The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 5 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 9, 1924, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of April 7), 1924

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Jerry Hall Service to be aid.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY

Warren Webster Whitside to be colonel, Quartermaster Corps.

Nelson Empy Margetts to be lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery.

Albert Whitney Waldron to be major, Field Artillery.

Parley Doney Parkinson to be major, Infantry.

William Giroud Burt to be captain, Infantry.

Marshall Joseph Noyes to be captain, Corps of Engineers.

Charles Manly Walton to be captain, Infantry.

Samuel Lyman Damon to be captain, Corps of Engineers.

Guy Lafayette Hartman to be captain, Infantry.

Thomas Thomas to be captain, Infantry.

Harry Nelson Burkhalter to be captain, Infantry.

Charles Maine Wolff to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.

Simon Foss to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Davis Ward Hale to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.

Edward Melvin Starr to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Joseph Sladen Bradley to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Arthur Launcelot Moore to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

Robert William Crichlow, jr., to be first lieutenant, Coast Artillery Corps.

Martin Anthony Fennell to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.

Ralph Harris Bassett to be first lieutenant, Infantry.

John Mitchell Willis to be major, Medical Corps.

Allen Chamberlain Wight to be captain, Veterinary Corps.

Elwood Luke Nye to be captain, Veterinary Corps.

Carroll Tye to be first lieutenant, Cavalry.

Donald Frederic Carroll to be first lieutenant, Field Artillery.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Lola P. Neff, Biggs.

Thomas J. Wylie, Cedarville.

Craigie S. Sharp, Crannell.

James Gillies, Napa.

Anna McMichael, San Juan Bautista.

MICHIGAN

Charles J. McCauley, Wells.

NEVADA

Dora E. Rice, Sparks.

NEW MEXICO

Henry W. Wallace, Embudo.

PENNSYLVANIA

Jones Eavenson, Christiana.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clyde C. Asche, Olivet.

Cyrus J. Dickson, Scotland.

VIRGINIA

Connally T. Rush, Abingdon.

Henry G. Norman, Cedar Bluff.

Lucius M. Manry, Courtland.

Waverly S. Barrett, Dendron.

Robert A. Pope, Drewryville.

James S. Castle, Dungannon.

William T. Oakes, Gladys.

Bernard Willing, Irvington.

Richard E. Bristow, Ivor.

David G. Snodgrass, Meadowview.

Dorsey T. Davis, Nathalie.

Margaret Wood, National Soldiers' Home.

Frank H. Forbes, North Tazewell.

J. Richard Peery, Pocahontas.

Amos L. Cannaday, Pulaski.

James O. Dameron, Weems.

French A. Taylor, Westpoint.

Guthrie R. Dunton, Jr., White Stone.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, *April 8, 1924*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Exercise Thy mercy toward us, our Heavenly Father, as we draw nigh to Thee. Be with us this day and let our extremity be God's opportunity. The Lord magnify Himself in human weakness. Awaken new desires in our hearts and perfect in our characters every great principle. Because of Thy infinite love and compassion bless us with cleansing and with forgiveness. Whatever there is in our country that stains its character, whatever there is that puts its greatness in peril, let these be defeated. And, O Lord, whatever there is that qualifies public contentment, peace, happiness, and prosperity, let these remain, we beseech Thee, for Thy glory and for our good. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REREFERENCE

The SPEAKER. The bill granting to the State of Utah the Fort Duchesne Reservation for its use as a branch agricultural college was referred by the Chair to the Committee on Military Affairs. Both the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and the chairman of the Public Lands Committee agree that the bill should go to the Committee on Public Lands. Without objection, the Chair will so rerefer it.

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7995) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the immigration bill, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how the time stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington has consumed 50 minutes and has yielded 45 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], making a total of 1 hour and 35 minutes; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has used 1 hour and 18½ minutes, a total time of 2 hours and 53½ minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] use some time now?

Mr. SABATH. If I am not mistaken, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS] desires to proceed.

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman from Washington will remember that time was yielded to me on Saturday by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER]. The gentleman from California, however, is not present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think it would be all right for the gentleman from Oklahoma to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Oklahoma for five minutes.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I understand that we have general permission to revise and extend our remarks in the RECORD upon this bill. Am I correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, the question of immigration is one of intense interest throughout the entire country. I believe that the people generally are better informed upon this question than upon any other subject which will come before Congress for consideration during the present session.

The World War aroused an interest in the study of foreign questions, and during the past few years the question of immigration has been the subject of debate in the schools throughout the country. It has been discussed from the pulpit, through the press, in civic bodies, labor organizations, Legion posts, and has been the subject of individual investigations, so that the people have more information upon the subject and are better prepared to express themselves upon it than perhaps any other public question.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The bill under consideration—H. R. 7995—is the result of the careful study of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and embodies the amendments agreed upon by the committee after extended hearings.

The report of the committee goes into the details of the bill, contains much valuable information, and is helpful to the proper understanding of the provisions of the bill.

The bill is authorized to be cited as the "immigration act of 1924," and might well be called the "selective and restrictive immigration act of 1924."

It recognizes the principles of the immigration law enacted in 1917 and the acts subsequently passed supplementing and extending it, and does not repeal these laws except where there is a conflict or it is specifically so provided in the act.

Section 3 of the immigration act of 1917 is not repealed by the bill but is continued in force, and enumerates in great detail the classes of aliens to be excluded from admission into the United States, and among them are idiots and insane persons, paupers, vagrants, persons afflicted with tuberculosis or with any loathsome or dangerous contagious disease, persons convicted of felony involving moral turpitude, polygamists, anarchists or persons who are opposed to all forms of law or who are opposed to organized government and favor the assassination of public officials or the unlawful destruction of property, prostitutes, contract laborers, aliens over 16 years of age physically capable of reading who can not read the English or some other language, and many other classes enumerated in this section.

If this section were honestly, intelligently, sympathetically, and rigidly enforced, it would result in the rejection of many seeking admission to our country who are undesirable, and it would relieve from criticism, in a large measure, the foreigners who come to our country.

Everyone desirous of studying the immigration question should carefully read this section in order to appreciate the very great responsibility which is given to our immigration officials under this bill, first, to the consular officials abroad, and second, to the immigration officials at home.

Those aliens who are not eligible to citizenship are excluded by the provisions of this bill and other acts of Congress, and this, of course, will exclude the Japanese, Chinese, and the yellow races of Asia. They can not be assimilated, are not in sympathy with our form of government and should be excluded. These aliens will gradually spread to the interior. This is a very acute question now on the Pacific coast.

The act of May 19, 1921, amended by the act of May 11, 1922, expires on June 30, 1924. It is therefore both important and necessary to enact this legislation in time for rules and regulations to be promulgated under it and that prospective immigrants may be advised before the expiration of the above amendatory acts.

Immigrants, under the terms of the bill, are divided into two classes, "quota" and "nonquota" immigrants.

(1) "Quota" immigrants are composed of 100 persons plus 2 per cent of the nationals based upon the census of 1890; and

(2) "Nonquota" immigrants, as defined in section 4.

This bill provides for the admission as "quota immigrants" of 100 persons in addition to 2 per cent of the number of foreign-born individuals of such nationality who are now residents of the United States, based on the census of 1890. In other words, 100 persons may be admitted from any foreign country, and in addition thereto 2 per cent of the nationals from that country who were residents of the United States as shown by the census of 1890.

The bill also provides (sec. 2) that the consular officials in foreign countries, under rules and regulations to be prescribed, may issue tentative immigration certificates up to but not to exceed the quota which it is provided may come from that country, and this certificate shall indicate the nationality, name, age, sex, race, and a sufficient personal description to identify the applicant, the date and place of his birth, and such additional information as may be prescribed by the rules and regulations of the Secretary of Labor, who has the administration of the act in charge. These certificates may be issued to "quota" and "nonquota" immigrants.

In addition to the quota immigrants the bill provides (sec. 4) that there may be admitted in addition thereto as nonquota immigrants children under the age of 18, dependent parents over 55 years of age, husband or wife of a citizen of the United States, an immigrant previously admitted and who is returning to this country after a temporary visit abroad, and one who has continuously resided for the past 10 years in Canada, Newfoundland, Mexico, Cuba, Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, or islands adjacent to the American continents, an immigrant who continuously for the past two years preceding the time of his application to enter the United States has been, and who seeks to enter this country solely for the purpose of, carrying on the vocation of minister of any religious denomination or professor of a college or university, an immigrant who is a skilled laborer, and students who desire to enter college and universities for the purpose of study.

Based upon the census of 1890, it is estimated that the maximum number of immigrants admitted annually would not exceed the total of 161,184, and I am herewith appending a table, based upon the best information obtainable, as follows:

Estimated immigration quotas based on census reports of 1890, 1900, 1910, and 1920—2 per cent plus 100 for each nationality

Country or region of birth	Estimated quotas based on 2 per cent of census plus 100			
	Census of 1890	Census of 1900	Census of 1910	Census of 1920
Albania	104	121	292	212
Armenia (Russian)	117	141	252	419
Austria	1,090	1,891	4,994	11,510
Belgium	609	749	1,142	1,356
Bulgaria	100	100	302	311
Czechoslovakia	1,973	3,531	11,472	7,350
Danzig, Free City of	323	314	300	250
Denmark	2,882	3,298	3,846	3,844
Esthonia	202	337	998	1,484
Finland	245	1,365	2,714	3,113
Fiume, Free State of	110	117	148	210
France	3,978	3,734	3,920	3,177
Germany	45,229	43,081	40,172	28,705
Great Britain and North Ireland	41,772	37,282	34,508	29,152
Irish Free State	20,886	18,641	17,254	14,576
Greece	135	259	2,142	3,625
Hungary	588	1,232	3,932	8,047
Iceland	136	142	150	150
Italy	4,689	10,815	28,138	32,315
Latvia	217	371	1,126	1,681
Lithuania	402	655	1,852	2,801
Luxemburg	158	161	162	352
Netherlands	1,737	2,000	2,504	2,738
Norway	6,553	6,857	8,234	7,425
Poland	8,972	16,277	20,752	22,902
Portugal	574	1,016	1,744	1,616
Rumania	731	1,512	5,046	2,157
Russia	1,892	4,596	16,370	25,161
Spain (including Canary Islands)	224	245	708	1,320
Sweden	9,661	11,772	13,462	12,649
Switzerland	2,181	2,414	2,602	2,477
Yugoslavia	835	1,504	4,384	3,500
San Marino	110	110	110	110
Andorra	100	100	100	100
Liechtenstein	100	100	100	100
Monaco	100	100	100	100
Palestine	101	104	138	164
Syria	112	167	688	1,142
Turkey	123	218	1,870	841
Hejaz	105	105	105	105
Persia	125	125	125	125
Egypt	106	108	112	117
Liberia	100	100	100	100
Abyssinia	100	100	100	100
Morocco	100	100	100	100
Union of South Africa	110	110	110	110
Australia	220	240	296	323
New Zealand and Pacific Islands	167	152	154	178
Total	161,184	178,769	239,930	240,400

This table not only shows the number that would be admitted, based on the census of 1890, but also the census of 1900, of 1910, and of 1920.

By basing the admissions upon the census of 1890 and reducing the percentage from 3 to 2, the number of immigrants to be admitted will be very greatly reduced.

I favor a further reduction of the "quota" immigrants, either by basing the admissions upon an earlier census than that of 1890, or by reducing the percentage from 2 to 1, and shall vote for such an amendment if given an opportunity. However, it is stated that no census prior to 1890 can be used as a basis for the reason that the nationality of immigrants is not shown.

There were admitted during the past year 522,919 immigrants, whereas, under the provisions of this bill, there will be admitted 161,184 immigrants.

During the past six months there were 469,000 immigrants admitted into the United States.

The number of immigrants admitted to our country during the more than a century of our Government is a very interesting study. Prior to 1842 the number did not reach 100,000 in any one year. In 1842, 104,565 were admitted. In 1863 the number reached 459,803. The largest number admitted during any one year was that of 1907 when 1,285,349 were received, and more than a million came to our country in the years 1905, 1906, 1907, 1910, 1913, and 1914. Since the World War a new tide of im-

migration started and in 1921, 805,228 immigrants were admitted, but the number was reduced the following year by the act of May 19, 1921, and of May 11, 1922. From September 30, 1820, up to and including June 30, 1923, 35,292,506 immigrants were admitted to our shores.

In order to get away from Old World conditions, unless immigration is restricted as by the terms of this bill, we may expect a much larger influx of immigrants. The period of depression, unstable conditions, militarism, the love of political liberty, and religious freedom will greatly stimulate immigration from Europe.

This bill restricts immigration to those persons eligible to citizenship in the United States and it is the purpose of the bill to reduce the number to those who can be assimilated. Every immigrant permanently admitted to our country should be carefully examined and none should be admitted except those who desire to and will become useful, productive, and patriotic citizens of the United States.

In considering this bill many questions are important. Immigration is a domestic question and one for congressional legislation. We have a right to determine how many immigrants may or may not be admitted from any country. We may admit from one country or class and not from another.

In certain congested centers the percentage of foreign born is very high. The questions of assimilation, of education, of illiteracy, of teaching them the English language, of finding employment, of not displacing other labor, and many other questions go to make up the problem to be solved in considering immigration.

It is imperative that we do not admit those who would make undesirable citizens or those who are ineligible to become citizens or those who could not be assimilated.

The American Legion, at its annual convention in San Francisco in October, 1923, adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That Congress be urged to permanently deny admission hereafter, as immigrants or permanent residents, to all aliens who are ineligible to citizenship under the laws of the United States.

The American Federation of Labor, in October, 1923, at Portland, Oreg., in its annual convention, adopted the following resolution:

We recommend that the executive council be instructed to advocate before the Sixty-eighth Congress a more stringent immigration policy under which immigration shall be curtailed below the present quotas.

The American Farm Bureau Federation passed a resolution in Chicago on December 12, 1923, as follows:

We favor a limitation of the number of immigrants permitted to enter this country to approximately the present total. We would shift the basis upon which the percentage is determined from 1910 to 1890, or an earlier period. We recommend that all immigrants be selected after physical, mental, and other tests in the land of their nativity by representatives of our Government, and that the Congress take proper steps to put such plan into operation.

It will be noted that the persons to be admitted, embodied in the pending bill, follow very closely the number recommended to be admitted in the above resolution.

The National Grange, November 14–24, 1923, at Pittsburgh, adopted the following resolution at its annual meeting:

The grange favors immigration laws which will make for more loyal Americanism and better citizenship, and urges such modifications of the present laws as will accomplish this end. We favor the substitution of the census of 1890 for the census of 1910 as the basis for the percentage immigration law should it be reenacted. We reiterate the previous action of the grange asking for denial of permanent residence in the United States to aliens ineligible to citizenship.

The above resolution indorses the substitution of the 1890 census for the census of 1910. In addition, various civic organizations and patriotic societies, chambers of commerce, and Daughters of the American Revolution have passed resolutions favoring a further restriction of immigration and for the weeding out of the undesirables, and the selection of a better class of immigrants who would be eligible for citizenship when admitted and who could be assimilated into our body politic.

While I am not a member of the committee, and have not had the time to carefully read all of the hearings and the arguments used before the committee, I favor a reduction in the number of immigrants to be admitted and a selective system by the issuance of tentative certificates in foreign countries, with a final determination by our more responsible officials in this country, so that the number of immigrants will be greatly reduced and confined to those eligible to citizenship in this country and those who will be in sympathy with our Constitution and laws and those who can be readily assimilated. We have had many people of foreign birth who have added greatly to our citizenship. We must not overlook the splendid record they have made. We are not unmindful of the fact that in almost every Cabinet, from the days of Washington down to the present time, some member thereof has been of foreign birth.

However, in these days following the World War, when conditions abroad are so disturbed, we must give great care to a proper selection of those who are admitted to our shores, seeing to it that no undesirable foreigners are admitted, who will be a menace to our institutions, who can not be readily assimilated, and who will be a burden and not a help to the communities in which they will reside. This law, under the nonquota section (4), will admit the minor children, wives or husbands, or the dependent parents over 55 years of age of those foreigners who have been previously admitted, and grant to them the privileges of citizenship in this country, so that there will be no hardship upon them; and in our selection of new immigrants we have provided for tentative certificates to be first issued abroad, so that prospective immigrants may not be admitted if they are not entitled to enter. We agree with the sentiment that no immigrant should be admitted to this country whom we would not welcome as a citizen of our State and Nation. This is our own beloved country; let us protect the fundamentals upon which it was founded as we would guard the purity of our own homes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Has the gentleman read the minority report?

Mr. HASTINGS. I have read it as carefully as I have had an opportunity. I have, however, given it consideration.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. At this time do you not think we ought to have a provision to bring in under the exemption of quota the wives and minor children of those who have come to this country and declared their intention to become American citizens for the purpose of uniting the families of those who came here to seek citizenship and whom we have admitted to our shores?

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not know how many that would affect. I would be glad to see the families of all desirable immigrants eligible to citizenship united. I will say, however, that as far as I am concerned, I would be in favor of a further restriction of immigration. I think it is absolutely necessary at the present time.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes more in order that I may ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the time is under the control of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will yield the gentleman two minutes.

Mr. WINSLOW. For the purpose of information and not for controversy, I would like to ask the gentleman if he could make a statement as to the supply of labor, in the lower classifications, in the part of the country that he represents?

Mr. HASTINGS. I do not believe I have sufficient information to answer the gentleman's question in detail, but I do believe that we have a sufficient supply of labor in all branches in my State of Oklahoma, and that it is not necessary to enlarge the percentage or the number of immigrants in order that we may have an additional supply of labor.

Mr. WINSLOW. So it would appear that in the locality the gentleman comes from that phase of the matter would not be of particular interest?

Mr. HASTINGS. It is not.

Mr. WINSLOW. I am simply asking this for information.

Mr. HASTINGS. I am perfectly willing for the gentleman to interrupt. So far as I know, and so far as I have information, there is an abundance of labor in my State, and it is not necessary for us to admit additional immigrants to supply the necessary labor.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HASTINGS. I will.

Mr. WATKINS. Wherever skilled labor is needed, that can be brought in under this bill by virtue of section 4, subsection (e)?

Mr. HASTINGS. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. WINSLOW. To correct any misapprehension arising out of the gentleman's question, it was not in my mind to inquire about the supply of skilled labor but rather what we call "lumper" labor.

Mr. HASTINGS. I so understood. There is no scarcity of labor in any class in my State. The supply is greater than the demand.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having taken the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Welch, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2930. An act reaffirming the use of ether for radio communication or otherwise to be the inalienable possession of the people of the United States and their Government, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1219) for the relief of Thomas Nolan.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 514) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a right of way over the Government levee at Yuma, Ariz.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) authorizing the Secretary of War to lease to the New Orleans Association of Commerce New Orleans quartermaster intermediate depot unit No. 2.

IMMIGRATION BILL

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am strongly and unalterably opposed to the bill under consideration, in its present form. To my mind it will engender a feeling of warranted resentment among a very large percentage of our alien population, greatly disproportionate to any possible future benefits, which its sponsors claim, but which I can not admit. Selective immigration is to be desired; it is perhaps imperative. Restrictive immigration can be defended. Its extent and its necessity are controversial. But to my mind selective restriction, based upon the theory of racial superiority or inferiority, is wholly indefensible and violative of every hitherto recognized principle of American fair play. Selection and restriction are far different from selective restriction. The former may be justified on many grounds, the latter on none.

The proposed bill makes a discrimination which bodes ill for the future happiness and complacency of mind of millions of our present and future citizens. This discrimination is apparent on the face of the majority report which accompanies this bill. On page 13 of this report appears the following language:

> We should not and do not speak of these as undesirable when we mean near nonassimilable or slow of assimilation.

The persons particularly sought to be excluded are not spoken of as inferior or undesirable but as near nonassimilable, and on this ground are, in effect, discriminated against. The adjective is changed, but the subject is sought to be removed as a potential factor in our future national life. The anguish of the patient is not lessened by adjectival injections.

I am always ready to accord to any person the loftiest of motives and purpose in the consideration of any matter which comes before this House, and my views are not in any sense to be taken as an attempted criticism of the proponents of this bill. *If I held the same* views as they do relative to the disastrous effect of a continuation of immigration, based upon the census of 1910, I should undoubtedly come to the same conclusion and favor a change in the existing law so as to adopt a quota system based upon the year 1890. But I can not admit the accuracy of the premises and therefore can not reach the same conclusion.

It seems to me that without any adequate or logical reasoning or proof, one immigration is deemed to be a menace and a way to avoid this supposed and fancied, but not real, menace, is immediately sought by changing the quota year. This bill seeks to control the source of immigration, rather than its quality, or if it be argued that it also seeks to change the quality, then it must be contended that changing the source changes the quality.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island. I would like to continue without interruption because I want, in the short time at my disposal, to maintain the continuity of my thought and argument.

It is readily conceded that one of the chief purposes of this bill is to reduce the proportion of immigration from southern and eastern Europe and to increase that of northern and western Europe. And how effectively this is done by changing the quota year is shown by the fact that the present percentage of immigration, under the 1910 census, from northern and western Europe is 55 per cent, while that of southern and eastern Europe is 45 per cent. By the simple method of changing the quota year to 1890, as proposed in this bill, the percentage of immigration from northern and western Europe is increased to 87 per cent, while that of southern and eastern Europe is decreased to 13 per cent. And this drastic diversion of the river of immigration on the plea that those adversely affected thereby are nonassimilable! Does this term imply a lower social caste? If it does, it would indicate a spirit of snobbishness and the idea of intellectual as well as moral superiority, which, I am frank to say, I do not believe is intended. Then it can only refer to failure or disinclination to enter into and appreciate the advantages and obligations of citizenship in these United States. But the facts relative to this matter are startling and illuminating and favor the "newer" immigrant so unjustly discriminated against in this bill.

To ascertain the comparative interest in citizenship of the "old" immigrants from northern and western Europe and the "new" immigrants from southern and eastern Europe we must ascertain the comparative length of residence in this country of each of these two classes of immigrants before they acquired citizenship; length of residence before acquiring citizenship is the dominant and determining factor. Figures compiled by the Bureau of Naturalization, after examination of more than 26,000 petitions for naturalization, for the year 1913, which was regarded as a normal year before the War, show that for the most part the immigrants from southern and eastern Europe displayed a greater interest in acquiring citizenship than those from northern and western Europe. It is apparent from the figures so compiled that the races coming from countries where they have suffered oppression and tyranny are more anxious, eager, and ready to acquire citizenship, than racial groups coming from other countries, from which they hesitate to forswear allegiance.

It has been said that "Distance lends enchantment" and "Familiarity breeds contempt." In this case the converse is true. Those who have no experience with immigration or its immediate effects seem to be most ardent in the support of the bill, and in maintaining the 1890 quota which the bill proposes, while those coming from sections where the work and worth of the immigrant is apparent and known, are for the most part in favor of maintaining the quota on the basis of the present quota year of 1910. If a reduction of numbers is desired, why not reduce this number on the present quota year of 1910 or shut off immigration entirely? Neither of these plans would permit of a charge of discrimination. Why select the only method which gives just cause for such a charge?

I represent a State which has the most alien population, with respect to ancestry, of any State in the Union, a percentage amounting to possibly 60 per cent. And yet I state with confidence and boldness and without fear of successful contradiction that there is no more loyal, industrious, broad-minded, open-hearted and law-abiding citizenry in any State of this mighty and wonderful Nation than that of the little State of Rhode Island. Prosperity, contentment, tolerance of the views of others and a spirit of obedience to law mark its daily life. The spirit of America is strong and unmistakable. The wheels of industry turn with wondrous speed, the hum and throb of loom and shuttle keep time to the heartbeats of a people attuned to a spirit of love for the country of their adoption. America has first place in their hearts.

Nearly 40 per cent of the people of the district which I have the honor to represent claim the shores of France as the land of their origin. And yet their love for America is unsurpassed. France has been our traditional ally and our friend, and their descendants in this country have well kept up and preserved that ancient friendship and have contributed largely to the moral and material welfare of this great Nation. They have furnished to the fair State of Rhode Island more than their share of distinguished men and women, whose memories are revered and who have done much to upbuild and preserve the cherished traditions of the founders of this Republic. They have furnished a number of governors, two of whom are now living and who have made for themselves a record in administrative accomplishments of which the State of Rhode Island always shall be proud.

In my State, though not in large numbers in that particular district which I represent, there are many people of Jewish lineage, forming a very important factor in the economic and social life of the State. They have joined heartily in every movement for civic betterment, have readily assimilated and have taken an active part in every endeavor to promote a

higher sense of civic duty and social and political morality. Their manufacturers and business men are leaders in their particular fields, they are represented ably in all the professions, one member adorns the bench of the superior court and is one of the ablest jurists ever to hold office, in a State noted far and wide for the ability and great learning of its judiciary, both past and present. The loyalty of the Jewish residents of Rhode Island is not surpassed by that of any other race and entitles them to equal protection and consideration in the enactment of legislation of such widespread interest and application as proposed in the present bill.

The descendants of that illustrious gentleman and intrepid mariner who discovered this great continent in 1492 and made it possible for all of us to be here on this very day and hour in the greatest deliberative and legislative body in the world are most shabbily treated by the terms of the proposed bill. Their quota is reduced from 28,238 to 4,089, an almost negligible figure. And this on the flimsy pretext that they are near nonassimilable. What a shallow plea and how distantly removed from truth.

The Italian population of Rhode Island has been one of the most important factors in the development and prestige of that State, has added to its wealth and contributed to its progress in every conceivable way. Peaceful, orderly, and law-abiding, they have assumed the duties and obligations of citizenship with a realization of its responsibilities that may well merit emulation among those who term themselves 100 per cent Americans.

One of the most forceful and able judges on the bench of the superior court is of Italian descent and, if I mistake not, was born in Italy. Educated at Harvard, he became a prominent member of the Rhode Island bar, was chosen as first assistant attorney general, making an enviable record in the prosecution of crime and upholding the majesty and supremacy of the law. In recognition of his exceptional ability and high legal attainments he was elevated to the superior court, a man as truly American in every fiber of his being as any gentleman who graces the Halls of Congress. One of the present attorneys general is also of Italian parentage, and his administrative record is one of which the whole State is proud. Many others of Italian birth or parentage are prominent in all the affairs of the State of Rhode Island and active in preserving its peace and prosperity. Can broad-minded men, with vision and understanding, deliberately discrimanate against citizens of this character?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman does not mean that this gentleman is literally an Italian.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Rhode Island. He is of Italian parentage, but is now one of the most prominent Americans we have in the State of Rhode Island. There are a great many people in Rhode Island of the same character. These are not isolated instances that I am pointing out. I say to you that the people of Rhode Island of alien ancestry, many of them not citizens because they have not been here a sufficient length of time, are as good Americans as can be found in any part of this land.

Gentlemen, let us consider this question without rancor, without prejudice, and let us show the world that America still leads the way, that our hearts still throb with love of our fellow men, and that the greatest Nation in all the world still holds out a hand of greeting and of welcome to the oppressed of every land and clime. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman yields further I would like to ask a question about the procedure. There is now a little less than five hours left of the original eight hours provided under the rule, as I understand from the Chairman. That means that the original debate provided for by the rule would close a little after 4 o'clock. Is it the purpose of the gentleman from Washington to move to rise and take a recess for the night session at that time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I think when we have completed the debate we will be justified in rising, but I would like to discuss the matter and see if we can not make an arrangement with the gentleman from California by which the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] can be assured of some time this evening.

Mr. RAKER. I am willing to yield the gentleman from Louisiana 10 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Inasmuch as I control 90 minutes of the time this evening, if I should yield to the gentleman from Louisiana the 40 minutes he requires, and the gentleman from California 45 minutes, I would have but 5 minutes left.

Mr. RAKER. My purpose was to give the gentleman from Louisiana 10 minutes of my 45 minutes to-night. If the gentleman from Washington will yield him such time as he can and the gentleman from Illinois will give him 10 minutes, I think it can be arranged.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The rule divides the time equally between those opposed and those for the bill, leaving me in control of four hours and the gentleman from Illinois four hours. Now comes the evening session for the extra debate following the rule, and I would be entitled to one-half of that, but I hardly feel that I could yield all but five minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Anything that will help out.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Permit me to suggest that in view of the fact that the debate will close under the rule at 4.30——

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is that the fact?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I was so informed from the desk.

Mr. SABATH. Unfortunately, as gentlemen know, a great deal of time is always lost in yielding time to Members and for other causes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I allowed for that, and I thought it would conclude about 4.30. We are taking up time now, possibly, but perhaps by doing so we will be able to reach some satisfactory agreement. If it be agreeable, the committee could run an extra hour, so that it would not have to rise at 4.30 o'clock.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It seems to me that that is wise, and then have two hours this evening instead of three?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Oh, I thought perhaps we could work in this extra hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We will do the best we can.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Personally, I do not care.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for three minutes in order that I may make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, first, it is not my desire and has never been my desire to intrude upon the time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], the distinguished chairman of the committee. He asked, in the first place, for 10 hours only of general debate, and through the graciousness of the House the whole 10 hours were granted. I did not want to interfere with him, and so I asked the House, without getting his permission, to grant me one extra hour of time. He objected, but as a result the House granted three hours of extra time for to-night. Saturday the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], the distinguished chairman of the committee, came here and had a gentlemen's agreement with me, yielding me 40 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], though on the other side, graciously gave me 10 more. I accepted the 50 minutes for to-night. Last evening at 5 o'clock the distinguished chairman of the committee called my office and announced that he had decided to give me only 20 minutes to-night. In the beginning I did not ask him for any time. I recognized that under the rules of this House, which were so liberalized (?) a few weeks ago, the chairman of this committee would control all of the time—and, he may think, all of the wisdom—on this bill. I am asking not to interfere with his plan. I secured the three hours additional for to-night. I am for this bill, as far as it goes. I would like to see the rat holes stopped in it so that we could make it a real immigration bill. If it can not be amended, I will vote for it as it is. I asked not to interfere with the chairman's business or with the members of the committee but to have time to report to the House an investigation which I made with the Secretary of Labor, which gave me opportunities I never expected to have and never shall have again of going into central Europe in a private car for over 6,000 miles, so that I saw the conditions from officials down to the humblest, visiting the Bolshevik headquarters, the Communists, and the Fascists. I thought I might be able, in my humble way, to give some of these facts to this House at this time, so that they might be of some value. I am asking for time because of my concern for the stability and perpetuity of the institutions of this Republic. I went there at my own expense, and made the request for unanimous consent because of my concern in the fiber and quality of the American citizen in the years to come. I would rather have this House grant me an hour, not in connection with the gentleman from Washington but out of its graciousness. I would prefer to make my remarks separate and distinct from the

control of the time held by the gentleman from Washington, who is temporarily chairman of the Committee on Immigration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a moment or two.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to see if we can not suggest some arrangement, and I ask the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee. I do not think that we could make it at this time, but we might continue the general debate until half-past 5 this afternoon. That would give an additional three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And then have the night session?

Mr. LONGWORTH. And then have the night session as already arranged.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I think that would be satisfactory.

Mr. LONGWORTH. We can rise sometime, and then I shall ask unanimous consent in the House that debate continue until half-past 5, notwithstanding the limitation fixed by the rules, and then have three hours to-night.

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, a unanimous-consent agreement was reached in the House so that the limitation of time for general debate under the rule is modified, and general debate will continue until the recess this afternoon, and then further from 8 o'clock to-night until 11 o'clock. The Chair thinks that no further action is required in the House on the subject.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then a request could be made in committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that no request would be necessary if the gentlemen in charge of the time will simply yield time.

Mr. ASWELL. May I inquire how much time they have graciously agreed to give me now?

Mr. SABATH. The Chair would not know anything about that. That is a matter in control of those having control of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that there has been no agreement in the House by which the committee definitely assigned the gentleman time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from Washington assures me that if he had that extra 20 minutes he would be very glad to yield them to the gentleman from Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that debate this afternoon be continued, notwithstanding any other arrangement, until 5.30 o'clock, with the understanding that the extra 20 minutes will then be granted by the gentleman from Washington to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, the Chair has just held that general debate will continue until the recess, in any event, and then when the committee rises, after the recess, there will be three hours of general debate this evening. The Chair holds that to be a part of the agreement. That being the case, no further agreement is necessary, and, really, we could not make it in Committee of the Whole, in my opinion. That being the holding of the Chair, all that is necessary to do is to run on and not rise until we get ready.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman from Washington is so confined as to time that he found it impossible to yield the extra 20 minutes. However, if we run now for a sufficient length of time this afternoon to give him that extra time he will be very glad to yield it to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. KUNZ. I reserve the right to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio withdraw his request for unanimous consent?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio withdraws his request for unanimous consent.

Mr. KUNZ. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SABATH. I think the gentleman from Washington desires to use some time.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield just a moment? I understand the gentleman from Washington will yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana, and I will yield 20 minutes. He will have 40 minutes. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] will yield 10 minutes, and that will be 50 minutes. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I desire to place one or two matters in the RECORD for the information of Members, particularly the last report of arrival of immigrants, as follows:

Last permanent residence of immigrant aliens admitted to, and future permanent residence of emigrant aliens departed from, the United States during specified periods, by countries.

Countries	Immigrants, July, 1923, to February, 1924, inclusive	Emigrants, July, 1923, to February, 1924, inclusive
Albania	226	178
Austria	7,296	136
Belgium	1,792	351
Bulgaria	493	168
Czechoslovakia	13,244	1,000
Denmark	4,120	357
Esthonia	377	4
Finland	3,582	219
France (including Corsica)	5,283	871
Germany	73,778	568
Great Britain and Ireland:		
England	23,640	3,037
Ireland	16,878	866
Scotland	33,235	573
Wales	1,507	44
Greece	4,268	4,878
Hungary	5,309	350
Italy (including Sicily and Sardinia)	46,318	17,039
Latvia	1,437	58
Lithuania	2,241	243
Netherlands	3,613	235
Norway	10,526	549
Poland	28,139	1,713
Portugal (including Azores and Cape Verde Islands)	2,562	2,620
Rumania	10,860	747
Russia	12,284	391
Spain (including Canary and Balearic Islands)	674	1,925
Sweden	17,489	512
Switzerland	3,606	219
Turkey in Europe	1,423	79
Yugoslavia	5,523	1,313
Other Europe	304	21
Total Europe	342,027	41,234
China	5,562	2,611
Japan	3,379	1,644
India	133	119
Syria, Palestine, and Mesopotamia	2,558	325
Turkey in Asia	2,726	153
Other Asia	238	48
Total Asia	14,596	4,900
Africa	803	85
Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand	545	327
Pacific Islands (not specified)	38	28
Canada and Newfoundland	133,306	1,723
Central America	1,209	375
Mexico	53,150	1,422
South America	6,706	751
West Indies	11,208	2,851
Other countries	54	2
Grand total	563,642	53,728

Mr. Chairman, I call attention of the Members to the fact that the total shown in the gross of aliens admitted in eight months, 563,642, is something like 205,800 more than the whole quota allowance for the fiscal year ending June 30 next, which quota total is 357,800. All quota immigrants have arrived except 2,000. All of this is on the 3 per cent based on the 1910 census. I am showing you one reason why we prefer but 2 per cent on an 1890 basis. Since July 1 last to February this year there have come to the United States immigrants in the number of 563,642 persons, while but 53,700 have gone out.

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman will yield, that is from every section?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am putting the table in the RECORD.

Mr. SABATH. And that includes Mexico and Canada?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let us take up the Mexican argument now. I do not propose that those who do not want much of any restriction shall harp all the time on the subject of immigrants coming from Mexico in the hope that they may break this bill. We will take care of that in good time, and in a correct manner, I think.

Mr. SABATH. I wanted to have correct information.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I decline to yield for the moment. We are going to hear about Mexicans from now until Saturday night. The number of Mexicans that came in in eight months through the ports was 53,150. I have other statistics to show that several thousand of those who thus came were illiterate and should not have been admitted. How they got by is more than I can tell. I think we will be able to prove that there are many thousands of these 53,000 who have been admitted and who have paid head tax were actually brought in here in violation of the contract labor laws of the United States with their head tax of $8 each paid for them. As

soon as we get this bill passed—the clauses in it which give a little more leeway as to the deportation—we will then be able to throw out of the United States a whole lot of these Mexicans contracted to be brought in here at $5 per head plus the head tax of $8.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will yield.

Mr. SABATH. If they are brought in in violation of our law, they would not be counted, would they? They come in without being counted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am talking about the contract-labor ones. If agents in Chicago and elsewhere between that city and Mexico made secret contracts at $5 a head to bring in these Mexicans and pay the head tax, that tax was paid when they were brought in; they show in the records; but there is——

Mr. SABATH. I think the price is much higher than $5. I am told they charged $50 to $100 per person.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed.

Mr. PERLMAN. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In a minute. In addition to those who are admitted under the present quota, we are obliged to admit now a large number in addition on account of 21 recent court decisions. Nineteen of those decisions have been put together in a pamphlet, which can be found in the rooms of the Committee on Immigration. Two additional decisions have been just made, and I am calling attention to them for the purpose of inserting them in the RECORD, where the Members can see them. If you will examine these decisions, you will see how it affects the present quota law. There are two new ones, and one of the two decisions by Judge Bondy permits the admission of orphan children in other countries adopted by persons in this country; that is, persons here in the United States can adopt orphans in Russia, Germany, Poland, or elsewhere throughout the world. A decision like that stands on top of the present immigration law and will let the orphans of the world be adopted and brought here to the United States. I shall put the decisions in the RECORD.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. What State permits adoption without the child being present in court?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There seem to be some States.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. I should say certainly not in the State of New York.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. According to the laws of Illinois

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Then Illinois is an exception, and the gentleman from Washington must be correct to that extent. Under the jurisdiction of a State government, the child must be in the State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I realize that, of course.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Then the gentleman wants to modify his statement. The gentleman's statement would have applied to all States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If I said all States, I did not mean to do so.

The decision referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY'S OFFICE,
New York, April 7, 1924.

Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON,
Chairman Immigration Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose for your consideration copy of Judge Bondy's decision in the case of Candelman, as per your telegram of April 7, 1924.

The aliens, however, will not be released unless a bond be filed in the sum of $1,000, conditioned that they will abide by the further order of the district court and the mandate of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

This office has been advised to perfect an appeal from decision. We do not believe that Congress intended to make children adopted in a particular State of the United States, without having the children present in its jurisdiction, a child under 18 years of age, of a United States citizen, within the meaning of subdivision 8 of the quota act.

If I can give you any further information with respect to these proceedings, please be good enough to let me know your requirements.

Respectfully,

JAMES C. THOMAS,
Assistant United States Attorney.

[United States District Court, Southern District of New York. In the matter of the application for a writ of habeas corpus to inquire into the detention of Belda Candelman or Zelda Gandelman.]

It appears by a duly exemplified copy of an order of adoption that the excluded alien, who is an orphan under 18 years of age, was adopted by her aunt and uncle, who are naturalized citizens of the United States, in accordance with the laws of Illinois.

The quota act exempts from its operation "aliens under the age of 18 who are children of citizens of the United States."

The board of review on appeal confirmed the order of exclusion solely on the ground that the exemption applies only to blood children and stated that it is believed that the alien will be properly cared for until she can be admitted regularly.

Adoption creates the relation of parent and child between foster parents and adopted child to all legal intents and purposes. All legal incidents and consequences with reference to an adopted child are the same as if the child had been born to the foster parents in lawful wedlock. The context of the statute does not justify the interpretation that Congress did not intend to embrace adopted children within the meaning of the word "children." (See United States *v.* Lee Chee, 224 Fed. 447; United States *v.* Pierce, 285 Fed. 663; Ex parte Fong Yim, 134 Fed. 938.)

The fact that the infant was not in the United States at the time of its adoption does not affect the legality of the adoption. As the certificate shows, the adoption took place in substantial compliance with the statute that did not require the presence of the infant. The writ, therefore, is sustained.

BONDY,
United States District Judge.

NEW YORK, *April 2, 1924.*

SIR: I am inclosing these decisions of Judge Bondy for your consideration.

Respectfully, J. C. THOMAS.

[United States District Court, Southern District of New York. In the matter of Isaac Israel and another.]

One of the excluded aliens testified that he is a cantor and teacher of religious subjects. He produced a certificate of the chief rabbi of an orthodox Hebrew community in Rumania, certifying that having passed the required examination, he is declared to be a Jewish teacher. He also produced a certificate showing that he has been employed abroad as a cantor and instructor in Hebrew.

He came to the United States to accept a position offered him as a cantor and teacher in a synagogue.

He has been excluded because the quota allotted to Rumania, his native country, has been exhausted.

Etymologically, ecclesiastically, and generally speaking the word "cantor" signifies a singer, as reference to any dictionary will show. The cantor occupies an official position in the synagogue. He takes an especially important part in the Hebrew religious service. The voice is one of the essential qualifications of a cantor.

There being no question of fact as to the status of the alien as a cantor in the most technical meaning of that word, the court is of the opinion that he is exempt from the operation of the quota law because he is a professional singer.

The offer and acceptance of employment as a cantor and teacher does not violate the alien contract labor law. (See Holy Trinity Church, 143 U. S. 457.)

The writ, therefore, is sustained, as to both the cantor and his wife.

——— ———,
United States District Judge.

NEW YORK, *April 2, 1924.*

[United States District Court, Southern District of New York. In the matter of a petition of a writ of habeas corpus for and in behalf of Eli Glouberman Shohan, immigrant.]

It appears by a certified copy of a degree of adoption and that the excluded alien, who is an infant under the age of 18, was adopted under the laws of the State of Illinois by citizens of the United States.

The quota act exempts from its operation "aliens under the age of 18 who are children of citizens of the United States."

The Commissioner of Immigration therefore erred in excluding the infant. See memorandum in Candelman *v.* United States. He also erred in excluding the adult accompanying alien who is the wife of an alien that was admitted.

The writ, therefore, is sustained.

——— ———,
United States District Judge.

NEW YORK, *April 2, 1924.*

Mr. PERLMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I can not yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Now, for the further information of Members I would like to say that in the bill pending

before this committee the provisions of the present quota law relating to designations of foreign countries that are dependencies, islands, have been changed somewhat. The purpose of this present bill is to let dependencies run to the quotas from the mother countries, and that is for the purpose of simplicity. However, nothing is stated in the bill now under consideration as to actual quotas from countries over which mandates have been placed. I have here a letter just received from Secretary Hughes making some further suggestions as to minor amendments to satisfy the State Department, as to countries, colonies, dependencies, and other territories, which I shall place in the RECORD which I would like the Members to read before the bill is considered for amendment.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 7, 1924.

The Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I have received the copy of H. R. 7995 introduced by you in the House of Representatives March 17, 1924, and reported with amendments on March 24, 1924. I understand that you desire that consideration be given to the provisions of section 11 of the bill and that you desire a statement of my views concerning any amendments that may be necessary in order that the practice at present followed in preparing the annual quota statement, of including certain countries, colonies, dependencies, or other territories under the designations "Other Europe," "Africa (other than Egypt)," "Other Asia," "Atlantic Islands," and "New Zealand and Pacific Islands" shall be discontinued.

With respect to "Other Europe" I might state that under the present practice immigrants from Andorra, Liechtenstein, Monaco, San Marino, Malta, and Gibraltar are charged to the quota allotted to this subdivision.

Under the provisions of section 11 (b) as now drafted, San Marino would be given a separate quota, as it is "a country recognized by the United States before 1890, but for which a separate enumeration was not made in the census of 1890." With respect to immigrants from Malta and Gibraltar. I am of the opinion that, as the bill is now drafted, such immigrants would be charged to the quota of Great Britain and northern Ireland. Under the provision of the bill, set forth in lines 2 to 12 on page 17, aliens from such a colony or dependency are to be added to the number of those already determined by the census of 1890 to have been born in the country to which the colony or dependency belonged.

It seems, however, that sufficient authorization has not as yet been conferred so that separate quotas can be established with respect to immigrants from Andorra, Liechtenstein and Monaco, as it is not certain that they were recognized by the United States before 1890. It is observed that on page 17 of report No. 350, submitted by your committee on March 24, 1924, favorably reporting H. R. 7995, a statement is printed containing estimated immigration quotas based on census reports of 1890, 1900, 1910, and 1920 on the basis of 2 per cent plus 100 for each nationality. The statement provides a separate quota for each of the three countries above mentioned. I am of the opinion that, in order to provide such a separate quota, it will be necessary to omit the words "before 1890" in line 21 on page 16 of the bill.

With respect to "Africa (other than Egypt)" I may state that under the present practice immigrants from all parts of Africa, other than Egypt, are charged to the quota allotted to this subdivision. It is observed that on page 17 of report No. 350 above mentioned the statement provides a separate quota for Morocco, Liberia, Ethiopia (Abyssinia), and the Union of South Africa. These countries and the Union of South Africa, as a self-governing dominion, would be given separate quotas under the bill as now drafted. Furthermore, immigrants from colonies or dependencies of European governments in Africa would be charged to the quota of the country to which the colonies or dependencies belong. Provision is not made, however, for territories over which European governments exercise a protectorate or which formerly belonged to Germany and are now held under mandates. In order to provide for cases of protectorates, it is suggested that you consider the advisability of inserting on page 17, line 3, after the figures "1890," the words "or of a protectorate."

With respect to territories administered under mandates, I consider it desirable to add a provision so that it will not be necessary to treat them as colonies, dependencies, protectorates, or as belonging to the country which holds the mandate over them. I may state that all of these mandates should, in my opinion, be given separate quotas. With a view to dealing with this situation, I suggest that in line 20, on page 17, after the words "United States," the following words should be added: "or (4) in the administration of territories under mandates."

I also suggest that on page 18, in line 1, after the word "surrender," the following words be added: "or administered under a mandate."

I consider it desirable to add, on page 18, line 9, after the word "surrender," the words: "or administered under a mandate."

I also suggest that on page 18, line 10, after the word "country," the following words should be added: "Such treatment of territory administered under a mandate shall not constitute consent by the United States to the proposed mandate where the United States has not consented in a treaty to the administration of the territory by a mandatory power."

With respect to "other Asia," I may state that under the present practice immigrants from Persia, Iraq, the Hedjaz, Cyprus, and Rhodes with Dodekanesia and Castellorizzo are charged to the quota allotted to this subdivision. Under the provisions of section 11 (b) as now drafted separate quotas would be given to Persia, the Hedjaz, and Muscat (Oman). Immigrants from the island of Cyprus would be charged to the quota of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. A separate quota would be given to Iraq, as it is administered under a mandate. A separate quota would also be given to the islands of Rhodes, Dodekanesia, and Castellorizzo as territories surrendered under the provisions of section 11 (b) (3). In case the treaty concluded at Lausanne between Italy and other allied powers on the one part and Turkey on the other part is ratified, these islands will be transferred to Italy and immigrants from these former Turkish islands will be charged to the quota of Italy.

At present the quota designated "Atlantic islands" includes immigrants from all islands in the Atlantic Ocean other than the Azores Islands, the Canary Islands, the Madeira Islands, and the islands adjacent to the American Continents. Under the bill as now drafted immigrants from the Atlantic islands would be charged to the quotas of the countries to which the islands belong.

With respect to the quota designated "New Zealand and Pacific islands," I beg to state that this quota includes immigrants from the self-governing dominion of New Zealand and from various small islands in the Pacific Ocean other than those belonging to Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and the United States. Under the provisions of the present bill, and the amendments suggested above with respect to protectorates, immigrants from these islands would be charged to the quota of the country to which the islands belong or by which they are administered as protectorates. Those territories administered under mandates which are outside the barred zone established by section 3 of the immigration act of 1917 would be given separate quotas under the amendment suggested.

I also desire to invite your attention to the fact that section 11 (b) does not specifically provide that the statement prepared by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor shall be revised annually. I believe it is desirable to make it clear that such an annual revision of the statement is authorized in case it is considered desirable.

In conclusion I desire to make it clear that nothing contained in this letter should be deemed in any way to modify the views I expressed in my letter of February 8, 1924, regarding the desirability of eliminating section 12 (b), which would exclude persons of Japanese nationality from the quota provisions. Referring to the grounds then stated, I may observe that under the provisions of section 10 (a) the quota is fixed at 100 plus 2 per cent of the number of foreign individuals of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1890. Upon this basis the quota allotted to Japan would be only 146 persons.

I am sending copies of this letter to Senator COLT, to the Secretary of Labor, and to Representative FROTHINGHAM.

I remain, with high regard,
Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I regret I can not yield further now.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield four minutes to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am not going to attempt to make any speech at this time, even if I were able to. I just want to clear up one point in this matter relative to the Mexican situation. You will have the matter before you, and then you can look up the record and see if my statements are borne out by the record.

In the first place, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has stated the number of Mexicans that come in here. During the war an order was made by the then Secretary of Labor, to continue until October 9, 1923, allowing certain Mexicans to come into the United States. That order has been rescinded, and those people can not come in any more simply for development purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like the gentleman to tell us why it is that the restriction of Mexicans is not incorporated in this bill?

Mr. RAKER. That is what I got up for right now.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LAZARO. The Secretary of Labor, Mr. Davis, stated this—it is just in five or six lines:

As a basic proposition I have suggested that any quota limitation imposed shall apply to all countries from which we permit aliens to come. The present law excepts from the quota restrictions British North America, Mexico, Central, and South America. This is manifestly wrong. Last year, out of a total of 522,919 immigrants admitted, Canada sent us 117,000 (including 39,295 English, 30,438 French, 17,045 Scotch, 12,000 Irish, and 4,486 Hebrews), and Mexico nearly 65,000 (practically all Mexicans).

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERLMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Gentlemen, will you pardon me for a minute without interruption, please? I want to get this matter before the committee, and give the opportunity to fortify it from the record. I say that to-day under the law, while sixty thousand and odd Mexicans came into the United States, yet if the laws were enforced there would be no more than 1,000. I can demonstrate it under the laws that now exist.

In the first place, from 75 to 90 per cent of all the Mexicans in Mexico are illiterate and can not lawfully come to the United States. I have been told by those who live along the border, in New Mexico and other border States, that 90 per cent of those that come here are illiterate, so that if the laws on the statute books were enforced they could not come. They are subject to the head tax, and it has been demonstrated that these Mexicans do not pay the $8 head tax. Under the contract labor law, under section 3, none of these men could come in, and it has been demonstrated before the committee that 95 per cent of all the Mexicans that come to the United States have come in under the contract labor law, and have entered illegally. That has been demonstrated by a man who testified within the last six weeks.

What do they do? They go down and employ an agent, a Mexican, who can talk Mexican, to go over to the Mexican side. He tells the Mexicans that there is labor here, and a man drives them into the railroad car like cattle and sheep, and puts men in charge of them, and sends them to their work. That is the history of these transactions, as can be proved, and if you will read the record taken by this committee in the last six years you will find that it is demonstrated. These men are employed to go over. Agents are sent across and hired to bring Mexicans over, and when they come over the man who employs them in the United States pays the head tax, pays their expenses to their place of living, including men, women, and children; and from 75 to 90 per cent of them are illiterate. The Secretary of Labor has said that if he had enough men on the border and those that were there tried to enforce the law and did their duty honestly there would not be a thousand Mexicans entering the United States. You look into the record and verify this statement. That is the reason why we did not strike that out of the bill. We will get better relations and still exclude people from the United States.

Mr. KUNZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. KUNZ. Why do they not deport them? Chicago is being filled with Mexicans. Why not deport them if they are brought here illegally?

Mr. RAKER. We do not deport them because we have not got money enough. We have Chinese in New York, and we have not got money enough to deport them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order just to ask a question. This bill is reported by the rigid immigration restrictionists, and yet the bill leaves open the doors for perhaps the worst element that comes into the United States—the Mexican peon. He comes in without restriction, without regulation, without any attempted opposition. He comes in, and he does not go back. He gets into all the southwestern section of the United States and the western section and he supplies these sections with such labor as they need—Oregon, Idaho, California, Washington, Texas, and the border States, like Arizona and New Mexico. They bring them in and employ them everywhere, and yet you refuse to let white men into other ports. The West and the Southwest take care of themselves.

This bill, while it pretends to restrict immigration, opens the door wide and unrestricted to the most undesirable people who come in under the flag. And yet you say this is an American bill and that a man who does not vote for it is not an American and is not in favor of American institutions and the protection of American institutions. I say the bill is a farce. [Applause.]

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL] 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Committee of the Whole House, H. R. 7995, the final form of H. R. 5, H. R. 101, H. R. 561, and H. R. 6540, proposed as the immigration act of 1924, according to the report of a majority of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization—

1. Meets an emergency; and

2. Offers a constructive policy for the permanent regulation and restriction of immigration.

The bill deals with a fundamental question, and upon the wise decision of the immigration question depends the character of the America of the future, the America of your and my children and their children's children. A great many really irrelevant questions and a number of unnecessary racial considerations have entered into the discussion of the matter. The questions of immediate necessity and of permanent policy have been confused, and before taking up the precise questions presented by H. R. 7995 it will be well to dispose of certain, often perhaps unconsciously, conflicting points of view.

The majority report insists that "the use of the 1890 census is not discriminatory," while the minority report alleges that the pending bill "is confessedly discriminatory in its operations." John B. Trevor, of New York, an expert produced on behalf of the majority of the Immigration Committee—a majority in number, not of party and a majority regardless of party—discussing the basis of the pending bill with seeming unfairness, brands the opponents of the 1890 census as "foreign" and "selfish" when he says:

Under these circumstances anyone free from foreign attachments and devoid of selfish interest must conclude that the adoption of the 1890 census as a basis for the computation of quotas renders substantial justice to our unassimilated population, who by noisy clamor are attempting to coerce our President and Congress in behalf of races and people having no stake or care in the welfare of the United States.

I am not at present in favor of the 1890 census, and I am certainly "free from foreign attachments." My father's people settled in Plymouth, Mass., before 1638; my mother's first American forbear came out from England in 1705 to be attorney general of Virginia; I have not one progenitor who was not here before the 1790 census, and I am a member of the Society of the Cincinnati, because my great-great-grandfather was wounded at Bunker Hill.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. What percentage of the gentleman's constituents are foreign born or of foreign blood?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I shall be glad to take that up in a moment, and I have all the tabulations here. Less than 18 per cent of my constituents are foreign born. I want to say to the gentleman that if the gentlemen proposing this immigration bill would stand on a basis of square Americanism and not try to interject the suggestion that those of us who oppose this bill are doing it for self-interest, they would show themselves more American and get along a great deal better. [Applause.]

Mr. WATKINS. I will read the census figures to the gentleman.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I do not care to yield to the gentleman; I will make my own speech.

Mr. WATKINS. I merely wanted to give the gentleman the census figures.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I have the census figures for my district and will myself put them in the RECORD. If we are going to adopt a proper and permanent immigration policy for the country, we must cut out all this talk against everybody who stands up and opposes a temporary and half-baked policy as to immigration. I propose to take up an exact analysis of my district. And I want to say to the gentleman that I happen to be one Member of the House who votes his belief irrespective of the sentiment of his district or the make-up of his district. [Applause.] I will say to the gentleman that that is how I happened to get here—because I voted my convictions.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman permit another observation?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I shall be glad to permit it if I can be given five more minutes.

Mr. WATKINS. Has not the gentleman always noticed that in practically every case where a district is overwhelmingly foreign born that the Congressman happens to vote that way?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. No; I do not notice it; but I do notice a great many Congressmen who are in favor of making a separation of the makeshift, temporary policy of this bill from the consideration of a permanent policy in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman give me time to read in his speech——

Mr. HILL of Maryland. No; I can not let the gentleman make a speech in my time, even if he wants to read my own. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I therefore do not consider my opposition to the 1890 census as due to my "foreign attachments," nor do I consider my views on the subject "noisy clamor," using the elegant language of Mr. Trevor.

Whatever the final decision on the permanent immigration policy of the United States, there are two fundamental principles that must be recognized at the start: First. The American citizen who was naturalized last week is just as much of an American as I am. He is just as much an American as the gentleman who just questioned me, and just as much an American as those who date back to the 1790 census. He is not a "foreigner," and he is just as much interested in the proper settlement of the admission of aliens as any other American. Second. The settlement of a permanent immigration policy is purely an American question. It is the business of nobody but Americans.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield with reference to that observation?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. No; I will not yield to the gentleman to make a speech in my time, although if the gentleman will get me more time I will yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I have no time; if I had, I would take it myself.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I yielded a gentleman two minutes the other day when I did not have it, and he got away with it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. In reference to the first point, I recall the parable of the laborers, in the vineyard (Matthew xx, 1-17), for the United States, in the matter of equality among its citizens, is like the Kingdom of Heaven, which the Master likened to "a man that was a householder, who went out early in the morning to hire laborers for his vineyard." He hired them at a shilling a day, and they went to work. At the third hour, at the sixth, and ninth hours and even at the eleventh hour he hired and put to work in the vineyard more laborers.

This will probably be a new and interesting point of view to the gentleman, and I wish he would pay special attention to this. I heard the gentleman on Saturday talk about the extra rights of those Americans whose ancestors had been in this country and fought in the wars of the country. Here is the position of the Master Himself on that kind of an argument.

When pay time came, all of them got the same pay, a shilling. The first hired objected and pointed out that they had "borne the burden of the day and the scorching heat," but their claim was denied. The householder said:

> I did thee no wrong; didst thou not agree with me for a shilling? * * * Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?

The United States can do what it pleases on the immigration question, and the most recent citizen is one of the householders to be pleased just as much as the others who date back to the 1790 census. In considering the immigration problem the question is between Americans, no matter what their place of birth, and aliens, no matter what their place of residence.

We will do well to read again what Theodore Roosevelt said in "Fear God and take your own part."

And I quote from what I consider one of the most true and striking pronouncements of the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence.

> Among the generals of Washington in the Revolutionary War were Greene, Putnam, and Lee, who were of English descent; Wayne and Sullivan, who were of Irish descent; Marion, who was of French descent; Schuyler, who was of Dutch descent; and Muhlenberg and Herkimer, who were of German descent. But they were all Americans and nothing else, just as much as Washington. Carroll of Carrollton was a Catholic; Hancock a Protestant; Jefferson was heterodox, from the standpoint of any orthodox creed; but these and all other signers of the Declaration of Independence stood on an equality of duty and right and liberty as Americans and nothing else.

The children of the recent citizen who comes from the country that gave us Pulaski, De Kalb, Kosciusko, Gallatin, Von Steuben, and all the rest are just as much interested in the permanent immigration policy of the United States as the yet unborn descendants of Schuyler or Carroll of Carrollton or of Jefferson. Once an American citizen, all others are "aliens." If you do not like that, make it harder to attain citizenship.

If you do not like that, you have it in your power to make it harder to obtain the privileges of an American citizen. But when a man is once admitted by naturalization a citizen of this Nation he is an American citizen. When you once admit a man to that type of rank and rights which was held to be, in the days of Rome, the proudest distinction that any man in the world could hold, and when you make a man an American citizen you have no business talking about his being a foreigner. He is not a foreigner; he has stopped being a foreigner.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. How much more time have I, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I will yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Whereabouts in the Scripture was the quotation to which the gentleman referred?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The twentieth chapter of Matthew, the first to the seventeenth verses.

