actuated by a sort of subtle fear that these so-called patriotic societies have influence commensurate with their intolerant gall and effrontery and that they may have some merit to back their claims to patriotism; but common sense applied to the known facts of American history shows that these intolerant men, of narrowed minds, of poisoned hearts, are themselves out of place in our free air, and have yet to grasp in the slightest degree the meaning of human liberty and the mission of this Government. What is the spirit of this Government that from its inception has made it what it is? It has been that sublime spirit of fraternity and kindness; of gentleness and asylum, as the President so well expressed it in his message of disapproval. It has been the very essence of sheltering and universal asylum that has made this country truly great. Why, what is a nation? Is it a matter of battleships and armies? Is it a matter of bank accounts or balances of trade? Is a nation measured by geography or by its material wealth? Not in the right conception of nationality. A nation is a spiritual thing, and when you gentlemen who favor this measure take the narrow, selfish point of view that because we have got a good thing in this country therefore we must exclude men from foreign lands from sharing it—when you take that material, selfish point of view you repudiate the essential principle of this Government and the spirit that gave it life at the beginning. Not only that, it is unwise economically as well as being unfair, un-Christian, and unkind.

Furthermore, I suggest that right now in the Old World is being enacted the most tragic illustration of the folly and insanity of the spirit of selfishness, such selfishness as even in our own land here and now actuate the men who are backing this measure; the selfishness of men who want to take the property of all men and hold it to themselves, of men who would profit by the gifts of Almighty God and to the exclusion of other men just as deserving in His sight. I say there is being enacted in Europe a tragic illustration of what comes to nations when they permit their destiny to be shaped by greed, avarice, and selfishness; when they permit the spirit of materialism to control them; when, with greedy hearts, they would take what somebody else produces, and take it by force of arms if necessary. You would not take it by force of arms, perhaps, yet you would hold it by this legislation. You would deny other men the opportunity to labor, to produce wealth from nature, under the same pretense of self-preservation that drives the mighty armies of Europe on one side or the other. Oh, the spirit of materialism and of greed, the spirit of avarice and of power, the spirit of selfishness! Oh, the selfishness of this bill—the brutal selfishness of it! It is a blind and ignorant selfishness, too, because instead of benefiting those who think they would be benefited it would injure them and make them more helpless in the grind of greed. But that does not relieve those who strive to destroy our Nation as the refuge of the oppressed of the odium of being actuated by selfish motives. That does not relieve them of the odium of seeking by this legislation to take away opportunities from other men just as deserving.

The President well said that the inspiration of this people from the beginning, the star of hope that led them through every difficulty, was always symbolic of universal brotherhood and of the equality of man. The immortal declaration penned by Jefferson that all men are created equal and endowed of certain inalienable rights, of life, property, and the pursuit of happiness, meant just what it said. Jefferson did not say all men within the confines of these 13 colonies are entitled to these rights, but he said all men. Thus spoke the philosopher when he was discoursing upon the rights of men as such, all men, whether they be from the south of Europe or from the north of Europe or from New England or Kentucky. So, I say that is the spirit of this great Nation, and a nation's greatness is measured by its spirit and not by its wealth or by its armaments or its bank account. You once inject into the spirit of a great nation the selfishness of exclusion, the selfishness of greed, the selfishness of appropriating what belongs by God's decree to all mankind, you once inject that into this Nation and it is the beginning of the end. Just as we are now witnessing on the far fields of Europe, where the best of the toiling men are being destroyed in mighty battalions, because their Governments and the Governments of their opponents permitted action to be taken along lines of selfishness for their own people without regard to the rights of other people. Until a nation is content with spiritual power and until it can recognize the rights of men as such regardless of where their cradle rocked, until a nation is content with power of serving all men created in the image and likeness of Almighty God, it has no place in history, and no credit in all the annals of time.

I only hope that this great Nation of ours will put behind it the spirit of greed, the spirit of selfishness, the spirit of imperialism and of power, and open its heart, as it did at the beginning, to the toiling sons of Europe, its honest men and honest women who seek opportunity to work and to live, and to do their full duty as human beings. If this Nation has the wisdom to do that all will be well. If we, its representatives to-day, have the wisdom to forget the manufactured sentiment, and the clamoring of bigoted men on the outside, we will sustain the President in his veto. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, there are but two propositions embodied in the President's message calling for consideration of the House at this time. The first proposition laid down by the President is inferentially, and almost expressly, that we owe an obligation to those foreign countries superior to the obligation which we owe to our own citizenship. [Applause.] He stands for the open door in immigration, subject to restriction only with reference to mental and physical defects and criminal tendencies.

Mr. Speaker, we have no such obligation. The question is the effect of unrestricted immigration upon our own citizenship and upon our economic conditions, and that, Mr. Speaker, is an obligation that we owe superior to that which we may owe to any general question of any general brotherhood of men. [Applause.] Our obligation, Mr. Speaker, to our own citizenship is to do that which is within our constitutional power to enlarge the opportunities for the average citizen of the United States, to do those things, Mr. Speaker, which will elevate the character of the citizenship of this Nation. And if unrestricted immigration will narrow the opportunities of the citizenshp now here, if its effects may be to lower the general character of the citizenship, then our obligation is to pass this bill over the veto of the President. Whether such would be the effect of the passage of this bill is a fair subject of discussion upon which patriotic men differ.

But the President in his message does not touch upon that question. It is simply the broad question of whether our superior obligation is to those abroad rather than to those now here. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] spoke of the selfishness of this kind of legislation. Why, Mr. Speaker, whatever our individual views may be, as a theoretical matter, it is our sworn duty to legislate for the people who have sent us here to represent them. And as for selfishness, it is the same kind of selfishness, sir, and none other, as the selfishness you exercise with reference to having a little greater care for the opportunities for the children of your own family than you have for the opportunities of the children of your neighbors. [Applause.] It is a proper kind of selfishness, and unless, sir, we have that kind of selfishness, if you choose to call it such, for the people of our own country, there is little hope, indeed, for our own future.

The next proposition, Mr. Speaker, that the President lays down is that he is not unalterably opposed to this legislation, but that the American people have never expressed themselves upon this subject. He says:

> Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I

make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from California [Mr. KENT] is not going to use his time, and I therefore will yield the five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. He said:

Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances it would be assumed that a measure that was favored by one Congress by an overwhelming majority, an election had intervened, and another Congress elected by the people, and that second Congress by a two-thirds majority had expressed itself in the same way upon that subject—ordinarily, as I say, Mr. Speaker, that would be taken as some evidence of what the public sentiment was upon that question. But the President of the United States casts that all aside. So far as Republicans are concerned, he perhaps ought not to be condemned for casting their votes for this bill aside, for in his Indianapolis speech he said that the Republicans were either blind, misguided, or most of them ignorant. But the majority of you Democrats of both Houses have voted for this bill, voted for it two years ago, an overwhelming majority voted for it a short time ago, and what about you? Ought not the President of the United States to infer that you represent the sentiment of the people upon this question? But no; he says you do not represent the people. And perhaps he ought not to be condemned too greatly for that, because this is the first important measure that has reached the President of the United States where you have exercised your own judgment at all. It is the first measure that you have passed where you have not first obtained the consent of the President of the United States to pass it. And inasmuch as you did not first obtain his consent, it is natural enough that the veto message is here before us. He says it was not in a political platform. Suppose it was in a political platform, what would it amount to? I need not refer to some provisions that are in a present political platform, and there is not a Democrat looking me in the eye to-day who will say that some of the promises in the platform amounted to the snap of your finger. Perhaps the President takes the position that it shall be tried out in the next election, and that if the Democrats put this in their next platform and the President is defeated, that then it will be an expression that they do not want this legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, you might place in your next platform all the promises that the mind of man could conceive of, and among them this one, and the American people would not pay the slightest attention to that promise, because the test will be not the promises that you make in your platform but what you have done with the power that you have had while you have been in control.

Mr. Speaker, there is no direct referendum on this question. There can be none. And, indeed, if a defeat of a President of the United States who has vetoed this legislation is any indication of public sentiment on this question, I recall that President Taft two years ago vetoed this very bill, and that Taft is not the President of the United States to-day. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to this legislation and have before on other occasions cast my vote against this bill. In doing so I have been prompted by the best of motives and the best of feeling for the best interests and the general welfare of my country and for the great body of people who are unable to plead here to-day for themselves. I come from the city of Chicago and the great West. The development of this part of our country and these States is the direct result of a policy that has been followed by our Government for over 125 or 130 years. We have grown and builded not by a policy of restriction, but by a policy of liberality and a policy of welcome for all who have come here to aid us. In my city are gathered representatives of most of the races coming from every section of the world; nearly every tongue is spoken; newspapers printed in most every foreign language are issued daily and weekly, and the effect of this has been for good and of great benefit; and in consequence of it we are solving the problems of the greater future of this country. The old theory of America for Americans I had hoped had long since passed away, and to-day new and more important issues were before us.

I was more than pleased with the President's veto of this bill, and the sentiments conveyed in his message are worthy of more than a passing thought. He has laid great stress upon the fact that the people of the United States have never had this issue presented to them, and it is true. I appeal to every man here to inquire if this is not a true statement. The message stated that while we are the Representatives of the people yet this issue was never submitted to be passed upon in a campaign at large before the people.

Persons and associations banded together and organized for mutual and economic purposes have unquestionably expressed opinions, but let us examine their protests. Are they not signed by the leaders of the interests, and not the voice or the wishes of the persons whom they pretend to represent? The great masses of our people, however, have not passed upon this question.

I have always believed in party fidelity and party loyalty, and I appeal to my friends on my side of the House to remember that we have a leader to-day in the White House who dares to express his opinion, and having expressed it appeals to us to sustain him. That chivalrous spirit ever makes a union successful and powerful. For over 50 years the Democratic Party has not been in power for any length of time, and during all of that period we have looked for a leader. I am saying nothing against any other parties, many members of which will stand back of the President to-day; but I do appeal to that unity of purpose, that unity of interest which the President is entitled to at this hour. It has been stated on this floor that both parties have in their platforms asserted the right of restriction of aliens. In reply to this I will only say that when the platform of my party is examined it will be found that the restrictions there mentioned were never intended to exclude those affected by the literacy test, but the dominant thought was to keep out the undesirables of Europe, and nothing more; and it is unjust to state, as has been stated here to-day, that the platforms of both parties are against the statements made by the President. All this is hardly true when you analyze the real object and intent. You gentlemen can not point to a single rostrum where an advocate stood representing either party submitting the issue as to the literacy test to the people as a part of his argument.

I am surprised at the woeful lack of knowledge that Members display here in regard to our foreign population by advocating this legislation. Do they know anything of those people? Have they ever lived among them to any extent? I do not think so.

I come from and live in a district that is made up entirely of foreigners. The Polish population in my district, the Italian population, the Jewish population exceed by far in numerical strength that of any single district in the United States. My district is in the very heart of the great populous and enterprising city of Chicago. Upon this district in finance, industry, and conveniences these great and progressive peoples by their sterling qualities of manhood and womanhood have impressed their enterprising individuality. And against these people, than whom no more moral or God-fearing people ever lived anywhere, we hear a lot of cheap talk, senseless tommyrot, which proves undeniably that those who declare these sentiments are grossly ignorant of the qualities of these peoples and convince the initiated that they positively do not know what they are talking about. [Laughter and applause.]

These people come here to better their condition, and they are positively doing it, and if you want any evidence of this fact come into my district and I will show you just as great churches, just as good schools, just as big banks, just as happy homes, and just as numerous and just as prosperous people as you can find anywhere upon God's footstool. [Applause.]

The youth of that district crowd the schools and colleges, preparing for all the learned professions of law, medicine, dentistry, pedagogy, and devoting their best mental energies to the study of the arts and sciences.

I see my friend from California [Mr. RAKER] smiling sardonically over there, as he always does when the plain truth is distasteful to him. He referred to some steamboat companies or shipping interests on the Pacific coast, telling us about the crews they employed upon their boats, but he did not tell us anything about the people who unload those boats upon the docks, the poor people who are compelled to unload them upon the docks, who are striving hard to better their conditions, and who have an interest in this matter. [Applause.]

The President's veto message is a masterly document, showing a breadth of vision and a wealth of information of which he has been able to secure possession by reason of the facilities at his disposal to accumulate it. His reasoning is sound, his argument unanswerable, and his patriotism unimpeachable. He has spoken in this ringing appeal with a clearness and a force that will inevitably convince anyone whose mind is free from prejudice and whose spirit is not burdened with intoler-

ance. He has spoken not for the present alone but for all time to come, blazing the way for future statesmen to build up a Nation here in our beloved America that is destined to become the most cosmopolitan, the most progressive, and the most prosperous that the sun, in all its course, has ever shone upon.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KINDEL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KINDEL] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KINDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad of the opportunity to express my sentiments, which will be subjective, rather than objective. I am the son of an immigrant. My father came to this country and he could only write his name. He was as sturdy and as honest a citizen and as useful a citizen as any man that I know of, and I, his humble son, will say, without egotism, that I have, in my humble way, done more for the general mass of the people to reduce the cost of living by championing fair and equitable transportation rates than I dare say any other man on the floor of this House [applause], because I have for twenty-odd years devoted myself to the subject of transportation, the currency of which everybody knows, or, rather, ought to know, is paramount to the currency of money in the development of our country. [Applause.]

I am surprised that you want to come here and legislate against a man who can not write because of the literacy test. Why do you not keep out the European goods? Why do you let them come in here at a less rate than is charged to transport domestic goods from interior points? Why, I was forced to buy goods in England simply because I could save $75 a car from Liverpool via Galveston to Denver instead of from New York via Galveston to Denver.

It is the same way with the express companies. The foreign parcel post, in conjunction with American express companies, will charge you $1.20 for a package of a certain kind, whereas our domestic express companies, shipping a similar package from New York to the same point or destination will charge you $1.75. On the foreign shipment our express companies receive but 24 cents. The parcel post comes along, and it is said it was introduced in order to reduce the cost of living. I am surprised that not one of you has gotten up here to challenge me and to say that these things that I have pointed out are not correct. Now, in order to prove these figures, I have repeatedly issued statement after statement; and now I wish in a concrete way to show you what is happening with the parcel post. I am surprised that the labor unions have not taken this matter up.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Colorado yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. KINDEL. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. I understand the gentleman is in favor of this bill and its provisions as to exclusion, except as to the literacy test?

Mr. KINDEL. Yes. I say the literacy test is wrong—to hold that up——

Mr. RAKER. Is the gentleman in favor of the rest of the bill?

Mr. KINDEL. Oh, yes. I do not want criminals and imbeciles or other undesirables of that kind to be allowed to come to this country, but I am most emphatically opposed to the literacy test.

Now, I will show you what has happened in regard to the parcel post, which the Postmaster General has said reduces the cost of living. A 5-pound parcel from New York to Denver would cost 51 cents by parcel post; by express it is 37 cents. A 10-pound package from New York to my city of Denver would be $1.01 by parcel post, while by express it is 57 cents. A 20-pound parcel by parcel post would be $2.01 from Denver to New York, whereas by express it is 98 cents. A 50-pound parcel from New York to Denver would be $5.01 as against $2.22. Mind you, I am quoting the cost of transportation on edibles, the things that reduce the cost of living. And yet this administration has been for two years compounding and perpetuating this error, with all the rest of the inexplicable and irreconcilable rulings I complain of. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SAUNDERS). The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LEVY] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, section 19 of the pending immigration bill is so ambiguous and uncertain and so loosely drawn as to give unlimited power to the immigration authorities who have charge of deportation. Suppose, for instance, that an alien who, having been admitted to this country, has made application for citizenship papers, and the probabilities are that he would receive his final papers at the expiration of five years; then, perchance, some designing person would make complaint to the Bureau of Immigration that this alien, who is on the verge of receiving his final papers, was subject to some of the provisions of this bill, it would place in the hands of that bureau unlimited power. Perhaps some innocent female might be taken advantage of by the exercise of such a power—a power far exceeding any lettres de cachet issued during the reign of Louis XIV—and she might be deported without being given any fair notice whatever.

Under the existing law innocent women have been charged with crimes of which they were perfectly innocent and deported without any protection, and it is now time for legislators to prevent the enactment of such unjust and extraordinary laws and to properly protect the immigrant and to curb such enormous power as deporting anyone who has been in this country for a period of five years. No such power should be placed in the hands of any official or representative of the Government unless properly safeguarded, but as the proposed section is now drawn it gives unlimited power to officials to deport perfectly innocent persons. This section alone should be sufficient to sustain the presidential veto and thus defeat the measure.

The whole spirit and proposition of this bill is opposed to the principles of American institutions and the Democratic Party. Such a measure was one of the causes of our throwing off the yoke of Great Britain and bringing on the Revolution. In the Declaration of Independence the following is contained concerning the obstructions to immigration:

> He has endeavored to prevent the population of these States, for that purpose obstructing the laws of naturalization of foreigners, refusing to pass others to encourage their migration hither, and raising the conditions of new appropriations of lands.

And this very section which I refer to was one of the principles advocated by the immortal Jefferson.

I opposed a similar measure in the Sixty-second Congress and voted to sustain the veto of President Taft. In opposing such a bill I sustain the principles of the Democratic Party as laid down by Thomas Jefferson in his proclamation concerning foreigners, in which he said:

> It has been the wise policy of these States to extend the protection of their laws to all those who would settle among them of whatsoever nation or religion they might be, and to admit them to a 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 writing to Citizen Genet, the representative of the French Government in this country, on the subject of free immigration Mr. Jefferson said:

> Our country is open to all men, to come and go peaceably when they choose.

And, again, in writing to Gen. Kosciusko on the same subject he said:

> The session of the First Congress, convened since republicanism has recovered its ascendency, * * * are opening the doors of hospitality to fugitives from the oppressions of other countries.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. LEVY. I can not yield.

Instead of abolishing the onerous shipping laws which are on the statute books at the present time, this bill intensifies them and makes them more obnoxious and more troublesome to our merchant marine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired?

Mr. LEVY. Can I have one more minute?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman one minute.

Mr. LEVY. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will vote to sustain the veto of President Wilson, and by doing so they will be following the teachings of the father of Democracy—Thomas Jefferson.

The pending measure is very unfair to captains, masters, agents, and consignees of vessels, as it lays down intricate rules and regulations so difficult to construe as to make it almost impossible to conform thereto, thus interfering with the efficiency of our commerce and merchant marine service. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, what is the score, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The score is as follows: The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] has 47 minutes, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] has 54, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has 51 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has 28 minutes.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] has promised to yield to me three minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. How does the gentleman from California get his time?

Mr. AUSTIN. I think he gets it from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. I have yielded five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], and it has just been stated to me that the gentleman from California [Mr. HAYES] is not going to occupy as much time as I thought, so at the end of the five minutes I hope to be allowed to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee a little more time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That question will arise at that time.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, we are called upon this afternoon to vote either for America or for the rest of the world. I am for America first, last, and all the time. [Applause.] We are called upon to decide by our votes whether we will legislate in the interest of our own beloved country; our own honest and deserving people; or in favor of foreign lands and alien people; whether our consideration, justice, and charity shall begin at home or on foreign shores; whether we prefer the interest and advancement of the native and naturalized American citizen or the far-away stranger from beyond the seas; whether we will favor the four or five millions of unemployed American workingmen, or whether we will favor more than a million of idle aliens who are landed upon our shores every 12 months by a greedy Steamship Trust. [Applause.]

When this bill was under consideration in this House a year ago, I read the following letter to show how aliens were used to underbid and take labor from our own people:

EDWARD HORVATH LABOR AGENCY,
124 EAST THIRD STREET,
New York City, October 4, 1913.

S. E. & H. L. SHEPERD CO.,
Rockport, Me.

GENTLEMEN: Foreign laborers are now available in this city for less wages than you can secure men for in your State.

Are you in need of any? If so, we can offer for immediate shipment any number of them of any desired nationality.

Trusting to hear from you, we are,

Very truly, yours, M. ENGEL, *Manager.*

After this letter was submitted, the gentleman from New York City [Mr. CANTOR] interrupted with this statement:

Oh, Mr. Chairman, that is not an authorized labor agency at all. We are familiar with that letter. This is an old chestnut, 2 years old.

To prove that my statement was correct and the gentleman from New York was in error, I offer the following letter from the manager of the labor agency and a telegram from Commissioner Bell, who, under the law, issues licenses in New York City:

EDWARD HORVATH LABOR AGENCY,
New York City, February 1, 1915.

Hon. R. W. AUSTIN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your favor of the 30th ultimo, in which you inquire whether I am the manager of the Edward Horvath Labor Agency. In reply to the above I beg to advise that I am as yet the manager of the above concern, which has been in existence for the last six years, and is duly licensed and bonded by the city of New York in accordance with the law.

In connection with the above, permit me to express my surprise as to the knowledge of that particular New York Member of the House, who has informed you that our agency was not legal, without license, and a myth.

May I give you yet additional information which that particular Member of the House could not furnish to you?

Yours, very truly,

M. ENGEL, *Manager.*

—

NEW YORK, *February 2, 1915.*

R. W. AUSTIN, *Washington, D. C.:*

Edward Horvath Labor Agency, 124 East Third Street, is licensed and bonded according to law and was in 1913.

GEORGE H. BELL, *Commissioner.*

As further evidence along the line of this offer to furnish foreign laborers for lower wages in the State of Maine, of how these people are used after their arrival in this country, I call the attention of the House to what the members of a subcommittee of which I was a member, in investigating the coal strike in Colorado last spring, discovered. The proof shows the places of the miners in the first or original strike, occurring several years ago, were taken by foreigners who were shipped in from eastern cities, and in the last strike, in 1913, the strikers' places were filled by labor agents in Pittsburgh, Pa., furnishing foreign miners, some of whom admitted on the witness stand they had been in this country three or four months. When we had this immigration bill under consideration last February I read an article from the daily New York Times, showing there were 331,650 men out of employment in that city. Judge E. H. Gary, chairman of the executive committee of the unemployed, is authority for the statement that "from the best estimate, the number of unemployed in New York City is 200,000 larger than it was at the same time last year." So we now have over 530,000 idle men in that city alone, and the President favors a policy which means landing yearly on our shores more than a million of idle persons, seeking work, from foreign lands, practically all of them to go ashore in New York City. I venture the assertion the great majority of the idle men in New York City are foreigners who do not speak our language and have no interest in our country except to get what they can out of it, regardless of the interest or welfare of our native or naturalized citizens.

President Wilson has vetoed this immigration bill, and in his message he says the American people have never passed upon the illiteracy question. The Democrats in their national convention several years ago placed this plank in their platform:

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.

The Republican Party in its national platform made this declaration:

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.

So we have had both national parties indorsing this legislation in one form or another.

Out of 213 Members in the Sixty-second Congress who voted to pass this bill over President Taft's veto, more than 160 were reelected. Of 252 Members of the present House who voted on the 4th of last February for this bill, and whose position was thus known to the voters, 185 were returned. Out of 126 who voted against this bill at that time, only 76 were reelected. In other words, out of a membership of 435 in the next House, there will be only 76 who went on record in opposition to this bill. The American people have passed upon this question by electing President McKinley on a platform favoring the illiteracy test by an overwhelming majority, and President Roosevelt upon a restriction platform; and I venture the prediction the next occupant of the White House will be elected upon a platform indorsing the principles of the bill now before us. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. Does the gentleman think any President could be elected on a platform pronouncing against the restriction of immigration of that kind?

Mr. AUSTIN. I am absolutely sure no candidate of any party could win on such a declaration or platform. As a patriot and a lover of my country, I am anxious to see this bill passed over the President's veto; but if I considered this matter as a partisan, I would want to see his veto sustained, in order that the American people could face him at the polls in the coming presidential election on the issue he has raised. [Applause.]

Congress must settle this question right for all time. We can not evade, indefinitely postpone, or side-step it. It will not down until a law is written closing our doors against the undesirables of every country on the face of the earth. The President of the United States in 1902 stated in his History of the American People we were receiving too many of what he termed "the lowest class of people from southern Italy and the meaner sort from Hungary and Poland." When he made that statement we were receiving 246,146 annually from those three sections of Europe. Last year we received from southern Italy, Hungary, and Poland 517,590, or more than double the number the President objected to. At the time of the President's criticism in 1902 the foreign steamships landed here a total of 648,743 aliens, and last year the number had increased to 1,218,480. In 1902 we received 165,105 illiterates over 14 years of age, and in 1914 263,225 illiterates landed. When an impartial historian and a private citizen, not a prospective candidate looking for the so-called foreign vote, the President stated, "The Chinaman was to be preferred as a workingman, if not as a citizen, to the coarse crew" we were receiving from southern Italy, Poland, and Hungary. Yet his veto means to keep our doors wide open to the people from these three countries, so they can be dumped upon our shores and their labor brought in competition with free, honest, American labor in the mine, workshop, and in all other lines of industry.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] says only the officials of the labor organizations, and not the rank and file of the members, are against this bill. I deny this. In a number of their national meetings, with delegates from every State and industrial city, they have unanimously asked the American Congress for the passage of this bill. I insist organized and unorganized labor is a unit for this legislation, and it has the sym-

pathy and support of a large majority of the American people—native and of foreign birth.

Two million members of the American Federation of Labor, 3,000,000 of the Farmers' Union and Alliance, half a million of the United Mine Workers, the trainmen's, conductors', engineers', and firemen's associations, and many other organizations, including practically every patriotic organization in the land, have repeatedly asked for the passage of this bill, and as their honest, just, and patriotic appeal fell upon deaf ears when they urged President Wilson to approve the bill, in the coming presidential election they will demand and materially aid in electing a Chief Executive of this Republic who will stand for the American home and for American labor against the cheap labor of Europe. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH]. [Applause.]

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of immigrants coming into this country who can read at least 30 common words of their own language, as provided by this bill.

I quote the literacy provision:

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 some one of 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.

This provision is the one so much objected to. The following provisions can hardly receive objection, it seems to me, from anyone. I refer to a part of section 28:

SEC. 28. That any person who knowingly aids or assists any anarchist or any person who believes in or advocates the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or who disbelieves in or is opposed to organized government, or all forms of law, or who advocates the assassination of public officials, or who is a member of or affiliated with any organization entertaining or teaching disbelief in or opposition to organized government, or who advocates or teaches 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.

And also to a part of section 35:

SEC. 35. That it shall be unlawful for any vessel carrying passengers between a port of the United States and a port of a foreign country, upon arrival in the United States, to have on board employed thereon any alien afflicted with idiocy, imbecility, insanity, epilepsy, tuberculosis in any form, or a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease.

I wish now to refer you to a statement made by President Wilson in his veto message, which, I think, commends the bill:

This particular bill is in so many important respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable. Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates.

In my State of Michigan we have spent millions of dollars for education, and no money is more liberally or willingly paid by the taxpayers than that paid for education. In that State is located the first great university of the United States—the University of Michigan, at Ann Arbor. We have the first agricultural college founded in this country, and we also have a great normal schools for teachers at Ypsilanti and many other institutions scattered over the State that are creditable and that we are proud of. And I will say for the University of Michigan that it is represented in more places on the globe, and has more representatives upon the floor of this House than any other great educational institution in the United States. [Applause.] In the State of Michigan we compel children under the age of 14 years to go to school under our compulsory-education law, and I am not in favor of letting down the bars to foreigners to come in here without an education and keep them up against our own children. I do not believe that the people of my State are in favor of it, and I can not see how the working people of this country can indorse such a policy. I want to say to you, my friends, that it is a very easy matter to learn to read 30 of the common words in your own language, and I stand absolutely upon the literacy test.

I am one of those who believe that education and good citizenship go hand in hand.

I know that if a man of fair intelligence will take a slate and pencil and sit down for one evening by himself he can learn to write the German alphabet. I say to you that when I heard the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] this morning say that Russians came to this country and set up forges and bakeries and made useful citizens that I would be willing to venture that these very people could read or write 30 common words in their own language. I tell you that letting people come into this country without being educated is not conducive to good citizenship. [Applause.]

An education is the best acquirement a person can obtain. It excels property and it removes mental blindness. Life is much more enjoyable to an educated person than it is to one uneducated.

We now restrict Japanese and Chinese immigration. Many of the people of these nationalities who are prohibited from landing on our shores are educated, but no distinction is made as to them.

Something has been said here that the laboring men are all in favor of the passage of this bill. They are the producers of wealth, a very respectable and considerable part and portion of our population. If they are interested, or if the bill is of any benefit to them, it adds to my interest in its passage.

I notice, from some of the papers, large concerns advertising for help make mention of Slavs, Finns, Poles, and Assyrians preferred. This is all right if they prefer that kind of workmen; and I am not opposed to the manufacturer selecting his own help, and I hope these workmen can all read at least 30 words in their own language.

If they can not read, I would put them in the class with our children and under the law require them to go to school until they learned to read and write, and by so doing give them a benefit which money can not buy nor money alone acquire. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE].

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Speaker, the disapproval of the immigration bill by President Wilson is founded in such sound common sense, is conceived in such a spirit of humanity, supported by Democratic traditions and American principles, that I cheerfully give my support to the President's position and shall vote to sustain the veto.

The proponents of the measure propose to enter upon a reversal of the historical policy of our Government concerning immigration. It has been one of our Nation's boasts that we have hospitably received the foreigners who, coming healthy in mind and body, law-abiding, and self-supporting, sought habitation in our land. Here, too, it has ever been our policy to give to those who came to our shores from lands where equal opportunity was denied or where educational advantages were withheld, an asylum against oppression and persecution. Yet now it is proposed to close our gates to those who, regardless of whether they are bodily or morally sound, useful in occupation, or self-sustaining, happen, because of educational opportunities denied them abroad, to be unable to pass a literacy test.

Mr. Speaker, as much as any man in this House, I am opposed to the admission to our country of the pauper, the bad and the vicious, and the really undesirable classes. I favor the enforcement of the law which looks to their exclusion. But surely because a man, woman, or child happens to be illiterate does not by any means imply that he or she belong to either of these excludable classes. Go to the great centers of population among the immigrant classes and see how illiteracy decreases, as many of these immigrants avail themselves of the opportunity held out to them to learn to read and write.

I heard the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GALLAGHER] describe the conditions in his city respecting the foreign born, their progress and advancement. I come from the city of New York, which abounds with multitudes of the foreign born. Aided by their contribution of thrift and industry, energy and perseverance, my city has grown in wealth and position, in power and in influence, and we who come from that cosmopolitan city, teeming with the myriads of people of almost every nationality, do not in any way share the fears about the influx of immigration so freely expressed on this floor by the advocates of the bill.

I have at all times been a supporter and advocate of the cause of labor. Throughout my public career I have willingly, cheerfully, and unhesitatingly supported the measures designed for the benefit of labor and the betterment and protection of the working classes. I have stood for the principles of organized labor. I, too, want to see the standard of American living maintained and the standard of American wage upheld. I can

not believe that the admission of a few illiterates, otherwise qualified under existing law for entrance to our land, would work the conditions which the advocates of the bill argue on this floor would be produced.

Mr. Speaker, were we to look into the ancestry of many of those who have served city, State, and Nation in public station—aye, of many of those who from time to time have served with honor and distinction in this House—we would find many who came to America from foreign lands illiterate. They, like the immigrants of the present day, quickly entered into the spirit of American life and became imbued with American habits and ideals. They, like the immigrants of the present day, eagerly sent their children to the schools, where, with remarkable aptitude for study, these children made rapid progress in education, and the rolls of honor in our colleges and universities are replete with names of the children of these foreign born.

Through means of immigration our land has prospered, our wealth augmented, our cities and towns upbuilded, and our general welfare increased. Yet for over a hundred years the demand for restriction of immigration has come, more frequently from the narrow minded, the prejudiced, or the ill informed. In the debates on immigration in the House during my years of service I have pointed out, as others, too, have done, the vain fears and gloomy forbodings expressed by the enemies of immigration from the earliest period of the Republic to the present time, yet our country has grown and prospered and become the mighty Nation that it is to-day, while the fears and doubts and pessimistic misgivings have vanished as thin air.

Ah, but some say the quality of immigration is not to-day what it was years ago. Mr. Speaker, that is the same, same old cry. It is the same cry made every time restriction was proposed. Years ago it was directed against the Irish, the Germans, the Austrians, and the Scandinavians. These splendid, sturdy, industrious, and thrifty immigrants made splendid, valuable, most desirable acquisitions to our land. Who now dare deny their worth, their quality, their value to our common country. Now the hand of the restrictionist is directed against the Russian Jew, the Italian, the Roumanian, the Hungarian, the Pole, and the Slav.

You gentlemen who come from districts into which little or no immigration comes do not understand the worth and quality and value of these people. They come hopefully into this country, and, like the immigrants that preceded them, seek, through earnestness of effort, through thrift and energy, through labor, and all that makes for decent manhood and womanhood, to build for themselves and their families and for usefulness and happiness of home. So, sir, aside from those who are honestly and squarely moved to support this bill because they in their judgment believe economic conditions demand it, I fear that much of what underlies the advocacy of the measure in the minds of some is that spirit which is born of narrowness and conceived in racial prejudice.

Time does not permit me to pursue the subject longer. My views, frequently expressed on this floor on the literacy test, are well known to the membership of the House. I ask the House to sustain President Wilson in his scholarly and patriotic message. The literacy test, neither a test of fitness or character, determining neither the morality of the immigrant nor his quality, but used only as a subterfuge for arbitrary restriction, has been three times by Presidents condemned. President Cleveland, in vigorous terms, disapproved it. So did President Taft. Now that great Jeffersonian Democrat who so ably stands at the helm of state, in a message that commends itself to the judgment of fair-thinking men, calls upon us to sustain that policy under which America, as the land of liberty and opportunity, has held its gates open to the stranger from other lands. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT], the chairman of the committee, to yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BROCKSON].

Mr. BROCKSON. Mr. Speaker, restriction of immigration into the United States has been a fixed policy of our Government so long, I believe, the wisdom of such policy is not now debated.

The act of March 3, 1875, prohibited the immigration of alien convicts.

The immigration of Chinese laborers was prohibited by the act of May 6, 1882. Section 1 of that act was as follows:

> That from and after the expiration of 90 days next after the passage of this act, and until the expiration of 10 years next after the passage of this act, the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States be, and the same is hereby, suspended; and during such suspension it shall not be lawful for any Chinese laborer to come or, having so come after the expiration of said 90 days, to remain within the United States.

This law was continued in force for an additional 10 years by the act of May 5, 1892, and it was reenacted and continued in force without limitation by the act of April 29, 1902.

The act of August 3, 1882, prohibited the immigration of "any convict, lunatic, idiot, or any person unable to take care of himself or herself without becoming a public charge."

By the act of February 26, 1885, section 1 provided that—

> It shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership, or corporation, in any manner whatsoever, to prepay the transportation, or in any way assist or encourage the importation or migration of any alien or aliens, any foreigner or foreigners, into the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia, under contract or agreement, parol or special, express or implied, made previous to the importation or migration of such alien or aliens, foreigner or foreigners, to perform labor or service of any kind in the United States, its Territories, or the District of Columbia.

The following provision was added to this act by the act of February 23, 1887:

> That all persons included in the prohibition in this act, upon arrival, shall be sent back to the nations to which they belong and from whence they came.

Section 3 of the act of March 3, 1891, was as follows:

> That it shall be deemed a violation of said act of February 26, 1885, to assist or encourage the importation or migration of any alien by promise of employment through advertisements printed and published in any foreign country, and any alien coming to this country in consequence of such an advertisement shall be treated as coming under a contract as contemplated by such act, and the penalties by said act imposed shall be applicable in such a case.

Subsequently various amendments were added to these laws. By the act of February 20, 1907, now in force, the "contract laborers" who are excluded from admission into the United States are described as follows:

> 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.

Thus from time to time our immigration laws have been made more restrictive.

The pending bill provides for further restriction of immigration by excluding aliens who can not read their own language. The bill has been returned to us by the President without his approval, and is now before us for reconsideration.

Do we need further restriction? If so, should the literacy test be used?

The act of February 20, 1907, provided for a commission, consisting of three Senators, three Members of the House of Representatives, and three persons to be appointed by the President, to investigate the subject of immigration.

This commission, after an investigation of three years, made its report, containing 41 volumes, in 1910. The report of this commission states:

> From July 1, 1819, to June 30, 1910, 27,818,710 immigrants were admitted to the United States. Of this number, 91.5 per cent came from European countries, which countries are the source of about 93.5 per cent of the present immigration movement. From 1819 to 1883 more than 95 per cent of the total immigration from Europe originated in the United Kingdom, Germany, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, Belgium, France, and Switzerland. In what follows the movement from these countries will be referred to as the "old immigration."
>
> Following 1883 there was a rapid change in the ethnical character of European immigration, and in recent years more than 70 per cent of the movement has originated in southern and eastern Europe. The change geographically, however, has been somewhat greater than the change in the racial character of the immigration, this being due very largely to the number of Germans who have come from Austria-Hungary and Russia. The movement from southern and eastern Europe will be referred to as the "new immigration." In a single generation Austria-Hungary, Italy, and Russia have succeeded the United Kingdom and Germany as the chief sources of immigration. In fact, each of the three countries first named furnished more immigrants to the United States in 1907 than came in the same year from the United Kingdom, Germany, Scandinavia, France, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Switzerland combined.
>
> The old immigration movement in recent years has rapidly declined, both numerically and relatively, and under present conditions there are no indications that it will materially increase. The new immigration movement is very large, and there are few, if any, indications of its natural abatement. The new immigration, coming in such large numbers, has provoked a widespread feeling of apprehension as to its effect on the economic and social welfare of the country.

Mr. DONOHOE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROCKSON. I have not the time. If the gentleman will excuse me, I must decline. If I yield, I will not have time in which to conclude what I desire to say.

The Commissioner General of Immigration, in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, says:

Immigration, judged from the results of the year, has apparently reached the million mark permanently, and unless some affirmative action is taken by the Federal Government to restrict it, or steps are taken by European and other nations to reduce the steady stream of persons leaving the various countries of the Old World, we need hardly expect that the number annually entering the United States will hereafter fall far below 1,000,000. During the last fiscal year 1,218,480 souls have immigrated to the United States, 20,588 more than were shown for the previous year and only 66,869 less than the total shown for 1907, the banner year in immigration. Comparison of the record of emigrating aliens with that of immigrating aliens shows that 633,805 left the United States, so that the net increase in population by the immigration was 769,276. It was 815,303 in 1913 and 401,863 in 1912.

Paragraph 8 of the Immigration Commission report, which I have mentioned, is as follows:

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 the industries of the country as a whole, and therefore demand legislation which will at the present time restrict the further admission of such unskilled labor.

It is desirable in making the restriction that—

A sufficient number be debarred to produce a marked effect upon the present supply of unskilled labor.