Mr. PERKINS. I have a Bible here, and it says a penny and not a shilling.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The gentleman has the old St. James version, while I have the revised version.

Mr. PERKINS. Is the gentleman a modernist or a fundamentalist?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I want to say to the gentleman that I am a fundamentalist. I believe the Lord changed water into actual wine. I do not believe in this modern business. I stand by the old Bible as I stand by the old Constitution. [Applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. I hand this copy of the Bible to the gentleman and he will note it says a penny.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. This is a prohibitionist's Bible; it is changed. [Laughter and applause.] I personally will present the House of Representatives with a good, old-fashioned St. James version of the Bible.

Mr. MEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. The illustrious Representative from Maryland was a distinguished soldier in the late war. Would he care to take as the quota basis—as a great many gentlemen are anxious to arrive at a right basis—the number of these boys who enlisted and served in the World War as a better basis than the so-called 1890 census?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I will say to the gentleman that my division was a division which contained troops in it from the State of New Jersey, the State of my colleague, the eminent bibliographer, or "bibleografer," whichever it is, the gentleman who has just interrupted me. In that division were men of all types, and I would rather take them than I would the 1890 census.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield for a slight correction?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. This is the authorized or King James version of the Bible.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. That must have been King James of Rumania, and not of England.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield two more minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. If we deem best, we can exclude all aliens forever. That is not questioned. The Italian ambassador, in calling attention to the effect of the 1890 census, said:

The Italian Government has never questioned the right of any country to dispose of its internal affairs as best suited to the national interests; it therefore would understand the Government of the United States raising or lowering the percentage of immigrants admittable in accordance to the interests of the country as long as this was done by varying the quota percentage used so far.

The chargé d'affaires ad interim of Rumania also wrote the Secretary of State—

conceding absolutely the undoubted right of the United States of America to limit or even to entirely suppress immigration.

The United States may exclude entirely or it may discriminate if it desires. The question is one for us. Shall we discriminate?

Secretary Hughes asks us not to do so. He said on February 8—

In appropriately providing for a restriction of immigration, the importance of which I fully recognize, I hope that it will be possible to find some basis which will be proof against the charge of discrimination.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MADDEN. Secretary Hughes advised against discrimination even against Mexicans.

Mr. HILL of Maryland. Absolutely; and I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that this bill is the kind of bill that locks the front door and leaves all the back windows and all the back doors open. It shuts out the people from Europe, and it lets in anybody who chooses to come in through Mexico or through Canada, and I want to say to some of the gentlemen from Texas that, having served for one winter at Laredo, I prefer to have Europeans rather than to have Mexican peons.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is not because of the Mexicans themselves, but because the Mexicans lend themselves to systematic exploitation by labor, that they are desired at this time?

Mr. HILL of Maryland. The reason is exactly as the gentleman states it and you can not possibly consider this pending bill as a permanent measure when, according to what the chairman of the Committee on Immigration has said, they are later on going to take up the consideration of Mexico, when through Mexico last year and through Canada over 200,000 people came into this country.

The use of the 1890 census, as proposed in H. R. 7995, is intended to discriminate. The majority report admits this and claims that discrimination is necessary and proper. It says:

Since it is an axiom of political science that a government not imposed by external force is the visible expression of the ideals, standards, and social viewpoint of the people over which it rules, it is obvious that a change in the character or composition of the population must inevitably result in the evolution of a form of government consonant with the base upon which it rests. If, therefore, the principle of individual liberty, guarded by a constitutional government created on this continent nearly a century and a half ago, is to endure, the basic strain of our population must be maintained and our economic standards preserved.

With full recognition of the material progress which we owe to the races from southern and eastern Europe, we are conscious that the continued arrival of great numbers tends to upset our balance of population, to depress our standard of living, and to unduly charge our institutions for the care of the socially inadequate.

If immigration from southern and eastern Europe may enter the United States on a basis of substantial equality with that admitted from the older sources of supply, it is clear that if any appreciable number of immigrants are to be allowed to land upon our shores the balance of racial preponderance must in time pass to those elements of the population who reproduce more rapidly on a lower standard of living than those possessing other ideals.

We owe impartial justice to all those who have established themselves in our midst. They are entitled to share in our prosperity. The contribution of their genius to the advancement of our national welfare is recognized. On the other hand, the American people do not concede the right of any foreign group in the United States, or government abroad, to demand a participation in our possessions, tangible or intangible, or to dictate the character of our legislation.

Here is a plain statement against the "substantial equality" of admission of certain peoples. Is it wise for us to adopt a discriminatory policy? If it is to be adopted it is to be adopted by American citizens, not by any "foreign group in the United States" or anywhere else. What, therefore, shall be our policy? We have read the majority views. What do the minority say? Here is a letter from one of those who signed the minority report. Read it:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., April 2, 1924.

IMMIGRATION—STATEMENTS MADE THAT I FAVOR AN OPEN-DOOR POLICY ARE MALICIOUS AND UNTRUE

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I am sending you herewith the minority report on the latest immigration bill, H. R. 7995. From this report you will observe that the position of the minority has not changed.

1. I am for America, for American institutions, American standards of living, and for the maintenance of the American labor wage standard.
2. I am for selective, restrictive immigration.
3. I am opposed to the use of the 1890 census as a basis for the quota, because it is deliberately discriminatory.
4. I am for the examination of immigrants on the other side (but opposed to giving unlimited authority to our consular officials).
5. I am against the admission of the unassimilable and the undesirable. Section 3 of the act of 1917, now in force (extract therefrom herewith inclosed), when properly administered, will keep them out.

Sincerely yours, A. J. SABATH.

We are all seeking for the best solution of this question. What is that solution? I shall not attempt to go into the ethnological questions involved, because I think that there are two separate questions—the immediate need and the permanent policy. In the Senate on April 3, discussing the Senate bill on immigration, occurred the following colloquy:

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The Senator from Massachusetts referred to the Italians as being relatively fewer. Is it not a fact, however, that a large percentage of the inhabitants of northern Italy are Teutonic in origin?

Mr. LODGE. True; Lombardy is almost altogether Teutonic. You can not make exact ethnological divisions; it is impossible.

The House bill offers the 1890 census, as follows:

SEC. 10. (a) When used in this act the term "quota" when used in reference to any nationality means 100, and in addition thereto 2 per cent of the number of foreign-born individuals of such nationality resident in the United States as determined by the United States census of 1890.

The Senate bill offers the 1910 census, as follows:

SEC. 8. (a) The annual "quota" of any nationality shall be 200 and in addition thereto 1 [2] per cent of the number of foreign-born individuals of such nationality resident in continental United States as determined by the United States census of 1910, and, when it shall have appeared by the census of 1920 that more than one-half of the foreign-born individuals of any nationality then resident in continental United States had become naturalized citizens of the United States, there shall be added to the quota of that nationality an additional 4 per cent of the number of foreign-born individuals of such nationality resident in continental United States as determined by the census of 1910 [but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100].

Which quota is best? Here are the estimates of the numbers and kinds that may come in under the 1890, the 1900, the 1910, and the 1920 census:

Estimated immigraiton quotas based on census reports of 1890, 1900, 1910, and 1920—2 per cent plus 100 for each nationality

Country or region of birth	Estimated quotas based on 2 per cent of census plus 100			
	Census of 1890	Census of 1900	Census of 1910	Census of 1920
Albania	104	121	292	212
Armenia (Russian)	117	141	252	419
Austria	1,090	1,891	4,994	11,510
Belgium	609	749	1,142	1,356
Bulgaria	100	100	302	311
Czechoslovakia	1,973	3,531	11,472	7,350
Danzig, Free City of	323	314	300	250
Denmark	2,882	3,298	3,846	3,844
Esthonia	202	337	998	1,484
Finland	245	1,365	2,714	3,113
Fiume, Free State of[1]	110	117	148	210
France	3,978	3,734	3,920	3,177
Germany	45,229	43,081	40,172	28,705
Great Britain and North Ireland	41,772	37,282	34,508	29,152
Irish Free State	20,886	18,641	17,254	14,576
Greece	135	259	2,142	3,625
Hungary	588	1,232	3,932	8,047

[1] Fiume is to be added to Italy.

Estimated immigration quotas, etc.—Continued

Country or region of birth	Estimated quotas based on 2 per cent of census plus 100			
	Census of 1890	Census of 1900	Census of 1910	Census of 1920
Iceland	136	142	150	150
Italy	4,689	10,815	28,138	82,315
Latvia	217	371	1,126	1,681
Lithuania	402	655	1,852	2,801
Luxemburg	158	161	162	352
Netherlands	1,737	2,000	2,504	2,738
Norway	6,553	6,857	8,234	7,425
Poland	8,972	16,277	20,752	22,902
Portugal	574	1,016	1,744	1,616
Rumania	731	1,512	5,046	2,157
Russia	1,892	4,596	16,370	25,161
Spain (including Canary Islands)	224	245	708	1,320
Sweden	9,661	11,772	13,462	12,649
Switzerland	2,181	2,414	2,602	2,477
Yugoslavia	835	1,504	4,384	3,500
San Marino	110	110	110	110
Andorra	100	100	100	100
Liechtenstein	100	100	100	100
Monaco	100	100	100	100
Palestine	101	104	138	164
Syria	112	167	688	1,142
Turkey	123	218	1,870	841
Hejaz	105	105	105	105
Persia	125	125	125	125
Egypt	106	108	112	117
Liberia	100	100	100	100
Abyssinia	100	100	100	100
Morocco	100	100	100	100
Union of South Africa	110	110	110	110
Australia	220	240	296	323
New Zealand and Pacific islands	167	152	154	178
Total	161,184	178,769	239,930	240,400

NOTE.—By reason of alteration of bases of computation, principally the elimination of "Other Europe," "Other Asia," and "black" Africa, certain quotas are materially changed. The German quotas are reduced by reason of the allocation of quotas to Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc. The Danish quota increases at the expense of the German quota by reason of the award of Schleswig to Denmark. The British quota increases by absorption of quotas from Cyprus, Gibraltar, and Malta (heretofore part of "Other Europe"), but is decreased by allocation of a quota to the Irish Free State. The Italian quota increases by reason of absorption of Rhodes, Dodekanesia, and Castellorizzo. All estimates printed above, therefore, are subject to considerable revision. They can not be considered as final.

There are 48 nations listed here. Ten of them have the same quota under the 1910 as under the 1890 census. The 1910 census admits 78,746 more in all than the 1890 census. I tried to figure out last night how this affected the various individual nations.

Under the 1890 census 6 nations out of the 38, where there is a difference, would get 69 per cent of the immigration with 31 per cent to the remaining 32 nations, while under the 1910 census the 6 nations would get 44 per cent and the 32 nations 56 per cent.

Here are my estimates and figures. I will not vouch for their accuracy, but they are interesting. Under the estimated immigration of 2 per cent plus 100 for each nationality in the tables on page 17 of the majority committee report the following nations will be entitled to the additional numbers more under the 1910 census than they would be entitled to under the 1890 census:

Albania	88
Armenia	135
Austria	3,904
Belgium	533
Bulgaria	202
Czechoslovakia	9,499
Denmark	964
Esthonia	796
Finland	2,469
Fiume	38
Greece	2,007
Hungary	3,344
Iceland	14
Italy	23,449
Latvia	909
Lithuania	1,448
Luxemburg	4
Netherlands	770
Norway	1,681
Poland	11,780
Portugal	1,170
Rumania	4,315
Russia	14,478
Spain	484
Sweden	3,801
Switzerland	521
Yugoslavia	3,549
Palestine	37
Syria	576
Turkey	1,747
Egypt	6
Australia	76
Total	124,784

Under the 1910 census the above 32 nations would be entitled to bring in annually more than under the 1890 census to the number of 124,784

Under the 1910 census the following six nations would be entitled to bring in less than under the 1890 census, as follows:

Danzig	23	
France	58	
Germany	5,057	
Great Britain and North Ireland	7,264	
Irish Free State	3,632	
New Zealand	13	
Total	16,047	

UNDER THE 1890 CENSUS

Total admitted		161,184
Danzig	323	
France	3,978	
Germany	45,229	
Great Britain and North Ireland	41,772	
Irish Free State	20,886	
New Zealand	167	
Total for six nations		112,355
Total for 32 nations		48,829

UNDER THE 1910 CENSUS

Total admitted		239,930
Danzig	300	
France	3,920	
Germany	40,172	
Great Britain and North Ireland	34,508	
Irish Free State	17,254	
New Zealand	154	
Total for six nations		106,308
Total for other 32 nations		133,622

Which is the best, the 1890 or the 1910 census? It is a puzzling question, but we do not need to answer it yet. The pending bill claims to offer a policy of "permanent regulation," but it does not. It applies the quota only to Europe and leaves open the borders of Mexico and Canada for unlimited entries. That is no "permanent" policy. It is admitted it is not, for the majority report says:

The increase of immigration from countries of this hemisphere, and particularly from adjacent nations, is attracting attention, and it is assumed that Congress will soon have to act with regard thereto. But when Congress does act, machinery for the protection of the borders will have to be set up, and if patrols are established they should be empowered to act for the enforcement of all the laws of the United States—customs, health, liquor, narcotics, immigration, etc.

Under the proposed 1890 quota, 161,184 quota immigrants could come in, but last year from Mexico and Canada there came in 212,768, from British North America 117,000, from Mexico 63,768, and from all other countries of the Western Hemisphere 32,000; total, 212,768. The bars are still down under the pending bill. Therefore, the pending bill can not be viewed as offering a permanent policy until it deals with the whole situation. The following provision of H. R. 7995 makes it temporary:

(c) An immigrant who has resided continuously for at least 10 years immediately preceding the time of his application for admission to the United States in the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, the Republic of Mexico, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, islands adjacent to the American continents, countries of Central or South America, or colonies or dependencies of European countries in Central or South America, and his wife, and his unmarried children under 18 years of age, if accompanying or following to join him.

We must, therefore, either continue the present law for another year or do some other temporary thing while a permanent policy is worked out.

When we take up a permanent policy the following tables, offered on April 3 in the Senate by Senator COLT, are worthy of consideration:

Mr. COLT. Mr. President, in view of the inquiry of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] with regard to relatives, I call attention to this table from the report of the Commissioner of Immigration, Mr. Husband, which will throw a little light upon the subject. This table shows what we do not all realize, that the drawing power of immigration is in this country.

Immigrants coming to join relatives were 75 per cent of all those who came in, and immigrants coming to join friends were 10 per cent, so that 85 per cent of the total immigration of 522,919 came to join relatives and friends. Forty-five per cent of the passage money was paid by relatives and 5 per cent by friends. The amount of money which these immigrants had in sight was $33,967,000. I think this

table, which I will ask to have put in the RECORD, demonstrates that there is the closest connection between the foreign born who are here and immigrants who come over every year. I ask that the table may be inserted in the RECORD.

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

Immigration statistics showing number of immigrants coming to this country to join relatives and friends

(Figures taken from Commissioner General Husband's annual report for year ending July 1, 1923, pp. 49, 50)

Total immigration for year ending July 1, 1923	522,919
Number of immigrants coming to join relatives	387,656
Number of immmigrants coming to join friends	55,676
Number of immigrants coming to join either relatives or friends	443,332
Number of immigrants whose passage was paid—	
By relatives	223,513
By friends	15,986
By either relatives or friends	239,499

Total amount of money brought over by immigrants during year ending July 1, 1923, $33,067,040.

Percentages based on above statistics

Immigrants coming to join relatives	75
Immigrants coming to join friends	10
Immigrants coming to join either relatives or friends	85
Immigrants whose passage was paid—	
By relatives	43
By friends	3
By either relatives or friends	46

The facts here tabulated support the view I expressed before the Committee on Immigration on Monday, December 31, 1923:

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, on the 21st of April, 1921, when the last immigration quota law was being considered, I offered on the floor of the House an amendment providing that that act should not apply to parents, brothers and sisters, and children of American citizens. In the bill which the committee is now considering, H. R. 101, on page 4, section 4, there is a provision that—

"When used in this act the term 'nonquota immigrant' means—

"(a) An immigrant who is the husband, wife, father, mother, or unmarried minor child of a citizen of the United States who resides therein at the time of a filing of a petition under section 8."

Mr. VAILE. Mr. HILL, the committee had tentatively agreed to make a slight change in that language, as follows:

"Father or mother over the age of 55 or unmarried minor child under the age of 18."

You might bear that in mind in discussing this proposition.

Mr. HILL. I would like to bear that in mind. I introduced on the 15th of December H. R. 3844, which provides as follows:

"That the parents, brothers, sisters, or children of American citizens who otherwise comply with the mental, moral, and physical standards prescribed by the immigration laws of the United States shall be admitted into the United States regardless of limitations imposed by these quota regulations."

I have asked the privilege of coming before the committee in order to present to the committee the suggestion that the scope of subsection (a) of section 4 be enlarged, perhaps, to cover the intent of H. R. 3844.

The committee then asked me certain questions, and the discussion is interesting along the lines of the immigration of the relatives of American citizens. I therefore offer it here.

Mr. RAKER. Will you explain to the committee from your observation what would result if a man thus coming to the United States has become naturalized, has lived here 10 years, let us say, and has two brothers and three sisters in the foreign country with their families, what obligation or duty has the United States to admit them solely because they are the brothers of one who is naturalized, and what right has he to ask that they come in, if it should happen that we have an excess population?

Mr. HILL. I am glad you asked that question, because it brings out exactly what I have been trying to represent to the committee. You are not providing for absolutely cutting off of immigration. That is not the purpose of the committee, as I understand it. Under this proposed legislation, there will be a certain number of new persons permitted to come into the United States, presumably with the purpose of ultimately becoming citizens. I am strongly of the opinion that it is better for the United States to have the relatives of people who are already in the United States come in rather than those who have no affiliations here.

Mr. RAKER. That is what I would like to have you explain. On what theory do you base that?

Mr. HILL. The theory is this: Take, for instance, the district which I represent, which is a city district. That district has a good many first-generation citizens. I have in mind a good many citizens who were born abroad and who have relatives abroad. I only use them as examples because they are typical in explaining why I feel as I do about this matter. A great many of them have done very well, indeed. They occupy responsible business positions in the community and are a part of the general community life. I should think it would be very much better, for instance, for the community in which those people live to have one of their relatives come rather than to have some one who is totally alien to the whole situation as it exists. That, of course, is my own personal belief. In the past two years, while I have had some applications with reference to brothers and sisters, in proportion to the population it has not been such a large number. There are about 250,000 people in my district. I do not believe I have been called on in more than about 100 cases relating to brothers and sisters; cases where people have come and asked advice as to what the law was relative to brothers and sisters coming in.

I do not believe, as a practical matter, if you widen the scope of subsection (a) of section 4 to include brothers and sisters, you are going to have any very large amount of people come in under that section. I should be willing to go further and say that if an alleged brother or sister could not prove quite conclusively that he was a brother or sister, that he or she would not come under this act. Brothers and sisters who are not really brothers and sisters and who are not really in sufficient communication with their American relatives would not be the type of brother or sister who would be, under my view, a desirable addition to this country.

* * * * * * *

Mr. WATKINS. What percentage, if you know, of your constituents is foreign born?

Mr. HILL. I am not able to say that precisely, because many are foreign born and many are born of foreign parents here.

Mr. WATKINS. Foreign born themselves is what I referred to.

Mr. HILL. I do not think I could answer that exactly, but somewhere between 20 and 25 or 40 per cent, but I am not sure that it runs as high as that.

Mr. WATKINS. You say you prefer the kin of those who are already here in preference to an outsider. Would you prefer to have some Bulgarian who has kinsmen here to an Anglo-Saxon who has no kin at all?

Mr. HILL. I think it depends upon the Bulgarian pretty largely.

Mr. WATKINS. In what way would it depend on the Bulgarian?

Mr. HILL. I speak with entire impartiality, because I have no Bulgarian constituents.

Mr. WATKINS. What is your main group of aliens?

Mr. HILL. My district is largely American born of perhaps second or third generation.

Mr. WATKINS. Of what nationality?

Mr. HILL. I have a great many very desirable Irish.

Mr. WATKINS. Any Greeks?

Mr. HILL. There are a number of Russians but no Greeks; that is, not a considerable number. I have a lot of Bohemians. I myself am the father of three little Americans of Irish-Bohemian descent. There was a Bohemian settlement in Maryland which was started about the same time that New Amsterdam was started. A large quantity of land was granted, but it never developed very much. There was very little Bohemian immigration for over 100 years into Maryland. Now, we have in my district a very prosperous and very intelligent Bohemian community of several thousand people. A majority of them are second-generation people. Most of my constituents are really of the second generation. I have also a number of splendid Polish people, and also many of German descent.

Mr. WATKINS. Have you many southeastern Europeans?

Mr. HILL. There are many desirable Italians, but I do not think I have very many from southeast Europe.

Mr. RAKER. What do you mean by Bohemians?

Mr. HILL. Czechs.

Mr. RAKER. Czechs from what country?

Mr. HILL. The Czechs are from what was formerly the Kingdom of Bohemia.

Mr. RAKER. What are they? Bulgarians?

Mr. HILL. No.

Mr. RAKER. Do they come from Austria-Hungary?

Mr. HILL. They are not Austrians, but formerly were governed by Austria.

Mr. WATKINS. They are from that country.

Mr. VINCENT. They are from a Province of what used to be Austria-Hungary, of which Prague was the capital.

Mr. HILL. Prague is the capital. Bohemia was one of the original Christian bulwarks against the incursions of the Turks from the East.

Mr. RAKER. It could not have been Austria-Hungary because none of those people came to the United States until after 1861.

Mr. HILL. What was formerly Bohemia is now known as Czechoslovakia.

Mr. WATKINS. What kingdom and what king did they renounce when they assumed naturalization in this country?

Mr. HILL. At the present time it is a Republic.

Mr. WATKINS. At that time. Was their King Franz Josef?

Mr. HILL. It must have been.

Mr. WATKINS. Would you consider it a good or bad thing to suspend immigration entirely for a period of years, let us say 5 or 10 years?

Mr. HILL. No; I should be against that.

Mr. MCREYNOLDS. You stated it is better to have relatives than outsiders?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. MCREYNOLDS. I think your plan covers both.

Mr. HILL. I am advocating both.

Mr. MCREYNOLDS. Do you advocate lowering the percentage that this bill advocates?

Mr. HILL. I would much rather have unlimited relative immigration and absolutely shut down on the rest of the immigration.

Mr. WATKINS. What census would you prefer?

Mr. HILL. As far as relatives are concerned, you do not have any census because you have simply the question of determining whether it is a relative of an American citizen or not. In presenting this point of view it seems to me from my observation that it would be much better to shut out all unaffiliated claimants for immigration and give preference to the brothers and sisters and other relatives of existing American citizens, on the theory that they come into definite American relationship, while the others do not come into it so well. I might say this, that during the war I had opportunity to make a great many observations at first hand in reference to different types of Americans. My divisions took in New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. In New Jersey there were an enormous number of soldiers who came from the most diversified types. There were Italians, Greeks, and there were Germans, to a certain extent, that is, second generation Germans. There were Poles. The New Jersey regiments were regiments from nonoriginal stock Americans. With those people we found that when a new man came into the existing organization he got along very much better if he came from a community where they had been; that is, where they were recruited from, because he had friends to steer him straight. In other words, if the man who was not thoroughly Americanized came into an organization where a lot of his own sort of people were with him there, he quickly got the idea of the discipline of the organization.

Here are the exact figures and percentages of my district asked for by the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. WATKINS, which have been prepared by the Bureau of the Census at my special request:

Third Maryland district, 1920—Baltimore, wards 1–8, ward 22, and one-third of ward 18

	Number	Per cent distribution of total	Per cent distribution of foreign-born white
Total	229,083	100	
Native white	155,643	67.9	
Foreign-born white	42,910	18.7	100
Country of birth:			
Austria	1,404	.6	3.3
Canada	228	.1	.5
Czechoslovakia	2,336	1	5.4
Denmark	73	(1)	.2
England	768	.3	1.8
France	127	.1	.3
Germany	5,614	2.5	13.1
Greece	307	.1	.7
Hungary	218	.1	.5
Ireland	950	.4	2.2
Italy	4,925	2.1	11.5
Yugoslavia	81	(1)	.2
Lithuania	1,342	.6	3.1
Netherlands	54	(1)	.1
Norway	160	.1	.4
Poland	8,584	3.8	20
Rumania	224	.1	.5
Russia	14,769	6.4	34.4
Scotland	159	.1	.4
Sweden	150	.1	.3
Switzerland	77	(1)	.2
Wales	42	(1)	.1
West Indies [2]	41	(1)	.1
All other countries	277	.1	.6
Negro	30,351	13.2	
All other	179	.1	

[1] Less than one-tenth of 1 per cent.
[2] Except Porto Rico.

Third Maryland district, 1910—Baltimore, wards 1–8, ward 22, and one-third of ward 18

	Number	Per cent distribution of total	Per cent distribution of foreign-born white
Total	216,302	100	
Native white	143,655	66.4	
Foreign-born white	47,604	22.0	100
Country of birth:			
Austria	5,479	2.5	11.5
Canada	218	.1	.5
England	1,002	.5	2.1
France	93	(1)	.2
Germany	12,964	6.0	27.2
Greece	233	.1	.5
Hungary	329	.2	.7
Ireland	1,683	.8	3.5
Italy	3,832	1.8	8.0
Norway	121	.1	.3
Rumania	173	.1	.4
Russia	20,082	9.6	43.4
Scotland	164	.1	.3
Sweden	121	.1	.3
Switzerland	92	(1)	.2
All other countries	418	.2	.9
Negro	24,857	11.5	
All other	186	.1	

[1] Less than one-tenth of 1 per cent.

Third Maryland district—Baltimore, wards 1–8, ward 22, and one-third of ward 18

General nativity and parentage	Number		Per cent distribution of native white	
	1920	1910	1920	1910
Native white	155,643	143,655	100	100
Native parentage	87,671	76,955	56.3	53.6
Foreign or mixed parentage	67,972	66,700	43.7	46.4
Foreign parentage	53,898	(1)	34.6	(1)
Mixed parentage	14,074	(1)	9	(1)

[1] Not given separately by wards.

The present bill is only an emergency bill. It closes the front door to Europe and leaves open several back doors to Mexico. In many ways it is an improvement over existing law as to administration. We can not, however, adopt the 1890 census, and I shall vote against it. We must pass some emergency legislation and then take up the question of a permanent policy. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, section 10 of this bill provides that immigration quotas shall be based upon 2 per cent of the number of foreign-born individuals of each nationality resident in the United States as determined by the census of 1890. The gentlemen who are opposed to this bill call attention to the discrimination which results from thus using the census of 1890. Those gentlemen would take the census of 1910 and determine the number of foreign born as disclosed by that census. I am advised that one of my colleagues is going to propose an amendment basing quotas upon the foreign born as of 1920. All the plans, you see, take into account the foreign born and no one else.

The reason for this is perfectly clear. It is because this House in enacting the original quota law of 1921 made that mistake. It was carried into the law at that time and has been continued ever since. The point I want to emphasize in my few moments is the unwisdom and the unfairness of basing quotas only upon the foreign born. For my part I do not see why we should measure immigrants only by the foreign born in America. Why not pay some attention to the American born in America? [Applause.] Have you who are American born no say whatever in this thing? Must we always measure the future of our own country by the numbers of foreigners who are here? Is it true that the United States is already a collection of foreign colonies rather than a nation of native Americans?

In what I have just been saying I have been paraphrasing the substance of a speech made a fortnight ago by an authority on the immigration question, Henry H. Curran, commissioner of immigration at New York. I do not want to discriminate against the foreign born in this bill. I do not want to discriminate in favor of the foreign born and against the native sons of America. [Applause.] That is the whole ques-

tion, as I see it, gentlemen. The farther off we get into an elaborate discussion of whether we shall take foreign born as of 1890, of 1900, of 1910, or of 1920, the farther off, in my judgment, we get away from the fundamentals that ought to aid us in this question. We shall base quotas upon the whole body of persons resident in America, not upon the foreign born exclusively.

Senator REED of Pennsylvania made a speech in the Senate the other day that I think is well worth the careful consideration of every Member of this House. You will find it in the RECORD of April 3, which was Thursday of last week. You will note in the course of his speech a table which shows how this plan will work out. When the proper point is reached under the five-minute rule, if no member of the committee offers the substance of the Reed plan, I propose to offer it and urge its consideration and acceptance by the House.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Senator REED admitted to the Senate, did he not, that his plan worked out identically as the plan of 1890?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I reply to the gentleman from California that if you assume the result in the pending bill is a sound one and a wise one, you must also admit that that desirable result is reached by an undesirable route. A route that involves racial discrimination should be avoided. My suggestion is that the plan advocated by Senator REED and others would reach the desirable result by a desirable route.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am sorry, but unless the gentleman can spare me some time, I would rather not yield to him further. I want to read another sentence from Mr. Curran's speech of a fortnight ago. He says this:

> The first essential is to resolve our 100,000,000 of Americans into more of a national unit, and the best way to help this through immigration is to admit from each European country the same fraction of the annual total number of immigrants that the natives and descendants of that country already here bear to our present total of 100,000,000 of Americans.

That is to say, gentlemen, if there is in the whole body of the white American population 1 per cent of Portuguese stock, we will say that each year after this we will admit 1 per cent of Portuguese immigration into the United States.

In other words—

Says Curran—

> take us as we are to-day and then add each year in whatever amount Congress may decree, a European immigration installment that reflects in its national composite make-up exactly the national composite make-up of the American people as we all muster to-day. Let each year's immigration be an exact miniature of what we are as to stock, nation by nation, like to like.

And then mark this significant comment from an expert on the subject:

> I have talked with many people who oppose using the 1890 measure, but not one of them has dissented from the basis I have outlined.

Gentlemen, you can not dissent from this principle, because it is fair. It does not discriminate for anybody and it does not discriminate against anybody. This, in brief, is what it does: You and I decide and Congress decides how many immigrants we shall admit as a total in a given year. Senator REED of Pennsylvania proposes 300,000. I should propose, I think, about 250,000. I then allow a year for the elaborate and difficult racial calculation to be made and presented. I then propose that after July, 1925—or after July, 1926, if still more time is needed—the annual quota of each nationality shall bear the same ratio to the maximum total number of immigrants as the number of inhabitans of the United States having that national origin shall bear to the whole number of inhabitants. However, I leave out of account the descendants of the involuntary immigrants, mostly from Africa.

Gentlemen, I am a restrictionist. I am not trying to trick you by proposing an unworkable or fantastic substitute in the hope of defeating this bill. I am a sincere and practicing restrictionist of immigration. I have voted for the literacy test and for every restrictive measure that has come before the House in the last six or seven years. I believe in a very limited and very carefully selected immigration. I am not proposing this plan as a fraud on the Nation. I believe in it, I believe it is workable, and I believe the result attained, if adopted, will be to satisfy everybody who believes in fair play, who recognizes that the whole population of America in this fundamental matter is entitled to be considered.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In other words, the gentleman is for this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. For the bill modified by the Reed proposal.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Senator REED——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will admonish gentlemen that they must not discuss the proceedings in the Senate.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. If 250,000 is the number that should be taken, can the gentleman furnish us with a table showing the quota coming from each country?

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will refer the gentleman to page 5470 of the RECORD, which shows approximately how an immigration flow of 239,000 persons would be subdivided by nationalities. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend I print herewith the text of my proposed amendment, which follows very closely the language of the Reed amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts offered the following amendment:

"After July 1, 1925, the maximum total number of immigrants that shall be admitted into the United States in each fiscal year shall be 250,000. On or before April 1, 1925, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor shall, jointly, make an estimate showing as nearly as may be the several national origins of the persons who in 1920 comprised the whole population of continental United States, excepting the descendants of such persons as were involuntary immigrants into the territory now included therein. In the preparation of such estimate the said officers are authorized to call for information and expert assistance from the Bureau of the Census and to receive and utilize any information that may be available from other sources. After July 1, 1925, the annual quota of each nationality shall bear the same ratio to said maximum total number of immigrants as the number of inhabitants of the United States having that national origin shall bear to the whole number of inhabitants other than the descendants of involuntary immigrants. On or before April 1, 1925, said officials shall jointly proclaim and make known the quotas of each nationality, determined as aforesaid, and thereafter the said quotas shall continue with the same effect as if specifically stated herein and shall be subject to correction and readjustment only if it shall be made to appear to the satisfaction of said officials that an error of fact has occurred in said estimate or in said proclamation: *Provided, however*, That no person included in the provisions of section 4, subdivision (c), shall for the purposes of this section be regarded as subject to the quota herein established."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STENGLE].

Mr. STENGLE. Mr. Chairman, true Americanism demands that this Congress shall take a decided stand on the immigration question—a stand which shall be so positive in character that none can possibly say that we forgot our duty and legislated in terms of political expediency. [Applause.]

Coming as I do from the great city of New York, whose population is largely composed of foreign-born people, I can well understand how politically unpopular I shall be when I cast my vote in favor of either a decidedly restrictive or absolutely prohibitive immigration measure. And yet, colleagues, when I think of the dangers which beset us should we continue to open our doors to all comers, regardless of their physical, mental, and moral fiber, I know of no other way by which I can honestly represent my constituency than to cast my lot among those who give preference to America. [Applause.]

You and I should be vitally interested in fostering patriotism and in perpetuating the principles for which our forefathers fought, and we should thoroughly realize that one of the greatest menaces to the proper development of our cherished ideals lies in the invasion of our country by that class of foreign immigrants who have no conception of nor interest in those ideals and principles for which we stand but have been taught and trained in antagonistic principles for many generations in the countries of their nativity. Moreover, we find many of the present-day immigrants engaging in propaganda that is striking directly at the roots of our most cherished social and political institutions. Knowing this to be true, it is our duty to employ our best efforts toward the passage of an immigration law which will stem the tide of undesirable aliens who have been for a number of years past flooding our country.

Immigration which touches an integral part of our national existence; immigration, which is not a little responsible for the upbuilding of our great Republic, might have reasonably been expected to have received every possible consideration at our

hands, but the records show that instead of formulating a constructive policy for its systematic absorption we have, through lack of vision, allowed it to flounder among uncharted rocks in perilous seas.

The very fact that this country freed itself from all foreign entanglements, declaring its independence, proves very clearly that the United States of America was from its very inception destined to be the one Nation in the world free from the dominating and contumacious influences of the ever narrow and greedy European rulers or those who would seek to propagate their doctrines.

America is to-day suffering from racial indigestion. This fact is nowhere more evident than in our large seaboard cities, where we no longer find a society of common spirit, feeling, and race, bound together by language, custom, tradition, and civilization with a sense of unity and distinctness, but rather many colonies of many tongues with ideals far apart.

Prior to the Revolutionary War America received the cream of Old World people, though she also got some of the skimmed milk in the form of criminals and paupers. During that period there were bonds of a common sympathy and common customs born of the struggle for livelihood in a new country. But in the last quarter of the last century began the deluge of immigrants—the oppressed and fortune hunters of the earth. Since then the flood has never ceased. We are told that aliens admitted to the United States are supporting and reading more than 1,000 journals printed in more than 30 foreign languages. That in a single block in New York 18 different languages are spoken, and one public school in that city has pupils of 26 nationalities.

The worst anarchistic outbreaks, the most destructive strikes, have occurred where radical foreign population is involved.

The tendency of the immigrants of this country is to dwell in isolated groups, clinging to their native language and customs. The fire has apparently gone out under the melting pot and the original American stock is not absorbing these insoluble alien elements. In fact, as the foreign groups become more numerous and conscious of their growing power, citizens of the American strain are alarmed at the possibilities in organized alien minorities, for a State composed of groups that do not amalgamate into a people is in danger.

What shall be the solution of this grave problem? Where does duty direct us, the lawmakers of the Nation, in a crisis like this? Shall we stop to quibble about percentages and quotas and the relativity of nationalities permitted to enter our ports or had we not better "close the gates" for awhile and await the assimilation of those already here?

I, for one, honestly believe that the time has arrived when America should take an "immigration vacation" for at least two or three years and use every power and influence at her command to thoroughly assimilate those we already have among us from other shores. This is not discrimination, but rather a desire to bring about successful and speedy digestion.

You, who here represent districts far removed from either eastern or western seaboards, can scarcely realize your full duty in this matter, but we who come from those sections which are alive with the seething masses of peoples from almost every country on the globe, we who come into daily contact with these unassimilated elements of discord and strife, we who daily rub elbows with those who frequently preach sedition rather than absorb true American patriotism, have a duty to perform which can not be brushed aside by a plea of ignorance.

The question before this House is not "What shall we do to please some foreign country?" Ours is to legislate for America's welfare. Ours is to decide whether we intend to continue to permit America to become the dumping ground of the world or to here and now announce that we have had enough until such time as those who have arrived on our shores shall thoroughly understand and appreciate our institutions and respect Old Glory and what it typifies just as much as we do.

Speakers on this floor within the last few days have sought to emphasize that America was and should always be "an asylum for the distressed from every land." That is a beautiful sentiment and one worthy of consideration and support, but not before those who seek entrance under such classification shall first show beyond peradventure that they are willing and anxious to render whole-souled allegiance to our flag and undisputed obedience to our laws. These things, in my humble opinion, can not be correctly established by a system of quotas nor upon a basis of any particular year, but could best be arrived at by an honest selective immigration act—selective as to character, mentality, physical well-being, and willingness to serve our country and preserve her integrity just as faithfully as any native son would do. To some this may appear to be a Utopian dream of an impractical idealist, but, gentlemen, if America is to continue to be the leader of civilization some such plan as this will have to be evolved, and until such an evolution has taken place it behooves us to steer the great ship of state on an even keel and to permit no passengers on her decks who are unwilling to follow the course laid down by our forefathers.

I am no particular stickler for the 2 per cent of 1890 basis, but if that is to be changed to 1910 I strongly favor a 1 per cent quota or less. The only argument thus far made against the basis mentioned in this bill is that it is discriminatory. I am not ready to concede that point, but if those who argue in this direction are absolutely speaking in good faith let them accept the 1 per cent of 1910 or admit with true frankness that their arguments are specious and only intended to becloud the real issue before us.

Mr. Chairman, we hear much on this floor about our great American Constitution, and those whose names appear beneath that sacred document are held in loving remembrance by every true American. Every statute written for the guidance of this Republic is founded upon the doctrines of that organic instrument. We find therein the hopes and aspirations of a free people, the sacred guaranties of our liberties, as well as the protection of our homes and firesides. And yet right here in this country there are those to-day who would make of our magna charta a mere scrap of paper, notwithstanding the fact that we welcomed them to our shores in their hour of distress and need. Do you wonder, then, that many of us hesitate when we are asked to continue a liberal policy of free admission to our fair land?

It has been claimed on this floor that restriction of immigration according to the plans laid down in the bill before us is an insult to certain nationals—a reflection upon certain countries. Gentlemen, that claim is extremely illogical. I might invite into my home any man or men of my acquaintance and accord them the most cordial treatment. Must that be taken as a guaranty that the same welcome shall be accorded to all of their relatives, neighbors, and friends without first meeting with my approval and securing my invitation? And must the fact that I have not invited them or approved of their admission into my home be taken as an open insult by those who are already my guests? Suppose a young man, hale and hearty, were to woo and wed a young lady, bright and beautiful, and after the wedding breakfast took his prize to a home which he had prepared for her. Then suppose a few days later that the bride's father, mother, sisters, and brothers were to drive up to the newly weds' love nest, bringing with them all of their earthly belongings, and attempt to move in and become a part of the household. Imagine, if you can, what the bridegroom would think or say should his bride insist that if he refused to admit the entire family he was discriminating against her race and insulting her entire nationality.

There would be just about as much logic in that bride's position as there is in the arguments of those gentlemen who claim that to shut America's door against anybody is both insulting and discriminating. Nonsense. You and I know that such arguments are intended only to stir up strife and create animosities.

We are face to face with conditions, gentlemen, and not idle theories. Either America is to be ruled by Americans or it is to become the stamping ground of cheap labor, alienism, internationalism, and hyphenism, which are at strong variance with our American institutions and the national spirit, and which are to be brought to our shores by greedy steamship companies for the sole purpose of creating inflated dividends for their selfish stockholders. I for one refuse to be a party to any such plan. If this means political extinction for me, I shall gladly return to the shades of private life and, thank God, take a clear conscience with me.

Mr. Chairman, an emergency of a very serious nature confronts America and will continue to confront this Nation until we intelligently solve the immigration question. There is no need of fooling ourselves about this matter. We have either got to restrict and restrict hard, or close our gates entirely, if we would preserve our Republic. Those who attempt to continue an "open-door" policy are either greatly misinformed or suffering from a badly twisted brand of Americanism. For years past we have deluded ourselves with the thought that America was a great "melting pot" into which people of every country and character could be assembled and from which there would pour forth a vast army of thoroughgoing naturalized American citizens. What has been the result?

A visit to any of our seaboard cities will convince the greatest doubter among us that we have been having a splendid

dream followed by a terrible nightmare. Instead of compact cities, we find municipalities made up of foreign colonies, reading foreign papers, speaking foreign languages, and fostering foreign ideals. Indeed, many of the inhabitants of these cities appear to be tied up to foreign countries by their sympathies, customs, interests, and aspirations, and apparently but little interested in the future welfare of their adopted country. Thousands of them do not think enough of America to even take out first papers of citizenship, and are content to enjoy our hospitality without entering into any of our Americanizing activities.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in fostering friendship with all nations. I believe in bestowing charity upon the suffering and hungry everywhere. I believe in extending the strong arm of help to the fallen of every clime. But I certainly do not believe in destroying our own home in order to furnish the timbers for the erection of a domicile for those who seem to delight in chasing every "ism" of the world except true and unadulterated Americanism. Antagonisms of thought have never yet bred unity of spirit.

This is not a fight to punish a man because he happens to have been born in southern or eastern Europe. Far from it. If that were the only question before this House, an honest solution could be easily arrived at, but what we are here and now trying to do is to protect America and prevent her dissolution; to magnify true patriotism by reminding those already here that America is for Americans first; to prevent by statute the overflowing of our borders by those who seem not to understand our ideals or appreciate our aspirations; to hesitate long enough to allow those already among us to become assimilated if assimilation is possible; and last, but by no means least, to preserve our inherited birthright of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Chairman, my position in this matter is unalterably fixed. I stand first and foremost for the absolute closing of our gates for a period of from two to five years, in order that time may be had for the proper adjustment of national affairs along immigration lines; if I can not get that, then I stand for an immigration law based upon 1 per cent of the census of 1910 or 2 per cent of the census of 1890.

In all events, I stand firmly for America and her welfare first, regardless of the likes or dislikes of any other nation or any political effect my vote may have upon my future activities in life. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN].

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia makes the point that no quorum is present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty Members present, a quorum.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that I propose to discuss this question from a different angle from which it has yet been approached I desire not to be interrupted by either friend or foe. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, some years ago when this House was considering a restrictive immigration measure I had occasion to rise in my place and to ask my auditors, "What is immigration?" It occurs to me to-day in opening what I may have to say on this measure that I ought to repeat the question.

We all know that movement is the law of life; the running rivers refresh and fertilize the world; the constant flow and ebb of the tides keep the ocean from stagnation and the earth from death; and above and beyond the circling spheres in their ordered march around the center of our system—itself in flight through space round vaster systems—control, maintain, and direct the movement and motion of our sphere, which is life. [Applause.]

The sun draws from the deep the rains it scatters over hill and dale to feed the rivers, supply the springs, and renew the seas; the earth moves the moon, which is the mother of the tides; and so all the forces of God and nature, from the green things growing in our yard even to the outermost rim of limitless space, unite to compel this universal movement, which is, I repeat, life. [Applause.]

Man—the races and nations, the tribes, and the clans—is subject to this universal law; it has been so since the beginning of recorded time; and this human movement, mark you, is immigration. The race has ever been on the move. Movement, eternal movement, the ceaseless marching of the peoples, the constant waste and restoration that eliminated the weak and made the strong, that selected the brawn and developed the brain, that gave us the splendid thing we call civilization, that plowed and cultivated the fields from whose soil have sprung religion and culture, law and letters, trade and commerce, and the freedom, peace, happiness, and order that are ours to-day.

Under the providence of God and the inspiration of a great soul America was discovered and given to the world, and the human waters left over from the war and waste of the centuries and bidding fair to stagnate, stale, and putrefy in a Europe dammed by a mighty ocean from its instinct to move on began to flow across the sea to fill and fructify America and build up the America of to-day. [Applause.]

In my judgment that constant addition of new men and new blood to the Republic is as necessary for the health and refreshment, the expansion and continuance of civilization and all it means to-day as always, and that is why I take my place here and now in fervent opposition to the bill which the House has before it for consideration.

This bill differs from all the others which have preceded it in a material way, because it puts the stigma of inferiority upon many self-respecting Americans, who will mentally revolt against such an indictment.

Now, I have no quarrel with those who seek to exclude the unworthy, but you must admit that no one race of people can be said to possess all the virtues or all the vices of mankind. Good men are to be found among the humblest as well as among the highest; among the Semites as well as among the Anglo-Saxons; among the Latins as well as the Nordics—by the way, the latter a new designation, the exact meaning of which no one knows. Probably it is one of the evil legacies of the late war. You know that during the struggle we had the fancy to denounce Germany for advancing the idea of the "superman" and "supernation." Now, that doctrine of superiority which was originally sponsored in this country by the Ku-Klux Klan seems to have found an expression in this proposed legislation. The doctrine of Nordic superiority is, in my judgment, but an extension of the German doctrine of "supernation" which we denounced so bitterly.

Now, what is a Nordic? For a good many years men who pretended to be students of the human race have insisted that everything good in civilization came from the light-haired, long-headed race that swept down from the north of Europe and looted and ravished the more-cultured peoples of the south.

There is little doubt but that the great, light, northern race had a tremendous and beneficent influence upon civilization; the industrial arts were developed by this people. But it is in Germany that the Nordic influence can be traced. Poor England's Nordic claim is a borrowed one. England was successfully invaded by other races. If one or more happened to be "Nordic," it only proves that the English could not defeat the Nordic invaders any more than it defeated the Normans. But England claims to be the center of Nordic civilization.

So England's propagandists dig into history and take oath that centuries ago the Nordics were the only people and that these Nordics were the great-great-grandpas of modern Englishmen of the better class, and, likewise, the ancestors of every American who is identified with the Ku-Klux Klan. "We must keep civilization safe for Nordics," says the English propagandists, and the corpse of the Loyal Coalition in the city of Boston lifts itself from its bankrupt grave to respond, "Indeed, we must!" [Laughter.]

And so the Nordic hysteria continues!

A Nordic criminal, a Nordic agitator, is a safe investment for America, the English tell us, while a peaceful, honest, hard-working Slav is a menace. If a majority of the National Congress agrees with the English, the Johnson immigration bill will be enacted.

I read what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL] said the other day on this immigration question. His speech was long, interesting, but not always accurate. For instance, when he talked about our jails being filled with "scum of the other world," he would lead you to believe that all the crimes in America are committed by the immigrant or the son of the immigrant. Now, I want to admit and agree that we have the highest murder rate of any civilized country in the world. At least so affirms Dr. Frederic L. Hoffman, who is said to be the only man in America who keeps continuous statistics of crime in the United States and speaks with authority. His figure of 10,000 murders in the year 1923 must be faced. But listen, men of America, to one of his most startling statements! The city of Memphis, Tenn., possessing the lowest foreign population of any city in this country, had the highest murder record for years. Memphis has a population of 175,000 souls and in the last year there were 113 murders.

But Doctor Hoffman continues, and he is not discussing immigration in the speech to which I refer, by the way, and says that in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, where the immigration population is abundant and cosmopolitan, the murder rates are relatively low when local conditions are borne in mind. Is there a man in this House who ever dreamed that such a murder rate as existed in Memphis last year could possibly exist in a city which boasts it has few, if any, immigrants among its people? I do not speak offensively, but simply to give the House information which has just come under my observation.

Of course, it is true that many immigrants do not absorb the spirit of American democracy as we understand it, yet their children and grandchildren become oftentimes better and more loyal Americans than those whose ancestors came over on the *Mayflower*, or soon thereafter. Let us not forget that history writes in large letters that the beginning of the decline and decadence of a nation starts when the bars are set against alien blood, and a doctrine of "self-centered complacency" is established. I can not too strongly emphasize that I most heartily agree with all of those who say that the physically unfit, the mental incompetents, and those of extremely radical minds must be kept out of this Republic. Yet I believe that this country is so large that there is still plenty of room for all kinds of good people. [Applause.]

Whatever policy is to be pursued with reference to immigration, be it 3 per cent, 2 per cent, or even less, it should be one that would fairly and equitably affect the American people as they are to-day. Our civilization here is a civilization of fusion to which every nation from every corner of the earth has given its share. The immigrants of yesterday helped to make the America of to-day, and the foreign tongue and the strange garb of the newcomer is only the outward shell of a spirit that loves liberty, that loves America, law, and order, and work. The attitude toward immigration on the part of many seems to be predicated on religious and racial antipathies—again a terrible legacy of the Great War.

I am advised that the political machine which controls legislation in this body has decided that this bill shall pass. Therefore I make an appeal to some of my good friends on the Democratic side of the House who hitherto have stood shoulder to shoulder with the Republican restrictionists; and what I say to my colleagues over here I say in all kindliness. You seem to forget that only the other day your ancestors were alien—the sons of England and France, Ireland and Scotland, Germany, Italy, Poland, Russia, and other lands. Though that stream of fresh and revivifying blood has ceased to flow into the South, it still continues to renew the energies and courage of the North as ever. You all know why it was deflected from the South; it would not seek competition with slave labor, for the aliens in these early days represented the most adventurous and courageous sons of Europe; and when slavery ceased the alien stream still refused to change its course.

Again—and I speak in the most friendly spirit—there is a singular and inexplicable prejudice in most of the Southern States against the immigrant, presumably because you do not get him and you do not know him; yet the fact remains that his energy, courage, fidelity, and brains have made the regions wherein he has cast his fortune blossom like the rose. He has come by the millions into the North. 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.

Do not forget that in every crisis of our country's history these alien classes have stood loyally by the Republic that gave them asylum and home. Let us continue to make this country one for progress and humanity. Let us enjoy the benefits from the good that can come to us from other lands. Let us blaze forth the beacon of liberty and justice, and let us use that foresight which seems to be sadly lacking in many of us who are known as "politicians" and those who cater to the "interests."

Emphatically and pronouncedly I am opposed to this bill and shall so vote. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ROSENBLOOM].

Mr. ROSENBLOOM. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Congress, I have given careful thought and attention to the bill which is before us to-day. I have been struggling with conflicting sentiments and emotions, divided between sympathy for the unfortunate of all lands and a feeling of devotion for the interests of our country and its future security and prosperity. Many of the gentlemen here are undoubtedly actuated by similar feelings, for the result of our actions will not only influence the lives of many people now living but as well generations yet unborn.

To legislate intelligently for the future it is necessary to revert to the experience of the past. In the days of early settlement and development of our country those who were fearless and brave enough to come here represented the best and bravest of the stock of the countries from which they came. During the course of continued and uninterrupted development and prosperity of these United States we continued to bid welcome and invite the brave and well intentioned of every land to seek the opportunities and the equalities that we made fundamental in the structure of this Republic. We offered a haven of refuge for the persecuted, the oppressed, and the heavily burdened peoples of all the earth, insured their equality with all of us, and gave them opportunity to advance their own fortune and contribute their individual mites toward the creation and maintenance of the greatest nation of all time. And, gentlemen, it matters not whether this or that particular pilgrim was carried to these shores on the *Santa Maria*, the *Mayflower*, or the *Oceanic*, or whether he landed at Santo Domingo, at Plymouth Rock, or Ellis Island, the basic fact remains that at some time every man, woman, and child in this country eligible to citizenship, or their ancestors, came from somewhere across the water and landed somewhere on these shores.

I say to you that it was the best stock of the lands from which they came, and I do not say this boastingly. I say it advisedly and deliberately, for the reason that it was not the titled aristocracy, nor he who had all of the world's goods that he needed, nor yet was it he who was worthless who came. It was the great middle class, those who were willing to face the hardships, to take up the task of fighting the wilderness and providing a place for themselves and their children in a new and strange land in order that they might have opportunities, liberties, and privileges for themselves and their posterity, which had been denied them in the lands of their birth.

I am orthodox in a great many beliefs and opinions, but am a believer in what I consider a truth, that a Divine Providence guides all humanity. It is my belief that there is a Great Power, all seeing and all wise, that kept from mankind a knowledge of the New World until that portion which we know as the Old World had been brought to the acceptance of the idea of the fatherhood of God by man. That He reserved from the knowledge of humanity a new land, richer, greater than any other, where He should teach the second great lesson, the brotherhood of man. In my humble opinion, that is the function, that is the purpose, of this country of ours.

I believe further that it was a divine inspiration that guided the mind and hand of the creator of the emblem of our country. Why the idea of a grand galaxy of stars in Old Glory if not to typify to the world a land where the brotherhood of man should be realized? As we gaze at that emblem you see a star for he who, or whose ancestors, came from Poland, a star for him from Russia, England, France, Germany, Belgium, Italy—a star for every nation on the face of the earth. Can any of you say which of the stars of the flag shines brightest upon the history of our country, on our advancement or our civilization, or on our struggles?

I can not agree with those who undertake to say that there is a difference among those of us who constitute the citizenship of this country. It is true there are some among us, unfortunately, who go about among their fellow men and who for personal profit or selfish advantage endeavor to array man against man and brother against brother. They point out a seeming religious or racial difference and try to stir up strife and hatred in the hearts of men. Should you be approached, gentlemen, and asked to lend your cooperation for the spread of bigotry or religious intolerance, in all sincerity I ask you to consider before you agree. Whether you are invited beneath the hooded cloak of a secret organization, in the darkness of the night, whether in the columns of a political paper or in the columns of the privately owned paper of some multimillionaire to become an accomplice in stirring up strife and hatred, ask your questioner to take you by the hand to any of the battle fields of the world where men have given up their lives for liberty and freedom, and to open the graves of those who lie there, to remove from those graves the ashes of the heroes who paid with their all for a common liberty; bid them lay the ashes side by side and then point out to you the Methodist, the Protestant, the Catholic, the Jew, the negro, or the white man—the Italian, the Englishman, the Frenchman, or the Russian. When this is done successfully, then I will agree that there is a difference, and that all men are not brothers.

When the call for troops to defend our flag, and when in answer to the call of duty there assembled defenders from everywhere, we stood on the sidewalks to bid farewell, and watched them march away. As they left your city, did anyone stand at your side and point out to you a Protestant, Catholic, Jew, or Negro. Rather, did we not all join in a great hurrah for the American soldier who was going into battle to fight for his country and for the liberty and freedom of us all. On the battle field when a shell exploded, or when a machine gun found its mark, did it pass harmlessly over the head of the Methodist or Catholic or Jew—did it leave unscathed the negro or the white man?

Or did it not exact its toll among men, and not those of any particular race or creed. All standing together in defense and in protection of the Stars and Stripes. "In my Father's house there are many mansions," and there assemble our heroes—one for the Catholic, one for the Protestant, one for the Jew—one for those of every faith to the knowledge of man. A mansion prepared and waiting for him who had lived according to the light as God had given him to see.

The body politic, however, is not unlike the human body. We are taught that germs of all diseases lie in the human system, and we are dependent upon the power of the system to generate enough combative force to destroy those germs. It would be idle and foolish to take medicine for ills that might attack the system before there were any symptoms of contagion, such diseases as scarlet fever, pneumonia, and so on, particularly as long as the body was in full health and vigor. But when symptoms develop which threaten the health and perhaps the life of the body, it is advisable to take medicine, it is advisable to take treatment, it is advisable to forego eating certain things, and it is foolhardy to put more into the system than it is able to digest. It is here that I find justification for restricted immigration, and although I would prefer that the percentages be based on the actual population at this time, yet I am so firmly convinced that we need some preventative method to prevent a national indigestion at this time, that I shall support such bill as will be agreed upon by this body. It is my firm conviction that were everyone in this country a citizen, were everyone familiar with our country and its institutions, it would be unnecessary to enact this legislation. When those who have but recently come among us realize that there is unlimited opportunity for them and their posterity—that the workman's son of yesterday, or the workman, himself, is the captain of industry to-day, or that he or his posterity will be the captains of industry and the men in high positions of the Government to-morrow—there would be no danger of him assisting in any way to change this Government or the institutions of government which makes these opportunities possible.

There can be no danger from them when they are brought to realize that they are part and parcel of a land where no man is born to his station in life; when he realizes that his son may become President of the country in which he lives; that he can attain to the highest offices in our Government and in finance; that unlike the land from which he came he realizes that the circumstances of his birth will not retard his progress; that none can command his service by reason of a supposed superior birth; that he will not be destined to follow the footsteps of his father, should he decide otherwise; that he is living in a land where all men are kings and all women are queens.

But until he does realize this there is danger that he may listen to those who are guided by evil design and intention, and lend his assistance in tearing down that which has been built up by careful and patient toil and sacrifice. With the poverty and dissatisfaction prevailing throughout the rest of the world at this time as an aftermath of the war, to permit them to come here without restriction, carrying this bitterness of heart and mingling with those of our citizens who are not entirely familiar with our country and its institutions, a poison may be spread to such an extent as to injure this Government, and in my opinion we must restrict the entrance of large groups at this time for the future welfare not only of our country but of all the peoples of the world.

This problem is not a new one nor is it peculiar to this country or to this age. The problems of a nation never change—they only change in the degree of importance. The more important problems before us to-day, those clamoring the loudest for immediate consideration, are the same as have confronted men during the time of recorded history—respect for law, taxation, governmental expenditures, immigration. There are, of course, many others. That these questions would become important during the Sixty-seventh and Sixty-eighth Congresses I realized when I first announced as a candidate for office in 1920. In order that the people of the district which I represent would know my views on these matters, I presented to them in my announcement for office a statement which I made while a member of the senate of West Virginia at the close of the session of 1917, when, in accord with the custom that has prevailed there, I was presented with the flag of our country which had draped the rostrum of the president. In reply I made the following statement:

> It has been my endeavor during the time I have had the opportunity of casting a vote in this body on behalf of the people of the first district to cast it in accordance with their desires and for the protection of their interests, as I have always appreciated that the only manner in which we can express our gratitude to those who made such grand opportunity accessible to myself and my people is by preserving for posterity those inestimable rights and privileges which came to us by reason of the sacrifice of those who established this land and this flag.
>
> I have never known any other flag. I shall never know any other flag, but shall always endeavor to keep it flying with the message that it carries to all those unfortunates of other lands, that here they can come and live in equality and with an opportunity that has heretofore been unknown in the history of the world, and that though their way be hard and their grief unallayed that beneath the folds of this emblem shall they find peace and opportunity.
>
> It has been a privilege that will never be forgotten by myself to have had this opportunity to appear here and speak for the people of my district, and I shall at all times keep before me as the beacon toward which I shall travel the fact that only by our preservation for those who come after us and those worthy unfortunates who come from other lands that which our ancestors found when they cast their lot with the fortunates of this emblem can we in any way reward those whose sacrifices have made this opportunity possible.

While it may be charged that my action in voting for this measure is contradictory to the statement quoted, I do not agree. I believe it is necessary in order that a beacon shall be preserved on the face of this earth, a place be preserved where liberty and freedom shall remain, and where opportunities shall be equal to all; that it is necessary, until the world has adjusted itself to present-day conditions, to preserve at least one place where those living to-day and those to come hereafter shall find those opportunities that we and our ancestors found.

It is whispered about in the cloakrooms and on the streets and has been the subject of newspaper articles that the basis for this legislation is religious prejudice, and it may be true that there are some who are advocating and supporting this measure with that object in mind. I believe their number is negligible. From my personal acquaintance with the Members of this House I know that were there no other basis except religious prejudice the bill would not be considered. From my knowledge and association with the membership of this body I know that prejudice against a particular creed or race is not the underlying cause for the consideration of this bill. It would not become me to vote for a bill which sought to discriminate against any religion or creed.

And I want it further understood that the men whose respect I desire to have and to hold are men whose faith is the same as my own. A man whose faith differs from that which is mine has subscribed himself to the theory that only by abandoning the faith of his fathers can he be saved in the world to come; when he does so he acknowledges his approval of a teaching that those who did not do as he has done are eternally lost. He further agrees that those whom he holds near and dear will forever be lost to him; that he will know them no more; that when those who are near and dear to him have departed this life they shall never meet again; that is why I say that I believe that we men are all of the same faith. The faith that is mine has come to me through the centuries.

In order that it reach me it was necessary for my ancestors to undergo centuries of persecution. They lived huddled in the ghettoes of the various cities of the world. They wore black robes with a yellow circle on their breast; they were not allowed to cut their hair. When they passed a place of worship different from their own they must do so on their hands and knees, and those of other faiths could slay seven of them without committing an offense; that in the fifteenth century in Spain my ancestors were placed on ships without sails, without food, and cast adrift into the ocean; all they needed to do to avoid all this was to say they "believed when they did not." They preferred to pay the price in order to maintain a principle in which they believed—"the right to worship God as they saw fit." It is true many of them faltered and secured peace by the surrender of their principles; it may be that the descendants of some of those who so surrendered are Members

of this body, but I know that my ancestors did not so surrender; that they preferred to pay the price that was asked of them in order to preserve the principle in which they believed.

The price I have paid to maintain that principle is as naught as compared with the price paid by those heroes, and yet I paid and still pay it gladly for the privilege that is mine. As a child at play I was called "Sheenie." I did not understand, but in a few years when those with whom I played and loved would shout this at me and I would rush home to my mother with broken heart. All pain would cease when she would stop her work and nestle me close to her bosom, would tell me not to mind, they were "just bad boys." I was paying the price. When as a youth I attended college and played on the West Virginia varsity football team my manners were good; I behaved as a gentleman, yet I was not invited to the social functions or to join the fraternities, though they fought for athletic members. I was paying the price. When as a man I chose my profession and the city in which to erect my permanent structure certain social clubs and circles were closed to me. Personally, we could mingle, but not as members. I am paying the price.

Whether this faith is right or wrong I do not know, nor can anyone say, but it has been maintained and has come to me in this way, and I say to those of you whose friendship and trust I desire to have and retain that our faith is the same—*it is the faith in our mothers.* To you who criticize me for that faith if you would have me change it I will tell you how. Go you to the city of my birth, to the outskirts thereof; there in her little home you will find a sweet-faced, gray-haired mother angel, surrounded by her children. Teach her to worship Jesus as her Saviour, I will press the cross to my lips; teach her to worship Mohammed, I will say "Allah be praised"; teach her to worship a graven image, and I will be found on my knees at her side.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS].

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I would be very glad to hear the gentleman from Tennessee, but before that I would like to ascertain if there is a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make a point of no quorum?

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. If necessary to find out that way, I will.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. LARSEN of Georgia. I withdraw the point, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. One hundred and sixteen gentlemen present, a quorum.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen [applause] the enactment and enforcement of proper immigration laws for the protection of this Republic are at present the most serious propositions which we have to consider. It is far-reaching, not only for the protection and preservation of the rights and liberties which we now enjoy but for future generations.

In 1820 the Government began to count the number of immigrants who landed in this country, but not until 1882 was any legislation passed seeking to control or limit immigration. The Chinese exclusion act was passed in this year; and also an exclusion of fanatics, lunatics, idiots, persons likely to become a public charge.

The next step was the passport agreement with Japan, which became effective in 1908. Various amendments were passed in reference to qualifications of immigrants in 1889, 1893, 1903; and in 1917 the Burnett Act was passed, which is now known as the immigration act of this country. This act deals with the mental, moral, physical, and educational condition of the immigrant who seeks admission.

In May, 1921, the 3 per cent immigration act was passed, which placed this quota on the census of 1910 of the number of foreign born of each nationality in this country at that time. The law expired by limitation June 30, 1922, by the act of May 11, 1922, its life was extended to June 30, 1924, and it is under this act that we are now operating. You can readily see that some legislation must be had prior to June 30 of this year; and if this is not done, it is said that millions are waiting on foreign shores looking in across the expiring date and ready to flood our shores. If such a thing were to occur, it would be a blow at the vitals of our institutions and Government.

Under the quota system of 3 per cent there were admitted into this country in 1923, 335,480; under the quota system as we are now proposing in this bill there will only be admitted into this country under the quota during next year 161,184. From June, 1913, to June, 1914, prior to the great World War, 1,218,480 immigrants came to this country, and out of this number 75.6 per cent came from south and eastern Europe; from June, 1920, to June, 1921, after the war was over, 805,228 immigrants came to America, and 66.7 per cent of said number were from south and eastern Europe. They were rapidly approaching the pre-war proportions until the present law was enacted.

It is said that in 1923, 3,000,000 people were ready to come to America if our doors had been open; that 150,000 Greeks alone were clamoring for admission.

With this great influx of people from foreign countries, was it not necessary, and is it not still necessary, that we place the strongest kind of restriction and selection upon our immigrants? The census of 1920 shows that there were nearly 14,000,000 of foreign birth in the United States. Statistics show that of all males over 21 years of age in the United States 22.1 per cent are of foreign birth, which is over one-fifth of the total. Of course, much higher percentages are reported in certain sections of the country. In the Western Atlantic States—New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania—35.4 per cent of the male population 21 years of age and over is foreign born. In the New England States, 38.2 per cent; in Massachusetts, 41.9 per cent; in Boston, 46.3 per cent; and in New York City, 53.4 per cent. And it is further estimated that 80 per cent of the population in New York City is either foreign born or of foreign parentage. Is not this condition alarming, when such a great proportion of the voting strength of this country is in the hands of foreign born? Can you imagine a more threatening condition to our institutions and our laws than to pick up foreigners by the thousands coming from Europe, with different environments, different teachings, different ideals and ideas of the form of government, and allow them to come to this country and, in the course of five years—as our naturalization laws now provide—be given the rights of citizenship and the right to vote and exercise the same privileges which we exercise? To my mind this is the most dangerous condition which can exist in our country, and it means the absolute destruction of our form of government and our institutions if not stopped.

Suppose we concede, for the sake of argument, that those who come are as intelligent as we are; as moral as we are; as law-abiding as we are; but coming as they do, with different environments, different ideas of government, different social relations and ideals, they will hold on to their ideals, spreading their doctrines in this country and undertaking to force the same upon us. They have never drawn the breath of freedom; they have never lived under a republic, and it is the history of most Latin countries that a republic can not prevail, that they live greatly in revolution and fomentation. Any judge can constitute an alien an American citizen, but it takes a change of heart and mind to make an American. Mr. Speranzo, a well-known writer of foreign descent, in an article not long ago, said that an immigrant might be a good worker and a good citizen in his own country by intuition but not necessarily able to become a good American.

One of the greatest menaces is the large number of newspapers published in this country in foreign languages. There are over 1,500 of such papers published in the United States and published in more than 30 different languages from Yiddish to Arabic. The constant use of the native language of itself has a tendency to prevent the amalgamation of and Americanization of foreigners, and furthermore there was proof before your committee that many of these papers are disloyal to this Government, teaching loyalty to the government from which they come. In a single block in New York City it is said that 18 languages are spoken. In fact, this great city was referred to by one of foreign birth before your committee in the House as the greatest foreign city in the world.

Under these conditions, and various other reasons, is it and should it not be apparent to every good American citizen who will consider this proposition from an unbiased and nonprejudiced standpoint that, for the welfare of this Republic and for the maintenance of our institutions, we have select and restricted immigration laws? Personally, I have felt that the conditions of this country are such as to justify even suspension of all immigration, except certain relationship, for a period of some four or five years. I think this would be justifiable, not only from the conditions existing in this country—because there is no social or economic condition which will justify

immigration—but from conditions which exist in the countries from which these people come. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. If we are strong enough in votes, we can write that into the bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. How can you justify the admission into the United States of any number of Mexicans with their wives and minor children?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. If you will give me time, I will answer you.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have no time to give.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Then what are you asking the question for? The gentleman knows that I have no time to reply to him, and he thinks he might ask something that might get somebody to vote against the bill.

President Coolidge, in his message at the opening session of the Sixty-eighth Congress, said:

American institutions rest solely on good citizenship. They were created by people who had a background of self-government. New arrivals should be limited to our capacity to absorb them into the ranks of good citizenship. America must be kept American.

For this purpose it is necessary to continue a policy of restricted immigration. It would be well to make such immigration of a selective nature with some inspection at the source and based either on a prior census or upon the record of naturalization. Either method would insure the admission of those with the largest capacity and best intention of becoming citizens.

I am convinced that our present economic and social conditions warrant a limitation of those to be admitted. We should find additional safety in a law requiring the immediate registration of all aliens. Those who do not want to be partakers of the American spirit ought not to settle in America.

On March 12, 1924, there appeared in the Washington Post, an administration paper, an editorial headed "Speed Immigration Legislation." This editorial indorses the present bill under discussion and, among other things, said:

In the earlier years of the Republic immigration was not at a rate that negatived absorption, and most of those who entered did so with intent and purpose to make themselves Americans, to attain the American viewpoint and to adopt American ideals and to adapt themselves to the customs and habits of mind of the nation. But in more recent years a large percentage of immigrants have come with differences. For decades now immigrants that have been pouring in have obviously been bent on seizing the opportunities offered by America but without disposition to adapt themselves to the American viewpoint and to adopt American ideals and concepts of government and citizenship in return. The record is crowded with instances in which groups of immigrants have stoutly resisted Americanism, have resented the suggestion that they acquire the language of the land, and have maintained their foreignisms. From their entrance great numbers of them have made it plain by their conduct that they propose merely to take what America has to give without giving what America should receive. At the present time, in certain areas, immigrants constitute a substantial percentage of the population and, drifting together and holding aloof from Americanization, hold themselves as foreigners in America.

These citations are given to show the attitude of the present administration upon this great question and its anxiety for speedy remedial legislation; and further, that this is not a matter of partisan politics, but strictly a great American question.

The conditions existing in this country, as well as throughout Europe, are such that we must protect America from this foreign menace which is seeking to enter our country.

Since the world's Great War, many dangerous and deadly doctrines have sprung up throughout Europe; governments have been changed over night, and in many instances the rights of property and freedom of speech and action are unknown. These same dangerous and deadly doctrines have been spread throughout this country, to a great extent, by foreign propaganda and foreigners.

Communists with headquarters in Russia are perfecting their organizations in this country, and to such an extent that not long since the Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, saw fit to expose their intrigues in this country and claimed that the final purpose of these organizations was to overthrow the Government of the United States and plant a Red flag upon the White House in Washington. Not long since Lenin, the great leader of the Communist party, which controls Russia, died; and since that time over a thousand memorials have been held in this country for him. This shows the dangers which we face and that it is up to the American people to see that America is kept American. [Applause.]

The present bill provides for 2 per cent plus 100 for each nationality on a basis of foreign born who were in this country in the year 1890. To be frank with you, this cuts down the immigration from south and eastern Europe from what it is at present, because they are receiving more than their per cent. We have in this country what is known as the old and the new immigration. Up to 1890 nearly all of the immigrants who had come to this country, and who were responsible for the upbuilding of this country, for our laws and institutions, came from north and western Europe. For the past 40 years this immigration has fallen off to a great extent, and they have come by the millions from south and eastern Europe.

If immigrants are to be admitted in this country on a quota basis—and of course on a selective basis—then the census of such a year should be selected as would give all the people of the country from whence they come, proper representation, without discrimination. For this reason the census of 1890 is selected. This has raised quite a protest from certain nations of south and eastern Europe, charging discrimination, but this is without merit. The estimated number to be admitted of the different nationalities under the 2 per cent law plus 100 taking 1890 as a basis, if enacted, would be as follows: And similar tables for 1900 and 1910 inserted for comparison.

Estimated immigration quotas based on census reports of 1890, 1900, 1910, and 1920—2 per cent plus 100 for each nationality

Country or region of birth	Estimated quotas based on 2 per cent of census plus 100			
	Census of 1890	Census of 1900	Census of 1910	Census of 1920
Albania	104	121	292	212
Armenia (Russian)	117	141	252	419
Austria	1,090	1,891	4,994	11,510
Belgium	609	749	1,142	1,356
Bulgaria	100	100	302	311
Czechoslovakia	1,973	3,531	11,472	7,350
Danzig, Free City of	323	314	300	250
Denmark	2,882	3,298	3,846	3,844
Esthonia	232	337	908	1,484
Finland	245	1,365	2,714	3,113
Fiume, Free State of [1]	110	117	148	210
France	3,978	3,734	3,920	3,177
Germany	45,229	43,081	40,172	28,705
Great Britain and North Ireland	41,772	37,282	34,508	29,152
Irish Free State	20,886	18,641	17,254	14,576
Greece	135	259	2,142	3,625
Hungary	588	1,232	3,932	8,047
Iceland	136	142	150	150
Italy	4,689	10,815	28,138	32,315
Latvia	217	371	1,126	1,681
Lithuania	402	655	1,852	2,801
Luxemburg	158	161	162	352
Netherlands	1,737	2,000	2,504	2,738
Norway	6,553	6,857	8,234	7,425
Poland	8,972	16,277	20,752	22,902
Portugal	574	1,016	1,744	1,616
Rumania	731	1,512	5,046	2,157
Russia	1,892	4,596	16,370	25,161
Spain (including Canary Islands)	224	245	708	1,320
Sweden	9,661	11,772	13,462	12,649
Switzerland	2,181	2,414	2,602	2,477
Yugoslavia	835	1,504	4,384	3,500
San Marino	110	110	110	110
Andorra	100	100	100	100
Liechtenstein	100	100	100	100
Monaco	100	100	100	100
Palestine	101	104	138	164
Syria	112	167	688	1,142
Turkey	123	218	1,870	841
Hejaz	105	105	105	105
Persia	125	125	125	125
Egypt	106	108	112	117
Liberia	100	100	100	100
Abyssinia	100	100	100	100
Morocco	100	100	100	100
Union of South Africa	110	110	110	110
Australia	220	240	296	323
New Zealand and Pacific Islands	167	152	154	178
Total	161,184	178,769	239,930	240,400

[1] Fiume is to be added to Italy.

It is urged that a 2 per cent quota based on the census of 1890 of the foreign population in this country is a discrimination against southern and eastern Europe.

I am opposed to any discrimination as to foreign countries or nationalities, but my insistence is that this per cent on the 1890 census comes nearer placing all people in the country on equality than any other census. I insist that if the 1910 census was taken as a basis, that it would be a discrimination against the people of other nationalities who live in America who originally came from northern and western Europe. Discrimination, prejudice, this bill is the product of a narrow

and bigoted class, without knowledge of the facts, coming from a country where there is no immigration and know nothing of the facts—these are some of the charges that have been made against your committee, which is responsible to a great extent for the bill. Out of 17 on that committee, scattered throughout the United States, 15 from 13 different States reported this bill as fair to the American people. Why do they try to divert the real issue? Because they know that the American people are fair; because they know the people of this House are fair; and we say to you that it is not the alien, that it is not the foreign born that are entitled to this quota, but it is the American people. [Applause.] No foreigner or foreign nation has any right in this country except what we give him. It is a matter of privilege and not a matter of right. Who has undertaken to introduce in this discussion the race question, religious prejudice, superiority of races? It is the gentlemen who oppose this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield? I did not write the Laughlin report.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I have not the time; I am sorry. No, sir; but the gentleman wrote the minority report, and in that he stated, sir, that the people who were for this bill came from those States which had no immigration, and yet the patriotic organizations of the great States which have this immigration are asking for relief, and for your benefit and for the benefit of those gentlemen who are from the State of New York, permit me to read to you a part of an editorial that was published on March 1, 1924, in the New York Times, one of the greatest newspapers in the world, published and controlled by Hon. Adolph Ochs, one of the greatest men of the Jewish race:

The census of 1910, as a matter of fact, favors the newer immigration at the expense of the old, and permits fewer representatives of those races which built up the United States during the last century to come in than of the recent arrivals.

In formulating a permanent policy two considerations are of prime importance. The first is that the country has the right to say who shall and who shall not come in. It is not for any foreign country to determine our immigration policy. The second is that the basis of restriction must be chosen with a view not to the interests of any group or groups in this country, whether racial or religious, but rather with a view to the country's best interests as a whole. The great test is assimilability. Will the newcomers fit into the American life readily? Is their culture sufficiently akin to our own to make it possible for them easily to take their place among us? There is no question of "superior" or "inferior" races, or of "Nordics," or of prejudice, or of racial egotism. Certain groups not only do not fuse easily, but consistently endeavor to keep alive their racial distinctions when they settle among us. They perpetuate the "hyphen," which is but another way of saying that they seek to create foreign blocs in our midst.

A policy must be formed without discriminating unfairly against any given groups, but at the same time with regard to the interests only of the whole and not of any special part.

But, gentlemen, we insist in the first place that the 1890 census does not discriminate, and I propose to argue this question in this way: First, that the census of 1890 is fair to all the people of this country, and that the census of 1910 is unfair. [Applause.] Second, that if the eastern and southern European countries are discriminated against they have brought it upon themselves, and we are justified in discriminating against them. [Applause.] Then again I propose to hold up before you to some extent those great American citizens, and by name you shall know them, foreign organizations, and foreign countries who are opposing this bill. Then I propose to show you to some extent that narrow and bigoted class, that class who are prejudiced, who are favoring this bill. The gentleman who preceded me a few minutes ago stated that those people from the South, to a great extent, were prejudiced and were not in a position to be fair on this proposition. I come from the great State of Tennessee, a State which has less than 1 per cent of foreign born. I have no prejudice against any nation, nationality, or any peoples, but I feel that I approach this question with a feeling of what is just to America and what is right from the American standpoint. [Applause.] And let me say that this question only is to be determined for what is best for America from the American standpoint.

The only justification that we can have in placing a quota on any census of the number of foreign born in America is not with a view of giving foreign born who were living in America at the time a quota, but it is for the purpose of trying to give a proper quota on a proper census that will properly distribute immigration from European countries on an equal basis of those who live in the United States.

The alien himself, from a logical standpoint, is not entitled to any quota whatever. If this were true, it would be placing a premium on the greater number who have reached our shores from any nationality during recent years.

The 1920 census shows that there were nearly 14,000,000 foreign born in this country, and nearly half of this number were not American citizens, and yet if we should put it on the census of 1920, we would be giving representation to a foreign element who are in this country and not American citizens.

So, I say again, what we are endeavoring to do is trying to discover a basis with a per centum fixing a certain census year so that we can give equal representation from foreign nationalities of the people who constitute America.

It has been said that all of the people in this country or their ancestors were at one time immigrants. This is true, and for that very reason there should be no discrimination of those American citizens who are descendants from people who came from other portions of Europe at the time of the discovery of this country and the infancy of this Republic.

If we are to place our quota on the number of foreigners who were in this country according to the census of 1910, then we give preference to the recent immigration and fail to give proper representation to those who descended from an older stock and who are responsible for the freedom and the glorious achievements of this great country.

The descendants of and the aliens from south and eastern Europe only constitute 11.8 per cent of our total population. This being true, then is it not logical to say that those people from those countries are only entitled to this same per cent in the number of immigrants that we admit from said European countries? Is there any reason why they should be given any greater percentage than that which represents their portion of the people of the United States of America? I feel sure that no one stating this question will answer that it is just and equitable to give them more than that portion of the immigration which they now represent in this country.

Mr. SABATH. This bill does not do that——

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Give me two minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Sure.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Give me five.

Mr. SABATH. I will give it to the gentleman.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I want to say that it does. The census of 1890 was selected not because it was 1890, but because the results obtained from that year came nearer giving us a proper percentage of the immigration in this country of the countries from which they came.

If we take the census of 1890 as a basis for computation of quotas, southern and eastern Europe would receive an allotment of approximately 15 per cent. This is more than their per cent of population. Then have they any right to complain? Have they any right to say that there is a discrimination, unless they insist that it is the alien who is entitled to have the per cent and not the American people who constitute the population of this country.

The quota based on the census of 1910, as is now the law, and as is the insistence of the minority report, is a discrimination as against the people of this country who did not originate from southern and eastern Europe.

Under the provisions of the present quota law, based on the census of 1910, approximately 44 per cent of the quota is allotted to southern and eastern Europe, when as a matter of proper representation they would only be entitled to about 12 per cent. The reason for this large percentage is from the fact that the immigration from southern and eastern Europe is what is known as new immigration, the most of whom have come to this country during the past 30 years. Practically all immigration prior to 1870 was from northern and western Europe.

The immigration from 1860 to 1870 was 98.4 per cent from northern and western Europe; from 1870 to 1880, 91.5 per cent from northern and western Europe; and only 8.5 per cent from southern and eastern Europe. From 1880 to 1890, 20 per cent came from southern and eastern Europe. 1890 marks the time, in a way, between old and new immigration. From 1891 to 1900, 52 per cent came from southern and eastern Europe; 1901 to 1910, 76.7 per cent came from southern and eastern Europe, and from 1911 to 1920, 77.5 per cent came from southern and eastern Europe.

From these figures you can plainly see that if we place the quota on the number of foreign born in this country on the census of 1910, we discriminate as against the old stock who builded this country and give preference to those aliens constituting the new immigration.

It is not the foreign born alone—many of whom were not American cititzens—that are entitled to a percentage of the immigration that comes to this country; but it is the American people who are entitled to this percentage of the nationalities

from which they spring, and whenever this is done we will keep America, as it is now, with the same ideas and ideals.

The idea which I am trying to impress is, that it is not the aliens who are entitled to a quota, but it is the American people who are entitled to a quota. [Applause.] And this quota based on a percentage of the alien population should be such a percentage as will give the people of this country proper and equal representation to the nationalities of which this country is made up, regardless of whether the immigration is new or old.

With this in view, the quota based on the census of 1890 comes nearer being just and equitable to all the people of America than any other census which we can adopt.

It is not a question of what is just and equitable to the foreign countries—their coming into this country is a privilege and not a right—but it is a question of what is just and equitable to the people who constitute this great Government and who, either they or their ancestors, have come from foreign lands. But under this present bill, taking the 1890 census as a basis for our quota, the people of the United States representative of southern and eastern Europe are favored, rather than the people representative of other portions of Europe, on the theory, of course, that this bill is intended as legislation in behalf of the American people. Under the provisions of this bill there are those people who can come in under the nonquota system. For instance, the father and mother over 55 years of age and the wife and unmarried children under 18 years of age of American citizens. These are exempt from the quota and the new immigration, which is composed of the people from southern and eastern Europe, gain a great advantage by this exemption as can be thoroughly demonstrated.

It is reasonable to presume that practically all of this class who have not come to America are those whose people came to America since 1910. The census shows that 77.5 per cent of the immigrants to this country from 1910 to 1920 came from southern and eastern Europe. This being true, then 77.5 per cent of these people who are entitled to come and that are exempt from the quota would come from southern and eastern Europe.

Italy, which country would be greatly reduced under this system, has protested very vigorously against this bill becoming a law, claiming that it is a discrimination against her people. No foreigner has any vested rights in the United States of America. We have the right to pass such laws as we may see fit for the protection of our country. Under these figures you will note that Italy's quota has been reduced from something like 42,000 to 4,799, and her people are making strong protests against this quota, claiming that it is discrimination and direct insult to Italy.

We are not intending any insult to any nation or race of people. Personally I would cast no reflection or wound the feelings of any nationality. It is the man who counts, regardless from whence he comes.

In order to determine just how many people can come in under this bill we will have to consider the bill as a whole, not only those that can come under the quota but those who can come that are not included in the quota. Among other exceptions, as before stated, the bill provides that fathers and mothers over 55 years of age of American citizens and the wife and children unmarried under 18 years of age can be admitted outside of the quota. From this let us estimate just how many aliens who may come within this provision and what nationality would get the greatest benefit from such provision. Mr. Wm. S. Rossiter, a former official of the Census Bureau and authority on the subject, says that from analysis of the 1920 census that there are more than 500,000 wives of foreigners who are still in European countries. These can come in if the foreigners become American citizens. An analysis of the last census shows that foreign-born women average a little over four children to the family. Taking four as an average, we have some 2,000,000 children who are evidently across the waters. This would make 2,500,000 of wives and children of foreigners who could come to American soil. It is fair to estimate that if an alien has not his wife and children in this country that his father and mother would not be here; and many, of course, who have their immediate families and at the same time their father and mother are not here. It seems to me that a million of these would be a small estimate. This makes the sum total of 3,500,000 who may at some time be admitted under this bill; and as the bill stands to-day there is no limitation as to when a man may become a citizen. So the chain would be endless. Seventy-five per cent of whatever number estimated would come from southern and eastern Europe. Let us carry this further and see how this would affect Italy.

The census of 1920 shows nearly 14,000,000 foreign born in this country. The Italians have out of that number over 1,600,000, nearly one-seventh of the total. This being true, under the father, mother, wife, and child clause of the proposed law, if our estimates are correct, there might come about half a million of Italians to this country from those who are already here. They would reap a greater advantage under this clause than any other nationality, because their immigration is of recent date. This clause should be stricken or amended. Permit me to say further that if the proof is correct which we have had before our committee, it does not lay within their mouths to complain, because it is authoritatively stated that people going out of Italy are required to have a passport, and that they only give to those people whom they desire to emigrate the passports. It is charged that for the purpose of getting around the quota system now in vogue in the United States that they have persistently given passports to men and refused passports to men's families, so as to prevent taking up the whole quota in order to systematically create a sentiment in this country against the division of families.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in three weeks two steamers arrived from Italy with 2,000 wives on board?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes; on account of a decision of the court. If you do not pass this bill and shut the doors 3,000,000 more will come in, as they are ready and waiting.

Any nation that will resort to this scheme has no right even from an equitable standpoint to make the cry that the United States is discriminating against their government. When this bill is duly considered in all of its terms, with the statistics of the past, it does not discriminate against any people from Italy or any other country, but equalizes and makes possible for all the people of this country to have proper representation of the nationality from which they sprung.

A few days ago one, Mr. Ludovica, formerly member of the Italian war mission and of the Italian Parliament, who is visiting in this country, gave out an interview in the New York Herald criticizing the Johnson bill—this bill—as an insult to Italy. It seems to me that a man of his standing, who is here through the courtesy of this country, would not insult the American people by such a statement. It is sufficient to say that his interview would have been in better taste and more thoroughly appreciated by the American people had he made some statement as to when the Italian Government intends to pay the United States the $2,000,000,000 which she owes for borrowed money. This is the gratitude which they seem to express.

I am not insisting that there are better people in north and western Europe than there are in south and eastern Europe; nationality or races is not in my mind. We appreciate the greatness of many of the people of south and eastern Europe. We realize the fact that many people from those countries are patriotic citizens of America, yet we can not understand why many of these people want their nationality admitted regardless of quality. They should know that few of their best people are coming to this country, and this is one reason that we are endeavoring to restrict and limit our immigration. We are not getting the best, and I say that the character of immigration to a great extent from south and eastern Europe is not the character of citizenship which we desire in this country. With Italy selecting her emigration out of which we select our immigration, no one would expect us to receive the best class of people from countries of this kind. If they are being discriminated against, they have brought it upon themselves by permitting hordes of undesirables to reach our shores.

I notice from the press a few days ago that the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] addressed two or three thousand foreigners in Philadelphia, wherein it was reported he said that the Johnson bill is the product of a narrow and bigoted class.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I stand on that statement.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes. This same gentleman made a statement on the floor of the House not long since, that he was surprised at the stupidity of Congress, or words to that effect; and again he said he was from that race—Italian—which was the mother or founder of civilization. "Upon what meat doth this our Cæsar feed, that he is grown so great. [Applause.] Rome, thou hast lost the breed of some of thy noble bloods." [Applause.] According to his views, if correctly quoted, his fellow Members who are responsible for this bill, are narrow and bigoted, and I presume he will be surprised at the stupidity of those who vote for it. This is the gentleman's opinion; and in regard to his opinion of himself, permit me to quote from Bobby Burns, "Oh, wad some power the giftie gie us, to see our-

sel's as others see us." [Laughter and applause.] Oftimes the character of opposition is the strongest kind of evidence that the proposition is of merit.

It is ours to permit immigration under such conditions as we may provide; it is theirs to come under these conditions, if they so desire. But they say that the placing of this quota on the 1890 basis is showing preference to our enemy—Germany—and discriminating against our allies.

In the first place, I deny that it is a discrimination; secondly, Germany is not our enemy now. The war is over. Regardless of what census may be used as a basis, the pro rata for the German people in this country will be large, because there have always been many Germans in this country.

As to our allies, we of course appreciate what these brave boys did. And those of foreign birth who were not citizens and who fought with us have been honored by this country by allowing them to become citizens in a very simple way. Were they fighting for us alone or were they not fighting also for their nativity? The countries from which they came were involved in this Great War, and they had no other place to go. But who knows where many of them would have gone, had this country been in war with some great country of south and eastern Europe. This Great War had for its incipiency assassinations from one of the countries for which you cry discrimination; the people among whom there has thrived anarchy and blackhand assassins; nationalities among whom much hatred is fomented; overthrow governments in a night and destroy those in power. Many nations who rule by might rather than by right. Can people of this kind come to America, settle in groups of their own kind in large cities, have a change of heart, and a change of mind?

This is the character of some of the people that are coming as immigrants. Many of the countries of Europe are sending peddlers, sweat-shop workers, fruit-stand keepers, street vendors, organ grinders, and bootblacks; mostly nonessential members of their own country, a leech upon the public in this country. And yet it is claimed by some that those of foreign birth in this country have as good or better record than our native people; covering criminals, paupers, and insane. This is not true, as is thoroughly demonstrated by statistics.

The last analysis of census available is that of 1910. It is carried into the Statistical Abstract of the United States of 1922, Table No. 42, page 66 of that report, and gives these figures:

Sentenced persons in penal or reformatory institutions January 1, 1910

Native white	53,359
Foreign-born white	19,438
Total white	82,797

Foreign-born white, nearly 26 per cent.

You should bear in mind that the foreign-born white in the census of 1910 was only 16.2 per cent of our total white population, and yet they have nearly 26 per cent of the total white who were in prison on that date.

Since this census, however, the prohibition laws have been passed in this country, and the foreign-born white per cent would run much larger. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE] says that the statistics of the State of Illinois show that 90 per cent of the violation of the prohibition laws of that State are by foreigners.

Insane in hospitals, January 1, 1910

Native white	120,128
Foreign-born white	54,096
Total white	174,224

Foreign-born white a little over 31 per cent.

Paupers in almshouses

Native white	44,609
Foreign-born white	33,125
Total white	77,734

Foreign-born white a little over 42 per cent.

These statistics were taken from the 1910 census, as the Government has not yet made any report on the 1920 census. The Government has, however, issued a report taken from the 1920 census of illiterate persons 10 years of age and over. By illiteracy is meant one who can neither read nor write. Table No. 44, page 67, of the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1922, shows the following:

Native white	1,242,572
Foreign-born white	1,763,740
Total white	3,006,312

Foreign born, 56.6 per cent; and the foreign-born white were only 14.4 per cent of the total white population in this country at that time.

The investigations made by the Intelligence Division of the War Department of foreign born during the enlistments for the World War shows a much greater mental deficiency of foreign born than can be imagined from the figures above given.

If this character of people be permitted to flood our country, you can readily see the lowering of our standards and a menace to our institutions and Government. Some seem to think that because this great Government has been charitable to them that they have an inalienable right to bring in as many more of their race as they may desire. This country can no longer be the melting pot for foreign nations. There was a time when this could be done, when conditions were different, but this time has long since passed. We want to see this country preserved and protected, but this can not be done if we allow our country to get under foreign influence. Foreign influence is already being exerted in this country. We have thousands of foreigners in this country who have gone through the form of becoming American citizens, yet they keep alive that sentiment and love for the particular country from which they came. Their children are taught the native tongue, and they point with pride to the greatness of their nativity. This character of citizenship is not to the best interest of America. When they come to this country, if they intend to become American citizens, they should be extended a helping hand; but they should burn the bridges behind them. No one can serve two masters.

Some claim that our immigration laws should not be so strict, because we need labor in this country. It is generally not a shortage of labor, but cheaper labor that some desire. There is no shortage of labor in this country. There may be a shortage in certain communities for certain work, but there are plenty of people in this country to do the work, if they can be procured. There is no shortage where the immigrants locate, and there is no way of scattering them throughout the United States to relieve any temporary condition wherein such shortage is claimed. But even if there was a shortage, we can not hazard our heritage by the class of people who might come. It is better to have no immigration, regardless of business, than to have that class which would lower our social and moral standing. It is better to have a shortage of labor, if needs be, in our mines and manufactories rather than have that people come who are not in accord with our ideas and ideals. As some one has said, "Better smokeless chimneys than a degenerate people." President Roosevelt said:

> We should never admit any "merely because there is need of labor;" better run short of labor than foul or dilute the body of citizenship into which our children are to enter. In practice it is not easy to apply exactly the proper tests; but fundamentally our aim should be to admit only immigrants whose grandchildren will be fit to intermarry with our grandchildren, with the grandchildren of the Americans of to-day.

Do you think that many of the immigrants who are coming to this country can meet these requirements? Do you desire to develop this country from the ideas and ideals of southern and eastern Europe, or do you desire to develop according to the ideas of present America? And if you do we should admit our immigrants on a basis which will preserve our present racial conditions.

The question of immigration has been one of much concern ever since the foundation of this Government. After George Washington, the Father of his Country, had retired from the Presidency, he used this language upon this question: "My opinion with respect to immigration is that except for 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 much questioned; for by so doing they retain the language, habits, and principles, good or bad, which they bring with them, whereas by any intermixture with our people, they or their descendants get assimilated to our customs, measures, and laws; in a word, become our people." The time has come in this country when they do settle in groups and retain their language, habits, and principles, which he questioned at that time.

Without meaning any disrespect, either nationally or individually to any people, let us analyze to some extent the conditions, the characteristics, and environment of what we call the old immigration and the new immigration. The old immigrants are the same racial stock as the majority of the people already in the United States, while the new immigrants are unlike this stock in environments, language, ideal, and ideas of government. The old stock in this country came here under different conditions, different political histories, and these countries had limited monarchs during the period of their largest emigration, and their ideas and ideals form the basis of this great Government which we now have. The governments from

whence our new immigration came were more autocratic, less stable, and which resulted in formation of bodies or groups, in defiance of law and order; and under these conditions, disrespect and hatred for law officers—oftentimes resulting in anarchy and assassination of those in authority. Naturally, people coming from countries of this character bring with them, to a great extent, the Old World environments and social status; and this of itself raises serious social, economic, and political conditions. Is it not just, then, that in admitting our immigrants that we do so with the theory of giving all of our people just representation with the view of maintaining our social, economic, and political conditions as they now exist? Are we to continue to develop and control the policies of this country, our social and economic conditions, according to American ideas and deals? Or shall we permit our social and economic conditions to be controlled by the ideas and ideals of those who come from other countries; educated in a different school of thought, different in language, different in ideas and ideals; who come here restless and resentful from the iron hand of tyranny?

This question should be decided from an American standpoint. [Applause.] It is not what is best for foreign countries, but it is what is best for America, her civilization, her refinement, her social conditions, and her Government.

The greatest danger which we have from immigration is their settling in groups in this country, where they cling to their original ideas and customs and where their own national feeling is kept alive and more easily aroused.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. If the gentleman will give me two minutes more I will.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee declines to yield.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. When they settle in groups in this country they become a power which has to be dealt with politically, economically, and socially. The people that we are receiving from southern and eastern Europe have a greater tendency to go to cities, and hence live in groups, than those who come from northern and western Europe.

The 1910 census shows that 67 per cent of the Germans were urban; Scandinavians, 53 per cent; Russian Jews, 87 per cent; Italians, 78 per cent.

In 1920 in the State of New York there were 545,000 Italians, and over 440,000, or 81 per cent, were in the cities having a population of 100,000 or more. New York City contains 72 per cent of all the Italians in the State. Nearly nine-tenths of the Russians are in the cities. Three out of every four of the foreign population of this country are found in the cities.

This is a very serious situation and one which demands the best thought and action of the American people. We have had before our committee some able gentlemen from New York City speaking in behalf of Jews and Italians, especially claiming that if 1890 was taken as a basis it would be an insult to their people. This should only be looked to from an American standpoint. These gentlemen, while men of standing and of high character, yet as much as they desire to be, they are not impartial judges; they are clinging to the nationalities from which they sprung, and while we have respect for them we can not see their viewpoint.

It seems to me that every American citizen, regardless from whence he came, or from what nationality he sprung, should not want any people of his own nationality to come to this country unless they were so qualified to make good American citizens, not only as a protection to his adopted country but to prevent a reflection upon his own nationality.

As evidence of this, their own particular nationality being their viewpoint, when one of these distinguished gentlemen was before our committee and was arguing against the census of 1890, and when asked if he would be satisfied if the quota was based on the number of naturalized citizens of different nationalities from the census of 1910 or 1920, he answered that he did not know, and immediately turned to his adviser and said, "How does that affect us?" When one gentleman who was before the committee, from New York City—an editor of a foreign paper in that city—was asked what he thought about certain articles written by Mr. Speranzo, he immediately answered that he thought he was a traitor to his people. This shows their viewpoint. He could not imagine Mr. Speranzo, a man of Italian descent, looking to any other interest except to the Italian people, although he was an American citizen. An insult to his people! His people should be those who are Americans, regardless of their nationality. Immigration should be decided from the standpoint of what is best for America and not what is in the interest of any other nationality.

There has been quite a sentiment created throughout this country to examine and finally pass upon immigrants before they sail for America. If this policy could be put into effect it would save a great deal of suffering and trouble and annoyance to those who come to this country. This bill carries that provision so far as possible under the present treaties, but this can not be done fully without involving new treaties with various nations; and as to what immigrant shall come to this country, we certainly do not want to leave it to a treaty-making power. These nationalities who are complaining certainly would not allow us the privilege of examining upon their own soil without a treaty, and with a treaty you could, of course, expect them to demand more liberal terms.

This being the condition of affairs, this bill accomplishes this in so far as can be done by providing that a questionnaire should be handed to an inquiring alien propounding to him various questions; his life's history, his physical condition, and everything that could be material. If he answers truthfully all these questions and they are answered properly he is issued a certificate, providing the consul decides he is so entitled, but his final examination takes place on these shores. However, he is not issued a certificate unless there is a quota for him; and if he is passed by the consul there will be very little chance of his not being admitted when he arrives in this country. Conditions warrant it, and the people are demanding this legislation. This bill is just to all people of this country, and yet it preserves America for Americans.

The present question affects the vitals of America; America's present and America's future; and if we preserve our laws, our institutions, our mode of government, our social conditions, yea, our nationality, it must be done by Americans who consider this question from no other standpoint except that for the good of America. [Applause.] It is no time for foolish sentiment; the issue is made; we know the conditions and we know the remedy; let us apply the remedy so that our flag will ever be emblematic of the greatest nation on earth and truly representative of the rights of a free people. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman from Texas, Judge Box, a few days ago gave a long list of those who opposed restricted immigration and those who favor it. In the list furnished you will see the names of all kinds of foreign organizations, and many, many organizations of the sons of Italy on the side who oppose it.

Favoring this bill you will find the class which they denounce as narrow and bigoted, the American Legion, which organization is made up of all nationalities and consists of over 600,000 men. This organization passed unanimous resolutions at their last meeting requesting suspension of all immigration for a period of five years. It is composed of American citizens of all nationalities.

Just this day I received a telegram from the adjutant of the American Legion for the State of Tennessee indorsing this bill, which I read you:

NASHVILLE, TENN., *April 7, 1924.*

SAM D. McREYNOLDS,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The national conventions of American Legion have gone on record as specifically for exclusion of all persons ineligible to citizenship in United States as immigrants or permanent residents. The American Legion of Tennessee requests that you support this legislation as incorporated in immigration bill now on floor of House.

GUY H. MAY, *Department Adjutant.*

They fought under the Stars and Stripes during the World War. You also find for restricted immigration all kinds of patriotic orders of this country, the Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution and various organizations of this character. For my part I prefer to stand with those organizations which are strictly American. [Applause.] In other words, I prefer to speak the sentiments of the sons of America rather than the sons of Italy. [Applause.] I prefer to speak the sentiments of the descendants of John Sevier and his riflemen, who from the banks of the Wautauga climbed the steeps of Kings Mountain and turned back the tide of the Revolution. [Applause.] I prefer to speak the sentiments of the descendants of those brave pioneers of Tennessee who followed Andrew Jackson—"Old Hickory"—with their long rifles over the hills, through the swamps, and through the forests to New Orleans in 1812, where they whipped the British and forever established the rights of the American flag upon the high seas. [Applause.] In his language, "By the Eternal, we shall protect and defend that flag," I speak the sentiments of those boys

who answered their country's call in this last great war, from the mountains and the hills and the valleys of Tennessee. I speak of the boys of the One hundred and seventeenth Infantry and One hundred and fourteenth Field Artillery of the Thirtieth Division who upon the battle fields of France were the first to break the Hindenberg line. [Applause.] I speak the sentiments of the people of the grand old Volunteer State of America, Tennessee, just named because first in peace and first in time of war. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN].

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has that right under the general leave granted.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Following the eloquent speech of the gentleman from Tennessee, I am afraid that the facts I am going to present will appear dry, but I feel I am justified in presenting these facts to you before a vote is taken.

With the close of the recent war there came over the American people a great fear. We imagined that America would soon be swamped with 10,000,000 Europeans desiring to escape from the intolerable conditions of their native lands. The nightmare was further aggravated in 1920 by a growing army of unemployed in our own country. It was natural enough at that time, under those conditions, that as a temporary expedient an emergency immigration restriction bill should have been passed. I believe, however, that it was the hope of all liberty-loving Americans, remembering the great traditions of the founders of our Nation, that these restrictions of the act of 1921 would, after a brief period, be at least relaxed, if not entirely removed.

Instead of a liberalization, we have a further restriction proposed in the Johnson bill before us. As this bill proposes to establish a more or less permanent policy, and inasmuch as it breaks in some important respects with our traditional policy, it is our duty, as Representatives making laws for a great people, laws which will leave their mark on the passing years, to look at this question without prejudice and without self-interested motives.

What are the facts? I shall attempt to present the facts by answering five questions:

1. Are there too many foreigners in the United States?
2. Is the flow of immigration under the present law too great?
3. Do the immigrants colonize too heavily in big cities?
4. Does the character of the new immigration menace our institutions?
5. Does the Johnson bill fairly and effectively meet the situation?

I shall address myself to the first question:

ARE THERE TOO MANY FOREIGNERS IN THE UNITED STATES

When Lincoln was elected President in 1860 there were 13 foreigners in this country to every 100 inhabitants. When Garfield was elected President in 1880 there were 13 foreigners to every 100 inhabitants. When McKinley was elected President in 1900 there were 13 foreigners to every 100 inhabitants. When Harding was elected President in 1920 there were 13 foreigners to every 100 inhabitants. There has been, therefore, practically no change since the Civil War in the ratio of foreigners to the total population. This ratio has ranged from 13.2 to 14.7 per cent, as is shown by the following table:

Ratio of foreign-born population in United States from 1860 to 1920[1]

	Per cent
1860	13.2
1870	14.4
1880	13.3
1890	14.7
1900	13.6
1910	14.7
1920	13.2

Through this 60-year period, from Lincoln to Harding, this country has achieved an unprecedented material progress in manufacturing, farming, mining, transportation, telephone, telegraph, and radio. It passed victoriously through three wars, with the Nation more strongly unified than ever. What justification is there, then, for saying that we now have too many foreigners? The facts disprove any such conclusion.

THERE IS NO IMMIGRATION PERIL

Mr. SABATH. Does not the gentleman mean the foreign born?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I mean the foreign-born population in the United States in proportion to the population as a whole. In the face of these facts, therefore, I say that this imaginary peril of too many foreigners in our country is without foundation.

Mr. CABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. CABLE. Is it not a fact that at the time of Mr. Lincoln the foreign born were spread out over the country to a greater extent than at present?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I am going to answer that question in addressing myself to my second inquiry, and if I do not answer your question please ask it again.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. With reference to what the gentleman said a moment ago as to the time of Lincoln, is it not a fact that all of the foreign born fought for the preservation of the Union?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Not only that, but they fought loyally and valiantly in every war for the creation and the preservation of this Union. The splendid service of the foreign born in the recent World War established that point beyond any question. The inspiring patriotic services of Lafayette, Steuben, De Kalb, Pulaski, and Kosciusko were emulated by the young men from all nations who fought as volunteers or drafted men under the Stars and Stripes in the recent war. The wooden crosses in France and Flanders are planted above the fallen bodies of the boys of Poland, Italy, Greece, Germany, France, Russia, Bohemia—and they all died as Americans. In their sacrifice and their death there was no distinction of race, nationality, or religion.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Is there any other country in the world where the percentage of foreign-born people anywhere near comes to what it is in this country?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Suppose that were so, what of it?

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman does not answer the question.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Well, I say, suppose I admit that for the sake of argument, what of it?

Mr. PERKINS. I am not trying to argue with the gentleman but I am asking him a question.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I say, suppose that were so; what of it?

Mr. PERKINS. Does not the gentleman admit that the percentage is large enough?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. That is another question altogether. The gentleman's first question was this: "Is there any other country in the world that has as many foreign-born?"

Mr. PERKINS. No; I said in proportion to the population.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I will say there is no such country; but still we are the greatest country in the world. Does the gentleman question that as a fact?

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman answer my question or not?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I think I have answered it.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman mean to say that it does not make any difference?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Difference in what respect, and judged by what standards?

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman say it does not make any difference?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. No; I do not say that. But I will say this: Nobody has yet demonstrated just what is the safe proportion of foreign-born to have in a country, nor has it been demonstrated when it is safe to stop the number of foreigners who may safely be admitted into a country—our country.

Mr. PERKINS. Is it not true that there are at least ten times as many foreigners in this country, in proportion to the population, as in any other country in the world?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. That I can not answer offhand.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. FAIRCHILD. Conceding that what the gentleman from New Jersey says is true, if it is true now it was true in every census during the entire history of this country, and if during the entire history of this country we have had that much larger proportion, has it not resulted in this country becoming the most powerful country on the face of the globe?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. That is true, of course. If there were any point to the gentleman's question then logically we should have closed our doors to all immigrants in Lincoln's day. As I say, it has not yet been demonstrated when we reach the point where we have too many foreign-born in this country. I say the facts show that the ratio of the foreign-born in this country is no greater to-day than it has been during the last 60 years.

With these facts before us, certainly the burden of proof for reducing the ratio of foreign-born in this country by further

[1] See page 97, Abstract of 14th Census of the United States (1920).

restricting immigration—the burden of proof, I repeat, rests with those who would change our to-date successful national policy.

Mr. WATKINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I am sorry I can not, unless the gentleman will get me more time.

Mr. WATKINS. I have not any time or I would be glad to give the gentleman an hour. But I would like to ask the gentleman a little question.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I am sorry I can not yield to the gentleman, but if I get through in time I shall be glad to yield for questions. I must hurry on to address myself to my second inquiry.

Is the flow of immigration to-day too strong for the maintenance and perpetuation of our institutions? Is the annual intake of foreigners too great for us to absorb? Let us again turn to the facts and lay aside fear and prejudice.

In the 100-year period from 1820 to 1920 we permitted to come into this country of ours on an average of 6.3 per cent for every thousand inhabitants residing within its boundaries. During the two-year restriction period ending June 30, 1923, only 3.7 per cent for every thousand were admitted. This represents a reduction or restriction of over 40 per cent in the flow of immigration. The flow of immigration for this 100-year period is shown in the following table:

Immigration per 1,000 population in the United States for the period 1820–1923 [1]

	Per cent
1820	[2] 0.7
1830	2.4
1840	4.4
1850	4.1
1860	3.7
1870	8.3
1880	8.9
1890	8.2
1900	5.5
1910	9.3
1920	[3] 3.3
Average for 100 years	6.3
1922 and 1923	3.7

Notwithstanding the restriction on the flow of immigration imposed by the act of 1921, the majority report of the Immigration Committee, advocating further restriction, makes the following statement, page 11:

This country thus serves notice that it can no longer be an asylum.

The fact is that the 1921 act has denied the privilege of America as an asylum, as indicated by the table given above, to literally thousands upon thousands. The same report says: "The mass of immigrants who came in 1890 is too great to be assimilated." But the flow of immigration was checked by 40 per cent in 1921, and the operation of this law is too recent and too brief to be any guide as to whether the restriction was wise or unwise. Certainly no new evidence has been introduced to justify further restriction.

The simple fact is that the flow of immigration has been cut off to a very appreciable extent by the operation of the 3 per cent quota law enacted in 1921 and still in force.

If we keep in force this act of 1921 over a period of 10 years, the number of foreigners in this country in 1930 would be only 12½ per cent of the entire population, which is less than at any time since the Civil War.

The facts speak for themselves. Every individual may have his own interpretation, but if figures mean anything, they prove that America to-day is not being overrun with foreigners, nor has it in its midst more foreigners than at any other time since the Civil War. No one has yet demonstrated what is the safe ratio of foreigners for any country. A farmer learns by experience how thickly he should sow his seed or how far apart he should set his plants. So only by experience can we learn whether we have among us too many foreigners. Experience shows that this country has not suffered in the last 60-year period from having 13 foreigners on the soil occupied by 100 inhabitants. The stream of immigration supplying this foreign stock is slower to-day under our present law than it has been for over 60 years. The burden of proof rests with those who would change this policy and this American tradition.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there? Does not the gentleman make a distinction as to the foreign-born, whether they speak and use the English language or not?

[1] This ratio is derived in the following manner: Population data for each decennial census period is used, and the immigration figures are averaged for the five-year period at each census year. The immigration divided by population represents the ratio or flow of immigration. The population and immigration data are, of course, taken from Government publications.

[2] This low ratio is due undoubtedly to the fact that statistics were first collected in this year and are probably not accurate.

[3] This low figure of 1920 is due to falling off of immigration in 1918 and 1919, which are included in the five-year average data for 1920.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes; I am coming directly to that point in my third inquiry. I have answered two questions, the first being, Have we too many foreign born in this country? and I have shown you that we do not have any more to-day proportionately than in Lincoln's time; the second question being, Is the flow of immigration to-day too heavy? and I have demonstrated that the flow of immigration is less to-day than it has been for a century. Let us now turn to our next inquiry.

Do the immigrants colonize too heavily in big cities?

Unquestionably the concentration of foreigners in our big cities has had much to do with increasing the prejudice which exists against them. The abnormal herding together of strange people in a few of our metropolitan cities makes the natives unduly conscious of the presence in their midst of people with strange languages, strange customs, and unknown and mysterious aspirations.

Without in the least approving of such "colonization," it is my opinion that we have become unduly alarmed over this situation. Our forefathers felt the same apprehension about the colonization of foreigners in their day.

It may surprise you to learn that back in 1860, in the time of Lincoln, the principal cities of the United States had as heavy an intermixture of foreign population as the principal cities of our own time. We think of New York as being a foreign city. As some wit has facetiously put it: "The English language is spoken all over the world except in New York." But only 36 per cent of the population of New York to-day is foreign-born, as against 48 per cent in 1860. Brooklyn, with its 33 per cent to-day, had 39 per cent in 1860. Boston, with 32 per cent to-day, had 36 per cent in 1860. Detroit, with 29 per cent to-day, had 47 per cent in 1860.

It is hard for us to believe that St. Louis in 1860 had 60 per cent of its population foreign-born; that 50 per cent of the population of San Francisco were foreign born, as were also 50 per cent of the population of Chicago and 50 per cent of the population of Milwaukee. Here we have four cities, San Francisco, St. Louis, Chicago, and Milwaukee, with half of the population foreign born in 1860, while our most foreign city to-day is New York, with only 36 per cent of its population foreign-born.

In my home city of Rochester, the foreign-born constitute to-day 24 per cent as against 39 per cent in 1860. The population of Rochester in 1860 was 48,204 and the number of foreign-born was 18,897, or 39.2 per cent. In 1920 Rochester had a population of 295,750 and its foreign white population was 71,321, which is only 24 per cent. The average for Rochester to-day is the average for all the big cities of the United States.

Monroe County, as a whole, had more foreign-born in Lincoln's day than it has to-day. In 1860 Monroe County had a population of 100,648, of which 30 per cent were foreign-born. In 1920 it had a population of 352,000, with a foreign-born population of 22.6 per cent.

Even in the rural districts of the county, outside of the city of Rochester, there were more foreign-born in Lincoln's time than in Harding's time. In 1860 out of every 100 people that lived on the farms and in the villages in Monroe County, 23 were foreigners, whereas to-day only 14 out of every 100 are foreigners.

Monroe County, including Rochester, is none the worse for having had these foreigners settle there back in 1860. The "100 percenter" of Lincoln's day had his misgivings as to the future of Monroe County. We of to-day know how unfounded were his anxieties and fears. The farms and the factories, the homes and the gardens, the churches and other social institutions of our splendid community have in no small measure been built up by the brawn and brain of the foreigners who settled among us 75 years ago.

In the following table is shown the foreign-born population in the principal cities of the United States in 1860 and in 1920: [1]

Foreign-born population in principal cities of the United States in 1920 compared with 1860

[The figures given show the percentage of foreign-born of the total population of these cities]

	1860	1920
	Per cent	*Per cent*
Total United States	13.1	13.2
Albany	34.66	15.1
Alleghany City	31.21	
Baltimore	24.71	11.6
Boston	35.88	32.4
Brooklyn	39.22	33.0

[1] The data for 1860 is taken from the 1860 United States Census, page 31. The 1920 data is taken from the 1920 census reports on population.

Foreign-born population in principal cities of the United States in 1920 compared with 1860—Continued

	1860	1920
	Per cent	*Per cent*
Buffalo	46.44	24.2
Cambridge	24.20	30.4
Charleston	15.55	3.2
Chicago	49.99	29.9
Cincinnati	45.71	10.7
Cleveland	44.76	30.1
Dayton	22.84	8.6
Detroit	46.79	29.3
Hartford	30.09	29.6
Jersey City	39.11	25.6
Lowell	32.87	33.8
Louisville	33.73	5.0
Manchester	27.25	13.5
Memphis	30.66	3.6
Milwaukee	50.49	24.1
Mobile	24.13	3.3
Montgomery	6.53	1.8
New Haven	27.1	28.4
New Orleans	38.31	7.1
New York	47.62	36.1
Newark	37.02	28.4
Philadelphia	28.93	22
Pittsburgh	36.7	20.5
Portland	14.83	19.3
Providence	24.8	29.4
Reading	13.09	8.9
Richmond	13.07	2.7
Rochester	39.2	24.1
Roxbury	36.28	----------
Salem	19.44	26.3
San Francisco	50.09	29.4
Savannah	20.86	3.9
St. Louis	59.76	13.4
Syracuse	35.74	18.9
Troy	34.31	15.8
Utica	32.52	24.5
Washington	17.61	6.7
Wilmington	18.86	14.8
Worcester	24.81	30

A study of this table will take the edge off of some of our prejudiced alarm and fear. Thirty-three out of the forty-four principal cities listed in the 1860 census had more foreign-born in 1860 than in 1920. I am not indicating that it is a wholesome thing to have this concentration of immigrants in our cities. I wish merely to point out that it is not a new situation in American life. It existed 60 years ago in a no less aggravated form than it does to-day. And still we have not only survived as a Nation but have prospered and reached the top.

I should like to summarize this situation by stating that 30 per cent of the population of the 44 leading cities of the United States in 1860 was foreign-born, whereas to-day only 24 per cent is foreign-born in the 68 principal cities, as shown in the following table:

	Total population, principal cities	Foreign-born population in same cities	Per cent
1860	3,955,728	1,486,513	30
1920	27,429,326	6,643,300	24

I am sure that my readers will be surprised, as indeed I was, by the discovery of these facts. When we think of the days of President Lincoln we naturally think of a 100 per cent American Nation, and yet there were more foreigners in the big cities of Lincoln's day than there were when Harding was elected President.

This fact is all the more surprising when we recall that during the last 50 years there has been an unusually strong drift of all population toward the cities. It is a commonplace to say that the cities are robbing the country of its flesh and blood. In all countries humanity has been herding itself into the cities, and this is true in America not only for the foreigners but for the natives as well. Keeping this sociological fact in mind makes the figures given above all the more impressive, for we would naturally expect to find not 30 per cent of our cities foreign-born, as was the case in 1860, but perhaps 50 per cent to-day. Instead we find only 24 per cent.

The evils of "colonization" were as well known to our forefathers as they are to us to-day. The old records show clearly that the natives of 60 years ago, and even 100 years ago, feared for the permanency of our American institutions with the ever-increasing flow of foreigners into our country and especially into our cities.

I have been rereading recently our American history of 100 years ago as recorded in newspapers, periodicals, and Government reports. I find in them the same spirit of antagonism to the immigrant because of the concentration and colonization in cities. The tenor of this opposition to the foreigner will be shown later, where I deal with the character of the early immigrants as contrasted with that of to-day.

The Immigration Committee of the House, which reported in the Johnson bill, held many public hearings. Plans were suggested for distributing the immigrants throughout the States and thus preventing the herding in cities. The Immigration Committee, however, did not see its way clear to embodying in its bill any provision for remedying this situation.

It is natural that foreigners coming to a strange land should quickly join their own people who are already residing in the cities and to colonize with them within those cities. This is a sociological phenomenon which even lawmaking can not overcome. It operated in the Old World for centuries in nearly all of the large cities.

It would be better for the foreigner and for our own institutions if our immigrants lived in smaller communities, where they could more quickly absorb the spirit and learn the form of American manners and institutions and where they could more quickly become naturalized.

Let us not forget the facts. Our big cities to-day are no more foreign than they were in 1860; in fact, they are less so to-day. And with it all, we have become the foremost nation of the world.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a short question?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I am very sorry, but I only have 20 minutes in which to make a three-hour speech. However, if the gentleman will state his question, briefly, I will try to answer it.

Mr. BARKLEY. What is the proportion of the foreign-born with the children of foreign-born in New York City?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. You mean the foreign-born and also the children of the foreign-born?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Unfortunately, the census of 1860 did not give that and therefore I can not make any comparison.