As far as possible the aliens excluded should be those who come to this country with no intention to become American citizens or even to maintain a permanent residence here, but merely to save enough, by the adoption, if necessary, of low standards of living, to return permanently to their home country. Such persons are usually men unaccompanied by wives or children.

As far as possible the aliens excluded should also be those who, by reason of their personal qualities or habits, would least readily be assimilated or would make the least desirable citizens.

The following methods of restricting immigration have been suggested:

The exclusion of those unable to read or write in some language.

The limitation of the number of each race arriving each year to a certain percentage of the average of that race arriving during a given period of years.

The exclusion of unskilled laborers unaccompanied by wives or families.

The limitation of the number of immigrants arriving annually at any port.

The material increase in the amount of money required to be in the possession of the immigrant at the port of arrival.

The material increase of the head tax.

The levy of the head tax so as to make a marked discrimination in favor of men with families.

All these methods would be effective in one way or another in securing restrictions in a greater or less degree. A majority of the commission favor the reading and writing test as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration.

The commission as a whole recommends restriction as demanded by economic, moral, and social considerations, furnishes in its report reasons for such restriction, and points out methods by which Congress can attain the desired result if its judgment coincides with that of the commission.

All the members of the commission excepting one recommended the adoption of the reading and writing test.

The testimony recently taken before the Committee on Immigration also shows an oversupply of unskilled labor in this country. The foreign unskilled laborers are evidently coming to this country in greater number than new positions are being made or supplied. Hence they are crowding out or interfering with the unskilled laborers among us. Many unskilled labor immigrants find such little opportunity here for work that they return to their native country.

We all know that it is impossible for this country to provide for properly and assimilate the millions of unskilled laborers that might come here if they were admitted without restriction. Since we can not admit all we should select for admission those who are most desirable and best fitted for our institutions.

Will the literacy test in the pending bill assist us in making the selections? I believe it will.

True it is that education alone does not prove good character, and the lack of education may be evidence of the lack of opportunity. Yet it is also true that the lack of education may be evidence of the lack of diligence. In some cases the lack of education proves a lack of diligence.

By adopting the literacy test we would reduce the immigration of unskilled laborers and would still receive those immigrants best fitted to become citizens.

As I have shown by the laws quoted, we have been attempting for years to exclude undesirable unskilled laborers. The Chinese-exclusion law prohibits the immigration of "Chinese laborers," regardless of whether they are educated or not educated, skilled or unskilled. The "contract-labor law" excludes persons who have been induced "to migrate to this country by offers or promises of employment," without regard to their education or lack of education, except that "skilled labor may be imported if labor of like kind unemployed can not be found in this country." Certain professional persons are also excepted.

It is not morally wrong for a foreigner to promise to work in this country. If it were not for the law prohibiting such an agreement, it would be the part of prudence to have an agreement for a position before coming here.

The laws I have mentioned plainly show that we do not want to encourage the immigration of unskilled laborers but do desire to discourage the immigration of such laborers. The "contract-labor law" is hard to enforce, and it is generally believed that it is being constantly evaded and violated.

Probably 99 per cent of the immigrants who are unable to read come to this country to work as unskilled laborers.

The enactment and enforcement of a law containing the literacy test would greatly check and restrict the immigration of such laborers. Too many are coming here under present conditions. There are good reasons for believing that a still greater influx of unskilled laborers will occur after the close of the European war. I believe existing conditions require a law to restrict immigration without delay. No man has offered a bill better than the bill now pending. Therefore I shall vote for the passage of this bill.

It has been well said:

This above all: To thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

As with the individual, so should it be with the Nation. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURNETT. How much time does the gentleman yield back?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two minutes.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BATHRICK].

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Speaker, I desire briefly to protest against the effort on the part of some gentlemen to bring this question into the scope of partisanship. I voted to pass this bill over the veto of President Taft, and I would not be consistent or square with my own conscience if I did not do the same in my party lines and vote to pass it over the head of my President.

Mr. DONOHOE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATHRICK. I can not with the time I have. Now, in reference to partisanship, in reading a letter sent to me by Michael A. O'Leary, chairman of the Democratic State committee of Massachusetts, I was rather surprised that he should make the statement that if this bill passed it would ruin the Democratic Party in that State, and I think it was a direct attempt to bring the bill within the scope of partisan politics. In the same mail I find that the Massachusetts State branch of the American Federation of Labor, being for the passage of the bill, stated that 200,000 members of labor in Massachusetts desired its passage, and in the same mail also I find that the Central Labor Union of Boston, representing 85,000 workmen of that city, desires to have the bill passed. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I desire that a letter to Mr. O'Leary, from the president of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, be read by the Clerk. I believe the Democrats of Massachusetts need to look around and see where the votes are.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read in the gentleman's time.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 2, 1915.

Mr. MICHAEL A. O'LEARY,
Chairman Democratic State Committee,
No. 15 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: We are advised that you are circularizing Members of Congress, urging them "that the future success of the Democratic Party in Massachusetts as well as throughout the country would be greatly endangered by the refusal of Democratic Members of Congress to sustain the President's veto of the immigration bill, and that the dictates of humanity, the high ideals of American fairness and justness, as well as party contingency, require that every Democratic Member shall vote to sustain the President."

In view of the passage of the immigration bill, both in the House and in the Senate, by a substantial majority, it would seem that your conclusion that the future success of the Democratic Party depends upon sustaining the conclusion of the President is not well founded.

We have within a few days past sent out letters to Congressmen and Senators in behalf of our 45,000 members throughout the United States urging that the immigration bill be passed over the President's veto.

We believe that we are qualified to speak with authority and knowledge upon the disastrous effect of free trade in labor, which has now left this country with a bread line of monstrous proportions in all the industrial centers of this country.

It has not been considered that the high ideals of American fairness and justness has been invaded by the qualifications along educational lines required to pass civil-service examinations, and thereby curtail the opportunities for employment of those unable to reach civil-service standards. Politicians have found it necessary to reduce through the civil-service plan the number of applicants for employment within the gift of political organizations or political officials. It is not inconsistent with fair play to humanity and justice if the workers of this country seek the slightest protection which might be afforded by the literacy test contained in the bill vetoed by President Wilson. The workers of this country have to share opportunities for employment with a large foreign element, when there are two or three men looking for one job. It is very easy to note that the influences behind opposition to this bill comes from large interests, who appear to believe that there must

be an unlimited opportunity to secure workers, regardless of the compensation they are to receive. The significant statement of Mr. J. P. Morgan before the National Commission on Industrial Relations yesterday that he supposed $10 a week was enough wages for a man if he was willing to accept employment at that rate, and that if that was the rate of wages there was no obligation upon the part of the person seeking employment to take the wages if they were not satisfactory. We can well understand how Mr. Morgan reaches the conclusions of this kind, as he evidently has never been in a position of seeking employment in an overcrowded labor market or with hungry children needing sustenance.

I express my unqualified surprise that the Democratic Party of this State is responsible for the issue of a circular such as you have sent out to the Congressmen. I am quite sure that the rank and file of the Democratic Party of this State will repudiate any such action upon your part.

This, in my opinion, is not a party measure, and I do not believe that the Democratic Party will be sustained if it is found to be lined up with the President in his veto of this important bill.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN F. TOBIN,
General President of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union,
246 Sumner Street, Boston, Mass.

Mr. BATHRICK. I desire to insert, in addition to the letter just read by the Clerk, the letter of Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, to the chairman of the House Committee on Immigration, and certain inclosures with reference to the manner in which the opposition to this needed legislation is financed by the Shipping Trust and other big combinations, who want cheap labor at any cost to our standards of living and ideals of government:

[From the American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C., Saturday, January 30, 1915.]

SHIPPING, STEEL, AND MINING CORPORATIONS FINANCE OPPOSITION TO IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION—THE FOLLOWING AUTHENTIC DOCUMENTS DISCLOSE THAT THE NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE, WHICH HAS CONDUCTED THE CAMPAIGN TO OPPOSE RESTRICTION AND REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION, HAS BEEN FINANCED BY THE SHIPPING TRUST, THE COAL BARONS, THE STEEL COMPANIES, AND OTHER CORPORATIONS—THE OFT-REPEATED CHARGES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE BY ORGANIZED LABOR'S REPRESENTATIVES AND OTHERS FAVORING IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION ARE PROVEN—PRESIDENT GOMPERS ANSWERS PRESIDENT WILSON'S VETO OBJECTIONS TO THE IMMIGRATION BILL.

HEADQUARTERS AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., January 29, 1915.

Hon. JOHN BURNETT,
Chairman Committee on Immigration,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is sincerely regrettable that the President found it necessary to exercise his great constitutional prerogative by vetoing the immigration bill which passed both the Senate and House by such overwhelming votes, more than two-thirds of each body. It was hoped that with all the information before the President and with the history of the legislation since and including 1896, he would have reached the conclusion to give the bill his approval.

I have before me a copy of the President's veto message, in which he gives his reasons for his inability to give the bill his approval. Of course any utterance from so learned a man, from a man whose heart and mind are so attuned to the people's welfare as are Hon. Woodrow Wilson's, as well as from a man who, in addition, occupies the great office of President of the United States, is deserving of greatest respect and consideration. And still when a measure of such vital importance is yet under consideration and awaits final action by the Congress of the United States, it becomes the duty of citizens to express either their approbation or dissent, as their judgment and experience warrant. In line with this thought, I beg to submit for your consideration some views which are contained not only by me but which are generally entertained by the people of our country.

The President gives two reasons for his veto: First, that the bill embodies a radical departure from the long-established policy for this country, and would close the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of man; second, that the bill provides for a literacy test.

In connection with the first objection which the President interposes, it should be understood that without regard to that provision of the immigration bill the existing law of the United States does exactly what the pending immigration bill emphasizes. The President's objection is against what is now law, even should the immigration bill fail to become law, and in order to remove that objection, if the immigration bill shall fail of enactment, immediate steps thereafter should be taken to repeal the law which in principle the President characterizes as unjust and improper.

Now, in regard to the second objection of the President—that is, the literacy test—permit me to say that the essential purpose is to restrict and limit and better regulate immigration. In view of present conditions, as well as those which will necessarily confront us after the close of the European war, some measure of foresight is imperative if the menace of an overwhelming immigration is to be averted. No thinking, observing man who has his highest hopes centered in the welfare, the protection, and the mission of the people of the Republic of the United States disputes the fact that there must be some measure to restrict, limit, and better regulate immigration to our country. While a literacy test may not be the highest ideal for its accomplishment, yet that it is the most practical, advantageous, and workable no one in or out of Congress has undertaken to disprove, nor has anyone taken the people of our country into his confidence by suggesting or proposing a better method.

For a moment I must again call attention to what is generally apprehended regarding immigration after the close of the present terrible European war. The nations engaged in the conflict will, undoubtedly, do everything within their power to keep the strong and the healthy men at home. They will do everything in their power to encourage the emigration of the weak or incapacitated men and those whose health is partially undermined. Many will be glad to escape compulsory military service, and will do all they can to get away from the burdens of taxation which will result from the war.

And, pray, where will all these men go? Surely they will not go from their own to other countries now engaged in the struggle. They will come, if they can, to America, and come in such numbers as to overwhelm the toilers already here, to depress their standard of life, and to add to the already large number of unemployed.

The present is the time to make provision against what will surely become a menace unless the laws of our country shall restrict and limit and better regulate immigration.

If ever the citizenship of the United States has given indorsement to any measure of legislation, it has certainly done so to the principles embodied in the immigration bill now before Congress.

Not necessarily for your information, but because of the benefit the record may have, let me here state that:

In 1896–97 the Senate and House passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test. It was vetoed by President Cleveland. The House passed the bill over the President's veto. In the Senate it failed of passage over the veto by a few votes.

In 1898 the Senate passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test, but the bill, it is generally conceded, was crowded out of consideration of the House of Representatives by reason of the Spanish-American War.

In 1902 the House passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test.

In 1906 the Senate passed an immigration bill in which the literacy test was embodied. The House substituted a bill creating the Federal Immigration Commission. The commission consisted of nine members, eight of whom recommended the adoption of the literacy test as the most practical means for restricting, limiting, and better regulating immigration.

In 1913 the Senate and House passed an immigration bill containing the test recommended by the commission. The bill was vetoed by President Taft. That bill passed the Senate over the President's veto, but failed to pass the House over the President's veto by four votes.

In 1914–15 the House and Senate passed by more than a two-thirds vote the immigration bill now before Congress, which contains the literacy test. That is the bill which President Wilson has vetoed.

In the President's message he asks the following question: "Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter?" The answer is found in the Democratic and the Republican national platform declarations as far back as 1896. The Democratic national convention platform made the following declaration:

"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 that same year—that is, in 1896—the Republican national convention platform contained the following declaration:

"For the protection of the quality of our American citizenship and of the wages of our working men 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."

And, as you know, the candidates for President and Vice President of the United States nominated upon the platform containing this declaration were elected.

Of course it is sometimes profitable and always justifiable to ascertain the real purposes sought to be attained by and actuating the advocates and the opponents to legislation. Those who advocate the enactment of the immigration bill are persuaded that the needs of the people of our country require some means to protect them, their rights, their work, and their future against wholesale immigration—immigration planned on a great scale to depress the condition of the workers here by large numbers who may and do supplant them and take from them their opportunities to earn a livelihood; immigration which is so potent a factor to intensify and make acute the industrial and social injustice to our people. In a word, there must be some provision to meet a serious and menacing situation jeopardizing American standards of life and American concepts of freedom. If there be any desire for further information as to the justification for the attitude of the advocates of immigration restriction, ample evidence can be found in the report of the Federal Immigration Commission, the report of the Federal Bureau of Labor upon the investigation in Bethlehem, Pa., the report of the House committee giving the results of its investigation of the conditions in the steel industry (known as Stanley report), the statistics of immigration for the last 20 years (now temporarily reduced by the war), and many other sources of official and authentic information. If there be any desire to learn from whence the means has come for America's wage earners' movement to secure the enactment of an effective immigration restriction law the books and papers of the American Federation of Labor are open to you and to any Representative in Congress.

The purposes and the means by which the opponents to the enactment of the immigration law have conducted their campaign are equally a justifiable subject of inquiry. The opponents have openly stated the purpose they have in view. They have publicly declared that their motives are altruistic and patriotic; that they have conducted a campaign open, fair, and square; that the means by which their campaign was financed were contributed by men prompted by motives such as they themselves have openly declared; and that there were no ulterior motives prompting the financial contributors to the campaign of opposition.

Now, there has recently come into my possession a number of documents which place an entirely different light upon the motives, the purposes, and the methods of the campaign which has been conducted in opposition to immigration legislation. These documents have been printed. I make part of this letter a true copy of the documents I have. They are inclosed. If you or any other Representative or Senator in Congress cares to examine as to whether what is inclosed are authentic copies of the documents I have, I should be very glad to afford an opportunity for that purpose.

In conclusion it is earnestly hoped that the Congress of the United States will enact the immigration bill, the President's veto to the contrary notwithstanding.

Very truly, yours,

SAMUEL GOMPERS,
President American Federation of Labor.

WHAT THE STORY TELLS.

Trusts furnish money to National Liberal Immigration League to finance campaign against immigration legislation.

League affirms friendship for National Association of Manufacturers.

Hamburg-American Steamship Line notified by cablegram that league owes $7,000 and is liable to be sued and forced into bankruptcy.

French steamship company urged to aid in financing "a tremendous agitation" against immigration legislation.

Steamship companies campaigned for the appointment of Charles Nagel as Secretary of Commerce and Labor under President Taft. Mr. Nagel is referred to as one "not likely to favor legislation restricting immigration."

Hamburg-American Steamship official tells an associate that "a number of delegations composed of members of various nationalities" were sent to Washington to oppose immigration legislation. He says: "The delegates were not really chosen by bodies of their own nationality." It is stated that the campaign includes "visiting the societies of various nationalities, as Italians, Hebrews, Hungarians, etc., including the unions, for the purpose of advocating liberal immigration."

"We have to send appeals and communications to some 15,000 influential persons, most of them clergymen," says the steamship official.

National Liberal Immigration League, in another appeal for financial aid, tells trusts it is making possible "the influx of alien unskilled labor," and if contributions are not received "we will not be able to keep up our work."

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 30.*

A sensation was sprung to-day in this city by the publication of authentic documents, many of which bear their own authenticity, and others so circumstantially proven that there is said to be no escape from their purport. As will be observed, among the documents are letters and appeals from the officers of the National Liberal Immigration League to corporations for funds and "subventions"; letters from the officers of the Liberal Immigration League to shipping companies of Germany and of France; cablegram appeal for funds by Mr. Behar, managing director of the National Liberal Immigration League, and a carbon copy of letter to the same company confirming the cablegram; financial statement of the receipts of the National Liberal Immigration League showing that $15,000 was paid as an annuity for the conduct of the campaign against protection of America's workers from stimulated immigration; letters from Mr. Behar, managing director of league, to Messrs. Japhot and Sagot, Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Rue Auber, Paris, France, and the reply of Mr. Rene Sagot; appeals by B. A. Sekely, field secretary of the National Liberal Immigration League, who, in addition to his salary, it is declared, became entitled to 25 per cent of his successful solicitations; correspondence on official letterheads between Mr. Behar, managing director of the National Liberal Immigration League, and Emil L. Boas, resident director and general manager of the Hamburg-American Line, 45 Broadway, New York City, and J. Pannes, the St. Louis representative of the company, in the campaign to make Charles Nagel the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor in President Taft's Cabinet, whose campaign was conducted upon the platform that he was an anti-immigration restrictionist; the documents also expose the fake of the delegations representing their own nationalities, for as one official informs his associate that "the delegates were not really chosen by bodies of their own nationality."

In view of the immigration bill now before Congress for a vote over the President's veto, the means by which the National Liberal Immigration League financed its campaign by contributions from the corporations most hostile to the interests of America's workers is both timely and of great import.

This is one of a series of circular letters appealing to corporations for the customary contributions and cash signed by the field representative, who is B. A. Sekely:

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

Educational committee: N. Behar, managing director; John E. O'Brien, secretary; B. A. Sekely, field representative; Arthur F. Day, George M. Dodge, Michael J. Drummond, Charles W. Eliot, Judson Harmon, John J. Haynes, G. Gunby Jordan, Charles R. Parkhurst, Charles L. Stickney, William E. Story, William Sulzer, F. William Vogt.

[National Liberal Immigration League. (Selection and distribution rather than restriction.) Headquarters, No. 150 Nassau Street, New York City. Telephone 4762 Beekman. P. O. Box 1261.]

OCTOBER 14, 1913.

SUSQUEHANNA COAL CO.,
907 Arcade Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: There are now eight new restrictive bills before Congress. One of them, introduced by Representative Roddenbery, provides for an educational test, increase of head tax from $4 to $25, possession of $100, and a physical test like that imposed on recruits for the Navy.

Worst of all these bills is the new Dillingham measure, providing that not more than 10 per cent of the number of any nationality in this country shall be admitted in any one year.

As soon as the regular session of Congress opens there will be started a bitter fight on immigration. We must be prepared, and the most effective way is to strengthen the hands of this league, which is the official organization of the liberal immigration movement. To do this is the duty of every citizen who believes in keeping the gates of America open to deserving immigrants.

This league has no lobby in Washington, and never has had one. It has always worked openly in legitimate and commendable ways, by educating public opinion, by holding meetings in various parts of this country, and sending delegations to Washington when necessary. We believe this honest expression of enlightened public sentiment will in the end triumph over the methods of the restrictionists. But we must present a united front, and to that end we ask you to send your contribution, as you did last March.

Very truly, yours,

NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE,
Per ——— ———, *Field Representative.*

—

Some corporations' contributions.

1912.

Nov. 20. Berwind-White Coal Mining Co., New York	$500.00
May 24. Jones & Laughlin Steel Co., Pittsburgh	250.00
Aug. 26. Pittsburgh Coal Co., Pittsburgh	200.00
Nov. 25. Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh	100.00
May 2. Jacob H. Schiff, New York	100.00
Sept. 23. Standard Sanitary Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh	50.00
91 contributions ranging from 50 cents to $25	357.30
Total	1,557.30

1913.

Mar. 1. Susquehanna Coal Co., Philadelphia	$500.00
Feb. 2. Lackawanna Steel Co., Lackawanna, N. Y	100.00
Mar. 24. Rogers-Brown Iron Co., Buffalo	50.00
Mar. 26. Keystone Coal & Coke Co., Greensburg, Pa	50.00
76 contributions ranging from 50 cents to $25	304.90
Total	1,004.90

MAY 29, 1913.

INCOME OF THE NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE FROM JANUARY 1, 1913, TO DATE.

Mar. 1. Susquehanna Coal Co., Philadelphia, Pa	$500.00
Feb. 2. Lackawanna Steel Co., Lackawanna, N. Y	100.00
Mar. 24. Rogers-Brown Iron Co., Buffalo, N. Y	50.00
Mar. 26. Keystone Coal & Coke Co., Greensburg, Pa	50.00
May 27. Carnegie Corporation of New York	250.00
114 contributions ranging from 50 cents to $25	558.40
Total	1,508.40

—

Rough drafts used as basis for letter to Andrew Carnegie, appealing for contributions and indorsing National Association of Manufacturers:

DEAR SIR: May I for a moment claim your kind attention to the character and labors of the National Liberal Immigration League?

The chief aim of our league is to preserve for our country the benefits of immigration, while keeping out undesirable immigrants.

Amongst our definite achievements I may say that since December, 1905, our league has, by means of open agitation through mass meetings and the distribution of argumentative literature, defeated all anti-immigration bills, beginning with the Gardner bill No. 8495, introduced that year, which provided for a $40 head tax. Conspicuous amongst such bills defeated by us was the Hayes bill of 1910.

All along we have ceaselessly been advocating the distribution of immigrants and labor, improvements in steerage conditions, and increased facilities for the naturalization of aliens worthy of that privilege. While on the other hand it has been our continued aim to promote good citizenship and patriotic sentiment amongst immigrants.

Up until recently we were receiving from a steamship line * * * $15,000 per annum, which, however, scarcely covered our running expenses, considering the vast amount of literature we print and distribute during the year. But the steamship line in question no longer see their way to keep up their contribution. And so we are compelled to fall back for support upon appeals to private citizens. We are confident that the responses will come in according to our deserts.

As a friend of our cause, as shown by yourself in your letter to our president February 2, 1911, we would appeal to you to head our list of subscribers.

Sincerely, yours.

The league, however, is fully inclined to indorse the National Council for Industrial Defense, organized and conducted under the leadership of the National Association of Manufacturers. We are convinced that their activities are beneficent to labor as well as to capital, to employees as well as to employers.

Very truly, yours, ——— ———.

The foregoing paragraph was evidently an afterthought.

NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE.

Statement of income and liabilities, July 1, 1910, to Nov. 20, 1911.

RECEIPTS.

Paris	$15,000.00
Subscriptions for the distribution of Prof. Charles W. Eliot's letter	1,584.30
Dues and donations	380.42
Total income	16,964.72

EXPENDITURES.

From July 1, 1910, to Nov. 20, 1911	19,476.19
Deficit	2,511.47
Deficit July 1, 1910	1,680.70
Total deficit Nov. 20, 1911	4,192.17
Liabilities to date	1,974.97
Total deficit and liabilities	6,167.14

The foregoing financial statement discloses a deficit of $6,167.14, and shows the reason why Mr. Behar, managing director of the National Liberal Immigration League, sent the following cablegram and letter confirming the same:

[Postal Telegraph commercial cables telegram.]

DECEMBER 15, 1911.

Director STORM,
Hamburg-Amerika Linie, Hamburg, Germany:

We owe over $7,000 in salaries, rent, printing, etc. Unless we pay immediately we will be sued and put in bankruptcy with disagreeable consequences for all concerned.

BEHAR.

Mr. ADOLPH STORM,
Director Hamburg-Amerika Linie,
Hamburg, Germany.

DEAR SIR: This morning I said to Mr. Boas that I am continually assailed by creditors to whom we are indebted for rent, printing, etc. I added that it had been suggested to me to send these people to him, but he had always acted so kindly and gentlemanlike that I found it my duty to spare him any trouble. He suggested to me to address to you the following cablegram, "We owe over $7,000 in salaries, rent, printing, etc. Unless we pay immediately we will be sued and put in bankruptcy, with disagreeable consequences for all concerned," which I did.

Very truly, yours, ——— ———.

The following is a banking statement of Nissim Behar in account with the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York on the company's financial blank:

Nissim Behar, 150 Nassau Street, New York. In account with Guaranty Trust Co. of New York.

If no report be made within ten days the account will be considered correct. Vouchers returned.

Line No.	Day.	Checks.	Day.	Total checks.	Date.	Deposits.
1	10	$1,083.13	10	$1,083.13	9	$11,083.13
2	17	200.00	17			
3	28	9,800.00	26	9,800.00		
Balance interest to Dec. 28						8.13
Total Dec. 31, 1910				11,083.13		11,091.26
Balance						8.13

The following is a carbon copy of a letter sent by Mr. Behar, managing director of the National Liberal Immigration League, to Messrs. Japhot & Saget, Compagnie Generale Transatlantique, Rue Auber, Paris, France, appealing for contributions to start a tremendous agitation throughout the country against immigration legislation. The letter discloses the activity of former Congressman Bennet and the "service" rendered by the socialist paper, the New York Call:

NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE,
November 23, 1910.

MESSRS. JAPHOT & SAGET,
Compagnie Generale Transatlantique,
Rue Auber, Paris, France.

GENTLEMEN: We arrived safely on the 22d instant. I was permitted to leave the steamer without any formality as an American citizen, but my baggage, naturally, went with the rest to Ellis Island, causing me some annoyance and loss of time. On the 24th I went to Washington to see the Secretary and hand him over a letter from the secretary of our league, of which I inclose copy. I inclose also clipping from the Sun on this subject. The same has been appearing throughout the press generally, even in the Call, which is the socialist paper.

Though I am personally not unknown to the Secretary, still I took with me my friend, Mr. William S. Bennet, who is prominent in the Republican Party. The Secretary assured us that he and the President are anxious to prevent the breaking of family ties of American residents, but the law must be obeyed, according to the decision given by the solicitor, as per inclosed. But he will do his best to make the application as rare and as lenient as possible.

As to the consequences of the last elections, I was told at Washington that they would be felt in the tariff question, the Democrats being since long declared against the tariff, if not unanimously, at any rate in an overwhelming majority. As to the immigration question, there are Democratic restrictionists, as well as liberals, and, to be more correct, they go according to the manifestation of public opinion.

I will urge all my friends to start a tremendous agitation throughout the country, beginning in December and continuing through January. I shall be very glad to receive your contribution as soon as possible, as I am compelled to make inroads now before the end of November in the supplies which are to last until August, 1911.

Respectfully, yours, ——— ———.

The following letter is from Mr. Rjene Sajot to Mr. Behar, responding to the latter's letter of November 23, 1910:

PARIS, *30th December, 1910.*

DEAR MR. BEHAR: I was glad to hear that you had a good crossing on the *Chicago* and that you landed safely on the other side.

I suppose my chiefs have now written to you. Anyhow, I must thank you for the very interesting literature you have forwarded to me.

Would you mind in future addressing your correspondence to my chief alone and not mention my name on the address, as I am far from being on the same footing in the firm?

Wishing you a happy, healthy, and prosperous New Year, believe me, dear Mr. Behar,

Yours, very truly, RENE SAGOT.

Here is a copy of the original letter sent by Mr. Pannes on the official letterhead of the Hamburg-American Line:

HAMBURG-AMERICAN LINE,
902 Olive Street, St. Louis, January 20, 1909.

Mr. E. L. BOAS,
Resident Director and General Manager
Hamburg-American Line, 45 Broadway, New York.

DEAR MR. BOAS: Your wire arrived too late to secure to-day the information you want on Charles Nagel, but I shall do my best to write you fully to-morrow.

The inclosed article appeared in the St. Louis Globe Democrat of January 19.

Yours, very truly, J. PANNES.

The following is a copy of a newspaper dispatch printed in the St. Louis Globe Democrat:

NAGEL SLATED FOR CABINET POSITION—SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AND LABOR PORTFOLIO FOR NATIONAL COMMITTEEMAN—HIS NAME ON THE LIST—TAFT PLANS TO KEEP IT THERE ACCORDING TO RELIABLE REPORT—NO PULLING FOR HIM—ST. LOUISAN'S WORK ATTRACTED ATTENTION OF PRESIDENT ELECT LONG AGO.

WASHINGTON, *January 18.*

From a source whose reliability can not be brought into question it was learned to-day that the name of Charles Nagel, of St. Louis, appears at this time on the tentative list of the Cabinet of President-elect Taft. The place opposite the name of Mr. Nagel is that of Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

From the same source comes the story that Mr. Taft, having completed a tentative draft of his Cabinet slate, does not propose to change it before his departure for Panama. He will upon his return take up with Senator Knox, who is to be his Secretary of State, some of the Cabinet places which have not been definitely offered to the men picked out for them. Close up to March 4, when he is to be inaugurated, the President elect will make his final revision in the light of some inquiries which Mr. Knox is to make for him.

WANTED MISSOURI TO HAVE PLACE.

It develops that early in his consideration of his Cabinet the President elect determined that Missouri should have a place. One of the fond desires of Mr. Taft was to carry Missouri. He felt that there would be a labor defection which would make him suffer in some parts of the country.

Mr. Roosevelt during the campaign twitted Mr. Taft repeatedly about carrying Missouri, telling the candidate that he might make a good race (the President was always confident of Mr. Taft's election, and said so to all who asked him), but he never would duplicate his own performance in introducing the "mysterious stranger" into the Republican camp. When the slow returns made it apparent that Taft had carried Missouri there was a rapid-fire exchange of pleasantries between the two.

HEARD GOOD ABOUT NAGEL.

Mr. Nagel was brought to the favorable attention of Mr. Taft during the administration of Mr. Roosevelt. Mr. Taft was several times the guest of Mr. Nagel. Mr. Taft often heard eulogistic references to Mr. Nagel from Mr. Roosevelt. While the national campaign was on, the best of reports came from Chicago as to the intelligent advice which Mr. Nagel was able to give to the campaign managers. Not only was he deferred to in many steps taken in the Middle West, but he had a controlling voice, so it was said, in many of the general policies adopted in the national campaign.

It was also asserted to-day that no member of the Taft Cabinet will come into his place with less of wire pulling and solicitation in his behalf. It is said that after a dignified presentation of Mr. Nagel's name from the right quarters no campaign was carried on in his behalf, and that the only further representations made were at the solicitation of Mr. Taft, who sought additional information.

ONLY ONE ADVERSE REPORT.

The only adverse movement in connection with Mr. Nagel's name was that which involved bringing the President elect's attention to the fact that Mr. Nagel's law firm had as clients a big brewery concern, and also, at one time, the Standard Oil Co. This information was conveyed to Mr. Taft by one of his senatorial friends with whom he went over his tentative Cabinet list. Recently the President elect has fully informed himself as to the reports. After weighing them carefully, he is said to have fully determined that Mr. Nagel's high personal character and the character of his law service has been such in no way to disqualify him for the service which Mr. Taft seeks at his hands.

Although Mr. Nagel's name has been frequently associated with the place of Secretary of the Interior, it is said that place will go to R. A. Ballinger, of the State of Washington.

TREASURY PORTFOLIO UNFILLED.

AUGUSTA, GA., *January 18.*

That the President elect has not determined who is to be his Secretary of the Treasury is indicated by the circumstance that he to-day had a conversation with J. Shaffer, president of the Chicago Post, regarding the qualifications of the several Chicagoans whose appointment has been urged by Shaffer, who came here at the special request of the President elect for this conference. He says Mr. Taft is giving careful attention to the Treasury portfolio, and that he may not decide the matter until immediately before his inauguration.

Walter S. Dickey, Republican State chairman of Missouri, will talk politics with Mr. Taft to-morrow.

The following letter is upon the official letterhead of the Hamburg-American Line and discloses the campaign to make Mr. Charles Nagel Secretary of Commerce and Labor of President Taft's Cabinet:

HAMBURG-AMERICAN LINE,
902 Olive Street, St. Louis, January 21, 1909.

Mr. E. L. BOAS,
Resident director and general manager
Hamburg-American Line, 45 Broadway, New York.

DEAR MR. BOAS: The inclosed abstract from the Book of St. Louisans contains condensed information on Mr. Nagel's professional and political career, also of the career of his former partner, Judge Finkelnburg.

Mr. Nagel is an intimate friend of Mr. Adolphus Busch and is attorney for the Anheuser-Busch Brewing Association.

I am now waiting for additional information from Mr. Jos. A. Wright, an attorney with whom I am very well acquainted and on whose discretion I can rely absolutely.

Information secured from other sources is too general in its nature, and I suppose of no use to you. I refer to the general statements that he is highly respected, upright, a conservative, etc.

The inclosed clipping is from to-day's Globe-Democrat.

I hope to have other particulars to-morrow morning in time for the mail which reaches New York on Saturday afternoon.

Yours, very truly, J. PANNES.

NAGEL QUITS PIERCE CASE—FILES FORMAL NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL IN MISSOURI SUPREME COURT—HIS CONNECTION WITH SUIT—ACTION IS NO SURPRISE, BUT MAY HAVE BEEN HASTENED BY TALK OF A CABINET OFFICER.

JEFFERSON CITY, MO., *January 20.*

Charles Nagel, of the firm of Nagel & Kirby, of St. Louis, who is said to be on the Taft Cabinet slate for Secretary of the Department of Labor, to-day filed with the clerk of the Supreme Court of Missouri formal notice of the withdrawal of his firm as associate counsel for the Waters-Pierce Oil Co., which, in the ouster suits, was shown to be largely owned by the Standard Oil Co. The notice of withdrawal was sent by mail.

When. Gov. Hadley, then attorney general, filed his oil suits to oust the Standard Oil and Republic Oil Cos. from the State and to revoke the charter of the Waters-Pierce Co., the latter a Missouri corporation, Charles Nagel was to have been general counsel for the Waters-Pierce Co. His outlined policy of defense did not suit H. Clay Pierce, president of the board of directors of the company, and Judge John D. Johnson was made general counsel and Judge Sam Priest his associate. Nagel was retained in a minor capacity and took little part in the hearing of the oil cases before Commissioner Anthony. About his only connection with the case was in consultation and in making a final argument of about an hour before the commissioner in St. Louis when the case was submitted on the testimony.

Although Mr. Nagel stated some time ago that he meant to withdraw from the case, the fact that President elect Taft has slated him for a Cabinet position as a reward for his good work for Republicanism in Missouri while serving as national committeeman may have hastened his action.

Here is a biographical write-up of Mr. Charles Nagel:

[From Book of St. Louisans, published by the St. Louis Republic, 1906. Data for biographical sketches furnished by the parties themselves.]

Nagel, Charles, lawyer, born in Colorado County, Tex., August 9, 1849; son of Dr. Herman and Fredericka Nagel; educated in country school in Colorado County, Tex.; academic course in private school and high school, St. Louis; two years' course in St. Louis Law School and one year in University of Berlin, where studied Roman law, political economy, etc.; married, first, Louisville, Ky., 1876, Fannie Brandeis; one child, Hildegard, living; married, second, St. Louis, 1895, Anne Schepley; four children, Mary S., Edith, Charles, and Anne Dorothe. Returned to St. Louis after studying abroad in 1873, and engaged in practice; associated at different times with various partners, and January 1, 1903, became partner in firm of Finkelnburg, Nagel & Kirby, which changed, on the withdrawal of Judge Finkelnburg, June, 1905, to Nagel & Kirby. Since 1875 has been professor at St. Louis Law School; has been member of the board of trustees Public Library, trustee Washington University, member of board of control of St. Louis Museum of Fine Arts, member St. Louis Turner Society; Republican; member Missouri House of Representatives, 1881–82; president city council, St. Louis, 1893–1897. Clubs: St. Louis, University, Commercial, Mercantile, Round Table, Noonday. Office, 700 Security Building; residence, 3726 Washington Boulevard.

Finkelnburg, Gustavus Adolphus, lawyer, born near Cologne, Prussia, April 6, 1837; educated in Germany and St. Charles, Mo.; attended St. Charles College, Missouri, and graduated Cincinnati Law College; married, first, Emma Rombauer; married, second, Ida M. Jorgensen. Admitted to Missouri bar 1860; member Missouri Legislature, 1864–1868; Member Congress, 1868–1872; Republican nominee for governor of Missouri, 1876; defeated; same for supreme judge, 1898; defeated; appointed district judge May 20, 1905; member American Bar Association; Republican; author: practiced in supreme court and the courts of appeal in Missouri, 1894; wrote article on the "Power of the State to regulate prices and charges," American Law Review, July, 1898. Clubs: Mercantile, University. Office, room 320, Customhouse; residence, 4312 Westminster Place.

—

The following is another letter on the official letterhead of the Hamburg-American Line, which is self-explanatory:

HAMBURG-AMERICAN LINE,
902 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo., January 23, 1909.

Mr. EMIL L. BOAS,
Resident Director and General Manager
Hamburg-American Line, 45 Broadway, New York City.

DEAR MR. BOAS: Mr. Wright could not let me know until to-day the result of his inquiries about Mr. Nagel. Mr. Wright says that in the opinion of Mr. Nagel's intimate friends he is well fitted for the post and not likely to favor legislation restricting immigration, since Missouri and the Southwest are in great need of immigrants.

This and the information already sent you is all I can secure at present. If you wish me to try for more definite information, I shall do my best to find out more.

Yours, very truly, J. PANNES.

Here is a most illuminating and interesting letter from Mr. Behar, managing director of the National Liberal Immigration League, to Mr. Emil L. Boas, resident director of the Hamburg-American Line:

JANUARY 24, 1908.

Mr. EMIL L. BOAS,
Resident Director Hamburg-American Line,
35 Broadway, New York.

DEAR SIR: The league has so far succeeded in checking the efforts of restrictionists, but the foes of immigration are the kind of people whose energy is increased by opposition, and whose earnestness and enthusiasm grow by defeat. The Junior Order tents have multiplied in Pennsylvania and in other parts of the country, and the delegates of the Immigration Restriction League and of other restrictive organizations are agitating everywhere.

We have sent to Washington a number of delegations composed of members of various nationalities, but the delegates were not really chosen by bodies of their own nationality. If we are to continue the campaign successfully we must penetrate into the masses and interest them to send delegations and instruct Congress that they are opposed to further restriction of immigration.

Our agitation should be carried on in the following ways:

First. Through mass meetings organized in all important centers voting resolutions.

Second. Through delegations to Congress and to all important conventions.

Third. Through public lectures and through special delegates visiting men's and women's clubs throughout the country.