Mr. BARKLEY. What are the facts now?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. As I say, I can not make a comparison, but so far as the figures are available, I can give you a reference to them. All I say is, that so far as the facts are concerned, there is an imaginary peril in the concentration of our foreign-born in our cities. We had five cities in 1860 that had close to 50 per cent of their people foreign-born. There is not a city in the United States that approaches that to-day. St. Louis had 60 per cent of foreign-born population in 1860, and notwithstanding this concentration of foreign-born in cities in 1860 this country has gone through three wars very successfully and has reached a point of material development unsurpassed in history.

I have therefore answered my third question, is there too great a concentration in our big cities? I say we have become unduly alarmed, though I would not care to see any further concentration.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there? Has the gentleman looked up to see the number of foreign language papers published in New York or in the United States to-day?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I do not think that has anything to do with the question. If you want to ask a question on this point, I shall be glad to answer it, if I am able, even though my time is limited.

Mr. CABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. CABLE. Can you tell us the total percentage of foreign-born living in cities in 1860?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes; I am awfully glad you asked that question, which is a very significant one. In 1860, 30 per cent of all the people living in these big cities were foreign born.

Mr. CABLE. And what is it to-day?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. And to-day only 24 per cent.

Mr. CABLE. To-day it is 75 per cent in cities of 2,500 or more.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. The gentleman asked me for the facts and those are the facts as given by the Bureau of the Census for the principal cities listed in the census of 1860 (pages 31 and 32), and the cities listed in the 1920 census having a population of 100,000 and over.

Mr. CABLE. And I am giving the gentleman some facts, too.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JACOBSTEIN] takes his figures from the United States census and not from Chamberlain or Trevor.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I will give the gentleman the reference to these figures, and if he thinks I am wrong he can get the

floor and put his figures in the RECORD. All I say is that in 1860, 30 per cent of the people living in the principal cities were foreign-born and to-day only 24 per cent are foreign-born in the large cities with 100,000 population or more. What happened? What became of this foreign-born population? They were gradually assimilated, not only they themselves but their children and their children's children. They were absorbed into the general population.

I must hurry on and answer my fourth question. My fourth question is this: Has not the character of our immigrant changed so that, even though we do not have more foreign-born than we used to have, and even though the flow of immigration is not so great, and even though our cities are not more heavily colonized with foreign born than they used to be, the question is, has not the character of the immigrant changed so that we need a new immigration policy?

Gentlemen, this brings me to the most interesting phase of this discussion, which I regret has not received dispassionate consideration.

DOES THE CHARACTER OF THE NEW IMMIGRATION MENACE OUR AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS?

When confronted with the facts stated above, the proponents of this bill fall back on their last line of defense. They say: "But to-day we are getting a different type of immigrant."

It must be apparent to everyone that the desire to restrict immigration at this time has its origin primarily in the feeling that the immigrants who have been coming to us of late years are of an undesirable type. The hostility against the latest newcomer crops out in every debate on this question. When the fact is demonstrated, as I have demonstrated, that we have no greater numbers of foreigners in this country than we have had in the past, proportionately, and that the flow of immigration is less to-day, proportionately, than formerly, the reply inevitably comes back: "But to-day we are getting a different type, a more undesirable type."

It is neither strange nor unnatural that those who make the loudest outcry about the inferior character of the new immigration should be the representatives of those States that know the least about the people of southern and southeastern Europe. It is the people from these countries that the present Johnson bill seeks to keep out of America, or, at least, to reduce to the lowest possible number. The purpose is not always stated, but the motive back of the bill plainly is to restrict, proportionately, the numbers coming from southern and southeastern European countries and to increase, proportionately, those coming from northern and northwestern Europe.

Perhaps the chief argument expressed or implied by those favoring the Johnson bill is that the new immigrant is not of a type that can be assimilated or that he will not carry on the best traditions of the founders of our Nation, but, on the contrary, is likely to fill our jails, our almshouses, and other institutions that impose a great tax burden on the Nation.

Based on this prejudice and dislike, there has grown up an almost fanatical anti-immigration sentiment. But this charge against the newcomers is denied, and substantial evidence has been brought out to prove that they do not furnish a disproportionate share of the inmates of these institutions.

One of the purposes in shifting to the 1890 census is to reduce the number of undesirables and defectives in our institutions. In fact, this aspect of the question must have made a very deep impression on the committee because it crops out on every occasion. The committee has unquestionably been influenced by the conclusions drawn from a study made by Doctor Laughlin.[1]

Prof. H. S. Jennings, professor of zoology at Johns Hopkins University, and a student of hereditary and racial problems, after studying the Laughlin report, reached the following conclusion:

> What it shows is this: That a European-born population constituted as in 1890 would have a larger proportion of insane than that of 1910. It would have a very much larger proportion of dependents. It would have a somewhat larger proportion of epileptics; it would have a very much smaller proportion of criminals; it would have a considerably smaller proportion of tuberculous. There is one other class that would be reduced, but I can not think of it this moment.
>
> If my computations are correct, and I bring them to you only as suggestive, it follows that the 1890 basis would not change the number of defectives in our institutions, but would change the combinations, make more insane, more dependents, and fewer criminals, and fewer tuberculous. (Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, 68th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 101, p. 511.)

This is not the first time in American history that such an anti-foreign hysteria has swept the country. Reread your American histories. Go back and glance through McMaster's History of the United States covering the years from 1820 to 1850. You will find there many pages devoted to the "100 per centers" of that time. So strong was the movement against the foreigner in those decades before the Civil War that a national political party, the "Know-Nothing Party," sought to ride into power on the crest of this fanatical wave.

In those early days, however, the anti-foreign movement, strangely enough, was directed against the very people whom we now seek to prefer—the English, the Irish, and the Germans. The calamity howlers of a century ago prophesied that these foreigners would drag our Nation to destruction. The same historian, McMaster, sums up the sentiment expressing this hostility to the immigrant in the following words:

> Foreign influence, even now (1830–1840) by far too powerful in our country, is rapidly growing. The day is near when most of our public offices will be filled by foreigners, and when, instead of governing ourselves, as is our native right, we shall be ruled by men who but a few years ago scarcely knew we existed. Europe is ridding herself of an excess of population that has become burdensome to her. And who does she send us? Her paupers, her criminals, her convicts, the outpourings of her almhouses and her jails. Many who came of their own choice were disgruntled malcontents at home. Greedy of power, ignorant of our customs, caring nothing for our laws, heedless of all civil restraint, they become the spreaders of anarchy, radicalism, and rebellion among our free and happy people.

Petitions against the Nordic foreigners of that day flooded the Halls of Congress. Newspapers and pamphlets carried the "American" message throughout the land, sounding the alarm and a note of warning. Disturbances, clashes, and riots broke out in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Kentucky, Louisiana, and other parts of the country.

The health officer of Baltimore in 1828, referring in his report to the type of immigrants who were coming into this country, says:

> The paupers, the cripples, the lame, the blind, the diseased, the idiotic, are being dumped on our shores.

He pointed out that English communities paid the ocean passage of immigrants to rid themselves of their surplus and undesirable citizens.

The feeling ran so high against the foreigners of those days because of their undesirable characteristics that the matter was brought to the attention of Congress and a select committee was appointed to investigate the subject of "foreign paupers and the naturalization laws." This select committee brought in a report, dated July 2, 1838, in which may be found the same arguments used to-day in almost the same language. I will quote a few significant passages from this early report of nearly 100 years ago:

> There is probably a pauper population in the United States of about 105,000, who are supported at public expense, and it is estimated that more than one-half of the number (and these the most helpless and expensive) are foreigners.
>
> On the 12th of June, 1837, there were in the almshouse in the city of New York 3,074, of which number three-fourths were foreigners (English, Scotch, Irish). Of the 1,200 admitted into the almshouse at Bellevue, 982 were aliens. In 1836 there were in the almshouse at Boston, Mass., 596 Americans and 673 foreigners; and in that of Philadelphia there were 1,505 Americans and 1,266 foreigners. * * * If the estimate of numbers and the expense of their maintenance be correct, it will be seen that the citizens of the United States are paying annually for the support of their pauper population $4,400,000, one-half of which is paid to support foreign paupers.
>
> Out of 168 paupers admitted to the poorhouse proper in the city of Washington (D. C.) in 1837, 70 were foreigners. From May, 1837, to February, 1838, 118 were admitted, and of the white males admitted about two-thirds were foreigners.

Here is a passage from this report of 1828 which sounds as if it might have been taken from a speech delivered in the Congress of the United States on April 5, 1924:

> In two districts alone in Philadelphia there were in the year 1810, 1,390 paupers, and in the year 1820 there were 2,500, their number having nearly doubled in 10 years. * * * And the fact is not unworthy of notice that in proportion as the number of immigrants increases or diminishes is the increase or diminution of paupers and convicts in the penitentiaries and poorhouses in that and the other Atlantic cities. * * * The fact is unquestionable that large numbers of foreigners are annually brought to our country by the authority and at the expense of foreign governments and landed upon our shores in a state of absolute destitution and dependence, many of them of the most idle and vicious class, in their personal appearance the most offensive and loathsome, and their numbers increasing

[1] Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot, by Harry H. Laughlin.

with such rapidity by immigration as to become burdensome to the American people, our citizens being obliged to contribute largely from their own earnings to support them in idleness. It is within the recollection of all that within the last few years large supplies of breadstuffs from Europe have been imported into the United States, and not only paid for by the earnings of our citizens but applied to the maintenance of the pauper population of the very country from which these breadstuffs have been obtained.

On the 4th of July, 1836, a resolution was adopted in the Senate of the United States directing the Secretary of the Treasury to cause to be collected and laid before the Senate at its then next session all such facts and information as could be obtained respecting the deportation of paupers from Great Britain and other places.

That the situation was taken very seriously and viewed with great concern is indicated by one of the conclusions and recommendations in the report, which reads as follows:

The committee apprehend that few Americans, if any, will doubt the propriety of interposing legislative restrictions upon the deportation from Europe of foreign paupers and convicts to the United States.

I could go on and quote page after page from Government reports, newspapers, periodicals, pamphlets, and resolutions showing that the native Americans of nearly a hundred years ago felt the same alarm because of the inferior character of the then newly arrived immigrants which we feel in regard to the newcomers of to-day. But does it not seem strange that the very arguments that we now use against the modern Europeans are those which were then used against the English, the Irish, the Scotch, the French, and the Germans?

I stress this point because one of the chief arguments made against the new immigrant is that he fills our jails, almshouses, hospitals, and other institutions, which impose a heavy tax burden upon the community, and this is exactly the argument which was used against the immigration of 100 years ago. America, however, guided by wise statesmen, kept a cool and level head and refused to change her immigration policy.

What happened to these so-called paupers and criminals of 1820, 1830, and 1840? They, or rather their children and their children's children, given every economic opportunity that a free country could offer, gradually but inevitably raised their standards of living, were assimilated, and have become the flesh and blood of our Nation in the best sense of the word. Of the 435 Members of this Congress fully 150 are descended from families whose names are not recorded in the first census of 1790. I have no doubt that some of the descendants of some of those so-called paupers and otherwise undesirable foreigners are the very ones who to-day are crying out against the Italians, the Poles, the Lithuanians, Bulgarians, Russians, Jews, and Bohemians. The Americanization process begins to be effective with the children. Oliver Wendell Holmes said that to properly bring up a child you must begin with the grandparents. I am tempted to say that the Americanization process is not complete until you come to the grandchildren.

I would not, in the least, minimize the problem that confronts us. I realize that because of the more marked differences in language and tradition and custom it is more difficult, and will be increasingly so, to completely absorb into our social and political life these varying groups of people. It imposes upon us a heavier burden and a larger responsibility. We will need more time in which to meet it. We will have to put forth a more and more conscious effort to assimilate these people as they come to our shores. This, however, is far from saying that they are of so inferior a character that the process of assimilation is either impossible or too costly or not worth the effort.

Nor must we forget that these peoples from south and southeastern Europe can make, as they have made, their distinctive contribution to American life. Their temperament as well as their distinctive cultural past enables each of these nationalities to contribute to the mosaic which we call America.

We never have been a homogeneous people, and it is questionable whether homogeneity is the thing to be most desired in national life. As in agriculture so in human culture, cross-fertilization, to a limited extent, may be a desirable process.

This does not mean at all that I would throw the doors wide open to unlimited numbers from these or any other countries. I believe in restriction and selection, but the selection should be on the basis of individual discrimination and not group discrimination, the undesirables being rejected as individuals and not as groups. I do not believe in selection which artificially groups people according to races and nations, declaring some to be desirable and others undesirable.

That the newcomers present a more striking contrast to those already here than did the immigrants of 100 years ago can not be doubted. Also, it must be conceded that conditions, social and political, are less simple than they were when our fathers and forefathers came to these shores. It must likewise be conceded that the late war has created a psychology which makes the American less hospitable. All of these conditions make the immigration problem a more difficult one to solve.

Mr. RAKER. And is it not a fact that at the next Congress following that report they passed the contract labor law, prohibiting these contract laborers from entering this country?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. In 1840?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. As a matter of fact, the first general immigration law did not come until 1883.

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Look up your facts. I say that the people who now boast their superior ancestry—and it is splendid—these same people are supposed to have been the paupers and immigrants in 1820, 1830, 1840, and 1850.

Gentlemen, I went through the Congressional Directory and I discovered that there are 150 Congressmen whose names are not in the first census of 1790. There are 150 Congressmen who are descendants, apparently, on the male side, from these people that were considered so undesirable in 1838.

In all times you find this antiforeign feeling; and, mind you, the prejudice that existed in 1838 was not against the Italian. Oh, no. It was not against the Slav, the Czech, or the Semites, but against the Welsh, the Scotch, the Irish, the English, and the German. Those are the facts. Read McMaster's History; go back and read the pages of history and see how the people a century ago talked about the people from England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales just as you do about the people from southern Europe.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there a government in Europe to-day of which the gentleman would like to be a subject?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I do not think that has anything to do with the question. But I will answer it in this way: I would rather be a citizen of the country in which I had the honor to be born—and that is this country—than any country in the world.

Mr. BLANTON. Then let us protect it for the gentleman and his posterity.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. But I am not so prejudiced as to think we are the only great country in the world.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman does not want this country to be like the countries in Europe?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. No; I have seen the countries in Europe. I would rather live here.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman does not want to see this country in the condition that the European countries are?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. No. How did this country get in such good shape? Surely the immigrants did not stand in the way of this country's growth; then let us keep on and have the same ratio of foreigners. [Applause.]

I will now address myself to the next inquiry:

DOES THE JOHNSON BILL FAIRLY AND EFFECTIVELY MEET THE SITUATION

I believe it is a fair statement to make that the proponents of the Johnson bill have in mind to accomplish two objects: First, to correct the weaknesses in the administration of the present law, and, second, to reduce to a minimum the number of immigrants coming from southern and southeastern European countries.

The authors of this bill are to be commended for some very admirable features in it, especially those designed to ameliorate the sufferings and hardships resulting from the operation of the present 3 per cent quota law. We will all approve that feature of the bill which permits the uniting of families of citizens of this country. The provision which exempts fathers, mothers, wives, husbands, and children from the operation of the quota law is absolutely fair and humane.

That feature of the law which will reduce to a minimum deportation is also worthy of our support. This will be accomplished by the granting of certificates on the other side which, while not guaranteeing the holder entrance into this country, will prevent him from being deported except for physical reasons or upon the discovery of new evidence tending to show that the holder of the certificate is seeking admittance in vio-

lation of the law. Examination on the other side prior to the granting of certificates is a sensible provision.

These splendid features of the Johnson bill are counterbalanced by one fundamental defect which amounts to a glaring and gross injustice, the inclusion of which makes the bill, as a whole, unacceptable.

I stated above that it was the very definite, if not always stated, purpose of the proponents of this bill to reduce to a minimum immigration from southern and southeastern Europe. This the majority of the committee were so anxious to accomplish that they have stultified themselves by recommending an unjust and untenable basis for computing the admission quotas.

As you know, the bill provides that in place of the present 3 per cent quota on the basis of the 1910 census, there shall be substituted a 2 per cent quota on the basis of the 1890 census. The operation of this new quota provision is shown in the following table:

Yearly immigration quotas admissible under present law compared with pending bill, H. R. 6540 [1]

Country of birth	Present 3 per cent quota, 1910 census	Proposed 2 per cent quota, 1890 census	Per cent reduction for important countries
Albania	288	204	
Armenia (Russia)	230	217	
Austria	7,451	1,190	−84
Belgium	1,563	709	−55
Bessarabian region	2,792		
Bulgaria	302	200	
Czechoslovakia (Bohemia)	14,557	2,073	−85
Danzig, Free City of	301	423	
Denmark	5,619	2,982	−47
Esthonia	1,348	302	
Finland	3,921	345	−91
Fiume, Free State of	71	210	
France	5,729	4,078	−29
Germany	67,607	50,329	−26
Great Britain and Ireland	77,342	62,658	−19
Greece	3,294	235	−93
Hungary (including Sopron District)	5,638	688	−88
Iceland	75	236	
Italy	42,057	4,089	−90
Latvia	1,540	317	
Lithuania	6,744	502	−93
Luxemburg	92	358	
Netherlands	3,607	1,837	−49
Norway	12,202	6,653	−45
Poland	26,862	9,072	−66
Portugal	2,465	674	
Rumania	7,419	831	−89
Russia (European and Asiatic)	21,613	1,992	−90
Spain (including Canary Islands)	912	324	
Sweden	20,042	9,761	−51
Switzerland	3,752	2,281	−39
Yugoslavia	6,426	935	−85
Palestine	57	201	
Syria	928	212	
Turkey (European and Asiatic)	2,388	223	−90
Other Asia	81	245	
Africa (other than Egypt)	122	238	
Egypt		206	
Atlantic Islands	121	241	
Australia	279	320	
New Zealand and Pacific Islands	80	267	
Total	357,803	169,083	−53

[1] The new bill (H. R. 7449) reduced slightly the 1890 quota by providing for 2 per cent plus 100 for each country instead of 2 per cent plus 200. The general percentages of reductions would remain with but slight change.

NOTE.—Canada, Cuba, New Foundland, Mexico, and countries of Central and South America not subject to quota restriction. For the year ending June 30, 1923, 117,011 came from British America, and 82,961 from Mexico, Central and South America, and West Indies

It is clear from these figures that the percentage of reduction for southern and southeastern European countries is much greater than the percentage of reduction for the northern and northwestern European countries. The proponents of the bill do not deny these facts. They admit the discrimination, but seek to justify it on the ground that it is necessary to do this in order to wipe out a discrimination of the present act by which the countries of southern and eastern Europe are given, as they say, an unfair advantage. Their defense is that they are removing a discrimination in the present 3 per cent immigration law based on the 1910 census.

It must be clear to anyone who understands the immigration question and is familiar with the flow of immigration into this country that a quota law based upon the most recent census would naturally favor those countries from whence immigration has been the heaviest in recent years, namely, Italy, Poland, Russia, and other southern and southeastern European countries.

The committee that presented the bill in 1921 knew this at the time. That they realized what they were doing is evidenced by the fact that they refused to take the 1920 census. To correct this so-called discrimination the committee now proceeds to perpetrate another discrimination, this time in favor of the German, English, Swiss, Danish, French, and other of the northern and northwestern countries.

Even if we admit that it was wrong to take the 1910 census as a basis, two wrongs do not make a right. One way of avoiding this discrimination would be to take an average over a period of years, say, the last four census periods. The operation of such a basis for computing admission quotas is shown in the following table:

Estimated immigration quotas on census reports of 1890, 1900, 1910, and 1920—2 per cent plus 100 for each nationality with average for the four census periods

Country or region of birth	Present law, 3 per cent 1910	2 per cent census of 1890	2 per cent census of 1900	2 per cent census of 1910	2 per cent census of 1920	2 per cent average for 1890, 1900, 1910, 1920
Albania	288	104	121	292	212	182
Armenia (Russia)	230	117	141	252	419	232
Austria	7,451	1,090	1,891	4,994	11,510	4,871
Belgium	1,563	609	749	1,142	1,356	964
Bulgaria	302	100	100	302	311	203
Czechoslovakia	14,557	1,973	3,531	11,472	7,350	6,467
Danzig	301	323	314	300	250	311
Denmark	5,619	2,882	3,298	3,846	3,844	3,467
Esthonia	1,348	202	337	998	1,484	755
Finland	3,921	245	1,365	2,714	3,113	1,859
Fiume	71	110	117	148	210	146
France	5,729	3,978	3,734	3,920	3,177	3,702
Germany	67,607	45,229	43,081	40,172	28,705	39,297
Great Britain, North Ireland	77,342	41,772	37,282	34,508	29,152	35,678
Greece	3,294	135	259	2,142	3,625	1,540
Hungary	5,638	588	1,232	3,932	8,047	3,449
Iceland	75	136	142	150	150	145
Italy	42,057	4,689	10,815	28,133	32,315	18,989
Latvia	1,540	217	371	1,126	1,681	849
Lithuania	6,744	402	655	1,852	2,801	1,427
Luxemburg	92	158	161	162	352	208
Netherlands	3,607	1,737	2,000	2,504	2,733	2,245
Norway	12,202	6,553	6,857	8,234	7,425	7,267
Poland	26,862	8,972	16,277	20,752	22,902	17,225
Portugal	2,465	574	1,016	1,744	1,616	1,237
Rumania	7,419	731	1,512	5,046	2,157	2,361
Russia	21,613	1,892	4,596	16,270	25,161	12,005
Spain	912	224	245	708	1,320	624
Sweden	20,042	9,661	11,772	13,462	12,649	11,886
Switzerland	3,752	2,181	2,414	2,602	2,477	2,418
Yugoslavia	6,426	835	1,504	4,384	3,500	2,555
Other Europe	86	410	410	410	410	410
Palestine	57	101	104	138	164	127
Syria	928	112	167	688	1,142	527
Turkey	2,388	123	218	1,870	841	763
Other Asia	92	230	230	230	230	230
Egypt	18	106	108	112	117	110
Africa	104	410	410	410	410	410
Australia	277	220	240	296	323	269
New Zealand, Pacific Islands	80	167	152	154	178	163
Total	357,682	161,184	178,769	239,930	240,400	207,748

In this table is indicated the number admitted under the present 3 per cent law, based on the 1910 census, and the number which would be admitted under the Johnson bill, providing for a 2 per cent quota based on the 1890 census, and a 2 per cent average based on the four census periods.

If the committee were sincere in desiring to avoid discrimination for or against any people they would have proposed such an average as I have indicated. It is not yet too late to do so.

The committee recommending the Johnson bill had to have some reason or excuse for the use of the 1890 census. They discovered that pretext in this fact, namely, that a 2 per cent quota based on the foreigners in this country in 1890, by some strange coincidence, happens to coincide or approximate the percentage of distribution of foreign-born in this country up to the present time.

The committee has invented a new kind of political arithmetic. In this political arithmetic they lump together a group of nations from northern and northwestern Europe, including England, Ireland, Scotland, Germany, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. The committee claims that these countries gave us the basic stock out of which our Nation has developed. By the use of this political arithmetic they discovered the following: That a 2 per cent quota based upon the 1890 census would preserve the "racial balance."

In violation of all known sociological facts the committee lumps together the following nations: In the grouping of countries the following are treated as southern and eastern countries, namely, Albania, Armenia, Austria, Bulgaria, Czechoslo-

vakia, Free City of Danzig, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Russia, Spain, Yugoslavia, and "other Europe"; the following are treated as northern and western countries, namely, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain and Ireland, Iceland, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland.

Could anything be more absurd? What sense is there in a grouping which includes the Latins of Italy and Spain with the Slavs and Tartars of Russia, with the Teutons of Austria, the Czechs, the Semites, and others?

The travesty of their political arithmetic may be disclosed by one illustration: The committee will admit, of course, that the principal stock out of which our country grew is the English, and yet under this bill 45,229 will be admitted from Germany and only 41,772 from Great Britain and north Ireland. You can not lump together a group of nations artificially without committing the grossest kind of injustice in assigning quotas to individual nations within those groups.

The trouble is that the committee is suffering from a delusion. It is carried away with the belief that there is such a thing as a Nordic race which possesses all the virtues, and in like manner creates the fiction of an inferior group of peoples, for which no name has been invented.

Nothing is more un-American. Nothing could be more dangerous, in a land the Constitution of which says that all men are created equal, than to write into our law a theory which puts one race above another, which stamps one group of people as superior and another as inferior. The fact that it is camouflaged in a maze of statistics will not protect this Nation from the evil consequences of such an unscientific, un-American, and wicked philosophy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Will the gentleman grant me a little time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will yield the gentleman three additional minutes. It is not quite fair to say that the committee makes any such classification as that. It arbitrarily selects the 1890 census for the purpose of getting behind the years in which a large number of immigrants came from all countries. It does not say that Finland belongs to any particular part of Europe or any particular group.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I think I see the point, and I know the significance of it. I will tell the gentleman where I think there has been some rather fuzzy thinking upon this question. I have given very close attention to all of the statistics and have read all of the speeches that have been delivered. Here is where the gentleman makes his mistake. Let us say for argument's sake that there are in the United States to-day, of all those that settled here, 85 per cent who came from these countries which you call northern or northwestern Europe, and 15 per cent from all of the other countries. What do you proceed to do? You say that out of every hundred immigrants that come into this country, naturally and logically, 85 ought to come from those countries. Is not that your conclusion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Partly.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Can the gentleman not see that that is not sensible arithmetic, because you do not distinguish as between nations within the group? I called attention to the fact the other day in a debate on the floor that under this theory you give Germany more than you do England, and yet the whole hypothesis is based on the fact that the English people and their stock founded this country. You give Germany more than you do England. There is something wrong with your arithmetic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman is not quite right.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Do you not give Germany more than you do England?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It would take too long to answer that question.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Wait a minute, and I will answer it—45,229 for Germany and only 41,772 for Great Britain and northern Ireland under your bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will answer it. The point is here. We admit that this country is made up of immigrant stock, and immigrants came freely at a time when all struggled alike to get this country on its feet. We had lands to give away, and as those conditions changed the type of immigrants changed, until we began to develop the mass settlement, and in an effort to get rid of that we have sought to cut out the mass settlement, no matter from what countries they come.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I do not think you quite see the unfairness of what you do. I know what you are after. In attempting to get at one result you do an injustice to arithmetic. You lump all of the nations together in one group, and you give more to Germany than to England. I have nothing against Germany. You lump together what you call undesirable Italy with what somebody might call desirable Bohemia. What is the sense of running together the Semites, the Slavs, the Magyars, the Latins, and all these other people who have had different cultures, and so forth?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is what we do not do. We are not responsible for the outside public classification, or even for the classification of the Commissioner General of Immigration. So far as we are concerned, we do not care whether they are round heads, longheads, or bone heads. We are going to cut down the number that come here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is giving the House such valuable information that I can not help yielding him another five minutes.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I recognize, and I think you must all recognize, that the more recent the census we take the greater is the number you admit from southern and southeastern Europe. I am going to be perfectly fair. When you gentlemen drafted that bill you favored those countries. On the other hand, the further back you go the more you favor those who come from the other countries. If the 1910 census is unfair to one group, your 1890 census is unfair to another group. If you want to accomplish your purpose, let me whisper something to you: I have worked out the figures, and I suggest that you take the census of 1880, and then you will not admit any undesirables at all—or the number will be reduced to the vanishing point.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, yes; they would.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Well, very few. It would reduce it to an almost insignificant number. If you want really to be fair, you ought to go back as I have done, and I will be glad to show you these figures, and take the average of the several census periods, giving due consideration to the people who were here at the various census periods, and then you will do justice to the various peoples that come from the various nations. Then you get away from the idea of discrimination. If you take the four census periods, 1890, 1900, 1910, and 1920, I think you will strike a fair average, and you will get away from this un-American and unfair proposition such as you have in your proposed bill, and, we might as well say, such as there is in the present law.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. The gentleman says that the chairman has been unfair to arithmetic.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. LINEBERGER. Does not the gentleman think that that is a rather technical objection? Is it not better to be unfair to arithmetic than it is to be unfair to the American people?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. But you must not violate such a fundamental thing as arithmetic.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman favor the exclusion of the Chinese?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman favor the exclusion of the Japanese?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. Is not that unfair to them?

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. No, and I will tell you why. I would not go into a country where I did not have an equal status with other people in that country, and I say this in justice to those foreigners, I am not thinking only of America, I am thinking of those who come here because if we do not assimilate them, they can not help us. It is bad for them and bad for us.

Mr. PERKINS. Possibly it would be a fair thing for America to suspend immigration until we digest what we have here.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. I would rather suspend immigration for a period, say, of three years, if it were necessary to do that, than to pass a law which sets loose prejudice, antiracial, antireligious, and anti-American feelings.

Mr. PERKINS. I would agree to that, perhaps——

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. But it is not necessary. You are working on the assumption that there are too many foreigners in this country, that the flow is too great, that we can not assimilate them, and that this is a menace. I do not agree with that philosophy.

Mr. PERKINS. I am working on the assumption of America for Americans.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. So am I. But what is an American? How long do men have to be here to be Americans? How long has the gentleman been here?

Mr. PERKINS. Since I was born, and my forefathers had been here for 260 years.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Does the gentleman think for that reason he is better than one whose ancestors did not come over in the *Mayflower?*

Mr. PERKINS. I can lick them.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Then the gentleman must be Irish. [Laughter.]

Mr. SABATH. There may be some the gentleman can not lick.

Mr. PERKINS. I will take on anyone who is not an American.

Mr. JACOBSTEIN. Now, gentlemen, what is the conclusion? I do not know how you will vote, but you ought at least to admit the facts. There have been so many statements made on this floor that are loose and unfounded that I felt it my duty to present these facts to you so you may vote intelligently.

These facts show, first, that we have no more foreign-born in the United States than in 1860 in proportion to the entire population. The facts show the flow of immigration to this country is less to-day than it ever has been in the last 80 years. The flow of immigration has been cut 40 per cent under our present law. I have shown by absolute facts that the concentration of foreign-born in our cities is not as great as it was when Lincoln was elected President, and I have shown that the cry against the change in the character of immigration has always been made. It was made against your forefathers in 1820, it was made in 1830, it was made in 1840, and in 1850. Finally, if it is necessary, if we are to meet the situation in an American way, I am willing to vote for restriction for the good of the country, but I am not willing to vote for restriction on a basis which is absolutely un-American, as is this feature of the present Johnson bill. [Applause.]

I realize that we have in this country over four million unnaturalized foreigners. I realize that it is more difficult to completely assimilate some of these people than it was to assimilate the foreigners of a hundred years ago. I realize that the congestion of foreign population in our industrial centers aggravates the situation. Realizing all of these things, I can by some effort convince myself that a temporary but moderate restriction policy might be wise as well as necessary, not only for the welfare of America but in justice to the aliens who are here as well as in justice to the immigrants that may arrive in the future. It is my hope that the discriminatory and un-American features of the Johnson bill will be eliminated and its many fair and just provisions be retained.

For such an amended bill I am willing to vote.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to exclude all foreigners for years to come, at least until we can ascertain whether or not the foreign and discordant elements now in what many are pleased to term "our great melting pot" will melt into real American citizens.

We have admitted the dregs of Europe until America has been orientalized, Europeanized, Africanized, and mongrelized to that insidious degree that our genius, stability, greatness, and promise of advancement and achievement are actually menaced.

The Johnson bill now under discussion is the best measure we can get and is indorsed by 99 per cent of my constituents. This bill allows only 2 per cent of the nationals of foreign countries to enter our gates, based on the census of 1890, and they must conform to strict requirements as to moral, mental, and physical excellence. We are under no obligations to incorporate in our social framework the poorest quality of European manhood and womanhood, and the quicker we deport the unassimilable we now have the better for America. As the last boatload of these undesirables left our shores for foreign ports they sang "To hell with America." Certain highbrows profess to be shocked that our doors are to be practically closed to aliens. They claim they want to Americanize these aliens, when the danger is that we will alienize America if we continually allow steamship companies to profit by pouring into our country a steady stream of cheap alien laborers, many of whom are people with a strange religion, are radical or red, hating our customs and disloyal to our flag.

That our people can be happy and prosperous without any considerable foreign immigration, I refer my colleagues and the country to the South, the section in which I live and where my people have lived for generations. The South has in it but few people of foreign extraction, as the term is defined and understood, and I am reminded here of General Grant's views in this connection, stated years ago.

GENERAL GRANT'S PROPHECY

General Grant, when at the height of his power, said to members of his family, more than 40 years ago, as his son, Jesse Grant, recently wrote the Manufacturers' Record, that he regarded as a grave danger the heavy immigration of foreigners into this country. And to that statement he added that he feared and believed the time would come when the South, with its Anglo-Saxonism, could be depended upon largely to save the Nation from serious hurt by the influence of an alien population.

If General Grant could have lived to the present time, the fear which he had 40 years ago would have been intensified many times.

The figures as to the number of foreigners or those of immediate foreign stock living in the United States are startlingly significant. New England, once the home of rock-ribbed Americanism, has ceased, so far as population is concerned, to be truly representative of America. Over 60 per cent of its population is of foreign stock.

Rhode Island leads all other States with a foreign stock of 69 per cent, followed by Massachusetts with 66 per cent, Connecticut and North Dakota with 65 per cent each, Minnesota 64 per cent, New York 62 per cent, Wisconsin 59 per cent, and New Jersey 58 per cent.

New York City had at the census of 1920 a total population of 5,620,000. Of this number, 4,294,000, or over three-quarters of its population, are of foreign stock. Chicago, out of a population of 2,700,000, had 1,941,000, or 72 per cent, of foreign stock. These two cities are but typical of many others, the detailed figures for which I shall omit.

On the other hand, the South has been almost wholly free, as compared with the rest of the country, in the matter of foreign stock. The total for the South, including Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas, is only about 8 per cent, against 48.2 per cent in the rest of the country. As Rhode Island leads with 69 per cent of foreign stock, North Carolina leads the Nation at the other end of the line with only seven-tenths of 1 per cent of foreign stock. North Carolina is one of the most prosperous States of the Union. It is developing—industrially, commercially, and agriculturally—with amazing rapidity. It is probably one of the most law-abiding States in the Union, and its courts enforce the laws without fear or favor. It is carrying forward a campaign of college and university extension involving the expenditure of six or seven millions of dollars at present for new buildings and having $20,000,000 as the ultimate plan of this campaign. Some $42,000,000 was expended and voted for public education in the single year June 30, 1921, to July 1, 1922, in that State. It is putting $50,000,000 or more into highway improvements. It is harmoniously expanding its hydroelectric developments and its cotton-mill interests, and yet it is doing this with less than 1 per cent of foreign stock, an unanswerable proof of the fact that this Nation can carry forward its material development and expand every interest which makes for the betterment of humanity without any great influx of foreigners. My own State of Arkansas has developed wonderfully with but a small alien population.

I close by quoting the lines of Thomas Bailey Aldrich, which we should read often and remember:

Wide open and unguarded stand our gates,
Portals that lead to an enchanted land.
Of such a land have men in dungeons dreamed,
And with the vision brightening in their eyes
Gone smiling to the fagot and the sword.

Wide open and unguarded stand our gates,
And through them presses a wild, a motley throng—
Men from the Volga and the Tartar steppes,
Flying the Old World's poverty and scorn.
These bringing with them unknown gods and rites,
Those tiger passions, here to stretch their claws.
In street and alley what strange tongues are these;
Accents of menace, alien to our air,
Voices that once the Tower of Babel knew!

O Liberty, White Goddess! is it well
To leave the gates unguarded?
Stay those who to thy sacred portals come
To waste the gifts of freedom.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman used four minutes.

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it will be my pleasure to vote for the Johnson immigration bill, as it looks like it is the best we can do under existing circumstances. It seeks to protect American ideals and institutions. In doing this it is fair—nay, more than fair—it is even generous to all the nations of the earth. A bill of this kind ought to have been passed some years ago, but it was, I presume, impossible then, as the idea was prevalent that Uncle Sam was young and strong and able to become the asylum for all the nations and tribes of the earth. But now the situation has changed, and the vast majority of the American people, in my judgment, believe that the time is now at hand to really restrict immigration or prohibit it altogether. Every delay on this matter now means danger. Good as this bill is, it is not all I would have it to be, for the reason that I believe all immigration ought to be prohibited until we can Americanize and assimilate the population we now have, and if there be any among us who can not and will not be assimilated, they should be sent back to the country from whence they came. In this view I do not stand alone, for the country is behind the movement, and this being a representative form of government it is our duty to carry out the wishes of the people. I do not criticize the committee because I realize that in a committee, as in the House, practically all legislation is a compromise and the "give-and-take" element has its innings. But I am wondering why the bill was not written in more restrictive terms. Some days ago, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE] was discussing the immigration question, he made the statement in an answer to a question that he believed the House would pass a bill prohibiting immigration if the committee had reported it. The American Legion Weekly in its issue of February 29, 1924, quoted Chairman JOHNSON, of the House Immigration Committee, as having made the statement—

> that a poll of both Houses of Congress shows that a majority favors a more rigid restriction of immigration than has ever been written into a bill.

In his speech last Saturday in the House the distinguished chairman of the Immigration Committee [Mr. JOHNSON] said:

> I believe that fully 80,000,000 citizens of the United States are bending a laboring oar with a majority of the Members of the House and Senate in this effort to really restrict immigration to the United States.

Therefore I am wondering why we can not pass a really prohibitive measure demanded by the vast majority of the American people. I am wondering why a more restrictive bill was not reported by the committee. In my campaign for Congress I advocated in my platform and on the stump an absolute prohibition of immigration, and I introduced a bill in this House seeking to carry out the idea I had advocated. I got my eyes opened on the immigration question during the great World War, for among the many valuable lessons we learned during that war was that we had in the United States too many people with us who were not of us nor for us.

When General Pershing accompanied the expeditionary forces across the submarine-infested waters to assail hostile lines which had never been broken and divisions which had never been conquered, the first message, as I recall, that he sent back to the President of the United States was:

> You take care of the enemy at home, and I will take care of the enemy over here.

What did that mean? It meant that we had a number of people in the United States who were content to enjoy the blessings and protection of the greatest Government on earth while their hearts were in a foreign land and their hopes were with a foreign people. "A house divided against itself can not stand"; and the only reason we did stand was because the traitors here "boring from within" were in a hopeless minority. And I was surprised on last Saturday in this debate to hear the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KUNZ], who seems to be opposing this measure, say:

> Look at the statistics. You have 5,000,000 aliens in America who are not loyal to the flag, who are not loyal to the Stars and Stripes. If they were, they would take the oath of allegiance.

So, according to the statistics referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KUNZ], we still have among us those who are not of us and not for us. I am aware that we have many people of foreign birth in the United States who are now and always have been good, patriotic citizens. I am aware that they have contributed largely to our past glory and our present greatness, and I would not pluck one star from their crowns. It is not of them that I speak. I speak only of those who were not loyal then and are not loyal now. This country, as great as it is, as immense in area, has no room for one to stand who harbors in his heart a divided allegiance. I think it is the duty of each citizen to support constitutional government in all its relations and to safeguard Anglo-American civilization upon this continent. Many who are opposed to this bill have argued that it discriminates. I can not see wherein it discriminates. The bill to me seems fair. I agree with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE] that there is no discrimination; and if there is, then there is less than in the act passed by the last Congress. I do not understand that anyone has an inherent right to come to this country.

This great question is an American problem, and I am looking at it from the standpoint of an American citizen as to what is best for America, without malice or prejudice against anyone. I agree with the gentleman from California [Mr. MACLAFFERTY] that "we are all God's children," and under His divine guidance it is our duty to work out not only our destiny individually as best we can, but our national destiny as well, and that in doing this it is our right and duty to say who is to come and abide with us; and in making this selection we should be "dead sure" that those who do come have both the capacity and inclination to make good citizens, who will place this country above all other countries and our flag above all other flags. The late Theodore Roosevelt said that we had become a "polyglot boarding house." I understand that in one State of this Union 25 different languages are spoken. Why not have just one language here, and that the English language? We can not always remain the "melting pot." The lumps that will not melt should be thrown out. This Republic can not endure if we permit to come in all the odds and ends of the earth with their many tongues, their many ideas and ideals, practically all of which are foreign to our history, our institutions, our traditions, our plans and purposes. "With charity for all and with malice toward none as God gives us to see the right, let us strive to finish the work we are in" and transmit to those who are to come after us the blessings of free government, the most priceless heritage we can bequeath to them. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SWANK].

Mr. SWANK. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, one of the most important measures to come before this session of Congress is the immigration question. As a nation, Christian and charitable, we have been too lax in our laws admitting foreigners to our shores. The question of preserving our ideals, institutions, and free form of government is before us for decision, and we must act and act now. As for myself, I am ready to act and would liked to have seen this bill made into law long ago. I voted for the 3 per cent law approved May 19, 1921, and for its extension, approved May 11, 1922. This law expires June 30, 1924, and we must remedy the situation before adjournment and before the expiration of the present law. This bill should have received consideration earlier in the session, but the Committee on Immigration has been busy holding hearings on the various bills before it, and this bill is the result of the careful deliberation of the committee. The members of the committee who reported this bill favorably for the consideration of Congress deserve the commendation of the entire membership. They have labored hard and long and have brought forth the best immigration bill ever offered to Congress and the country. If the bill were submitted to the people of the country it would not take long for it to be adopted by an overwhelming vote. Our American citizenship is thoroughly aroused over this question and is awake to the dangers of delay on the enactment of a more stringent law.

I have no hatred for people from foreign lands, and the other Members who favor this bill have none. All our ancestors came from a foreign country at some time in the past, but they came here for the purpose of building homes, erecting churches and schools where they could educate their children as they desired and worship God as their conscience dictated. They came to America to escape the tyranny, hardships, oppression, militarism, and monarchies of the Old World. These hardy pioneers constructed the greatest government ever yet devised by the mind of man. That great charter of human liberty, the Constitution of the United States, was the work of their minds and their descendants. They founded upon the shores of the New World the greatest civilization of all time. They took God for their guide and paid no allegiance to any other ruler

except the Government of the United States. Now, after all these years of thought and toil we must not permit their labors to come to naught. Those hardy settlers and others who followed later were looking for freedom politically and religiously. They did not come to destroy a free government erected here, and we will not permit it to be destroyed now. Congress has decided to act and its action will be effective. We will show the world that we are Americans who believe in the right to make our own laws.

As other Members of Congress, I am sorry for the honest immigrant, oppressed by the kings, princes, and emperors of foreign governments, but we can not afford to take any chances of destroying our own Government to accommodate some of these people. Our hospitality has been abused in many cases. We must restrict immigration. We must assimilate those who are here and Americanize them before admitting others. If they want to become Americans and believe in our institutions, let them show their good faith by becoming naturalized and obeying our laws. Those who are here now, denouncing and abusing our Government, should be deported at once. When they become dissatisfied with the way Americans do business they should not criticize the Government, but should go to the land from whence they came.

Greater restrictions should also be added to our election laws. In the time that a person from a foreign country may become a naturalized American citizen it is impossible for him to appreciate our form of government, our institutions, and our citizenship. A person born here must live in the United States for 21 years before he can vote, but this does not apply to a person born in a foreign country. A person born and reared in a foreign land and residing there until young manhood can not possibly understand our system of government in the short time required of him to live here before he votes. Some say it is a delicate question, but as for myself I am not seeking the votes of any person who wants this country run by foreigners from any country. Many of them who have been naturalized in the past are among our best citizens, law-abiding, and thrifty. That class of immigrants have been a good addition to our country. The population of the United States is increasing in large numbers each year, and if we do not add further restrictions on our immigration laws more people will be out of work. We are for our own people first, and after they are taken care of then there is plenty of time to look to those of other countries. I sympathize with the oppressed in whatever country he may have the misfortune to live, but I am for the Americans first. Our first duty is to those at home. Why do the opponents of this bill want more foreigners admitted? Many American citizens born in a foreign country are for this bill. They appreciate the dangers that beset us unless greater restrictions are added.

Mr. Chairman, if I had my way and were permitted to write this law I would prevent all immigration except the immediate members of a citizen's family for a period of at least five years. I would try to Americanize those who are already here before permitting the entrance of others. Many who had not been naturalized, it is true, fought for human liberty and the preservation of free government in the World War, and everyone praises them for their heroism, and they can become American citizens in fact. When that class of citizens are naturalized they will make Americans and will have our best interests at heart.

This bill now under consideration limits the number of immigrants to 2 per cent of the number of foreign-born individuals of particular nationalities resident in the United States as determined by the census of 1890, and 100 in addition. The minority report complains that this will reduce the quotas from the different countries. That is what we are trying to do by the enactment of this bill. In addition to this quota the bill permits the wives, children under 18 years of age, and parents over 55 years old of American citizens to be admitted. The bill provides for preliminary examination of immigrants overseas before coming to this country, and places the burden of proof where it belongs, on the alien instead of on the United States. No one has yet made a valid objection to those provisions. Some say that this bill will contravene treaties with certain countries. Our Constitution places the treaty making power, it is true, in the Executive, but the same document also provides that treaties must be approved by the Senate of the United States. I do not believe that the Department of State is greater than the American Congress, and am opposed to that department, whatever the political complexion may be, making immigration treaties without suggestions from Congress. Let the Secretary consult with the lawmaking body and then negotiate his treaty. If he makes a treaty with any foreign country admitting more of the citizens of that country than is good for the United States, then it should be promptly rejected by the Senate. It is the duty of Congress to make the laws, and the duty of the Executive to enforce those laws.

Mr. Chairman, many patriotic bodies in the United States have passed resolutions for the enactment of more stringent immigration laws. The American Legion at its annual convention in San Francisco last October passed the following resolution:

> That Congress be urged to permanently deny admission hereafter as immigrants or permanent residents to all aliens who are ineligible to citizenship under the laws of the United States.

At the annual convention of the American Federation of Labor in Portland, Oreg., October, 1923, the following resolution was adopted:

> We recommend that the executive council be instructed to advocate before the Sixty-eighth Congress a more stringent immigration policy, under which immigration shall be curtailed below the present quotas.

In opposition to the bill, I quote from a resolution adopted at a conference of foreign-language newspaper editors and publishers at the Pennsylvania Hotel in New York, December 11, 1923:

> *Resolved,* That we, the undersigned publishers and editors of the foreign-language press of New York, at a conference in Hotel Pennsylvania, on December 11, express our unequivocal opposition to any and every attempt to limit further the immigration into this country, and to establish cleavages in our democracy by discriminating against certain nationals and racial groups from Europe, particularly as applied in the proposition of the new Johnson immigration bill, which changes the census year upon which the quota is based from 1910 to 1890.

Mr. Chairman, in the letter with which the resolutions were inclosed, signed by the chairman of that meeting, is the following statement:

> We call your particular attention to that part of the resolution which dwells on the proposition to base the new quota of immigration on the 1890 census. This is the most objectionable part of the new Johnson bill. It is so objectionable that the United Foreign Language Newspaper Publishers and Editors are determined to carry on an educational campaign throughout the length and breadth of this country to enlighten all of our citizens on the iniquity of the proposition.

The foreign-language papers will not deter any Member of Congress from doing his duty. Such attempted dictation to an American lawmaking body is an insult and is another good reason for passing this bill.

The following is a table showing the number of immigrants from different countries based on the percentage of this bill under the census of 1890, 1900, 1910, and 1920:

Estimated immigration quotas based on census reports of 1890, 1900, 1910, and 1920—2 per cent plus 100 for each nationality

Country or region of birth	Estimated quotas based on 2 per cent of census plus 100			
	Census of 1890	Census of 1900	Census of 1910	Gensus of 1920
Albania	104	121	292	212
Armenia (Russian)	117	141	252	419
Austria	1,090	1,891	4,994	11,510
Belgium	609	749	1,142	1,356
Bulgaria	100	100	302	311
Czechoslovakia	1,973	3,531	11,472	7,350
Danzig, Free City of	323	314	300	250
Denmark	2,882	3,298	3,846	3,844
Esthonia	202	337	998	1,484
Finland	245	1,365	2,714	3,113
Fiume, Free State of[1]	110	117	148	210
France	3,978	3,734	3,920	3,177
Germany	45,229	43,081	40,172	28,705
Great Britain and North Ireland	41,772	37,282	34,508	29,152
Irish Free State	20,886	18,641	17,254	14,576
Greece	135	259	2,142	3,625
Hungary	588	1,232	3,932	8,047
Iceland	136	142	150	150
Italy	4,689	10,815	28,138	32,315
Latvia	217	371	1,126	1,681
Lithuania	402	655	1,852	2,801
Luxemburg	158	161	162	352
Netherlands	1,737	2,000	2,504	2,738
Norway	6,553	6,857	8,234	7,425
Poland	8,972	16,277	20,752	22,902
Portugal	574	1,016	1,744	1,616
Rumania	731	1,512	5,046	2,157
Russia	1,892	4,596	16,370	25,161
Spain (including Canary Islands)	224	245	708	1,320

[1] Fiume is to be added to Italy.

Estimated immigration quotas, etc.—Continued

Country or region of birth	Estimated quotas based on 2 per cent of census plus 100			
	Census of 1890	Census of 1900	Census of 1910	Census of 1920
Sweden	9,661	11,772	13,462	12,649
Switzerland	2,181	2,414	2,602	2,477
Yugoslavia	835	1,504	4,384	3,500
San Marino	110	110	110	110
Andorra	100	100	100	100
Liechtenstein	100	100	100	100
Monaco	100	100	100	100
Palestine	101	104	138	164
Syria	112	167	688	1,142
Turkey	123	218	1,870	841
Hejaz	105	105	105	105
Persia	125	125	125	125
Egypt	106	108	112	117
Liberia	100	100	100	100
Abyssinia	100	100	100	100
Morocco	100	100	100	100
Union of South Africa	110	110	110	110
Australia	220	240	296	323
New Zealand and Pacific Islands	167	152	154	178
Total	161,184	178,769	239,930	240,400

NOTE.—By reason of alteration of bases of computation, principally the elimination of "Other Europe," "Other Asia," and "black" Africa, certain quotas are materially changed. The German quotas are reduced by reason of the allocation of quotas to Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc. The Danish quota increases at the expense of the German quota by reason of the award of Schleswig to Denmark. The British quota increases by absorption of quotas from Cyprus, Gibraltar, and Malta (heretofore part of "Other Europe"), but is decreased by allocation of a quota to the Irish Free State. The Italian quota increases by reason of absorption of Rhodes, Dodecanese, and Castellorizzo. All estimates printed above, therefore, are subject to considerable revision. They can not be considered as final.

It will be seen from the above table that the total quota under the terms of the Johnson bill is 161,184.

The Census Bureau estimates that in 1900 from the original immigrants by the census of 1790, 35,000,000 people have descended. It is also estimated that there are more than 45,000,000 of these people in the United States in 1920. There are nearly 14,000,000 foreign-born persons in the United States at this time and about 7,000,000 of these have never been naturalized. But few of the last number can read or write the English language.

Among other recommendations by the legislative committee of the American Federation of Labor, we find the following:

The provisions of the Johnson immigration bill, which provides for a 2 per cent quota and the admission of families of foreign-born citizens, are being maliciously attacked. The greatest opposition comes from foreign countries, their nationals in this country, and unfair and greedy corporations. The January and February reports of the United States Employment Service show a surplus of labor, especially of what is designated as unskilled labor, in nearly every industrial city and town in the United States. Secretary of Labor Davis has said there are 10,000,000 people in Europe who are anxious to come to America. It will thus be seen that the danger ahead of the United States can not be treated lightly.

With unemployment in this country, greater distress will be felt here unless we further restrict immigration of aliens to our common land. Not only will this affect the industrial life of our cities and towns, but it will also affect our rural life. Those people who are not acquainted with our standards and methods of living will not add to our domestic happiness nor our civilization. We must take care of our own people first. Some concerns no doubt want the flow to continue from foreign countries that they can employ labor more cheaply, regardless of the effect upon our Government. It is time to call a halt on this influx of aliens to this country, and now is the time to act.

Those who do come we want to become full-fledged Americans and throw off all allegiance to all foreign governments and their rulers.

Mr. Chairman, we must and will maintain in this country 100 per cent Americanism, the enforcement of the law, and the perpetuation of our free institutions. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman use some time on the other side?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY].

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, the New World was settled by the white race. True, we found here when the Pilgrim Fathers landed the red race. The Indian was never adapted to civilization. His home was the forest. He knew no government. He cared nothing for civilization. He gave freely of his land to the white man for trinkets to adorn his person; and this race of people, the first Americans, were pushed back as the forests receded until to-day he occupies here and there small portions of the United States, living the primitive life, wards of this Government, and in a few years they will be known no more forever.

They never were a menace to the Government. They have never been known in politics. On account of race and blood they have never been able to assimilate with our people and have kept their own place and have caused very little trouble in the progress of civilization in this country.

America! The United States! Bounded on the north by an English colony, on the south by the Tropics, and on the east and west by two great oceans, was, God-intended, I believe, to be the home of a great people. English-speaking—a white race with great ideals, the Christian religion, one race, one country, and one destiny. [Applause.]

It was a mighty land settled by northern Europe from the United Kingdom, the Norsemen, and the Saxon, the peoples of a mixed blood. The African, the orientals, the Mongolians, and all the yellow races of Europe, Asia, and Africa should never have been allowed to people this great land.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERSEY. No. I have only 10 minutes.

These are the mistakes of the past, now almost without a remedy. In our eagerness to conquer the wilderness, to plant the land, to cultivate the cotton and the cane, greedy importers brought to this country from Africa a race foreign to our people, who never could mingle with the blood of the white race except under the curse of God. To me one of the most awful tragedies in American life was the introduction of the African race, not voluntary on their part, but brought here as slaves to become ever after a source of danger, cause for civil wars and dissensions among our people. To me the greatest curse of the South was the introduction of slave labor and the mingling with a race that never could be a part of our people or could ever form true civilization in the process of assimilation.

The South, the richest, the fairest, the most God-endowed land in all the world, has been handicapped, obstructed, and defeated in its course toward a grander success in America by the 11,000,000 negroes that have overrun that fair portion of our continent. The negro was intended of God to constitute one race and one people and one nation, and while he lives upon the American continent, mingling with the white race with whom he can never expect to assimilate, whose blood can not mingle with ours, whose aims and purposes and life are all foreign to the white race, we must suffer and continue to suffer as a retribution for the sins of our people who brought them here as slaves.

This is not all. From the east have come the Chinese and the Japanese, the oriental, and settled all along the beautiful Pacific coast, a people whose blood and race and habits of life and ideals have made it impossible to assimilate with our people and to become one in our objects and purposes and destiny. Their rapid increase in population has overrun the far western part of the United States and threatens and contests the supremacy of that beautiful part of our country with the white man.

This is not all. We have thrown open wide our gates and through them have come other alien races, of alien blood, from Asia and southern Europe, the Malay, the Mongolian, the oriental with their strange and pagan rites, their babble of tongues—a people that we can not digest, that bear no similarity to our people, that never can become true Americans, that add nothing to civilization, but are a menace to our form of government.

We have brought them here in the past in the name of labor that we might open our mines and dig our canals, dredge our rivers and harbors, and build the railroads of our lands. They have performed this work, completed it, but have not returned to the land from which they came and they remain here to menace our civilization.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. HERSEY. No; I can not yield.

When we consider our present-day troubles in this land we easily trace them to the colored race in the South stretching over the Northern States, organizing antirace blocs and groups, holding the balance of power in elections, dictating to Members of Congress what class of legislation, in their favor, shall be enacted or what Members of Congress shall be defeated.

We find in the great West the Jap and the Chinaman, protesting and objecting to any restrictions upon immigration of people from their own land. They assume the right to dictate to us who we shall admit as immigrants into this country and assume also to contest with the people of the western coast the supremacy of that beautiful land. The immigrants from

southern Europe, of mixed bloods, the soviets and the socialists and the bolshevists, the radicals and anarchists obtain possession and control here and there of organized labor and persist in dictating to labor its policy and to form into groups that menace the peace of the land and organize into revolutionary blocs to destroy the government of our fathers.

I have a great deal of respect for those mighty organizations of labor which combine together men of brain and brawn for their own interests, for lawful purposes, who love the flag of the country and whose aims are the highest and the grandest. But lawful, wise, organized labor to-day has no greater foe than those alien peoples who do not become citizens, who talk broken English or some foreign tongue and who combine not only to destroy the effectiveness of labor unions and the standards of labor but to destroy the government as well.

The hour has come. It may be even now too late for the white race in America, the English-speaking people, the laborer of high ideals, to assert his superiority in the work of civilization and to save America from the menace of a further immigration of undesirable aliens. [Applause.]

I wish it were possible to close our gates against any quota from southern Europe or from the orientals, the Mongolian countries and the yellow races of men. The present administration did a great work along this line in the enactment of the present law and yet, under that law, we admitted last year 522,919 immigrants into the United States, while it is estimated from reliable sources that over 1,000,000 more came into the United States illegally and unlawfully through our southern and northern borders.

Those legally coming into the United States during the last year are as follows:

Twenty-one thousand five hundred immigrants registered as coming from England, 15,700 from Ireland, and 23,000 from Scotland, a total of 60,000; yet a record of the nationalities of all immigrants coming into the United States discloses the fact that there were 60,525 English, 30,386 Irish, and 38,627 Scotch. Only 48,000 registered as having come from Germany, but the nationality records show that there were 65,500 Germans admitted. Only 4,380 came direct from France, but there were over 34,000 French admitted during the year.

In other words, a very large proportion of the immigrants came from some other country than their native country. Canada is the most prolific source of immigration of this character. Out of the 523,000 immigrants admitted last year, 115,635 came through stations on the Canadian border.

Of all nationalities admitted, the Germans were highest in number, 65,543 being admitted. Mexicans stood second, with 62,709; England third, with 60,524; Hebrews fourth, with 49,719; Italians fifth, with 48,000.

Through the port of New York came 295,473, considerably more than half of all the immigrants admitted.

This bill attempts to restrict immigration for the future and admits quotas under the census of 1890. Our immigration up to 10 years ago was about 70 per cent from northern Europe and 30 per cent from southern Europe. These figures have now been reversed, and therefore it is necessary to use the 1890 census.

The New York Times gives the reason for using this census instead of the 1910 census, and says:

The charge of unfairness and discrimination, as applied to the pending bill, which bases the quotas on the census of 1890, is entirely unfounded. That bill, in fact, merely preserves the racial status quo in the United States with respect to immigration more nearly than can be done by taking any other census as the basis. In other words, the proposed legislation, far from being aimed at any particular race, is based on broad considerations of public policy and the welfare of the country as a whole.

The Boston Transcript gives a picture of the alien rush to America during the last year. It says:

The great influx of aliens into American ports that has taken place with the beginning of a new fiscal year and the consequent beginning of new immigration quotas has demonstrated anew the necessity of some kind of immigration restriction as a defense of the legitimate interests of the American people. America's reported unpopularity abroad apparently has not abated by a whit the desire of Europeans to leave their homes in the Old World and establish themselves in the United States. Hardly had the calendar indicated the start of another fiscal year when a veritable fleet of trans-Atlantic liners sought to unload in American ports their human cargoes of hopeful immigrants. In New York some dozen liners raced up the bay in an effort to reach Ellis Island before the quotas of one or more nationalities for July should be exhausted. These ships, the advance guard of a still mightier fleet, carried 6,000 immigrants who desired to land on American shores. This number, it may be pointed out, is approximately equal to the number of immigrants who entered the United States from Europe in 1923. Nor is the rush confined to New York. Four ocean liners reached Boston, each bringing their hundreds of prospective American settlers. If the rush to American ports is so pronounced under the operation of the 3 per cent rule, how all-sweeping would be the inrush were the bars to be taken down? What sort of a place would America be if the American people permitted their country to be a haven of refuge and an asylum for the tens of millions in Europe and the Near East who so earnestly desire to set foot on American soil?

The Washington Post graphically places before its readers the menace of immigration under our present law when it says:

Public sentiment against admitting stubborn and unassimilable material into American life is growing stronger. Radicalism is said to be provoked by the situation resulting from admitting masses of indigestible foreigners. These aliens, not knowing American ways and having no interest in becoming citizens, remaining here only for pillage and mischief, have proved only too often their dangerous character. Among the aliens, also, are men who work for starvation wages because they live on a standard far below anything that an American would tolerate. These aliens take work away from Americans, and in some cases there have been serious clashes because of this economic struggle.

The primary reason for restriction of the alien stream, however, is the necessity for purifying and keeping pure the blood of America. The danger line has been reached, if not passed. The percentage of illiterates here is too large, and the percentage of unassimilable aliens is also excessive. The Secretary of Labor sounds a plain warning to his countrymen, and reminds them that millions of the wrong sort of aliens are already here. If they can not be absorbed, why should others be admitted to increase the danger? The nature of American institutions should not be changed, even for the sake of relieving a labor shortage. Prosperity is desirable if it is the right sort, but it is too costly if purchased by debasing the level of American manhood and womanhood.

The riffraff of Europe will pour into America if an opportunity is offered. Employers and contractors of labor, not feeling responsible for the welfare of America, can not be trusted to direct the national policy. The situation plainly requires Congress to be extremely cautious in changing the laws which regulate immigration.

The bill before us provides for a greater restriction of immigration and yet sufficient for our needs. It goes further and makes a careful selection of immigrants, who must pass the examination of our American consuls abroad.

The opposition to this bill comes with few exceptions from the importers of labor who are importers of aliens who are to-day in agreement and in contract with ship owners who seek to make money out of the traffic of those who can find sufficient funds to pay their voyage to our land. America can not afford to imperil her future and further demoralize her Government and destroy the hopes of the Nation and undermine our standards of civilization by any legislation less drastic than this bill. [Applause.]

President Coolidge, in his first message to this Congress, states clearly our duty when he says:

American institutions rest solely on good citizenship. They were created by people who had a background of self-government. New arrivals should be limited to our capacity to absorb them into the ranks of good citizenship. America must be kept American. For this purpose it is necessary to continue a policy of restricted immigration.

It would be well to make such immigration of a selective nature, with some inspection at the source, and based either on a prior census or upon the record of naturalization. Either method would insure the admission of those with the largest capacity and best intention of becoming citizens.

I am convinced that our present economic and social conditions warrant a limitation of those to be admitted. We should find additional safety in a law requiring the immediate registration of all aliens. Those who do not want to be partakers of the American spirit ought not to settle in America.

Secretary of Labor Davis, in his annual report, says:

There is no instance in all history, since the Goths, starving and in danger of extinction by their enemies, succeeded in begging their way into the Roman Empire, which does not demonstrate that soon or late the immigrant people overthrows the older civilization. This has not been accomplished by force or by armed invasion. In almost every instance great civilizations have perished through peaceful penetration of aliens who were admitted to do the work of the community. In some cases they drifted in as free labor, many entered as slaves, or as soldiery in the employ of the higher civilization. In every case, however, these migrations have resulted in the overthrow of the higher civilization by the infiltrating aliens.

[Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OLIVER]. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I represent a large part of a great section of New York City known as the Bronx. The statistics quoted in debate on the floor during the last two days show that a large part of our population was born in European countries. They show that the sons and daughters in large numbers of these so-called aliens constitute another great part of our people. They are all called aliens and un-American by speakers on this floor. I have been somewhat amazed at the turn in the debate and the effort to prove by statistics what I throughout my life have not found to be true. I shall not endeavor to support my statements by statistics, but rather by a life's observation. Any deduction may be drawn from statistics, so I prefer the test of observation and experience over a considerable course of years.

This bill has been drawn to freeze out the Italian and the Jew from America. I have lived among the Italians and Jews and people of foreign birth in the Bronx. I find them fine people. I have palled with them since boyhood; have played with them on the field of sport, studied with them, and met them in their business and social life. I pay them my tribute as a neighbor and a friend. They have been to me close friends and fine friends. I believe that so far as the people of the Bronx are concerned there are no better or purer or more loyal citizens in the entire United States.

Gentlemen have arisen here with statistics alleging that certain of our foreign-born citizens commit the majority of crimes in this country. Other gentlemen have put before us statistics proving this is not so. Statisticians may battle as much as they please over that subject, but as far as the Bronx is concerned we find there one of the cleanest counties in the State of New York. Our officials have been selected from this so-called foreign group that gentlemen here complain of.

Judge Gibbs came to this country as a boy from Russia. He could not speak the English language. Yet the other day the great governor of our State said he is one of the finest, most humanitarian, and honorable judges in this country to-day. The former district attorneys, now Judge Martin and Judge Glennon, elevated because of their splendid records to the supreme court of the State, and our present great district attorney, John McGeehan, all well known to my friend who gives me his close attention, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], have testified to the good order, decency, and law-obeying qualities of our people. All of these great officials are the sons of aliens. Judge Vitale, the great son of an Italian immigrant, is living testimony of the capacity for American citizenship of the people of the blood of his father. I can call the roll of honored Americans of foreign birth in the Bronx by the hour. No more learned and capable lawyers are there than Assistant District Attorneys Albert Cohn and Jeremiah Adelman, of Jewish origin, or George De Luca, of Italian blood.

The romantic story of the rise of poor boys of foreign birth is told in every block of my district. Davis Brown and Maurice Miller are but two examples that come to my mind in this hurried talk. They represent men from foreign countries who have contributed heart and brain and hand to make America a little greater than they found it. But the number of men and women of foreign birth who have loyally served are legion. I could mention dozens of names of men from Irish and German stock, of whom America can well be proud, who reside in the Bronx. But the Irish and the German people are paid a tardy compliment in this bill. All who have debated this question on the floor admit that they have made great Americans. It is too bad that that was not admitted when they first landed, so that they could have been spared the years of unhappiness that bitterness and predjudice caused them as they came ashore as immigrants.

Criticism has been made of the protests from the Italian and Jewish citizens against the enactment of this bill. It has been said here that their complaints are un-American. They protest not because they are un-American but because they refuse to believe that the people of the United States, who have profited by their loyalty to America in peace and war, should now condemn them on the ground that they are inferior in quality and unfit for citizenship.

The State of New York sent into the World War 518,000 soldiers. Of these 13,850 soldiers were killed. A large sector of these were alien troops, if you please, shot in battle wearing our uniform and under our flag. I remember General O'Ryan said in a speech he delivered in New York that when he passed over a battle field of Europe in the late war upon which a New York City regiment had fought he thought he was at a place where some foreigners had struggled, because when he looked at the identification tags on the bodies of the dead he judged from the names that they represented every nation on earth. But they were New York boys who fell in the forefront of the fight under the flag of the United States. He paid them the only tribute worth reckoning with now, the tribute conveyed in the admission that the loyalty of sons of aliens was proven beyond question by the blood they shed in America's cause.

I believed the story told during the war, the story that came from every section of the country, that here in America there is no North, no South, no East, no West, but one country, one people, one destiny, one America. I heard it uttered on the floor to-day, but not for the same purpose and not in the same spirit and not for the same end. No! The great sentiment is now invoked to break us up into factions, fractions, fragments, and mere sections and blocs. I am astonished at the new test of patriotism that is being put upon us to-day. Why, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS]—I am sorry I do not see him here now—the other day was ingracious enough to ask the question, "Did not these foreigners who enlisted with America fight really for their old homelands?" Why did he not ask that question when these men enlisted for the war, whether they were enlisting for America or for some other country?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. May I have three minutes more?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. I have heard it said that those of us from city districts are representing foreign governments or foreign votes. That is a strange thing. The city of New York has been a part of America all the years of America's life. We have only one flag there; and yet when you come to look at the statistics under your supposed test of a foreign city we have always been largely foreigners. In the census of 1793 we had a total population of 314,366; and we had an English population of 245,901; Scotch, 10,034; Irish, 2,525; Dutch, 50,000; French, 2,424; German, 1,103; Hebrew, 385; and others, 1,394.

We have been aliens under the test of what is now called alien from the beginning of this great country. Yet at what time of the Government's stress and need have you called on the people of the city of New York and found them lacking in any way?

I will pay my tribute to the gentlemen of the South, the Anglo-Saxons, as some here call them. They are a wonderful people. They are a grand part of America. Nor has anyone more admiration than I have for the people of the West. I have a great regard and affection for them. I have met gentlemen here from all sections of the country. If I ever had a prejudice against any section, which happily I have never had, my association with Members here would relieve me of that. I find here men as fine as there are in the world. But I do not pick out any section where I find the best and the finest of you. I look everywhere and find you equal. I find a standard of manhood here that is equal to the manhood of our city in every regard. But we have in New York citizens who are no whit inferior to the best that you have here. We have a bright, ingenious, patriotic set of splendid, devoted Americans.

Do not pass this law. It looks to me as if it was written by a couple of horse traders. It is a slick law, a slippery law. A card sharp never would have thought of anything as shrewd. It runs back to the census of 1890, 33 years ago, to find a foundation for our Government to-day. There is no honest purpose in that. You should pass a fair law. Pass a law based on a quota representing the flood tide of immigration, not a quota on a basis of what was not coming in. I do not like that kind of thing. It is a cheat. I would not vote for it. I will vote for restriction on a fair principle. I do not believe in an immigration that wants to come to America just because it wants to run away from the burdens of Europe. That is not what we want. That is a negative immigration. We want a positive immigration that comes to America for America's sake, for liberty's sake, and for justice and to help the great cause of our Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield some time to myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, during the course of the debate on this bill it has been frequently asserted that the subject of immigration presents the most vital and serious problem that confronts the American people to-day, and that upon the swift, certain, and correct solution thereof depends not only the welfare of

our people and the preservation of our American stock, but the stability and perpetuity as well of those sacred institutions transmitted to us by an intrepid and illustrious ancestry. I find myself in complete harmony with those who take this position.

Mr. Speaker, there have been three distinct epochs in our immigration history. Our first immigration policy was based upon what is known as the asylum theory—that is, that the United States should be a haven of refuge for the persecuted and oppressed of all lands. Of course, this asylum sentiment was a very lofty and praiseworthy one, and while as a result of this policy an indiscriminate and conglomerate mass of humanity came to our shores they were by no means all undesirables. These early immigrants are the lineal ancestors of some of our very best and most patriotic citizens to-day. While it will be recalled that during this period many European governments emptied their prisons, sending the inmates thereof to our shores, very few of them were of the real criminal class, most of them being men and women who had been confined in prison for conscience sake—for the alleged crime of demanding freedom of the press and freedom of speech, and for insisting on the still higher privilege of worshiping Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences. They came to America inspired by the very highest ideals—to better their conditions and to help build up this great western country which at that time was an unbroken forest.

Then came the epoch in our immigration history based upon an economic policy. During this period we encouraged immigration, especially immigrants of the laboring classes, because we felt the need of them in the development of our great country with its boundless and immeasurable resources. This condition continued until it had been advertised and known around the globe that the United States was the "land of opportunity"—a land, if you please, utterly flowing with "milk and honey." So that during this period the United States became a veritable dumping ground for all of the nations of the earth. Designing nations took advantage of our generosity and hospitality and inflicted upon us much of their undesirables—their diseased, their paupers and dependents, and their criminally inclined. This menace to the moral and physical welfare of our Nation was responsible for the third era or epoch which is generally known as the biological period. It was at the beginning of this period that we began to enact more stringent legislation governing our immigration activities, requiring mental, moral, and hygienic tests to insure us of the desirability of the alien for American citizenship. Under our loose immigration policy there had been dumped upon our shores thousands of undesirables, morally, mentally, and physically, and they have naturally found their way into the reformatory and eleemosynary institutions of our country, thus entailing an expense of many millions a year upon our taxpayers. It was to put a stop to this practice and admit only immigrants that were fit and desirable for American citizenship that legislation further restricting immigration was enacted. The urgency of this situation is what gave rise to what is known as our present percentage system. We have been criticized to some extent on account of the alleged severity of our immigration laws, and the measure under consideration has been assailed from many quarters, but, gentlemen of the House, the time is at hand when we must protect ourselves and our institutions against a menace which manifestly, if not met promptly and decisively, will mean absolute doom for the American Republic in a very few years.

We now have approximately 12,000,000 foreigners in the United States who neither speak nor write the English language, and a large majority of whom, by the eternal gods, do not want to learn how to do so. During this period of laxity in our immigration policy they were dumped upon our shores like so many cattle by the great steamship companies of the world, which vied with each other in commercial rivalry to see which could deliver the greatest number, regardless of their quality. These foreigners have gathered themselves together principally in the great centers of population and have established colonies in some instances the population of which exceeds 100,000. They have had the audacity to refer to these settlements as "Little Italys," "Little Russias," "Little Germanys," and so forth. In these colonies no pretense whatever is made to speak or write the English language, and no appreciation whatever is shown of the spirit of our institutions.

This class of foreigners brought over with them the habits, customs, traditions, and religions of the fatherlands and have thereby boldly undertaken to set up systems of life and activities at variance with our own. In these colonies they speak their own native tongues, read their own newspapers, and maintain their own separate educational system.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman give us the figures on the illiteracy among the natives of Tennessee and Kentucky?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. We have no illiteracy in Tennessee and Kentucky.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No illiteracy there?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is not as much as in New York City.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Under the law they must be literate or they can not come in.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I do not care to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Has the gentleman seen the New York State legislative document for 1924, No. 76, just issued by the joint legislative committee on the exploitation of immigrants, with the Hon. Salvator A. Cotillo as chairman, and added thereto the report of John R. Riley, specialist in the evening schools, on the question of illiteracy among the aliens in New York?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is not as to illiteracy but as to a knowledge of the English language, is it not?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; it is as to their illiteracy.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Does that report show that they are aliens?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It shows that 92 per cent of them are foreign-born whites. So do not let us hear anything more about illiteracy in Tennessee or Kentucky.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows that under the law they can not come in if they are illiterate.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. This class of foreigners brought over with them the habits, customs, traditions, and religions of the fatherlands and have thereby boldly undertaken to set up systems of life and activities at variance with our own. In these colonies they speak their own native tongues, read their own newspapers, and maintain their own separate educational system.

In 1920, out of a white population of approximately 95,000,000, nearly 14,000,000 were born in 45 different foreign countries and 23,000,000 more were of foreign or half-foreign parentage. These 14,000,000 foreign born, as a part of more than 34,000,000 aliens officially admitted into the United States from all countries since 1820, are supporting and reading 1,052 newspapers printed in more than 30 different languages, varying from Arabic to Yiddish, from Albanian to Welsh. In a single block in New York City 18 different languages are spoken and one public school in that city harbors children of 26 different nationalities.

These figures and conditions, Mr. Chairman, demonstrate undoubtedly one of two propositions, viz, either that these peoples are incapable of assimilation or that they obstinately refuse to assimilate; and either horn of the dilemma, in my opinion, presents a situation that is sad to contemplate.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, ponder for a moment, if you please, the 1920 census figures showing the proportion of foreign born in the great metropolitan cities of New York and Chicago, with the knowledge that this percentage holds good substantially in most of the large centers of population throughout the North and East. According to the Federal census of 1920 the population of the city of New York proper was 5,459,463, and of this number 3,591,888 were foreign born. According to the same census the total population of Chicago was 2,701,705, of which number 1,893,147 were born abroad. These gigantic figures must be appalling to every thoughtful, red-blooded, patriotic American citizen. If this foreign element in our population would abandon the traits and traditions and predispositions of the fatherland, embrace the spirit of our institutions, dedicate and consecrate themselves to our flag and our Constitution, and thereby become good American citizens, the picture would not be half so dismal. [Applause.] But when we realize that there are to-day more than 12,000,000 foreigners in the United States who have refused or at least refrained from becoming a part of our integral citizenship; when we contemplate that more than 10 per cent of our total population owe and acknowledge allegiance to foreign flags and foreign governments, and decline to become a "part and parcel" of us, my friends, we must concede the cold logic of the measure under consideration and admit that the time has come for prompt and decisive action. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I can not yield because my time is very limited.

Candidly, Mr. Speaker, if I had my way about it, I would suspend foreign immigration altogether until some satisfactory

disposition had been made of these upward of 12,000,000 aliens that we already have among us. Why increase the burden? Why aggravate and enlarge the problem? There ought to be some system devised whereby these people can be given a reasonable time in which to determine whether or not they want to be American citizens, and if they decide in the negative, they should be invited to return to the land whence they came. According to my philosophy, there is no room on our good American soil for the man or woman who withholds from our flag that respect and reverence which its meaning deserves or from our Government that devotion and adoration which every good patriotic citizen rejoices to render.

Certain foreign nations and particular alien groups have had the temerity and presumption to criticize our immigration policy, as if this were a subject about which they had some natural or artificial prerogative to be consulted. Whoever before heard of such brazen effrontery! I grant to the bona fide, naturalized American citizen or to any other citizen of our country the right to criticize our policy upon any subject whatsoever, but for a foreign nation, or for a group of aliens in this country to assume to challenge the policy of our Government on this or any other subject is indeed to me preposterous and the very height of impudence. This is a sovereign Nation, and the immigration question is clearly a domestic one; and we certainly have the right to enact any sort of immigration bill that may suit our peculiar taste, convenience, or expediency, even if it may appear to be arbitrary or discriminatory as some of the enemies of this measure have suggested. So far as I am concerned, if it takes arbitrary, discriminatory, or even despotic legislation to protect America and American institutions, in the name of God, let us have them! [Applause.] The future welfare of America is the prime object of this legislation, and this should be the slogan of every American whether adopted or native born.

During the course of this debate, two distinguished Members of the New York delegation, both of whom are not very many generations removed from Europe, but both of whom are true Americans of recognized and unimpeachable loyalty, have taken occasion to say that opposition to immigration comes from States and districts that have no appreciable foreign element. This may be true to a certain degree, and I shall not attempt to controvert the allegation. I am an immigration restrictionist, almost if not to the point of exclusion; and I come from a district that is practically 100 per cent original stock. The people of East Tennessee and of the Allegheny section of our country generally are often referred to as "our contemporaneous ancestors" so pure is our Anglo-Saxon blood. Do you want to know why we are opposed to immigration as a fixed governmental policy? I will gladly tell you.

It is because we know something of the problems with which you in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and in the other big population centers have to deal, and while we sympathize with you, we do not want this condition extended to us. We want no "Little Italys," "Little Russias," or "Little Germanys" down in east Tennessee. [Applause.] America, with all that magic word means—Old Glory, with all that our victorious flag represents and symbolizes, is good enough for us; and we do not want anybody among us that entertains any different or diluted views upon our sacred acceptance of Americanism.

It is true that the foreign element in the population of the State of Tennessee, for example, is practically negligible. According to the Federal census of 1920, out of a total population of 2,337,885 only 15,648 were foreign born—a little more than one-half of 1 per cent. I seriously doubt if more than 500 foreign-born residents could be found in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. There is at least one county in my district that has not a single, solitary foreign-born resident in it, and there are others where the same condition substantially prevails. But, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be this pronounced distinction between the foreigner that comes to Tennessee and those that are attracted to the big population centers. Our foreign born immediately and in good faith renounces his alliegance to the fatherland; he learns our language, adopts our customs, sends his children to our public schools, exhibits a real and honest appreciation of our governmental activities, and just as soon as the law will permit he applies for American citizenship. This type of foreigner very soon takes rank with our very best citizens, and as a rule in a very short while his nationality is submerged in the great process of amalgamation. You will find no sign or symptom of Bolshevism or anarchy in the character or conduct of this class of foreigner, and the red flag is just as repugnant to him and his sensibilities as it is to our own native born.

There is still another phase to this immigration subject which should challenge the patriotic consideration of the Congress, and that is the labor side of the proposition. We all recognize that immigration affords the strongest source of competition for the American that "eats bread in the sweat of his face." Every foreigner of the laboring class that enters our ports limits to that extent the opportunity of the American laboring man for industrial livelihood. A great hue and cry that has made the very welkin ring has gone up from the capatilistic interests of this country to the effect that there is a shortage of labor, and that our immigration policy must be modified to meet this demand, which they have denominated a great national emergency. So far as I am concerned I am opposed to subjecting the American laboring man to competition with the pauper labor of Europe and Mexico. I take the position that it is better for the country, for business and for society to have two jobs for every workingman than to have two workingmen for every job, and this proposition epitomizes one of the vital and outstanding equations of the immigration problem.

While discussing the immigration problem in this Chamber on December 11, 1920, I took occasion to accord to a certain secret organization proper credit for its part in the awakening of the public conscience of America to the dangers of unrestricted foreign immigration. This order is the Junior Order United American Mechanics, and its part in this campaign for a safe and secure America has been very conspicuous indeed.

I want to again to-day invite your attention and the attention of the whole country to the invaluable contribution which this stalwart organization has made to the sum total of what we have or may hereafter accomplish in the way of rescuing America from the "dumping-ground" and "melting-pot" menace. For the patriotic and unselfish service which this splendid order has rendered to the cause of Americanism it has earned and will deserve the everlasting gratitude of the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, recently I read in a letter published in the Boston Herald the following, which impressed me with its logic and philosophy:

> America is slipping and sinking as Rome did, and from identical causes. Rome had faith in the melting pot, as we have. It scorned the iron certainties of heredity, as we do. It lost its instinct for race preservation, as we have lost ours. It flooded itself with whatever people offered themselves from everywhere, as we have done. It forgot that men must be selected and bred as sacredly as cows and pigs and sheep, as we have not even learned. And, like us, it put full faith in the devils—luck and chance. And Rome perished—needlessly, ignobly, shamefully; and we shall perish if we do not speedily change and embrace intelligence. Rome brought in as slaves from all quarters conquered peoples who had no training in self-government and none of Rome's earlier ideals. They submerged and eliminated the Roman population. This sapped Roman stamina. The Romans were traitors to Rome, to themselves, to the Roman race. They paid the inflexible penalty; Rome rapidly senilized and died.

The question is, Shall we profit by Rome's example? If the propaganda by which the alien elements hope to overawe the Congress shall triumph in the defeat of this measure, Americanism will pass; and this Republic, the greatest experiment in human freedom ever attempted, will follow ultimately in the wake of the ill-starred and unfortunate Roman Empire. On the contrary, if this bill is passed it will restore faith and reassure confidence in the principles promulgated by the fathers. It will rekindle the fires of patriotism and reincarnate liberty in the hearts of the people, rejuvenate Uncle Sam, restimulate the American eagle, rehearten the American spirit, and reglisten every star in Old Glory's field of blue. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if I were to take seriously some of the speeches which have been made since the opening of this debate I would be afraid to go back to my own home city, which I love, for fear that there I would see that the great institutions in that part of the country, which represent the best that is in Americanism, were about to be destroyed.

I have learned for the first time as an American Congressman that I do not represent Americanism. We have been told upon this floor, that because we do not believe in the methods taken by those who have drafted this bill we are not true to America and her institutions, but that we are the hirelings of the nations across the sea.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I have no fear for the future of this Nation. I do not stand here in fear and

trembling because of its institutions, for I can look back to my district, one of the districts made up of cosmopolitan people, and there I can see the representatives of almost every nation of Europe—a happy people, a prosperous people, with no race or religious prejudices; with no race suicides, but there happy, rosy-cheeked children of the immigrant playing in the playgrounds and upon the highways—they the future citizens of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, after studying this bill and the hearings held thereon by the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization a thing which strikes me rather forcibly is what appears to be an effort on the part of unscientific men to solve the problems of immigration by scientific methods. So forcibly has this point impressed me that I have searched the entire records of the progress of this bill and fail to find that the pseudo scientific claims of the sponsors of the bill have been substantiated from any scientific source. As a matter of fact this committee assuming to deal with the highly scientific subject of racial characteristics of man has failed to invite the opinion of any recognized scientific authority on the subject. The question of the desirability of one race of people as against another has been handled in a most slovenly manner, and this legislative bungle is the result, a bill smattering of Ku-Klux Klanism, religious bigotry, and racial hatred.

I have heard much said by way of recommending that the so-called Nordic race, as potential American immigrants, are more desirable than other races of people, and I wonder if these champions of the Nordic people really know what they are talking about. I wonder if they know the origin of these Nordic people who are now represented as bearing in their hands the panacea for the imaginary perils assailing American ideals and institutions; the sedative for the hysteria which, strangely enough, had its birth so soon after the rebirth of the Ku-Klux Klan.

It is not my purpose, nor my desire, to plunge into discussion of the origin of the races of man, their migrations, and their final blending into the types which inhabit the world to-day, but I would like to dwell briefly on the cycles of immigration to the United States which have governed the discovery, exploration, colonization, and development of our country.

In the beginning there were no human beings on the American Continent with the exception of the American Indian. That fact given recognition, the only deduction remaining is that all others now on the American Continent are foreigners or descendants of foreigners. It is pertinent to ask, by what divine right do these foreigners and sons of foreigners ordain that this glorious corner of God's green earth is to be set aside for their particular and peculiar benefits? Granting and in hearty accord with the principle that we have the right to control and regulate immigration to our shores, by what methods of reasoning do one class of immigrants arrive at the astounding discovery that their race or type is superior to all others?

After acknowledging that our American Indian is actually the only "100 per cent American" in our country we arrive at the next stage of our racial composition—that of discovery. There is no need for lengthy discussion of this phase, but it is important to again note that a son of Italy—Christopher Columbus—gave to us the wonderful heritage we enjoy to-day in America.

The next stage is that of the invasion of America, the period when schemers and adventurers came here to plunder, for greed, for domination, and for other selfish motives. The first type to come here and settle were the Spaniards in 1512, in Florida, and in 1539 in New Mexico and Arizona. They were followed by the English, Dutch, and French. Some of the settlements established by these early arrivals have flourished, others have ceased to exist.

The third stage was the period of the true pioneer, or those who came here in the eighteenth century, the true settlers. Large numbers of English, Scotch, and Irish; more Dutch came to the East, and more Spaniards to what is now Texas and California. This period also saw the beginning of the German immigration. Some of those who came were sent here as a reward, others who came were criminals sent here as punishment and for exile. This last is particularly true of some of the early English arrivals at the Carolinas.

A study of the history of the world for the eighteenth century reveals that many conditions operated to make living uncomfortable and unbearable for certain races of people in Europe. Wars, tyranny, religious and economic persecutions, and other causes drove many people to America. For them it was a haven and a refuge in their hour of direst need. It was reached only after countless hours of suffering; travel in those days was not the smooth-running machine we have in operation to-day.

The beginning of the nineteenth century found all Europe knowing of the wonderful opportunities afforded in America to the politically oppressed. Transportation was better organized and not so much terror attended the voyage to America. The French, English, and Napoleonic wars caused much derangement in the economic life of Europe; men were jailed for their thoughts and utterances; the spirit of liberty had grown to a sturdy plant which the heel of tyranny could no longer spurn to the ground. Revolution swept Europe like wildfire; advocates of religious and political liberty were put to death or escaped to America. For the most part those who escaped were young people and the best blood of the Old World—college students, writers, journalists, and men of high education and high ideals.

The other causes which contributed to increased immigration during the nineteenth century were increases of population, need for expansion, famines, and so forth. In Germany, central Europe, and other sections the consequence of increased population was increased saturation. Some means had to be found to absorb the overflow and as America was becoming better known and no other part of the world offered similar opportunities the most of European surplus population came here. A condition of famine in Ireland brought on by despotism influenced a large bulk of the Irish immigration of that time. The Irish came here in great numbers and have taken their places as admirable citizens of the United States.

We now come to the most powerful factor in inciting immigration to America in the nineteenth century—our reputation as the land of the free and the haven for oppressed peoples. Inhabitants of overcrowded, harassed Europe, ruled by despots, victims of greed, suppressed and subjected to all manner of difficulties arising from political intrigues, turned their faces to the west, seeking this wonderful freedom and happiness to be found in America. Friends and relatives already in the United States wrote glowing accounts of living conditions here, the cheapness and abundance of food, and the availability of unlimited and untouched natural resources waiting to be changed into the gold for which men live and die. In many cases the letters were accompanied by tickets for transportation. The result was many thousands of Europeans disposed of everything they possessed in worldly holdings, severed the ties which held them to the places of their birth, and faced the west with indomitable courage, decision, and determination.

At this point it would be well to give some thought to the racial composition of these immigrants of the nineteenth century. The first to come in any great numbers were the Irish. They settled in the Northeastern States, and very soon came into control of the great cities which were springing up in that section. They had the same mother tongue which had been adopted in America and progressed rapidly. A hardy, happy, prolific race of people, they have been America's strong bulwark in peace and in war.

The next to come were the Germans and central European Slavs. They were, many of them, skilled artisans, and laid foundations for many important industries in the United States. Then came the Poles, Slovaks, and Hungarians, who drifted inland and settled in the Allegheny country. There they aided in developing the great mines of that area and the steel industry, in which America leads the world. The next to come were the Scandinavians and Finns. They found the climate of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the central Northwest comparable to that of their native lands. They found their livelihood in the forests and on the farm lands which soon opened up under their cultivation. This class of immigrant soon controlled the lumber industry, and has now become an important factor in the production of foodstuffs in large quantities.

Following the Scandinavians came the picturesque Italian from the sun-kissed shores of what was once the greatest empire in the world. From one of the most overcrowded sections of Europe came these happy, fiery, swarthy descendants of Cæsar's soldiers, asking no more than a breath of God's pure air, the warmth of God's sunlight. Behind them extended centuries of the highest culture the world has ever known—contributions to art, sculpture, discovery, exploration, and literature. Following on the heels of their blood brother, they came to seek the benefits which he gave to the world, ready to do their share to make this country what it is to-day, and this they have done. The hand of the Italian was turned to developing the great public utilities which we enjoy to-day. The development of our great railway system was then in

progress, and the son of Italy turned to that work with vigor. To-day, enjoying and utilizing these things, how little credit we give to the race of men who made them possible.

Then came the Yugoslavs and the Jews. No more determined, aggressive, and thrifty race of people exists in America to-day than the Jew. True, he came in the final stages of our development, but there still remains a great deal to be done, and I know of no race better fitted to do this work than the Jew. They have taken their places in American life with a vigor that bewilders the complacent and frightens the laggard. Only those who by shiftless methods can not attain success lift their voices in condemnation of this virulent race of people—voices tinged with envy, discordant with malice.

A study of the origin and composition of the peoples of Europe will very soon explode any theories that one race of people is superior to another. Latin races are regarded by some as inferior to other races of people. When it is recalled the countless migrations of people from every section of Europe to every other section, it is a bewildering problem to find in any section of Europe a race of people which is distinct. Every section of Europe is inhabited by people of the same types we find in the United States to-day. Environment, climate, food, and habits may give one race different facial characteristics than another, but fundamentally all types have the same admixture of races and blood. The people of Great Britain, as well as those of Germany, France, central Europe, and Italy, are all greatly mixed and built up of the same racial elements. The Latin type, which seems to be the target of this bill, only yesterday ruled the world. They have in their veins the blood of Celts, Goths, Germans, and Slavs, as well as Mediterranean blood. On the other hand, the Alpines, as well as the Mediterraneans, enter into the composition of the British type; the Germans are probably one-third Slavic, one-third Nordic, and one-third Alpine. There is no scientific grounds for the notion that any European type, any part of the white stock of the world, is superior or inferior to any other, excepting through economic conditions, in education, and in habits, which are all temporary matters and can be balanced by new environment and education. The history of the children of immigrants shows ample confirmation of these facts. Most often do we find that the children of immigrants grasp the opportunities held out to them more quickly than do our own American children. Adversity appears still to be a faithful teacher.

So long as men so devise, any set of statistics can be made to yield arguments for and against any proposition. It is not my purpose to invite a controversy with the type of man who is dexterous in manipulating statistics. However, I will try to give my colleagues briefly the conclusions I have arrived at after a lifetime of residence among several of the types this bill is aimed at—Italians, Jews, Syrians, Greeks, Armenians, and the others.

My district comprises the most thickly populated sections of the great city of Boston. It is perhaps the most historic ground in the United States. The scene of the Battle of Bunker Hill, the Boston Tea Party, the Boston Massacre, and harboring the Old North Church, Faneuil Hall, Kings Chapel, and the birthplaces of Franklin, Paul Revere, and other patriots. In that district I think I have more Italians than there are in any other district in the country. I think I know the Italian people better than any other Member of this House, with the possible exception of my good friend from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA]. In all my lifetime dwelling among the Italian people I have never noticed that they constitute a grave menace to America. On the contrary, I find that they have made most excellent citizens. Italians and sons of Italians in my district have educated themselves in medicine, law, and the other professions; they toil hard, maintain the highest codes of honor, and subscribe to the laws of the United States. Many of the Italians in my district hold high public office—legislative and judicial. We in Boston love and respect our Italian people. In the face of ridicule and obstructions placed in their path they have arisen to places of prominence in Boston. In peace and in war they have answered the call of America without flinching, without qualification. The records of the World War bear me out in this; there were no Bergdolls among the Italian people of Boston. Sons of Italy lie buried in the soil of France, where they died to perpetuate the institutions, ideals, and flag of the country which now offers to Italians this accolade of a grateful Republic, this immigration bill discriminating against their brothers overseas.

During the past few years socialism and radicalism have sprung up in the United States. Strangely enough, we in the Northeastern States have not been troubled much by these elements; yet our States are peopled by the very races of people this bill seeks to eliminate. On the other hand, the Central States, peopled by your Nordic people, are hotbeds of socialism and radicalism. Only the other day Milwaukee reelected a Socialist mayor. Do not socialism and radicalism constitute a graver peril to America than "failure to assimilate"? Why not eliminate those types of people which accept the doctrines of socialism and radicalism most readily—the Nordic.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, just a few words, now, on assimilation. Several days ago I had occasion to visit Arlington National Cemetery. I have always found that a visit to Arlington is a great sedative for a troubled mind. Go there, and linger awhile in the sacred atmosphere of America's most holy spot, and you will come away with a renewed faith in the ideals, institutions, and principles on which our Government is founded. Sleeping the eternal sleep are the heroes whose supreme effort was for the perpetuation and protection of our Republic; the heroes of every armed conflict in which the Stars and Stripes have waved. I stood awhile at the tomb of America's Unknown Soldier, the last resting place of him, whom we know not, nor whence he came. Standing there, with bared head, I wondered if in life he was an Italian, an Irishman, a Jew, a Nordic, a Slav, or what; would we in our blind gropings for a solution of our immigration problems forever bar from our shores his loved ones? And I thought of what a travesty on American ideals it would be if in passing this bill we would prevent coming to America the unknown mother of our revered unknown soldier. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BOX. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I be not interrupted. Gentlemen, our colleagues who speak as if we were persecuting newly arrived or older immigrants of any race do not themselves speak discriminatingly. We are not proposing to punish anybody. We are not proposing to limit the privileges of any man living in the United States, however recently he may have arrived. We are providing that he may remain; he may return if he wishes after a trip to his old home; that he may develop to the fullest the opportunities of American citizenship; that he may make the best of our great life; that if he becomes a citizen he may bring his minor children; that he may bring his wife; that a wife may bring her husband; or that either may bring aged parents.

The only question is whether or not, after having admitted great numbers in our generosity and then having provided that they may bring their near and dependent relatives, all their racial kindred have a right to a residence and employment here. Because we have been generous with those who have come, is it unjust to deprive them of the privilege of bringing all their racial kindred?

Now, our colleagues on the committee, the two gentlemen who did not sign the majority report, speak pityingly of the ignorance and narrowness of the 15 who signed the majority report, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] accused somebody—probably members of the committee—of not being sincere.

This is an American committee if you can get one. Four of its membership are drawn from the three Pacific Coast States, two from Gulf States, four or five from States lying on the Canadian border, or Great Lakes, three from States touching the waters of the Atlantic, and the rest of the membership comes from such interior States as Colorado, Kansas, and Tennessee. If you are able to find men who are in touch with American life, you ought to get them from the delegations of the imperial States from whose delegations this committee was drawn, States on the four sides and in the middle of the Republic.

I wonder by what freak of fortune these two gentlemen on the committee, one from New York and the other from Chicago, became so wise while all the rest of the committee were so narrow and so ignorant, so un-American, and even so dishonest? The gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], who joined in the majority report, lives out on Long Island Sound, in the sea breezes and sunshine, but he is not within the charmed circle; he does not live within the city of New York, and is said to be narrow, ill informed, and prejudiced.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. I can not yield. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOLADAY], who also signed the majority report, has the honor of being the successor of Uncle Joe Cannon and is a worthy Representative of the great State of Illinois; but he does not live in the peculiarly constituted population of the city of Chicago, and therefore is ignorant, narrow, and un-American.

Gentlemen, your committee, drawn from all over the country, has prepared just about the best bill it could prepare. It does not represent the individual views of nearly all of the Members. I had a bill excluding the Mexicans and other undesirables from the United States, but I could not have my way as to that. The bill does represent the best composite that could be made and that which we believe best represents the enlightened sentiment, judgment, and patriotic purpose of the people of the United States.

I want to say now, lest I forget it later, that this bill ought to pass unamended. If you favor immigration restriction you ought to vote for this measure; if you want an excuse to vote against immigration restriction you will find something in it you can criticize. You will always be able to find that, but you will not promote the great cause in which the people of the United States are so much interested by weakening or breaking up this measure by amendment. You will not promote the great cause by voting for ill-considered amendments, for the chances are that every amendment you might propose has been considered over and over and over again. This measure represents the best efforts that your committee could make.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. I can not yield. Of course, you have the right to offer and vote for such amendments as you please. But if you want results as distinguished from loud talk, if you want to carry home accomplishments as distinguished from blustering noise, you had better pass the bill which the united sentiment of the restrictionists of Congress and of this committee have agreed upon and by which they propose to stand throughout this legislation. [Applause.]

The United States is, in fact, in the midst of a great world migration. It is the center toward which the crowded out and the unfortunate of every race and every land are trying to come. Nations are destroyed by tides like this. That has occurred over and over again. I wish I had time to review with you the history of the effort of China to unload its population upon the United States and with what difficulties Congress combatted that effort.

I wish I had time to discuss the same effort now being made by Japan. Although I do not live on the Pacific coast I have been in that section of our great country working with my colleagues on the committee. I say to my patriotic colleagues from every section of the country that the Pacific coast is imperiled. If our attachment to those fine people did not require it, good, sound Americanism requires that we stand by them in the struggle they are making. [Applause.] I hope there will be no surrender on that point, but that to the end we will follow the course which we have market out. [Applause.]

Oh, they dispute the statement that there is a great migration from all the world toward America. Why do the Japanese want to come? For lack of room—for the same reason the Chinese wanted to come. When the war closed Italy officially claimed a place for 1,500,000 of her people in the United States on the ground that we owed them a domicile for that many because the war had prevented that many from coming during the war period. A gentleman who, in his wisdom or lack of wisdom, will vote against this bill told me that he saw in Warsaw 1,500 people standing before the American consulate waiting to get their passports viséed in order to come to the United States. I asked a witness who was in Palestine, a Government official, what percentage of the people who had gone to Palestine from central and middle and southern Europe with a view to settling there wanted and planned to come to the United States. His first answer was 100 per cent. Later he modified his answer and said it might not be more than 95 or 97 per cent. One country has enough applications now from would-be immigrants to fill their quota for seven years. The tide had reached the enormous figure of about 1,300,000 per year before the World War disturbed conditions.

Disturbance, famine, and distress make great masses of men seek to find new places on the earth. If they were coming at the rate of 1,250,000 per year in the peaceful times which preceded the war, how many more would come now if permitted? We are well within the bounds of reason and fact when we tell you that the carrying capacity of the ships of the earth represent the only limitation that would be placed upon the number that would come to America if our laws did not restrain them. I make that statement, gentlemen, to you as my deliberate conviction after years of study. It is a fact, and you ought to deal with it as a fact.

This bill accomplishes two things. The first fundamental thing it accomplishes is that it restricts the number. It matters not how excellent the people may be, people of other attachments and other tastes should not pour in here in such numbers that they do not acquire the American character, that they do not love American institutions, that they do not live American lives, that there does not spring up from their minds, from their aspirations that which created American life and must maintain it if it is continued, for Americanism lives only in the hearts of the people and not in the letter of the Constitution or the outward forms of social or political life. [Applause.]

We propose to restrict the numbers. The present quota law, which is highly restrictive, reduced immigration to a mere fraction of the volume it would have had but for the law. It allowed quotas from Europe and the Old World numbering 357,000, when 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 would have come. Even under it we have already received above 500,000 during the present fiscal year, those coming from Mexico and other parts of America being included.

All these gentlemen, who were then in Congress, and now oppose this bill—or practically all of them—opposed that law. They have opposed every measure that has tended to limit the number. When it was proposed to keep somebody from Austria or Russia or Italy out of the United States for America's sake I look in vain for an instance in which that group stood up and said, "Yes; keep them out. We love America most." They do love America, but their anxiety to take care of the crowded-out and the unfortunate of other lands, in my judgment, carries too much weight with them. One of my colleagues asked interested parties presenting the view these gentlemen now express over and over again during the hearings, "Which is paramount, the interests of America or the distress of Europe?" The question was always apparently embarrassing. But still they seemed to fail entirely to get the American viewpoint.

We propose to restrict the number and reduce it from the figures under the present quota from the Old World of about 350,000 per year—which is too many—to about 161,000. With a quota of 357,000 we have already received over one-half a million through the doors this year, not counting those who have come illegally. I doubt not that America will receive 750,000 to 800,000 immigrants during the present fiscal year, counting the thousands or hundreds of thousands entering illegally.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. I can not yield.

It is a question, gentlemen, of maintaining American life by maintaining American character. American life exists nowhere but in America. Our newcomers are not bringing it with them nor satisfactorily acquiring it here.

Then the bill proposes to select. It does not do that perfectly and nobody pretends that it does, but nobody has any right to question our method of selection. Domicile and work and citizenship in America are gifts to be bestowed upon whom we please.

No man over there has a vested right here, and no man without a vested right has any cause of complaint when we act on our own judgment on a matter wherein he has no vested right. It is arrogance, it is presumption, it shows a wrong spirit, it shows a dangerous attitude when men come to believe that the unfortunate millions of Europe and elsewhere have vested rights here that American statesmen and American officials must recognize. It is effrontery. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOX. No; I can not yield.

On my responsibility as a Member of this House I tell its membership that groups of gentlemen representing these views expressed here repeatedly displayed the same attitude, the same ugly un-American spirit. I am sure that other members of the committee recognized it, and I doubt not that many of you have recognized it here. It is dangerous, it is time to check it, and the American people expect us to check it.

With 15 of the 17 members of the committee, without regard to party, joining individually in the report presenting this bill in the determination that this great question shall not be made the football of partisan politics, I think your committee makes a good suggestion of nonpartisan, patriotic teamwork to the House. The chairman would have carried the responsibility, but 15 members of the committee signed the report, believing it to be a matter of the utmost importance and one wherein the spirit of partisan politics should not be permitted to divide and distract. This report is signed individually by the whole majority membership and by all of the minority members except two. It is a matter of sincere regret on my part that every Democrat on the committee did not sign the report. They used their discretion and I use mine, and I am not criticizing them personally for that, but my Republican colleagues have the crown of honor in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. BOX. There is one other thing to which I want to call attention, and one which I would, if time permitted, be glad to discuss at length, and that is the question of how America ought to regulate her immigration problem—whether she ought to treat it purely as a domestic question, handle it through Congress where her voice is supreme, or whether it ought to be done by treaty regulation wherein the voice of foreign countries must be heard, their wills consulted, and their consent obtained.

In every effort of the country to protect itself against the immigration of Chinese, in almost every instance it was charged that we were violating treaties by exclusion acts, and more than one President vetoed such acts. One administration made what is known as the Burlingame treaty in 1878, reciting and binding the United States to recognize that the Chinese had an inalienable right to travel anywhere and reside permanently in this country as they pleased. That treaty solemnly recited that they had an inalienable right to do that. The Government had great trouble in getting rid of that treaty. But it was done finally by action of Congress in passing a law that forbade them to come. Later another treaty, only a little better, was made, and the same difficulty arose.

One of the great dangers to America now is a danger involving the dignity and importance of this body, and that is in the passing of control of immigration to the treaty-making power. With that power exercised in the regular way this body loses all voice and the foreign governments get a voice in our immigration policy. Let it be controlled by agreement made by the Executive with some foreign power by "gentlemen's agreements" and not even the Senate has a voice. The gentlemen's agreement with Japan is an instance. The Senate never saw it; nobody outside the State Department knows what is in it. There were different versions of it. A partial statement of it was published in 1908 by the Commissioner General of Immigration. President Roosevelt, on page 414 of his autobiography, stated one phase of it which was never published to the American people elsewhere, so far as I have seen. That was that if the Japanese did not stop the immigration of laborers from Japan the United States would pass an exclusion law. The developments now justify that, if it were not justifiable on other grounds.

In the case of a treaty you have the Executive, however large a conception he may have of his prerogatives, meeting the chancellories of the world and agreeing to let their surplus population come and stay here. Under such a system you, my colleagues, and your people at home are to be silent and helpless.

I hope this Congress during this session in the consideration of this bill will continue to assert the right of the American Congress to control this purely American question without responsibility to anybody except to obey the law of good faith and take care of the interests of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the legislation proposed in this bill does not provide for overseas examination in any full or final sense. It does provide that a count of those receiving immigration certificates shall be made and the number of such certificates so limited as to reduce to a minimum, if not to prevent, the coming of immigrants in excess of quotas. If it operates as the committee hopes it will, there will be few—comparatively, at least—who are turned back at our ports merely because they are in excess of the quotas admissible from their countries. That will eliminate some measure of the rush and the difficulty and distress attendant upon the coming of greater numbers than can in any event be legally admitted to the United States. If the law is enforced, an excessive number will not start from foreign ports.

The bill also provides that prospective immigrants must submit a verified statement in the form of an answered questionnaire to the United States consul who visés their passports. That questionnaire will cover pretty fully the questions determining their admissibility or inadmissibility. If the questionnaire or other information discloses that they are probably inadmissible, it will be the duty of the consul to refuse an immigration certificate and a visé of their passports. It is hoped thereby to eliminate many who are plainly inadmissible and prevent their coming to the United States to be rejected at the ports and sent back home.

It is not contemplated that we will erect immigration stations at foreign ports. We have no right to do that without the consent of foreign countries, as already indicated, and foreign countries have not consented for us to do it. For other reasons, some of which have already been suggested, that would not be a workable arrangement. For one thing, if we had gotten through the necessary negotiations and secured permission to erect such stations and establish and maintain such forces abroad, it would require the erection or acquisition of suitable stations and the organization of the forces, all of which would involve an enormous expense and require much time. Therefore, American immigration stations will be maintained at the home ports, as heretofore. While it is hoped that fewer excess-quota immigrants and a smaller number which have to be rejected for other reasons will be turned back from our ports, yet our stations and our home forces will continue to be maintained. All those excluded under the act of 1917 or subsequent acts who chance to present themselves at our ports will be rejected and sent home. It would be unfortunate for the people of the United States and for prospective immigrants to understand that this bill is based on the foreign selection of immigrants. It only attaches to the work of the consulate the duty of counting immigration certificates and visés and of refusing visés to those found to be inadmissible as immigrants, but leaves the work of examination to be done at the home ports with an entailment of all the consequences attendant thereon, except that it is hoped that the number of rejections will be greatly reduced. But let it be understood here and abroad that the Government reserves the right to reject at its own ports all found to be legally inadmissible.

It should be frankly recognized and avowed that the measure is intended as a highly restrictive one, by which the number of those admissible to the United States from Europe and other regions to which the quota provisions apply shall be reduced to about one-half of those permitted to come under the temporary 3 per cent quota act of 1920, based on the census of 1910. This will be a substantial reduction. It is greatly to be regretted that the restrictive provisions of the measure have not been applied to Mexico and South American countries and adjacent islands. It would probably be necessary to apply the quota to Canada if it was applied to Mexico and adjacent countries. The United States is now getting some 60,000 or 70,000 immigrants per year from Mexico and a larger number from Canada. A 2 per cent quota to Mexico, based on the census of 1890, would reduce the number coming from Mexico to about 1,500 per year and would affect Canada in much the same way. The committee has found the task of regulating immigration from the Orient and from Europe and Africa and the Near East big enough for one undertaking. It will regard the country as fortunate if Congress successfully and adequately deals with that important undertaking at this time, but the Congress and the country should understand that the time is at hand when immigration from Mexico, South America, Canada, and adjacent islands must be more restricted and better controlled. At present our forces are utterly inadequate to administer such laws as we have. This act will fail largely unless additional funds and forces are provided for the enforcement of it and the act of 1917.

The act provides additional selective tests. It leaves in force all the provisions of the act of 1917 relating to examination and inspection and adds the quota restrictions and the other regulations carried in this act.

The term "selective immigration," as often loosely used—meaning one thing to one writer or speaker and another thing to another—can be aptly applied to the act of 1917. It was and is highly selective. This act, in choosing the sources of immigration and regulating the number coming from different countries, is made more selective. One cardinal principle which has controlled the committee in providing this additional method of selection is the consideration of racial homogeneity. In exercising its unlimited right to select the sources from which the country's population shall be recruited the United States is under no obligation to use the latest census nor any particular census as the basis for its count. It is certainly not bound to receive greater numbers of the newer immigration merely because they are newer, which would be involved in using the last census as the basis. The fairest basis would be one which would make our immigration from European countries most nearly approximate in racial qualities the present population of the United States. That would make for the perpetuity of the old race and its institutions and for peaceful accord and cooperation among America's hundreds of millions who must find happiness and work out their destiny here, setting an example of order, peace, and cooperation, and leading the world toward the best things of which the race is capable.

The limited time at my disposal will not permit me to further discuss the provisions and probable effect of this measure. If it were legislatively possible to do it, I would be glad to see a complete stoppage of general immigration. Of course, there would have to be provisions for the coming of certain exempt

classes, several of which are enumerated in this legislation. But there is no possibility of the enactment of such a measure, and I would rather help accomplish a substantial restriction than to bluster much about what I know is impossible under present circumstances.

Therefore I am supporting this measure in the earnest hope that all friends of restrictive immigration legislation, and all who favor the suspension of immigration, will unite in support of the measure. Efforts to amend it will probably tend to break it down. Of course, the House has the right to amend it, but I sincerely hope that it will exercise that right with great caution, for some years of study of this question and several weeks work on this measure convinces me that if it is disarranged and broken by amendment the result will be disastrous to all restriction. The opponents of the measure would be tremendously gratified if the friends of restrictive immigration should become divided and contentious between themselves, each struggling for the adoption of his particular ideas, resulting in disappointment to all through the breaking down of the best plan which your committee has been able to propose.

If time permitted I would say a word to my colleagues and to the country about the imperative necessity for the enactment of some such legislation as is embodied in this bill. The question is, I verily believe, one of life or death to the American people as they existed from colonial times down to a generation ago. American institutions are also at stake. America, as we and our fathers have known and loved it, is involved. It is probable that future generations and centuries to come will be influenced by what we do or fail to do with this measure. I hope that we will not fail in the face of this great responsibility and the momentous consequences dependent upon our action.

In an effort to promote a correct understanding of what is involved in the suggestion that prospective immigrants be examined and accepted in foreign lands, I include the following statement made by me to the committee and printed at its request for its use:

From time to time for many years there has been talk of selecting immigrants at the source. If it were possible to adopt such a plan and make it work, and if its adoption and application did not involve the sacrifice of important principles and vital practical interests, it would be a good thing. Manifestly, though, this is like saying that if it were possible for government to be maintained without levying taxes, that would be a good thing.

The writer has been surprised to hear intelligent business men and others, who are supposed to have reached conclusions based on information and consideration, criticize their Government for not having adopted a proposition, which, according to the easy words of the critics, would be so "humane," "scientific," "simple," "practicable," and "easy" that any legislator could provide for it. Many people, who would not be expected to adopt or indorse any important business or legislative suggestion without having thought out what was involved in it, have urged the adoption of this measure, and, when questioned, have frankly confessed that they have not inquired whether the Government has considered such a plan and found it unworkable, or whether other governments would permit us to maintain immigration inspecting stations and forces in their countries, or whether such a plan entails consequences which we must avoid. Such questions as whether it could be done at all, whether it would work, and whether foreign governments would permit it, are passed over as of no importance, while people speak and print their criticisms of the Government of the United States for not having done this thing which they treat as so simple and easy. Unfortunately, those who make and administer law have to deal with facts as they are. Lectufers, speakers, newspaper and magazine writers, and others who discuss public questions, can ignore or assume facts, as may be convenient, but facts bristle in the paths of those who have to do things instead of talking about them.

This proposal is not a new one; it has been brought forward and received thorough consideration before. Decades ago our Government even went so far as to try to find a way for the adoption of the plan, though the writer has no doubt that this was done with foresight that the adoption and working of the proposition was improbable. In 1910 Senator LODGE, now chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate; Senator Dillingham, long a leading member of the Senate Committee on Immigration; Hon. John L. Burnett, afterwards chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization; Senator McLaurin; Prof. Jeremiah W. Jenks, long an immigration expert, as members of the National Immigration Commission, said of this proposition: "This plan was so strongly urged that this Government a few years ago made official inquiry respecting the probable attitude of European governments toward it. At that time one or two governments" (among several scores whose consent was necessary) "expressed a willingness to permit such an inspection by American officials; others made indefinite replies to the inquiry, while others were positively opposed. No attempt was thereafter made to further the plan. After an investigation by the commission of the situation at all the principal ports of Europe it is clear that even were its consummation possible such an arrangement would not materially improve conditions." The reader will note that the suggestion for the adoption of such a plan had been strongly urged some years before these gentlemen investigated and reported their findings, which they did more than a decade ago.

The suggestion involves, first, grave, and probably insuperable, diplomatic difficulties; it is unworkable; while its adoption and use, if possible, would involve consequences which the country must not accept. The reader's attention is invited, first, to the diplomatic difficulties which have heretofore barred the way to the adoption of the plan. The passage quoted above shows that these are not new and that they have heretofore been too serious to be overcome. In a statement published during the fourth session of the Sixty-seventh Congress, First Assistant Secretary of Labor Henning, who is in charge of immigration matters and acquainted with the facts, as contra-distinguished from the theories concerning it, published a statement in which he is quoted as saying: "Foreign countries steadfastly have refused to allow the United States to examine immigrants at ports of departure on the ground that the exercise of that function by any nation would be an invasion of sovereignty. Attempts to extend these powers to include direct action in examination and selection of immigrants who have been consistently objected to by France, Italy, and other foreign governments." Let the reader note and consider Assistant Secretary Henning's use of the words "steadfastly" and "consistently" in connection with the words of Senators LODGE and Dillingham, Hon. John L. Burnett, and others, some 12 years earlier.

Since the above was written the Hon. Edward J. Henning, Assistant Secretary of Labor, who has actual charge of the administration of the immigration laws, in an address before the twenty-sixth annual convention of the American Mining Congress, published in the Mining Congress Journal of October, 1923, said on this subject:

> "The countries of Europe refuse flatly to let us actually examine aliens in their countries. You read the sob stories of hardships. Every mail brings us many letters from good men and women all over the country abusing us like beggars and saying, 'Why do you tolerate this awful thing of people leaving their homes and coming to Ellis Island and being turned back? Oh, what brutes you are!' They say, 'Why do you not go to Europe and pass on them before they come?' To date, there isn't a country in Europe that would permit that for one moment. The proposition of examination abroad has often been before Congress. Always there was objection from the countries involved. They come and say to us, 'You are invading the sovereignty of our country by proposing to come over there and saying who may leave our country.' They intend to do the selecting themselves. The gentle art of 'unloading' is as old as Europe, and they are not seeking to give us the flower of their manhood and womanhood."

The House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has considered the suggestion, and, doubtless, in deference to the repetition of the proposition, in its report to the Sixty-seventh Congress, No. 710, accompanying House Joint Resolution No. 268, said:

OBJECTIONS TO EXAMINATIONS OVERSEAS

> "The hearings of the committee have covered all phases of the subject. Considerable time was spent in attempting to develop a plan of examination of immigrants at ports of embarkation, but these efforts were made with a letter from the Secretary of State."

Some Members of the House and Senate had introduced bills adopting this suggestion. That gave rise to the writing of the following letter to Secretary of State Hughes by the Italian ambassador:

MEMORANDUM FROM ROYAL ITALIAN EMBASSY

> "The royal chargé d'affaires for Italy presents his compliments to his excellency the Secretary of State and has the honor of bringing the following to his attention:
>
> "During the special session of this Congress there have been presented bills—one in the Senate and two in the House of Representatives—by the terms of which, among other provisions, it is proposed to have United States medical and immigration officials in the United States consulates, or elsewhere, to exercise functions not purely informative in character but of direct action in the medical examination and definite selection of the emigrants, connecting such functions with that of the granting of the consular visé to passports.
>
> "Such action, even if exercised in the interior of the consulate offices, would go beyond the usual consular functions recognized by treaties, and pertaining, as it does, to interests connected with em-

igration whose regulation is reserved to the sovereignty of each State, could not be considered as conforming with either treaty or law on emigration in Italy.

"It is true that this is a matter relating merely to proposed legislation; nevertheless, the intense desire to avoid later any possible motive for discussion between our two countries inspires the friendly intention of the present recommendation, especially since it has been stated to the Secretary of State that the Italian Government would be most willing to meet the wishes of the United States in conforming the action of its emigratory services so as to satisfy the reasonable requirements of the American regulations if both can be made the subject of a specific agreement beforehand, as already suggested.

The embassy would certainly have hesitated to approach the Secretary of State on this matter were it not that the Secretary of Labor, in recommending the above-quoted bills, according to public press statements, had not made it felt that the measures before Congress probably expressed views not contradictory to those entertained by the United States Government, whereupon any assurance on the subject, if possible, on the part of the Department of State, so that in time it be forwarded to the Italian Government, would be highly appreciated by the Italian Embassy.—Washington, D. C., September 15, 1921."

The letter of the Secretary of State follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 28, 1921.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: I inclose copy of a memorandum of September 15 from the chargé d'affaires ad interim of Italy, in which he discusses certain bills which have been introduced in Congress providing for the examination in American consulates of aliens desiring to emigrate to the United States.

Informal objections to the proposed legislation have been made by representatives of other countries, and I shall endeavor to keep you informed as to any further objections which may be received by this department from representatives of interested foreign countries.