Fourth. Through delegates visiting the societies of various nationalities, as Italians, Hebrews, Hungarians, etc., including the unions, for the purpose of advocating liberal immigration.

Fifth. Through literature. The league ought to continue to send pamphlets and other publications to the Members of Congress and other notable citizens, and to the public in general.

Sixth. Through correspondence. We have to send appeals and communications to some 15,000 influential persons, most of them clergymen.

In order to prove effective the propaganda must be carried on steadily all the year round. It would require vast financial resources to cover adequately all the above-enumerated points. However, if we had a definite sum of money to spend annually, we could arrange a plan for a systematic campaign, selecting the most important means of agitation. The formulation of such a plan is obviously impossible when we have no idea to what amount we may commit ourselves. We therefore suggest that a regular subvention would greatly enhance the value of our activity.

Hoping you will take this matter into consideration for the present year, I remain,

Sincerely, yours, _____ _____,
Managing Director.

The following is a circular letter sent out by the National Liberal Immigration League, of which Mr. Edward Lauterbach at the time was president:

[Edward Lauterbach, president; S. M. Newman, first vice president; William D. Eckert, second vice president; Frank Y. Anderson, third vice president; J. B. Young, fourth vice president; Antonio Zucca, treasurer; N. Behar, managing director; Mark J. Katz, John E. O'Brien, secretaries. Advisory committee, William S. Bennett, Benjamin F. Buck, David James Burrell, Frank S. Gannon, Louis N. Hammerling, J. J. B. Johnsonius, Herman C. Kudlich, Louis Edward Levy, R. D. Silliman, Thomas R. Slicer, Benjamin F. Tracy, Gallus Thomann. National Liberal Immigration League. For the proper regulation and better distribution of immigration. Headquarters, No. 150 Nassau Street, New York City. Telephone 4762 Beekman. P. O. Box 1261.]

GENTLEMEN: Since 1906 this league has kept America's door open to deserving immigrants. Without it, as Members of Congress and others have repeatedly asserted, laws would have been enacted to shut out yearly hundreds of thousands of immigrants whose labor is so much needed for our great industries.

In addition, this league has constantly advocated remedial legislation, such as Federal distribution of immigrants, deportation of criminals, and other measures that would take away the evils of immigration while preserving its great blessings.

We also do educational work by distributing our literature among libraries and debating societies, from whom we receive daily requests for pamphlets. In this way we are building up a public opinion in favor of liberal immigration among future citizens.

Our league had fully carried its claims for support from all public-spirited citizens, and especially those who are connected with industries whose existence is made possible by the influx of alien unskilled labor that can not be replaced by the native element. In default of such support we will not be able to keep up our work, and the Immigration Restriction League, of Boston, will have the field to itself.

Mr. B. A. Sekely, our field representative, will call on you and we bespeak your kind consideration on his behalf.

Yours, very truly, _____ _____,
President.

No contract binding upon this league unless countersigned by the managing director. No person is authorized to use the name of the league otherwise than in connection with its corporate activity.

The following financial statements of the National Liberal Immigration League showing moneys which they received from some of the corporations:

National Liberal Immigration League—Statement.

NEW YORK, *April 10, 1907.*

DEBIT.

Amount brought forward from statement of Nov. 9, 1906	$411.60	
To expenditures from Nov. 9, 1906, to Apr. 10, 1907, as per detailed account herewith	14,913.71	$15,325.31

CREDIT.

By cash received	15,000.00	
By donations received	46.50	
By membership dues received	36.00	
		15,082.50
Balance due		232.81
Liabilities		2,071.15
		2,303.96

National Liberal Immigration League—Statement.

NEW YORK, *January 1, 1908.*

DEBIT.

To expenditures from Apr. 8, 1907, to Dec. 31, 1907, as per detailed account herewith		$6,642.92

CREDIT.

By cash received—		
On Apr. 23, 1907	$500	
On May 6, 1907	500	
On May 13, 1907	225	
On June 4, 1907	500	
On July 3, 1907	500	
On Aug. 5, 1907	500	
On Sept. 4, 1907	500	
On Oct. 3, 1907	500	
On Nov. 4, 1907	1,500	
On Dec. 17, 1907	500	
		$5,725
By subscriptions to league, Apr. 8 to Dec. 31		$17
By donations to league, Apr. 8 to Dec. 31		82
By subscriptions to Federation Review, Apr. 8 to Dec. 31		42
By advertisements in Federation Review, Apr. 8 to Dec. 31		31
		$5,897.00
Balance due		745.92

National Liberal Immigration League—Statement.

NEW YORK, *February 1, 1908.*

DEBIT.

To balance as per last statement	$745.92	
To expenditures from Jan. 1 to 31, 1908, as per detailed account herewith	932.46	$1,678.38

CREDIT.

By cash received Jan. 8, 1908	1,500.00	
By subscriptions to league, Jan. 1 to 31, 1908	3.00	
By donations to league, Jan. 1 to 31, 1908	14.00	
By subscriptions to Federation Review, Jan. 1 to 31, 1908	.50	
		1,517.50
Balance due		160.88

National Liberal Immigration League—Statement.

NEW YORK, *March 1, 1908.*

DEBIT.		
To balance as per last statement	$160.88	
To expenditures from Feb. 1 to 29, 1908, as per detailed account herewith	1,111.08	
		$1,271.96
CREDIT.		
By cash received Feb. 6, 1908	1,000.00	
By subscriptions and donations, Feb. 1 to 29	26.38	
By advertisements in Federation Review	2.50	
		1,028.88
Balance due		243.08
LIABILITIES.		
To Wm. Siegrist, printer	$569.08	
To H. Berlin, for arrears in salary	100.00	
To H. S. Ely & Co., March rent	52.50	
		721.56
Deficit		964.64

National Liberal Immigration League—Statement.

NEW YORK, *April 1, 1908.*

DEBIT.		
To balance as per last statement	$243.08	
To expenditures from Mar. 1 to Mar. 31, 1908, as per detailed account herewith	1,309.70	
		$1,552.78
CREDIT.		
By cash received Mar. 2, 1908	1,250.00	
By subscription and donations, Mar. 1 to 31	2.00	
By advertisements in Federation Review	5.00	
		1,257.00
Balance due		295.78
LIABILITIES.		
To William Siegrist, printer	$382.46	
To H. Berlin, for arrears in salary	100.00	
To Law Reporting Co., for reporting league meeting	45.00	
To H. S. Ely & Co., April rent	52.50	
		579.96
Deficit		875.74

National Liberal Immigration League—Statement.

NEW YORK, *July 1, 1908.*

DEBIT.		
To balance as per last statement	$295.78	
To expenditures from Apr. 1 to June 30, as per detailed account herewith	4,492.58	
		$4,788.36
CREDIT.		
By cash received Apr. 1	1,250.00	
By cash received May 1	2,500.00	
By cash received June 1	1,250.00	
By subscriptions and donations to league, April	13.50	
By subscriptions and donations to league, May	80.80	
By subscriptions and donations to league, June	2.00	
By subscriptions and advertisements Federation Review, April	1.50	
By subscriptions and advertisements Federation Review, May	13.50	
By subscriptions and advertisements Federation Review, June	12.00	
		5,123.30
Balance on hand		334.90

—

IMMIGRATION BILL IS DISCUSSED—PRESIDENT WILSON HEARS ARGUMENTS BY BOTH SIDES AT OPEN MEETING—THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, RAILROAD BROTHERHOODS, AND FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS PLEAD FOR THE LAW—CHARLES EDWARD RUSSELL INFORMED THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE "1,000,000 SOCIALISTS" OPPOSE BILL—TAMMANY AND "BIG BUSINESS" ALSO PROTEST.

WASHINGTON, *January 30.*

In the White House last week 300 men and women urged President Wilson to sign and urged him to veto the Burnett immigration bill. It was an interesting assembly that arranged itself in a semicircle around the Nation's Chief Executive, who gave close attention to the workers' pleas for restriction and the oratorical flights of "big business" representatives. The battle was waged on the section of the bill providing for a literacy test.

Unions affiliated to the American Federation of Labor, the railroad brotherhoods, and the farmers' organizations asked that the bill be signed. On the other side were patriotic representatives of "big business," vote-hunting politicians from every party, and those who opposed the bill for sentimental reasons.

Ex-Congressman Bourke Cockran, New York lawyer, and Congressman GALLIVAN, of Massachusetts, led the opposition. Their rounded sentences and inspiring appeals for the American flag might well be termed classics for schoolboys. Such gems as this were common: "A constellation in the firmament of civilization."

Mr. Cockran indicated who he represented, however, when, in opposition to the literacy test, he said, "I believe a hand calloused with labor should be a better passport."

Former Lieut. Gov. Whitman told the President he represented Tammany, and that that organization was opposed to the bill.

Charles Edward Russel, magazine writer and lecturer, said, "1,000,000 socialists" oppose the bill, which, he declared, was "unsound and could not be enforced."

Secretary Morrison, of the American Federation of Labor, diplomatically called attention to the opposition of some associations "that depend for existence for contributions from the employing class." In referring to the $60,000,000 annual income of steamship companies, he said, "this will account in a great measure for the opposition of societies of various nationalities composed wholly or partly of business men and the attorneys of business men," whose freight charges might be increased to meet the companies' deficit if immigration was restricted. The unionist presented organized labor's position on this question, and showed, by the testimony of investigators, that workers are correct when they state that ignorant aliens are beating down the living standard of American wage earners.

The President gave two and one-half hours to the hearing, which was divided between the two forces. Secretary Morrison had charge of the time for friends of the bill.

J. H. Patten, representing the three farmers' organizations, comprising millions of members, presented resolutions passed by National and State conventions in favor of the bill. The speaker denied the claim that farmers desire the sort of immigrants the bill is intended to exclude. He protested against the "Russianizing" of American labor because of the influx of ignorant aliens.

William M. Clark, vice president Order of Railroad Conductors, spoke on behalf of the railroad brotherhoods, representing 350,000 workers, who favor the bill.

Dr. Stewart Paton, of New York, on behalf of various organizations of alienists and State boards of health said that three-fourths of the insanity in certain sections of the country is the result of illiterate immigration. He said the cost of maintaining them is greater than the cost of our common-school education. His figures were startling. He said this insanity could be largely traced to the flood of aliens arriving every year.

Prof. Fairchild, of Yale University, insisted that the illiteracy test is American and fair. He stated that when this same bill was up for consideration in previous Congresses Italy built schoolhouses in anticipation of its passage. The schoolhouses were abandoned when the bill was defeated.

Prof. Ross, of Wisconsin University, said that of all the tests that had been proposed to restrict immigration the one of illiteracy was the best.

Opponents of the bill showed much alarm at the prospects of this country running short of labor. Many opponents declared in favor of restriction, but "not this kind." None of them, however, even hinted of an effective substitute. Among the other speakers against the bill were Representatives Sabath, of Illinois; Goldfogle, of New York; J. Hampton Moore, of Pennsylvania; and Prof. Larned, of the University of Pennsylvania; Oscar Villard, editor New York Evening Post, and several representatives of foreign fraternal and other organizations.

—

LITERACY TEST FAVORED BY TRADES-UNIONISTS; AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR SECRETARY MORRISON TELLS WHY.

At a public hearing in the White House last week President Wilson listened to arguments for and against the literacy provision contained in the Burnett immigration bill, which has passed both Houses of Congress by overwhelming votes. Secretary Morrison spoke for the workers of this country, and in urging that the President sign the bill, presented the following defense of the literacy-test clause:

"Mr. President, the proposition to prohibit immigration to the United States of able-bodied men and women because they can not read has a sympathetic viewpoint, where individuals are considered; but, notwithstanding such a viewpoint, the American Federation of Labor, which represents the organized workers of the country, and which is the only method or organization or agency which can with any justification or reason represent the unorganized workers, has repeatedly declared by resolutions in conventions 'that the literacy test is the most practicable means of restricting the present immigration of cheap labor whose competition is so ruinous to the workers already here, whether native or foreign.'

"A great deal has been said and published in an endeavor to create the impression that it is necessary to induce immigration to come to this country for the purpose of securing agricultural workers. There is no question in my mind but that such agitation has for its purpose the enticing of emigrants to our country to supply the United States Steel Co., the great manufacturing concerns, coal companies, packing houses, and railroads with men willing to work at a cheaper wage than those who are born here.

"That there may be no misunderstanding in regard to what the farmers think about using immigrants for farm hands, their representative, in his statement to you to-day, has clearly placed the farmers' organizations on record as opposed to the proposition of bringing immigrants into this country to do agricultural work.

"The opponents of this test make the argument that common laborers would belong to the class that could not pass the literacy test, and that this country is very much in need of that particular kind of labor.

"The great industrial companies of this country have more men to-day than they can employ, but they want the present conditions of unemployment to obtain. They want two men for every job. They know that unemployed men must work to live, and their necessities will force them to accept any wage set by the companies. Hence the workers' wages are literally held below a living wage by the hunger, misery, and distress of the unemployed.

"The organized wage workers have declared in favor of restriction of immigration to maintain unlowered the American standard of life. Those who oppose restriction are representatives of companies and associations composed of employers of labor, whose dominant interest is the dollar, and associations that depend for their existence upon contributions from the employing class.

"They feel that a reduction of immigration will result in a higher wage for their workers, which will disturb the profits and dividends from products manufactured by them, or perhaps they have been informed that if the steamship companies do not receive $60,000,000 a year for transporting aliens they will raise their freight rates.

"This reason will account in a great measure for the opposition of societies of various nationalities composed wholly or partly of business men, and the attorneys of business men. Restriction may interfere with their profits.

"With them it is always the dollar—with never a thought for the success or comfort of our millions of wageworkers or the hundreds of thousands who are continuously without sustaining employment. The steamship companies' interest in immigration is the $60,000,000 or more a year collected by them for carrying aliens to and from our shores. These companies have no interest in the welfare of our people. Their interest is in the dollars they collect.

"We oppose any attempt to lower the standards of American life. We want to raise them, and we are opposed to the exploitation of millions of aliens with its attending evils to swell the profits of the steamship companies, even if it adds to the resources of those companies $60,000,000 a year, even if it enables the United States Steel Trust to pay dividends and interest on $400,000,000 of stocks and bonds which never cost that company one cent.

"I wish to call your attention to the fact that industry is protected by a tariff, but labor is not; that the products of labor are protected, but we have a free flow of labor coming to our shores all the time; that the manufacturers have protection against products manufactured by cheap labor in foreign countries, but labor has no protection against the importation of cheap labor.

"The opponents of this measure say that if the products of labor are protected, then labor itself must be benefited, because the manufacturer can sell the products at a much higher price than can be obtained in other countries and will be in a position to pay higher wages to his employees. The protected manufacturer does receive a higher price than the products can be sold for in other countries, and the second contention—that they are thus made able to pay higher wages to their employees—is also true, but the fact is they do not pay higher wages. They pay lower wages.

"We find that the most highly protected industries, particularly the industries that are now controlled by trusts, such as the Steel Trust, Rubber Trust, Sugar Trust, packing houses, and textile industry, pay to their employees the lowest wage in the country, and some of them less than a living wage for a family. A high tariff has nothing to do with the wages paid in these industries.

"We hold that limitation of immigration to our country will compel social and industrial reform in the countries from which the immigrants flow. The fact that these countries have an outlet for a great number of their people means that there is an outlet from the oppressive conditions in those countries. For that reason those countries delay social and industrial reforms. As a consequence industrial and social misery is perpetuated in those countries, because their citizens are induced to come to this country.

"Those of us who have made a careful study of the question and have watched the census have been forced to the conclusion that it has become a habit of mind of the people of this country to have small families. The foreigners who come here have large families, but after being here some time they seem to get into the habit of mind which prevails among those born here; that is, the ever-decreasing number in a family. Those who have given this particular subject much thought and observation have come to the conclusion that this habit of mind is one of the direct results of the tremendous influx of foreign immigration into this country, which causes competition, increases the difficulties in way of obtaining a living wage, and forces the workers to the conclusion that it is their one recourse to enable them to sustain the American standard of life, and to survive the competition of the million or more aliens that have been coming here each year.

"The fact is that immigrants have been exploited to such an extent that workers possessing American ideals can not compete with them.

"On February 2, 1914, Representative AUSTIN read the following letter:

[Edward Horvath Labor Agency, M. Engel, manager. Licensed and bonded. Telephone, Orchard 1039. 124 East Third Street.]

NEW YORK CITY, *October 4, 1913.*

S. E. & H. L. SHEPHERD CO.,
Rockport, Me.

GENTLEMEN: Foreign laborers are now available in this city for less wages than you can secure men for in your State.

Are you in need of any? If so, we can offer for immediate shipment any number of them of any desired nationality.

Trusting to hear from you, we are,

Very truly, yours, M. ENGEL, *Manager.*

"The following advertisement appeared in a Pittsburgh paper:

"'Men wanted—Tinners, catchers, and helpers to work in open shops; Syrians, Poles, and Roumanians preferred. Steady employment and good wages to men willing to work. Fare paid and no fees charged.'

"The wage earners believe in an effective regulation of immigration, because they desire to retain the American standard of living. The standard of wages for both skilled and unskilled labor of this country is the result of many years' effort by organized labor. When an immigrant accepts work at less than the standard wage, he not only takes the place of a man working at a higher rate, but he assists in forcing downward the prevailing rate of wages in that industry, which result carries with it a corresponding reduction in the physical, moral, and intellectual standards of American life.

"It is now an undisputed fact that in many industries the immigrants who come here are working for wages so low that the American worker, insisting on American standards, can not compete with them. In fact, they can not support a family on the wages paid them.

"In support of my statement that the American worker can not compete with this induced immigration and support a family on the wages paid, I refer you, Mr. President, to the investigation of the Bethlehem Steel Works made by a committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ, representing over 16,000,000 people, and the investigation made by Commissioner Neill, of the Department of Labor, as to wages and conditions in the steel industry.

"The committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ, commenting on the wage scale at Bethlehem, said:

"'This is a wage scale that leaves no option to the common laborers but the boarding-boss method of living, with many men to the room. When a man has a family with him, they take in lodgers, or often the woman goes to work. It is reported that immigrant parents send their children back to the old country to be reared while the mother goes to work. On such a wage basis American standards are impossible.'

"Again, they say:

"'None of these common laborers in any of these steel mills are paid a living wage for the average-size family.'"

"The literacy test is an expedient which should be adopted now, and time and experience will demonstrate what further legislation will be necessary in the interest and for the safety of the American people, for the improvement of American citizenship and homes, and for the perpetuation of the American Republic.

"The American Federation of Labor, at its convention held in November in Philadelphia, unanimously adopted a report urging the speedy enactment into law of the immigration bill. I will read so much of the report as refers to the literacy test:

"'It may be well understood that the Governments of Europe will exert themselves to the utmost to the end that those who are fit and who survive the destruction of the present conflict will not be permitted to leave their native countries, but will be seduced by whatever promises are necessary to remain and aid in the restoration of those countries to their lost position in commerce and industry, at the same time offering whatever inducements or assistance they may to the migration of the unfit to the United States, Canada, or any other country that may receive them. * * * For this, if for no other reason, the organized labor movement of the North American continent should devote without cessation its most earnest endeavor to secure the speedy passage of the Burnett bill, containing the provision for the literacy test.' * * *

"Mr. President, no other single proposed addition to our immigration laws has received the indorsement accorded to the literacy test. Seven times since 1894 bills to regulate immigration have passed one or the other Houses of Congress; in each case they have been passed by large votes. The Immigration Commission, which studied the question for nearly four years, said in the statement of its conclusions:

"'The commission as a whole recommends restriction as demanded by economic, moral, and social considerations.'

"A majority of the commission favor the reading and writing test as the most favorable single method of restricting undesirable immigration. The majority in this case consisted of eight out of nine members of the commission.

"The men who are chiefly interested in importing cheap labor into this country are the great tariff barons, the great mine barons, who want cheap labor. They know that they can not get cheap labor unless they get ignorant labor, because ignorant labor is the only labor that does not organize, that does not combine, and does not defend itself. When you bar men because of illiteracy, you do not bar them because of themselves—you bar ignorance. You bar ignorance, because ignorance is dangerous to free institutions in a self-governing country."

PRESIDENT VETOES IMMIGRATION BILL—UNIONISTS URGED TO WRITE REPRESENTATIVES—QUICK ACTION NECESSARY TO OFFSET INFLUENCE OF POWERFUL STEAMSHIP LOBBY AND ITS ALLIES—SUCCESS DEPENDS UPON A TWO-THIRDS VOTE.

WASHINGTON, *January 30.*

President Wilson communicated to the House of Representatives, Thursday, that he disapproved the Burnett immigration bill because of the literacy test. The American Federation of Labor, the railroad brotherhoods, and farmers' organizations prepared for this possibility, and have been urging their members to communicate with Representatives, who are being urged to not sustain the President's veto. It is agreed by House Members that action on the veto will be taken next Thursday, February 4. A two-thirds vote is necessary to reject the veto. Both sides in the House have issued a call for absent Representatives, as it is predicted the vote will be as close as when President Taft's veto on the same bill was sustained in the House by but 4 votes.

Trades-unionists are urged to immediately telegraph their Representatives to not sustain the veto. All other believers in maintaining the American standard of living are urged to do likewise. It is imperative that this action be taken to offset the influence of the shipping interests and their allies, who are working under the guise of "liberalism" to permit them free access to the world's cheapest labor markets.

The passage of the Burnett bill is necessary for workers in their struggle to maintain American ideals and living wages.

Inform your Representative of this fact to-day.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1915.

Hon. JOHN BURNETT,
Chairman Committee on Immigration,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since my letter to you of yesterday, in which I undertook to meet the objections interposed by the President in vetoing the immigration bill, and in which letter I also referred to the source from which the National Liberal Immigration League obtained its financial backing, and in which I also incorporated copies of documents which came into my possession, I have this morning by mail received several documents of importance bearing upon this latter subject. One of them is a copy of an agreement entered into between the National Liberal Immigration League, Mr. N. Behar, managing director, and Bela N. Sekely, field representative of the league. The agreement provides for the commissions which B. A. Sekely shall receive for financial contributions made by trusts, corporations, and holding companies, and special reference to the United States Steel Corporation. For your information, as well as for the record, I inclose a copy of that agreement.

I also inclose a copy of a pen-written letter by Mr. Behar from Wiesbaden, Cologne, under date of August 22, 1913, to Mr. Sekely. These are of the most important among those I received.

In addition, I should say that the person who placed these communications in my possession writes me to the effect that if the documents submitted to you yesterday and the inclosed should be supplemented by others, or if he is wanted "to appear before any properly constituted body to substantiate by statement," and anything in reference thereto, he will be glad to comply. It seemed to me that as chairman of the Committee on Immigration of the House of Representatives all this information should be in possession of yourself, of your committee, and of Congress.

Very truly, yours, SAML. GOMPERS,
President American Federation of Labor.

NATIONAL LIBERAL IMMIGRATION LEAGUE,
150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK.

AGREEMENT.

Entered into June 17, 1912, by and between the National Liberal Immigration League, of New York, party of the first part, and Bela A. Sekely, of New York, party of the second part, witnesseth:

First. Party of the second part agrees to endeavor to raise financial support for the National Liberal Immigration League and party of the first part agrees and obliges itself to pay to party of the second part commissions as stated in the following paragraph for each and all contributions and donations secured by party of the second part.

Second. It is mutually agreed by the contracting parties that party of the first part will pay to party of the second part the following commissions on each of the donations and contributions secured by party of the second part—

(a) On sums over $10,000 a commission of 10 per cent.
(b) On sums over $5,000 up to $10,000 a commission of 15 per cent.
(c) On sums over $1,000 up to $5,000 a commission of 20 per cent.
(d) On sums amounting to $1,000 or less a commission of 25 per cent.
(e) On all contributions and donations made by parties after one year has elapsed since their first contribution was made party of the first part will pay to party of the second part a commission of only 10 per cent irrespective of the size of such contributions or donations.

Third. It is mutually understood and agreed that when a single contribution is made by business concerns known as trusts or holding companies this contribution comprising the contributions of several subsidiary companies of such trust or holding company—like the United States Steel Corporation—then the amount of such contribution is to be subdivided by the number of companies belonging to such trust or holding company, and the percentage of commission is to be determined by, and to be paid on each of the average amounts shown by the subdivision stated above.

Fourth. Party of the first part agrees to pay to party of the second part a weekly sum of $25 to cover his personal expenses, the total of such payments, however, to be deducted from the total of commissions due to party of the second part.

Fifth. Party of the first part agrees to pay the traveling expenses for party of the second part and such necessary business expenses as typewriting, etc.

This agreement can be discontinued by either party in giving two weeks' notice to the other party.

BELA N. SEKELY.

N. BEHAR.

WEISBADEN, COLN., *August 22, 1913.*

MY DEAR MR. SEKELY: I am going shortly to Liverpool, as everything depends on the decision taken there.

I will do my best—as far as argument and persuasion can go.

Received your friendly lines the 5th instant. I hope by this time you have received from Mr. Waron or otherwise the $30.

Very glad to hear that you will go often to the office.

I enjoyed the trip in the steamer, where I could do good service by refraining from sitting at table at night for supper. No more so, since I must count the sous and the pfennigs.

Let us hope, with kind regards for you and Mr. Berlin.

My address: 9 Rue Wauquelin, Paris.

Yours,

N. BEHAR.

I hope you will obtain from Mr. O'Brien to sign a letter to the signatories, which I will send by next mail. The object of the letter in question is to notify our signatories that we will append their names to our arguments.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to use some of his time.

Mr. MOORE. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Speaker, there is unquestionably a strong sentiment among a large number of people in this country that this measure should prevail. These people are actuated by the very highest ideals; they are among our very best citizens and sincerely believe that the immigrant coming to this country who can not read or write is a menace to our institutions. I respect their views, and if I could bring myself to agree with them, I would gladly vote to-day to override the President's veto.

This country was settled by immigrants. Our forefathers came here that they might enjoy freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and have an opportunity to work out their own and their children's happiness. I am heartily in favor of keeping out the undesirable alien, and when this measure was under consideration voted for it with the literacy test eliminated. I regret sincerely that it did not pass in that shape. It would have been a stronger and better measure than the one now in force.

Much has been said to-day of the attitude of labor on this important question, and it has been argued that the coming to this country of large numbers of immigrants has tended to decrease the earning capacity of the American citizen. My observation in the great city of New York, where we have to meet and work out this problem, is entirely contrary to that view. I have been a close observer of labor conditions in the city and State of New York and of the wages paid there. I know that 30 years ago the men engaged in the common labor in our State were largely of Swedish, Irish, German, and English extraction. Now the children of these same men are engaged in the skilled trades at wages from 25 to 50 per cent more than they were paid 30 years ago. The effect of immigration has been to force up the wages of the immigrant of 30 years ago, who is the American of to-day. Common labor in the city of New York is now almost entirely performed by the Italians and the other races from southern Europe. We have spent in New York State during the past eight years on the roads in our rural communities and in the rebuilding of the Erie Canal over $150,000,000, and have now under contract or in contemplation the expenditure of over $300,000,000 for the extension of our great subway system in the city of New York. More than half the labor in these great public improvements is performed by unskilled workmen, and the vast majority of the men engaged in this work are illiterate. In New York State we have a law which compels every boy and girl to go to school until they are 14 years of age. In the northern European countries the same law also prevails. Neither the young American or the alien from the countries referred to will perform the common laboring work demanded in the great public improvements we have undertaken in recent years.

I said a moment ago that in New York City we have this great problem to solve, and we are solving it successfully. It is true that at present over 400,000 men and women in our city are out of employment, but in this vast number few are among the illiterate. These people take care of their savings and, when the hard times appear, are able to live on their savings until business revives.

My observation, Mr. Speaker, is that when the illiterate foreigner comes here he is the first one to see the necessity of education. I have gone through some of our night schools and find the great majority of those attending are from our foreign-born population. They can neither read nor write, and they improve the first opportunity to gain this advantage. They learn in these night schools the rudiments of an education and respect for our American institutions, and most of them when they are here long enough to become citizens are sufficiently advanced to present themselves to our courts and be accorded the rights they are entitled to under the law. I have visited some of the high schools in the city of New York. I find that a majority of the boys and girls attending there endeavoring to obtain an education are children of foreign-born parents. These parents, realizing their lack of education, grasp it immediately for their children. I am informed that in the College of the City of New York the parents of three-fourths of the children are of foreign birth. Men on this floor have criticized the character of the citizenship of our city. We are proud of it. The leveling influence of our great public-school system is doing more to solve this problem than all the laws we can place on the statute books. We want the strong, decent immigrant. We need him. We can assimilate him. We are assimilating him. We do not want the criminal, the anarchist, the unclean or indecent, and I am in favor of making the law just as strong as possible to keep out the men and women who, from their character, their health, their previous habits, will not in the end become good American citizens.

The other day, in a conversation with several Members of the House, it was suggested that our pension laws should be amended so as to prohibit the granting of pensions to pensioners who did not reside within the boundaries of the United States. This brought very forcibly to my mind the story of two cousins of my maternal grandfather who came to this country at the outbreak of the Civil War—two young Irishmen who could neither read nor write. They had heard of the war for the preservation of the Union. They knew this country had been the haven for the oppressed of their land, and they offered their services to the United States. One of these illiterate lads was killed at Gettysburg and the other severely wounded. The wounded boy returned to his old home after the war and there married a young Irish woman, and shortly after left her a widow. She is living in the old country, drawing a small pension, which I am sure, when the circumstances are understood, nobody will try to take from her. I simply point out this incident to indicate how unfortunate it would have been if at that time these two young liberty-loving Irishmen had been unable to come here and serve this country in its hour of need.

Mr. Speaker, I address the House to-day with some misgiving. As I indicated in the opening of my remarks, many of the best people in my State and city differ with me on this question. Frankly, I have at times struggled with myself in an effort to see if it were not possible to agree with them on the subject, but I can not do so. In a matter of this kind one must vote according to his conscience, and I can not bring myself to vote to shut the door of opportunity to the unfortunate man or woman who has been denied the chance that you and I have had.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND].

Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND. Mr. Speaker, having supported the bill now pending before the House, I shall now vote to pass it, the veto of the President notwithstanding.

The necessity of some character of restriction to keep from our shores undesirable classes of immigrants has been growing more apparent from year to year, as the records have disclosed an annually increasing number of arrivals at our ports. Various methods have been proposed to solve the problem during the decade that I have been a Member of this body. In 1907 Congress provided for the appointment of a commission to make a thorough study of the entire question. At that time a bill providing a literacy test was pending. Before adopting this plan the House desired that a thorough investigation of the whole subject should be made. This commission was composed of three Members of the Senate, three Members of the House, and three others not Members of Congress. One of these outsiders was a distinguished citizen of the State of California, Mr. William R. Wheeler. An investigation was made of conditions abroad. Exhaustive hearings were had. In reporting the commission was unanimous that some method of restriction was necessary. As I recall—and I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] so stated upon the floor yester-

day—eight of the nine members of the commission advocated a literacy test.

The President in his veto message declares that he knows of no desire on the part of the American people for this character of law. My experience in this House has taught me that when a measure passes this body by an overwhelming vote it is in response to a well-defined public sentiment throughout the United States. Upon two occasions a literacy test has passed this House by an overwhelming vote. I maintain there can be no better or more accurate test of public sentiment throughout the country than shown by a majority vote of the Members of Congress representing every section, and who are responsible to the people of their various districts for their every act. Yes; and I have found that the Members of this House are quicker to detect public sentiment than any other body or individual in the country. They appeal to the people every two years.

The President also declares that the political platforms should speak. It seems to me that the President of the United States is the last person upon the face of the globe to disapprove a bill because it is not mentioned in the platform of the party. We have seen too many planks repudiated that were contained in the platform of the Democratic party. We saw the free-toll plank repudiated; and now the President and his party are about to repudiate another plank in the Democratic platform—the one in reference to a second presidential term. So, it seems to me, that this argument falls to the ground. Oh, it may be that this test will not keep out of the United States all of the undesirable immigrants we would desire to keep out, but, in my opinion, it is a step in the right direction. [Applause.]

This method may not be perfect, but what better plan is offered? It will be found that most of those who oppose the literacy test are unfavorable to any form of restriction.

As a nation we have always welcomed the thrifty and industrious immigrant, and will, I hope, continue this policy. Those who fail to have the proper respect for our institutions, those who do not appreciate the value of American citizenship and would subvert our laws, this class we do not welcome. The literacy test, in my opinion, will bar many.

I freely acknowledge that many of our best and most desirable citizens are foreign born. Had they come to this country under present conditions, considering the advance the world has made in education, there would be few, if any, who would have been unable to meet the simple literacy test provided in this bill. Any foreigner imbued with the proper ambition and possessed of sufficient enterprise would fit himself for the test.

In this connection I will quote the language of the literacy test. I do not see how it can be seriously objected to in this enlightened age. It reads as follows:

> 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 some one of 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.

When the war in Europe ends the Pacific coast will be confronted with a new immigration problem resulting from the opening of the Panama Canal. Then the European immigrant will land directly at our doors. We are taking steps to meet the situation. The best methods of locating immigrants in the soil is being studied. With this in view, a Pacific coast immigration congress was held in San Francisco in April, 1913, attended by 327 delegates from 42 cities in California, Oregon, and Washington.

As shown by evidence already placed in the RECORD, the chief fight against this section is being inspired by the foreign steamship companies which profit so largely from the traffic. They want no restriction of immigration. It is not surprising that these companies have contributed to the fund raised by the National Liberal Immigration League, which is the leading organization fighting against the restriction of immigration. Probably it will be impossible to override the veto of the President owing to his power, but the issue will be a live one in the next campaign. Organized labor is interested. Patriotic men and women in every section, anxious to raise the standard of American citizenship, will continue the fight.

In California no man or woman can enjoy the privilege of full citizenship, can exercise the right of the ballot, unless able to both read and write. Should not the immigrants entering that State be able to read at least, as provided in the literacy test?

We of the Pacific coast want restriction that will aid in excluding the undesirable classes, and, in my opinion, this bill is a marked advance over existing laws or any new law so far proposed. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McGUIRE].

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, if the Democratic Party were going to remain in power indefinitely there would be no occasion to restrict immigration. The Democratic Party always has restricted immigration, and for a splendid reason, and that reason is that when the Democrats are in power there is no work in this country for the laboring man, whether he be foreign or domestic. The Republican Party was divided in the last presidential campaign. However, notwithstanding that division, I want to make this observation, that if President Wilson had gone before the American people with the statement that there would be a bill such as this before the American Congress, and that it would pass both the House and the Senate and that he would veto it, he never would have been President of the United States. [Applause.] There never would be a man elected President who was opposed to restricted immigration if the people knew his position prior to the date of election. They say that they qualify quickly in this country; that they learn to read and write quickly. I see no reason why a man, if he is competent, can not qualify just as quickly in some other country as he can after he gets here. I fail to see the force of that suggestion.

I have in my office now no less than 100 protests from different sections of the United States, all coming from organized labor, requesting that I vote to pass this bill over the President's veto. I have two letters on my desk at this time requesting that I vote to sustain the President of the United States. And I apprehend, gentlemen, that the ratio of population of this country is in accord with the ratio of letters which I have received pro and con upon this question.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. I can not yield now. I undertake to say that for every man in America, whether for labor or otherwise, for every man who is opposed to restricted immigration there are no less than 50 who favor restricted immigration, and you can generally rely upon the disinterested, honest, frank, and candid judgment of the American people.

Talk about its not being in the Democratic platform. The President says it has been in no platform. The President is mistaken about that. Every party that has ever mentioned it has always declared in favor of restricted immigration. But the President has been for some things that were not only in the platform, but which declared for the opposite of his subsequent position. I speak particularly of the Panama Canal tolls. The ladies went to him some time ago and interrogated him in respect to woman suffrage. He said, "I can not do anything, because it is not in my party's platform." Well, I will tell you there was something, gentlemen, in the Baltimore platform; there was a plank or paragraph in that platform that the people of America were for. I refer to rural credits. There was an affirmative statement in favor of rural credits in that platform, so that the President, it seems to me, could find something to do by taking up things they did declare for. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a notification of the resignation of a Member. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

JERSEY CITY, N. J., *February 4, 1915.*

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Washington, D. C.:

Have this day tendered my resignation as Member of House of Representatives to the governor of New Jersey. Formal notification mailed to you this morning.

EUGENE F. KINKEAD.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, the President in his message vetoing this bill, in speaking of the literacy test, employed the following language:

Restrictions like these, adopted earlier in our history as a nation, would very materially have altered the course and cooled the humane ardors of our politics.

That is true, Mr. Speaker, but the American Government of to-day is unlike the American Government of yesterday. Conditions prevailed then not only in this country but in other countries very much different from now.

New and changed conditions have made necessary new and changed laws. What was the situation in the formative period of this Government? Here was a great country with untraveled forests, unexplored streams, and unbounded opportunities; a country that extended an invitation to the oppressed and adventurous of other lands—an invitation, however, that was accepted mainly by the sturdy Anglo-Saxon, whose ambitions cried out for liberty and whose heart beat for freedom. The undesirables, the riffraff, the outcasts, and the scum of other countries did not accept the invitation, first, because they were unable to feel its warmth of meaning, and secondly, because they did not breathe the spirit of adventure, thrift, and liberty—qualities that make a people strong, a nation great.

There were in those days, Mr. Speaker, no great steamship lines to encourage and bring over for selfish purposes the criminals and illiterates of other lands, but those who came were moved by a spirit of liberty, a love of freedom. If you say few of them were educated, I answer yes. If you say that had the literacy test then been invoked few of them could have entered, I answer yes. All that is true, yet it argues nothing. In those days many people, not only in America, but in the great countries of Europe were uneducated. One hundred and twenty-five years ago few colleges and no public schools could be found in this country, but since that time no fact has been appreciated quite so much by the American people as the necessity of education. They see in it the preservation of high ideals, the perpetuity of Christian institutions, the stability of the Government, and the greatness of the Nation.

In 1800 there was expended in this country for education a little more than $1,000,000. Last year there was expended over $700,000,000. Since the foundation of our Government we have expended incalculable sums for education, and to-day schoolhouses nestle on almost every hill and great towering universities and magnificent colleges are found in almost every community throughout this country.

The spirit of education pervades all our people, and why? Because we would inculcate into their hearts and minds the highest ideals of good government and good citizenship. A similar condition is found in practically all the civilized countries of the world. There is no reason now, as there might have been in former days, for any person in any part of the civilized world to be deprived of an education—the best test of the true qualities of good citizenship.

I ask you, sirs, in view of these changed conditions, is it asking too much that the same test be applied by this Government to those who would seek the opportunities and advantages of our land, the protection of our Government, and the society of our people as is applied to our own citizenship? [Applause.] There is nothing unfair or unjust in the literacy test. It will deprive none who are entitled to come from coming; it will allow those who ought to come to come; and by the adoption of such a test as is embodied in this bill the high ideals and splendid character of our people will continue to be exerted, shedding the benign influence of liberty and freedom and good government to all the nations of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEVENS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEVENS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STEVENS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I voted against this bill when it was before the House, and I shall vote to sustain the President's veto.

I do so with some doubts on the subject, because there are arguments in favor of restriction that appeal to me. But, Mr. Speaker, restriction of immigration runs counter to all our history and our democratic sentiments. I am not yet convinced that we need restriction of immigration in the United States.

It is true the conditions of to-day are somewhat different from those of 100 years ago, but to-day in America, with millions of untilled acres of land, thousands of acres of forests untouched, vast resources that are undeveloped, this country could support in prosperity and happiness millions and hundreds of millions of more people than it has to-day. If the coming of men to America meant that every man who came took some bread out of the mouths of those already here, if the amount of wealth was limited and it meant sharing it with more men, if our resources were developed and our power to support population fully matured, then, indeed, it would be wise to restrict immigration. But that is not the fact, and every man in this country knows that it is not the fact.

Furthermore, even if it were necessary to restrict immigration to-day I would be opposed to the literacy test, which is no test whatever of a man's qualifications to become a citizen of the United States. The question is not whether you can read or write or whether you have been educated, but are you educatable, are you the kind of people who will take advantage of the opportunities for education and work if you have them?

Unfortunately there are many countries in Europe peopled by men who have fine human qualities, where the opportunities for education are very limited, and thousands and thousands of men get no opportunity whatever to go to school. I do not believe that it is American, I do not believe that it is just to exclude such men merely because they have not had opportunities in their own land. I would point out to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], who speaks of the vast amount of wealth we spend in education, the fact that that wealth that we put into education has been largely created by immigrants and the sons of immigrants. These men who come here bring with them not only mouths to feed, but hands to work with, and they produce more wealth than they consume.

The one argument, Mr. Speaker, that appeals to me in favor of restriction is the one from the labor-union point of view. There is no doubt that the steady flow to this country of large numbers of unskilled laborers from other countries makes more difficult the great problem of union labor, and with that I sympathize. But I believe that we can help laboring men more in this country, and labor unions more, not by this crude makeshift policy of exclusion, but by better laws for the distribution of immigrants when they come, and better laws governing the distribution of wealth which the workers receive in this country. [Applause.] I will go as far as any man in Government action to encourage unions, to protect the right of men to organize, but restriction of immigration does not appeal to me as a way of helping the workingman.

So, Mr. Speaker, for these reasons I shall vote to sustain the President's veto. [Applause.]

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. FITZGERALD, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, reported a bill (H. R. 21318) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report (No. 1365), ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserves all points of order on the bill.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I did not expect anything to arise that would call for an effort on my part during the short time that I am to be among you as a Member of this honorable body. But an occasion has arisen which I can not conscientiously ignore, especially as no one else seems to insist on the aspect of the matter which appeals so strongly to me.

I leave Washington on March 4 next with the conviction that I have been made a better and broader-minded American citizen by my term in Congress and by contact with the many men of brilliant parts who, in the ranks of different parties, are serving their country unselfishly and well.

But before going from among you I feel in duty bound to give voice to a protest and a warning, and I do it not only as a Member of this House but also as an American citizen trained from youth to respect authority.

As Members of Congress we are called to be the big men of the country. This is the place where big things have to be dealt with that concern a big Nation's health and prosperity. As Representatives of the people in the work of national legislation we should be a pattern for the people in all that makes for sound citizenship.

It is in this spirit that I protest with all the earnestness and energy within me against the insinuating language which has been used on the floor of this House with reference to the President of the United States.

We enjoy the privilege of differing with the President on each and all of his policies. We have the privilege of voicing

such differences either here or elsewhere and of giving the reasons that seem to justify our opposition to his plans and measures for the welfare of the country. We have the privilege of fighting against his policies with all the energy of our convictions. But I hold, gentlemen, that we are doing a positive injury to the Nation and to the dignity which should characterize all our activities as Members of this important branch of the Government when we descend to personalities and to mean insinuations that seem to imply dishonest or dishonorable conduct on the part of the President.

By choice of the people he is President of the United States, and as long as he occupies the White House he is President not merely of the Democrats but of all the people—your President, gentlemen of the minority, as well as mine. As such we owe him respect, and we should be the first to give this example to the Nation.

Remember, it is not opposition to the President—it is not persistent and conscientious antagonism to policies the President may favor—which I am protesting against as hurtful. My protest is entirely against the manner in which that opposition has been expressed on the floor of this House; against unjustifiable accusations and insinuations and language that was full of disrespect for the Chief Executive.

Deep down in our souls, gentlemen, we of this House know that Woodrow Wilson stands before the country and the world as a man of transparent patriotism, unshakable honesty, and singleness of purpose—a man whose whole thought is the welfare of the Nation, the peace, happiness, and prosperity of its people. We know him as a man of courage and strong convictions, so conscious of rectitude that he can court the searchlight of publicity with confidence in the sound judgment of the people.

In the political history of the Nation there have been many truly great men. We have a Washington, a Jefferson, a Jackson, and a Lincoln to honor and be proud of. Yet in their day, when the country was profiting by their service, their patriotism was questioned, their motives maligned, and they themselves made the butt of many a jibe and sneer. Disaster was prophesied as a result of their policies. Well, these critics have passed into oblivion, but the names of these great Presidents are enshrined in the memory of the Nation forever.

Who of us to-day would dare to stand on this floor and insinuate that President Lincoln was a sneak? Who would dare speak of Jackson as a coward? None, of course, because we know that to do so would be to sound the death knell of one's political career. Yet these accusations have been hurled at the head of our present distinguished President, and while the gentlemen who went to such extremes may have been able to convince themselves that there was sufficient foundation for their accusations, I am maintaining that they are false, and that such language is a disgrace and an injury to all of us as a body and to the people we represent, and may be productive of consequences which these same gentlemen would be the first to regret.

There was a Brutus once, "the noblest Roman of them all, who loved the name of honor more than he feared death; who would have brooked the eternal devils to keep a state in Rome," yet the smooth and sweet-tongued Cassius and his fellows, with persistent insinuations, under the guise of a sublimated patriotism, were able to inveigle even Brutus into believing that the undoing of Caesar was for the good of Rome, and moved him to a deed which he regretted only when it was too late.

And if a Brutus could be so influenced against the man who called him friend, and who, when he plunged the dagger in, said, "You, too, Brutus?" what of the ever-present multitude whose passions are easily inflamed by words spoken in high places, perhaps in haste and without the judicial calmness which should mark the utterances of all Members of this distinguished body?

In times of great stress great passions lie smouldering near the surface, and oftentimes a trifling word or act may start a flame that would develop into a conflagration. Among the many millions of our people there are always those who seem forever wandering on the very brink of fanaticism, ready to leap beyond the bounds of all restraint on the slightest provocation. We as a Nation are at the present time going through such a period of stress.

The terrible war into which all of the great European nations have unfortunately plunged has prolonged and emphasized the slight depression which was bound to follow the great body of legislation which this Congress has enacted into law. Most naturally the condition affects more acutely the great multitudes who labor and who have little or no resources to fall back upon, who in their present need see little comfort in the good that is predicted. Many of these are not inclined to search beneath the surface of things for real causes, but slip into the old fallacy of arguing "after this; therefore because of this," or, in other words, "the milk soured after the new moon, therefore the new moon caused the milk to sour." They blame their troubles on the new administration, and there are politicians petty and unpatriotic enough to further their own selfish ends by fostering this attitude in the minds of such people.

For these people the administration centers in the President, particularly when, as now, the President stands out predominant as a big man; a strong man who has admittedly accomplished big things. Therefore we should weigh our words and let them be the result of serious reflection, the words of men who measure up under all conditions to the dignity of the position they occupy.

Besides, gentlemen, we are a cosmopolitan Nation. Many of our citizens are children of nations now unhappily at war, struggling perhaps for their very existence. Most naturally their sympathies go out to their native land in the present gigantic conflict, and even though the administration is trying most scrupulously to maintain an attitude of strict neutrality, it would not take a great deal of unjust criticism to convince some that the Executive of the Nation is not doing all in his power to preserve an impartial attitude toward all.

We as a Nation are blessed with peace amid almost universal turmoil, with glorious prospects ahead, please God, because of peace, and we look forward to the happy time for which we pray when, because of neutrality, we shall be a strong force in securing for all a happy and lasting peace.

As regards the great forces of labor in this country, to which one Member referred while charging the President, I can say that, having come from the ranks of labor myself, I yield to no man in my sympathy and in my respect for that great institution—the laboring man.

I have worked for them with Wilson, both in the State of New Jersey and the Nation, and I am firmly convinced that when he lays down the burden of office the workingmen of America will have lost the truest and most sympathetic and effective friend that ever occupied the White House.

The times are big, gentlemen; big with calamity; big with prospects for the future. Let us be big and avert calamity from our Nation; big to grasp all opportunities for our people. Paraphrasing Wolsley's advice to Cromwell, Let all the ends we aim at be our country's, our God's, and truth's. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSTER). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill because it restricts immigration. Had I lived a hundred years ago I would have been opposed to it for the same reason that I am in favor of it now. One hundred years ago we needed more people, now we need less. A hundred years ago there were more opportunities than there were men. During the long years of the century just passed people have been coming here by the millions. One opportunity after another has been taken, until now our country is full of men and our cup of opportunities is about empty. There are at least a million more people now here than there are jobs. We ought to send a million undesirable men back to their native land instead of permitting any more to come. It is true in times past we made this country the asylum for all the world, but our gates should now be closed, for the room is all taken. Years ago we had an insane asylum at Napa City, Cal., but after a while it became full, and the management refused to admit another patient. I say, as an asylum for immigrants, the United States is full. Ninety-nine million people are all it will hold, and we have a hundred million on hand. For one I am in favor of closing the gates of our country against laboring immigrants, at least until what we now have are assimilated.

Some one has said:

> The literacy test, and the tests and restrictions which accompany it, constitute an even more radical change in the policy of the Nation.

The same force of reason could have been used against the failure of the management to admit patients to the Napa Insane Asylum after it was full.

You might just as well demand that your friend should drink a barrel of water because he asked for water when thirsty as to claim the United States should not stop foreign immigration when its needs are supplied. [Applause.]

I consider the passage of this bill of more importance than was the passage of the Underwood tariff bill or the banking and currency bill. Those measures dealt with the finances of the country; this bill deals with the personnel of the country; and as men are of more importance than dollars, so this bill is of more importance than any measure dealing with money. This country is rich in financial resources. As far as wealth is concerned, it will last forever. Our valleys, rich with alluvial soil, and our mountains, stored with gold, are a guaranty against poverty; but bear in mind gold and silver are not the greatest consideration of a nation. Especially is this true of a Republic that claims to be the light of the world. With the advantages God has given us, foolish, indeed, would we be if by the passage of nonsensical laws we confound our resources so our temporal wants can not be supplied. Our forefathers established a Government that, like our soil, is the best there is on earth, a Republic where every man has an equal opportunity and an equal say, and where each man's power is as great as that of his fellow's. This land in the days of our forefathers was full of opportunities but empty of men, and so they threw wide open our eastern and western gates, invited the European to come by the way of New York and the oriental by the way of San Francisco, but at no time have they intimated that their invitation would never cease. An invitation is always limited to time, place, and numbers, and by its very nature signifies there will come a time when the gates will be closed.

When our fathers won this land on the bloody battle fields and extended an invitation to the world to come, they reserved unto themselves and their children the right to withdraw the invitation whenever they should see fit, and during the years that have passed we have exercised this right whenever we so desired.

In 1892 we closed our western gates to the Chinese and departed from our original policy in reference to them. At that time there were a hundred million of them who wanted to come, but we told them frankly that our invitation to them had ceased. We did not do this because we dislike them or because it was for their best interests to stay away, but because it was for the best interests of our country that they should not come. Doubtless by this act we prevented many good men from coming here, but, nevertheless, by the exclusion we did our country a thousand times more good than harm.

This country does not belong to the world, as some people seem to think, but it belongs to us and our children forever, and the question is, Are we wise enough to keep it? To-day, in spite of the Chinese-exclusion and other exemptions we have made, we find too many immigrants are coming to our shores and that we must make a further exclusion.

Being unable to assist all of the unfortunate, poor, and needy, have we not 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 all of 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, 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 and capacity to acquire a little learning 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, 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 emphasize upon the minds of ignorant people of all lands the fact that the human race is developing, and that all must keep apace with the times.

Enlightenment being necessary in this country, we have decided to exclude the ignorant. Some one has said:

This is an exclusion against those who have not had opportunity.

Such is not the truth. Many people in Europe have not had an opportunity to attend a college or university. Some have not had an opportunity to attend a school of any kind; but all have had an opportunity to learn to read simple words in their own tongue. A primer in any language can be purchased for a few pennies or a dime, and anyone who has been sufficiently frugal to earn traveling expenses with which to come to this country and money enough to guarantee against becoming a pauper certainly has had the opportunity to buy a little book. On the corner of almost every street in any city of the world can be found persons who will help another learn his letters and to read 40 simple words. I am sick of hearing people talk about poor, lazy mortals, covered with dirt and scurvy, never having had an opportunity in the world.

The man who has not had an opportunity to learn to read 40 simple words in his mother tongue, has never heard of the United States, and should he by chance wander onto a ship coming to these ample shores, would be excluded from landing by the immigration authority under the present law on the ground that he was an idiot. I do not say all who can not read in their own language are idiots, but I do say all who have not had an opportunity to do so are of unsound mind. I freely admit there are thousands of good people in the world who can not now meet the educational test of this bill; but I claim it would be no unreasonable hardship while earning sufficient money with which to pay traveling expenses here to employ an hour or two each evening for a couple of months learning enough to meet this educational test. [Applause.]

Certain animals when born have not the power of sight, but nature has ordained that such shall not wander from the parental nest until they can see. This bill provides that prospective immigrants must stay at home until through their intellectual eyes they begin to discern at least some rays of light. It is better they remain at home during the black hours of intellectual night in a monarchical form of government where others see and think for them, in a government they can not harm, than to come to this Republic, where enlightenment is the watchword and where all are equal.

Ignorance is the greatest enemy of a republican form of government. It will no more live in harmony with a republic than will fire exist in harmony with water. Wherever a republic and ignorance meet, one subdues the other; it means an uncompromising fight to the finish. Sometimes one is victorious, and sometimes the other; it depends altogether, and always, upon the relative strength of each. But bear in mind that victory for either in a way means defeat, for the victor always comes out of the ordeal more or less injured. Just in proportion as you fill up a republican form of government with ignorance, just to that extent do you bring down its standards. If the standards fall below a certain point, the ship of state will be left to unskilled hands and will soon drift among the rocks of revolution and be lost, and ignorance will prevail. If the standards are left just above this point, the ship will still take its feeble course without proper attention soon to become a byword among men. For one I am not in favor of mingling the clay of ignorance with the iron of this Republic.

Ignorance thrives in a monarchical form of government, for there the subjects do not govern themselves, but are governed. The more ignorant the subject is, the easier is he governed. I would rather the prospective immigrant would stay at home while he is ignorant, where his ignorance is a blessing, than to come to this country where his ignorance is a curse. Let him prepare himself while in his own land, to be a blessing to our land when he comes. When I invite a tramp to abide under my roof, I always insist that he take a bath before he retires for the night. Once I purchased a Texas steer, but I sawed off his horns before I turned him loose, for fear he might harm the other stock. I insist that care and preparation is necessary before any radical change is made, for without it one may become injured, or may injure others.

As I said before, I would, if I could, stop all immigration of the working classes to this country, not because I hate the working classes that might come but because I love the working classes that are now here. The working classes come to this country to get a job, and there are not jobs enough for those who are already here. There are a million men in this country now, looking for a job. They might just as well be looking for the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. The one does not exist any more than the other. It is because I love the working classes at home, and the working classes abroad, that I would restrict immigration. The working classes that come would be disappointed, for they would not find what they seek, and the working people here would be disappointed to have the foreigner come and be their competitors, so it is a blessing at home and abroad, to have them not come. The only persons who will be benefited by immigration are those connected with the transportation companies, the agencies across the water that thrive on immigration, and the employing classes here. If 1,000,000 immigrants come to this country each year, and there are frequently more than that number, and the transportation companies charge $50 apiece for bringing them here, it is plain to see their gross income will be $50,000,000 per annum. Viewed from this standpoint, it is not strange there are some whose hearts are turned to stone

in reference to the working classes at home, but whose hearts fairly bleed for the men intellectually as dark as night, who live in the jungles across the sea.

I am in favor of restricting immigration, because I believe in equality, and immigration, under its present condition, works a hardship upon the working classes in this country, while the capitalists receive a great benefit. The more men there are hunting jobs that do not exist, the more competition there is in labor, and the more labor is degraded. The more men there are hunting jobs which do not exist, the greater the benefit to capital that is anxious to secure cheap labor. Every man who comes here hunting work is a blessing to the capitalist, for he wants work to be cheap. Every man who comes here seeking work is a curse to the laboring man, for he wants expensive work. The working classes that come to this country must be assimilated by the working classes that are now here. Some people seem not to know how the working classes feel on this subject of foreign immigration. Let me call the attention of such to the fact that the American Federation of Labor, with its membership of more than 2,000,000 wage earners, in every national convention of recent years, with all the States represented, has asked for this legislation. The United Mine Workers of America, with 450,000 deserving members, are in favor of it; in fact, the last resolution they adopted a few days ago demanded the suspension of all immigration until the million of unemployed men now in the country could be furnished with work. The Farmers' Union, 3,000,000 strong, demands this legislation. The National Grange, the Farmers' National Congress, the Railway Trainmen's Association, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Conductors, and Firemen, all are praying for the passage of this bill.

Within the last 48 hours I have received letters and resolutions from S. E. Heberling, international president of Switchmen's Union; G. W. Perkins, international president of the Cigar Makers' International Union; O. L. Baine, general secretary-treasurer, at international headquarters, Boot and Shoe Workers' Union; J. T. Carey, president-secretary International Brotherhood of Ropemakers, Albany, N. Y.; V. A. Olander, secretary-treasurer of Illinois State Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill.; J. W. Hays, secretary-treasurer International Typographical Union, Indianapolis, Ind.; E. Lewis Evans, secretary-treasurer Tobacco Workers' International Union, Louisville, Ky.; John P. White, president, and William Green, secretary and treasurer, of United Mine Workers of America; Frank Duffy, general secretary of United Brotherhood of Carpenters-Joiners; S. J. Konenkomp, international president, and Wesley Russell, international secretary-treasurer, of Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, Chicago, Ill.; James Wilson, general president Pattern Makers' League of North America; and others too numerous to mention, all demand in the strongest terms the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

The issue in regard to this measure is clearly drawn. All the laborers, toilers, farmers, artisans, mechanics, and those who wear gloves to protect their hands against blisters and slivers are on one side while the transportation companies, the rich and employing classes, all who wear gloves to keep their hands from becoming sunburned are on the other. Every man who wants a job is in favor of the bill and every man who has a job that he wants to fill with a man is against it. If you who are opposed to this measure only had faith enough in the judgment of the working man to believe he knows what he wants the controversy would end right now in favor of the bill; but you are not willing to make such a monstrous concession. You will never be able to say that you did not know what the toilers wanted, for they have written, telegraphed, and sent you resolutions by the thousands. You will not find one intelligent toiler anywhere in the 48 States of this Republic, who is posted and willing to use his own judgment, who will not tell you he is in favor of suspending all immigration of the working classes until again there are more opportunities in this country than there are men. [Applause.]

Some say this country is a refuge and asylum for the poor and oppressed, therefore we should not make the exclusion. If not now, when we have a hundred million people, when shall we make it? Will not your arguments be just as applicable when the time comes? Is anyone so shortsighted as to claim the exclusion should never be made. Is it the idea of such that here should be the great melting pot; that the gold of this country should be mingled with the silver, the copper, the tin, the zinc, and the lead of all lands? If so, let me tell you the crucible, when finally cooled, will contain a base metal without quality and without use. The gold will have lost its ring, the iron will have lost its strength, and the individuality of each metal will be gone forever.

Some say ignorant immigrants should be brought to this country to occupy positions which the people here now will not fill, that we are continually evoluting and leaving behind a class of work that we have outgrown. I object to this conclusion, because the premises are not true. Such a notion is against the fundamental doctrines of this Republic. In this country we have no use for kings, crowns, titles, caste, or class, In this country all work is honorable and the hands of every honest man, regardless of what kind of work he does, are clean.

Gentlemen talk in sentimental tones about the men in Europe coming here to escape the tyranny and oppression of their native land. I would like to invite some of you city-bred, hothouse, sentimental gentlemen to come out into the great West and temper your sentiment with observation and reason. If you did, you would be convinced that illiterate foreigners do not come here to escape anything save, too often, the laws of their own land, which they have violated. They come here because the financial opportunities are greater; because more pumpkins can be grown on an acre of land; and because red wine costs but 19 cents a gallon. There is no more sentiment about these letterless immigrants than there is about a swine drinking clabber milk. The only purpose the majority of them have in coming to this country is to get their feet into the trough.

My friends, will you kindly stop figuring from the standpoint of the man in Europe and figure from our own standpoint, and tell me, as long as we can not admit everybody, why we should not take our pick, and have the best?

As our cup will only hold so much, why not fill it with strawberries instead of soap root and choke cherries?

Why should we invite to become members of our great national family people of whom we will be ashamed?

In this country where we spend millions of dollars each year combating ignorance, why should we import more?

Why not import men to help us fight ignorance rather than import ignorance for us to fight? [Applause.]

I am sorry this bill is not broad enough at least 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 sea.

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 are the greatest problems and the greatest plagues 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, bring 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.

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 are anxious to come.

The most important matter pertaining to immigration is to keep from our shores all who 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. Speaker, 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. [Applause.]

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 each year a half million of full-grown men and women, intellectually as dark as midnight, 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 our intellectual standard?

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. [Applause.]

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 enough at home sufficient to enable him to read and write? 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 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. [Applause.]

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's 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 in 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, "The Government of the United States of America was lost by reason of the lack of patriotism of her people." [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts use some of his time now?

Mr. GARDNER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, after a studious consideration of all the arguments that have been advanced in opposition to the literacy test as applied to our immigration laws, I am constrained to add by voice and vote in favor of this bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The question of an amendment to our immigration laws that would in some degree regulate and restrict the great tide of aliens flowing into the country from southern Europe has been much agitated and discussed in Congress and in the public press during the last two decades. That an urgent necessity exists for some legislation that would conserve the peace and the material and social welfare of the country has been the almost overwhelming sentiment of Congress during that period, as shown by the record of what has been done here, and I believe the action of Congress has been supported almost unanimously by public opinion.

HISTORY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION.

In 1896–97 the Senate and House passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test. It was vetoed by President Cleveland. The House passed the bill over the President's veto. In the Senate it failed of passage over the veto by a few votes. In 1898 the Senate passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test, but the bill was crowded out of consideration of the House of Representatives by reason of the Spanish-American War. In 1902 the House passed an immigration bill containing the literacy test. In 1906 the Senate passed an immigration bill in which the literacy test was embodied. The House substituted a bill creating the Federal Immigration Commission. The commission consisted of nine members, eight of whom recommended the adoption of the literacy test as the most practical means for restricting, limiting, and better regulating immigration. In 1913 the Senate and House passed an immigration bill containing the test recommended by the commission. The bill was vetoed by President Taft. That bill passed the Senate over the President's veto, but failed to pass the House over the President's veto by 4 votes. In the present Congress the House passed by more than a two-thirds vote and the Senate by a vote of 7 to 1 the immigration bill now before the House by reason of the President's veto.

It will be seen that the literacy test, which is the main feature of this bill, was supported by a large majority of both Houses of Congress all through this period and incorporated in all the acts passed. Finally, the able commission created by Congress to investigate the subject of immigration, after four years of exhaustive inquiry, at a cost of nearly $1,000,000, made a report, covering 42 volumes, from which the following conclusions are summarized:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF IMMIGRATION COMMISSION.

The investigations of the commission show an oversupply of unskilled labor in the basic industries to an extent which indicates an oversupply of unskilled labor in the industries of the country as a whole, and therefore demands legislation which will at the present time restrict the further admission of such unskilled labor.

It is desirable in making the restriction that—

(a) A sufficient number be debarred to produce a marked effect upon the present supply of unskilled labor.

(b) As far as possible, the aliens excluded should be those who come to this country with no intention to become American citizens or even to maintain a permanent residence here, but merely to save enough, by the adoption, if necessary, of low standards of living, to return permanently to their home country. Such persons are usually men unaccompanied by wives or children.

(c) As far as possible, the aliens excluded should also be those who, by reason of their personal qualities or habits, would least readily be assimilated or would make the least desirable citizens.

The following methods of restricting immigration have been suggested:

(a) The exclusion of those unable to read or write in some language.

(b) The limitation of the number of each race arriving each year to a certain percentage of the average of that race arriving during a given period of years.

(c) The exclusion of unskilled laborers unaccompanied by wives or families.

(d) The limitation of the number of immigrants arriving annually at any port.

(e) The material increase in the amount of money required to be in the possession of the immigrant at the port of arrival.

(f) The material increase of the head tax.

(g) The levy of the head tax so as to make a marked discrimination in favor of men with families.

All these methods would be effective in one way or another in securing restrictions in greater or less degree. A majority of the commission favor the reading and writing test as the most feasible single method of restricting undesirable immigration.

INDORSED BY LABOR AND FARMERS' UNIONS.

It has been truly stated that no single proposed addition to our immigration laws has the indorsement that has been given to this test of literacy. The party platforms of two political parties advocated it in the election of 1912; the Farmers' Educational Union, representing 3,000,000 farmers in the United States; the Federation of Labor; and numerous other labor and patriotic organizations have urged its adoption. Wherever an inquiry or caucus of individuals or societies has been made the sentiment in favor of such a provision has been found to be almost unanimous.

DESIRABLE IMMIGRANTS ADMITTED.

It has been estimated that in some portions of northern and western Europe the operation of the law would exclude not more than 1 per cent of the immigrants, and in some sections 2 per cent. Of the Scandinavians and Bohemians, who make desirable additions to our population, less than 1 per cent would be excluded; of Scotch, Irish, and English less than 1 per cent, and of the Germans not more than 2 per cent. But of the vast hordes that in recent years have been coming from southern Europe, 60 per cent would be kept out, and of the Greeks and Syrians about 40 per cent. These latter classes are those that settle in the congested districts of our cities, who are never producers, and who, to a great extent, engage in occupations that are not really useful or necessary.

The truth of this statement is borne out in the report of Dr. Thomas Darlington, president of New York Board of Health under the administration of Mayor McClellan, who investigated the conditions referred to. He says:

I have heard the assertion that immigration is necessary to carry on our public works, to build railroads, to dig canals, and the like. But the present immigrants now coming over do not come for that purpose, and will not do that sort of work. No; they prefer to become push-cart peddlers and to live in our cities in poverty, breeding crime and disease. They occupy our streets, the streets for which our taxpayers have paid heavily. They interfere with traffic and break the laws of sanitation which we have decided are necessary for the preservation of public health.

Even in the early days of the Republic, President Washington foresaw the possibilities of undesirable immigration, and expressed his views, as follows, in a communication on the subject:

My opinion with respect to immigration is that, except of useful mechanics and some particular descriptions of men or professions, there is no need of encouragement, while the policy or advantage of its taking place in a body (I mean the settling of them in a body) may be questioned, for by so doing they retain the language, habits, and principles, good or bad, which they bring with them. Whereas by intermixture with our people they or their descendants get assimilated to our customs, measures, and laws; in a word, soon become one people.

For more than 75 years after this the immigrants coming voluntarily to our shores were the kind the country needed, men and women who came with a sincere purpose to attach themselves heart and soul to the New World, to share its benefits and destiny, from Ireland, Germany, and Scotland, and later from Sweden and Norway. These, with their habits of industry and thrift, assimilated with the American people, and became a part of the great bone and sinew of the Nation. But, Mr. Speaker, in the years since 1885 the tide that has swept in upon us from other parts of Europe has been of a vastly different type. They have come with their different ways and customs and ideas of life, their illiteracy and uncleanliness, their lack of thrift and morality. They have huddled together in the already congested sections of our cities under the most insanitary conditions.

UNDESIRABLES NOT WANTED HERE.

Many of these people do not come here with any intention of becoming citizens of the country. They are sought out in the highways and slums of southern Europe by agents of the steamship companies and of the great corporations that can use unskilled labor. On arrival here they do not go out to the farms, where conditions would be tolerable, where they could find employment that would enable them to live comfortably, but go into the already congested sections of cities, to become a menace and a burden.

The pitiful conditions that exist in the so-called Ghetto district of New York City have been ably portrayed, and constitute a scathing arraignment of those who are aiding hordes of paupers to come to this country, where they require them to work 16, 18, and even 20 hours a day for wages so low as to be almost beyond belief. It is charged that a very large percentage of the thousands of low-grade immigrants arriving in this country every month for years past have been aided to come by these commercial influences for their own purposes. Three hundred thousand unfortunate human beings live in the Ghetto district under conditions that are appalling. Families of six and seven persons, including young men and women grown, are found inhabiting one basement room and sleeping side by side on the floor. There are filthy tenements in which children sleep under their parents' beds in dark, unventilated rooms, without a glimpse of the sun or of trees or flowers during all their early childhood. These are illustrations of the conditions that exist among the illiterate and undesirable class whom this bill would in future exclude from the country.

It is an admitted fact that, as a general proposition, those who are ignorant of language are likewise ignorant of all the qualifications of good citizenship, and do not come here to acquire any permanent interest in the country. Even when not actually criminals or of the vicious classes, they become a burden and a menace to the social life and institutions of the Nation.

It is charged against them that they are lowering wages by underbidding the American laborer, that they are driving the American entirely off the field of fair competition by reason of their willingness to live and toil under conditions of congestion and filth to which the American wage earner can not submit. They are charged with preventing a general introduction of the eight-hour law and a general betterment of the status of the laboring man by reason of their willingness to work any number of hours a day for any kind of wages in any kind of a place. It is further charged that by reason of their congesting our already overcrowded cities they breed and disseminate there all manner of crimes and diseases; that they are filling our jails, reformatories and brothels, our orphanages, hospitals, and almshouses. This is the indictment that has been drawn against them by those who have made a careful study of the immigration question. Can we safely afford to further delay legislation for the protection of the laboring men and women now citizens of the country by limiting the influx of this undesirable horde?

I happen to have at hand statistics for a period of one year ending June 30, 1914, during which time there were received into the United States 1,218,480 immigrants, of whom 122,657 were Poles, 138,051 Hebrews, 251,612 from the south of Italy, and 25,819 Slovaks, showing a large increase over previous years. These people have flocked into our cities, to the factory towns of New England, and to the coal-mining districts of other States, where they are displacing the American laborers that were there by reason of their willingness to work for starvation wages. This is not a fanciful picture. In many of the cities of the districts mentioned the foreign population has increased at an incredulous rate during the last few years.

It is estimated that more than three-fourths of all immigrants have remained in the cities. In the great city of New York over 40 per cent of the population is foreign born; in the little manufacturing city of Bridgeport, Conn., it is 38 per cent; in Lowell, Lawrence, and Fall River, Mass., large factory cities, the foreign population has increased to nearly 50 per cent, and conditions in these cities at the present time are reported to be deplorable. Wages in the mills have been reduced to the starvation point, and thousands of former operatives have been supplanted by this cheap labor. The city of Philadelphia has 24 per cent of foreign-born population; Chicago, 35 per cent; Cleveland, 33 per cent; Worcester, Mass., over 33 per cent; Paterson, N. J., 36 per cent; and Providence, R. I., 34 per cent. These figures illustrate a situation that is rapidly producing what may soon come to be intolerable conditions.

Prof. Louck, who has made an exhaustive study of the immigration question, in a published document states:

Of the employees in the bituminous mines of Pennsylvania in 1909, only 15 per cent were native Americans or born of native father and 9 per cent native born of foreign father, while 76 per cent, or slightly more than three-fourths, were of foreign birth. What is more significant is that less than 8 per cent of the foreign-born mine workers were English, Irish, Scotch, German, or Welsh. The majority were from southern or eastern Europe, with the Italians, Magyars, Poles, and Slovaks predominating. The term "American miner," so far as the western Pennsylvania field is concerned, is largely a misnomer. When they work these miners average, as in the case of the Roumanians, as low as $1.85 a day, while in the greater number of cases the range is close to $2; more than one-tenth of the Ruthenians, Roumanians, Poles, and Croatians earn on an average under $1.50 a day. But unemployment in the course of the year brings down the general average for heads of families to $431. The south Italians earn only $399 and the Poles $324 a year.

Mr. Speaker, it is evident beyond controversy that we have confronting us in this immigration question a great problem and one that must be speedily solved if the American ideals, for which we have struggled and legislated, are to be preserved. I shall record my vote in favor of this bill, because I believe it will stay in some degree the vast tide that threatens to overwhelm us.

WE MUST PROTECT OUR OWN PEOPLE.

The idea that these United States should extend the glad hand to all comers regardless of source or condition is not so attractive to our minds as it may have been in the days when half the country was unoccupied. Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and of nations as well. Charity begins at home, and we should make sure for the future of our children and their children's children, before receiving on our shores more than one and a quarter million foreigners annually, unless they are of a character which will not crowd out our own wage earners and make it impossible for them to maintain their present high standard of living.

MILLIONS SENT TO EUROPE.

The drain on the Nation's wealth represented by the money sent abroad by foreign immigrants in this country who do not intend to make America their home is alarming, amounting to over $200,000,000 annually.

We have in this country several millions of industrious naturalized citizens who came here from other lands, and who have become as much a part of the body politic as those who are to the manor born. A great number have gone into the mines and shops, others have helped to construct our railroads, and have aided in the development of our resources. Is it fair to them, most of whom are dependent upon their earnings to support themselves and family, to continue to admit to our shores millions of uneducated and undesirable people who are unfitted for becoming citizens, and who by underbidding the labor market deprive those now here of their means of livelihood and bring distress upon our industrial communities?

BUT A SMALL PROPORTION OF IMMIGRANTS LIKE THE FARM.

One of the remedies that has been recommended by various philanthropists and students of government for our immigration troubles and the overcrowded condition of our cities is the distribution of the surplus upon the land and through the farming districts of the country. But unfortunately for them, these people are not farmers, and do not want to become farmers, even if they had sufficient capital to install themselves upon farms. They can not be induced in any appreciable numbers to leave the cities. Two or three years ago the agricultural bureau of the State of Pennsylvania made an earnest, organized effort to secure from the cities much needed help for the 228,000 farmers in that State. The appeal was sent to the farm congress, or committee of distribution in New York, but out of a very large number of requests to send immigrants, but few responses were noted. This is the experience of other States and localities.

FARMING LAND AVAILABLE IN WEST.

Easily within the memory of many of us now living the United States has acquired vast areas of territory which have from time to time been added to the public domain for settlement. To quote the language of a distinguished citizen of my own State:

The Congress of the United States has done and is doing much toward providing homes for the people within our borders, both native born and naturalized. Under the public land laws millions of acres of fertile land have been given away to those who desired it, and now that the most desirable land has been given away, millions are being expended to reclaim the desert places, that they, too, may be divided among the people. No charitable or humanitarian effort can hope to compare in generosity and magnitude to the donations made by the United States; and yet, in spite of it all, congestion such as has been described is an alarming condition in many of our large cities. Will not the embarrassments which now exist in our cities because of this congestion increase rather than diminish? How long can we continue to add to the number of impoverished in our cities without detriment to our Nation?

It has been claimed that we need more labor here to carry on our improvements and develop our resources. It is true that there is need of labor that will till the land and increase the products of our farms, but, as has been already shown, we are not getting many of that class of workers among the immigrants now coming into the country. It is also true that there are still large resources to be developed. In all the Rocky Mountain States there are excellent opportunities for trained farmers; but those immigrants who would be kept out by the proposed law and who are now buying tickets on the installment plan in southern Europe, with the intent of landing in San Francisco, Portland, or Seattle after the opening of the Panama Canal, are of the same class that now congests the cities of the Atlantic coast. They have no intention of going into agricultural pursuits and are not desirable additions to our population. They are men and women with barely enough money to permit them to enter under existing laws and must secure employment at whatever wages they can obtain, bringing disastrous competition upon many of our own native-born and naturalized citizens, millions of whom are now seeking employment themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this bill may not be a complete remedy for all our immigration ills, but it is the best possible solution that has been evolved after an agitation of nearly a score of years; it meets the recommendations of the Immigration Commission, which made such an exhaustive study of the question in this and foreign countries; it has passed this House by nearly a two-thirds vote, and there were but 7 votes against it in the Senate. It is to be regretted that the President has felt impelled to veto the bill, regardless of the overwhelming sentiment in favor of the proposed legislation, as indicated by the arguments advanced and the affirmative vote of a great majority of the Representatives of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to a few selected communications which I have received, which indicate the interest that is being taken in this legislation by the labor organizations of the country:

WALLACE, IDAHO, *January 29, 1915.*

Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the members of Wallace and vicinity Trades and Labor Council, representing 16 local organizations of labor, are unanimously in favor of passing the immigration bill over President's veto, and earnestly request your fullest unqualified support.

JAMES G. ARTHUR, *Secretary.*

—

MOSCOW, IDAHO, *February 2, 1915.*

Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.:

Every member of organized labor, and approximately every citizen of Idaho, request that Congress pass immigration bill over veto. We respect our President, but feel that he has made a mistake, which must be remedied, or disaster is likely to follow.

MOSCOW CARPENTERS' UNION.

—

BOISE, IDAHO, *January 28, 1915.*

Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

As a relief to the unemployed of this State and Nation, organized labor of Boise unanimously request that you work and vote for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto.

P. H. SPANGENBERG, *Secretary.*

—

BOISE, IDAHO.

Hon. BURTON L. FRENCH and Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
Members of Congress from the District of Idaho:

We, the undersigned citizens of Boise City and Ada County, Idaho, respectfully request that you do all within your power to place upon the statute books of this Nation the immigration bill, which was recently vetoed by the President. To this end we desire that you take such action as is necessary to pass said bill over the veto of the President.

The electrical workers and other unions are talking of and watching this matter. If, in President Wilson's opinion, the voice of our Representatives is not the voice of the people, what is it?