As this matter touches upon the foreign relations of the United States, I would ask that you be so kind as to keep me informed concerning the progress of the proposed legislation.

I am, my dear Mr. JOHNSON, sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

In the second paragraph of his letter to Chairman JOHNSON, Secretary Hughes informs him that "informal objections to the proposed legislation have been made by other countries." It must not be understood that Italy is the only country making these objections. The country which does not make them is an exception. On June 2, 1922, as will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, the writer, while presenting this situation to the House of Representatives, was interrupted by Hon ALBERT JOHNSON, long a Member, and now chairman, of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, who then remarked:

"I would suggest that he [the writer, who then had the floor] do not omit from his present discussion the fact that other governments are at this time making protests quite similar to the one that he has just read from the Italian Government, against proposed provisions in the so-called shipping bill, clauses of which would authorize investigation overseas. I am told that these protests against the new legislation, now being considered before another committee, are much stronger than have been made heretofore."

During the same discussion the writer was again interrupted by Mr. CONNALLY of Texas, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, who said:

"Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, in that connection I would say that, as I recall now our hearings on the passport control bill, it developed that practically all of the foreign countries objected to the setting up in their countries of agencies for the investigation and examination of immigrants.

These official statements by a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, by the chairman of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the National Immigration Commission, the Assistant Secretary of Labor in charge of immigration administration, and by Mr. Hughes, the present able and experienced Secretary of State, all showing that this suggestion is not a new one, and that the proposition has again and again met insuperable diplomatic difficulties, ought to remind writers and speakers interested in helping the country solve its great immigration problem that they are doing a vain and hurtful thing in inconsiderately leading public thought into a blind alley.

Students of the problem will probably inquire by what right and for what reason foreign governments prevent our doing this, if we want to do it. First, let us understand that the maintenance of embassies and consulates in foreign countries is entirely a matter of diplomatic usage and treaty agreements. We can not maintain an ambassador, a minister, or a consul, or any kind of an official representative in any foreign country against its will. Diplomatic usage sanctions the maintenance of embassies and consulates which promote ends desired by both parties to the agreement. Their establishment and activities are wholly subject to treaty agreement and the consent of foreign powers. Their withdrawal may be demanded and enforced by such power at any time.

The scopes of the activities of consuls, ministers, and ambassadors are fixed or limited by usage and agreement and can be extended only by consent. The selection of would-be immigrants is not one of the usual functions performed by consuls or diplomatic representatives. The treaties under which such representatives are maintained do not authorize the establishment or maintenance of immigration stations of any kind nor the performance of any of their functions on foreign soil; neither does diplomatic usage sanction it. These officers and the performance of these functions within the territory of a foreign sovereignty without the consent of such country is impossible unless enforced by war.

The motive which prompts them to consent to the establishment and maintenance of consulates and embassies is mutual commercial and diplomatic interest. This mutuality of interest does not exist as to immigration. Japan, China, England, Spain, Italy, and other Old World countries usually want a place to which they can send their surplus or undesirable population. Our immigration laws are designed to prevent their unloading this surplus and burdensome population on us. Thus we desire to prevent what they desire to do concerning immigration. They will not go beyond the limits of diplomatic usage to agree with us upon the establishment of agencies on their soil by which they would help us do what they want to prevent. This is not merely natural and logical; it is actual.

The phrases "selecting immigrants abroad" and "selecting immigration at its source" may mean selection at a few great clearing houses abroad, or it might mean going to their very doors to choose them. Let us consider the suggestion interpreted into each of these meanings. It is impossible to go to each immigrant's home or lodgings to look him over and accept or reject him or her there. They come from millions of homes or lodgings, in every nook and cranny of the world. To seek out each prospective immigrant at his place of abode and have him examined as to health, social and moral desirability, is an impossible undertaking, which will be rejected upon its suggestion. To establish ample immigration stations and forces in every country of the world, equip and maintain them, would be at prohibitive expense, and involve administrative difficulties which would make it impossible. Some of these will be pointed out in subsequent paragraphs. The establishment of a few great immigration clearing houses on the seacoasts of Europe, Africa, and Asia would itself involve an enormous additional expense, and would not eliminate our present home establishments and expenses; but, aside from that, no country in which we would want to establish such agencies would think of permitting it.

If one of these were maintained in London or on the coast of France, or Spain, or Italy, it would mean that millions of all kinds of people, including the criminal, diseased, and insane would gather from all the countries near and back of that portion of Europe to be examined and have the bad rejected and left upon the country which was foolish enough to permit us to make it such a dumping ground. Does anybody imagine that the United States would permit Canada, which has a restrictive immigration policy, to maintain two or three such stations in the United States near the border, at which hundreds of thousands of all classes would gather and where the worst of all classes would be rejected and left in the midst of our people? Some countries of Europe, particularly France, probably others, have complained, officially or unofficially, because the path of the diseased and criminal immigrants from the central and back portions of Europe and sections of Asia to the United States leads through their countries. It has been officially ascertained that certain diseases prevalent among our immigrants have been increased and extended along this trail traveled by the motley millions coming to America. How much worse it would be if the worst were stopped and left among the people of England or France.

Clearing houses at central points in Europe, Asia, or Africa would not eliminate our inspection immigration service at home, because we could not maintain guards along every foreign coast and on every sea to prevent immigrants from avoiding these clearing houses, as thousands of them now avoid our home immigration stations. The work of inspecting alien seamen would also have to be done at our seaports. The great numbers of would-be immigrants who come from or through Mexico and Canada, and from all South America and the West Indies, would have to be guarded against and inspected.

The selection of immigrants at foreign clearing houses, or even at the very source of immigration, would be a very slow and cumbersome process unless we made the finding of each subordinate or the administrative head at each station final and subject to no appeal. A policy which gave to subordinate officers, or even the heads of local stations, conclusive and final authority is inconsistent with the genius of our Government and our thoroughly established policy. We

do not permit it, even when our immigration commissioners act within our own boundaries, as it were, under the eye of the Commissioner General of Immigration, the Secretary of Labor, and the numerous inspectors under their direction; much less could we permit it in far-away Europe or Asia. Every immigrant offering has a right to have his case appealed to Washington, and the findings of the commissioner and boards of inquiry reviewed by a higher and usually more competent authority. This very process causes delays now, of which much complaint is made by those who delight in criticizing all restrictive laws and their operation. But it is a much quicker, simpler procedure to have an appeal in such case rushed from Baltimore, New York, Boston, or even San Francisco, to Washington for early disposition than it would be to send it from Warsaw or Constantinople or Tokyo, and wait weeks for final action and instruction.

One argument advanced in favor of foreign selection is that it would protect immigrants from the hardship resulting from their selling their effects and breaking themselves loose from their homes and sources of livelihood, expecting to be admitted to the United States, and thereafter finding themselves denied admission and thrown adrift, penniless, friendless, and away from home. Unless these stations were located, at prohibitive cost, in hundreds of places, the prospective immigrants could not be selected near their present homes. The establishment of immigration stations in a few great cities on the coasts of Europe, Asia, and Africa would not meet this difficulty. These seaports are hundreds of miles from the present homes of most of the immigrants, and in countries foreign and strange to them. They would have to go in families hundreds of miles, often across national boundaries, necessitating passports, and a great part of the travel, expense, and difficulty which they now meet. The average immigrant can not, without selling all, carry his family from the center or back side of Europe to the seacoast for examination. If he could, he would not know how long it would require him to return to his home with his family, to sell out and thereafter return to the immigration station on the coast. The uncertainty, delay, expense, and other difficulties of such a course would forbid its adoption by the average immigrant. He usually sells all, and, under the proposed plan would sell all, and break up completely, before leaving his old home to go to the place of inspection and embarkation. The risk of this break-up would have to be incurred under any system except one which sent the inspector to each immigrant at or near his present home, which is manifestly impossible.

The suggestion that the "division of families" would be avoided by foreign selection will not bear examination. If a man migrated five years ago, and lawfully or unlawfully entered the United States, leaving his family in Europe or Asia, and has decided to stay away from them unless they are successful in their efforts to come to him, will their rejection in Europe or Asia reunite the family? If a whole family start together, and part of them stand the tests and enter, while others can not meet the requirements as to health, intelligence, or numbers, and are rejected in Europe, will that keep them together? Not if the admissible members elect to remain away from the rejected members, which they must do under the present system to create a case of "separation."

The steamship companies, relatives, and other opponents of restriction, and some restrictionists are engaging in this talk of regulating immigration at the source, which means, among other impossible things, treaty control of immigrant. The letter of the Italian ambassador to Secretary Hughes, above quoted, states in polite, diplomatic language, "that the Italian Government would be most willing to meet the wishes of the United States in conforming its emigratory services so as to satisfy the reasonable requirements of the American regulations, if both can be made the subject of a specific agreement beforehand, as already suggested." The reader will observe two suggestions in the clause quoted: First, that Italy has an "emigratory service," which is true. It has a regularly organized system under which, for the profit of the business and for relief from its burdensome surplus population, it is sending its people away. Many other crowded countries are doing the same thing by different methods. Second, it has proposed that we make our regulations "reasonable" to Italy, and that we make them "the subject of a specific agreement beforehand," which means that we would have to agree with Italy about our immigration policy. Under the present system we have to agree with nobody about it, which is fortunate, because they want to unload on us and we want to avoid having them do it.

Ambassador Geddes, of Great Britain, is quoted as favoring the adoption by the United States of a policy of foreign selection "if possible." The words "if impossible" are considerately used by that accomplished diplomat, doubtless because he appreciates that it probably is not possible; but Ambassador Geddes' suggestion in behalf of England is in line with that made by the Italian Government in behalf of Italy. Both are based on our obtaining the consent of foreign governments, which is itself contingent upon our consulting their interests in our immigration policy. That would withdraw our control of immigration from the forum where our own will prevails and gives it to another, the treaty-making power, where foreign ambassadors, serving foreign peoples, would have a voice and must give their consent before any policy could be adopted. In that consultation Congress, representing the American people, would have no voice. Naturally foreign governments and their ambassadors favor it. Naturally our own Government should be too wise to make the mistake. This brings us to the discussion of the treaty regulation of immigration, to which I invite attention.

It has been shown that the adoption of the plan of foreign inspection depends upon treaty agreements, and that treaty agreements depend upon our complying with the wishes of foreign governments in our immigration policies, their wishes being to dispose of their surplus and least desirable population and ours being to have the best immigrants or none. Treaties regulating immigration would become the supreme law of the land. Our part of immigration regulation would pass to the President as the treaty-making power, subject to the ratification or rejection of the Senate. The House would lose all voice in this question; so would Congress, as a whole, though the Senate as a part of the treaty-making power would have the legal right to be consulted. However, the Nation's practical experience proves that the President might make agreement without the advice and consent of the Senate, and that such agreements might control immigration, as will be shown hereafter.

Our experience as to the attitude of our Presidents toward this problem should warn us of the danger of passing absolute or chief control of it to him. The President's constant contact with delicate and difficult questions of our foreign relations and the necessity of maintaining cordial intercourse with foreign countries expose him and his advisers and agencies to constant pressure toward a tendency to too great liberality in immigration laws and regulations. Our people now almost unanimously agree that we have heretofore been ruinously loose in our immigration policies; but even such restrictive measures as have been adopted in the past have nearly all been enacted in the face of Executive opposition. Nearly every step forward has been in spite of the President's veto.

In 1879 President Hayes vetoed the first Chinese exclusion act. (2 I. C. R. 580.) In 1882 President Arthur vetoed an act suspending Chinese immigration for a period of 20 years. (2 I. C. R. 581.) On March 3, 1897, President Cleveland vetoed an immigration act excluding illiterates. (2 I. C. R. 573.) President Taft vetoed an immigration bill in 1913 containing a restriction against the admission of illiterates. (P. 101, Rec., special sess., 59th Cong.) In 1917 President Wilson vetoed an act excluding illiterates, but Congress passed it over his veto. The present percentage quota immigration law was first passed by the Sixty-sixth Congress, but failed because President Wilson withheld his approval. It was again passed by the Sixty-seventh Congress and later extended, both acts having been approved by President Harding, whose action on these measures was about the first approvals by a President of the United States of any measure designed to reduce, or strictly regulate, immigration from foreign countries.

In 1863 the Burlingame treaty between the United States and China declared it to be the inalienable right of men to migrate and emigrate at will. California had then been for 15 years alarmed and in trouble on account of the coming of great numbers of Chinese. The California Legislature had passed laws in efforts to protect the State. Pacific coast cities had passed ordinances for the same purpose. Congress itself in 1862 had taken note of the degradation and slavery of Chinese coolie laborers and had forbidden American ships to transport them. This was seven years before the Burlingame treaty was made by the President and ratified by the Senate declaring the right of such people to migrate to the United States to be "inalienable." So aptly did the treaty-making power deal with the problem in that instance.

Conditions in California and on the Pacific coast were then and soon afterwards so bad that, in 1872, California was pleading with Congress for the exclusion of the Chinese; that is, for the termination of the "inalienable right" of Chinese to come to America in tens, or even hundreds, of millions.

A congressional committee was sent to California, where it found conditions very bad. In 1879 Congress passed what was practically a Chinese exclusion act and undertook to abrogate the obnoxious sections of the Burlingame treaty of 1869.

Here another unfortunate incident to immigration regulation by treaty developed. President Hayes vetoed the act of 1879, practically excluding Chinese immigration, and gave as one reason his contention that Congress had no right to abrogate a treaty. That action illustrates the fact that the President can by his veto nullify an act of Congress, unless a majority of two-thirds or more can be induced to override the veto. It would also appear that the President, by and with the approval of two-thirds of the Senate, can make a treaty, which, being later than an act of Congress, would become the supreme law of the land, and repeal or abrogate an act of Congress, even if it had passed over the President's veto. This last probably would not occur; but, under our system, administration and Senate majorities might so change as to make it possible. After the treaty of 1868, explicity declaring that Asiatics had the inalienable

right to migrate to the United States, and the veto of President Hayes to the act of 1879, because it impaired that treaty, a new treaty was made between the United States and China in 1880, in which China consented for the United States to suspend the coming of laborers only, but the treaty explicitly prohibited the United States to forbid general Chinese immigration. In that same year Congress passed an act suspending Chinese immigration for 20 years, but President Arthur vetoed the act, chiefly because a 20-year suspension of Chinese immigration was not in keeping with the latest treaty with China, which permitted the United States to only limit or suspend the coming of laborers in such a manner and to such an extent as should be "reasonable."

It was soon found that this immigration treaty was unwise and the United States asked China to agree to its abrogation; but China objected and delayed, until Congress passed a drastic exclusion law, from which the President withheld his approval until he became convinced that China would not enter into a new treaty abrogating the treaty of 1880, of which the United States was by then anxious to be rid. That was the second successive failure of the treaty-making power of our Government to handle Chinese immigration in a manner which our own people would tolerate.

President Roosevelt's agreement with Japan, made in 1908, commonly called "the gentleman's agreement," has now been recognized by both countries for some 15 years. Both Japan and the United States have insisted that they were living up to its terms.

The use of the word "agreements" in the immigration acts of 1920 and 1922, both passed by the two Houses of Congress and approved by the President, was a conscious and deliberate recognition of the "agreement" made by President Roosevelt with Japan, regulating immigration from that country to the United States. Yet that agreement was made by the President regardless of the wishes of Congress and without the consent of the Senate. It was never submitted to the Senate for ratification. That agreement was held up to the Legislature of the State of California as a valid treaty, prevailing over the will and power of that State legislative body. In a letter which President Roosevelt wrote to Speaker Stanley of the lower House of the California Legislature, under date of February 8, 1909, protesting against certain anti-Japanese legislation then pending in that legislature, among other things, President Roosevelt said:

> "But such a bill as this school bill accomplishes literally nothing whatever in the line of the object aimed at and gives just cause for irritation, while in addition the United States Government would be obliged immediately to take action in the Federal courts to test such legislation, as we hold it to be clearly a violation of the treaty."

Thus President Roosevelt called this agreement, made without submission to the Senate, a "treaty" and threatened the Legislature of California, with its prevailing power as a treaty, to which the Legislature of California submitted.

In my judgment that agreement has always been without legal or binding force. However, at least two Presidents have recognized it as valid, and one of them has called it a treaty. Congress has twice recognized it, and a sovereign State has submitted to it as the supreme law of the land. In addition, it has been in operation between two great countries for some 15 years, during which it has regulated the immigration from Japan to the United States. Manifestly, then, it is possible that the President might, without consulting Congress or even the Senate, inaugurate a system of immigration regulation according to his own will. Because that has been done in a very vital immigration connection and a precedent thereby set, it is more apt to be done again. Under such a system neither Congress nor the Senate would have any voice in immigration regulation.

This vital function should be performed throughout the future as it has in the past, notwithstanding the regrettable exceptions named; then the people will retain power, through their elected representatives in the House and Senate, to protect themselves by wholesome immigration laws, as they have been striving to do for many years, in the face of great difficulties, some of which have their origin in lack of Executive sympathy.

The loss by the people of the power to control immigration through their elected representatives, in the transfer of that power from Congress to the Executive alone, or to him as the chief part of our country's part of the power to make treaties, would be an irreparable calamity. As already shown, foreign countries, under the promptings of self-interest, must consent to the provisions of treaties. Under that system our immigration policy would be shaped not by the representatives of our people but partly by our treaty-making power and partly by foreign countries. If that policy should ever be generally and permanently adopted, it would entail consequences too tragic to be stated here.

The foregoing portions of these remarks were prepared and first printed at the request of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, of which I have the honor to be a member, for its consideration in dealing with this question. Since they were prepared I have had the benefit of considerable discussion of the positions taken and their bearing upon the present legislative situation and proposed methods of obviating whatever force may be in the conclusions reached. The following paragraphs deal with suggestions which have been made in these later discussions.

A member of the committee, in his study of this question, has submitted the general proposition as to our right to maintain establishments and men in foreign lands for the selection of immigrants to two or three eminent gentlemen, who, without dealing with the questions involved, and without evidencing any mature consideration of them, indicate opinions not in harmony with the conclusions reached in this statement. Hon. George W. Wickersham, former Attorney General of the United States, who acts as president of the "National Committee on American-Japanese Relations," which has conducted an active propaganda against this legislation, and to whom the gentleman submitted a copy of the memorandum prepared by me for the use of the committee, and constituting the first portion of this statement, said concerning it:

> I have read the brief of Congressman Box, of Texas, with much of which I entirely agree. There is no doubt that no country has a right to send its representatives or officials to another country and there to conduct an examination into the fitness, physical, mental, or moral, of proposed immigrants without the consent, express or implied, of the government of the country where such investigation is to take place.

He also expressed the opinion that my statement "goes too far." Let it be noted that he did not state in what part of it the writer goes "too far." Had he done so, the writer and other seekers after a correct solution of this problem would have been able to consider his grounds of dissent and to modify the views expressed if subject to well-considered criticism. But even the great learning and ability of Mr. Wickersham are not sufficient to prove the existence of errors which he does not name or indicate. In his letter (hearings, Serial 1-A, p. 730) Mr. Wickersham says:

> Of course, as you say, if a foreign government should refuse to let us make such inquiry in their country, we might bar immigrants from that country from coming into the United States. That, however, would be a drastic remedy and would give rise to a very unfriendly feeling on the part of a country thus treated.
>
> The matter should be dealt with, it seems to me, by negotiation with these foreign countries. The agreement which might be reached through negotiation would not necessarily be a treaty, but the sort of agreement which customarily is made by the executive branch of our Government, as, for example, the international postal conventions. There is quite a range of international agreements not rising to the dignity of a treaty, respecting which throughout our history the executive government has acted without reference to the treaty-making power.

The suggestion in this connection concerning agreements which "do not rise to the dignity of" treaties probably refers to the "gentlemen's agreement" regulating immigration from Japan, made by Mr. Roosevelt, and others like it regulating the same subject which might be made by other Presidents. Not "rising to the dignity of" treaties, these "agreements" would not have to be submitted to the Senate. The "gentlemen's agreement" was not. Such agreements, if made and accepted as valid regulations of immigration and then successfully held up as bars to congressional action, would oust Congress of all control over our domestic policy concerning a problem of greatest importance. If such "agreements," not subject to the approval of the Senate, are to be permitted to control our immigration policies, President Hayes, who made the Burlingame treaty, which guaranteed the Chinese "the inalienable right" to migrate to America, could have merely made an agreement "not rising to the dignity of" a treaty and accomplished what he then contended for. President Arthur could have likewise worked his will in avoiding a later act in restraint of Chinese immigration to America by such an agreement much better than by a veto, as he undertook to do. Presidents Cleveland, Taft, and Wilson needed only to have made such agreements and to have Congress and the American people accept them as inviolable international obligations too sacred to be touched by congressional action. Mr. Wickersham's suggestion as to "agreements not rising to the dignity of" treaties regulating immigration to the United States is very unfortunate, unless it proves fortunate as a reminder that the handling of immigration by agreement not submitted to the Senate might be resorted to again and again until it became an established policy, and Congress thereby ousted from control over the question, leaving it wholly to those who have almost, though not quite, uniformly tried to restrain the Congress elected by the people

from doing the will of the Nation in protecting it, even so far as it has been protected. Control of immigration by treaties would be dangerous. Control of it by agreements between the Executive and foreign countries "not rising to the dignity of" treaties would be even more dangerous.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rather regret that the gentleman in control of the time has been courteous to me as the successor of the eloquent gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOX]. I certainly have no power to reply either, perhaps, in argument or in eloquence to the wonderful address we have just listened to. I do, however, differ quite materially from him in certain statements he makes, and also from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR], who spoke a few minutes ago. The undercurrent of the thought of both gentlemen seemed to be that there was a desire to make this a dumping ground for the poor centers of immigration to this country. I stand for nothing of that kind. We do not want the kind of immigration coming here that will fill up the ships in the manner the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] described. What is it to us that hundreds of thousands of people may want to come to this country who can not legally come here? We do not blame them for wanting to come—not in the slightest. We know that this is the best country on God's footstool, and, naturally, if they have any sense at all they want to come here, but that is no reason why we should let them come. Therefore, I believe in just as much restriction for immigration as does the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], provided it is not discriminatory. I maintain that the bill we have before us is absolutely discriminatory against certain classes, certain races that have come to our shores and have made good citizens. You can not say that the Hebrew race has not provided good American citizens, nor can you say that the Italian race has not provided good American citizens. There are also many excellent Polish citizens on the farms of western Massachusetts. So let us look the matter squarely in the face and see why the 1890 census has been selected. It is purely to benefit the northern European immigrants rather than the southern European immigrants.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. I just wanted to ask what the gentleman would suggest as a fair proportion between them?

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not care about the charts that the gentleman exhibited here the other day. I want to take the absolute facts and see whether in a progressive land like ours we ought to go back 35 years to find the measure of proportion. [Applause.] That is the question before this House. I would much prefer to take the census of 1920, be its ratio what it may, and let each race take its own chance. I do not know what would result if, instead of 1910, as the law is to-day, we substituted 1920, but it would be fair and honest to ourselves. Let us adopt that type of principle rather than hunt for an excuse to accomplish in a roundabout way what we are not men enough to stand up here and say we want to try to accomplish. Let there be not subterfuge. People talk about wanting to maintain the native American stock. I have no doubt the eastern district of Tennessee has as fine people in it as any place in the land, but we in Massachusetts are not likely to permit our type of citizenship not to take rank with those who have built a fence around them. I would not insinuate that the reason there are no more immigrants in eastern Tennessee is because the immigrants do not want to go there, that it is not inviting enough in a business way, not a good enough place to live in. I would not make that insinuation, but I do say that my colleague, Mr. TAGUE, of Massachusetts, differ as we do in political faith, knows the type of citizenship that we have there. I do not represent a city district solely. Coming from the country section as I do, I can see as he sees the effect in our population of the various races that have come to make up our citizenship there. I believe in another thing that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] does not advocate. I believe that we should designate a time when this new population coming in here should apply for naturalization and become citizens in our land. We either must have their assistance in upbuilding our citizenship, a love for our institutions and our flag, or they should go elsewhere. They should either accept the responsibilities of citizenship or not ask for the benefits of residence here.

Something has been said about the pure blood of our Yankee land. I do not know whether I qualify under that head or not, but modestly I admit that ancestors of mine fought in the Revolutionary War. That may qualify me or it may not. I do not care. I present it for what it is worth, and just the same I do not say that I am any better American citizen than the man who has come from a foreign shore and who has assimilated our life here and become a part of it. [Applause.] This whole question to my mind hinges around the point of whether we are going to deal fairly with ourselves or try to fool ourselves. If we want to fool ourselves and think we are fooling the American people at the same time, let us vote for the basic ratio as established by the 1890 census. That is the only way that we can vote for it. We must simply lay aside all right and all argument, all question of fair play, and say that we want to accomplish one purpose and one purpose only, namely, the exclusion of immigrants from southern Europe. If that is the purpose then write it into your law. If it is not the purpose, adopt a ratio based on something a little more up to date than 35 years ago.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. If the gentleman wants to be fair to these people of southern Europe or northern Europe, is it not fair to give them the same proportion which they have contributed to the present racial stock of the country?

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not know how you are going to get at it if you go back 35 years. I have read the gentleman's speech. I have looked at his tables. I must say with all fairness to him that he may be able to convince himself of the merits of the program that he has mapped out, but I do not think that he can convince the average citizen of the United States that it is a fair program in any sense other than to accomplish what the believers in this bill want to accomplish.

Mr. VAILE. If we could give these people of southern Europe their actual proportion in present population of the United States, whether by that or any other census, would the gentleman believe in it?

Mr. TREADWAY. Where do you get the present population other than in the 1920 census?

Mr. VAILE. Does the gentleman think it could be found in that census? That would give five to one?

Mr. TREADWAY. I do not know what it would do.

Mr. VAILE. The gentleman certainly can not criticize my figures.

Mr. TREADWAY. We do not need to know what it will do. We do know what the 1890 census will do. It has nothing to do with the affairs of to-day as I see it. I may be as wrong as I consider the gentleman's theory is, but nevertheless we will respect each other's viewpoint. I am going to assist in voting down this 1890 census. You can restrict your immigration just as closely as you desire through the literacy test and the mental capacity and the physical-condition test. We do not want the scum of Europe, and they can not come in here, and I do not think there is a man opposed to this bill on the floor to-day who is advocating doing away with the quota system at all. I have not heard that at all. If we accept the scare of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Box] admitting people coming here by the thousand from every boat that can be put into the service, we must say that we do not believe in any quota system at all. I have heard no such position as that advocated on this floor during this debate. Let us play fair. [Applause.]

A few weeks ago a representative group of Hebrew gentlemen and ladies from Massachusetts waited upon the Massachusetts delegation to protest against this bill and the discrimination of the 1890 census for the ratio. I wish some of the supporters of the bill could have attended the meeting in the Speaker's rooms. They were prominent business men, leading lawyers, and citizens of the very highest type, some of them immigrants and some of them children of immigrants. I, for one, am not willing to cast my vote here in a way that would discriminate against a race which can furnish material for such a group of people as those to whom I refer represent.

At the time the Johnson bill was reported to the House I happened to be in my district. I was invited by some of the citizens of Pittsfield to attend a meeting of protest against this bill. It was arranged by men of Italian descent. There again I came in contact with as representative a group of American citizens as one desires to meet, all true and loyal to the country of their adoption, many of them having been in our service and all of them self-respecting American citizens.

In as informal a way as I am addressing the House this afternoon I told those people that if on examination of the measure I was convinced that the bill was discriminatory I should vote against it. I also advocated at that time very stringent restrictions as to morality, literacy, and physical condition, all of which evidently was approved by the meeting.

I also advocated, as I am doing here this afternoon, requirement of naturalization, which was likewise approved.

I am therefore only repeating here to-day in large part what I have already told constituents my position would be on this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FROTHINGHAM].

Mr. FROTHINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I communicated with the State Department to find their final views in relation to this bill, and I merely wish to have placed in the RECORD a letter in response to that communication in which they suggest certain amendments to this bill.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 7, 1924.

Hon. LOUIS A. FROTHINGHAM,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. FROTHINGHAM: I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated April 4, 1924, in which you request the views of this department on H. R. 7995 as reported by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House of Representatives.

Since the consular officers under the jurisdiction of this department will participate to a large extent in the enforcement of the immigration act, I shall first comment upon the administrative features of the bill. There are two important questions which are presented in examining the bill from an administrative standpoint:

1. The requirement that an immigration certificate shall be issued by the consular officer, as provided in section 2 (a) of H. R. 7995, instead of having a visé or certificate stamped or printed on the immigrant's application, as suggested on page 3 of my letter dated February 19, 1924, to Senator COLT, a copy of which I inclose. I have sent Representative JOHNSON a copy of my letter to Senator COLT.

2. The proposal that nonquota certificates shall be issued to immigrants from countries in the Western Hemisphere.

With respect to the first question, I desire to emphasize the statements made in my letter to Senator COLT respecting the large increase in the personnel that would be required to copy the information contained in the application into a certificate, the fact that the certificate contains no information in addition to that already contained in the application, and the increased cost and delay in the handling of immigrants at the consulates resulting from such a provision. With a view to submitting a concrete proposal for saving the expense involved in employing additional consular personnel and in avoiding the other difficulties mentioned, I inclose a copy of H. R. 7995, on which suggested amendments have been indicated, which I believe will take care of this objection.

With respect to the provisions of section 4 (c), which require immigrants from countries in the Western Hemisphere to obtain nonquota certificates, I desire to invite your attention to the fact that under existing law the quota provisions do not apply to immigrants from countries in the Western Hemisphere. In case nonquota certificates are to be issued to immigrants from the Western Hemisphere it will be necessary to increase very largely the staffs of the consular offices in this part of the world. This, of course, would involve a large increase in appropriation and the employment of personnel on short notice. It will be extremely difficult to obtain trained personnel to administer these provisions of the act and have them carry out the work contemplated in the proposed measure in case the act becomes effective on July 1, 1924.

In any event it is believed that the suggestion that the certificate should be stamped or printed on the application instead of being a separate certificate applies equally to the nonquota certificate.

It is observed that the immigration bill introduced as H. R. 7995 does not adopt the suggestions I made in my letter of February 8, 1924, to Representative JOHNSON that section 12 (b), which excludes Japanese immigrants, should be omitted. I desire to invite your earnest consideration of the statements made in my letter of February 8 to Representative JOHNSON, a copy of which is inclosed. I may add that, as the base quota provided by section 10 (a) is now reduced to 100, the quota for Japan on the basis of the 1890 census would be 146. From the report of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization it appears that there is a misunderstanding respecting the working of the so-called gentlemen's agreement with Japan. It is stated in this report that the Japanese Government is given the right under this agreement to determine who shall come to the United States. The proposal that I have recommended provides for a double control of immigration from Japan. It contemplates the continuation of the gentlemen's agreement whereby we have the cooperation of the Japanese Government in excluding laborers. It also provides for the check on immigration from Japan by means of the quota restriction. On account of our long frontier lines, I am of the opinion that such a double control would be more effective to prevent the entry of undesirable aliens than an exclusion provision resulting in the loss of the cooperation of the Japanese Government.

I am suggesting to Representative JOHNSON an additional provision in section 11 (b) which will deal appropriately with the territories which have been placed under mandates as a result of the war. Some other slight amendments to this section which appear desirable are indicated in the inclosed copy of a letter I am sending to Representative JOHNSON to-day.

I am, my dear Mr. FROTHINGHAM,
Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. HUGHES.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the letter introduced, and which will be in the RECORD, deals entirely with the method of certification, and as to whether it shall be called an immigration certificate or a quota certificate and as to how much information shall be transferred from the questionnaire to the certificate. The matter has been before the committee many times.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. For a question.

Mr. MADDEN. I have been making a calculation of the cost of the administrative features of the certificated admissions, and it will cost $2,000,000 a year for these certificated admissions; but it might be reduced to about a million dollars if they would modify the certificate, and I am going to propose an amendment to that effect.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We will consider it——

Mr. MADDEN. I am going to offer an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have been paying some attention to the certificating. The certificates would be nothing more than a travel card, would cost about a million dollars——

Mr. MADDEN. About $2,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not believe it. The Secretary's statistician's own figures do not bear it out.

Mr. MADDEN. They are not the only ones who make figures.

Mr. SABATH. I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, perhaps no Member of this House may be more warranted than myself in opposition to legislation designed to discriminate against any people of any particular race or religion who may be seeking the boon and the blessing of citizenship under the flag of our Republic. And I am persuaded none here will now approach the problem of building immigration regulations with more perfect freedom from racial or religious prejudices. I am in the blood line of a people for long sorely persecuted by bigots in the realms beyond the sea. In search of a land upon which they might build their modest meeting houses, and there worship God in their own quiet way, they began soon after the dawn of the seventeenth century to transfer themselves to the American shores, where they hoped to find full right to worship and protection in exercise of their right to worship God in their own manner and design. Then, as now, there were those on American soil who were instant in effort to prevent the coming to American shores of all "undesirables." Behold in me the offspring of "undesirables" of the vintage of more than 200 years ago. [Applause.]

I want to play in my legislating here the best part I may in behalf of my country and her people. Some who either can not or will not understand my attitude with reference to the pending legislation have branded me as one ready to throw down all immigration bars. On the contrary, I am ready at this moment to join my fellow Members here in the passage of legislation to absolutely bar all immigration for a term of three or five years, so that America may have a breathing space in which to assimilate the immigration of recent years. This statement ought to instantly remove me from the list of pleaders for "undesirable" immigration; and if any shall doubt my sincerity in making this declaration let him offer to this bill an amendment to bar all immigration for a term of three or five years, and listen carefully when the Clerk shall call my name, and hear me give my favorable vote to such an amendment.

But I do not like the pending bill. My opposition does not run against any provision of the bill which lessens the volume of immigration, generally, but with heart and soul I protest against the bill because it discriminates against the entry of certain aliens of particular racial and religious mold. Men will be heard to say that this bill does not seek to enact such discriminatory regulations, but all men know that in basing future admission of immigrants upon the ancient quota base of 1890 the fact of such discrimination instantly appears.

I have been glad that in all the discussions of this measure here no gentleman has touched the hem of the garment of racial or religious prejudice. That fact is high compliment to the pure Americanism of the membership of this House. But in the hotel lobbies and on the streets men are speaking with less reserve. Some are complaining against this bill on the ground that the 1890 quota base will let in more Germans than ought to be admitted. Some are saying that the bill is both a business and a social invitation to all Northern Europe to close up shop over there and come to our open arms. Some openly speak their prejudices in favor of this bill, declaring that it will keep out "undesirable" Poles, Bohemians, and Jews, and they declare that the American door should ever be closed against these. Still others, bolder in their bigotry, openly assert that the real object of this bill is to forbid the entry of those who cling to one particular Christian body, and for that reason they like the bill.

I feel that in opposing this bill I am recording my vote against the basest of bigotry, as here displayed in the discrimination of the bill against certain nationals and certain religionists, who have furnished to our Republic some of the very flower of its chivalry, erudition, and honor. Instantly I express the belief that the authors of this bill had no such design, and yet it is so interpreted by the average citizen who has had opportunity to read and understand its provisions. Before we shall adopt legislation so cruelly discriminatory let us briefly consider at least one period of shame in the earlier days of the American colonies. Even in that far day, as in these new and better days, men were sometimes urged by the spur of bigotry when building immigration statutes. Perhaps no better authority on colonial immigration laws might be cited than Emberson Edward Proper. Listen while Proper is speaking on this subject:

> For a period of several years, beginning with 1656, the records of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, and, indeed, of all the New England Colonies, except Rhode Island, are filled with legislation designed to prevent the coming of the Quakers and the spread of their "accursed tenets." Whippings, imprisonment, banishment, and in a few instances capital punishment were the order of the day. To what extent these various laws restricted the immigration of this Quaker sect it is, of course, impossible to ascertain. That the restrictions were not prohibitive, and consequently did not meet the expectations of the authorities, is painfully evident, for in spite of the severe penalties members of that sect continued to come, and under the provisions of the laws were enacted cruelties the justification of which calls for a generous stretch of historical charity.

While the bare thought of inflicting personal violence upon the unmentioned and yet clearly indicated "undesirables" against whom this bill is aimed may not be entertained in this day and generation, yet who may say that such discrimination as the bill inflicts will not be as hurtful as a bodily injury to the hearts of men and women who are part and parcel of our citizenship? I speak now of those who proudly confess that they are of the blood and at the altar with those who will be proscribed by the legislation here proposed.

Let me plead in my gentle Quaker way for such amendment to this bill as will take from it every semblance and suggestion of discrimination against any people and any religionists hitherto invited to come and aid us in the rearing and maintaining of the greatest Republic under the sun. Before casting our votes upon the pending bill let me urge that again and again each of us may hold before his eyes our own Declaration of Independence and our own National Constitution, wherein we will find neither thought nor suggestion of discrimination against the coming to our shores of any of the Caucasian race, from wheresoever on the earth abiding or howsoever choosing a mode and manner of worship. Look once again upon those sacred foundations upon which the house of our Republic was so surely laid, and then I am sure each of us within these walls must be persuaded that we shall be out of harmony with the sentiment of those sacred documents if we shall so legislate here as to discriminate against a peculiar people and against a particular religious creed. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield 10 minutes to my colleague [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill. I am in favor of the 1890 basis of quotas. I am in favor of the 2 per cent, and I shall vote for these provisions as well as for the bill as a whole, but I would rather vote for absolute and total suspension. [Applause.] You on the Atlantic seaboard, you of the Eastern and Middle West States, are feeling the want of restricted immigration. We of the far West are with you; we want to help you and we want you to help us.

I shall aid you at every turn with my vote. Your problem is the same as ours, but we have one in addition. Both can be and will be solved by the passage of this bill. Our additional problem is the Japanese colonization of the Pacific coast. As a Pacific coast representative please let me speak of the exclusion features of this bill—those provisions prohibiting the coming to our shores of people incapable of becoming citizens under our laws.

A NATIONAL RIGHT

The first and highest exercise of the inherent power of a sovereign State is the right of determination of citizenship. Dependent upon this national attribute is the equal sovereign right of the independent State to say under what condition and in what manner and to what extent nationals of other countries may come and remain and their civil status. These principles are basic. They are powers exercised by nations since national organizations have been known and recognized among the family of mankind. There are theorists, sensationalists, moralists, and romancers who argue patiently, sometimes persuasively, against this national prerogative, calling it by the mild and inoffensive name of "policy," but none dispute the principle.

National right is one thing, it is fundamental, inherent, and permanent; national policy is quite another. In its broad sense it is the conduct or manner in which the national right is exercised.

It is a national policy we are contending for in this bill. So far as the exclusion paragraphs are concerned, they are general. The nationals of no particular nation are mentioned. The offense of enumeration is not committed. The odium of discrimination is not present, for there is no discrimination. There is no principle involved except the exercise of a general policy that this Nation has the right to adopt.

Throughout our national life it has been our national policy to exclude oriental immigrants from the right of Amercan citizenship, and such is our national policy to-day. Our laws have made him incapable of becoming a citizen. The exercise of our inherent national right has taken this form of expression and our institutions in this respect are fixed.

THE REASONS

The reasons for this age-long fixed policy and the exercise of this right are many, but they all follow a well-defined philosophy. It is not based upon race inferiority, nor is it based on race hatred. This country was settled originally by the peoples of Europe—the Spaniards, the English, the French, the Dutch, and later by those of all European nations—white blood, the white race, the white nations. It was this blood, this race that founded our institutions, the institutions that it is your duty and my duty to preserve.

Early in the commingling of nations and of races, when men had no means of knowledge of each other than by contact, it was perceived that there were certain inherent differences among the races aside from color. There were differences so marked, so basic, so apparent that the welfare of one was early found to be not necessarily the welfare of the other; and, further, that in the eternal distribution of the races in the geography of the earth it was best to leave each in the place where it was dominant. This philosophy has been followed in one form or another for 4,000 years. True it is that there have been some racial migrations, retractions, and a certain overlapping along borders, as well as certain colonizations for economic purposes and uses, but in the main this general philosophy has been followed and mankind has always stood divided.

So is the world to-day. The white race has its geography; the same with the yellow, the black, the brown, and the red. There is this basic distribution, each with its racial and national belongings, its color, its customs, and its institutions.

The Pacific coast is a white man's country the same as the Atlantic, peopled by the same class of people, alike in all respects. We are, however, farthermost off in the continental domain from the racial home of our ancestors and nearest the home of another race congested and overflowing. This overflow comes to us. Ours is the first land the eyes of an oriental immigrant rests upon when he leaves for the west. His race is beyond the bounds of its domain, and hither he comes, not in single one and twos, but in hordes. China, Japan, India, the Straits Settlements are just across the sea—a race or races strange to us, of no common bonds of color or customs—as different from us as nature has made them. Their coming is at variance with the philosophy the world has followed from the beginning.

THE CHINESE

Four hundred millions of Chinese just across the sea—a yellow race; old in blood, old in national customs, oldest of all in its institutional make-up. A Chinese is not by nature a wanderer. He likes his country, his home, and the home of his ancestors, but there is not room nor substance for all in his land of the Flowery Kingdom, and the overflow must of necessity migrate, and hither to our Pacific coast they came in myriads, until 80,000 and upward were on the coast attaching themselves to our soil. The Chinese are, however, a docile people, a submissive people, a people given to association amongst themselves. They are a people who work. An indolent vagabond Chinese is unknown. Their breaking into industry everywhere they could find a rift brought about an economic and industrial unrest amongst our own people. Wherever a pair of Chinese hands were employed it resulted in two American hands becoming idle. Conditions finally became so alarming that a national policy was announced that hereafter no Chinese laborers could or would be admitted to our land. This was quite 40 years ago, and from that good day to this the fixed policy of Chinese exclusion has been and is now followed. Everybody both in China and America now know of this national policy and this bill in no wise changes or interferes with that policy.

THE JAPANESE

Of late the Japanese have been coming in place of the excluded Chinese, only in greater numbers and to a greater menacing degree. The Jap is altogether a different man from the Chinaman. He is cunning, artful, ingenious, quick tempered. He, in contrast with the Chinaman, does not confine his association to those of his race. He does not come here as did the Chinese, brought by a colonization company that exercises its discipline over him and which has the power to return him whenever desirable. The Japanese comes on his own resources and is his own boss. He is naturally independent, self-reliant, and indifferent. He as a general thing has little if no respect for our laws, except such as he finds it to his financial interest to conform to. He remains an alien in heart throughout his life. He has no other thought. It is not difficult to see the result of this class of immigration. Japanese can drive any white man out of any production anywhere or in anything into which he enters. His only purpose in life apparently is to make money. They are of all kinds of avocations, trades, all characters of business, of all kinds of means of making money. Many are farmers; and when they get a foothold in a farming community or a truck-gardening community they, by the irresistible law of competition, drive every white man out of production. Aside from this, in country districts a white family will not reside in a community where Japanese get a foothold. They simply quit and move out. In these neighborhoods Japanese children flood the public schools, and the white family goes elsewhere.

It takes no prophet to see the inevitable if the flow of Japanese immigration continues. As yet there has not been any organized radical coast repulsion against the Japanese; but every year we are approaching nearer to that ultimate unfortunate end, especially on the part of those driven out of competition and the laboring classes generally. They now stand as unwelcome, disliked. Nor is this to be wondered at when we view it from the standpoint of Americans. How can any reasonable man view the condition otherwise, for, as I have said, where a pair of oriental hands are employed it means as a general thing a pair of American hands idle.

ECONOMIC AND INDUSTRIAL

First and probably foremost is the economic industrial angle. As I have said, an oriental is an oriental for life. He brings with him to this country his blood, his character, and his customs, his mode and habits of life, and his oriental standard of living. In every essential he is as different from us as the sea is different from the land. It is not his fault nor is it ours. God made him different and has ordained to keep him different. Neither law nor creed nor abode will overcome this inherent difference. It exists in the nature of things. He drives the white man out of employment, out of production, out of his home. In Asia—in Japan—it is the survival of the fittest. His ancestors were born, lived, and died according to this cruel law, and he brings that principle or theory of life with him. He is a relentless and unconquerable competitor of our people wherever he places himself.

There are now 7,874 Japanese in Seattle, as near as the population can be estimated at the present time, and probably twenty to twenty-five thousand in the State. There are 1,193 Japanese children in the public schools of that city, and the births there were 593 in the year 1923.

These 7,874 Japanese are engaged in every form of competition with our people. The majority are laborers—and women and men labor side by side. The woman works in the field, in the truck garden, in the dairy, aside her husband and this often in approaching motherhood. The children are taught to work from the hour they can pull a weed or wield a hoe. The man—the husband—is the driving force, the one unit of the family. The profit of all hands of the family are his. Oriental family control is one thing; American family control another. By the united efforts of a Japanese family with their standards of living it can produce the same commodity and he can and does sell for less. The competition is relentless and fatal. In small farming and in truck gardening the Jap has driven all white men out of production until now he absolutely controls that industry. The philosophy that he met at birth has won this industry for him.

Can anyone imagine that an American accepts this condition uncomplainingly? Is it expected that he will yield without a protest? Is it natural that he should? Americans are not built that way, and where is there an American that will blame him?

The Japanese are an industrious people as a class. Their industry makes them all the more deadly in competition. They work from dawn to dark and on holidays. They never stop, rain or shine. In business they have gradually and insidiously acquired some 180 small retail groceries and markets, in every case either buying a white man's store or driving him out of business by opening up a competing business alongside. The Japanese and his wife run the business, no clerk hire or overhead. He sells for cash and keeps no books. With a minimum of expense he sells from 8 to 10 per cent less. He opens his store at daybreak and closes at midnight, and only closes on Sunday if the law compels. Where is there a white man who can stand such competition. He lives on what an American would spend on recreation.

Equally insiduously they have acquired the control of some of our best hotels in Seattle. True you can not see a Jap around the establishment except bell boys, but the interest is theirs and the profit is theirs. The cheaper hotels and lodging houses are mainly owned and operated by them. They run soft-drink places, pool halls, cigar stands, and restaurants by the score.

They have entered every line of business—jewelry stores, dry goods, clothing, drugs, merchant tailors, every conceivable trade and business. There are three large Japanese banks in Seattle ready and willing, and they do finance a Jap in any business, for these banks appreciate he is a winner, due to his small overhead and low standard of living. There are two or three Japanese newspapers, dailies, and innumerable weeklies. As yet they have not entered the skilled trades nor have they generally entered the building trades except amongst their countrymen. It is only a question of time until they will attempt to break into these, and when they do the real industrial contest will be on and a race war, with all its horror, will result. I fairly tremble when this day shall come, for the American will not be driven out of the skilled trades; he will make his last stand for his bread and his life. No American can compete with a Japanese with his low standards of living and the long hours of labor. He should not be compelled to, and he will not, especially in his own land. I warn America of the approaching trouble.

IMPOSSIBLE ASSIMILATION

There is no possibility of assimilating these Japanese. Nothing is more impossible. There are a few miscegenetic marriages; few, if any, are happy. The inherent racial differences, the differences in mode of habits and purposes of life, the standards of living, temperamental and character differences make interracial marriages as a general thing failures—tragedies, sad and pathetic. They live according to a different code of morals. Many a white girl has tried it to her undying sorrow. Some Japanese have a desire for a white wife. In this respect they are totally different from Chinese. No greater tragedy can befall an American girl than to become the wife of a Japanese. Whether she be a sentimentalist, an internationalist, or what not, the ultimate end is either divorce or the sad death from a broken heart. There may be some place, somewhere, an exception to this rule, but I have never heard of it. Then, what of half-cast children? What of a child half white and half yellow or brown? Pure blood of whatever race is the salvation of the world. Scientists tell us the blood of the white race is the weakest of all, and that a half-cast child partakes more of the characteristics of the other race than it does of the white. There is not a scientist, an alienist, a scholar of the world who does not believe in the preservation of racial purity.

It is not based upon any theory of one race being superior to another. It is an insurmountable philosophy founded in the very nature of things.

Japan is or should be interested in preserving the racial purity of her people. A Japanese should be as proud of his color and blood as we of the white race are proud of our color and blood. If he has any racial pride, he is. If they are not concerned, we are; if they are indifferent, we are not. As far as I am concerned, I want none of it in mine.

THE BIRTH RATE

When a Japanese comes to the United States he brings his wife if he has one; if he comes a single man, he brings over, buys, or procures a wife, and the multiplication then begins. Where you see a Japanese family you will find a house full of children. Every child born in this country is a citizen of the United States and entitled to all the rights thereof. Amongst the common class they breed and multiply like the fishes in the sea. Let me cite you the vital statistics—registry of births as given by the office of the commissioner of health of Seattle for the 25th of December, 1923, as published in the Seattle Daily Times of that date. It was the last paper I received when I appeared at the hearings on this bill. I just happened to observe it at the time; nor have I particularly observed them since. On that date out of 19 births 11 were Japanese. Here is the list:

Mr. and Mrs. A. L. Hoyt, 1621 Fourth Avenue west, December 20, boy.

Mr. and Mrs. J. D. Hamilton, 801 Madison Street, December 18, girl.

Mr. and Mrs. Yoshio Shiosaka, 1715 East Spruce Street, December 4, boy.

Mr. and Mrs. Saburo Hayashizaki, 1261 Main Street, December 8, girl.

Mr. and Mrs. Koichi Higuchi, 1222 Weller Street, December 8, girl.

Mr. and Mrs. Seizo Itio, 217 Occidental Avenue, December 12, girl.

Mr. and Mrs. Sasuke Aoki, 1116 Washington Street, December 13, twin boys.

Mr. and Mrs. Masataro Sakaguchi, 667 Weller Street, December 14, girl.

Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Johnson, Preston, December 20, girl.

Mr. and Mrs. Swan Penn, 8439 Thirty-second Avenue SW., December 19, girl.

Mr. and Mrs. Shigeo Fukuhara, 218 Fifth Avenue south, December 13, girl.

Mr. and Mrs. D. J. Healy, 515 Tenth Avenue, December 17, boy.

Mr. and Mrs. Miyakishi Kumamoto, 215½ Seventh Avenue south, December 9, boy.

Mr. and Mrs. Ichitoku Sunada, 410 Eighth Avenue south, December 16, girl.

Mr. and Mrs. Takakiyo Ogawa, 235 Seventh Avenue north, December 11, girl.

Mr. and Mrs. Edward Bobeau, 1515 Boren Avenue, December 21, girl.

Mr. and Mrs. Arnold Morgan, 3842 Twenty-second Avenue SW., December 22, girl.

Mr. and Mrs. F. G. Pettit, 5241 Fifteenth Avenue NE., December 20, boy.

While that is higher than the ordinary daily list, it nevertheless shows the enormous increase. A wife to a common Japanese occupies a very different status from that of an American. She is not looked upon as a companion, an equal, from the social angle—a partner. She is looked upon as the inferior; her property rights are none; her station and purpose of life are to bear children and work for the husband. This is not our social nor moral standard. Therefore, the fate of an American girl who marries a Jap!

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

There are 1,200 Japanese in the public schools of Seattle, perhaps 3,500 throughout the State. Many of these are adults—young men 20 to 22 years of age. Some of these are graduates of schools in Japan. Being unable to read, write, and speak our language they enter the public schools in the low grades to get the benefit of the elementary instruction in the language. Here we have grown men side by side with white children of 7, 10, and 12 years of age. This is not a satisfactory condition. Grown men thrown into daily school contact with little boys and girls. The principle is wrong, the policy is wrong, but there is no way to help it. Native-born Japanese children are subject to the compulsory school attendance the same as the whites, and these generally and fairly correspond in age and school standing.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Washington. I have not the time, I thank you.

In some of the country schools Japanese children far outnumber the whites to such an extent that the white child is brought up, so far as school associations are concerned, in a Japanese atmosphere. This is unsatisfactory, and white folks either send their children elsewhere to school or move out of the locality. I have been in country public schools where over half and in one case 60 per cent of the children were Japanese. The school angle further increases the approaching danger of the situation.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND LAWS

The constitution of the State of Washington has a provision forbidding the alien ownership of land. This applies to all aliens. In this respect the constitution has remained unchanged since we have been a State. This, however, is no barrier to the Jap owning land, for he simply takes the title in a native born, either under or over legal age.

He has another ingenious way of procuring title. He loans money to the full purchase value on a tract of land or a piece of city property, takes a short-time mortgage, the white owner defaults, and the Jap forecloses, obtaining his title through foreclosure proceedings. This he has the legal right to do. In both cases he evades, circumvents both the constitution and the law. Added to this legal fraud, so to speak, the holding of our courts, both State and Federal, that only the State can question these titles, and even the State can not recover title when the land is procured in either of these methods. Another is to organize a corporation from Japanese money, procure sufficient Americans as directors of the corporation, and through this method by the aid of "dummies" get the title in the corporation.

AGRICULTURAL LANDS

Realizing how the Japanese farmer and truck gardener was driving the whites out of agricultural production, the Legislature of the State of Washington, the same as that of California, passed acts prohibiting the leasing of agricultural lands to aliens either for a term of years or "by crop." These laws have recently been held by the Supreme Court to be constitutional, but still Mr. Japanese goes along in his business.

He will resort to any evasion, subterfuge, fraud, or scheme. Naturally he is wily, resourceful, and unscrupulous. He cares nothing for our institutions, our laws, or our State constitution when his self-interests are involved. This has added additional cause of discontent. To see laws evaded, fraud perpetrated, and contempt manifested by a wily foreigner—an alien race—is calculated to increase the feeling and make more pronounced "the unwelcome."

NOT AN AMERICAN

The Japanese can not be made Americans. The native born are Japanese heart, blood, and soul. They never yield to the American idea of things. In their hearts they owe a superior allegiance to the Mikado. Their national sentiment is fixed, their faith is pledged. There is no such thing in truth as an American-Japanese; he is a Japanese, Simon pure, every inch of his body, every drop of his blood.

Aside from an intense national spirit and attachment for his ancestral and blood home, he, like all other races or nationals, responds to another philosophy at once basic and fundamental. Scientists tell us that the older the blood geographically confined, the older the racial or national customs, the older the character without change or modification, the more difficult it is to change the mental, moral, and temperamental make-up of a people. Oriental blood is the oldest blood in the world to-day unchanged by environment. Oriental customs, characters, and temperaments are the oldest of all. Japan for 2,000 years lived under one dynasty; her people, cycle in and cycle out, lived with their strict and unbending customs, institutions, habits, and thoughts. The national ideal was fixed. The very lives of the people were trained in one channel, and thus they made the character molded to one standard of the purposes of life. Only within the memory of men now living has her institutions become changed. Japan's modernization is not yet 50 years old, and some of her institutions are not yet changed.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that the individual Japanese character can not fit into our modern and democratic ways and customs. His nation has not had the rejuvenation that always follows the infusion of new or other blood of the same race. His blood is unchanged in thousands of years—marriages of his nationals within the national blood. It is not to be wondered at that his character is fixed, his customs unchangeable, his ideas and purposes of life permanent. When he comes to our country, or even born here, in either case the blood is unchanged and he remains as true oriental, a Japanese, as if his foot had never touched American soil. He remains a Japanese in heart, soul, and blood—as unchangeable as the stars. This

condition added to the others makes him still more undesirable. We can do nothing with him except let him remain a Japanese, which he chooses to do and will do.

COMMERCIAL INTERESTS

We on the Pacific coast have close commercial interests with the Orient, especially with Japan. We want to continue these. It is to our interest as well as to theirs that they be continued. We want no break. There are hundreds of superior Japanese in Seattle connected with these interests—shrewd, clever, business men. To these our objections do not apply. We want their commerce and they want ours, but this can not be continued where there is friction between the Nations. The sentiment of being unwelcome is bound to spread to these interests and in time will be felt far more deeply. As the years pass on and the feeling ripens into a class, a racial hatred—a repulsion—as it is bound to do, these commercial interests will be forced to respond to the Japanese national feeling toward the American people in their home country. It is to the interest of both nations and their respective nationals that this clash shall not come. The way to prevent it is to remove the cause, and the one cause that is hastening it and the one that should be removed is the unwelcome hordes of Japanese flooding the Pacific coast—the Japanese invasion. We want no repetition on the part of our country such as vexed Austria and Italy for two generations—"Italia irredetta." We want no "unredeemed Japan" of our Pacific coast, and the only way to prevent it is by the manly, firm, but courteous exercise of our undisputed national right of excluding peoples incapable of becoming citizens of the United States. There are Junkers and Jingos in Japan as well as elsewhere. There are, however, clear-headed, far-seeing statesmen over there who see the clash coming and with commendable foresight are endeavoring to so adjust matters with honor and true national respect for both countries. Japan in her own interest and in the interest of her people should join with America and her people in a manly, courteous, and final understanding.

There is no offense intended toward Japan by the passage of this bill. No one is contemplating any nor can Japan in the slightest degree be offended unless she strains her sensitiveness. In excluding peoples incapable of becoming citizens or in limiting or excluding those who are capable we are simply expressing our national right in the interest of our people and the preservation of our race. In this I am orthodox. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, 20 years ago, as an official of the United States Government, I was examining immigrants at the port of embarkation. In fact, I was examining immigrants as an official before some of the high officials of this Government asking for this bill were American citizens. At my port, the port of Fiume, I inspected 60,000 in 1904, 1905, 1906, and I did not let the steamships tell me how to do it, either. I examined every immigrant, and out of the 60,000 immigrants that embarked at my port in those years only 16 were deported. Look up the records.

Mr. CABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am sorry; not now. I spent three years at Ellis Island as an interpreter after that, and I know the conditions at Ellis Island. I came in contact with the problems as an official of the State of New York, as a deputy attorney general of my State, and later as the president of the board of aldermen, and I know what I am talking about when I talk about immigration. Just a few moments ago I heard statements made on the floor of this House by Members on their responsibility as such that they have no illiteracy among the natives of the States of Tennessee and Kentucky, and if the rest of their statements are as accurate as that then their whole argument falls.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE], together with his colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS], appeared before the House last Saturday with charts and diagrams, figures and statistics, figures and theories. Rather than an unbiased presentation of the case, instead of an argument in support of the provisions of the bill, we heard apologies, excuses, justifications, and alibi. What the gentlemen of the House are entitled to know in illustrating this human problem is not synthetic statistics, not arguments based on religious prejudices and racial hatreds, but a scientific report on the economic conditions of our country, the unemployment situation and the need of labor, needed labor at this time and for the next 10 years, based upon existing conditions and the actual experience of the past. That phase of the question has been entirely ignored. We hear, instead, extracts from the books of cranks, theories upon racial reproductions, vagrancies on assimilation, and expressions of fear for the future of the Republic unless we slam the door in the face of races which have a thousand years of civilization back of them and open the doors only to Anglo-Saxon stock.