Respectfully,

H. B. DECIUS.

—

POCATELLO, IDAHO, *January 29, 1915.*

Hon. ADDISON T. SMITH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned committee, representing the railway employees' department of the American Federation of Labor, respectfully urge you to give your support and use your influence to secure the passage of the immigration bill, indorsed by the American Federation of Labor, over the President's veto. Organized labor in this vicinity is strongly in favor of this immigration bill as recently passed by both Houses of Congress.

Yours, very truly,

JAS. W. PURDIE,
THOS. DARCY,
JOHN BONNER,
Committee.

I have also received urgent communications from the following organizations urging the passage of this bill over the President's veto:

American Federation of Labor executive council, Washington, D. C.
Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers' International Association, Cleveland, Ohio.
Central Federated Union, New York.

International Protective Association of Retail Clerks, La Fayette, Ind.
Washington State Federation of Labor, Tacoma, Wash.
International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C.
Massachusetts State Branch American Federation of Labor, Boston, Mass.
International Brotherhood of Teamsters of America, Indianapolis, Ind.
Railway Employees' Department, St. Louis, Mo.
Pattern Makers' League, Cincinnati, Ohio.
International Seamen's Union of America, Chicago, Ill.
Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, Harrisburg, Pa.
Minnesota State Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn.
New York State Federation of Labor, Utica, N. Y.
International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Albany, N. Y.
Cigar Makers' International Union, Chicago, Ill.
Washington Central Labor Union, Washington, D. C.
Boot and Shoe Makers' Union, Boston, Mass.
United Mine Workers of America, Indianapolis, Ind.
Tobacco Workers' International Union, Louisville, Ky.
International Typographical Union, Indianapolis, Ind.
Iron City Central Trades Council, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Switchmen's Union, Buffalo, N. Y.
United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Indianapolis, Ind.
Illinois State Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. GARDNER. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN] in his speech on the floor of the House this morning made the statement that 30 per cent of the constituency whom I have the honor to represent are illiterate. If that were true, it would be all the more reason why I should vote to prevent more illiterates coming to this country. If there is anything in the gentleman's statement, we already have too many illiterates in my district.

But I deny the charge of the gentleman. I deny the truth of his statement. I want to say to him that that statement is a remarkable perversion of the truth. Instead of having 30 per cent of illiterates in my district over 10 years of age, there are less than 20 per cent. There is in the entire State of Kentucky an average of 16.5 per cent of illiteracy. This includes, of course, the great cities of Louisville and Lexington and other cities in the Commonwealth, as well as the far-famed blue-grass region of the State.

Mr. MANAHAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANAHAN. I will ask the gentleman if the figures he gives are for the entire population of his district or just for the native whites?

Mr. POWERS. The figures I give are for the entire population of my district, including the colored people. The percentage is not so great if you count the whites alone. No man here represents brainier or better people than I have the honor to represent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MANAHAN].

Mr. MANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to correct my statement. I had in mind evidently another district in the South, mentioned in the last debate, where the percentage of illiteracy was approximately 3 per cent, and I made a mistake in attributing it to the district represented by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS]. I will accept 19 per cent as the correct figure, and I say that that is a serious reflection upon his district, ruled by native Americans for many generations; and I will say further that from the experience all over the North of the competition that comes from live-blooded foreigners, if he will bring into his district from southern Europe, or any other part of Europe, men and women with nerve and ability and ambition and live red blood in their veins, the apathy and backwardness of his people will be overcome, and the percentage of illiteracy will be decreased from 19 per cent to approximately 3 per cent, as it is in the State of Minnesota, where 75 per cent of our people are foreign born or the children of foreign born.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman yields back one minute.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, medical societies, patriotic orders, the farmers' union, the farmers' national congress, and the Federation of Labor all indorse this specific measure. The American people are demanding its passage. Eight of the nine United States immigration commissioners have indorsed the literacy test. American patriots who have devoted their lives to the study of the question of immigration have indorsed the reading test. Twice in two years both branches of Congress have passed this bill, and the eyes of the country are upon us to-day. What are we going to do? The reading test would not prevent the coming of any man worthy of American citizenship, but it would raise the general standard of intelligence among our alien arrivals. This bill contains provisions which make the mental and physical examination of aliens more effective and would exclude a large number of those whose coming would tend to lower the mental and physical standards of our people.

Is citizenship here of such small consequence that the foreigner wishing to obtain it will not learn to read just 30 words in the English or some other language? Are we to strike down the reading test, put a premium on ignorance, and throw our doors open to the scum of the earth in order that the army of cheap laborers may increase its numbers and the steamship companies ply their trade? In New York, the most populous State in the Union, the insane asylums and charitable institutions are full and overflowing with the feeble-minded, the lame and halt of the immigrant army. This condition has become so annoying and so burdensome that the governor of the State is calling upon the Federal Government to help New York care for the decrepit and feeble-minded foreigners pouring into the State. The State commissioner of lunacy tells us that in 1911 there were in the civic hospitals 5,700 patients, and that 2,737 of these were foreigners, and the New York State hospital bulletin states that in 1912 there were 31,000 patients in the 14 State hospitals and that 41 per cent of them were of foreign birth. The New York Herald, April, 1912, said that more than 60 per cent of the occupants of charitable institutions and insane asylums in New York were foreigners. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that foreign countries have taken advantage of our loose and lax immigration laws to rid themselves of the criminal element and the feeble-minded of their people, and instead of caring for their own diseased and insane people they are sending them to us with every steamship that sails. Mr. BURNETT has told us that Police Commissioner Bingham, of New York, said:

> This wave of immigration that brings to New York hundreds of thousands of criminals who don't know what liberty means, and don't care; don't know our customs, can not speak the English language, are in general the scum of the earth.

Frederick A. Pope, who was prosecuting officer in New Jersey, wrote to President Taft in February, 1913, that he had prosecuted in a certain length of time for various crimes 114 foreigners, and that 91 of them were illiterate—they could not read—and that out of 8 crimes against women, 7 were committed by men who could neither read nor write.

Southern Europe is encouraging large numbers of people to go to the United States, take the place of the American laborer, accumulate money and send it home, and others are urged to return when their fortunes are made. Thousands of these illiterate people are placed in charge of a foreign priest or minister who advises them not to become citizens of the United States. I read of an instance where the priest or minister told them that it was all right to work here and send their money back to Europe, but that they must hate the American flag and remain loyal to the mother country. The number of unnaturalized foreigners in the United States has grown so enormously that the people of southern Europe refer to them as "our colonies in America." And, Mr. Speaker, it is a deplorable fact that these European colonies in America have injured the standard of the laboring man, reduced wages here, and they have driven thousands and tens of thousands of American wage earners into the ranks of the unemployed. [Applause.] Millions of Americans who toil in the mills, dig in the mines, work at the bench, or beat at the forge are praying this day that you will shield and protect them from further invasion by cheap laborers from foreign countries. [Applause.]

If you are the friend of the wage earners of America who make their living by the sweat of their faces, love our institutions and follow our flag, now is the time to show it. If you have any regard for the wishes and the welfare of the millions of American farmers, you must tell them by your vote to-day. If you would guard our civilization and protect the life of our Nation from the dangers that threaten it, I call upon you now to vote for this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I wish the steamship companies well, but I am not willing that they should flourish at the expense of American ideals and institutions. An official of our Government tells us that it is the deliberate plan of certain European Governments to send to the United States the most undesirable of their people. Marcus Braun, of New York, an immigrant inspector sent by our Government to Europe to investigate immigrant conditions there, reported to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor that the Hungarian Government had a contract with a steamship company, the Cunard Line, to deliver to their vessels 30,000 Hungarians a year, to be carried to the United States. The Hungarian governmental official told the American governmental official that the contract to send so many of their people to the United States every year was none of our business. When will this traffic in human beings stop? This law would injure

the traffic of the steamship companies, but it would greatly benefit the American people. [Applause.] A few years ago the new King of Denmark pardoned 700 criminals, degenerates, swindlers, thieves, and murderers. The people of Denmark did not want these criminals to remain in their country, so they made up money and purchased tickets for every one of them, placed them on board a steamship and sent them to New York.

Representative BURNETT, while in Sicily investigating the immigration question asked, "Where are the bandits who gave you so much trouble a little while ago?" And the answer was, "They have all gone to America." Think of that, Mr. Speaker; no longer the asylum for the oppressed, no longer the promised land of the worthy, but a place to which foreign countries may send their undesirable people, a place on which the steamship companies unload more than a million people every year. [Applause.] Time was when the industrious and worthy foreigner who wanted to come to our country went to work, secured funds, and paid for his own transportation. Then the deserving foreigner went to work to meet American requirements in order that he might come over and share the blessings and benefits of this great Republic. Now the steamship companies have their agents abroad, urging every class and condition to go to the United States. Pictures are displayed showing savings banks and foreigners standing around with their hands full of American money, and they are told that it is an easy matter to make money here. All kinds of stories are told to induce the coming of the immigrant horde. All that the steamship company wants to know is, can he pay his fare? They have excursions and give cheap rates, and then the agents go out with their dragnets and gather them in, and tramp, tramp they come—more than a million a year.

Mr. Speaker, the Boston Transcript speaks truly when it says that there are those in this country who are opposed to any and all restriction of immigration. Thomas Jefferson said more than a hundred years ago, "While we are providing for the fortification of our country against a foreign foe, I am in favor of fortifying it against the influx of undesirable immigration." [Applause.] And yet, Mr. Speaker, there are gentlemen here who will not vote for a measure that will keep out of our country thousands and tens of thousands of undesirable persons. What strange and unnatural influence is it that impels gentlemen here to oppose any measure that will restrict immigration? Is it the fear of certain constituents at home who care more for the business of bringing in more people from foreign countries than they do for the welfare of our own country? Mr. Speaker, if this un-American influence is strong enough now to prevent the enactment of a law to restrict immigration, what Senate or House a few years from now will even dare to undertake the difficult task? [Applause.] Yes; every 12 months the steamship companies unload upon our shores more than a million of foreigners; and Mr. Speaker, at this rate, the time will soon come when you can draw a line across the Republic and place the native born and their descendants on one side and the foreign born and their descendants on the other, and they will outnumber us. Then if we should be engaged in war with a foreign power, foes from without and foes from within, you will have reason to be concerned about the safety of your country. If these influences are strong enough to stifle the American desire that is in you to protect our country against this horde of undesirable foreigners, if these baneful influences shall cause you to take the side of foreign countries who want to continue to send to our country the refuse of their own, the day will come when your children whose birthright you have bartered for a mess of political pottage will curse you in your graves.

You talk about preparations to prevent a foreign army from invading our country when, by your votes and un-American conduct, you are letting in every year thousands of men more dangerous to the vital life of America than could possibly be the attempt at invasion by any foreign army. We would be on the lookout for such an army and would prevent it from landing upon our shores; but here is an invasion dangerous to American ideals and institutions—an invasion that enriches the steamship companies and sends out of our country every year $150,000,000, and works great injury to the American laboring man. Mr. Speaker, thousands—yes, hundreds of thousands—of cheap laborers from Europe are here enjoying the blessings and benefits of free America, competing with loyal citizens in every line of industrial endeavor and in all the marts of trade. [Applause.] And yet some of you will vote against this measure and then talk about protection to American labor. What the American laborer needs most and what he is praying for this day is protection from the vast army of cheap laborers coming into our country every year.

In his farewell address President Washington admonishes us to "promote as an object of primary importance institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge." How fitting, Mr. Speaker, that in the month of his birth we should be engaged in the work of providing for the diffusion of knowledge among those who are to come here and share with us and our children the blessings and benefits of this great Government. Thomas Jefferson has said that when every man can read the country will be safe. Here we are trying to follow the advice of Washington and take the first step toward providing for the diffusion of knowledge among our alien arrivals, and here we are setting up requirements that will enable the foreigner who desires to come here to read and learn for himself of American institutions. [Applause.] It is high time that some of our citizens who come here from foreign countries and swear allegiance to the American flag were showing their unwillingness to permit all kinds of foreigners to come into our country. If these men really love our country, they are in favor of immigration laws that will permit only worthy and desirable people to come. If they do not agree with us that something should be done to prevent undesirable and unfit foreigners from coming here, then we may well ponder the question whether we shall preserve the Republic in all its integrity for our children and our children's children or permit it to become the dumping ground for the scum and refuse of every country on the globe. [Applause.]

Here, in full view of the likeness of Washington and looking upon Old Glory, our country's flag, let us reconsecrate our hearts, our strength, and our all to the highest and best interest of our country. This is not a party question, but a question of supreme importance to the American people, and I want this vote to-day to show to the country and to the world that far above the blaze of partisanism loom the altar fires of our patriotism. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the voice of Lincoln and the voice of Davis, the voices of Grant and Lee, could be heard in this House to-day they would admonish us, from the North and the South, from the East and the West, to support this bill and in so doing strike hands about a common center for the good of the Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY].

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer my congratulations to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] and his intrepid and patriotic Democratic associates on that side of the Chamber for rising above party considerations and resisting the menace of the pedagogic lash from the White House in order to serve the best interests of their country by voting to pass this bill over the President's veto. All honor to your courage and good judgment. I am glad that this is not being made a party question here. It ought not to be. And, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes think that if we had less partisanship and more patriotism in this House the country would be better off. [Applause.] Instead of this being a party question I should say it is rather a geographical question in view of the territory represented by its advocates and opponents. And incidentally the question of expediency may figure in it, too.

I voted to pass a similar bill over the veto of President Taft, and I did that with no less pleasure than it will afford me to vote to pass this bill over President Wilson's veto. I thought the leader of the Republican Party was wrong then, just as I think the leader of the Democratic Party is wrong now. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I am willing to concede that our party when it was in power was more or less remiss in its duty, and to that extent it was inconsistent when it failed to make the restriction wall around this country as high as it made the protection wall. It is no more detrimental to American labor to send the products of cheap foreign labor here to compete with them than it is to send the foreign laborers themselves here. Indeed, the competition is all the greater in the latter case. Believing earnestly, as I do, in the doctrine of protection, I am just as much in favor of applying it at the immigrant stations as at the customhouses. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSTER). The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] yield me another minute or two?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one minute more.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, it does not require the gift of prophecy to foresee some of the results of the war in Europe. Ultimately I think it will result in there being fewer monarchies and more Republics in the world, but that much-desired result

can not immediately follow it. There is one thing, however, that will immediately follow. The oppressed of all those countries that are in the throes of the conflict, all those who are discontented with royalty and its methods of government, will want a home in this great Republic, this land of neutrality and of promise. For that reason I regard it more important than ever before that our immigration laws be better safeguarded to the end that the coming to our shores of so many undesirable aliens may be stopped. If that could be accomplished in some other way more effectively than by the literacy test, I would gladly vote for that; but no better way has been found by those who have made an exhaustive study and investigation of the whole subject. Besides, I can see no good reason why we should add foreign illiterates to our population when we are struggling so hard to remove illiteracy from our land, so as to give the blessings of education to all our people. The failure of this bill to pass will be almost a calamity to our country. [Applause.] Mr. Speaker, this war has already taught us a valuable lesson, which is that our greatest national safeguard lies in our sticking closer together as a people, selfish though it be, and that we should "sharpen our wits" to help each other rather than to open our markets and our opportunities for employment too much for the benefit of the people of other lands. All of which, to my mind, vindicates the wisdom of the policies both of protection and of restriction of foreign immigration. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania consume some of his time now?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that I have no more time to yield to any other gentleman except to myself and I prefer to conclude for our part after the gentleman goes on.

Mr. BURNETT. We have only one other speech besides mine and that is a short speech.

Mr. GARDNER. Is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] reserving his time entirely for one speech?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask because there are two gentleman here who want to be recognized for half a minute, but neither is on the floor at the present time. I am already to have my time closed in a single speech by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. I am not going to speak myself.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman intends to conclude with the yielding to Mr. FESS?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman from Illinois says that he will consume some of his time himself.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman be willing to consume his time now? I will give way to Mr. MOORE, if the gentleman will speak now.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman will then reserve his time and close after both the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself?

Mr. GARDNER. No; after the gentleman has closed, then the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] will close, and then the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], and then the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it is immaterial to me, and I am perfectly willing to go on now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN].

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have read from the Clerk's desk the article which I have sent there, and I would like particularly to have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Sir Walter Scott said:

"I have read books enough, and conversed with enough of eminent and splendidly cultivated minds; but I assure you, I have heard higher sentiments from the lips of poor uneducated men and women, when exerting the spirit of severe yet gentle heroism under difficulties and afflictions, or speaking their simple thoughts as to circumstances in the lot of friends and neighbors, than I ever yet met with out of the pages of the Bible. We shall never learn to respect our real calling and destiny, unless we have taught ourselves to consider everything as moonshine compared with the education of the heart."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during the eight years of my service in this House I desire to say that every vote I have cast on labor questions has been in the interest of labor. If I thought for one moment that my action and my vote to-day would be against the interest of labor, I would rather resign my seat in this body than to cast that vote. But, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that my action is in the interest of the American laboring man. For 20 years, as has been stated, immigrants have come here in large numbers, larger than in the entire 80 years preceding, and I want to say to you that within the last 20 years, notwithstanding the large immigration, the conditions of the laboring man during that time have improved. Not only have the living conditions improved, but the wages of the American laboring man have increased. Twenty years ago, or in the year 1890, the yearly average earning of the American laboring man amounted to about $335, and the average earning of the American laboring man to-day is over $550. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that not only have the wages increased, but the hours of labor have been shortened in nearly every industry in the United States. For that reason I believe that immigration has not been detrimental to our country, but has been beneficial. It has helped the American laboring man to advance and secure a better position than he occupied before that immigration commenced. Oh, we hear that the Federation of Labor and other labor organizations are opposed to this measure. I admit that organized labor has done much for the laboring man, but I maintain that immigration has done even more. It has given the Federation of Labor their great leader, Mr. Samuel Gompers, as well as the able secretary, Mr. Morrison, who is a native of Canada. It has given this country the great Secretary of Labor, Hon. William B. Wilson, and it has given the Federation of Labor more than 50 per cent of its executive committee. The members of that organization know, or should know, that immigration is not detrimental to organized labor. In addition I desire also to state that not all of organized labor is in favor of this legislation. I hold in my hand a resolution which I received this morning signed by nine different labor organizations protesting against the enactment of this law.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman please name those organizations?

Mr. SABATH. I really have not the time to spare to read the entire resolution, but in the interest of my colleague, whom I know is honest and a sincere man and means well, but is misled, somewhat as a great many others are, I will have the Clerk read the resolution, notwithstanding that it will take more time than I really desire to give to it.

The Clerk read as follows:

NEW YORK, *February 3, 1915.*

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Burnett immigration bill has been vetoed by President Wilson. We learn that strong efforts are being made by the opponents of immigration to pass this bill over the President's veto.

The impression has been created that organized labor, without exception, is in favor of this bill, which seeks to restrict immigrants chiefly on the ground of illiteracy. We wish to call your attention to the fact that a large number of powerful organizations within and without the ranks of the American Federation of Labor are unreservedly opposed to the Burnett bill, and believe that its provisions are unjust, essentially un-American, and harmful to the best interests of our country.

Even from the standpoint of those who seek the interests of the workingmen, the restriction of immigration is not calculated to do them any good, but if put into practice will most likely result in serious harm. Immigration has not been responsible for the increased cost of living, but has, on the other hand, directly developed a higher standard of living, particularly among the workingmen, on account of the prosperity and opportunity for labor that immigration has afforded.

That immigrants do not lower wages or represent an unorganizable laboring element is strikingly demonstrated by the fact that the American Federation of Labor itself has grown in strength and influence largely through the increase in its ranks of great numbers of immigrants in every part of the country and in all trades.

The movement of unionism among women has been most successful in the case of immigrants, which shows the remarkable capacity for organization among the recent immigrants.

As representatives of great labor organizations embracing thousands of workingmen, we earnestly protest against the adoption of a measure which strikes at the roots of our American principles of equality by an insidious and indirect form of exclusion.

We trust that you will not only vote against the bill, but will do all in your power actively to prevent any attempt to override the President's veto from becoming successful.

Will you not kindly let us hear from you at an early moment to learn what you expect to do in this matter?

Very earnestly and sincerely, yours,

[Seal: The Workmen's Circle (Arbeiter Ring), Feb. 2, 1915, 175 East Broadway, N. Y.]

[Seal: International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, 32 Union Square, New York City.]

[Seal: Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 32 Union Square, New York.]

[Seal: United Laundry Workers' Union, Local 34.]

[Seal: The Hebrew Bakers' Union, Local 160. Incorporated 1903.]

[Seal: United Neckwear Makers' Union, Local 11016 A. F. of L. Organized Dec., 1905.]

[Seal: United Hebrew Trades of the State of New York. Org. Oct., 1888.]

[Seal: International Cabinet Makers, Machine, Hand, and Wood Turners' Union, Local 2 of N. Y.]

[Seal: Shirt Makers' Union of Greater New York.]

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a further question. I would like to ask if there is a seal on that communication?

Mr. SABATH. Those are all seals.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I would like also to ask if the gentleman does not know that some of those organizations are not official trade organizations?

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman know they are not?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. There is one of them organized for purposes of this kind—the labor circle. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman might know more about various labor organizations, but I am satisfied he is mistaken in this particular.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I take it the gentleman does not want to mislead the Members of this House.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman knows me too well to believe that of me.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. For that reason I rose to ask the question. I take the position that these are not legitimate trade-union organizations.

Mr. SABATH. I beg to differ with the gentleman.

In this connection I wish to say that I have other communications from other laboring organizations and societies, but time does not permit me to read them all. I will, however, read a few of them.

I have a telegram from the Iroquois Club, of Chicago, which reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 2, 1915.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH, *Washington, D. C.:*

At a special meeting of the Iroquois Club held February 2, 1915, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved*, That the Iroquois Club commends the President for his veto of the immigration bill, and urge the Illinois delegation in Congress to uphold the President in his veto."

WM. ROTHMANN, *President.*
LORING R. HOOVER, *Secretary.*

I have a letter from the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 50 per cent of the membership of which are business men, which reads as follows:

ILLINOIS MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, February 1, 1915.

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The directors of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, on behalf of the members of the organization, urged President Wilson to veto the immigration bill, because it contained the literacy test, which they believe unfair. You are respectfully urged to use your influence to sustain the President's veto.

Very truly, yours, JOHN M. GLENN, *Secretary.*

I have a telegram from the Slovak Guards of Illinois, which reads as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 3, 1915.*

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Slovak Guards of Illinois, representing 30,000 law-abiding naturalized American citizens, appeal to Members of Congress to vote to sustain the President's veto on immigration bill.

EMIL TEHLAR, *President.*

The Polish-American Alliance and the Polish Catholic Union of America have also sent me the following telegram:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 2, 1915.*

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

In behalf of thousands of our countrymen who have been deprived of the opportunity of acquiring an education in the mother country, we urge you to vote to uphold the President's veto of the immigration bill.

POLISH-AMERICAN ALLIANCE,
POLISH CATHOLIC UNION OF AMERICA.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to embody as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from one of the most beloved and fair-minded judges of our country, Judge John Gibbons, of the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois.

CIRCUIT COURT OF COOK COUNTY,
Chicago, January 7, 1915.

Hon. A. J. SABATH, *Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SABATH: I desire to register a solemn protest against the enactment of the immigration bill because it contains the literacy test. In no adequate manner can such a test determine the quality of good citizenship. Such a test would be unjust, undemocratic, and un-American.

The establishment of the Republic was a proclamation to the world that at last a land was opened and a government instituted in and under which all men could enter the lists of life and endeavor upon an equal footing with full opportunity to work out their own elevation and betterment. America soon became the Mecca of the Old World's oppressed thousands, hungering for freedom—freedom to speak, to act, and to grow. This opportunity for free individual action and development, never before offered to the "hewers of wood and drawers of water," was what moved them throughout all lands, as by a common impulse, to flee from the servitude of their native countries to build new homes and better, broader lives in a strange land. No class greater in numbers or stronger in purpose took advantage of this opportunity than the artisans and laborers, many of whom could neither read nor write. No class has proven itself more capable of growth and advancement under these benign conditions than they. In all that constitutes the true citizen and patriot, when the life of the Nation was in peril, they proved themselves peers of the noblest and the best. Such has been the result because here they found and utilized a fair field and full play for individual energy, talent, and effort.

Very respectfully, yours,

JOHN GIBBONS.

The organization known as the Friends of Russian Freedom submit the following communication:

FRIENDS OF RUSSIAN FREEDOM,
February 2, 1915.

Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives, Washington D. C.

DEAR SIR: To us it seems of very great consequence that the right of political asylum shall be maintained inviolate in this country.

The history of nations—of others as well as of our own—teaches that at times only through the unlawful destruction of property and the advocacy of this may despotism be thrown off and representative government attained.

Born of revolution themselves, surely the American people have signified no desire to reverse their attitude toward those who in other lands, inspired many times by America's example, fight for liberty and democracy even as the founders of this Republic fought.

We may not now present to you, as we presented to Congress last year, substitutes for the clauses which in the existing law and in the bill before you wrong the political refugee and injure our own name.

We can only urge you to vote against passing the immigration bill (H. R. 6060) over the veto of the President. This we do solely on the ground that the bill in our opinion runs counter to the proper and historic policy of this country in excluding and deporting (secs. 3 and 19) aliens "who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property," and in subjecting to fine and imprisonment (sec. 28) "any person who knowingly aids or assists any * * * (such) alien to enter the United States."

Yours, very truly,

HERBERT PARSONS,
President Friends of Russian Freedom.

And in this connection I wish to read the names of a few of the gentlemen who comprise the national committee of this wonderful organization:

Herbert Parsons, president; Right Rev. David H. Greer, vice president; George Kennan, vice president; James Bronson Reynolds, chairman, 105 West Fortieth Street, New York; Joseph M. Price, vice chairman.

National committee: The officers, members of executive committee, ex officio, and Dr. Lyman Abbott (editor the Outlook), New York; Jane Addams (Hull House), Chicago; Miss Alice Stone Blackwell (editor Woman's Journal), Boston; John Graham Brooks (author), Cambridge, Mass.; W. Franklin Brush, New York; Edward B. Butler (president of Butler Bros.), Chicago; Prof. John B. Clark (Columbia University), New York; E. H. Clement, Boston; R. Fulton Cutting, New York; Horace E. Deming, New York; Dr. Henry B. Favill (physician), Chicago; Dr. John H. Finley, New York; Homer Folks (ex-commissioner of public charities), New York; David R. Forgan (president First National Bank), Chicago; I. K. Friedman (author), Chicago; A. S. Frissell (president Fifth Avenue Bank), New York; Prof. Franklin H. Giddings (Columbia University), New York; E. R. L. Gould (president Thirty-fourth Street National Bank), New York; Rev. Percy S. Grant (Church of the Ascension), New York; Rev. Thomas C. Hall (Union Theological Seminary), New York; Norman Hapgood (editor Harper's Weekly), New York; Rabbi Emil G. Hirsch (Sinai Congregation), Chicago; W. J. Holland (chancellor Carnegie Institute), Pittsburgh; Charles L. Hutchinson (banker), Chicago; Dr. Abraham Jacobi (physician), New York; Mrs. Helen Hartley Jenkins, New York; Prof. W. R. Shepherd (Columbia University), New York; P. Tecumseh Sherman (ex-commissioner of labor), New York; Rabbi Joseph Silverman (Temple Emanu-El), New York; Cyrus L. Sulzberger (merchant), New York; Algernon T. Sweeney (ex-judge first criminal court), Newark, N. J.; Miss Ida Tarbell (author), New York; Charles R. Van Hise (president University of Wisconsin), Madison, Wis.; Oswald Garrison Villard (editor Evening Post), New York; Willoughby Walling (banker), Chicago; T. K. Webster (manufacturer), Chicago; Rabbi Stephen S. Wise (the Free Synagogue), New York; William M. Kingsley (vice president United States Trust Co.), New York; Hon. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE (United States Senator), Madison, Wis.; Henry M. Leipziger (director, department of education), New York; William H. Maxwell (superintendent of schools), New York; John G. Milburn (lawyer), New York; John E. Milholland (publicist), New York; Rev. Charles H. Parkhurst (Madison Square Presbyterian Church), New York; Jacob A. Riis (philanthropist), New York; Julius Rosenwald (vice president Sears, Roebuck & Co.), Chicago; Jacob H. Schiff (banker), New York; Prof. Henry R. Seager (Columbia University), New York; Prof. E. R. A. Seligman (Columbia University), New York.

Mr. Speaker, great stress has been laid upon the statement contained in the President's message, that no party has ever adopted the text of this bill as part of its platform. What the President did say was this, that no party has gone to the country on this proposition. This question has been raised not only by Members of the House, but in a special edition of the weekly news letter of the American Federation of Labor attention has been directed to just this part of the President's message, wherein he inquires whether any political party has ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter and gone to the country on it.

The article dwells upon the fact that in the year 1896 a President and Vice President were elected upon a platform containing a restrictionist clause. Is it possible that the gentleman had forgotten what the real issue was in that campaign? During the long campaign no one paid any attention to that portion of the platform.

In 1912 the Republican Party enacted the following as one of the planks in its platform:

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.

Surely no one can question the importance of this, and what was the result of the election in 1912? No party has ever suf-

fered such a humiliating defeat as the party which adopted this provision as a part of its platform.

Three times has the Democratic Party succeeded in carrying the Nation. It was in the years 1884, 1892, and 1912.

Four times did the Republican Party go on record against liberal immigration and three times did the Republican Party go down to defeat.

In upholding the sacred traditions of the country and of the Democratic Party, the Democratic platform of 1884 contained the following:

> We oppose sumptuary laws, which vex the citizens and interfere with individual liberty.
>
> In reaffirming the declaration of the Democratic platform of 1856, that the liberal principles embodied by Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and sanctioned in the Constitution, which makes ours the land of liberty and the asylum of the oppressed of every nation, have ever been cardinal principles in the Democratic faith.

In the platform of 1892, while the Democratic Party favored the enactment of more stringent laws and regulations for the restriction of criminal, pauper, and contract immigration, the following provision was also embodied:

> We condemn and denounce any and all attempts to restrict the immigration of the industrious and worthy of foreign lands.

In the latest pronouncement of Democratic doctrine, our platform of 1912, we have this ringing declaration:

> No treaty should receive the sanction of our Government which does not recognize that equality of all our citizens, irrespective of race or creed, and which does not expressly guarantee the fundamental right of expatriation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] who opened the remarks in favor of this bill stated that President Wilson is a great President. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Indiana. I agree that we have in Woodrow Wilson a great President, a President who has done more to bring about favorable legislation in the interest of the American people and laboring man than any other man who has ever occupied the White House. [Applause.] I admit that men as great as President Wilson have made mistakes, but I challenge the gentleman from Indiana to show that our President has made a mistake in vetoing this bill. The gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] cite the large number of foreign-born people in our insane asylums. They, however, neglect to show that in proportion to the population the percentage of foreign-born people is smaller than that of the native-born citizens.

Does not the gentleman from California know that under the provisions of the present law those persons suffering from insanity or even what the Department of Labor terms feeble-mindedness or presenility are now debarred.

The gentleman from Alabama is fearful for our future citizenship. If he would take the trouble to visit the homes of these people whom he dubs the scum of the earth and undesirable citizens I feel confident that he would not stand on the floor of this House and slander these hard-working, sincere, and law-abiding people.

Mr. Speaker, I, as well as these gentlemen, am desirous of protecting the standard of American citizenship and our American institutions. No man who is familiar with conditions can say that so far immigration has lowered the standard of American citizenship; and I maintain that, on the contrary, immigration has forced the standard of American citizenship to a higher level. Surely, this is true of the American workingman. The immigrant has come here and dug our million ditches, while the native American has been elevated to the positions of foreman, timekeeper, assistants, and so forth, positions which the native-born American is as yet not too proud to fill.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is fearful that immigration will lower the character of our citizenship. He comes from a State where nearly 80 per cent of the population is composed of foreign-born citizens, or citizens of foreign parentage. Does he desire to make us believe that his State is not up to the standard? He represents the State. The truth is that he, as well as so many others, has been poisoned by the malicious representations of certain lobbyists, whose activities have been directed against the policy of our Government and against the unfortunate immigrant.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt great stress will be laid on the great $1,000,000 Immigration Commission report, which no one has read, and with which none of the members of the commission are familiar, even though they have assumed to base their recommendations to the House on it.

In the face of these recommendations of the commission Prof. Jenks and Mr. Lauck, members of that commission, have the following to say in their book on "The Immigration Problem" (see pp. 335 and 344):

> In the judgment of the commission, as well as of most other enlightened citizens, the United States should remain in the future, as in the past, a haven of refuge for the oppressed, whether such oppression be political or religious. Any restrictive measure should contain a provision making an exception of such cases. We clearly ought not to close our doors against those whom the common opinion of the world would consider really the subjects of oppression.

No doubt great stress will also be laid on the activities of the Liberal Immigration League of New York City. As to that organization, I wish to state that I did not agree with their activities, but will say that I fail to see wherein they are guilty in asking aid from all to help the cause which they advocated, unless it be from steamship companies and the five other corporations from which they received money, according to the statement. All in all, it amounted to $5,000 in five years, and the largest contribution was $500. I have a statement before me which shows that the league is over a thousand dollars in debt. The various items which it is charged they have collected appear to be reasonable, and in view of the fact that they are not able to meet their expenses puts them in at least a better light than the various restrictive organizations which have been flooding the mails with bitter, restrictive literature, and which obviously have abundant funds to meet all expenses, however heavy.

May I ask the gentlemen who are so vitally interested in the dictates of the Junior Order of American Mechanics and kindred so-called patriotic organizations who it is that is furnishing the funds for these organizations?

Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that Democracy can be proud of the wonderful, excellent record that it has made under this great and wonderful President. We have given the country and the laboring people more favorable legislation than any other party in the history of our Government, and for that reason I feel confident that, notwithstandng the fact that the Federation of Labor has taken a stand on this one question contrary to the President, they will realize and recognize that he is a great President, a wonderful man, a man who desires to help the cause of humanity, to help the cause of the people.

Right here, Mr. Speaker, I can with pride point to my closing remarks in the speech which I delivered on August 23, 1912, and which read as follows:

> And in conclusion I desire to say this: I have been and am now a Democrat who believes in the Democratic doctrine, in equal rights to all and special privileges to none. I became a Democrat because of my belief in these principles and because the Democratic Party was the party that stood for them. I am a Democrat because I believe the Democratic Party is the party of the people and for the people; that it stands for and does what is just and right. I firmly believe that it stands for justice and equity; that it is a party that is broad and liberal; that and through it the people can secure beneficial legislation that will relieve them from oppression.
>
> It stands by its pledges. It carries out its promises. And, notwithstanding the fact that I stand for and firmly believe in all its fundamental principles and have been active ever since 1888, voting for Cleveland, Bryan, and Parker, and have been many times honored by it, if I believed that our candidate for President—the Hon. Woodrow Wilson—had intentionally spoken unfairly of our foreign-born citizens and actually was prejudiced against them, I would unhesitatingly refuse him my vote and my support.
>
> But, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that he is a man of broad and liberal ideas, a man of excellent judgment, a man of great knowledge and intelligence, honest and fearless, and I feel confident that, after he has been elected the President of the United States, the greatest and most glorious country under the canopy of heaven, and President of the greatest and most hospitable people inhabiting any portion of this globe, he will demonstrate to those who are endeavoring to place him in a false light that he can not and will not be swayed from the path of righteousness and justice, and will easily shine after his days of service are over with the other illustrious stars—Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, and Lincoln.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some gentlemen are going to try to make the membership of this House believe that most anyone now can come to our shores. For the information and enlightenment of those gentlemen I desire to say that last year alone we debarred at our ports 33,000 immigrants; and from July to November, 12,000; and we have deported over 4,000.

The gentlemen who have been and are now advocating the passage of this bill seem to show a great deal of solicitude for organized labor, and lay great stress upon the action of the Federation of Labor, but I am unable to place them. I can not just recollect where they were when other important legislation in favor of the American laboring man was being considered on the floor of the House. I am unable to recall the speeches which they made in favor of other bills which had for their purpose the betterment of the conditions of the laboring classes.

The RECORD must be at fault, for you will fail to find the names of many of these gentlemen included in the list of those who voted for legislation which was really in the interests of the laboring man.

Also, let me ask the gentleman how many labor organizations they have in their respective districts. Have they helped the cause in any way? The truth is that in a great majority of the districts represented by the gentlemen who are favoring this bill labor is not organized.

The gentleman from Tennessee in his speech proclaimed that he is for America.

Mr. Speaker, so am I. I am not only for America but I am for American institutions, for American citizenship, and for the American laboring man.

Due to immigration, our country is the wonder of civilization. Its population is made up of all the peoples of the earth. We have here all races, all religions, all nationalities. They have come to us from all quarters of the globe, and we have the best. Only the courageous hearts and adventurous spirits, who had the courage to face away from their native country and the homes of their birth, their kindred and friends, to face out to an unknown land, where the language they spoke was not understood, with nothing to beckon them on but the beacon light of human liberty, are the ones who have sought to make this country their home. They have planned to establish themselves where the tyranny of monarchy, the oppression of caste, and the insolence of titled wealth would not place heavy feet upon their throats. They brought with them their courageous hearts and adventurous spirits, their strong arms, their industries. The arts, sciences, professions, culture, genius, wisdom, and philosophies of thousands of years of civilization in the lands beyond the seas they gave to us. It has served to make us at once the envy and the wonder of the world. Best of all, they brought with them love and reverence for our institutions. [Applause.]

For the benefit of the House I will read, to refresh the memory of the Members, what the first Democratic President since the Civil War, Grover Cleveland, said on this question in his veto message:

MARCH 2, 1897.

To the House of Representatives:

I hereby return without approval House bill No. 7864, entitled "An act to amend the immigration laws of the United States."

By the first section of this bill it is proposed to amend section 1 of the act of March 3, 1891, relating to immigration by adding to the classes of aliens thereby excluded from admission to the United States the following:

"All persons physically capable and over 16 years of age who can not read and write the English language or some other language * * *."

A radical departure from our national policy relating to immigrants is here presented. Heretofore we have welcomed all who came to us from other lands except those whose moral or physical condition or history threatened danger to our national welfare and safety. Relying upon the zealous watchfulness of our people to prevent injury to our political and social fabric, we have encouraged those coming from foreign countries to cast their lot with us and join in the development of our vast domain, securing in return a share in the blessings of American citizenship.

A century's stupendous growth, largely due to the assimilation and thrift of millions of sturdy and patriotic adopted citizens, attests the success of this generous and free-handed policy which, while guarding the people's interests, exacts from our immigrants only physical and moral soundness and a willingness and ability to work.

A contemplation of the grand results of this policy can not fail to rouse a sentiment in its defense, for however it might have been regarded as an original proposition and viewed as an experiment, its accomplishments are such that if it is to be uprooted at this late day its disadvantages should be plainly apparent and the substitute adopted should be just and adequate, free from uncertainties, and guarded against difficult or oppressive administration.

It is not claimed, I believe, that the time has come for the further restriction of immigration on the ground that an excess of population overcrowds our land.

It is said, however, that the quality of recent immigration is undesirable. The time is quite within recent memory when the same thing was said of immigrants who, with their descendants, are now numbered among our best citizens.

A careful examination of this bill has convinced me that for the reasons given and others not specifically stated its provisions are unnecessarily harsh and oppressive, and that its defects in construction would cause vexation and its operation would result in harm to our citizens.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to submit the veto message of a Republican President, William Howard Taft:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 3175.

I do this with great reluctance. The bill contains many valuable amendments to the present immigration law which will insure greater certainty in excluding undesirable immigrants.

The bill received strong support in both Houses and was recommended by an able commission after an extended investigation and carefully drawn conclusions.

But I can not make up my mind to sign a bill which in its chief provision violates a principle that ought, in my opinion, to be upheld in dealing with our immigration. I refer to the literacy test. For the reasons stated in Secretary Nagel's letter to me, I can not approve that test. The Secretary's letter accompanies this.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 14, 1913.

And I do not believe that I would have completed my duty if I did not here and now bring to your attention once more the veto message of our great, wonderful, humane, peace-loving President, Woodrow Wilson:

To the House of Representatives:

It is with unaffected regret that I find myself constrained by clear conviction to return this bill (H. R. 6060, "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States") without my signature. Not only do I feel it to be a very serious matter to exercise the power of veto in any case, because it involves opposing the single judgment of the President to the judgment of a majority of both the Houses of the Congress, a step which no man who realizes his own liability to error can take without great hesitation, but also because this particular bill is in so many important respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable. Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates. But candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibility so clearly imposed upon me by the Constitution in matters of legislation leave me no choice but to dissent.

In two particulars of vital consequence this bill embodies a radical departure from the traditional and long-established policy of this country, a policy in which our people have conceived the very character of their Government to be expressed, the very mission and spirit of the Nation in respect of its relations to the peoples of the world outside their borders. It seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men; and it excludes those to whom the opportunities of elementary education have been denied, without regard to their character, their purposes, or their natural capacity.

Restrictions like these, adopted earlier in our history as a Nation, would very materially have altered the course and cooled the humane ardors of our politics. The right of political asylum has brought to this country many a man of noble character and elevated purpose who was marked as an outlaw in his own less fortunate land, and who has yet become an ornament to our citizenship and to our public councils. The children and the compatriots of these illustrious Americans must stand amazed to see the representatives of their Nation now resolved, in the fullness of our national strength and at the maturity of our great institutions, to risk turning such men back from our shores without test of quality or purpose. It is difficult for me to believe that the full effect of this feature of the bill was realized when it was framed and adopted, and it is impossible for me to assent to it in the form in which it is here cast.

The literacy test and the tests and restrictions which accompany it constitute an even more radical change in the policy of the Nation. Hitherto we have generously kept our doors open to all who were not unfitted by reason of disease or incapacity for self-support or such personal records and antecedents as were likely to make them a menace to our peace and order or to the wholesome and essential relationships of life. In this bill it is proposed to turn away from tests of character and of quality and impose tests which exclude and restrict; for the new tests here embodied are not tests of quality or of character or of personal fitness, but tests of opportunity. Those who come seeking opportunity are not to be admitted unless they have already had one of the chief of the opportunities they seek, the opportunity of education. The object of such provisions is restriction, not selection.

If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction of this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

I have no pride of opinion in this question. I am not foolish enough to profess to know the wishes and ideals of America better than the body of her chosen representatives know them. I only want instruction direct from those whose fortunes, with ours and all men's, are involved.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *28 January, 1915.*

In connection with President Wilson's great message I wish to read to you an editorial appearing in the Chicago Examiner on February 1, 1915. This is a paper which everyone knows has not demonstrated any very great friendship or love for our President:

WILSON ACTED WISELY IN VETOING THE UNAMERICAN IMMIGRATION BILL.

The President has done a distinct service to his country. He has, moreover, freed his party from a most menacing situation and has saved it from a humiliating exhibition of its lack of true Democracy. He deserves the approval of all true Americans, and especially the warm commendation of all genuine Democrats.

It seems incredible that any faction of the party in Congress should be fatuous enough to plunge it back into the mire from which it has been thus extricated by an effort to pass this most indefensible bill over the President's admirable veto. Should any such effort be made, the responsibility of those to whom it is credited will be a hard one for them to carry before the people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I had 14 minutes left.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 14 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. I regret that my time has expired, but permit me to say, in conclusion, that I trust all Members who desire to vote in the interest of humanity and justice will vote to sustain the President in his veto. [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

[Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HULINGS].

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Speaker, I desire very briefly to state the reasons which prompt me to vote for the immigration bill, notwithstanding the veto of the President.

The reasons assigned for the veto are: First, the purely sentimental one that America is the refuge of the oppressed, the suffering, and distressed; and, second, that the subject treated in this bill has never been passed upon by the American people.

These reasons are unconvincing in view of certain well-known facts.

We now by law exclude the diseased. As a matter of self-protection we exclude them, notwithstanding their manifest suffering and distress.

We now by law exclude the penniless and the pauper, even when he comes here to better his condition, and we do this for the purely selfish reason that he might become a public charge.

So we see that immigration to this "land of the free," from the first, has been restricted in order to protect American citizens.

The policy of "restriction" is not new. From time to time as the conditions of the country have changed these restrictive laws have been made more and more exclusive.

The "literacy test" proposed in this bill is not new. It has been considered by the people as perhaps few other measures have been considered.

A learned commission, after a full and exhaustive consideration, reported unanimously that immigration should be restricted, while eight out of nine of the commissioners advocated the adoption of the literacy test.

An American Congress by a large majority enacted such a law, which was vetoed by President Cleveland.

An American Congress enacted such a law by a great majority, which was vetoed by President Taft.

This Congress by an overwhelming majority passed this measure which has been vetoed by President Wilson. How can it be said then that the people have not considered this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this literacy test will restrict immigration, to an extent which I am informed will probably be 300,000 a year, though I do not regard it as the best measure that could have been desired.

When the bill was under consideration in the House I offered an amendment which would permit a man otherwise eligible, when accompanied by a wife or minor children to enter though he could not read or write. Such a modification of the measure would in very large degree remove the objections to the literacy test.

But, sir, as soon as it becomes known that immigrants must be able to read, those who have it in mind to emigrate to this country will know in advance of the date of their sailing sufficiently long, to acquire the meager ability to read, prescribed in this bill.

Restriction as a necessary self-protection is already our firmly established policy of self-protection. What then is the protection sought by this bill? It is twofold. Unrestricted immigration would open the doors and put American labor in side-by-side competition with ignorant hordes that have been coming in and will continue to come in, and would continue the absurd policy of pretending to protect American labor against foreign-made goods, while the foreign workman is permitted to come in, bringing with him his foreign habits of living; and would continue the ruinous policy of admitting hundreds of thousands of men who come here without any intention of citizenship, to work here for a season and carry his earnings home with him.

The literacy test would go far to avoid the present danger that great masses of ignorant and illiterate people coming here, unfamiliar with the language and habits of the American people, naturally follow the counsel and advice of adroit and educated fellow countrymen who come here, who make their contracts for them and live upon them and find in these illiterate masses a fertile field for the propaganda of anarchy and the destruction of property and the overthrow of all constitutional government.

This is one of the most important reasons, in my opinion, why the bill should pass, notwithstanding the veto of the President, and I shall so vote. [Applause.]

Mr. NEELEY of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely sorry because of a situation which makes it necessary that some of us should disagree with that splendid, clean, capable man who presides over the destinies of the American people; but I find no grounds for criticism because of his action. It is easy for me to understand that in cases where our party has failed to outline a policy he might hesitate to join with us in assuming the responsibility for the enactment of legislation of this magnitude; but as for myself my duty appears plain.

The seventh district of Kansas, which I have the honor to represent in this House, contains 32 counties, almost one-third of the entire area of the State. This district is nearly 250 miles long east and west and 125 miles wide north and south, and is traversed by two transcontinental lines of railroad, in addition to other lines of lesser importance. For some years it has been the custom of the companies operating these various lines of railroad to import Mexican laborers under contract to perform the section, track, bridge, and other construction work of a similar character on these various lines of road. These laborers are imported under a contract to work for a period of six months, their transportation being paid, and at the expiration of the term practically all of them return to Mexico.

The people of my district bear no malice toward the Mexican people as a race, and no ill will toward these laborers, but they do believe that the law which permits this is unwise and unjust to the laborer domiciled within our State, and that there is an urgent necessity for the enactment of more stringent legislation that will prohibit this practice.

These imported laborers own no property within our State. They pay no taxes there. They decline and refuse to work our roads; yet hundreds of their children attend our public schools, and not a few of them are inmates of our jails, our reformatories, penitentiaries, and insane asylums, and all without contributing to the burden of taxation borne by our citizenship.

Practically all of them reside in dilapidated box cars along the railroad right of way, in houses built there from old ties set on end and covered over with sod, or, perchance, in a hut constructed of grain doors and such odds and ends as they have been able to gather. They pay no rent, and, being content to exist on coarse fare and without comforts, they have forced wages down until they have practically driven out of the labor market that humble American who heretofore has been satisfied with an employment that permitted him to rear his family near some convenient church and school and enjoy the comforts of his toil.

During the campaign of 1910 I was constantly interrogated as to my attitude on this matter, and I pledged my people then, as I did at the special election held afterwards, and again in the campaign of 1912, that if sent as their Representative to this House I would vote for some kind of legislation that would prevent the continuation of this condition; would prohibit the importation of laborers under contract in competition with our own citizenship and restore the old opportunity for the laborers of our State.

The chairman of this committee, Mr. BURNETT, was kind enough to grant me a hearing; and after going into the matter carefully, the following provisions were incorporated in this bill, reading as follows:

SEC. 5. That it shall be unlawful for any person, company, partnership, or corporation, in any manner whatsoever, to prepay the transportation or in any way to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit, or attempt to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit the importation or migration of any contract laborer or contract laborers into the United States, unless such contract laborer or contract laborers are exempted under the provisions of section 3 of this act, or have been imported with the permission of the Secretary of Labor in accordance with said section; and for every violation of any of the provisions of this section the person, partnership, company, or corporation violating the same shall forfeit and pay for every such offense the sum of $1,000, which may be sued for and recovered by the United States as debts of like amount are now recovered in the courts of the United States; the Department of Justice may from any fines or penalties received pay rewards to persons other than Government employees who may furnish information leading to the recovery of any such penalties, or to the arrest and punishment of any person, as hereinafter in this section provided. For every violation of the provisions hereof the person violating the same may be prosecuted in a criminal action for a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of $1,000, or by imprisonment for a term of not less than six months nor more than two years; and under either the civil or the criminal procedure mentioned separate suits or prosecutions may be brought for each alien thus offered or promised employment as aforesaid.

SEC. 6. That it shall be unlawful and be deemed a violation of section 5 of this act to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit or attempt to induce, assist, encourage, or solicit any alien to come into the United States by promise of employment through advertisements printed, published, or distributed in any foreign country, whether such promise is true or false, and either the civil or criminal penalty imposed by said section shall be applicable to such a case: *Provided*, That States or Territories, the District of Columbia, or places subject to the jurisdiction of the United States may advertise, and by written or oral communication with prospective alien settlers make known, the inducements they offer for immigration thereto, respectively.

SEC. 7. That it shall be unlawful for any person, association, society, company, partnership, corporation, or others engaged in the business of transporting aliens to or in the United States, including owners, masters, officers, and agents of vessels, directly or indirectly, by writing,

printing, oral representation, payment of any commissions to an alien coming into the United States, allowance of any rebates to an alien coming into the United States, or otherwise to solicit, invite, or encourage or attempt to solicit, invite, or encourage any alien to come into the United States, and anyone violating any provision hereof shall be subject to either the civil or the criminal prosecution prescribed by section 5 of this act; or if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that any owner, master, officer, or agent of a vessel has brought or caused to be brought to a port of the United States any alien so solicited, invited, or encouraged to come by such owner, master, officer, or agent, such owner, master, officer, or agent shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located or in which any vessel of the line may be found, the sum of $400 for each and every such violation; and no vessel shall be granted clearance pending the determination of the question of the liability to the payment of such fine, or while the fine imposed remains unpaid, nor shall such fine be remitted or refunded: *Provided*, That clearance may be granted prior to the determination of such question upon the deposit with the collector of customs of a sum sufficient to cover such fine: *Provided further*, That whenever it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Labor that the provisions of this section are persistently violated by or on behalf of any transportation company, it shall be the duty of said Secretary to deny to such company the privilege of landing alien immigrant passengers of any or all classes at United States ports for such a period as in his judgment may be necessary to insure an observance of such provisions: *Provided further*, That this section shall not be held to prevent transportation companies from issuing letters, circulars, or advertisements, confined strictly to stating the sailing of their vessels and terms and facilities of transportation therein.

SEC. 8. That any person, including the master, agent, owner, or consignee of any vessel, who shall bring into or land in the United States, by vessel or otherwise, or shall attempt, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by vessel or otherwise, or shall conceal or harbor, or attempt to conceal or harbor, or assist or abet another to conceal or harbor in any place, including any building, vessel, railway car, conveyance, or vehicle, any alien not duly admitted by an immigrant inspector or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000 or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, or by both such fine and imprisonment, for each and every alien so landed or brought in or attempted to be landed or brought in.

From the above it will be seen that the present law, which simply provides a penalty of $1,000 to be recovered in a civil action in the name of the Government of the United States, the suit to be prosecuted at the instance and expense of the informant who is to receive one-half of the amount of judgment recovered, will be changed so that not only will there be a liability of $1,000 in a civil suit brought by the Government of the United States but the offense is also declared a misdemeanor and punishable with a thousand dollars fine and by imprisonment of not less than six months or more than two years, with separate suits or prosecution either civil or criminal for each alien offered or promised importation.

I believe this legislation will accomplish the desired result; that it meets the demand of the people of my district and State; and that in voting for this measure I am obeying the instructions of those whose representative I am.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to pass this immigration bill over the recent veto of President Wilson. I voted for this bill when it passed this House during this Congress by a vote of more than two to one. Since that time it has passed the United States Senate with only seven dissenting votes. This bill was also vetoed by President Taft, and I voted in this House to overturn his veto. This House failed by only four votes to pass the bill over President Taft's veto.

President Wilson, in his veto message, says:

It is with unaffected regret that I find myself constrained by clear conviction to return this bill (H. R. 6060, "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States") without my signature. Not only do I feel it to be a very serious matter to exercise the power of veto in any case, because it involves opposing the single judgment of the President to the judgment of a majority of both the Houses of the Congress, a step which no man who realizes his own liability to error can take without great hesitation, but also because this particular bill is in so many important respects admirable, well conceived, and desirable. Its enactment into law would undoubtedly enhance the efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of the public service to which it relates. But candor and a sense of duty with regard to the responsibility so clearly imposed upon me by the Constitution in matters of legislation leave me no choice but to dissent.

In two particulars of vital consequence this bill embodies a radical departure from the traditional and long-established policy of this country, a policy in which our people have conceived the very character of their Government to be expressed, the very mission and spirit of the Nation in respect of its relations to the peoples of the world outside their borders. It seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men; and it excludes those to whom the opportunities of elementary education have been denied, without regard to their character, their purposes, or their natural capacity.

It clearly appears from this langnage that the President would admit into this country the ignorant, illiterate, and un-American horde coming from every country under the sun, and it is equally as clear to my mind that he is absolutely wrong in his views on this very important subject.

This is the third time that a President of the United States has used his veto prerogative to prevent the literacy test becoming part of the immigration laws that have been passed by both branches of Congress. I am not urging my views on this on account of a narrow view of the question, but I realize that the very corner stone and foundation of a republican form of government such as ours rest upon the intelligence of its citizenship, and we can never expect to maintain a stable form of government if hordes of illiterates are allowed to come into this country unrestricted as they have been in recent years.

The conditions that so recently prevailed in West Virginia, Michigan, and Colorado, which caused such bitter warfare, would never have existed if it were not for the exploitation of these illiterate immigrants by those corporations who have practically made slaves of them. In my opinion those corporations have usurped the power of free government by taking advantage of these people and voting them through their bosses or padrone system. I urge you to pass this bill over the President's veto, as at this time there are millions of idle men unable to procure employment in the United States, and among them are millions of illiterates who have come to this country in recent years.

President Wilson further on in his veto message says:

If the people of this country have made up their minds to limit the number of immigrants by arbitrary tests and so reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that have gone before them, it is their right to do so. I am their servant and have no license to stand in their way. But I do not believe that they have. I respectfully submit that no one can quote their mandate to that effect. Has any political party ever avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter, gone to the country on it, and been commissioned to control its legislation? Does this bill rest upon the conscious and universal assent and desire of the American people? I doubt it. It is because I doubt it that I make bold to dissent from it. I am willing to abide by the verdict, but not until it has been rendered. Let the platforms of parties speak out upon this policy and the people pronounce their wish. The matter is too fundamental to be settled otherwise.

The President is mistaken in asserting, inferentially at least, that no political party ever has avowed a policy of restriction in this fundamental matter and gone to the country on it and been commissioned to control its legislation. The President is clearly wrong in this contention, as will be shown by the following plank taken from the Republican platform of 1896, and which is as follows, viz:

FOREIGN IMMIGRATION.

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.

Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me aright, Mr. William McKinley was that year elected President of this United States on that platform. I remember very well losing my vote that year in that election, cast by me for William J. Bryan for President.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic platform of 1912 also contains this declaration, namely:

We repeat our declaration of the platform of 1908.

The expanding organization of industry makes it essential that there should be no abridgment of the right of the wage earners and producers to organize for the protection of their wages and the improvement of labor conditions, and to the end that such labor organizations and their members should not be regarded as illegal combinations in restraint of trade.

Again, in another place in the platform:

We pledge the Democratic Party to the enactment of a law creating a department of labor represented separately in the President's Cabinet, in which department shall be included the subject of mines and mining.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I find, as far back as the Democratic platform of 1892, this language concerning immigration:

SEC. 12. We heartily approve all legitimate efforts to prevent the United States from being used as the dumping ground for the known criminals and professional paupers of Europe.

Reading these Democratic platform pledges in the light of reason, is not the Democratic Party pledged by them to vote to exclude from our shores all illiterate immigrants? Their exclusion will be the most legitimate means of preventing undesirable persons from entering our country. Mr. Speaker, from every part of this broad land come petitions, letters, and telegrams, from all kinds of labor unions and associations, imploring this House to pass this bill over the President's veto; and as an honest Representative, under my oath of office and in view of the above Democratic platform pledges to the laboring people of this country, I can not and will not do otherwise than vote to pass this bill over the President's veto.

Mr. Speaker, the President assumes by his veto message to stand between the people of our various districts and ourselves, and to prevent us from doing a wrong to our own constituents. I am constrained by my own self-respect and by my intimate knowledge of the views and conditions of the people of my dis-

trict to differ with the President, and to positively assert that I know more of their views and wishes on this or any other political subject than the President can possibly know; and I know that I am voicing almost their unanimous wish in voting to exclude from this country all illiterate immigrants.

Mr. Speaker, as samples of the many telegrams that I have been receiving on this subject I will submit as part of my remarks the following ones, viz.:

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., *February 3, 1915.*

JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Member Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Eighteen hundred union men of Wichita Falls urge you to support House immigration bill No. 6060 over President's veto.

C. W. JOHNSON,
Secretary Wichita Trades and Labor Council.

—

AMARILLO, TEX., *January 30, 1915.*

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Members of Pecos Valley Lodge No. 235, your honor, request that you support the immigration bill asked by American Federation of Labor by your earnest efforts in voting to pass the bill over the President's veto.

Yours, respectfully,

W. R. MCDOWELL, *President.*
J. S. HAYNES, *Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, I will now submit a few of the hundreds of letters I have been receiving on this immigration subject, and they will tend to show, in my judgment, that our good, wise, and patriotic President has been deceived into thinking that the people of this country are not in favor of excluding illiterate foreigners from our shores.

These letters are as follows, viz.:

GALVESTON LABOR COUNCIL,
Galveston, Tex., January 29, 1915.

DEAR SIR: I am writing you at the instructions of the Galveston Labor Council, a body representing 8,200 union men of this city, to plead with you to support and try and repass House bill 6060, known as the immigration bill, over the President's veto.

Hoping you will confer upon us this favor, the same as you have favored us on previous occasions, I beg to remain,

Yours, obediently,

JAS. P. WALSH, *Secretary.*

—

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 28, 1915.*

To the Honorable Members of the
House of Representatives, Sixty-third Congress.

GENTLEMEN: With deep regret we learn through press dispatches of January 28 that the President has vetoed the immigration bill. With reference to that bill, our hopes now rest with Congress, confronted with the cold fact of competition with cheap labor of illiterates coming from foreign countries, while thousands of our people are suffering from unemployment. For the welfare of the working people of this country—our people, our country—we earnestly urge the enactment of the immigration bill over the President's veto.

Respectfully,

INTERNATIONAL SEAMEN'S UNION OF AMERICA,
T. A. HANSON, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

—

ST. LOUIS, MO., *February 1, 1915.*

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It becomes our duty as officers of the Railway Employees' Department of the American Federation of Labor, representing 350,000 railway shopmen, to voice their earnest protest against the President's veto of the immigration bill embodying the literacy test. We earnestly beseech your cooperation and support in the interest of maintaining a standard living wage for the workers of this country to vote for the passage of this bill as a safeguard against the invasion of our country by the pauper labor from Europe.

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 rigidly enforced and so extended as to exclude from entrance to the United States those who can neither read nor write.

Hoping that our earnest appeal will receive your full support, to the end that the immigration bill will be passed in its original form, we are,

Yours, very truly,

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES' DEPARTMENT,
A. O. WHARTON, *President,*
JOHN SCOTT, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

—

NATIONAL COUNCIL DAUGHTERS OF LIBERTY,
1604 East Passyunk Avenue, Philadelphia.

HONORED SIR: In the early history of our country immigration was necessary and desirable and was readily assimilated with our population. It is now undesirable, because we do not assimulate it and it is making its impress on our American life, to its deterioration and injury. It has increased in such numbers that it has become a menace by reason of its low quality of illiteracy (73 per cent).

"Ignorance fosters vice." This is clearly shown by the Immigration Commissioner's report. We are appealing to you for protection to the American laborer and to maintain the standards of American life and morals.

House bill No. 6060 is opposed by every sordid influence, from which every principle for the benefit and protection of Americans and American institutions have been eliminated and they mercilessly shut out every consideration and sentiment that could be termed American.

The opposition maintains by their attitude that the man in a foreign land is entitled to the first consideration and the American second. Why should not our own have first consideration?

If parties were true to their platforms they should be true to their constituents. The Democratic Party adopted the following: "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." And the Republican Party, the following: "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." Protection that has the true ring is that which protects both the workingman and the manufacturer.

With the hope that we shall find your name recorded in the column to pass this bill over the President's veto for the welfare of all Americans, we are.

Sincerely, yours,

ALBERT L. BRADLEY, *National Councilor.*

Attest:

W. V. EDKINS, *National Secretary.*

—

CIGAR MAKERS' INTERNATIONAL UNION OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., January 30, 1915.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In behalf of the Cigar Makers' International Union, with a membership of 50,000, covering all ramifications of our country, I respectfully urge that you vote to pass the immigration bill, including the literacy test, over the veto of President Wilson.

The reasons for this request are many, chief of which are: That labor, in so far as it has been able to give free expression to its opinion, is practically unanimous in its advocacy of the immigration bill; that the American Federation of Labor, the supreme parliament and final authority through which labor's expression may be had, at its Seattle Convention, 1913, practically unanimously declared in favor of the immigration bill; that we hold that a free Democracy can not sustain its high ideals, justice, liberty, equality, and freedom in a state befitting advancing civilization, without the great mass of its voters possessing average intelligence and wisdom born of knowledge; that there is a vast difference between the immigrants now and those of 50 years ago; that all foreign countries have laws regulating and controlling both immigration and emigration, especially emigration, through a system of passports, the check-off plan, discretionary authority given to the emigration commission, and its system of spies and police surveillance; that under this discretionary power it becomes an easy matter for each country to keep out the immigrant not wanted and to hold back the sturdy, desirable citizen who would emigrate, and at the same time make it easy as well as helpful for the derelict and so-called undesirables to emigrate; that we personally know of cases where immigrants now here are more in favor of restricted immigration than are native-born Americans; that there are even in normal trade conditions and at all times fully 1,000,000 idle men seeking employment which they can not find, and that during periods of industrial and commercial stagnation this army of unemployed is doubled, if not tripled; that under the planless system of immigration millions of immigrants have landed on our shores with no concept of the responsibility that goes with citizenship here, and because of pressing poverty are forced into gainful occupations for wages, hours, and conditions, in the making of which, because of dire conditions bordering on starvation, they have no choice or say.

For these and a multiplicity of other reasons, with which I shall not burden you at this time, we favor the immigration bill including the literacy test. We again urge and respectfully ask that you vote for the immigration bill now in your hands.

Yours, respectfully,

G. W. PERKINS,
International President.

—

INTERNATIONAL TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 29, 1915.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Representing 65,000 members of the International Typographical Union, I am directed to request that you use your vote and influence to secure the passage of the immigration bill over the veto of President Woodrow Wilson.

Yours, truly,

J. W. HAYS,
Secretary-Treasurer, I. T. U.

—

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Indianapolis, Ind., January 29, 1915.

Hon. JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Our international organization, the United Mine Workers of America, is much interested in the passage of the immigration bill, which provides for a literacy test.

We ask you therefore to help pass the bill by your vote and influence, even though the President has seen fit to veto it. It is unnecessary to submit arguments in support of this measure, because you have no doubt given the subject very thorough consideration.

The 400,000 members of our organization believe the passage of such a law is necessary not only for the protection of American citizens but the foreign immigrants as well. This is an American measure and we believe ought to receive the support of yourself and associates in Congress.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN P. WHITE, *President.*
WILLIAM GREEN, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

—

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., *January 29, 1915.*

Congressman JOHN H. STEPHENS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Recently President Wilson vetoed the immigration bill containing the literacy test.

I am instructed by the general executive board of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Chauffeurs of America to write you requesting you to vote in favor of the passage of this bill over the President's veto.

It means a great deal to the membership of our organization. We have thousands of men out of employment in every section of the country. It can not be possible that the President of the United States

thoroughly understands industrial conditions. The American workingman is being driven to the wall year after year mainly as a result of immigrant labor. The children of the American workers are filling our jails and penal institutions because of the fact that they can not find suitable employment, resulting from the overcrowding of the labor market.

Employers' associations and shipping trusts are selfish in their desire for unrestricted immigration conditions, because a surplus of labor means cheaper labor for the employers, and the overflow if immigrants to this country means to the Shipping Trust enormous profits.

Religious organizations that are opposed to the literacy test take the position that unrestricted immigration will enlarge their congregations in this country.

The interests of the working masses of the Nation are entirely overlooked by the above-named interests. We who are in the front fighting and struggling with the thousands and thousands of workers know the conditions and we speak from actual contact with the workers and experience with conditions of life. If conditions continue as they are—that is, if the hundreds of thousands of workers from foreign countries are allowed to come into this country each year without any restriction, and especially the ignorant and uneducated class—it will be but a short time until the toiling men and women of this country will have to fight for bread that they and their children may live.

Look into conditions in New York and Chicago, in St. Louis and in Boston this winter, with 1,000,000 men and women out of employment struggling for something to eat—not the riffraff who never work, but those who are willing to work and are unable to find employment—and ask yourself, as a free-born, honest-thinking representative of the people, if you are justified in still continuing unrestricted immigiation.

Our membership of 70,000 English-speaking American workingmen ask you to vote for the passage of the immigration bill containing the literacy test over the President's veto.

Respectfully, yours,

DANIEL J. TOBIN,
General President International Brotherhood of Teamsters and Chauffeurs.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I desire to submit as a part of my remarks statistics which show the urgent necessity for the immediate passage of this bill, so as to close and bar the doors of our country against this vast stream of foreigners now flowing into our country, making it harder year by year for our own people to earn a living in the face of so much foreign-labor competition.

These statistics are as follows:

IMMIGRATION STATISTICS.

A Department of Commerce bulletin just issued shows that there were 13,515,886 persons of foreign birth living in the United States in 1910. These figures show an increase of approximately 3,500,000 over the number of foreigners residing here in 1910. The increasing ratio is slightly in excess of the general increase in population.

Approximately 10 per cent of this foreign-born population live in New York.

Pennsylvania ranks second as a permanent abode of foreigners, with 741,000. The majority of these people are miners. Illinois has a foreign population of 604,000, and Massachusetts has 453,000.

Germans represent more than one-fifth of the entire foreign population. There were 2,501,181 Germans scattered through the country. The tremendous Russian immigration during the last decade places the Czar's subjects in second place with 1,602,000. Italy was third with 1,343,000, and Ireland, which formerly led the list, was in fourth place with 1,333,000.

There were 1,174,000 Austrians in this country and 876,455 Englishmen.

The report shows that the American migration to Canada was offset by more than 1,000,000 English and French Canadians living in this country.

Other foreigners living in this country: From Sweden, 665,183; Hungary, 495,600; Norway, 403,858; Scotland, 261,034; Mexico, 219,302; Denmark, 181,621; Finland, 129,669; Switzerland, 124,834; Netherlands, 120,053; France, 117,326; Greece, 101,264; Portugal, 57,625; Wales, 82,479; Roumania, 65,920; Turkey, 59,702; Belgium, 47,397; Cuba and the West Indies, 23,169; Spain, 21,977; all other countries, 59,701.

The number of foreign-born males over 21 living in the United States was 6,648,317. Of these, 1,034,117 were naturalized, 570,772 had first papers, 2,266,000 were aliens, and there were 775,393 citizens not reported.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. It is a pleasure to find the President in a position in which we can give him our support. His veto of the immigration bill follows the example of his worthy predecessor in the White House. I shall vote to sustain him to-day.

No man can outdo me in my zeal for a high standard of citizenship, nor can anyone go further than I in barring from this country anarchists and those whose criminal tendencies or aversion to well-ordered government or those who are so mentally or physically defective as to prove a burden or a menace to our people.

But it has been declared by one of the advocates of this bill on this floor to-day that an alien can learn an alphabet in a single night and thus qualify himself for admission. I am opposed to saddling the Government with an enormous expense to enforce a bill which can be so easily evaded.

Another gentleman cries out in despair, "What are you going to do with the 4,000,000 idle men in this country?" In reply to that I would say: "Give them a little Republican legislation and a little less Democratic folly and you will do away with their idleness and put an end to the bread line."

There are millions of acres yet to be cultivated in this country, railroads to be built, tunnels to pierce the mountains, and new industries to be established in every section.

The time has not come when this Nation can afford to reverse its policy of more than a century and bar the worthy immigrant merely because he was deprived of educational opportunities beyond the seas.

It is a man's character and not his education that determines his worth as a citizen. A rugged body, an innocent mind, and a pure heart, combined with a manly ambition, is far more preferable in a citizen to a decrepit physique, a vicious heart, and a criminal, cunning, educated mind, which enables the anarchist and the enemy of good government to pass through the gates of American opportunity while the unfortunate is denied admission.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS]. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, it might be regarded that an affirmative vote on this measure to-day would be a rebuke to the President of the United States. That is not true. The President's function in legislation is limited to the veto power. I called the attention of this House once before to the legislative function of the Executive of the Nation. It is not positive in character, it is negative. It is not so much to say what the law shall be as it is to say what it shall not be so far as the Executive is concerned, and therefore when the President vetoes a measure he is within his rights constitutionally and is not subject to criticism of any Member upon the floor of either House when he has exercised his constitutional right as written in the Constitution. The President has put his veto upon the ground of two items in the bill. The first is—

> It seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum which have always been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural inalienable rights of men.

The clause in the bill that induced the President to make that statement is in these words:

> Who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property.

Mr. Speaker, I admit that it is not a pleasant situation for any Speaker to be required to ask for order in the greatest legislative assembly in the world, and yet it seems that debate on this floor has reached a place where it is thought that a man is seeking to be heard and not to convince, and I think it is a suggestion of a public opinion which emanates from this floor that is not complimentary to any Member who speaks or to those who hear. The one thing that would induce me to vote for this measure, strange to say, is the language that the President has asked us not to vote for, for if there is anybody who ought to be excluded from the shores of this country it is the person who advocates or teaches the unlawful destruction of property, and not only that, but who will attack the constitutional institutions of our country.

The other point that the President has allowed to be his determinant is the educational, or the literacy, test. Speaking as one who believes in education, a citizen of a Nation that believes in a compulsory system of education, a citizen of one of the 48 States of the Union, most of which have compulsory laws compelling education, I for one will not vote against a measure that requires the same test of an immigrant who comes here that we require of the individuals growing up under laws that compel them to obey certain regulations pertaining to education. It is not unfair for a nation to put a demand upon a man who seeks to come to our shores that we put upon the children who grow to manhood within the nation. It is inconsistent to take any other position, it seems to me. Then, on the other hand, while I could understand why Members of the House who are opposed to a system of protection, as the Democratic Members, might oppose this limitation of immigration, yet I can not for the life of me understand how Members on this (Republican) side of the House, who believe in a system of American protection, can argue against an immigration bill on the basis of protection to American labor.

My Republican friends, whether you believe in a system of protection to American wages, as has been announced over and over again in the platforms as we publish to the world, and whether you do that because you belong to a particular party promulgating it or not, matters little to me, but it does matter when men stand upon a platform that pronounces for the protection of the present system of wages, through a protective tariff, and then argue for the admission of the laborer who becomes a competitor of American labor. If it be wrong to admit goods made by him, then why is it not wrong to admit him? Cheap goods in competition with our American goods we refuse, then why allow competition in American labor and thus reduce the wages paid to labor in this country to the wages paid in the country from which he comes? [Applause.]

As a consistent believer in a system of wages that allows a workingman to have a carpet upon his floor and modern conveniences in his home, I insist that whether we have a protective tariff or a revenue tariff, the time is here for this country to put up protective bars against indiscriminate introduction of European-paid labor to force down American labor to such a basis.

Mr. KINDEL. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. KINDEL. Since you believe in the protection of American labor, why do you permit the goods to be shipped in at a lesser rate than from interior points to distant western points? For instance, we of Colorado now buy our pottery in Europe because the freight rate is less from Europe than it is from Ohio to the same point.

Mr. FESS. My friend is introducing parcel post, and I am not up with it sufficiently to make a satisfactory answer. [Laughter and applause.] I would say this, however, that my contention has been, and is now, to prevent the goods made in Europe by a cheaper labor coming here to enter into competition with the sale of the goods made by higher-priced labor, and that is the only reason why I should stand upon a protective tariff policy. [Applause.] How can you, believing in that policy, vote out the goods he makes and vote in the men who make them and to introduce this competition? [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KINDEL. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FESS. If it will not take too much of my time.

Mr. KINDEL. I want to ask you this question: Why do you concede the point that Lord & Taylor, of New York, must establish a plant in Europe, as well as in this country, whereby they supply from Europe to the western part of the United States at 81 cents for 11-pound parcel-post packages while from New York to the same points in the West it is $1.32?

Mr. FESS. I would not pass any law in this country to compel Lord & Taylor, of New York, to go to Europe to manufacture an article for which they would pay the cheaper labor in Europe and then sell it back here free of duty, to come into competition with their competitor who employs American labor, which will thereby be reduced to the wages paid by Lord & Taylor in Europe.

I was pleased and edified, as every Member of this House was edified, with the argument of my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. STEVENS]. I wish every man on either side of this Chamber would be as frank as that gentleman was when he said, "I have not come to the place where I believe that the Nation ought to enter upon a policy of limiting immigration."

Why does not the rest of the opposition take that position? You talk about objecting to this bill because of the literacy test or other items. The facts are, you object to it because you oppose restriction. No matter what be the item, you are against the limitation of immigration at all, and that is the issue we now have here to meet. I say to you that the gentleman from New Hampshire has taken the only legitimate position on that side of the question, namely, that we do not want to limit or restrict immigration at all.

But I say to you that we do want to limit and restrict immigration; we must meet this issue, and we should do it now. [Applause.] That is a policy that we must enter upon. It is no argument to say that the mothers of great sons in the past never went to school, were illiterate, and therefore you would crowd out some of the greatest and most useful people in the world by this literacy test. Yes; it is true. But, in the beginning, with no common schools and no colleges open to every boy and girl as to-day, with the doors swinging open both ways, many people grew up without education and became splendid citizens. But that was the time when there was no chance. They had to grow up that way or not grow. People who years ago never went to school, if they lived now would not plead for ignorance. Those same people never rode in an automobile. They may never have seen a carpet on their floor. They may never have talked over a telephone. They may never have walked over paved streets. They may not have known anything about modern civilization, but because they did not, do you mean to say that they now would reject them, or that they should be restricted the same as if they had not all of these privileges? No. This time demands that the standards of immigration be restricted in order to get a better class of immigrants. My contention is that you can not open the floodgates of Europe, admit indiscriminate citizens from Bulgaria, Roumania, Servia, and southern Europe, and then hope that your standard of living among the labor of the country will not be reduced to the level of those people. Let us vote for this measure as a beginning of a national policy that must be met, if not by this then by a future Congress. [Applause.]

In this connection I submit a letter from Dr. Jenks, a most thoughtful student of the question now before us.

THE FAR EASTERN BUREAU,
New York, February 2, 1915.

Hon. S. D. FESS,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FESS: Through my membership in the Immigration Commission and because of the study I have given to it during the four years covered by the commission's investigations I have come to believe that the immigration question is one of the gravest importance to the future welfare of our country. May I ask you, considering the present emergency and my own experiences as an impartial student of this problem, to take the time to read this letter?

The arguments against the literacy test, which I have lately read, seem to me to be largely beside the point.

The chief reasons for the imposition of any test of that kind at the present time are—

(1) The absolute necessity of restriction, in order to maintain American standards of living among our unskilled working people;

(2) The fact that no other restrictive measure at the present time could pass Congress; and

(3) While the literacy test is restrictive, it is also beneficially selective.

A vote to defeat the literacy test is a vote to encourage such public calamities as the Lawrence strike. Working conditions in Lawrence were doubtless sufficiently deplorable to incite the strike. Why did such conditions exist? On account of the great numbers of immigrants continually asking for positions at decidedly lower wages than those paid by employers. Of course, under such conditions, employers have little incentive to increase wages.