Mr. VAILE, who is as keen a debater as there is in this House, commences nobly with statistics from the Census Bureau, and I will say right here that we have as good a census bureau as there is in the world, aids himself by a multicolored diagram and chart—and I think it is a shame that the beautiful colors of his diagram are not duplicated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and, assisted by a silver-handled cane, proceeds to prove the problem, solves the solution, and rescue the Republic. He starts off with his statistics taken from the Census Bureau, but drops that like a red-hot iron; and his arguments are based entirely on the figures of the book called "The Century of Population Growth," by John B. Trevor; and his chart is based on the figures in Trevor's book and not on the figures of the United States Census Bureau. He then takes the figures in Trevor's book and proceeds to prove his case with the facility, ease, and brazenness of a real-estate expert testifying at so much per hour on the valuation of land. Trevor's figures! Oh, yes, figures do not lie, but liars figure. This House is entitled to a more accurate basis than the figures taken from a semifiction, semiscientific private publication. Starting with 1790 he multiplies the natural increase of the whole population, assuming that there were but certain races in 1790, ignoring entirely the early immigration from some of the very races that you seek to exclude in this bill, your so-called descendants of the races which you were willing to assume to be here in 1790, up to the figure of 45,309,600. Then the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, in order to justify the discrimination against certain races, explains that this is done in order to make up the errors and so-called discrimination in the present law. For instance, he says that Italy, according to his theory, should receive 2.92 per cent.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. I said Italy should have 3.92, and that under this bill she will get a little less than that.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. All right; we will make it 3.92. So it is 3.92 of our future immigration, while under the present law she is sending 11.75 per cent of our total quota immigrants. He desires to correct the error and in order to correct the error, according to his own figures of 8 per cent, he proceeds to cut the Italian quota 90 per cent. If Mr. VAILE is correct on his figures on page 5646 of the RECORD, then why does he reduce the Italian quota of 42,057 to 4,089? I repeat a 90 per cent cut. And the same happens with the Jewish immigration, which is cut 87 per cent, but every speaker in support of this bill has avoided entirely explaining the reduction in the Jewish immigration. They know that their position is unexplainable and unjustifiable. The Jewish immigration is covered in the immigration from Russia, Austria, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Rumania, and they group these countries, juggle their figures, do a few acrobatics in logic, and say there is no discrimination. I will give some figures in just a minute. I charge that your basis of 1890 is absolutely and intentionally discriminatory against the immigrants of Jewish faith and against the immigrants from Italy, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Russia, Hungary, and Austria, and I do not qualify that charge one bit. The basis of 1890 was taken only because it was the only census that would lend itself to the dirty work that is attempted to be done by the secret influences back of this bill.

What can be more artificial than to go back 34 years and arbitrarily take the census of 1890 for a basis? What can be more unfair than to go back to 1790 and ignore the immigration from 1790 to 1890 and to say that your total population of 1790 was composed of all Nordics? You arrogantly brush aside the early Spanish, the early French, and the early Italian immigration to this country, and because we have no accurate statistics of the early immigration, you simply credited it all to Anglo-Saxon stock, assume a multiple, and bring your figure up to the first available census to suit yourselves and to serve the purpose of this bill. Gentlemen, you can not escape the responsibility of the vicious, cruel discrimination against Italians and Jews mainly, along with the other countries that I have named, which you make in the bill you propose and support.

I will not take the time of the House to cite instances and examples here and there of Jews or Italians or Serbians who have achieved great fame in the professions, in the sciences, or in statesmanship, and in the arts, immigrants or sons of immigrants. That has been done so often here, and you tell me

that they are the exceptions. I will take an example and stand by it any lowly, inconspicuous, humble immigrant—I will take the average Jewish immigrant. Where will you find him? You will find him in the factories, you will find him in the shop, you will find him back of the pushcart, you will find him doing the most laborious work from the moment he lands here until he is laid away. What is he doing it for? He is doing it because he has come here for one great purpose, and that is to give his children an opportunity which was denied to him and his ancestors for centuries. This humble Jewish immigrant, and he is typical of 999 out of 1,000, kisses the land the moment he gets here, thanks God for his arrival here, and it is one uninterrupted, continuous life of sweat and labor from that moment to the very end. His children know no other land, owe allegiance to no other flag, love no other country but the United States. I speak for the Jewish immigrant because I have the honor of representing a great Jewish district, and I will say that there are no more loyal people in this country than the Jewish immigrants and their children. The children of the Jewish immigrant, given an opportunity of an education, they will take their place in the community; and in every city where Jewish immigrants have settled I will show you development, progress, business industry as the result of their labor, determination, and efforts.

The Italian immigrants—let us take the most humble again as example—leaving a country, unlike the Jew, a country that was his for centuries, where the sky is clear and the climate good, where he is surrounded by beauty that has been his for generations, leaves that home for the same laudable reason that prompted the Jewish immigrant. To come here he sells his little piece of land, his little home, and knocks at the door at Ellis Island for admission. He lands, and where do you find him? You soon find him with the pick and shovel building our railroads, digging our canals, boring our subways, or in the depths of our mines. He saves money, you say. Yes; saves money and saves money so that he may send to the other side for his wife and babies or for his bride who is awaiting him, and he establishes his little home, he builds his little house—you show me the house of an Italian laborer, no matter how humble, and I will show you every inch of the ground of his back yard cultivated as a garden; I will show you every place where there is space enough for one seed a beautiful flower; I will show you that Italian laborer on his day of rest, with his coat off, working around his home to beautify it—it is his only home and he wants to make it a real home. Come to our schools in New York and you will see hundreds of thousands of little black-headed sons of Romans poring over their a, b, c's in the grade schools; in the high schools preparing themselves for the duties and responsibilities of American citizenship. Is it fair, is it manly, is it accurate to paint an instance here and there out of a population running into millions of a crime committed and hold that such a case is typical of the immigration of an entire race? The Croatians, hard working, honest, industrious, you will find in the mines all over the country, and what better example of assimilation than that of the Croatian and the Italian—why, on the other side a Croatian and an Italian can not get along; they have been instigated and primed to hate each other by the cunning and trickery of European politics. They come here, work side by side, live in the same neighborhood, their children go to the same schools, no hatred, no hard feeling, living in perfect harmony, friendship, and love, their children intermarry. Why? Because they have immediately become entirely and absolutely assimilated. They are Americans in thought, spirit, and in attitude, and yet you come here and say that this newer immigration can not be assimilated.

Gentlemen, you will have to find some other justification for this law. I do not hesitate to say why I am against it. I am against it because it is unscientific, because it does not fit with the economic condition of the country, because it is the result of narrow-mindedness and bigotry, and because it is inspired, prompted, and urged by influences who dare not come out in the open, by the influences who have no intelligent information of conditions, but who have a fixed obsession on Anglo-Saxon superiority, who have an obsession as to religious dominance, and who believe that it is proper to take vengeance upon these humble, harmless, helpless immigrants, in the course of the work allocated by themselves to themselves, and in so doing believe they are rendering service to their country.

I feel sorry for them. As was stated by the very gentlemen who are sponsoring this bill in a boastful spirit, the districts they represent have no immigration problem, to use their own phrase. If these people could only see, could only hear, could only know, they would understand. If they could observe in an unbiased manner the immigrant in his labors, in his work, their children in their studies, their development and progress, their devotion to the country, all of this prejudice and fear would disappear and how much happier we would be in this country if we could abolish forever religious differences, racial hatreds, and concentrate all our efforts and reconsecrate ourselves as one people, regardless of race or origin to service and united loyalty to our country.

While the Jewish immigration is not charged to any country because it comes from various parts of Europe, I think it can be approximately located. We have no statistics of religions as far as I can ascertain, and prior to 1920 statistics account for country of origin only. That would leave us entirely to the immigration records which sometimes classify immigrants as Hebrew "nationality." From my own experience at Ellis Island I find that this classification is incorrect owing to many Jewish immigrants being classified as Austrian, Hungarian, Russian, or Polish. The Census Bureau in the 1920 census compiled statistics in accordance to "mother tongue of the foreign white stock" and from that it will be seen that 1,091,820 were classified as "Yiddish and Hebrew mother tongue," with a total of 2,043,613. Of these 1,091,820 were foreign born, classified principally as follows:

Russia	791,181
Austria	99,279
Rumania	37,287
Hungary	16,964
England	9,845
Germany	3,100
Canada	2,687

The remainder being scattered among foreign countries, principally, I believe, Jewish immigrants from the above-named countries who emigrated first to another country.

Several explanations have been offered why the 1890 census is now taken and why the 1910 census was taken in the original quota law. The truth of it, gentlemen, is that the 1910 census was taken because at the time the original act was approved on May 19, 1921, it was the last United States census and the only census that should have been taken. You will find that the 1920 census was transmitted by the Director of the Census to the Department of Commerce on November 21, 1921, the census containing the number of foreign born in this country. The census of 1910 was not arbitrarily taken, as some might have been led to believe. When the original act was enacted it was the last census. Since then the 1920 census has been made available. As I said just a moment ago, the percentage or whatever percentage you decide should be based on the last available census, namely, 1920, as was done in the original act in 1921.

I pointed out, gentlemen, in my remarks Saturday when the rule was under consideration that the doors are left wide open on the Mexican line. I stated—and no one dares contradict, because the report of the Commissioner General of Immigration shows that 67,000 Mexicans entered the United States last year, also that the Secretary of Labor has publicly stated that an equal number unlawfully entered. It is not disputed that several hundred thousands came in in 1917 and 1918 and that they have not left the United States but are going from place to place where cheap labor is desired and where manufacturers or growers are specially calloused to want to exploit this peon labor at the expense of natives, yes, and of decent immigrants who come here to make their home and want to live up to the American standard, so that as long as the proponents of this measure permit the intolerable condition of the exploitation of cheap Mexican labor at starvation wages then they can not be heard to say that they are seeking to protect American wages and the American standard of living.

Let me point out some of the testimony given before the committee and received with a great deal of interest by the committee. Mr. W. R. Satterfield appeared. He stated he was not a real-estate promoter but interested in the development of the "alluvial territory along the Mississippi River and its tributaries." To give you an idea first of this gentleman's attitude toward immigrants, he states, and you will find his testimony on page 1052 of the hearing:

> We believe there has been too much of the scum of Europe, so to speak, to use the original expression, coming into this country.

Then, again, he says, on page 1057:

> The reason we have been advocating a selective form of immigration is because we made "a survey of these birds that come over here," if you will pardon that common expression, to see if we could not induce them.

I mention these expressions to show the attitude of this gentleman toward these very people that he seeks to bring to his "alluvial territory" and tells the committee he is not a real-

estate promoter. This very "scum," these "birds" that he refers to, ought to be induced, he asks, to go out to his territory.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. Does the gentleman know how far he got with that proposition?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I am telling you.

Mr. VAILE. Let me tell the gentleman that the southern Members of the committee repudiated that proposition with the same scorn they would repudiate a proposition to let in unassimilable people from anywhere else.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But he was in favor of your bill, nevertheless.

The negroes can not do the work, continues Mr. Satterfield, and because the negroes, he claims, will not till the undeveloped ground. Then, the witness continues, he does not want to draw from other sources of the country, although later on he says an attempt was made and he just could not get people to go down to his alluvial territory after "combing the country." What does he offer them? He offers them to go down, mark you this is not a land scheme at all, says he, to buy the land; he will finance it, says he, and he wants $10 an acre for this undeveloped land and he holds this "purchase" for 14 years at $10 an acre. In other words, he wants the immigrant to go there, stay on his land for 14 years, pay $140 a acre for absolutely untilled, undeveloped land which the poor immigrant himself has to develop, and by the time he has developed the land at the end of 14 years he will be so much in hock, as every farmer in this country knows, that what he will have to do is to pick up, go to some place near by, leaving the fruit of 14 years of labor of himself and his family to this generous Mr. Satterfield and his corporation. Why, this offer is so attractive that he is unable to find anyone in this country who will accept his generosity. He states on page 1054 of the hearing, "We are sending out constant literature to try to get people in the Southland to raise cotton," and yet he can not get them, notwithstanding that he paints a pretty picture as to the possibilities of cotton and the high price of cotton in the future, although some of the very gentlemen from the Southland who will vote for this bill will take every opportunity to protest, and properly so, against conditions in the Cotton Belt and the need of doing something for the cotton grower.

Again to show the attitude of this generous Mr. Satterfield:

If there is a Greek—

He says at page 1084—

except in the restaurant business, or a few of those dark-complexioned persons, we do not know it; and there are a few of these Italians down there that we commonly called "dagoes." If our white folks mix with them, I do not know it.

What a splendid type of man to come forward and suggest a colonization scheme to make landowners out of the immigrant. A swell chance the poor, unfortunate immigrant who falls victim to the claws of this man with hatred in his heart, seeking to get rich on the labor and exploitation of the poor immigrant. He wants to stock up this land with Nordics; and on behalf of the Nordics I protest against any such land scheme—any such promotion scheme—and I tell you right now if you are friends of the Nordics you will prevent them from becoming the victims of Mr. Satterfield and his gang of exploiters of human beings.

Reference is made from time to time concerning the statistics of aliens in our insane asylums. Gentlemen, when you refer to statistics in an insane asylum and you charge that to racial causes, when you charge that to immigration, I say with all due deference and respect that you do not know what you are talking about. It is true we have aliens in our insane asylums in New York, and you have them in other asylums in other parts of the country, but, gentlemen, they are not there because they are aliens. If they were at home and never came to this country they would not be in an insane asylum. If instead of aliens we had to draw entirely from your native Nordic stock to put in our factories, in our mills, in our shops, under the river-boring tunnels, the toll of the industry of modern industry under our production system, just as your toll of death and casualties of war, you would have an equal number in those insane asylums of your preferred Nordic stock. It is the pressure, the tension, of modern machine industry to which human beings are subjected that accounts for the number of insane. It is the constant, continuous go, go, of your big industrial centers that breaks the human system. Do not believe that in stopping immigration from Italy and Rumania and Russia that you are going to stop insanity. As long as under the present competitive system we use human beings as cogs in a machine we will have our insane asylums occupied. No greater mistake has ever been made than to charge that cost up to immigration. Charge it up where it belongs—to the inevitable casualties and cost of modern industry, competitive system, and the existing economic condition under which we are living.

Let me give you a few statistics as a proof of the industry and thrift of the alien. Let us not take Atlanta or the insane asylum, and I believe that a careful, honest, unbiased analysis of the figures of either of these institutions would wipe away entirely the conclusions presented by the sponsors of this measure, but let us take the records of the postal savings banks. Surely those figures are not juggled. I have before me the annual report of the operation of the Postal Savings System for 1923 as contained in the letter from the Postmaster General to the Speaker of the House of Representatives dated December 6, 1923, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, document 102. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES], who is as keen and able a Representative as there is in this House and for whom I have the greatest admiration, took the floor last Saturday in defense of this restrictive immigration measure and finished in an eloquent expression that in his district he did not have one-half of 1 per cent of alien population. The gentleman from South Carolina hails from the city of Aiken and according to the report of the Postmaster General there is not a single solitary depositor in the city of Aiken in the postal savings system of the United States. To-day the gentleman from Chattanooga brought out the same point, and we find there are just 22 depositors in the postal savings bank. Mr. CABLE who comes from Lima, Ohio, and in the city of Lima there are just 18 depositors having funds in the Postal Savings System; and the energetic whip, the gentleman from Anderson, Ind. [Mr. VESTAL], who made a passionate appeal for restrictive immigration a few days ago, we find that he has 31 depositors in his city putting their savings with the postal system. Now, along comes the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], a member of the committee, and he, too, refers to these terrible aliens, and in the city of Alturas, Calif., from whence the gentleman comes, there is just one depositor with $10 deposit, and I bet you a dollar to a doughnut that that $10 comes from some little Greek peanut dealer who has saved a penny at a time. The chairman of the committee, Mr. JOHNSON, who is given to the country by the citizens of Hoquiam, Wash., boasts of 149 depositors in the postal savings bank, while the champion of restriction, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. VAILE, coming from Denver, has 1,096 depositors, and knowing Denver as I do, I tell you that if you inspect the list of the depositors making up this 1,096, you will find they are Italians, Jews, and Poles and among the foreign population of the city of Denver who make up the list.

Now, let us take New York City, my little town with its terrible, tremendous foreign population. When you mention it you gasp and you refer to it as the vicious evil that you are seeking to obliterate. Why, my town has 186,086 depositors with a total deposit in Uncle Sam's bank of $56,486,528, out of a total savings in the entire United States of $131,671,300 [applause], and if you will take the centers where you have large foreign populations and add them up you will see how much is left in the territories where there is no foreign population and who are hounding their Congressman to pass this vicious law. From an inspection of the list from New York City you will find that it is the humble Jew, Italian, Pole, Russian, and Greek immigrant bringing his savings to Uncle Sam because he trusts him, because he knows him, because he loves him, and because he is here to stay. These savings represent the sweat of their brow, the fruit of their honest labor, their part and contribution to the wealth, greatness, and the welfare of their adopted country.

I am willing to take the savings not only in Uncle Sam's savings bank but the savings banks generally, and show you where you have big foreign populations, you have big savings deposits. You tell us that these immigrants are a drain on the country; that they send money home. How contrary to American spirit, to real American generosity, it is to throw into their face the few pennies of their hard-earned money which they send to an aged parent or to a poor relative. The figures of the postal savings bank in Uncle Sam's bank are figures which belie that statement and show entirely the contrary to be true, that these millions of newly arrived immigrants not only contribute to the country their labor, but use the fruits of their labor for the benefit of the entire country by putting it in these institutions.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. They are contributing something else, too. The Attorney General says that despite the fact that the foreign born is less than 11 per cent, they contribute more than 50 per cent of the criminal record in this country.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman had been in this Chamber when I began my remarks he would have heard my statement on that point. If you take the average, you will find that it is nothing like as much as 50 per cent. While that is suggested by the gentleman from Oregon, let me say that the way to assimilate, the way to teach Americanism, is by setting a good example. You talk about keeping out radicalism; you talk about keeping out Bolshevism. You can not keep it out by an immigration law or by a censorship. But we are in no danger of radicalism or Bolshevism in this country.

Our form of government is as perfect a form of government as imperfect human beings can live under. The way to keep out radicalism and bolshevism is to put honest, decent officials in office, and kick out officials who betray the confidence of the people. That is the way to do it. Set a good example to these new Americans. [Applause.] Let us end these hatreds, these prejudices; let us restore to the people the kind of representative government the liberty-loving framers of our Constitution intended, and drive from public office men who have violated the trust given them. By all means let our conduct on the floor of this House be an example and inspiration to every newly arrived immigrant of American fair play, American manhood, and the spirit of brotherhood and love which our Republic typifies.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. May I say to the gentleman, in regard to Oregon, that the district court of appeals recently declared un-American a law passed by referendum in the great State of Oregon, where our teacher on Americanism comes from.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is correct. The forceful gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCREYNOLDS] criticized a meeting I attended. Gentlemen, that meeting was public; everybody could come to that meeting, and at that meeting everybody's face was visible. [Applause.]

Yes; the opponents of this bill were directly charged with being influenced by the aliens in our respective districts. It has been repeatedly stated by the sponsors of this bill that pressure was being brought to bear by the foreign-born citizens. I say in reply to that that the foreign-born citizen as I know him, and I think I know him intimately, would not ask their Representative in Congress to vote against any measure that was for the good of the entire country, and I say with equal force that when the foreign born is made the target of a small organized minority who do not understand him and who refuse to learn to know him are directly framing legislation to hurt him and his family at the expense of the welfare of the country, it is only natural that loyal American citizens should call upon their chosen Representatives in Congress and ask them to oppose this measure. There has been no secret about it; protest meetings have been held in every large center. Petitions have been filed right here in the basket, witnesses have appeared before the committee—how can you create any improper influence out of anything, out of a movement carried on in the open honestly A great deal has also been said about the foreign press. The foreign press is not the only kind of press taking an interest in this proposition. I have here in my hands a publication which has featured restrictive immigration legislation for a long time. If you will read the Fiery Cross of January 18, 1924, you will find there an alarming headline entitled "Americans' Heritage Menaced," says Doctor Evans; and who is Doctor Evans? Why, the Fiery Cross says that he is no less than their imperial wizard, Knights of the Ku-Klux Klan, and a five-column article carrying the imperial wizard's views, opinions, and instructions to Congress is printed in detail in the Fiery Cross publication of the hooded knights. Then the imperial wizard says:

> Ku-Klux Klansmen have been underlining it for some years, and now many leading American journals and publicists are sounding a deep and loud alarm. Action can not be too quick. Something has been done, but not enough; the quota law is but a step in the right direction. Illiteracy, disease, insanity, and mental deficiency are still pouting in upon us. Immigrants are streaming into cities to make modern Sodoms and Gomorrahs. Up to 1880, 95 per cent of our immigration was of the Nordic types—kindred, desirable, easily assimilable people. * * * What Nordic greatness has wrought in this country, if the Ku-Klux Klan has anything to say—and it is going to have something to say—neither shall be torn down by political madness nor shall be dragged down by disease and imbecility.

And in the Fiery Cross issue of Friday, March 28, 1924, we find that the energetic gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CABLE] put the floor leader of the majority on record and required him to do so in writing, according to the news report in the flaming paper, and I read:

> Congressman CABLE, one of the sponsors of the immigration bill, was determined that a vote be urged with the least possible delay, so he obtained the following written promise from Mr. LONGWORTH—

Then the written promise we find was the statement given to the press by Mr. LONGWORTH in outlining the legislative program of the House some 10 days ago and I quote from the so-called written promise as contained in the paper:

> The immigration bill will be considered immediately following the passage of these bills.

The bills referred to being the regular appropriation bills.

Then turning the page of the Fiery Cross to the editorial section, we find this startling pronunciamiento:

> For those who may not be aware of it, it might be stated here that Ohio is one of the chief strongholds of the Klan, ranking next to Indiana, which at this time leads the Nation in Klandom. Taking Ohio as a single unit, Dayton is one of the strongest Klan cities in Ohio. Dayton is "Klan all through"—

And then let me read the next editorial criticizing one of the great New York dailies, the Brooklyn Eagle, and it is not necessary for me to go to the defense of that great daily. There is no better, more loyal nor square daily in this whole country than the Brooklyn Daily Eagle. That paper is not of bi-political faith, nor of my school of politics. It often criticizes me and does so squarely, but I will say right here that its ownership, its editorial staff, is of the very highest type of Americans, and nothing that may be said by the Fiery Cross can in the slightest affect the standing of that paper or its personnel. But let me read:

> The entire country is aware that the Catholic and the Jew are for unrestricted immigration. Americans, however, are not. They see the deadly menace that faces America at this critical time. It is possible that the editor of the Eagle, too, sees the menace; but with less than 1,000,000 people who are of white Protestant, Gentile, American extraction in a city of approximately 6,000,000 souls, it is only natural that the Eagle should play to the overwhelming majority.
>
> There is hardly any doubt but that the editor really meant the people of New York City are not for it. Some kind person should send the Eagle editor a map of the United States that he might learn that America only starts in New York and runs clear to the Pacific Ocean before stopping. Also inform him that the opinion of "the average New Yorker" is not necessarily the opinion of the millions of Americans west of Jersey City.

I read these quotations to show the warp-minded attitude of the official organ of the hooded organization and to demonstrate the one-sidedness of its argument; why, gentlemen, every Member of this House knows that the word of the floor leader is his bond. The Fiery Cross, of April 4, 1924, states that thousands of letters are being received by Mr. JOHNSON from New York, and that New Yorkers complain that they have to depend upon Congressman JOHNSON and upon the efforts of the Ku-Klux Klan, because their Representatives in Congress are going to vote against the bill. Why, gentlemen, I have a whole file full of the publications, and I say to you that the leaders responsible for the activities of the Ku-Klux Klan are doing more to divide this country and to divide the people of a country than any agency that ever existed in the history of the world. These arguments, these articles, are read all over the country. You can not prevent the people of the East forming their opinion of this organization.

They can not understand how you can stand up for Americanism, how you want to shut the doors against those who you believe do not understand American traditions, and how, in the darkness of night, these same people, with masks or hoods, will take some poor defenseless negro and chastise him by corporal punishment or by hanging him, and burning down the houses of the poor undefended negro—they can not understand why, in order to create law and fear, to establish brutal dominance, it is necessary to burn the very symbol of Christianity, which they have been brought up from infancy to revere and worship; they can not understand why it is that this organization has directed its activities and the power of its organized force at a group of people, at races, and religions who are defenseless, who want to take their place in the one big American family. Do you not see what harm is being done, what irreparable harm is being done, and in the name of the same God we all worship and for the glory of our only flag, I ask the Ku-Klux Klan to take off their mask and to meet us in the light of day to

talk these things over and to act in accordance with the best interests and in accordance with the tradition and spirit of America.

I will tell you gentlemen that he who steals my purse steals trash but he who attempts to take my Americanism away from me takes all I have and all that is dear to me. Gentlemen, I was raised out in the big State of Arizona, and anyone who seeks to question that Americanism, I do not care how big he is, will do so at his peril. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. Would the gentleman mind telling the committee, if he knows, about an organization composed of about 1,200 lodges with about 150,000 members to which you can not belong unless you speak and write a foreign language?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes; and let me tell the gentleman something——

Mr. RAKER. I am asking for information.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to be perfectly fair. Let me inform my colleague that he is laboring under a mistaken translation. I have their by-laws and have had a translation made. What it says is: "Without regard to language, religion, or political affiliations." I have a correct translation here, Mr. RAKER.

Mr. RAKER. I am asking for information.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Well, the gentleman has obtained it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from California that the present condition of the time does not permit that.

Mr. RAKER. We have from now until half past 5 o'clock, and I was to have one-fourth of that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state what the parliamentary situation is. By the rules of the House the time is divided four hours on a side. By a subsequent unanimous-consent agreement, after the expiration of that time, the general debate will run on until recess, and run on commencing at 8 o'clock until the House shall adjourn, which shall not be later than 11 o'clock. The Chair has no means of knowing whether there will be any more than eight hours used, and except by unanimous consent the Chair will allow the gentleman from Washington but four hours until after the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has consumed four hours.

Mr. SABATH. May I inquire how much time the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] has remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington has personally used two hours and two and a half minutes, and has yielded the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] 1 hour and 56 minutes, which leaves the gentleman from Washington with one minute and a half.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That will be sufficient for me to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has consumed 3 hours and 42 minutes. I have no doubt there will be plenty of time for this speech, but——

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from California have 15 minutes in addition to the time remaining to his credit and that the gentleman from Illinois have 15 minutes additional.

Mr. SABATH. In addition to the time I have left?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; that the gentleman from Illinois have 15 minutes additional.

Mr. SABATH. In other words, that I have as much time additional as the gentleman will use above his time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That will be 15 minutes additional, and thereafter we will see about the hour of rising.

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Washington has one and a half minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has 18 minutes, and that closes the debate.

Mr. RAKER. I have four minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. And the gentleman from California four minutes. This would close the debate until 8 o'clock to-night.

Mr. RAKER. No; we had an agreement that it should run until we adjourned, which would be at half past 5 or 6 o'clock to-night. That was the agreement this morning, the gentleman from Illinois will recall.

Mr. SABATH. That was the unanimous-consent agreement day before yesterday, as I understand it.

Mr. MADDEN. Let us see what you are going to do with the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am perfectly willing that the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] shall have 15 minutes in addition to the 4 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] 15 minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the impression that the Committee of the Whole can not by unanimous consent change the order set by the House, and the Chair is of the opinion that until the eight hours have been exhausted the Chair must follow the order which was directed by the House, and that even by unanimous consent in the committee we can not change it. I might suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that if he desires to yield time to the gentleman from California, on the presumption the House will have plenty of additional time, the gentleman can do so; but so far as the Chair is concerned, he will leave the time in the control of the gentleman from Illinois, with a minute and a half in the control of the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, for the convenience of the House, I am willing to yield the time to the gentleman from California now, with the understanding that later on I will be yielded that time back by the gentleman from Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington yields to the gentleman from California the balance of his time.

Mr. SABATH. And I yield him the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. And the gentleman from Illinois yields the balance of his time, and therefore, under the rule, the gentleman from California is recognized for nineteen minutes and a half.

Mr. RAKER. And also my four minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I do not know whether a man ought to attempt to qualify himself or not, but I feel I ought to say just a word or two on this matter before proceeding.

For 13 years I have been a member of this committee. I assisted in the bill when President Taft was in office, and it was vetoed; and then, as a member of the committee during all the legislation that brought about the act of 1917, which was vetoed twice and then passed over the President's veto, and also assisted in the subsequent legislation.

The Committee on Immigration was given the power to study the immigration question. The committee took testimony in Washington and went to New York and other places and spent two months and a half in the Western States taking testimony relating to immigration.

In addition to that, during the last year I spent practically all of my time after the adjournment of Congress on March 4 in going over the United States and visiting practically all the cities of the United States. I spent two and a half months on the Hawaiian Islands and I visited every island and saw every sugar plantation there except one. I visited every nationality and every organization that had any headquarters. I went there at my own expense and in my own time for the purpose of seeing the situation. I then again crossed the American continent and spent over two and a half months in Europe, having been there three years before, shortly after the armistice, when we went over a great part of Europe. This last time I went there for the purpose of seeing the conditions as they then existed and as they exist now.

In addition to this the committee has taken possibly 8,000 pages of testimony during the last four years. We have heard every conceivable question that relates to immigration discussed. We have studied the Mexican situation. We have gone into the labor situation, and we have gone into the different methods that have been suggested.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAKER. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Now that the gentleman has given us a certificate of his own qualifications, I would like to ask him what it was that induced him and the rest of the committee to leave the floodgates open for the admission of people from Mexico?

Mr. RAKER. In one word I will answer that. The committee gave great thought to that question. We had 25 or 30 witnesses before us some four years ago and went into it in every particular, and the committee also looked into the law, and I am convinced absolutely that with the literacy test and the $8 head-tax provision, and under the law regarding contract labor, I will say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois I believe, as I believe I am standing here, that if the contract labor law was enforced to-day there would not be a thousand Mexicans who would cross the border.

That is the reason we did not pass on that.

Mr. VAILE. How would it be enforced?

Mr. RAKER. They took some 78 guards away about four years ago. It needs men and money to enforce it. A man told me the other day, testified under oath before another committee, that he saw 58 Chinamen cross the border. The in-

spectors were within half a mile. They walked up to the immigration station and said they wanted to be sent back to China.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that daily Mexicans do come here under the law?

Mr. RAKER. No; they do not; if the law was enforced they would not do so.

Mr. SABATH. They do come in legally?

Mr. RAKER. They do not come in legally. I stand on that as I stand on my two feet here.

Mr. SABATH. The department says——

Mr. RAKER. I do not care what the department says.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. How does the gentleman justify the exclusion of families and children and that they have to reside in Mexico 10 years before it gives them the right to come in?

Mr. RAKER. Well, it does not mean that. That is intended for people who have been advised to get in that way. There would be a perfect stream of steamboats going to Mexico if there was no limitation, and that was intended that if they went to Mexico they would have to live there 10 years before they could come in. That was to plug up that hole.

There has been much discussion here as to the ineligible clause—those ineligible as citizens of the United States. I will make the statement here now that this bill as now presented does not violate a single treaty that has been entered into by the United States with any foreign government. I make that statement and stand on it, and will be prepared to meet it if it comes up later.

There has been only one treaty since the formation of this Government whereby we dealt with immigration, and that treaty was with China. That has been abrogated, and we have now an exclusion law. Since the beginning of the Government we said that these people of the race on the Pacific coast, such as Malays, and Chinese, and Japanese and others were not entitled to be citizens, and that they could not be naturalized. That has been the law for 137 years. The Supreme Court of the United States has decided that Chinese can not be naturalized. The Supreme Court of the United States says that Hindus can not be naturalized, and the Supreme Court of the United States has said the Japanese could not be naturalized. The Supreme Court of the United States has said that Filipinos can not be naturalized, as well as every Malay. So from the beginning of the Government those people can not be naturalized under our fundamental law, which has been the law down to the present time.

For the last 20 years the people of the West have been struggling as no people ever struggled before to keep out these people ineligible to become citizens and be naturalized. The people of California and many States have passed similar laws that these ineligible citizens can not come in under our laws. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that that act is valid and is not against the treaty; so that covers that. The Supreme Court has also used the language that it would be a dangerous thing to admit these people to obtain agricultural lands who were not subject to our laws, and who were not able to become citizens of the United States.

I want to say here that every man who has been opposing this law and has said that we would have trouble with Japan has made the same argument in regard to that question, and some who have appeared before the Supreme Court of the United States made the same argument they make in regard to the exclusion of these people who have been declared ineligible to become citizens of the United States.

Now, here is the story of a century: Look at this chart. Here is a graphic presentation of the past, present, and future of Hawaiians disappearing, Japanese already risen to predominance, and whites in hopeless minority.

You will see here demonstrated that in 1900 there were 230,000 Hawaiians. Look at the line coming down and you will see that there are now 23,723 Hawaiians on the Hawaiian Islands.

Now look again; Hawaiians, 18,000. For awhile there were many others, but they pinched them out.

With the gentlemen's agreement that there was to be no increase in the Japanese population in the islands or the possessions of the United States or in continental United States, starting in 1880 down to 1890 they got very few, and they run up until there was 109,274 Japanese in the Hawaiian Islands. I visited the schools of the Hawaiian Islands, one where the teacher told me there were over a thousand pupils present. So help me God, there were not over six white people attending that school. Anybody knows that within the last 10 years with those born in Hawaii they can dominate everything in the island of Hawaii and elect all the officers. Then they say there is no danger in this increase of population.

These are from the census, and I will tell you another thing that I was unable to get into the RECORD and which I tried to prove. I talked with the immigration official. He told me that when the student goes out, the native-born student, he registers as a Japanese. He gets a Japanese passport. When he comes into the country he comes in as an American citizen, and there is no record kept in regard to his entrance as a Japanese. Then people talk about an increase! There are 15,000 native Japanese in the Japanese schools, and when they come back they come in as American citizens, and they tell us that because there is not as large an increase because of this fact, there is no increase in the islands.

Let us take the map of continental United States—Japanese and Chinese population—continental United States, 1870 to 1920. In 1870, we had only 55 Japanese in continental United States. Follow the line up to 1880, 1890, up to 1900, and then it will be seen that between 1905 and 1907, when they were working on the gentlemen's agreement that the Japanese population had increased tremendously. The Department of Labor has never seen this gentlemen's agreement and we have their letter on file. No man has seen it except the Secretary of State and his officials. The committee members have been there and the members of the delegation have been there, and I call attention again to the fact that even the treaty, with that postscript upon it, is still a secret document and among the secret files in the Senate, and I have the letter from the Secretary of the Senate within the last three weeks about that. They have never yet admitted the American people to see how, or why, or what was done when they adopted the treaty of 1911. While they were doing that, we find, coming to the United States during that period, over 20,000 Japanese, and then when they adopted the gentlemen's agreement for about a year, it will be noted that the invasion slackened. Since that time, up until 1920, we find that they have now over 110,000 and they have been coming in continually and are coming in to-day.

During that period from 1912 to 1915 there were over 30,000 Japanese picture brides who came to the United States, and I have here a list on one vessel. The Committee on Immigration saw them coming, from 50 to 100 in a vessel. In the year 1923 I saw the same thing with my own eyes in the Hawaiian Islands. I saw them landing over 60 picture brides at one time, and 50 others during the month of May and June of last year. They shut out the picture brides so far as the continental United States is concerned in 1920. Within the last week I received this paper from Tokyo itself and here is one family which runs up to about a hundred. There is a memorandum showing that before the picture-brides order was made in 1919—it took effect in 1920, in August—they began coming over as picture brides. The Japanese Government, when a Japanese returned to Japan, made him enter the military service. They have abandoned that and they now give him from six months to a year, so that he goes himself to Japan and gets his bride and brings her in. The Japanese Government encourages that and the steamship companies give him credit, so that it really does not cost him any more to go over and get his bride than to go and come back. Here is a list showing that there were some 50 in the last month. That is a paper that is published in Japan and a friend of mine sent it to me.

Every child born in the United States is an American citizen. They want to own the land. It is transferred to them immediately, and then they appoint a guardian. We have gone so far in California in order to save our own homes and save the western part of continental United States as to provide by law that a person ineligible to become a citizen of the United States can not be the guardian of his own child, for the purpose of preventing the Japanese and their Government from controlling the lands in that country. At one place in Placer County there were 23,000 acres of deciduous fruits growing there. They use the old mining ditches that brought water down in the early days for hydraulic purposes, and when the mining ceased they converted those into irrigation ditches for deciduous fruits.

One-third of all of the deciduous fruits raised in California are raised there. Judge Box saw it and Mr. VAILE saw it. We took testimony in that locality. We saw where the white schools used to be, and we saw them abandoned. We saw where the American churches used to be, and we saw the windows knocked out and unused; but in the Japanese colony we saw where they were occupying the land and running the country. In that year, 1920, over 19,000 acres of that land were under the domination and control and use of the Japanese in that one locality. That is the situation. We went through the State of Washington, down through the valley between

Seattle and Tacoma, and we found in that wonderful valley over 80 per cent of the land in the control of the Japanese. We found that in the city of Seattle 47 per cent of every hotel in that great city was under the control and domination of the Japanese. We found the fish markets in Seattle under their domination and supervision. We found the vegetable markets under their control and supervision. We found banks and every other enterprise—barber shops, small stores, and others—under their domination and control. Go on down through California and down into Los Angeles, and the people there did the work themselves. We found that over 75 per cent of these occupations in these places are being controlled by these people, and then some people say that we do not have occasion to worry. As a boy I went to the normal school down near San Jose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The entire eight hours provided in the rule have now expired, and the time from now on is to be equally divided between the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the Chair hold that I can not ask unanimous consent——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that the gentleman can now yield time. The time is now under the control of the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. They had great orchards of almonds, peaches, and apricots. They had great fields of other work. In those days of 1883 and 1884 the American boy and the American high school and college girl assisted in doing this work. There were not any Chinese in the fields; there were not any Japanese in the fields. We go back 25 years and we find these boys and girls driven from their places of employ. You know and I know that high-strung American girls would rather go hungry than work in the same field with a Chinaman or a Jap. The same way with the American boy.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I will.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman kindly make it clear to the House that the minority is with the majority on this proposition?

Mr. RAKER. I did, and I state this in fairness to all: This matter came up before the committee, and the committee unanimously voted for these provisions in this bill. [Applause.] So we have the united strength of the entire committee on that part of this bill. I took this time for this reason.

There has been considerable agitation and there has been some literature circulated in regard to this provision that we were violating treaties, and now everybody yields and concedes that we do not violate any treaty. The next question is as to the gentlemen's agreement, which is not written, unknown, unseen, unworkable; and above and beyond all of that my contention is in reading our Constitution, reading the decisions of our Supreme Court, the treaty-making power itself could not enter into a treaty and give a foreign country the control of who should come to the United States. [Applause.] If Congress itself, if every vote cast upon it in the House and Senate, and the President should sign it, should pass a law yielding to a foreign country, as this gentlemen's agreement does, to say that Japan should say who should come to our country, it is against our Constitution, it is against our very sovereignty, and can not be done. [Applause.] Now the only point that we desire is that this matter might be fully and fairly presented to the House, so that we might put in positive law that the gentlemen's agreement is not in operation any longer, and that the statutes of Congress may control, and that our officials may determine who shall come to the United States. The immigration officers hold up their hands when you ask them, "Why do you not exclude these persons?" They have not a word to say. When a Japanese comes to our shores and presents a passport and he is admissible we can not exclude him unless he is diseased. Now, the dignity and honor and stability of our country demand that all the other nations of the earth abide by and with our sovereignty as a Nation. And we must say that one nation we have been good and kind to, and we have a high regard for their people and their civilization, but we want them to stay where they are. They said there would be war when we kept these grown men from sitting side by side with our little girls in school; they said war and the breaking of friendly relations would come when we passed the alien land laws; when we said our territories could not be used by an alien race of whom we could not make citizens—but the legislature took its usual, even course and the cases went into the courts, and from the lower courts to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the best brains and ability the Japanese could muster and bring together there argued and reargued, and the Supreme Court without a dissenting voice held in five cases, one from the State of Washington and four from the State of California, first, that they had the right to pass the law and it was not against any treaty.

Second, that they could not even lease, they could not belong to a corporation of which the majority of stock was held by aliens; and, next, they could not even have a copying contract, because it affected the soil, and they have been moving along in an even way; and, as the distinguished President said, if Japan ever increased her population we can and will pass an exclusion law, and then the gentlemen's agreement is wiped out. Now, I will just ask men to look at the map of Hawaii and then look at the map of continental United States.

Mr. BOX. I have here the words of the President.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman read them?

Mr. BOX. I will read just that section:

> I secured an arrangement with Japan under which the Japanese themselves prevented any immigration to our country of their laboring people, it being distinctly understood that if there was such immigration the United States would at once pass an exclusion law.

Mr. RAKER. Yes. That is the part of the "gentlemen's agreement" that was never put into the report of 1908. That is the part of the "gentlemen's agreement" that everybody left out. That is the part of the "gentlemen's agreement" that we ask to be enforced. It was dictated by the great President Roosevelt, and nobody will complain, nobody will object to our asserting our sovereign rights in such matters as this.

There is just one other thought that I wish to leave with the attention of the committee, and that is that we have been patient, we have done everything that has been within the human power of man to prevent any infractions of the law, believing in our Government, and believing that we would get legislation. We have secured it all except this, and there was sent here the other day by an organization from Los Angeles the statement that the American Legion refused to permit Japanese to build a church in Hollywood. Those are great boys.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It is my recollection that when the Legislature of the State of California was considering the passage of a land law relating to Japanese matters President Roosevelt asked the legislature not to pass that law, and later when one or both of these matters was up in California President Wilson sent Mr. Bryan, the Secretary of State, to California to intercede with the legislature not to pass it.

Mr. RAKER. Yes. I will refer to that. When President Roosevelt was in office we had a long telegram from him to this effect:

> Be patient, gentlemen. We will have it adjusted, so that there will be no more need of legislation.

That was the "gentlemen's agreement." Then you had Governor Johnson's administration in California, and this legislation was pending; and President Wilson, thinking that this thing could be disposed of and adjusted, proposed to send Secretary Bryan out to California. Before Secretary Bryan left, the Committee on Immigration had Secretary Bryan before it, on two several days, most of the forenoons, and he said it would be adjusted.

And without any egotism—far be it from me—when we heard that Mr. Bryan was to leave Washington, I went to see the President a number of times, and I begged him to recall Mr. Bryan and not send him to California, because, as I said, "Just as sure as he goes, the legislature will pass that bill, irrespective of anything relating to the treaty." It was all right so far as the treaty was concerned. I think that answers it.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. In order to satisfy some Members here, will the gentleman explain whether there is anything in this bill prohibiting immigration of Japanese to the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippines?

Mr. RAKER. It cuts them off from the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. MILLER of Washington. And from the Philippines?

Mr. RAKER. Yes; and from the Philippines. We except a certain class—Government officials, and so forth.

Now, one word in conclusion. The Supreme Court has said that the treaty of 1911 was a treaty of navigation and trade, and therefore we provide in this legislation that those who come to this country for the purpose of engaging in foreign trade are permitted to enter. So we will have no question about the treaty. We will admit those who come here to engage in trade, in interstate and foreign commerce; but we limit it, and the question will be settled, once and for all, to the satisfaction not only of the West but of the entire United States.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If their children are born here, of course they will become Americans?

Mr. RAKER. I will answer that by saying they become Americans by virtue of the Constitution, but God knows they will never become Americans at heart, no matter how long they stay here.

Mr. MADDEN. I mean literally.

Mr. RAKER. Yes; literally, I say. I want to thank the House for its courtesy. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to take five minutes for the purpose of making clear to the House that the minority of the committee, realizing that the four members of the committee who have sponsored this provision are from that part of our country confronted with the Japanese situation, and were better informed as to the conditions than we, we of the minority have agreed to their views. Therefore there is no question as to the Japanese and Chinese proposition to-day.

I also wish to say, in connection with a statement that has been made here as to foreign powers, that we of the minortiy also resent interference on the part of any foreign nation or any foreign people. Unfortunately some of the Members are sometimes under the impression that because people who are born here have foreign names, that they are foreigners. That is not true. These people, though of foreign parentage, and those naturalized have, under the Constitution, the same rights and the same privileges, I believe, as American citizens whose parents might have been born of so-called Nordic parents.

Now, as to the picture brides I wish to state that my colleage [Mr. RAKER] and the rest of the Members worked hard, and I have cooperated with them, to eliminate that practice, and am mighty glad that it has been eliminated. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, in speaking against this bill I desire to make it clear that my opposition is not to the administrative features of the bill, but to that provision which limits the number of quota immigrants who can enter this country in any one year to 100 and 2 per cent of the number of foreign-born individuals of a particular nationality residing in the United States as determined by the census of 1890, instead of using the census of 1910 as the quota basis. The administrative features are, for the most part, a great improvement over those contained in the present law, and that part of the bill which grants exemption in favor of parents, husbands, and wives, and children is especially commendable from a humanitarian standpoint. I recognize the importance of some restriction upon immigration, at least until the present disturbed economic conditions of the world have quieted down and until this country has had an opportunity to more completely assimilate those people who have already taken up their residence among us. But I believe that this should be done according to American principles and without discrimination against the nationals of any country or group of countries.

The principal argument of the committee in its report in favor of numerical restriction of immigration is that we should prevent foreigners from coming into our country faster than we are able to assimilate and Americanize them, and at the same time they present a bill which will have the effect of slowing up the Americanization of those nationals of foreign countries who are already among us. It is my opinion that this bill, in so far as it discriminates against the nationals of the countries of southern Europe by taking the census of 1890 as a basis for the quotas to be admitted, fails completely in its avowed purpose of Americanizing our foreign-born population. We tell the immigrant when he arrives upon our shores that you have now arrived in a land of liberty and equal opportunity, where all people are treated alike and without discrimination. He is asked to live under a Constitution based upon these principles. He is taught the evils of class legislation, and he is rightly looked down upon if he does not enter into the spirit of our institutions.

We expect him to become a thoroughly American citizen, and now by the provisions of section 10 of this bill we are attempting to put into the law a provision which says to a very large group of those people, who are already naturalized or about to become so, that we do not consider you particularly good citizens and are, therefore, materially reducing the number of your kind that may come into this country hereafter.

It must be apparent to every fair-minded Member of this House that this is the worst kind of discrimination against a large class of individuals and absolutely opposed to our American ideas of equality and justice. Is it not also apparent that a law of this kind will not have the effect of Americanizing our foreign born more rapidly but, on the contrary, will have the opposite effect and cause them to doubt our sincerity, to lose faith in the fairness of our Government, and to lose their desire to become loyal American citizens? In discussing the reasons for limiting admission of quota immigrants to 2 per cent of our foreign-born population based on the census figures of 1890, instead of 3 per cent based on the census of 1910, the committee said in its original report:

> An impelling reason for the change is that it is desired to slow down the streams of the types of immigrants which are not easily assimilated. Naturalization does not necessarily mean assimilation. The naturalization process can not work well with the continued arrival in large numbers of the so-called new immigration. The new type crowds in the larger cities. It is exploited. It gains but a slight knowledge of America and American institutions. It has grown to be a great undigested mass of alien thought, alien sympathy, and alien purpose. It is a menace to the social, political, and economic life of the country. It creates alarm and apprehension. It breeds racial hatreds, which should not exist in the United States and which need not exist when the balance shall have been restored.

Does not this statement show that the committee has taken upon itself to decide that the nationals of certain European countries are undesirable citizens, and has it not practically insulted all the people from those countries living in the United States, whether they are American citizens or not? It is true that they disclaim this intention in rather apologetic and unconvincing language on page 17, where they say:

> Our citizens do not speak of any type of peoples as actually undesirable. Nonassimilable or slow of assimilation is meant. The undesirables are the criminals, the insane, the paupers, and the other classes excluded by section 3 of the act of 1917.

In the later majority report they modify their language somewhat, but the fact remains they have made very serious accusations against the nationals of these countries; and this is hardly the way to encourage the Americanization of these nationals. Discrimination against those already here does much more to "breed racial hatreds" than anything else. If we desire assimilation, we must treat all alike.

There is another reason advanced for limiting immigration numerically, and that is to protect our own workingmen from abnormal competition from foreign countries; for example, when there is a general industrial depression in foreign countries, such as exists in some European countries to-day, there are likely to come into our country unusually large numbers of foreign laborers, a great many of them coming for a short time only, who come here for the purpose of making a living in competition with our own people, with the result that the standard of living of our own workers, who have built up this country, is temporarily, if not permanently, impaired by this abnormal competition. The committee has not discussed this phase of the question, and I simply call attention to it, as I believe it is the reason why a large number of national organizations have filed petitions with the committee registering their approval of this bill. I believe their reasoning is sound, but they are not interested in the question whether we adopt the census of 1890 or the census of 1910 as the basis of figuring the quotas, but favor some limitation on immigration and indorse the Johnson bill, as it is the only immigration bill before the House.

Now, let us see who the people are that are discriminated against by this bill. I happen to come from a State which has next to the largest foreign-born population of any State in the Union. Twenty-eight and seven-tenths per cent of our total population is foreign born and probably about one-half of the population is foreign born or born of foreign parents. As a result I have had an opportunity to observe intimately the Americanization of our foreign-born population and what they have done in the way of becoming assimilated and how they have adapted themselves to our industrial, social, and political life. One of the countries which would be most severely dis-

criminated against by going back to the census of 1890 for our quota basis is Italy. Under the present law 42,057 Italians are admissible each year. Under the proposed law this number would be cut to 4,089. What is true of the Italians, I think, is also true to a very great extent of the nationals of the other countries of southern Europe; but let us take the Italians as an example, and I shall speak of them as Italians for the sake of brevity, although a large part of them are Americans of Italian descent.

Industrially the Italians of our State have been extremely successful, and this is noteworthy when we consider the fact that a large number of them were unskilled laborers when they first arrived in this country. They are thrifty and a great many of them have acquired their own homes. Some have farms, and even those who have not are extremely skillful in raising agricultural products upon the lands which they possess or on small gardens around their houses. They do not confine their efforts to any one line of industry. They work on our farms, in our mills, and in our stores. We have successful Italian farmers, bankers, lawyers, doctors, and business men, and many of them rank at the top of their respective businesses or professions, having worked their way up from humble beginnings. For instance, one of the justices of our superior court was born in Italy, having come to Rhode Island in his youth, and because of his remarkable ability was chosen for the position he now holds.

Those Italians who have lived among us for a number of years have proved by their interest and activities in civic affairs that they are rapidly becoming completely Americanized and have adopted our social customs. They take an interest in the development of our institutions and charities. Whenever there is an effort made to raise funds for building hospitals or supporting charitable institutions the Italians always do their part, and do it cheerfully and energetically.

In regard to the political tendencies of the Americans of Italian descent and also the nationals of the other southern European nations there is a popular impression that they are inclined to be radical, but an examination of the citizens in Rhode Island, where we have as large a percentage of these people as any State in the Union, shows this to be untrue. For example, at the last election for governor in Rhode Island there were less than 1,000 votes cast for the socialist candidate. The New England States are traditionally conservative, and the large increase of foreign population during recent years has done nothing toward destroying this traditional conservatism. The Italians are becoming naturalized rapidly and are taking a deep and active interest in our political affairs. In the city of Providence one member of the board of aldermen and several members of the common council are of Italian descent. Several members of our State legislature and an assistant attorney general are also of Italian extraction. In examining the votes of these members of the various political bodies there is nothing to indicate that they are radical, and there is nothing to indicate that they are influenced by any racial considerations, but vote according to what they consider is for the best interest of the country and of the State of Rhode Island.

If we compare the radicalism existing in Rhode Island, where 28 per cent of our population is foreign born and largely from those countries against which this bill would discriminate, with some of the Western States, where the foreign-born population is made up largely of Nordic races, I think that we will find that there is much less radicalism in Rhode Island than there is in these Western States.

The record of American soldiers of Italian parentage during the war has already been called to our attention on the floor of this House, and I simply wish to add that what has been said of them is borne out by the opinion of a friend of mine who, as a colonel during the World War, commanded a regiment which contained a large number of these soldiers from Rhode Island, and he speaks of them as extremely brave and efficient.

Furthermore, let us not forget what men like Dante, Michael Angelo, Leonardo Da Vinci, Verdi, Galileo, Marconi, and innumerable other illustrious Italians have contributed to literature, art, music, and science. Should we hesitate to welcome the descendants of these men to our citizenship? Are they not likely to contribute something of value to our country and our civilization?

If we adopt the census of 1890 as the basis for the quotas to be admitted under our immigration law, we will greatly discriminate against the nationals of Italy and the other countries of southern Europe. If we amend this bill and retain the census of 1910 as our quota basis, we avoid this discrimition and we will have an opportunity to enact an immigration law which will be fair and just to the nationals of all countries and which will not offend any of our citizens. Whether our ancestors were born in northern or southern Europe or elsewhere we have all done our share in building up this great country of ours, and we are entitled to equal consideration in the framing of its laws, and I trust that the Members will keep this fact in mind in voting on the bill now before the House. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. KUNZ].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. KUNZ. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, let us be as generous in peace as we have been brave in battle.

There seems to be a great deal of alarm among the Members of Congress and more so than there is amongst the people of this country. There seems to be a great deal of national hatred among some of the Members of Congress, and I regret it very much. In the last year or two, since I have been a Member of Congress, I have observed it. I remember a year or two ago that I attended the Army and Navy game. I rose in my seat, with some of my friends from Chicago, and a Congressman from the State of Tennessee was asked who I was, and he stated I was a Polish Jew.

Now, gentlemen, if I were a Polish Jew I would be proud of it, because I believe the same sun that shines upon me shines upon that gentleman; that the very star which enlightened him enlightened me, and there is no difference between him and me; that the same Lord and Creator created him who created me, and I believe when the day of judgment comes he will be judged as I will be judged, whether he belongs to one creed or another, whether he worships in one church and I in another. It will not be a question as to the church in which he worships, but the question will be, What have you done for humanity and what kind of a man have you been during your time of life? [Applause.]

I was very much impressed when I heard the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCREYNOLDS] mention Gen. Andrew Jackson, a name so eminently known in history, one who led an army of men through the hills and valleys of Tennessee and through the swamps and lowlands of Louisiana during the War of 1812.

It put me back to my days of youth, when history recited that in 1778 not only did the Anglo-Saxons fight for the liberty of this country—who were here and had to defend their rights—but history tells us that in 1778 Kosciusko, Pulaski with a Polish army, Lafayette [applause], Rochambeau, and others came to this country, not to defend themselves or their rights but to defend the honor of liberty, to defend a home for those who were persecuted and those who desired to live under the banner of freedom and liberty. General Pulaski fell in battle at Savannah, Ga.

I read in the Appendix only yesterday where my worthy colleague of West Virginia [Mr. ALLEN] stated that in some Jersey town some foreign paper had published the fact that a Polish judge was elected.

That must be a crime. I do not know whether it is a felony or whether it is a crime against the Constitution of this country. I remember when in the city of Chicago, which is known to be a cosmopolitan city, Frederick A. Busse was elected mayor of Chicago on the Republican ticket by an overwhelming majority, and I remember reading in the German papers where they took pride in the fact that Fred Busse was a German and the heading was "Busse, one of our Germans, elected mayor of Chicago." There was no crime in that. When President Harding appointed Mr. Davis as Secretary of Labor, I have heard it said by a great many Welshmen, who took pride in the fact, that Mr. Davis, one of the Welshmen in this country, was appointed in the President's Cabinet, and there was no crime in that. In every locality, in a great country like ours, the melting pot of the world, where the people of every nation come to better themselves, we find instances of that kind. Why, gentlemen, it ought to be a lesson to us. When we go back to Germany we find that after the partition of Poland, Prince Bismarck tried to Germanize Germany. Those Poles who were partitioned and cast into Germany were prevented from using their language. Their schools were closed and they were forced to use the German language. They, being God-fearing and law-abiding, abided by the law; but when opportunity was offered them they took arms with the Allies against their persecutors.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. VAILE. As the gentleman has remarked on the floor here, this is a very important subject, and while I do not care to raise the point of no quorum, as the gentleman did the other

day, I am sorry the gentleman has not a quorum present to hear his remarks.

Mr. KUNZ. Well, I wish there was a quorum present. If the gentleman raises the point, I will be glad of it. Does the gentleman raise the point?

Mr. VAILE. No; I am a little more considerate than the gentleman was to me the other day when I was speaking.

Mr. KUNZ. I feel, Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of every Member of Congress, on a question so vitally important to the people of this country, to be here in order to be thoroughly advised without prejudice as to the conditions about which we all can learn.

I want to state to the gentlemen that in 1922 I visited Europe. Congressman Rainey, who is now dead, and myself spent 10 weeks in Europe studying the conditions of emigration, and I am better versed than a great many men who are on the floor of this House and have taken up this bill for consideration. [Applause]. The fact is I visited those countries and I did not need an interpreter to find out conditions, and I would like to tell you what happened there and the conditions as they are, but I have not the time. If I could have sufficient time it would be a great pleasure for me to tell you the conditions as they were.

Mr. CABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. CABLE. Could the gentleman give us any idea how many would come to this country if we did not have a quota law?

Mr. KUNZ. If the gentleman will give me the time I will be only too glad to describe the conditions as they were at that time.

Mr. CABLE. I have not control of the time.

Mr. KUNZ. If I had the time I would be only too glad to do it.

There has been a great deal of alarm among the Members of Congress in talking about bolshevism, about nihilism and a great many other disturbances in this country, and it is all placed in front of the foreigner. I am not here protecting the foreigner. I am an American, just as good an American as there is upon the floor of this House and just as good an American as there is in this country, and I can prove my Americanism way back yonder while some of the other gentlemen probably can not.

When you talk about communism and nihilism, you say it is the foreigner that breeds it. Why, gentlemen, let me call your attention to some facts. You remember the I. W. W., do you not? You remember Mr. Debs and you remember Mr. Foster. You remember that whole aggregation. Were they of southern Europe or were they Anglo-Saxons? Then why point your finger to one nation as against the other? Why say to one, You shall enter the gates of heaven, and you shall enter the gates of hell? He who created you and me will pass judgment as to inferiority and as to qualifications without our passing judgment upon people of that kind. [Applause.]

In August, 1922, I was in Berlin. I was there while the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was in London, England. I was in Munich and talked to the minister of Germany. I was in Berlin and met every German official in that country. I was in Helsingfors, Finland. I was in Warsaw, Poland. I was in the office of the consul of America there when I saw 1,500 refugees from Russia waiting to have their passports viséed to come to America. In every country that I visited there were people who were waiting anxiously to come to this country; and while I was in Munich talking to the minister of Germany, Von Karl, with Congressman Rainey, who is now dead, Mr. von Karl said to Mr. Rainey and myself, "You gentlemen are both from America. Let me tell you that we have not been treated fairly or honestly by America. After the war and before the election emissaries were sent to the German people with the promise of helping out Germany, but after the election Mr. Harding washed his hands and said he wanted nothing to do with the entanglements of Europe; but," he said, "remember that three-fifths of the population of America is German, and we will send a propaganda to America before the next election that will compel the American Congress to give the Germans aid."

At that time I paid very little heed to it; but only a few days ago our American Congress passed a measure, and while I voted for the measure because I believe there is a great deal of suffering there, yet our American Congress appropriated $10,000,000 to help the suffering Germans.