Trustworthy investigators, not only during the trouble at Lawrence but later, found from 25 to 30 single men living in houses that would accommodate satisfactorily families of not more than 6 or 8 people. Often there were 12 men sleeping on mattresses laid side by side on the floor of the room in which was their cooking stove and all their household goods. Here we have excessive immigration turning what should be homes into mere bunk houses, insanitary and incentive to the grossest immorality.

Shocking conditions of this sort, proved to be prevalent in Lawrence, are duplicated in very many places throughout the manufacturing and mining regions of the East and Middle West. Many of the investigators and members of the Immigration Commission were opposed to restriction when they began their work. They were made unanimous in favor of restriction because of conditions such as those at Lawrence, brought about wholly by excessive immigration. Of course, you do not wish to help perpetuate the transformation of the American home into the bunk house, with all its loathsome characteristics. Restriction of immigration can alone protect our communities and our unskilled American workers against this menace.

You yourself are, of course, conscious of the fact that Congress has repeatedly voted in favor of this particular measure of restriction. The country is determined to have restriction. If this bill is defeated by the President's veto, such defeat will merely strengthen the demand for restriction, and the next attempt to crystallize in legislation this sentiment is likely to be one regarding which there can be not the shadow of a doubt—a percentage test that would reduce immigration far more decisively than would the literacy test.

The greatest menace comes from the immigration of hundreds of thousands of men unaccompanied by their families and who, investigation proved, have no intention to make their permanent home here, but who come merely for the purpose of earning nest eggs with which to rejoin their families at home and to start anew in their own countries. These men are attracted solely by the sordid advantages presented by American economic standards. They have no interest in or sympathy with our American ideals or institutions. They come deliberately to underbid American wage earners if necessary to obtain work, to exist sometimes 12 or more in a room, and to send all their savings home. More than 90 per cent of the immigrants from Bulgaria and Greece and other such countries are males; they are mostly single men or married men without their wives or children.

The investigation made by the Immigration Commission revealed that 90 per cent of the married Bulgarians, 74.7 per cent of the Greek, and 36.9 per cent of the South Italian immigrants themselves reported that their wives continued living in their native countries. Between 1899 and 1909 the percentage of male immigrants from Europe increased from 58.5 to 73 per cent, and since then the rate of increase seems to have been continuous. That, in itself, is a very serious problem. Comparisons with early immigration, you see, are no longer valid.

The literacy test will exclude primarily men coming from the countries whence this particularly unsuitable type of immigrant emanates. According to statistics issued by the United States Census Bureau on January 26 the percentage of illiteracy in the United States for the total population over 10 years is 7.7 per cent and for the native white population 3 per cent. In Bulgaria the illiteracy percentage is reported as 65 per cent; in Greece, 70 per cent; in Italy, 37 per cent; and in Servia, 79 per cent.

The test is therefore beneficially selective.

This sort of undesirable immigration is directly responsible for our unemployment problem. Three days ago in New York City, Jeff Davis, so-called "king of the hoboes," declared that the "swarms of such undesirable immigrants, underbidding American workers, are turning our unskilled wage earners into hoboes, bums, outcasts, and criminals." I do not think there is any doubt but that increase in unemployment and criminality can be traced directly to excessive undesirable immigration.

During 1914 there was expended in this country on public-school education, in round figures, $500,000,000. The primary purpose of this great expenditure was, and is, to obliterate illiteracy. Trustworthy investigators are convinced that education is the best means of fighting pauperism and crime. Is the object of the expenditure of these millions to be nullified in fact by retaining the "open door" for illiterates who refuse to avail themselves of opportunities to learn even the rudiments of reading and writing?

On my return from Italy in a steamer carrying immigrants, the Italian commissioner of immigration in charge of the Italian immigrants on board that steamer told me he hoped the United States

would impose the literacy test, because, as he expressed it, "such restriction would within three years put a schoolhouse on every hill in Italy," and would "do more to further general education in Italy than anything the Italian Government could itself put into practice."

The argument that men can not learn to read in any country in Europe, including the Jewish Poles in Russia, is untrue and unfounded, as every well-informed Hebrew knows. Very few male Hebrews would be excluded by this test; and as you of course know, boys, wives, and parents—male and female—are not required to take the test provided their adult male relatives can read. There has been gross misrepresentation throughout the country on this point, as there has been gross misrepresentation of other provisions of the Burnett bill.

You have doubtless seen the published statement that "Lincoln's mother would not have been admitted into the United States had this test been in force in her time." Lincoln learned to read under conditions probably more difficult than those confronted by possibly 95 per cent of the present European immigrants. And Lincoln's ability to read would have brought his mother in.

It is frequently stated that this bill "would have excluded Carl Schurz and Garibaldi, and have prevented Congress from hearing Charles Stewart Parnell's famous plea in behalf of the oppressed Irish race." These great men would not have been excluded. They were not men who either applied or advocated "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." The bill specifically provides that "nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of an offense, purely political, not involving moral turpitude."

The bill would exclude such men as the anarchists who were executed in Chicago some years ago; Czolgosz, the assassin of President McKinley; and men who are ready wantonly to destroy property and valuable machinery in times of strike, a proceeding not countenanced by any reputable trade-union leader.

I am reminded that Charles Stewart Parnell more than once denounced the very acts and opinions prescribed by clause 3 of the bill; that he repudiated in the name of the Irish people association in the Phoenix Park murders; that the greatest living Irishmen denounce and deplore assassination and wanton destruction as political weapons; and that the greatest Irishman of modern times, Daniel O'Connell, declared that "the salvation of Ireland is not worth the shedding of a single drop of human blood."

I trust that the serious consideration of the real welfare of the American people, as manifested by the standards of living of their poorer classes, will easily outweigh any of the merely sentimental objections, largely hypothetical and unsound, that have been raised in opposition to the literacy test; and that you will further note the very numerous "admirable, well-conceived, and desirable" important parts of the bill mentioned by the President, which, as he says, if "enacted into law" would "undoubtedly enhance efficiency and improve the methods of handling the important branch of public service to which it relates." Those most familiar with the administration of our immigration laws would probably lay even more emphasis upon these provisions than does the President.

Very sincerely,

J. W. JENKS.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN].

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

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMRIDGE].

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote to pass this bill over the veto of the President. When it passed the House last year I gave it my support, and I see no reason why it should not still become a law. I heartily join in every word of praise that has been accorded to our American citizens of foreign birth. There is evidence on every side to establish the fact that our Government and institutions have the power to remold and recast the lives and character of people from every civilized nation. We are therefore justified in the belief that the principles upon which our Government is founded and which should control its administration affect the fundamental elements of human character.

The record of achievement which has been made in the assimilation of immigrant peoples into our American life well challenges the admiration of the world. Every door of opportunity has been kept wide open to the foreigner who has sought our shores. He and his have been accorded every advantage given to those of our own Nation. While the immigrant has laid upon us many obligations, he has been given many privileges.

Those who oppose this legislation assert that they are controlled in their judgment by humanitarian motives. It is stated that we are closing the doors of opportunity to the deserving people of other nations; that we are darkening the sky of hope to the distressed and downtrodden of other countries; that we are refusing to extend a helping hand to those who are seeking our aid. We can not divorce the principles of humanity and justice in considering this legislation. We must deal justly with our own people and our own interests as well as with the desire of those who may seek our shores. We should act upon this question in the light of present-day conditions. Is restriction of immigration desirable? Will it relieve an overburdened labor market? Will it improve the living conditions of the toilers who are now among us and who must remain citizens of this country? Will it in any way reduce the burden of taxation and build up American institutions? I believe this legislation will contribute to these ends.

The European war has arrested business operations in this country. How soon these operations will become normal no one can say. For the past six months there has been a great congestion in our large centers of population of those out of employment, and yet it is proposed to make no effort to stem the tide of foreign immigration that will undoubtedly seek our shores as soon as the war now raging is brought to an end. The opponents of the bill claim that there will be so much activity in the resumption of manufacturing, in the building up of devastated cities, and also in the development of agriculture, that there will be little, if any, immigration to this country. I do not share this belief. Our great country which has enjoyed the blessings of peace will prove more attractive than ever to the residents of other lands.

The impetus to seek new environment and to cast their fortunes in this favored land will be stronger than ever. Those who have been driven from their homes and who have seen their fields laid waste will dread the task of rebuilding new homes upon the ruins of the old and amid the devastation that has occurred. Just as we seek new environment when old associations become burdensome and unattractive, so will many thousands of those who may be left after the war has ended seek our favored land to repair their shattered fortunes. This bill is not harsh in its terms. Our doors would still be wide open to those who possess even the minimum of intelligence and who thereby indicate to some degree the existence of mental activity. The great need of our country to-day is for a more intelligent and patriotic citizenship. We do well to support and maintain our great institutions of learning and to accord every possible support to our great public-school system and to require that every American child shall be an educated child. If we ever lose any of our national ideals or our governmental power shall in any way become weakened, it will be due to our failure to enforce these obligations. This bill recognizes this fundamental element of our national character in requiring the immigrant to pass what is known as the literacy test. I am surprised that this provision of the bill has aroused such bitter opposition and do not understand why it should not receive the support of every loyal American. I can well understand why the great industrial corporations are opposed to this measure. They have recruited their ranks of workers from the immigrant class. It has been a most profitable source of supply. Men who lack intelligence and power to acquire knowledge of American independence and opportunity become ready victims to corporate greed and avarice. Conditions in mine, mill, and large manufacturing centers where our foreign population has largely gathered prove conclusively that many of the great trusts of the country have been built up by the exacting toll which they have levied upon foreign and ignorant workingmen. A better day is near at hand. Our society demands that human beings shall no longer be exploited for private gain. There will always be dangerous and unhealthy employment, but public sentiment, as expressed through legislation, will require that these shall be reduced to the lowest possible minimum. We have much to do along this line, and these problems and many others relating to them should be worked out under the most favorable conditions.

It will be the part of wisdom for us to settle and determine many problems arising from the large foreign population we now have without intensifying them and adding to their complications through a continuance of an increasing tide of immigration. The congestion of laborers in our cities should be relieved by some proper system of distribution. Agricultural life should be made attractive to the foreigner. There are vast areas of public domain that should be settled and developed. When we have found the remedy for these conditions and when we have put into operation proper means of assimilation and distribution, we can then open the flood gates and allow the stream of foreign immigration to flow in. Would it not be well, in view of these facts, to work out the necessary remedies? These can and will be found. The problem is worthy the best endeavor of our statesmen and leaders of public thought. The flow of immigration should be temporarily reduced until we are better prepared to take care of those who will come to us. This legislation can be justified, in my opinion, on the highest humanitarian grounds. We are doing little for the immigrant to permit him to come to us and lose himself in the congested tenement population of the city. If we can discover some adequate way through which we can immediately avail ourselves of his productive power, we will be doing him the highest service, and he will become a most valuable asset. He has been such an asset in the past, but there is fear that he is becoming a liability. It will be best both for him and us to

allow some period of readjustment that will enable us to solve some of the problems which have arisen from unrestricted immigration and permit us to properly care for the foreigners who are now here and those who will undoubtedly be able to come by meeting the conditions of the bill now pending. In supporting this measure, I believe I am doing a service not only to the citizens of my country but also to those who will seek a home under the protection of its flag.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I feel compelled to cast my vote to make this bill a law notwithstanding the President's veto, but I take it that a Representative, in the exercise of his prerogatives, may sometimes find it his duty to differ with the Executive, and may do so without disrespect or criticism. However much any of us may differ with the views of the present occupant of that great office, none will say that he has acted other than what, in his opinion, is for the best interests of his country. During his entire occupancy of that exalted position he has been so uniformly right that it makes it all the more difficult for us, especially his party associates, to be compelled to differ with him now. The President, in the exercise of his constitutional right, has seen fit to disapprove this measure, which a large majority of this Congress, as well as several preceding Congresses, has approved, and has returned the bill to this House, giving his reasons for withholding his approval. If the reasons thus given are not convincing, and we believe in the principles embodied in this bill, and believe the best interests of the country require its passage, we should not, in my opinion, shirk the responsibility as Representatives of the American people.

For many years I have believed some further restrictions should be made in our immigration laws, and as the years have passed and I have observed the operation of our laws on this question, I have become more and more convinced of the wisdom of such legislation as this bill proposes.

It must be apparent to all those who are informed on this question that we have outgrown, as it were, the present laws on immigration. It has been argued here that we have greatly prospered under our present law, and that we should not therefore depart from the old principles of the open door and let our country remain the asylum for the oppressed of all nations. This theory sounds well, Mr. Speaker, but things have changed. We are no longer a sparsely settled wilderness. We are no longer an undeveloped country comparatively. We no longer have a hundred jobs for one man to do, as in the early days of this Republic. We have passed the formative stages, the experimental stages, if you please, and by our brain and industry, coupled with patriotism, we have transformed this vast undeveloped wilderness into a great, living, vital, throbbing world power.

In those early days we could afford to be more liberal and less discriminating than we can now, because conditions are different now. We could better afford to take the chance of making good American citizens of those who came to our shores, because we needed people. We needed laborers. We needed everything that goes into the making of a great nation. It may also be noted that in the early days the people who came to cast their lot with us spread out over the rural portions of our country, and did not to the same extent as now flood and congest our cities, because we had no large cities as now. It must be admitted that our forefathers, in the main, made desirable citizens, and many who were illiterate contributed to the betterment of the Nation; but that does not prove that because of their ignorance they were as useful as if they had not been illiterate.

I am perfectly willing to admit that literacy is not a true test of character, but I am not willing to admit that it is desirable to have it in unlimited quantities. It is argued that as we have done so well as a Nation we should not change our policy in this respect; that is to argue that the laws governing trade and commerce should not be changed to conform to growth and changed conditions. It is to argue that trusts and monopolies should not be regulated because the country was prosperous under laws that made possible their existence. In fact, it is to admit that we must stand still and that we have not the wisdom to legislate for changed conditions.

It is almost equal to the admission that popular government is impotent and ineffectual. We may not be fully grown as a Nation; in fact, I believe we have undreamed of possibilities ahead of us, if we exercise that prudence and wisdom which have characterized us in the past and have the courage to meet such questions as this in a spirit of patriotism and not permit ourselves to become mere sentimentalists.

From a handful of colonists we have grown into a great Nation of nearly a hundred million of souls; a people filled with love of liberty and patriotism; and yet it is contended that we should keep the bars down to everybody who desires to become experimental American citizens, at a time, too, when there is a large alien element who have not been assimilated, and also at a time in our history when our progress commercially has been arrested by a great war.

When many of our own people are temporarily out of employment, it does seem to me that the opponents of this measure would stop and consider whether they owe most to the already American citizen or to the prospective American citizen that a mere sentiment would ingraft on our body politic. Do you not realize that many of our citizens are out of employment, due to abnormal world conditions? Do you not know that even in normal times there is always a large percentage of American citizens seeking employment? Do you not know that there are more people in the country now than can find work to support themselves and families? I do not mean that everybody is out of work, as is reported for political effect, and that it is due to the Democratic Party; but I do mean to say, gentlemen, that our immigration laws are so lax that we have permitted more people to come in than we have been able to assimilate properly, with the result that the labor market is overstocked and we have a great mass of undigested labor on our hands. This being the case, let me ask you which is the higher duty—to protect American labor from further congestion or, because of sentiment, refuse to restrict immigration? In other words, are we for American citizens and American labor or will we legislate for foreigners instead?

I would not want to utter one word that would foster selfishness on our part as a Nation, nor say a word of disparagement of the citizens of other countries, but I do say that our first and chief duty as representatives of this great people is to legislate for America and Americans. Then, when we have done what is for their best good, do all we can to help all other peoples in the world.

I do not believe it can be successfully shown that it is conducive to our best interests as a Nation to continue this wholesale, indiscriminate policy of immigration. If we do, it means that all this imported ignorance must be educated at our expense. It means that our own American labor must be further hampered by cheap labor. It means that the now splendid standard of living by American labor must be lowered. It means that our great farming interests must come into increasing competition with this vast horde of aliens that will continually pour into this country every year. It means an increase in crime; an increase in pauperism; an increase in insanity. The percentage of insanity among foreigners is greater than among American born.

Government statistics show that of the total number of inmates of insane asylums on January 1, 1910, 28.8 per cent were white, of foreign birth, while of the total population of the United States on the same date only 14.5 per cent were white, foreign born.

Two years ago I had occasion in an official capacity in my State to visit many of the insane institutions in other States of the Union, and I recall that the superintendent of one of the New York institutions at Ward Island stated that 75 per cent of the 5,000 inmates were foreign born.

As a Nation we have wards enough of our own without importing any. It is generally admitted that when the present European war is over—which I pray may be soon—that emigration will be greatly stimulated. The people who are left, many of them, will want to get away from devastation and strife, especially the element that are devoid of patriotism, the shiftless, and the anarchist; and where else would he wend his way but to America, the land of peace and of liberty? But some will say, "Shall we be so heartless as to deny him the privilege? Shall we refuse asylum to him?" I say yes. If we do not need him, would it not be a kindness to say to those people, "We are already overstocked with cheap labor. We can not assume the burden of educating you and providing you employment. We have passed the point in our history when we can do a good part by you. We can not take you all. We have 100,000,000 of our own citizens whose interest and happiness are paramount. We can only assimilate a part, and we have decided that it is to our interest to take the intelligent part. You remain where you are and help to rehabilitate your own nation, and work there in your own land in the interest of constitutional government."

By adopting such an attitude we will be doing what is best for them as well as ourselves. We have a tremendous responsibility as a Nation. We are almost the only great nation at peace with all the world. When this present war is over we will stand out

among the nations of the world as never before. We will be looked up to as never before. The peoples of the world will ask themselves, Whence the greatness of this great nation of peace? Why has America remained tranquil and at peace when all other nations were clamoring for blood?

The people of these unfortunate countries will begin to inquire the cause, and gradually will begin to realize that it is because we are a Government by and for the people. That we rely upon right and justice as between men; that we will not tolerate oppression; that our defense rests not with the sword, but we are secure because of the patriotism in the hearts of our people.

Getting such a conception of us will stimulate the people of all nations to follow our example. A love of freedom and constitutional liberty will spring up in their hearts and eventually put an end to the ruling of kings and potentates the world over. The example we are setting the world will perhaps eventually result in the universal rule of the people.

What a destiny and what an example, and what a tremendous responsibility is ours. How jealously we should guard the sources from which spring our power—citizenship itself. Our greatness as a Nation will continually be measured by the quality of our citizenship, and it is a matter of the gravest concern that our citizenship, which is the source of power, be kept free from contamination. It is the highest function of government to raise the standard of citizenship and see that the average is never lowered.

In what better way, let me inquire, can this be done than by the restriction of ignorance and superstition in our immigration laws? It is estimated that the American people are expending something like $1,000,000,000 annually for education and the eradication of ignorance and the growth of high ideals; and yet in the face of this stupendous effort many men stand here and plead with Congress to add more ignorance to the sum total of national illiteracy. The chief thought in all our education is the instilling of love and respect for our American institutions. It is a well-known fact that very many of the immigrants who yearly come to our country come primarily because of the desire to accumulate wealth and not because of a desire to become a part of us. It is a question of take all and give nothing in return. This is evidenced by the fact that thousands of aliens do not take the trouble to fit themselves for American citizens after they get here, and thousands in our large cities have never fitted themselves to exercise the highest privilege of an American citizen—that of casting a ballot and participation in government. Many such as these will be eliminated if this bill becomes a law, and they should be eliminated.

It is contended in some quarters that a question so far-reaching and involving such a radical departure from our time-worn policies should not be disposed of without first being made a party declaration and then passed on by the American people. While this may not have been done exactly, it has been made the subject of party declaration in general terms time and time again and for many years back. As far back as 1896 the Democratic national convention platform made the following declaration:

> We hold that the most efficient way to protect American labor is to prevent the importation of foreign pauper labor to compete with it in the home market.

In that same year—that is, in 1896—the Republican national convention platform contained the following declaration:

> 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.

And, as you know, the candidates for President and Vice President of the United States nominated upon the platform containing this declaration were elected.

I believe this bill represents the desire and will of the great body of Americans without regard to party. As early as 1896 this legislation has been before Congress and before the country, having been passed by one or both branches of Congress at intervals since that time. In addition it has been vetoed by the President of the United States three times, including the present veto, and has barely escaped passage over two previous vetoes.

In view of all this I do not think it can be successfully contended that this is new legislation or that it has not received the indorsement of the American people. Admit for the sake of argument that the policy should not be changed permanently, but that we should maintain our century-old policy of the open door to those who would find asylum here; admit that we should still continue to educate foreign ignorance; that we should continue the importation of cheap labor to compete with our own American labor; that we should continue to legislate in the interest of selfish employers' associations and the Shipping Trust, enabling them to pile up enormous profits at the expense of and to the detriment of American labor and the American farmer; admit even for the sake of argument that the appeal of every labor organization in America be ignored; admit that we should give no heed to the appeal made by 3,000,000 of the tillers of the soil of the Nation; yet we would be justified in passing this bill as an emergency measure on account of the European war. This Congress has been called upon to meet many grave questions growing out of this war.

When our revenues fell off on account of war we promptly passed an emergency tax bill to make good these deficiencies. We are proposing a ship-purchase bill, not because the Government wants to engage in shipping, but in order to move our commerce across the seas and because there seems to be no other means to do it.

For the same reason, if for no other, this bill should be enacted into law, so that our country may be protected immediately after the war and until world conditions again become normal.

But this should not be treated as an emergency measure, but passed for broader reasons, namely, in order that our policy should be permanently modified. I therefore appeal to this House of Representatives of the American people to consider the best interests of your own countrymen. I appeal to you in the name of the great agricultural interests of the Nation. I appeal to you in the name of American labor from one end of this great country to the other. I appeal to you in the name and for the sake of American institutions that cost the precious blood of many of our ancestors to establish. I appeal to you to protect American citizenship, the American home, and the American boy by casting your vote to make this bill a law of the land. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. [Applause].

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I intend to support this bill, notwithstanding the President's veto.

For 20 years I have supported this legislation. My constituency knows my position. They have returned me to Congress knowing my position, and therefore I take it for granted that a majority of my constituency favor this legislation. Nearly two-thirds of this House voted for this legislation four years ago. The constituencies represented by this House knew the position of their Representatives.

After four years the issue comes again, and we find that when the bill is before the House more than two-thirds of the Representatives of those constituencies vote in favor of the legislation.

I believe that the Representatives upon this floor always endeavor to voice the sentiments of their constituencies on whichever side they cast their vote. But when you find that after the issue has been presented, the American people understanding the issue, two-thirds of this House reflect that sentiment in legislation, I say it is idle to contend that it requires the pronouncement of a great party in convention assembled to determine the sentiment of the American people. [Applause.]

The reason of my support of this legislation is the very reason for which the President says he vetoes the bill. He says the object of such a provision—referring to the literacy test—is restrictive and not selective. There is not a man in this House who is not in favor of selective restriction and who has not always been in favor of it. There is not a man in the country who has not been in favor of selective restriction. But that is not the purpose of the bill. It did not go before the American people with that purpose. It went before the American people with the avowed purpose of restriction of foreign immigration into this country. And why? Not because we have not benefited in the past by liberal admission of immigration into the United States, but because our conditions have changed.

Now, the real question that confronts this House to-day is the question whether or not, acting on your responsibility, you will sustain the verdict that you rendered in favor of this bill but a few weeks ago. The real question that confronts you is the question whether or not you stand first for the American standard of life, the American standard of living, and the American standard of wage. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, we have only one other speaker. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] desire to conclude now?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is recognized.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, in Philadelphia, back in 1776, the Declaration of Independence, drafted by Thomas Jefferson, was first made public. The colonists who resisted King George and the burdensome legislation that was coming from the other side of the water declared through the patron saint of Democracy and the other patriots of those days that the King had "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 land."

That is the real basis of all immigration to the United States from the period of our independence down to the present time. We desired immigrants from foreign countries. We desired the brain and the brawn of the men who could populate this great land of ours. We had to send abroad in the days of George Washington for farmers to till our soil. We were short on industries and were obliged to gather up from other countries men who could work in the mills of those days. We were dependent upon this kind of immigration; and as we have grown in industries and in wealth we have been more and more dependent upon it. It has come to us because we have grown faster, almost, than it could serve us.

The President of the United States, in the message vetoing this bill on Thursday last, indicated that to pass a bill thus restricting immigration to the United States would be to reverse the policy of all the generations of Americans that had gone before. That is to say, it would reverse the policy of the Declaration of Independence.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], one of the militant restrictionists upon this side of the House, has indicated the purpose of those who favor this bill to be restriction—restriction absolute—and my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. FESS] a moment ago took the same ground. I am not surprised that one who has been as forceful in all his campaigns as the gentleman from Massachusetts should take so positive a stand upon this question, but I am almost brought to doubt the attitude of the gentleman from Ohio, for his kindheartedness is characteristic.

The difficulty with these gentlemen, and with others who have advocated the passage of this bill over the President's veto, is that they fail to distinguish between an economic question and a question of humanity. If he were standing on a pier at any one of the ports where the incoming ships bring these unfortunate people of other lands to look forward with hope and expectation to better lives than they have ever enjoyed, I can not conceive that the distinguished and learned doctor from Ohio would then have the heart to say, as he now seems to say: "Turn them back; turn them back."

But the gentleman goes further and criticizes those advocating protection who fail to urge the passage of this bill over the President's veto. In this the gentleman again fails to distinguish between the economic and the human side of this question.

Why, Mr. Speaker, it has been declared over and over again upon this floor that immigration has not reduced the wages of the laboring men in the United States. It has been stated time and time again, and is capable of proof, that during the last half century, in which we have received the greatest immigration, wages have steadily gone higher, and higher, and higher, until they are at the very apex of the wage scale of all the countries of the world. No one disputes that. It has been demonstrated further, and can be proven, that as wages have ascended regularly, in spite of all immigration, the hours of labor steadily have gone lower, and lower, and lower, until the laboring man to-day gives less in time to his employer than he ever did before in the history of the world.

But the gentleman from Ohio and others have indicated that the man who advocates protection is inconsistent in opening the door of hope to those who have asked for the right that was given to his forefathers and to mine—the right to come to this country from lands of oppression, lands where prejudice prevailed against them, so that they might acquire the opportunity of worshiping God according to the dictates of their own consciences and enjoy the blessings that all of us seemed to have enjoyed in this great and bountiful country of ours. [Applause.]

Would the gentleman from Ohio, would any Republican, prefer that we should take the goods made by the Singer sewing machine employees in Scotland, where they work for $6 or $8 a week, and bring them into this country to compete with the sewing machines made in Connecticut, where the wages are twice as high and more? Does the gentleman from Ohio prefer that we admit these foreign goods, made by cheap foreign labor in this way, or would he prefer, when our industries are crying for help—they are not crying very loud in these Democratic times, but when they are crying for help—would he prefer to have the men themselves come into this country to make machines here at the American wage, to be sold both here and on the other side at the American price?

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman asks me whether I would be willing to let the product of the Singer sewing machine factory in Scotland, with the——

Mr. MOORE. Yes; foreign made, at foreign-labor prices, come into this country. That is what I asked the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. I would not.

Mr. MOORE. Of course you would not. You are a protectionist, as I am.

Mr. FESS. And I would not let the labor employed over there come into this country in competition with the labor employed here, either.

Mr. MOORE. If, after it got here, it obtained the American wage, I think you would.

Mr. FESS. No; I would not.

Mr. MOORE. I think I can demonstrate that when foreign labor which is skilled comes into this country, it no longer works at the foreign price. Give the labor unions some credit for that. They aid in bringing these foreign laborers up to the American standard. Let them continue their work not solely for the purpose of keeping their competitors out of the country, but for the purpose of keeping up wages in the United States; and if they have not done that in this era of high wages, then the labor unions themselves and the protective tariff law of the Republican Party both have been dead failures; and I do not think they have.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. GARDNER. I would not interrupt him without his consent.

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GARDNER. What did the gentleman mean when he said I was an absolute restrictionist?

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman stated that yesterday on the floor. In the speech in which he led off this debate he declared for complete restriction.

Mr. GARDNER. What do you mean by that? I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. MOORE. Shutting the door of hope forever to any laboring man in Europe who wants to come to this side of the water.

Mr. GARDNER. I did not say anything of the sort.

Mr. MOORE. I understood the gentleman to define the policy of the restrictionists, and I also understood him in one of his questions to-day to take issue with the President of the United States, who indicated that the voice of the people had not yet been heard on this subject. Am I in error as to that? If I am, I send to the Clerk's desk this extract from the Springfield Republican, published in the gentleman's own State, which throws some light upon the subject.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LITERACY AND POLITICS.

In challenging the majorities in Congress that placed the literacy test in the immigration bill to make this issue one of the party platform planks in 1916 President Wilson raises a point that will not be met. No party would care to go before the people as the advocate of a policy that, if adopted earlier, would have seriously retarded the settlement of the United States and kept out some of its best people. The literacy test is not a question upon which either Republicans or Democrats are likely to take a stand, and, in view of the strong opposition to it from those who have studied the matter most carefully, it is surprising that it has been able to muster such strength in Congress.

Mr. MOORE. I think the Clerk is reading the part that I crossed out and not the part that I intended to have him read. I ask the Clerk to read the part that is not scratched out.

Mr. LANGLEY. Let it all go into the RECORD.

Mr. MOORE. I will put it all in, but I do not wish to use up my time in having all of it read. The part not crossed out is the part I want the Clerk to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Every party politician outside of the South would oppose desperately a literacy test plank in his national party platform if he had the least hope of having his ticket carry pivotal States like New York and Illinois. Massachusetts politicians have not forgotten so soon Congressman AUGUSTUS GARDNER'S frightful fiasco with his immigration issue in running for governor in 1913. Few candidates for office in New England or the Central Eastern States or the Middle West would care to face the large number of naturalized voters with a plank demanding that no immigrant should be admitted unless he could read a book, or even the headlines of Mr. Hearst's newspapers. No party will accept the President's challenge and make his veto an issue in 1916.

[Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will gladly yield a minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], if he desires to respond to the Springfield Republican. It may be in order for him to say whether his venture into the field of popular opinion on the subject of restricting immigration was a success.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] wishes to speak for a minute. Will the gentleman yield that time to him?

Mr. MOORE. Oh, certainly not. I love the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], as I do all Members of the House, but I wanted the gentleman from Massachusetts to say whether, in his differences with President Wilson, he came out best.

Mr. GARDNER. As between President Wilson and the Springfield Republican I would very much favor the opinion of President Wilson. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman made a gallant and brave fight for governor of Massachusetts on the immigration issue. Did the gentleman win?

Mr. GARDNER. Most unfortunately I was the worst-beaten man who ever ran for governor of Massachusetts on the Republican ticket. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. I knew the gentleman from Massachusetts would be square enough to acknowledge it.

Mr. GARDNER. Oh, I will acknowledge it, because the figures acknowledge it if I would not; but I do not think that had much to do with the issue—possibly it had something to do with the issue, for it takes some time to get the people educated up to the necessity of restricting immigration.

Mr. MOORE. Although the gentleman has been laboring for more than eight years to pass this bill, and it has been one of the vital issues with him, he did not succeed in that time, even in educated Massachusetts, for apparently the people there did not support him.

Mr. GARDNER. But in my own district, where I have been trying to educate them somewhat, I seem to have managed to fool them to the extent of 12,000 majority this last time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MOORE. When the gentleman admits that he fooled the people of Iowa, he surely places himself in the presidential class.

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; if I could fool the people of Iowa I would be; but the gentleman misunderstood me. I said I had been educating the people of "my own" district, not an "Iowa" district.

Mr. MOORE. Then the gentleman evidently "put one over," as the President did at Indianapolis; but I am afraid he will not succeed in "putting one over" now.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman had 31 minutes. He has used 14, and that leaves 17 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Let us see where the opposition to this bill springs from. Patriotic societies? Yes. Many of them want this bill passed, because those who for a long time have been active in those societies desire to show results. I do not blame any man who is the organizer of a patriotic society for keeping up this agitation. I have been on the Immigration and Naturalization Committee for eight years. I had no desire to go on that committee; but I have found during the whole of that time that the organizers of the patriotic societies have been on the job. Sometimes I question whether we ought to pass this bill, for fear we might put them off their jobs, and they would have little else to do. In saying that I have as high a regard for them as anybody. This, I believe, is the apologetic stage, when we ought to explain ourselves to folks, so that we may lay the foundation for our votes, and yet it seems to exercise our judgment as legislators whether we please or displease our friends the organizers, or whether we find the galleries applauding the sentiments we express or not.

Now, amongst the many communications that have come from the patriotic orders I find one that purports to have been sent by the National Council of the Daughters of Liberty. This is an interesting document, because it quotes political conditions and the provisions of platforms. It is quite a learned and informing production. What is most interesting about it, however, is the fact that in the largest type on the outside of the envelope under the title of the National Council of the Daughters of Liberty is this cheerful inscription: "Liberal pay to organizers." Yes; liberal pay to organizers, and I have no objection to organizers being liberally paid for legitimate work in agitating this or any other subject. I understand, however, that the Liberal Immigration League, about which I know little, has been very severely criticized by the proponents of this bill for attempting to collect a fund from somebody to conduct an organization to prove to Congress the other side of the case. So that if this be reprehensible with respect to the Liberal Immigration League or any other body opposing the measure, it is fair to raise the question as to labor bodies and patriotic orders. And as to this, what may we say of the American Federation of Labor, the great central body of organized labor, which has been indulging the habit?

The president, Mr. Samuel Gompers, has issued quite a document within the last few days which has given much satisfaction to my friend from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] in that it intimates, with great sensational headlines, equal to those in the Hearst journals, that there is a deep conspiracy here involving "the Shipping Trust," which, I would say parenthetically and in view of the agitation of the shipping bill from the White House, might be regarded at this particular time as a covert slap at the President of the United States.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Is not there a difference in the source of revenues of the one you refer to and the Liberal Immigration League? Is not there proof from the original copy of letters that the Liberal League was making appeals to the steamship companies and Coal Trust for revenue in order to carry it on?

Mr. MOORE. I do not think there is very much in the documents put out by Mr. Gompers. What is the difference between appealing to those who have charge of large industries and those who have charge of small industries, or those who draw upon labor, or those who appeal to prejudice?

Mr. BURNETT. Does the gentleman ask that question of me?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. There is this difference: The large industries that want to bring cheap labor to the country want to bring it here for the purpose of beating down wages of the people who are already here.

Mr. MOORE. I want to say, and it will not take long to do it, that those people who come from foreign countries to compete with American labor are of the intellectual or reading and writing class; there is scant complaint of the laboring class that go into the sewers and do the rough work that is avoided by the students. They are not welcomed into the cotton fields of the South or generally on the farm lands of the North. The kind of labor that comes into the country and which the gentleman would bar is not competitive; if it had been the wages in the skilled trades would have gone down, and these wages, in spite of all the gentleman says about immigration, steadily have gone up. [Applause.]

Why, we have the testimony of a distinguished labor leader, no other than Frank Morrison, the secretary of the American Federation, on certain phases of this question, and I hope I may get time to read something that this intelligent leader has said upon the subject. But that reminds me of the fine campaign work that has been done in concentrating this movement in the body of the American Federation of Labor. The work of informing Congress has been done thoroughly and well. A week ago, in the White House, under the leadership of Mr. Morrison, the forces favoring this bill, lawyers and professors of the great colleges of the country, pleaded for education, education, and more education. It was a great symposium for learning contrasted with the actual toil upon which education must thrive. Yes; and I am afraid that some of our professors in this House are inducing us to stand for that excess of education which teaches a man to despise work. There are too few of us indeed who teach that other form of education which advances with the work. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Speaker, let us see how this thing has been worked up. I say this in no offensive way. If I were an organizer of the Federation of Labor, I would agitate and organize with all the ability that I possess. Still, as a Member of this House I would exercise my judgment and try to consider both sides of this matter. I would stop to consider that while the American Federation of Labor and centralized labor organizations affiliated therewith number a little over 2,000,000 members, and other organizations not affiliated might carry the total up to 3,000,000, there are 30,000,000 wageworkers in the United States, 27,000,000 of them not organized. Who is to speak for the 27,000,000? The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] rises, and in an outburst of eloquence which we all admire asks that the cotton fields in the South be protected from this foreign invasion. Is there a difference in the price of labor? If I had time, I would like to quote from Mr. Morrison on this subject. I would like to take a few minutes to let you hear what he says. Let me see if I have not got it here. Yes; here is an

extract from the hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, Friday, December 12, 1913:

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.

Mr. MOORE. How did you succeed in organizing the mill workers of the South?

Mr. MORRISON. We have not been successful in organizing them.

* * * * * * *

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.

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.

Rise, Mr. HEFLIN, and tell me whether you want the eight-hour system working in the cotton fields of your State?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Now, let the labor unions answer.

Mr. HEFLIN. Not only that, if the gentleman will permit, but no farmer in the South wants any eight-hour proposition, and I do not know of any farmer in the North who wants it, and if there is any farmer in the gentleman's district, I am sure that he does not want it.

Mr. MOORE. Union labor wages in the mines in my State are $2.56 per day. Will the gentleman tell me what the wages are of those who pick the cotton in the fields of Alabama, where you have no organization? We are up against organization. What are you paying?

Mr. HEFLIN. Sometimes they get 50 cents a hundred for picking cotton and sometimes they pick 500 pounds in a day, which is $2.50 a day. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. And incidentally, if they ever pay that much in the cotton fields, it is for a 14-hour day.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows that in Colorado and in New York the people in the whole State voted three to one for an eight-hour day, and that included the farmers?

Mr. MOORE. Yes; and I know what the eight-hour day means as well as the gentleman. It means contraction of labor. I have voted for it and supported it many times. I think I have followed the gentleman in this House many times; but when it came to protecting eight-hour labor in the United States against the product of foreign labor that works at cheaper wages more than eight hours a day, the gentleman from Illinois was not with me. I know what it means—contraction of labor for one section of the country and for one set of industries, not for all. That is the point.

Now, let us see how well this thing worked out. The American Federation of Labor sent out these letters during the last week. I have an armful of them here, and I am glad to receive them, because I respect these men and admire their ability. But the question they raise, as I view it, is one of humanity, of barring the door of hope against the unfortunates of foreign lands. They want to keep them out of the United States. Who wants to keep them out? Mr. Gompers? Yes. And where was Mr. Gompers born? Born in England—a good man and one of the ablest leaders of labor this country has ever seen. Mr. Gompers, self-educated, has become a tower of strength within the civic bodies and amongst the labor organizations of the United States. But he was born in England. Take the secretary of the Department of Labor, who is another one of the great champions of this movement. Where was he born? Over in Scotland. He is a member of the President's Cabinet. Take Mr. Frank Morrison, whom I have just quoted, the vigorous secretary, whose careful, detailed work has helped to make the federation what it is. Where was he born? In Canada. Here are three of the leading men, whose word is forceful with the affiliated bodies, that have informed Congressmen during the past week that this bill should pass. Here is a pile of their correspondence. The story is told in language that varies but little. The hotel and restaurant employees and the International Alliance and Bartenders' League of America are uppermost before me. They write and tell us that they want this bill passed. Oh, you prohibitionists who vote against the President, beware the new alliance you are making on this head! [Laughter.]

The restaurant employees and bartenders' alliance are with you, for they do not want foreigners to come up to the bar. They are aiding prohibition already, though the federation opposed it. The International Brotherhood of Paper Makers say that foreign labor can not assimilate with the wage earners now here. Why, Lord bless you, we have all assimilated in one form or another or we would not be here. Every one of us is the outgrowth of assimilation of foreign stock, and I would like to know what foreigner coming from southern Italy, for instance, or Roumania, where the Jews are now being drafted for war service against their will, and who could not escape it if this bill passes, will compete with a skilled body of workmen like the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers. The Shipwrights and Joiners' Organization tells us the passage of the bill will benefit the organization. Will the Polanders who work in the mines compete with the skilled shipwrights? The International Seamen's Union of the United States opposes this bill. Why, the struggle we have recently had here has been to get some recognition for American seamen, but the tendency on the Democratic side has been to admit foreign labor into the shipping business of this country. What voice of protest against these shipping bills has come up from the International Seamen's Union of America? I would like to go on with these. I have too many of them, however, to discuss them all in the time remaining. But I glory in them, even though some of them may be overenthusiastic.

Mr. Morrison tells us in his testimony before the committee that the membership of the American Federation of Labor is a little over 2,000,000—I think 2,071,000. Remember these figures, for 12 bodies affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, that have endeavored so earnestly to impress Congress with their strength that they alone, if their communications are not at fault, have certified to a total membership of 2,625,000. There are dozens of others that give no figures at all. It is interesting also to note that one of the oil companies is also suggesting that we have a restriction of immigration. But I shall have to extend my remarks.

In closing, I will refer to what I regard as the crux of this whole situation. Mr. Clark, the vice president of the Order of Railway Conductors, a very intelligent and active leader of the labor movement in the United States, was asked a few questions about the development of men in the railway business. I can not go into all of it, but he tells us that brakemen must pass through various grades, that conductors must pass through various grades, that all such employees must serve a virtual apprenticeship of from 3 years to 10 years before they can qualify from one standard to another. What he said of the railway men is true of most of the skilled and organized trades. Competition comes from men who are not illiterate, but from those who must stand a variety of tests. An illiterate who is serviceable in digging ditches would not compete with the skilled mechanic who is driving an engine. If he had the training, he might, but an illiterate must learn and serve an apprenticeship before he displaces a trained hand. What illiterate Polander, coming to better his condition, to find work at first digging sewers, which the American boy will not do, can become a railway conductor in the United States? What downtrodden Slav or native of southern Italy would compete with a shipwright in the United States without educating and training himself for the task? And when he has done that, will he work for foreign wages? Mr. Clark goes on to say, in answer to certain questions, that his own son is a farmer. In answer to a question as to whether his boy would dig the sewers or work in the mines, he replied that the boy was made of better stuff. That is the spirit. I told Mr. Clark it was the spirit. Yes, my friends, our boys are made of better stuff; they are born in the United States. Will they work in the sewers? No. Ask Mr. Morrison what his children are doing, and the answer comes, they are studying, they are striving for a professional calling. it is commendable. But who is to do the drudgery? If we are

educated to despise the lowly, who will do the man's work on the road or the woman's work in the kitchen? Take away the untaught foreigner, who has done so much to develop and construct our institutions, and rely too much upon that excess education and pride of scholarship which abhors the basic labor, and you will halt our national progress. We have more to consider than the possibility of driving our own wives into the drudgery of the scullery or of pleading with our scholarly men to go down into the trenches. We must deal with the problem as one of humanity, which involves no crime save that of the misfortune of illiteracy. If we need the labor and it will be useful to us without displacing the labor we already have, the advancement of the illiterate under American tutelage and conditions will readily take care of itself. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is recognized for 17 minutes.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, just 12 months ago to-day this House, by 252 to 126, registered its vote in favor of the passage of the bill whose fate will in a few minutes be decided. Some have said that there are Members going out of Congress who will go back on their records and stand by the President and vote against overriding his veto. Mr. Speaker, I hope there is no Member here who now has less regard for the commission that the people gave him two years ago, and which he still holds, than he had for it before the last election. I can not believe there is any man who will look on that commission as any more sacred before the election than it is now. I do not believe that there can be a Democrat or a Republican, who, merely because his term of office is about to expire, will change his vote if he believes that the vote he cast 12 months ago was right or that it was in accordance with the will of his people.

But, gentlemen, the people are not asleep, and the man who voted for the bill a year ago will be watched by his people if he changes his vote to-day. Whether you are going out or not, if you voted for your people then, they will ask you why you did it if you vote against them to-day. Some have intimated that for the appointment of some Member's choice of a postmaster, or for some other sordid reason, men will barter their votes to-day. I can not believe it.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has referred to the fact that Mr. Gompers and Mr. Morrison and Secretary Wilson are all foreigners. That is true, Mr. Speaker, but those gentlemen are of that stock to which President Wilson referred in one of his books, when he said:

> Throughout the country men of the sturdy stock 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-Gaelic stock of France and northern Italy; but now there came multitudes of men of the lowest class * * * and men of the meaner sort, * * * men out of the ranks where there was neither skill nor energy, nor any initiative nor 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 work were such as American workmen had never dreamed of before.

That latter is the class, Mr. Speaker, which this bill proposes to keep out. That sturdy stock from northern Europe that the President was referring to is not touched by this bill. I am not here to say one unkind word against the great Chief Magistrate who graces the Executive chair of this country, called by the people to that high position. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALSH] must have written the speech which he has just read before he heard the speeches that were delivered here to-day, and he therefore anticipated that gentlemen would say unkind and harsh things in criticism of the President. I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, I have ever heard any debate in which there was less of partisanship, except what was injected by gentlemen who represent the opposition to this bill. I feel none. I believe, as said by my friend from Ohio [Mr. FESS], that our President did that which he not only had the constitutional right to do, but he did that which he believed to be right under the information and the light that he had.

But, gentlemen, it is a different question with you. You have studied this matter for years and years. As stated by some one, seventeen times the question of the illiteracy test has been passed by one or the other House in one form or another. Hence it can not be said, my countrymen, that we do not understand this proposition. Evidently the President by the question that he asked in his message has been misinformed by some one who assembled the facts for him. He asked the question whether any party had ever indorsed this proposition and gone to the country upon it and been commissioned to control its legislation. In 1896 the Democratic Party declared in favor of the positive prevention of foreign pauper labor coming into this country, and the Republican Party declared squarely in favor of the illiteracy test ingrafted on this bill. The Republican Party did then go before the country with that declaration in its platform, and did win, and the President's question is answered and the people's mandate has been heard. The Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, went further than the Republican Party, for it pronounced for absolutely preventing the importation of foreign pauper labor. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] tries to get around this declaration by saying no party has ever gone to the country on it as a single issue. Certainly, no party has ever gone to the country with any platform entirely upon one single issue. The President has not that same sort of information that we have when he believes that the country is not informed upon this question and when he believes that the 252 men who last February voted for this bill and those who were paired for it were not informed as to the wishes of their people. My friends, this is a proposition in the interest of labor, not simply the man who works in the shop and in the mine and on the railroads and in the manufactories of the country, but the people of the agricultural districts as well. For years, through every national grange and farmers' congress that has been assembled, through every farmers' union that has been held, both in the local and in the national unions, through the Federation of Labor as well as the railroad trainmen, through the patriotic organizations and hundreds of other independent organizations all over the country, this measure has been discussed and favored.

Mr. Speaker, these Members of Congress desire to reflect the wishes of the men whose servants they are. Many of you have had appeals from the organizations that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has condemned to-day. I was at the White House the other day when the President had a public hearing on this bill. Many on both sides presented their arguments. One who represented the railway laborers wound up his appeal to the President by saying, "Mr. President, the boys want this bill." He was followed by a distinguished orator from New York, with silver tongue and soft hands, who sneeringly repeated the statement that the "boys wanted it." When that jeer was made it was cheered by the assembled people opposing the bill, many of whom had perhaps been sent there by the steamship trusts, or the Liberal Immigration League. Mr. Gompers a few weeks ago denounced this so-called Liberal Immigration League and showed by decisive proofs and from the records themselves—the originals and carbon copies—that the officers of this league appeal to the steamships, the Coal Trust, and the Steel Trust for funds to finance an institution which they claimed to be altruistic and honorable; and this appeal had not been in vain.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BURNETT. I decline to yield. Yesterday I saw one of the attorneys of this liberal (?) league "gumshoeing" through the House Office Building. He told me, however, that he would not be here to-day. He ought not to be after the exposure Mr. Gompers made of the infamy of the league.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other proposition, outside of the literacy test, upon which the President bases his veto is that he says the bill seeks to all but close entirely the gates of asylum, which always have been open to those who could find nowhere else the right and opportunity of constitutional agitation for what they conceived to be the natural and inalienable rights of men. On that question the President again has been misled by some of his advisers. Many of the people that would come within the class of Czolgosz and other anarchists already have been excluded by the progressive restrictive laws that have been on the statute books for years. All that this bill adds to that part of the law is the exclusion of those who advocate or teach the unlawful destruction of property.

Is that what the President thinks will keep out those who desire the right of constitutional agitation?

Mr. Speaker, whom does it embrace? It embraces many who come from southern Europe, like the lawless herd in the Lawrence strike, with a torch in one hand and a bomb in the other. It embraces the militant suffragettes of England, who believe in blowing up churches and destroying mail boxes and private and public property. Are these the ones whom he calls constitutional agitators? Is the right to unlawfully destroy property the right of constitutional agitation? I want to say here to the splendid women of this country who believe in equal suffrage that there were no stronger advocates of that provision on our committee than the three gentlemen from the Pacific coast who live in equal-suffrage States.

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable that the President believes that that class of people ought to have the door held open to them. I do not believe he has studied this question, my countrymen, as you have studied it, and hence you, in voting for the bill, will be doing an actual favor to the great President of the

United States by saving him from this error. [Applause.] He overlooks the fact that in section 2 of the bill we expressly provide that "nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted of an offense purely political not involving moral turpitude." What more could he ask? I think the closing words of his message show that he actually invites you to act on your own knowledge of what your people want. He says, "I am not foolish enough to profess to know the wishes and ideals of America better than her chosen representatives know them," and, gentlemen, you are the chosen representatives of the people. You have had the question before you for years. You have said to the workingmen that rallied to you last year and two years ago that you were their friends. You who are on the other side have often appealed to them as "the boys." You have asked the boys to come to your aid, and they came. There are gentlemen upon this floor to-day with labor cards in their pockets who are about to strike a Joab thrust at the very vitals of labor. [Applause.] My countrymen, do not do it. If you betray them now, next year when you appeal to them again you will see written upon every gatepost and upon the lintels of every door, "Anathema maranatha"—Let him be cursed with a curse. When you approach the home of the peasant and of the man who toils he will say, "Depart from me, I never knew you."

Mr. Speaker, a great war is going on in Europe. The farmers, the laboring people, the patriotic people of the country, feel that just as soon as that war is over there will be the greatest influx of the worst people that ever have come to this country. My colleagues, if by your vote to-day you allow that door to remain open, and in one year or two years you see those surging hordes coming to this country, driving out the man that toils on the farm and in the mine and in the shop you may take the sweet unction to your souls that by voting against this bill you have helped to bring them here.

Gentlemen, do not think that this is going to stop. If you strike it down to-day, it will rise again next session. [Applause.] Brave, true men are back of it, and they know it is good.

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again—
The eternal years of God are hers;
But error, wounded, writhes with pain,
And dies amid his worshipers.

[Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read, if I had time, this letter. How much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has three minutes.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to read from a letter written by Mr. Oberlander, one of the superintendents of new prisons in New York, in which he states that in the city of Buffalo within the last three years five electrocutions have occurred, and four out of the five criminals were aliens who could not read. Last year when the Colorado and the Michigan mine strikes were being investigated it was stated on this floor, and all over the country, that it was the new immigration that was causing the trouble there. One of the big mine operators in my State said to me a few years ago that the Italians were the poorest of all his laborers. I said, "Why do you employ them, then?" He said, "For the purpose of regulating the price of wages."

The insane asylums of New York and other Eastern States are being filled with the very ones whom the illiteracy test would keep out.

You gentlemen, I believe, are all honest in your convictions; but, for God's sake, and in the name of the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow, do not register your vote to help the Steel Trust and the coal barons to keep down the wages of the men who are struggling to maintain the lives of those whom God has given into their care. The workingman only asks for decent wages and decent standards of living. Give him these. [Applause.]

I can readily see how you who were against the bill can vote to override the veto of the President, because you believe that the President, while he is exercising a constitutional right, is yet exercising a right which should not be used except in cases of extreme emergency. The veto power is a dangerous one. My friends, your commissions—some of them—will expire on the 4th of March. I beg you return those commissions to the men who handed them to you just as untarnished as when they placed them in your hands. [Applause.]

Talk about platforms. My friends, it is not always in platforms. We do not all have to receive our training from the classic shades of Princeton or from the conventions and declarations of our party. But over yonder, in the little red schoolhouse on the hill, with the American flag on its top and our mother's Bible on its shelf; down there where the sugar cane grows, down amid the cotton and the corn, and out there on the bounding prairies of the West, and out on the golden shores of the Pacific, and out in that country where "the frost is on the pumpkin and the fodder's in the shock" [applause], and down in the old Kentucky home [applause], and out by the Wabash you hear from them. From the mines and the shops, the factories and the stores, the railroad tracks and cabs of the engines come the mute appeals of brave men whose homes you seek to destroy. Here are letters from the great organizations of America urging you to stand by the man who toils. They can not send their hundreds here as can the Steamship and Steel Trusts to browbeat you into doing right or wrong; but I hold in my hand their mute appeals. Seven hundred thousand of them appeal to you from the great State of New York, men with calloused hands, and men who know what labor is and who know what it is to be driven out of their positions by that influx of foreign people, to pass this bill. [Prolonged applause.]

You understand this bill. Thousands who are urging you into opposition to the bill do not. A few days ago Cardinal Gibbons wrote to Mr. Epstein, stating that foreigners who were fairly educated in their own language would be excluded by this bill. Prof. Jenks, a member of the Immigration Commission, wrote him, calling attention to the fact that it is only necessary for them to read 30 or 40 words of their own language or dialect, and Cardinal Gibbons at once wrote him the following letter:

CARDINAL'S RESIDENCE,
408 NORTH CHARLES STREET,
Baltimore, January 28, 1915.

JEREMIAH W. JENKS, Ph. D., LL. D.,
Director of the Far Eastern Bureau, New York City, N. Y.

MY DEAR SIR: Your most courteous favor of yesterday came to hand this morning, and I thank you for calling my attention to the fact that the Burnett bill, regarding immigration, does not exclude aliens capable of reading their own language or dialect, though incapable of reading ours.

It affords me great pleasure to receive this information, and, of course, it modifies, in consequence, to the same extent my opposition to the bill.

I also note with much pleasure the other points you submit for my consideration, and I am happy to assure you that, when I can, they shall receive my serious attention.

In the meantime, believe me, very sincerely, yours,

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS,
Archbishop of Baltimore.

You see the misinformation in regard to this bill. You see that even our great President has been mistaken.

Gentlemen, your people understand the bill. Your mail from the universities, the colleges, and country schoolhouses for years has been filled with requests for literature on the bill.

Be not deceived; the people are not fooled. The man who dodges this vote will be held even more responsible than the man who votes against the bill.

Your constituents will brand the word "coward" across the brow of every man who ducks the vote. "He who dallies is a dastard; he who hesitates is damned."

The eyes of America are on you this day. Upon this record you place your name either for right or wrong, for the people or the trusts; the responsibility is yours. "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve."

If the steamships be your masters, serve them; if some prospective office for yourself or constituent be your master, serve that; if the people be your masters, serve them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the immigration bill, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? In plain, everyday English, if you are in favor of passing this bill over the President's veto, answer "yea," and if you are opposed to it, answer "nay." The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 261, nays 136, answered "present" 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 56.]

YEAS—261.

Abercrombie	Borchers	Clark, Fla.	Drukker
Adair	Bowdle	Claypool	Eagle
Adamson	Brockson	Collier	Edwards
Aiken	Brodbeck	Connelly, Kans.	Evans
Ainey	Brown, W. Va.	Cooper	Falconer
Alexander	Browning	Cox	Farr
Allen	Bryan	Crisp	Ferris
Anderson	Buchanan, Ill.	Cullop	Fess
Anthony	Burke, S. Dak.	Curry	Fields
Ashbrook	Burnett	Danforth	Finley
Aswell	Butler	Davenport	FitzHenry
Austin	Byrnes, S. C.	Davis	Flood, Va.
Avis	Byrns, Tenn.	Decker	Floyd, Ark.
Baker	Callaway	Dent	Foster
Baltz	Campbell	Dershem	Fowler
Barkley	Candler, Miss.	Dickinson	Francis
Barton	Cantrill	Dies	Frear
Bathrick	Caraway	Difenderfer	French
Beall, Tex.	Carlin	Dillon	Gard
Bell, Cal.	Carr	Dixon	Gardner
Bell, Ga.	Carter	Doolittle	Garrett, Tenn.
Blackmon	Church	Doughton	Garrett, Tex.

Gillett	Johnson, S. C.	Murdock	Smith, Idaho
Glass	Johnson, Utah	Murray	Smith, J. M. C.
Godwin, N. C.	Johnson, Wash.	Neeley, Kans.	Smith, Saml. W.
Good	Jones	Neely, W. Va.	Smith, Tex.
Goodwin, Ark.	Keister	Nolan, J. I.	Sparkman
Gray	Kelley, Mich.	O'Hair	Stanley
Green, Iowa	Kelly, Pa.	Oldfield	Stedman
Greene, Vt.	Kennedy, Iowa	Padgett	Stephens, Cal.
Gregg	Kent	Page, N. C.	Stephens, Miss.
Griest	Kettner	Palmer	Stephens, Nebr.
Gudger	Key, Ohio	Parker, N. J.	Stephens, Tex.
Guernsey	Kiess, Pa.	Parker, N. Y.	Stout
Hamilton, Mich.	Kinkaid	Patton, Pa.	Sumners
Hamilton, N. Y.	Kirkpatrick	Peters	Sutherland
Hamlin	Kitchin	Platt	Switzer
Harris	Knowland, J. R.	Plumley	Talbott, Md.
Harrison	Kreider	Porter	Tavenner
Hart	Lafferty	Post	Taylor, Ark.
Haugen	La Follette	Pou	Taylor, Colo.
Hawley	Langley	Powers	Temple
Hay	Lee, Ga.	Price	Thomas
Hayden	Lenroot	Quin	Thompson, Okla.
Hayes	Lesher	Ragsdale	Thomson, Ill.
Heflin	Lever	Rainey	Tribble
Helgesen	Lewis, Md.	Raker	Underhill
Helm	Lewis, Pa.	Rauch	Underwood
Helvering	Lindbergh	Rayburn	Vaughan
Henry	Linthicum	Rothermel	Vinson
Hensley	Lloyd	Rouse	Volstead
Hill	McGuire, Okla.	Rubey	Walker
Hinds	McKellar	Rucker	Walters
Hinebaugh	McKenzie	Rupley	Watkins
Hobson	McLaughlin	Russell	Watson
Holland	MacDonald	Saunders	Weaver
Houston	Mapes	Scott	Webb
Howard	Martin	Seldomridge	White
Hughes, Ga.	Mondell	Sells	Wingo
Hughes, W. Va.	Montague	Shackleford	Witherspoon
Hulings	Moon	Sims	Woodruff
Hull	Morgan, Okla.	Sinnott	Young, N. Dak.
Humphrey, Wash.	Morrison	Sisson	Young, Tex.
Humphreys, Miss.	Moss, Ind.	Slayden	
Jacoway	Moss, W. Va.	Slemp	
Johnson, Ky.	Mott	Small	

NAYS—136.

Bailey	Donovan	Kennedy, Conn.	Reilly, Wis.
Barchfeld	Dooling	Kindel	Riordan
Barnhart	Doremus	Konop	Roberts, Mass.
Bartholdt	Driscoll	Korbly	Rogers
Bartlett	Dupré	Lazaro	Sabath
Beakes	Eagan	Lee, Pa.	Scully
Booher	Edmonds	Levy	Sherley
Borland	Esch	Lieb	Sherwood
Britten	Estopinal	Lobeck	Shreve
Broussard	Fairchild	Loft	Sloan
Brown, N. Y.	Fergusson	Logue	Smith, Md.
Browne, Wis.	Fitzgerald	Lonergan	Smith, N. Y.
Bruckner	Fordney	McAndrews	Stafford
Brumbaugh	Gallagher	McGillicuddy	Stevens, Minn.
Buchanan, Tex.	Gallivan	Madden	Stevens, N. H.
Bulkley	Garner	Maguire, Nebr.	Stone
Burgess	George	Mahan	Stringer
Burke, Pa.	Gerry	Maher	Taggart
Burke, Wis.	Gill	Manahan	Talcott, N. Y.
Calder	Gilmore	Mann	Taylor, Ala.
Cantor	Gittins	Miller	Taylor, N. Y.
Carew	Goeke	Mitchell	Ten Eyck
Casey	Goldfogle	Moore	Thacher
Chandler, N. Y.	Gordon	Morin	Towner
Clancy	Gorman	Mulkey	Townsend
Coady	Goulden	Norton	Treadway
Connolly, Iowa	Graham, Ill.	O'Brien	Tuttle
Conry	Greene, Mass.	Paige, Mass.	Vollmer
Copley	Griffin	Park	Wallin
Cramton	Hamill	Patten, N. Y.	Walsh
Crosser	Hardy	Peterson	Whaley
Dale	Howell	Phelan	Williams
Deitrick	Igoe	Reed	Winslow
Donohoe	Keating	Reilly, Conn.	Woods

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Kahn Steenerson

NOT VOTING—24.

Cary	Hoxworth	Metz	Roberts, Nev.
Cline	Kennedy, R. I.	Morgan, La.	Smith, Minn.
Dunn	Langham	Nelson	Vare
Elder	L'Engle	Oglesby	Whitacre
Faison	Lindquist	O'Shaunessy	Wilson, Fla.
Graham, Pa.	McClellan	Prouty	Wilson, N. Y.

So the House on reconsideration refused to pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask for a recapitulation of the vote, and I will ask if this is a proper time.

Mr. SABATH. Why, Mr. Speaker, the vote has not yet been announced.

Mr. BURNETT. That is why I am asking if this is the proper time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is wise to have a recapitulation.

The SPEAKER. This is the proper time to have a recapitulation, if we are ever going to have it.

Mr. MANN. I think we ought to have it.

The SPEAKER. The vote is so close that the Chair thinks it ought to be recapitulated. [Applause.]

The Clerk recapitulated the names of those voting.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. FAISON with Mr. STEENERSON.

On this vote:

Mr. NELSON and Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada (for passing bill over veto) with Mr. KAHN (for sustaining veto).

Mr. DUNN and Mr. ELDER (for passing bill over veto) with Mr. METZ (for sustaining veto).

Mr. WILSON of Florida and Mr. L'ENGLE (for passing bill over veto) with Mr. VARE (for sustaining veto).

Mr. LANGHAM and Mr. LINDQUIST (for passing bill over veto) with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania (for sustaining veto).

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I wish to vote "no."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall listening at the time his name should have been called?

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. I was not.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman can not vote.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The announcement of the result was received with applause.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 6980. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7212. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 7213. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 7402. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

S. 6981. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee on Pensions.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 5, 1915, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of Maryland, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21236) to dissolve the Foundation for the Promotion of Industrial Peace, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1363); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BULKLEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 410) to create the national rural credit commission, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1364); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FERRIS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21200) quieting and confirming the title of the Methodist University of Oklahoma in and to certain tracts of land located in the city of Guthrie, Okla., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1366); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 21122) to validate certain homestead entries, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1367); 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. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 21315) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Suwanee River, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 21316) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to William B. Green Post, No. 100, Grand Army of the Republic, one cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 21317) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain tract of land in Minnesota for demonstration-farm purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 21318) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH (by request): A bill (H. R. 21319) to abolish the saloon and the retail sale of spirituous liquors in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Resolution (H. Res. 723) authorizing the payment of $1,200 to Norman E. Ives; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 21320) granting an increase of pension to John B. Hammer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BATHRICK: A bill (H. R. 21321) granting a pension to Henry J. Wing; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 21322) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 21323) granting a pension to Katherine Sternberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 21324) granting an increase of pension to William M. Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 21325) granting an increase of pension to James H. McCampbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLOAN: A bill (H. R. 21326) granting an increase of pension to Esther Phoebus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 21327) for the relief of Rittenhouse Moore, receiver of the Mobile Marine Dock Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

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 various labor organizations of the United States protesting against the veto of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of 356 citizens of Coshocton, Ohio, asking that the sale and exportation of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war to any of the friendly nations at present at war in Europe be prohibited; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Evangelical Church, German-American Alliance, and Germania Maennerchor, all of Newark, Ohio, asking for the passage of legislation which would prohibit the shipment of arms and munitions of war to the belligerent European nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Iron Molders' Union, No. 152, Newark, Ohio; the Martha Washington Council, No. 5, Daughters of America, Dennison, Ohio; the International Union of United Brewery Workers and the International Association of Machinists, praying for the passage of the immigration bill over the veto of the President; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Coshocton (Ohio) Council, No. 65, of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, favoring immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Coshocton (Ohio) Local Union of Mine Workers of America, favoring Kern-Foster bill, providing for extension of the work of the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Also, petitions of the Mansfield (Ohio) Trades Council; the Washington State Federation of Labor; the Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers' International Union; the Central Federated Union of Greater New York and vicinity; the Massachusetts State Branch of American Federation of Labor; and the National Council, Daughters of Liberty, asking for the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petitions of Allegheny Branch of National German-American Alliance, of the German Evangelical Church; of the Allegheny County Branch, National Federation of German Catholic Societies; of the Knights of St. George; and the Homestead and Mount Oliver German Turnverein, of Pittsburgh and vicinity, favoring House joint resolution No. 377, to prohibit the exportation of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war during the present trouble in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial and protest of the National Polish Alliance Associations of Pittsburgh, McKees Rocks, Horning, Homestead, Duquesne, Carnegie, Munhall, and Clairton, Pa., against the Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Pittsburgh and vicinity against Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Pittsburgh and vicinity favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Duquesne Council, United Commercial Travelers of America, favoring Roberts bill to change date of election of Members of Congress; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, petition of Saars Sholen Lodge No. 154, Independent Order B'nai B'rith, of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring support of President's veto of immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petitions of 7 citizens of Wellston, 10 of St. Louis, and A. Anthes, of St. Clair, all in the State of Missouri, protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Catholic Union of Missouri State League, composed of 387 members, of St. Louis, Mo.; 60 citizens of St. Louis, Mo.; German-American Alliance, Middletown, Conn.; 7 citizens of Boston, Mass.; 2 citizens of Wellesley, Mass.; A. E. Stickling, Milwaukee, Wis.; and German Beneficial Union, District 97, Johnstown, Pa., favoring passage of bills to prohibit export of all war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of delegates of the Evangelical Protestant Church, representing a membership of 30,000, of Pittsburgh, Pa.; 28 congregations of Lutheran churches of St. Louis; 13 citizens of Marthasville; 26 citizens of Florissant; Holekamp Lumber Co., of Webster Groves; Rev. G. Schultz, of Morrison; and Theodore von Derck, of Bismarck, all in the State of Missouri, favoring passage of bills to prohibit the export of all war materials; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of 114 citizens of St. Louis, Mo., Holy Cross and St. Cecilia Benevolent Societies, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BARTON: Petition of citizens of Kearney, Nebr., favoring free and unthrottled press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petition of the Browning Club, of Pasadena, Cal., protesting against the sending of American horses to European battle fields; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of Pomona and Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the Fitzgerald amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of citizens of Pomona and San Gabriel, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 334, for the appointment of a national marketing commission; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of citizens and organizations of New York, against passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also petition of citizens of the Bronx, county, city, and State of New York, respectfully urging support of the Burnett immigration bill in its entirety when said bill is returned to the House of Representatives for a final vote; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Miss Mary C. Griffin, of New York City, favoring excluding the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CALDER: Memorial of Associated Physicians of Long Island, favoring passage of the Palmer-Owen child-labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CURRY: Petitions by 38 citizens and residents of Stockton; Federated Trades and Labor Council of Vallejo; Machinists Local No. 252, of Vallejo, all in the State of California; the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance and Bartenders' International League of America; the Cigar Makers' International Union of America; and the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions by the Switchmen's International Union, the Pattern Makers' League of North America, the International Typographical Union, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, the United Mine Workers of America, the Tobacco Workers' International Union, the Illinois State Federation of Labor, the Minnesota State Federation of Labor, the New York State Federation of Labor, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America, the railway employees' department of the American Federation of Labor, the International Union of United Brewery Workers of America, the Retail Clerks' International Protective Association, the Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, the Massachusetts State Branch American Federation of Labor, the International Association of Machinists, the Washington State Federation of Labor, the Wood, Wire and Metal Lathers' International Union, the Central Federated Union of New York and vicinity and others, favoring the passage of the immigration bill without amendment over the veto of the President; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition by the Federal Labor Union, of Vallejo, Cal., favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of citizens and organizations of the United States, favoring passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Locomotive Superheater Co., New York, against ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of conference of American citizens, representing church, benevolent, educational, and other civic organizations, held at Washington, D. C., favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Union Guard and Holy Name Society, Holy Trinity Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring exclusion of the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens and organizations of the United States, against passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Memorial of Democratic caucus, house of representatives, of Oklahoma Legislature, relative to removal of Republican officeholders; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of Lane, S. Dak., favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of merchants of Peabody, Burns, Cottonwood Falls, Florence, Clements, Cedar Point, Saffordville, Lehigh, Burdick, Lost Springs, Marion, Hillsboro, Ramona, Tampa, Durham, Lincolnville, Elmdale, Strong City, and Aulne, Kans., favoring House bill 5308, to tax mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of United Presbyterian Congregation and Reformed Presbyterian Sunday School of Eskridge, Kans., against polygamy in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petitions of Albin S. Fendel, Union Hill, N. J., and W. H. Stowenhagen Co., of New York City, favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of mass meeting of citizens of New York, protesting against the literacy test in the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of St. Johannes Verein, La Crosse, Wis., composed of 67 members, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FALCONER: Petitions of Local Typographical Union No. 170, and various organizations of workers in the United States, urging passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FARR: Protests against the passage of the immigration bill from members of the Amos Lodge, No. 136, Independent Order B'rith, and members of the Young Men's Hebrew Association, Scranton; members of the Polish-American Citizen's League of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; members of the Friends of Russian Freedom, New York; and members of the Kosciuszko Polish Club, Taylor, Pa.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolutions in favor of the passing of the immigration bill from Charles Perry Taylor, Washington State Federation of Labor, Tacoma, Wash.; Ernest Bohm, of Central Federated Union, New York, N. Y.; O. Edward Risely, Scranton, Pa.; A. F. Butz, Scranton Council, No. 33, O. of I. A., Scranton, Pa.; George Preston, International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C.; 965 miners, Hyde Park shaft, Scranton, Pa.; and National Council Daughters of Liberty, Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of Federated Irish Society of Massachusetts, protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GERRY: Petitions of Manhattan Wholesale Grocery Co., U. S. Ring Traveler Co., James F. Bergin & Co., of Providence, and I. B. Crandall, of Westerly, R. I., protesting against preventing the Government from printing stamped envelopes bearing printed return request; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of M. W. Beebe, of Pawtucket; H. M. Laughlin, of Bradford; and United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Newport, R. I., favoring passage of the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petitions of Providence Central Federated Union, Providence, R. I., protesting against the increased cost of flour and urging investigation of same; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Court Rochambeau, No. 3597, Independent Order of Foresters, of Providence, R. I., urging the passage of the civil-service reform bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Rhode Island State Federation of Women's Clubs, of Providence, urging the passage of the Palmer-Owen child labor bill; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Charles McCusker, of Arlington, R. I., urging the protection of Catholics in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON: Petitions of J. S. Wood and Amos N. Barron, of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against the passage of the seamen's bill in regard to the Great Lakes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GORMAN: Petition of St. Joseph's Men's Society and other societies of Chicago, Ill., also citizens of the third Illinois district, favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petitions of John Ruf, of Philadelphia, Pa.; church, benevolent, educational, and other civic organizations of Washington, D. C., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of International Seamen's Union of America and various other organizations of workers of the United States, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the German Society of Philadelphia, favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Petition of citizens of Petersburg, Reynolds, Robinson, Sawyer, Sheldon, Sykeston, Turtle Lake, Wahpeton, Wild Rose, Willow City, and Great Bend, all in the State of North Dakota, favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JACOWAY: Petition of St. Boniface Society, of Hartman, Ark., favoring bill to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petitions of Sacred Heart Branch, No. 993, Catholic Knights of America, of Morristown; Ira B. Faust, of Coal Hill; and St. Boniface Society, of Hartman, all in the State of Arkansas, favoring excluding certain papers from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KAHN: Petitions of Labor Council, United Laborers' Union No. 1, International Moulders' Union No. 164, Stationary Firemen's Local No. 86, all of San Francisco, Cal., and other labor organizations throughout the United States, favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KEISTER: Petition of 70 citizens of Evans City, Pa., against granting to Postmaster General authority to exclude

from the mails certain publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of St. Michael's Society, of Monessen, Pa., against Burnett-Smith immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition of sundry citizens of Takoma Park, Md., protesting against the passage of House bill 20644, to amend the postal laws, or any bill with the same title; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of Stephens Benevolent Society, of Hartford, Conn., relative to use of the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of German Lutheran Church congregation, of New Britain, Conn., favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of J. J. O'Keelly and 384 others, of Kingston, N. Y., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of citizens of Cook, Nebr., favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of Scheller Lodge, No. 92, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Middletown, Conn., favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of German-American Alliance of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania, favoring House joint resolution 377, forbidding export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, letters from Messrs. Leach & Smith, Friedenbach Bros., and L. C. Morgan Co., all of Fortuna, Cal., urging the passage of H. R. 5308, providing for a tax on mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions and letters from sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging Congress to enact a law prohibiting the exportation of arms, ammunition, and munitions of war during the present European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN (by request): Petition of citizens and organizations of the United States, favoring passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of citizens and organizations against passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also (by request), petition of the Allegheny County Branch, State League, G. R. C. Societies of Pennsylvania, favoring exclusion of the Menace from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), petition of Charles L. Bernheimer, New York, relative to settlement of international disputes by arbitration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of Chamber of Commerce, Watertown, Conn., against passage of immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Council of the New York Commandery of the Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War, favoring creation of a national defense commission; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York and the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, against ship-purchase bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Woman's Board of Trade of Massachusetts, favoring a law prohibiting use of foreign labels on goods made in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens and organizations of the United States, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Communications from the Central Federated Union of Greater New York; the Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers' International Union; the International Association of Machinists; the Massachusetts branch, American Federation of Labor; the International Union of United Brewery Workmen of America; the Washington State Federation of Labor, Tacoma, Wash.; the National Council, Daughters of Liberty; telegrams from the Butchers' Union of San Francisco, Cal.; the label section of the San Francisco Labor Council; and Local Union No. 164, International Molders' Union, San Francisco, Cal., favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Petition of citizens of New York City, favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of 26 citizens of Mount Sterling, Ill., favoring a free press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SCULLY: Protest against immigration bill from Young Men's Hebrew Association, 250 members, Perth Amboy; Polish Cadets, Sayreville; and St. Joseph's Society, South Amboy, all in the State of New Jersey; Washington Central Labor Union, protesting against class legislation for the District of Columbia; American Federation of Labor, protesting against the Taylor system; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, communications favoring the passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto from International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America, Indianapolis, Ind.; the American Jewish Committee, New York; Pattern Makers' League, Cincinnati; Tobacco Workers' International Union, Louisville; Switchmen's Union, Buffalo, N. Y.; International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, Albany, N. Y.; Railway Employees' Department, St. Louis, International Protective Association; United Mine Workers of America; International Typographical Union, Indianapolis; United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Indianapolis; Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, Boston; Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance; Bartenders' International League of America, Cincinnati; the Commercial Telegraphers' Union of America, Chicago; Washington State Federation of Labor, Tacoma, Wash.; Wood, Wire, and Metal Lathers' International Union, Cleveland, Ohio; International Union of the United Brewery Workmen of America, Cincinnati, Ohio; Washington Camp, No. 111, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Asbury Park; Cigar Makers' International Union, Chicago; Massachusetts State Branch American Federation of Labor, Boston; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial and resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of New York; New York Nonpartisan Citizenship Committee; International Seamen's Union of America, Chicago; New York State Federation of Labor, Utica, N. Y.; Pennsylvania Federation of Labor, Harrisburg, Pa.; American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.; Illinois State Federation of Labor, Chicago, Ill.; New Jersey State Federation of Labor, Newark, N. J.; Minnesota State Federation of Labor, St. Paul, Minn.; and the Iron City Central Trades Council, Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: Petition of citizens and organizations of New York, Tacoma, Wash.; Cincinnati, Boston, Washington, St. Louis, and La Fayette, Ind., favoring passage of Smith-Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition or memorial of Friends of Russian Freedom, favoring sustaining of President's veto of Burnett immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition or memorial of Women's Political Union, of Colorado Springs, Colo., against passage of immigration bill over President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of citizens of Sterling and Amherst, Colo., favoring embargo on export of arms; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: Petitions of citizens of Sagerton and of Mills and Runnels Counties, Tex., protesting against the export of arms, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of 1,000 citizens of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of San Francisco Labor Council, favoring passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Browning Club, Pasadena, Cal., protesting against shipping American horses to European battle fields; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Petition of citizens of Denver, Colo., urging passage of the immigration bill over the President's veto; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petitions of 2,334 American citizens, favoring passage of resolution to prohibit export of war material; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of Local Union 128, Plumbers and Steam Fitters' Association, of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against employment of alien labor in the Canal Zone, Panama; to the Committee on Labor.