Now, you might say to me, "Well, they need it." I want to say to you in return, without fear of contradiction, that I have not visited a place in Germany where there was not a house of amusement where you did not have to reserve your seat three days in advance. There was not a public restaurant that was not crowded, and in the hotels when you registered as an American you had to pay 4,500 marks a day for a room where a native European would come in and receive the same accommodations for 1,000 marks. Of course, we were in the hotel where there were a great many people; Germans mixed with all other nations. I want to say that I talked with a great many Germans and they said that if it was not for President Wilson Germany would not be in the position it is, and they were only waiting the time when Germany would come back on its feet and be where it was before the war.

Now, gentlemen, there is no question in my mind but that Germany will be back on its feet. There is no question but that we desire to be friends with Germany, but I want to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Members so deeply interested in this bill to the fact that you are discriminating against other nations. As the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE] said, the 1920 census would give southern Europe five times more than they have now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. KUNZ. What difference would it make how many times more any nation would get if it was an honest deal? Do you intend to give Germany more? You know that in the last war we fought Germany bitterly and I have the courage to tell you, in spite of the German influence I speak as an American to you and stand up as an American. With what Von Karl told me and Mr. Rainey, that they would send propaganda to this country because three-fifths was German; under your bill you had approximately 50,000, which will strengthen the Germans, and finally you will be run by the German element and not by the Anglo-Saxon and those from southern Europe.

According to your census figures under the 1910 census Germany received 45,000; under the 1900 they received 48,000; and under the 1890, 50,000. It makes no difference to me what figure you give to Germany, whether you give 50,000 or 100,000; if they are justly entitled to 100,000, if it be just according to the census of 1920, I would say give it to them; but you are trying to discriminate in going back to the census of 1890 against other nations, and then you inject into it this assertion that they are inferior.

The American people have just emerged from the thick darkness of national distress, and emerged as no other nation could reasonably have expected to from such dangers—triumphant, though bleeding at every pore. The first impulse of a great people on being delivered from imminent perils is that of joy and thanksgiving. Then comes gratitude for those by whose achievements, under the guidance of the Almighty, safety has been attained; then a sad reflection upon the fearful sacrifices by which success has been purchased and a tender recollection of those who have fallen in the strife; and finally the composed mind gathers up the teachings of such a fearful experience—wisdom for the guidance of future years.

On the surrender of Germany and Austria, when the armistice was signed, our people gave themselves up to the wildest rejoicings. For a time the toils, the trials, the sufferings of five dreadful years were all forgotten. Business places were closed, our people rushed out of doors, impromptu processions filled the streets with all nationalities participating. Music led our exultant emotions as far as musical sounds could conduct them. Bands played, whistles blew, bells rang, and the shoutings of the multitude took up the joyful strains and bore them in tumult to the skies. Our people are fond of excitement and may be aroused to enthusiasm upon slight provocation. But then the grounds for national rejoicing were adequate and philosophical. Such dangers as had threatened our Government had been averted; such dangers as the world had never seen before had been suppressed; such results as had never before been accomplished by war had been achieved. We plunged into the war unprepared, sending millions of our fellow men across the sea. We came forth a Nation of free men no longer recognizing any distinction of nationalities or creed. Our Republic had successfully ended the experiment of its existence and took its place, a full, round, high place—first—among the powers of the earth. We had to thank the Almighty after the storms of war had passed that we had come out of the terrible conflict with the knowledge that we had fought for the right and had upheld the traditions of our fathers. [Applause.]

The brother love of man, the absolute equal rights of all men, the right of all to participate in the privileges and benefits of civil government, as they share its burdens, although to our minds familiar and self-evident truths, have dawned gradually

upon the earth and made their way slowly into the creeds of men. The Jew denied to everyone not a Jew not only the rights of citizenship in temporalities but all hope of enjoying the blessings of heaven.

The gentile might indeed be adopted into the Jewish commonwealth, but as gentile he was as nothing. When Pericles boasted that in Athens all men enjoyed equal privileges and were preferred for their merits and not for their birth, he spoke in a city of which no inconsiderable portion of its inhabitants were slaves. By all men he meant all Athenians; he did not recognize that any but Athenians were men. Jesus first burst the bonds of national selfishness. He came to establish a kingdom that should know no end; to be united with the destinies of no nation; which should survive all and supersede all, and its foundations were laid broadly accordingly. The Jew, the gentile, the Scythian, the barbarian, the bond, the free, the black, and the white were invited to share equal benefits in His kingdom. He first taught principles broad enough to include without discrimination all nations, races, and colors in a common benefit.

The Declaration of Independence, the corner stone of our nationality, was man's first attempt to introduce the liberal principles of Christian faith into the framework of civil government. It was a declaration, not that all Americans, all Englishmen, all Frenchmen were equal, but that all men were equal, no matter where born, no matter whether educated or ignorant, rich or poor, black or white. It deduced the right to equality before the law, the right to participate in civil government, not from the accident of birth or condition, nor yet from race or color, but from the fact of manhood alone. [Applause.]

Upon this principle, as the one great faith of our people, the ideal we intended to realize, the consummation to the accomplishment of which we pledged ourselves, our fathers appealed to the God of battles and succeeded. A more solemn covenant was never entered into between a nation and the God of nations. Upon that principle we stood through years of bloody wars against some of the most powerful nations of the world. Without an army, without a navy, without an exchequer we stood and withstood all the power of England, because the truth will always stand and right triumph over wrong while God sits on the throne of the universe.

Thousands of brave young men, without discrimination, left our shores to suppress war, with the Declaration of Independence in their minds—embodying liberty, freedom, and equality to all men—sleep in bloody graves across the seas, with tombstones above their graves, bearing foreign unpronounceable names, yet live in our tender and grateful memories. Their example should appeal to our manhood and our conscience.

They helped to carry our Government through a crisis in its existence; they strove to establish it firmly upon immutable truth and to give it the noblest opportunity a nation ever had to benefit mankind. It now devolves upon us who survive to determine whether their lives were laid down in vain and in no way, I conceive, can we so truly honor them as in studying well and performing faithfully the duty they have helped to cast upon us. If we prove equal to our opportunity; if we stand for justice and for equality among men; if we keep the lamp of liberty trimmed and burning and allow its light to shine from our altitude throughout the world, we honor them; they have not died in vain. Therefore, it seems to be appropriate to inquire into our duties to the best of our ability and gird ourselves for their performance. They died for others, not for themselves. Therefore let us so live as to exert the influence of the exalted position that has been conferred upon us for the welfare of mankind and not for the attainment of selfish ends.

The policy of our Government as expressed by the act which was passed in Congress in 1917 for a distinctive selective immigration measure has been to welcome to our shores all foreigners who are desirable, namely, those who are mentally, physically, and morally fit and friendly to our form of government. We are all the extract of the foreigner and the only question is, when did our forefathers touch the shores of this land of promise and freedom? Those people born here of foreign parentage and those born in foreign countries comprise one-third of the entire population of this great Nation, and 20 per cent of the recent immigration constitutes the young men and women of to-day's laboring classes so necessary to our industrial prosperity. We are in need of both skilled and common laborers, also domestic help, but this bill tends to keep out that class of immigrants best suited for such occupations. Under the provisions of the bill now under consideration it would not bring into this country a better class or a more assimilable body of immigrants than have come under the present law. This bill goes further than the present law in fixing an arbitrary number of immigrants than can be admitted. It is the purpose of this bill to embody our permanent policy of immigration and bind us to a program which will be inflexible, unscientific, and unjust; and furthermore, it is an attempt to treat a human problem upon a cold mathematical formula, since it is based on quantity rather than quality.

The present bill is particularly objectionable because it discriminates against certain nationalities already going to make up a great portion of our population and fans the flames of racial, religious, and national hatreds and brands forever those already here as an inferior stock. It discriminates against Poland, the home of culture and art and literature, from whence came Copernicus, the astronomer; two of our Revolutionary heroes, Thaddeus Kosciusko, who history tells us planned the defense of West Point and whose statue stands on the West Point parade grounds; and Kasimir Pulaski, who died on the battle field at Savannah, Ga., fighting for the freedom of these United States of America. Both of these heroes of Polish birth have been honored with statues and monuments in the Capital of our Nation and in several of the States. America has a strong artistic bond with Poland in the memory of Helena Modjeska, the tragedienne; in the memory of Chopin, the composer; Adam Mickiewciz, the poet. This bill discriminates against the Poles, who have volunteered their services in the late World War, and who, when opportunity was offered by our Congress have taken the oath of allegiance to fight for the Stars and Stripes and the freedom of the world against their land of birth. It discriminates against Italy, from whence came the discoverer of this great continent and to whom the world owes a great debt. It discriminates against France from whence came the immortal Lafayette and Rochambeau, both defenders in our great cause for freedom and liberty. Have we so soon forgotten the World War when the soldier was a hero, when the youth of those same nationalities residing in the United States joined hands with their relatives across the seas and brought victory to us and our allies in that great conflict? Shall we exclude these compatriots in arms, now claiming them to be inferior, by a mere mathematical formula? Is it fair? Is it American? Is it within the meaning of the Declaration of Independence of this great Nation? Statistics show that over 400,000 foreigners—that is, of immediate foreign extraction and foreign born—enlisted in the military forces of this country and when Congress passed the special act granting the privilege to become citizens to aliens having served in the allied forces, living in the United States one year, approximately 300,000 took advantage of this privilege. At that time no cry was raised against the foreigner, many of whom were of Polish ancestry, born in Germany, Austria, and Russia, and who took up arms against their land of birth to fight for the principles and ideals of their adopted country. Statistics also show that in the large cities, thickly populated by the foreign element, the sale of Liberty bonds far overreached the quota.

That in itself shows the loyalty of the alien to his adopted country. However, there seems to be a determined effort to be as unfair as possible. In addition to reducing the percentage from 3 per cent, this bill takes as a basis census figures 34 years old, before the resurrection of Poland and the birth of Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Latvia, and so forth, instead of taking the census of 1920 now available, or even the census of 1910, the basis of the present law. There is no provision in our Constitution as to seniority by birth or naturalization; once you become a citizen your rights are equal. Then why should we give preference to those of the 1890 census as against those who are here and have the same rights and privileges legislating this present date. This basis was deliberately selected to favor the so-called Nordic races and to discriminate against the races of southern and eastern Europe, which discrimination is a perilous doctrine for democratic America, founded upon the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal. I believe that there have come from the Nordic race, noble as it is, those whom they would not recognize as their children; and so with other countries celebrated for the noble characteristics of their race as a whole.

Our country is still large enough geographically, politically, and socially to receive those immigrants knocking at our doors, whether of brain or brawn, who answer our moral, mental, and physical requirements, and who can contribute to our art, our science, our literature, our commerce, and our industry. We have acres enough, industries enough, mechanical and natural resources enough, and sources of credit enough to make out of

this Nation the greatest nation on earth under our Constitution which gives us freedom and under our self-government, under which it has its rise and growth.

I realize the force of what has been said here by several gentlemen who are supporting the bill, that the first and the main obligation of an American, especially a Member of Congress, is to look out for the welfare of the American people. If the admission of immigrants to this country, however it might ease conditions in Europe, would in the slightest degree imperil not merely the safety of our institutions but the prospects of employment for our own laborers, or of the prosperity of the American people as a whole, I would advocate not only lessening immigration but prohibiting it. But because I believe the immigrant who cultivates our soil contributes to the welfare of the country as much, if not more, than he derives from it, I am opposed to discriminately restricting a force of benefit so important to our country.

Our most developed industrial States are those which have had the largest immigration. Our most backward States, industrially, are those which have had no immigration to speak of. The extraordinary and unprecedented growth of the United States is undoubtedly due to the effect of immigration. The States of the South pride themselves on keeping the foreigner from their territory, and yet it is a fact that their industrial progress has been slow. A new feature now confronts those States. The negro, to the number of 500,000, has migrated to the North to fill the places in factories, street jobs, and domestic places that have formerly been filled by the immigrant. This migration of the negro can only mean a decrease in the population of the South, which will have the effect of reducing the representation of the South in Congress.

The proponents of this bill repeat the exploded theory that there have been two periods of immigration—the good period before 1890 and the bad period since that time. The strange feature in our history is that the greatest progress we have made in industry, in science, and even in the last war, where no question was raised as to nationality, and everyone fought, whether he happened to be a foreigner or an American, for the preservation of our institutions and the freedom of the entire world, has occurred since 1890. Immigration yields the incalculable advantage of affording means by which the skilled labor of the country can be employed. It is true in some respects that the foreign laborer does displace the American laborer, but he displaces him by lifting him on his shoulders up to a higher plane of employment, where his wages are higher, his hours of labor shorter, and his conditions immeasurably improved.

The claim that there has been a great influx of foreigners to come into this country since the war by the proponents of this bill is somewhat in error. For instance, take the year 1923. The total immigration for that year was 522,919—215,397 female immigrants and 302,522 male immigrants, of which 46,241 were under 16 years of age. During the year of 1923 statistics show that 81,450 aliens left the United States and returned to their native countries. During that year 117,011 Canadians and 63,768 Mexicans crossed our borders and were classed as nonquota immigrants. I for one, Mr. Chairman, believe that if we are to have a restrictive measure it should also apply to these bordering countries. These people do not come into this country to become citizens, but only to accumulate wealth and return to enjoy the fruits of their labor in their native country.

For the welfare of the American laborers, for the prosperity of our country, for the safety of our Government, for the welfare of humanity, and for the progress and peace of the world, I believe this bill should be amended, striking out the discriminating feature and the 1890 census. The pending question before the American people is to keep the undesirables out of this country. Even under the discriminating limitations of this bill, as of the 1890 census, it will permit the entry of a great many friends and relatives of those against whom charges have been brought as being disloyal to this country. We will find in most cases where a man is opposed to the institutions of our country that he does not willingly take the oath of allegiance and is free to do as he pleases. It is he who breeds nihilism and bolshevism, being imbued with that idea before he arrives on account of the conditions in the country from whence he came where every effort was made to throttle his spirit of manhood, birth, and ancestry. My remedy would be that instead of permitting a certain percentage of any census of foreign born that we amend the bill to read "quota of foreign-born naturalized citizens," which would decrease the number under the present quota and permit bringing into this country relatives of citizens only who have been loyal to our Nation. We have in the United States a large number of foreign-born aliens who have willfully neglected their duty in becoming citizens and who to-day, on account of the progress they have made, are anxious to bring their relatives to this country so that they may benefit by the prosperity of our country. But if this law was limited to citizenship alone we would keep away those who come here for profit and to carry away our money.

We stand upon the broad platform of the Declaration of Independence that—

> All men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

We say that these rights are not given by laws, they are not given by the Constitution, but they are the gift of God, given to every man born in the world. Oh, sir, how glorious is this great principle compared with the inhuman—I might say the heathenish—appeal to the prejudice of race against race; the endeavor further to excite the strong against the weak; the endeavor further to deprive the weak of their rights of protection against the strong. God never made a man for the sake of making him nor that he might amass wealth and corrupt himself with its enjoyment.

Every man is sent into this world with certain qualities to be cultivated and developed; charged with duties to be performed and clothed with responsibilities commensurate with his power; sent into the world that some other may be better for his having lived and then say, do you believe God had no part, no design in all those wonderful events? He saw the end from the beginning, and the beginning would not have been if the end had not been intended. It is true that the love of liberty and freedom in their hearts, the critical condition of their countries, their fleeing to these shores, their founding of a free commonwealth, their growth in education and power as a people are all natural events.

The result of my observations thus made is that there is nothing to be more dreaded in this country than feuds arising from exaggerated feelings of religion and nationality. On the other hand, the one thing needed for making our country the happiest of nations is to rub down all sharp angles and to remove these asperities which divide our people on questions of origin and religious profession. The man who says this can not be done consistently with any set of principles founded on the charity of the gospel or on the right use of human reason is a "know-nothing," as every bigot is; while under the influence of his bigotry he sees no further than his nose. For a man who has grown to years of discretion, though some never do come to those years—who has not become wedded to one idea, who like some are ready to regulate their conduct as to set their watch when the church clock declares it wrong; who is ready to be taught by high as well as by low and to receive any stamp of truth—I may say that such a man may come to this conclusion: That there are in all origins, races, and religions men good, bad, and indifferent; yet for my part my experience has been that in all classes the good predominate. [Applause.]

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have strongly favored the admission of a nonquota class of aliens, as defined in section 4 of this bill. For it should appeal to the fair-minded man that the man who has come here with the fixed purpose to establish a home and become a citizen, who has lived up to that purpose, who has become a citizen, and who, by his industry and frugality, has accomplished that worthy achievement—the establishment of a home—is entitled to and should be permitted to have admitted his wife and minor children to share in the enjoyment of that home. For has he not proven beyond question that he is a highly desirable citizen, and it is highly desirable to him, to his family, and to the public welfare that in all such instances the home circle should be restored and preserved.

For it is well approved that upon the integrity and prosperity of the American home rests the strength, and through it is guaranteed the perpetuity of the social structure. It may further be said with absolute confidence the record of such a man furnishes the very best proof that those for whom he seeks admission will not become a public charge. He is here; we have admitted him; he has made good; and the admission of his immediate family carries with it the very minimum of risk for society and the Government.

I believe the sentiment in favor of limitation of immigration by a strong restrictive measure is almost unanimous. The necessity for such a measure must be apparent to every thoughtful American.

More and more is the welfare of America bound up in the solution of this problem. The statement of Chairman JOHNSON in the RECORD of April 5, calling attention to the vast number of applications—600,000—for passports and visés by persons in Russia, awaiting an opportunity to come to their relatives in the United States, and his further statement that the reports that there are now in Warsaw 70,000 people trying to get to the United States are true, has been questioned, but has not been disproven. And the very fact that many, many refugees are temporarily domiciled in the countries on the western border of Russia, waiting to come here, temporarily domiciled, because those adjacent countries will not receive them as permanent residents, proves that those countries, in their own best interests, are now pursuing a policy more drastic than is proposed in this bill. And in further support of the chairman's statement, I desire to here call the attention of this House to the statement of Mr. Nathan Grosshandler, of Youngstown, Ohio, a native of Hungary and a citizen of the United States for 23 years, a publisher of several newspapers, two of them foreign language—Hungarian and Slavic. His testimony gave evidence throughout of his intense Americanism.

Even the gentleman from Illinois could not, nor has he in the employment of his expressive phraseology portrayed a higher type. The witness said he had traveled in 14 countries in northeastern Europe as a student of economic, financial, and industrial conditions, and had this to say when interrogated on the subject of wages—the prevalence of the desire of the people of those countries to come to America. I quote:

Speaking of the psychology of the masses that prevails in Europe to-day, I might as well say to you honestly, you ask a hundred men if they want to come to America, and 99 out of the 100 responses will be that they want to come to America. Those are the conditions.

It would seem superfluous to pursue further the argument to prove this condition, but I here introduce one more quotation from Mr. Grosshandler's statement:

Mr. CABLE of Ohio (a member of the committee). How many people did you ask that question?

Mr. GROSSHANDLER. I have asked that question by the thousand.

Mr. CABLE. When you were in Europe?

Answer. Yes, sir.

Mr. CABLE. And if we did not have the 3 per cent law, all would migrate here?

Now note the language of the witness:

Answer. I believe of course, I will be honest with you, if the doors were open now, you might just as well figure, if the boats could carry them, they would come here by the millions.

And to be perfectly fair with the witness, he afterwards stated it would take a man four years to earn money to pay his passage to America.

A carpenter in Budapest earns 42,000 crowns a day, or 80 cents in American money. In the United States, from $6 to $10, and the proceeds of one day's labor for a mechanic in the United States will purchase from six to ten times as much flour as in Budapest. That is the main reason they are pressing to come to our shores.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW

We have wisely provided by law that this country shall not be the dumping ground of undesirable elements of foreign population from whatsoever source they may seek to enter.

It can not be reasonably expected that foreign governments will have a great care for the interests or rights in this respect. Indeed, reliable statistics prove beyond question that there have been grave and serious abuses in this particular, whether with the connivance of foreign governments I do not pretend to say. But every loyal American admits the imperative need of the strictest enforcement of the provisions of law in relation to this subject.

I have believed and have spoken before to-day for the mitigation of the harsh and distressing features of the law's administration. I have always been in favor of some flexibility in administration as against iron rigidity. Certainly when we come to the quota line in any case where a mother comes within the count we should not exclude her baby, although outside the quota. For this reason I have not severely criticized the temporary admittance, under bond, of some slight excesses of arrivals above the fixed quotas. While strong criticisms have been directed against what seemed in the instances I have quoted a lax enforcement of the law, I have felt that the error has been on the side of a recognition of humane sentiments.

I believe the present bill will eliminate any excuse for such procedure in the future. Now, as to whether there is unjust discrimination in the 1890 census as a basis of computation of quotas, the subject has been much discussed. Gentlemen who feel that it discriminates against certain nationalities have insisted that the peoples referred to have rendered great service to America in time of war and have contributed by their industry to her advancement in time of peace. This is true; and I would withhold from them no meed of praise that is justly theirs. And if that is a fair argument in their behalf, and if they who have been here so short a time have done well, and are entitled for that reason to be given a basis of admission most propitious for their former countrymen, is it then an unfair argument that the basic stock of America should be given commensurate consideration in the adjustment of this great problem, who have cherished the memory and the principles of those men who laid the foundation of civil and religious liberty in this country more than 300 years ago, principles which later found expression in our Constitution, a document which represented all the progress in government from the beginning of history until that good day? If it shall be true, is it strange that the millions of our population derived from that basic origin should believe because the principles enunciated in our organic law inhere within their very souls, who think with veneration and contemplate with gratitude the names and public service of the men who promulgated that great document? Is it strange that these millions who have borne the storms and trials of all the centuries should ask at least as much consideration as those who have come at a later date?

It is a question for America to decide, and to decide in the light of her own best interest—not for to-day alone, not for this generation, but for America and posterity. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. O'SULLIVAN].

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, of all the changes contemplated by the proposed immigration bill none appeals with greater force than does that which abolishes the brutality of existing law whereby this Government, after an invitation to the immigrant, turns him back to his own country because the quota for his race is exhausted when he reaches our shores. I can conceive few things more cruel than, having permitted these helpless immigrants to travel over the watery wastes, to compel their returning over the same useless journey to their homeland. Such unfortunate instances should not occur as where, during the past year, a steamship arrived at New York with a number of immigrants on board who were threatened with deportation because the vessel had reached its destination a few minutes before the time when a new monthly quota would begin. A certificate granted by the American authorities in the foreign land should be a ticket of admission, and the immigrant should not be permitted to sail on a useless journey to this country unless he is to be admitted, providing, of course, he can pass such tests as are by law provided.

However, the main thought of the bill is its restrictive feature, and the weakness of its restrictive philosophy revolves around that section which takes the census of 1890 as the basis upon which the various quotas are to be computed. This will cause an extraordinary change in the present immigration law, which is based on the census of 1910 for quota computation. The following table of figures will best explain what this proposed change involves:

	Present quota, 3 per cent, 1910	2 per cent, 1890
Albania	288	4
Armenia	230	13
Austria	7,451	1,103
Belgium	1,563	510
Bulgaria	302	61
Czechoslovakia	14,557	2,031
Danzig	301	228
Denmark	5,619	2,785
Finland	3,921	472
Fiume	71	11
France	5,729	3,914
Germany	67,607	51,227
Greece	3,294	47
Hungary	5,638	474
Iceland	75	37
Italy	42,057	3,912
Luxemburg	92	58
Memel	150	114
Netherlands	3,607	1,637
Norway	12,202	2,454
Poland	21,076	5,156
Eastern Galicia	5,786	870
Pinsk	4,284	395
Portugal	2,465	474
Rumania	7,419	638
Bessarabian region	2,792	258
Russia	21,613	1,199
Esthonian region	1,348	124
Latvian region	1,540	142
Lithuanian region	2,310	313

	Present quota, 3 per cent, 1910	2 per cent, 1890
Spain	912	91
Sweden	20,042	9,561
Switzerland	3,752	2,082
United Kingdom	77,342	62,458
Yugoslavia	6,426	851
Other Europe	86	5
Palestine	57	1
Syria	928	13
Turkey	2,388	129
Other Asia	81	45
Africa	122	44
Atlantic Islands	121	41
Australia	279	120
New Zealand and Pacific Islands	80	42
Total	357,803	168,837

Note these startling figures: The quota for Greece is reduced from 3,294 to 47; Hungary's from 5,638 to 474; Italy's from 42,057 to 3,912; Poland's from 21,076 to 5,156; and similar reductions are to be observed for all those countries which have supplied what is now known as the "new immigration."

Another interesting table is the following, which gives the number of quota immigrants and the number of their relatives to be admitted under the proposed act, as compared with the number of immigrants admitted under the law in force during the past two years:

Nationality	Quota immigrants admitted under the act of May 19, 1921	Quota and quota relative immigrants admitted under proposed Johnson bill	Relative percentage
United Kingdom	77,342	125,316	162.0
Germany	67,607	102,854	152.0
France	5,729	8,228	143.6
Norway	12,202	13,308	109.0
Denmark	5,619	5,970	106.3
Sweden	20,042	19,522	97.2
Poland	21,076	10,712	50.8
Eastern Galicia	5,786	2,140	37.0
Austria	7,451	2,606	35.0
Yugoslavia	6,426	2,112	32.9
Czechoslovakia	14,557	4,462	30.7
Hungary	5,638	1,348	23.9
Italy	42,057	8,224	19.6

Proponents of this measure maintain there are too many southern Europeans in America. Yet for the two years of the present bill's existence the net result between immigration to and emigration from this country indicates there are 4,619 less Greeks here, 5,039 less Portuguese, 13,343 less Spaniards, while the Italians show a slight increase of 2,207, and Yugoslavians have remained about stationary.

In order to justify his opinion, man is capable of some splendid demonstrations of mental somersaulting. Two years ago, when a bill similar to the one under consideration was before the House, the committee proposing the measure said in its report:

> It should be stated that the reduction of the quotas of the foreign born in the United States, according to the 1890 census, is not proposed for reasons in any sense discriminatory.

Yet the author of the present bill, writing for the Nation's Business for the issue of July, 1923, said:

> The new measure thus aims to change the character of our future immigration by cutting down the number of aliens who can come from southern and eastern Europe. In other words, it is recognized that, on the whole, northern and western Europe furnish the best material for citizenship.

In the Journal of Commerce on January 15, 1924, W. W. Husband, Commissioner General of Immigration said that the purpose of the law—

> is clearly to leave the way wide open for all northern and western Europeans who may desire to come, but to close the doors as much as possible to those coming from southern and eastern Europe.

The position assumed two years ago by the proponents of this bill rested on the assumption that there was no discrimination as the basis of its philosophy, yet to-day that position has been abandoned for one admittedly discriminatory against the Italian, the Hungarian, the Pole, and the people of those other nations of southern and eastern Europe. No longer is there any question of the real issue in this controversy. It focuses itself on the theory that because a youngster was rocked in his cradle in the city of Naples, or of Budapest, or of Athens he is not wanted in America, because he comes from stock which is alleged to be inferior to that of his brother in the north.

In the background of this doctrine of the inferiority of the southern European a rather extraordinary fiction is built relating to a race known as the Nordic, which appears to have been quite overlooked by the anthropologists until recently. Where this race had its origin is a matter of great conjecture, and an equal amount of light is thrown upon the manner in which it reached the lands its people now occupy. The anthropologists do say, however, that the Nordic is a dolichocephalic race, whose men are tall, blond, blue-eyed, rugged, and handsome. Being somewhat in doubt as to the meaning of the word "dolichocephalic," I consulted my dictionary to learn that it means the possession of a cephalic index of 77.6 or less. Thereafter, and still in the pursuit of learning, I discovered that "cephalic index" means the ratio of the breadth of the cranium to the length, usually expressed by a number denoting hundredths of the length, which ordinarily is measured from the glabella to the most prominent part of the occiput. The habitat of this race is mostly in Scandinavia, Scotland, and the north of England. While it is claimed that this race is vastly superior to others in deeds of daring, in vitality, in mentality, and in stalwartness, it would appear anomolous that this race is now passing away, and with all the rugged qualities graciously bestowed upon it, at least by the anthropologists, races which are alleged to be inferior have been the cause of its gradual extermination.

But wherein do we find the alleged superiority of the one over the other? Surely, if performances in the past count for aught, the people of Italy have much of which to be proud. Italy can well boast of a history wherein leaders of the world in art, science, and philosophy have played their part. What other nation has given a poet greater than Dante, a sculptor greater than Michael Angelo, a painter greater than Titian, a scientist greater than Gallileo, an explorer greater than Marco Polo? Perhaps we occasionally forget that America was discovered by a Genoese whose caravel was manned by Jews, Portuguese, Spaniards, and Italians, men of those very races whose exclusion is now sought.

The following table shows the net increase or decrease of the various nationalities through immigration to and emigration from the United States for the past two years:

Increase and decrease of various nationalities to and from the United States the past two years.

Country of last residence	Admitted 1922	Departed 1922	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Admitted 1923	Departed 1923	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	Total increase (+) or decrease (−)
Austria	5,163	735	+4,428	8,296	433	+7,863	+12,291
Bulgaria	304	781	−477	427	200	+227	−250
Czechoslavakia	12,641	8,550	+4,091	14,090	2,427	+11,663	+15,754
Germany	19,139	6,286	+12,853	50,575	3,646	+46,929	+59,782
Greece	3,809	8,682	−4,873	3,605	3,351	+254	−4,619
Italy	42,412	63,647	−21,235	50,828	27,386	+23,442	+2,207
Norway	5,865	2,356	+3,509	12,670	1,696	+10,974	+14,483
Poland	28,933	35,127	−6,194	26,915	6,010	+20,905	+14,711
Portugal	2,038	6,798	−4,760	2,434	2,713	−279	−5,039
Russia	17,274	6,909	+10,365	17,815	2,894	+14,921	+25,286
Spain	1,429	13,145	−11,716	1,897	3,524	−1,627	−13,343
Sweden	7,186	2,774	+4,412	18,493	1,881	+16,612	+21,024
United Kingdom	46,904	23,547	+23,357	74,832	20,394	+54,438	+77,795
Yugoslavia	6,120	10,173	−4,053	6,292	2,240	+4,052	−1
British North America	57,634	21,682	+35,952	126,742	24,222	+102,520	+138,472
Mexico	23,028	8,675	+14,353	67,287	5,063	+62,224	+76,577

As usually happens in movements of national import, those most active in the interest of a measure are those least affected. The State of Connecticut, with a large foreign-born population, is naturally vitally interested in the immigration problem. Yet Connecticut has raised no cry against the Italian, the Hungarian, or the Pole as an inferior type. To be sure, there are some among their number who are not the most desirable, but of what nation or race is not the same thing true? Rascals and scamps may be found in any country, whether it be America, Italy, or Sweden. It is no just criticism of a nation to single out the exceptions and base a critical conclusion thereon.

As one who has rubbed shoulders all his life with the immigrant from almost every land, in a State where the immigrant has settled in large numbers, I feel that I know something of their habits, their lives, and their desirability. Take the Italian. Wherever he has settled, he has been industrious, law-abiding, and ambitious. He buys a little farm to till the soil; he starts a little business; or perhaps he works in the mill. But wherever he is, he adds to our prosperity. He is ambitious for his children and their education, and, thank God, he usually has plenty of them, a fact most unhappily criticized by some of our modernists, as though the bringing of little tots into the world was a sign of inferiority.

He becomes naturalized in a comparatively short time; he tries to become Americanized. His tendencies are not those of a radical. The foreign-born population of Rhode Island, consisting largely of Italians and Slavs, amounts to 42.6 per cent, yet the total Socialist vote in that State at the last election was but 2.6 per cent. Wisconsin, which has a small population of the newer immigration, but a large number of the Nordic stock, polled a Socialist vote of 12.1 per cent. Connecticut, which is second in the number of foreign-born whites with a total of 41.2 per cent, cast but 2.8 per cent for the Socialist Party. Practically all the great leaders of radicalism in this country come from the old-time stock, while few, if any, are the product of the newer immigration.

But the crowning insult to the peoples of southern Europe arrives when we exclude them at the front door and permit to enter at the back door hoards of Mexicans. Last year 63,768 Mexicans came into the States, and a million more could have done likewise, had they so desired, for there is no quota law, or restriction of any sort for our southern neighbors. I do not know what standard is used to measure desirability, but I do know that the average Italian is as much superior to the average Mexican as a full-blooded Airedale is to a mongrel. Yet this bill will permit every Mexican in Mexico to enter the United States, and the same bill limits the number of Italians to 3,912 immigrants.

The impression is prevalent among some of the Members of this Congress that the Johnson bill develops a sharp issue between the sons of Italy and the sons of the American Revolution. A statement of that sort always suggests to my mind a cheap vaudeville team which drags into its closing number the American flag to pull the act out of mediocrity. However, there are some associations which appear to have taken a position against this bill whose names indicate a background of good American stock. Such a list includes, among others, the following organizations:

Federated Industries of Washington.
West Virginia Manufacturers' Association.
Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association.
American Cotton Manufacturers' Association.
American Electric Railway Association.
American Hardware Manufacturers' Association.
American Malleable Castings Association.
American Paper and Pulp Association.
American Pig Iron Association.
Electrical Manufacturers' Council.
Institute of Makers of Explosives.
Manufacturing Chemists' Association of the United States.
National Association of Cotton Manufacturers.
National Association of Farm Equipment Manufacturers.
National Association of Finishers of Cotton Fabrics.
National Association of Manufacturers of the United States of America.
National Association of Sheet and Tin Plate Manufacturers (Inc.).
National Association of Wool Manufacturers.
National Automobile Chamber of Commerce.
National Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association of the United States (Inc.).
National Electric Light Association.
National Erectors' Association.
National Founders' Association.
National Industrial Council.
National Lumber Manufacturers' Association.
National Metal Trades Association.
Railway Car Manufacturers' Association.
Rubber Association of America (Inc.).
Silk Association of America.
Tobacco Merchants' Association of the United States.
United States Rubber Co.
Labor Department, Michigan Sugar Co.
National Association of Manufacturers of the United States.
National Founders' Association.
California Manufacturers' Association.
Manufacturers' Association of Connecticut (Inc.).
Manufacturers' Association of Wilmington (Del.).
Associated Industries of the Inland Empire (Idaho).
Indiana Manufacturers' Association.
Iowa Manufacturers' Association.
Associated Industries of Kansas.
Associated Industries of Kentucky.
Associated Industries of Maine.
Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore.
Associated Industries of Massachusetts.
Michigan Manufacturers' Association.
Associated Industries of Missouri.
Nebraska Manufacturers' Association.
Associated Industries of New York State (Inc.).
Ohio Manufacturers' Association.
Oklahoma Employers' Association.
Manufacturers and Merchants' Association of Oregon.
Pennsylvania Manufacturers' Association.
Employers' Association of Rhode Island.
Manufacturers and Employers' Association of South Dakota.
Tennessee Manufacturers' Association.
Utah Associated Industries.
Associated Industries of Vermont.
Virginia Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. Chairman, there is a mighty big difference between restriction and discrimination. If it is restriction we seek, you may rely on my support. The workers in our mills and factories must be protected against an influx of millions who will seek their places. But I can not agree to any policy that violates all prior adopted American ideas. With such a bill, grounded on discrimination, we do violence to traditions that have come down to us from the fathers, and as well do we offer insult to those large groups of our citizens of the blood of southern Europe by proclaiming that they are of an inferior brand of human being.

But the main thought is a criticism of those societies with foreign-sounding titles, such as the Order of the Sons of Italy, which have petitioned against the passage of this bill. Since when has a man's love for this country been tested by the name of some fraternal or singing society of which he may be a member? What if these people of foreign parentage bind themselves together for beneficial reasons so long as the love of this land is not placed in jeopardy? Am I any the less an American if I, perchance, belong to some society with a name suggestive of Ireland? And who will deny my Americanism if I take pride in the glory of that land or hope for her prosperity and happiness, or if, forsooth, I hum a little Irish ditty on St. Patrick's Day, or wear a spray of shamrock?

My own humble judgment is that he lacks some element in his make-up who does not retain some affection for the land of his forebears.

A short journey it is from this building to Arlington Cemetery, where rests amid lavish appointments the body of the unknown soldier. Perhaps he was an Italian, who may have belonged to the Order of the Sons of Italy, for our Army numbered 250,000 Italians, of whom 20,000 were killed. Is there anyone with soul so shriveled with prejudice as to lower this unknown from his unattainable plane of homage because, forsooth, he was an Italian? Let me relate the tale of a little Italian lad, whom I had the privilege and honor of knowing. During the winter after the war I met him for the first time. He was tottering up the street, a decrepit, pathetic figure, almost lost in an oversized army overcoat that seemed to swallow his whole form. He was bent almost in two, partly from pain, but mainly from his new deformities. His eyes were like burning coals; his face, while flushed, was gaunt, and furrows wrinkled his forehead. The overcoat was tattered and ragged, while the shoes he wore had fallen to pieces, and at the ends you could see his toes. He told me his name was Jimmy Congillino. He had been in the country a short time when the war was declared, and he had joined the army. He had been gassed, and it was most apparent he was suffering severely

from tuberculosis. He had been hit with a bit of shrapnel in the back and legs, and a part of his spine had been affected. The wonder of it all was that the lad was alive to tell it. Whether it was due to his fault or to that of the Veterans' Bureau, is immaterial. The fact was that Jimmy was receiving no attention from the Government—from his Government—and he was eking out his meager living at the hands of his good friends. But not a whimper would he utter against the delay of the Government in providing him with his due. Eventually his claim was recognized, and he received his first real money. I met him again when he was given a day off from the hospital. "Jimmy, why don't you go back to Italy, where your folks are?" I said to him. "You have nobody near to you in America, and it might do you a lot of good to go back to your country." Jimmy's English was wretched; I doubt if he could read or write. But I did understand him when he said, "Italy is-a not-a my countree. This-a countree is-a my countree. I fight for him; I die in him." Jimmy's prophecy came true, for he died shortly thereafter. He has gone to the land that does not discriminate against the Italian. And in the days to come when the records of loyalty to country are disclosed, I will wager that Jimmy's name will stand out with greater glory than many of those self-proclaimed perfect Americans who want to keep other Congillinos from our shores, because they do not make good Americans.

I insert an article entitled "Eight American soldiers," which carries its own moral:

EIGHT AMERICAN SOLDIERS
(By Samuel McCoy)

The heroism of the eight Americans whom I am about to name was duplicated in every one of the hundreds of regiments which were sent from America to serve in France; I name these eight men merely because their war records happen to be before me at the moment and because much has been said of late in regard to the proper qualifications for American citizenship.

Each of these men was awarded the distinguished-service cross. Twenty thousand men who fought in the same division to which they belonged all acquitted themselves with honor in the face of danger. A thousand men of the division were singled out to appear in the divisional citations for feats of heroism performed in that campaign. But these eight were ranked even higher than all these. They were of the handful who won the distinguished-service cross—a decoration awarded only "for extraordinary heroism in action."

The first man, a sergeant, in the assault launched against the seemingly impregnable Hindenburg line, "although twice wounded, refused to leave the field, but remained with his platoon, exhibiting magnificent courage and bravery, until he was wounded a third time. His devotion to duty set a splendid example to the men of his company."

The second, a corporal, in the same fearful fire of the enemy, "was an advance scout for his platoon. The platoon was temporarily halted by machine-gun fire from a section of the enemy trench in their immediate front. He rushed through the heavy enemy fire to the trench, and at the point of his rifle compelled 12 of the enemy to surrender. He then signaled for the plantoon to advance."

The third, also a corporal, "left shelter, went forward under intense machine-gun fire, and carried a wounded officer to safety. In accomplishing this mission he was severely wounded."

The fourth man, a private, first class, "when the advance of his battalion was checked by heavy machine-gun fire, went forward, with two other soldiers, under heavy fire to reconnoiter the enemy position. By effective rifle fire they drove the gunners from two machine-gun nests into a dugout near by, which they captured, together with 35 prisoners, including 3 officers."

The fifth man, also a private, "after being severely wounded by shrapnel, took shelter in a shell hole somewhat in advance of his company, from which he had become separated in the fog and smoke. He saved the lives of four of his wounded comrades who were occupying the shell hole by throwing live grenades, which had been tossed into the shell hole by members of his own company in the rear, into the enemy's lines."

The sixth, a private, "under heavy shell and machine-gun fire, left the shelter of his trench, and going forward under a thick smoke screen, single handed captured between 30 and 40 prisoners * * *. Three weeks later, in a second battle, after the advance of his company had been stopped by strong hostile machine-gun fire, he, with three companions, advanced far ahead of the front line to attack an enemy position located in a large farmhouse. By skillful maneuvering in the broad daylight they covered all entrances to the house and forced the surrender of the entire force of the enemy, numbering 36 men and 2 officers. During the exploit they killed 2 of the enemy, who attempted to take cover in the cellar."

The seventh, a private, "exhibited exceptional bravery by leaving shelter and going into an open field under heavy machine-gun and shell fire to rescue wounded soldiers."

The eighth man, also a private, "while the advance against the Hindenburg line was at its height, seeing an American machine gunner exposed to the enemy, ran to his assistance. On the way he was seriously wounded, but continued on, reaching the position and using his body to shield the gunner while the latter poured a fire into the enemy. He was wounded three times, finally losing consciousness, but after his wounds were dressed he insisted on leaving the field unaided."

The names of these eight American soldiers, all of whom are still living, are John N. F. Bilitzki, Lonnie J. Moscow, Aloizy Nagowski, Isaac Rabinowitz, Epifanio Affatato, Wasyl Kolonoczyk, Daniel Moskowitz, and Antony Sclafoni.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], a member of the committee.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, that we are facing a crisis in our policy as a people toward immigration there can be no doubt. We must determine whether the old plan in vogue before the Great War of permitting all to come to our shores without limit shall be reverted to, whether all further immigration shall be shut off, whether there shall be a reduction based upon census figures, such as in the extension of the present law, or whether some other solution shall be found.

I dare say that no question confronting the country during the entire period of its history has ever been fraught with such momentous consequences as this one of what new bloods shall be fused with our stock, what new energies shall be added to the future of American life, what new elements shall compete with our labor, and what new points of view shall contribute to our political and social ideas and ideals. The scientific results of immigration are so exact that our children and our children's children can not but enjoy or suffer from the effects of what we do at this time. Therefore it devolves upon us to consider all the facts in the broadest and most patriotic light possible. As a member of the Committee on Immigration, I have tried to do so.

I have tried to approach this subject with an open mind, but solely, however, from the viewpoint of what is best for this country of ours and for no other country. I am convinced that what is for the best interest of the United States on this immigration question may be diametrically opposed to the selfish interest of other countries.

We are the greatest immigrant-receiving country in the world to-day, and probably the greatest in history. Nearly 10,000,000 immigrants have come to our shores during the past 15 years, and during 4 of these 15 years the World War stopped immigration entirely. The vital influence on the history of civilization of the migrations of people can not be minimized and should not be ignored. The Secretary of Labor recently has said:

One of the prime factors in the molding of civilization since the days when the first prehistoric man preempted for his dwelling the cave of the bear that he had killed has been the migration of peoples. Throughout the ages, wherever a given race or people has set up a strong, prosperous, comfortable state of life there have flocked the throngs of less advanced races seeking the ease of the better civilization. There is no instance in all history since the Goths, starving and in danger of extinction by their enemies, succeeded in begging their way into the Roman Empire, which does not demonstrate that soon or late the immigrant people overthrow the older civilization. This has not been accomplished by force or by armed invasion. In almost every instance great civilizations have perished through peaceful penetration of aliens who were admitted to do the work of the community. In some cases they drifted in as free labor, many entered as slaves, or as soldiery in the employ of the higher civilization. In every case, however, these migrations have resulted in the overthrow of the higher civilization by the infiltrating aliens.

But few of these migrations of the past have been characterized by great movements of population in short periods of time. Only some 200,000 Goths were in the original group which the Emperor Valens accepted as residents of Italy. There has never been in the history of all mankind a like movement of peoples of the magnitude of the tide of immigration which has come to the United States during the last century and a half.

Every nation, at least of Europe, is an emigrant-sending country. There you have at once the great clash of divergent interests. Every foreign country and every foreign representative here in Washington is watching the debate on this bill with intense interest. It behooves Americans to watch also.

We can be sympathetic to Europe's efforts to solve some of their problems by encouraging their people to come to this country, but we must never lose sight of the fact that this is an American problem and only an American problem. Unless we in this country look after ourselves and our own interests no one will do it for us.

Those of us who favor further restriction of immigration can not convince ourselves or others that we are right unless we are willing to squarely meet all of the facts. We must first concede to those who might wish even unlimited immigration a part of the facts of their argument. It is true that these are not all of the facts, and that the conclusions drawn from them seem to be erroneous, but nevertheless they are facts. Thus it may be conceded that all of our population to-day is based upon immigration at one time or another, with the possible exception of the American Indian whose ancestors may have originally crossed from Asia to Alaska. Columbus and his successors in the era of discovery lighted a beacon for the brave and adventurous of all lands. The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States lighted another which welcomed lovers of liberty and opportunity everywhere. And so, at first slowly because of the hardships they had to endure, and then more rapidly, they came in such numbers as to make the great migrations into western Europe, following the decline of the Roman Empire, seem insignificant by comparison. They who came had the character and the will to part from old conditions, tyrannies, and customs, and with the faith that was in them face a new life in a new land. The English came to give us a basis of law and institutions running back to Magna Charta. The Dutch came to encourage thrift and commerce. The French came to add a touch of chivalry, of spontaneity. The Spaniards came to throw in something of a spirit of adventure and bravado.

The Scotch came to add a gift of persistency and idealism. The Germans came to bring a thoroughness and an affection for their homes and their new land which not even a great war against their fatherland was able to lessen in the slightest degree. The Irish came to give a fighting humor which has aided us in all our history. The Jews came to stimulate our commerce. The Italians came with their imaginative energy. And so from the cold practicality of the Scandinavians to the warm impulsiveness of those of southern Europe we have had contributed to us the best of all of the Caucasian peoples. Their coming is the most thrilling of any story in the history of mankind. Because we still see them streaming through Ellis Island we do not realize fully the chapter that they have written in the life of the ages. They made America and there is not a man here who is not proud to say he is descended from them.

We must also concede that the immigrant, imbued with the spirit of our institutions, though born in a foreign land, has often contributed most to our achievement. I call to mind Andrew Carnegie, who came to America from Scotland as a very poor boy, helped to build perhaps the greatest of our industrial enterprises, contributed much to the welfare and public spirit of America and left a vast fortune to be used for the betterment of mankind. Who does not recall in this connection the three Strauss brothers who emigrated from Germany, one of them to become a great merchant, another to dispense wise philanthropy, and still another to enter the Cabinet of President Roosevelt? Surely no one will contend that they had been less patriotic because born in another land. You all know the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of this House Mr. KAHN, who was born in Baden, Germany, and yet did more than any other one man to enact the draft law when it was so vitally needed. I should like, if I had the time, to surprise you by calling to your memory the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives who have distinguished themselves during our century and a half of history and yet were born across the sea. Alexander Hamilton, the constructive genius of our Constitution, was an immigrant. Interspersed among our governors and mayors are many men who were foreign born. And if we regard the second generation we shall find many who have adorned our national life. Eight millions of those in this country of German descent have either parent born abroad. And so it is with a similar number of those of Irish extraction. Let us not forget that 250,000 German and 150,000 Irish immigrants fought to save the Union in the Civil War. The immigrant, from whatever land he has come, has shown what he can do for himself and his kind with every burden removed from his back and a free road to opportunity.

It must also be said, and it can not be denied, that the crossing of races in this country has created an American people entirely separate and distinct from any that has gone before in the history of the world. It is a biological fact that the crossing of differing strains produces a stronger race. From the beginning of time it is the crossed races that have done the work of progress. In the melting pot of America we have compounded the characteristics and the strength of all of the Caucasian races. Thus we have gained the composite American, more full of life and energy than any out of which he has come, redolent with creative force, ready to lick the world and do it in a hurry. It is idle to talk about this land of the American people being an Anglo-Saxon country. In England the Picts and the Scots and the Welsh were mixed with Angles and Saxons and Jutes and then Danes and Normans, making a British stock. We have here all stocks. They have married and intermarried until in a few generations they have been molded into something newer and more vital. It is just as idle to speak of a Nordic stock composed of those of light hair and blue eyes and high cheek bones in the north of Europe as it is to mention an Aryan race based upon root of language. It is unjust to say that the descendants of one race in our citizenship is better than another and should be treated with more consideration under the law than another. We are all Americans and America is for all of us. The very fact that these races have all been crossed and that they have brought forth a new, an American, race is the proof positive that we are able, biologically speaking, with the blood strength this gives us to promulgate our ideals until they are the ideals of mankind.

Upon these facts which I have briefly narrated those who favor unrestricted immigration argue that if all that we are is the result of immigration, if the immigrant individually has done much, if the crossing of races has made us the strongest people in the world, then we must conclude that the process should go on. Such a conclusion is, in my opinion, entirely unwarranted. Indeed, continued unrestricted immigration would unmake us as a Nation just as surely as previous immigration helped to make us a Nation. An analysis of other and quite as important facts will prove this.

In 1787, when the Constitution was adopted, the territory included in what is now continental United States was a wilderness. In 1800, 13 years after our life as a Nation had begun, our total population numbered 5,000,000. For a century thereafter the movement looking toward the complete development of the country continued, with the tide of immigrants ever advancing westward.

The Erie Canal, the Northwest trail, the discovery of gold in '49, the construction of the transcontinental railroads, the development of farm machinery and electrical power all had their part in this advancement. Then came a time in the early nineties when all of the easily tillable land had been utilized. That brought a continued movement during the nineties toward the reclamation of the arid lands of the West and the drainage of the swamp lands of the South. Then, as if by magic, following upon the telegraph and the telephone came the automobile and the radio. By the obliteration of distance and the unity of purpose of a great war all sections and interests were welded into one. We thus have to-day 105,000,000 of people in the United States and it is estimated that within 50 years by the normal rate of increase of birth alone we shall have within our present territory a total population of 200,000,000. In the consideration of the immigration problem, therefore, we must regard two important facts, that the easily cultivatable land of the United States has been occupied and that in 50 years our population will double.

Many figures are at hand to demonstrate that a different situation exists in this country than existed when the tide of immigration was at its highest. In 1900 we had a total population of 75,994,000. In 1910 this had increased to 91,972,000. In 1920 it had leaped to 105,710,000. The population per square mile in 1880 was 16.9, in 1890 it was 21.2, in 1900 it was 25.6, in 1910 it was 30.9, and in 1920 it reached 35.5. This is for the entire country, including the great waste places and mountain ranges. The concentration of population becomes more apparent when we consider that the population per square mile of the State of New York in 1880 was 106, in 1890 was 126, in 1900 was 152, in 1910 was 191, and in 1920 was 217. In Massachusetts the number of people per square mile in 1880 was 221 and in 1920 had jumped to 479. In New Jersey the number in 1880 was 150. In 1920 it was 420. In 1890 the average acreage per person in the entire United States was 30.2. In 1920 it was 18. Our cities have been overcrowded with immigrants. New York City contains 194,000 persons born in Germany, 145,000 in Poland, 126,000 in Austria, 479,000 in Russia, 390,000 in Italy, 64,000 in Hungary, 38,000 in Rumania, and 26,000 in Czechoslovakia. We have in this country to-day 4,831,000 persons above the age of 10 years who can not read or write. This is 6 per cent of the entire population. In our armies 961,000 were rejected because of physical disability.

I contend that we have a work to do in assimilating and Americanizing those we already have living under our flag without lifting the floodgates and permitting an inundation to come rushing in as though our western prairies were still peo-

pled solely by wandering bands of Indians and herds of buffalo. We can not do this work if we spend all of our time at Ellis Island welcoming the millions who would like to come from other and more unfortunate lands to this which our fathers conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all are equal.

In this connection it must be admitted that the nationals of some countries assimilate easier and become Amercianized quicker than the nationals of other countries. This difference can be readily shown by examining the statistics of the Census Bureau as to what proportion of aliens settling in America take advantage of the opportunities we give them to become naturalized American citizens.

According to the census of 1920 the following table shows the per cent of our foreign-born population who have become naturalized:

Country of origin—Per cent naturalized

	Per cent.
Northern and western Europe:	
Wales	72.9
Germany	72.8
Denmark	69.2
Sweden	69.0
Norway	67.3
Ireland	65.7
Switzerland	64.9
England	63.1
Scotland	60.9
Belgium and Luxemburg	60.8
France	56.7
Netherlands	56.0
Southern and eastern Europe:	
Czechoslovakia	45.8
Finland	41.3
Rumania	41.1
Russia	40.2
Austria	37.7
Hungary	29.1
Italy	28.1
Poland	28.0
Yugoslavia	25.2
Lithuania	25.6
Turkey in Europe	20.2
Greece	16.8
Portugal	16.4
Bulgaria	12.1
Spain	9.9
Albania	7.4

It is obvious in any impartial study of the influence of foreign immigration on American laws, American institutions, American customs, and American civilization in general, that the facts disclosed by the above table must be considered of the greatest importance.

It is a self-evident fact that the more dense becomes the population and the more keen grows the competition the less is the opportunity of either the immigrant or the native born. While it is true that the pursuit of business endeavors and wealth are as fruitful as ever, and while the advantages of our free institutions are as generously bestowed upon all as before, at the same time it can not be denied that it becomes more difficult to succeed in a densely concentrated population. I can not but believe that some of the disorder and lawlessness confronting us at frequent intervals is due to this condition of crowding. I have no doubt it has an effect upon the health of the average person in the larger cities. I do not doubt that it is possible to make of the immigrant the best citizen, but at the same time it must be said that those who come from lands unfamiliar with our institutions are quite naturally subject to insidious and deceptive propaganda which is alien to our traditions. It becomes increasingly essential, then, that we turn our efforts toward elevating those already here to the highest standards our fathers established rather than lower those standards to vast numbers who would come every year if we would still let them. If illiteracy is less than one-half of 1 per cent in Germany, certainly we who boast of our superiority ought to do something to make our percentage less than 6 per cent. Without education for all, and without appreciation on the part of all of what America means, we can not hope to progress as we have in the past. I have no doubt that when the people realize the facts, the fundamental necessities of the situation, they will set themselves to provide a remedy with the same zest and determination with which they turned the tide of battle in the Argonne and left an ineffaceable stamp upon world events for generations to come.

Labor needs protection. It needs protection in a tariff sufficient to cover the difference between the cost of production here and abroad. This principle was laid down by Hamilton and has become the central tenet of the Republican Party. Protection preserves the home market for the home producer. By stimulating home production and home employment it increases the purchasing power of that producer. This purchasing power in its turn again enhances trade.

Labor also needs protection by the restriction of immigration. Our standard of living, our wages, our output are the highest in the world. We should preserve that standard and those wages against an inundation of immigration just as we would preserve them from a free trade which would bring an influx of cheaper goods made where living standards and wages are lower. As a matter of fact, this policy of protection was extended to immigration at a time when it became imperatively necessary because of unemployment figures, which at their height numbered 5,000,000. I do not say that there should be no immigration whatever any more than I say that there should be no importation of foreign-made goods; but I do say that the principle should be applied in one instance as in the other—for the protection of American wage earners, their living standards, and their wages. At the highest point of immigration a million and a quarter of aliens came to our shores. If this number had been equaled or exceeded in each of the years after the war we should not now be enjoying a prosperity which is all the greater by comparison with conditions prevailing in other nations of the world. The fact is that it has been cut down to a reasonable minimum, giving our people, including our wage earners and the veterans of the war itself, an opportunity for recuperation and advancement, which have resulted in enormously increased deposits in savings banks and an increase in home building which has stimulated tremendous activity in the building trades.

It seems inevitable, therefore, that we must adopt a policy of permanent restrictive immigration. The question is, How shall we apply it?

I understand perfectly well that in the statistics of those who have been admitted from southern Europe it is shown that 40 and 50 per cent have been unable to read and write. I do not want those who have no intelligence to come to America and become a drag upon our people. It may be that the fact that a man can not read or write is not a conclusive proof that he has no intelligence; but, generally speaking, a literacy test is a good thing and is, outside of physical condition, the only means of testing intelligence upon the most average basis. But I am firmly of the belief that this intelligence test, or any other test that may be provided, should be applied to all alike, whether of the northern or southern or eastern sections of Europe. The best should be selected, no matter where they come from. The best are needed. No others are wanted.

If it may be said that we have received more of the north European races, it may also be said that in our admixture of blood to make the composite and perfect American we need also those with differing characteristics. In the decade ending in 1880 came 718,000 Germans, 436,000 Irish, 52,000 Italians, and 52,000 Russians.

In the decade ending in 1890 came 1,454,000 Germans, 655,000 Irish, 307,000 Italians, and 265,000 Russians. In the decade ending in 1900 came 543,000 Germans, 403,000 Irish, 655,000 Italians, and 593,000 Russians. In the decade ending in 1910 came 341,000 Germans, 339,000 Irish, 2,045,000 Italians, and 1,597,000 Russians. In the decade ending in 1920 came 143,000 Germans, 145,000 Irish, 1,109,000 Italians, and 921,000 Russians. I am not afraid of either of them because they are Germans, Irish, Italians, or Russians. Immigration should be restricted for all alike, but it should not be made obviously discriminatory against any people as a whole anywhere except when unassimilable. By unassimilable I mean Chinese and Japanese, who do not intermarry with the Caucasian race. The negroes came earlier and under different circumstances.

At this point I wish to again call your attention to the following pronouncement upon the subject of immigration uttered by that man whose courage and capacity have been thoroughly tested—President Coolidge:

> American institutions rest solely on good citizenship. They were created by people who have a background of self-government. New arrivals should be limited to our capacity to absorb them into the ranks of good citizenship. America must be kept American. For this purpose it is necessary to continue a policy of restricted immigration. It would be well to make such immigration of a selective nature, with some inspection at the source, and based either on a prior census or upon the record of naturalization. Either method would insure the admission of those with the largest capacity and best intention of becoming citizens. I am convinced that our present economic and social conditions warrant a limit of those to be admitted. We should find additional safety in a law requiring the immediate registration of all aliens. Those who do not want to partake of the American spirit ought not to settle in America.

Let us approach this entire problem, then, in this spirit. If the war made for national unity in a larger sense than ever before, it seems to me that it would be wisest and best to base immigration not upon a percentage of foreign born in the

country in any one year but upon all those who have come to our shores at any time since the foundation of Government. The present law uses the census of 1910 and makes up the quotas on the basis of the foreign-born residents of the United States as shown by the census of that year. This bill under discussion uses the census of 1890 but also makes up the quotas on the basis of foreign-born residents in the United States in 1890.

The trouble with both of these propositions is that neither takes into consideration native-born American citizens. I submit that in making up of immigration quotas citizens who are native born should be given at least as much consideration as foreign-born residents.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE] has ably demonstrated and proved that the present law, basing quotas as it does on a percentage of the foreign born according to the census of 1910 and ignoring the native born, discriminates against northern and western Europe. He shows, for example, that 85.02 per cent of the present—1920—white population of the United States, including immigrants, descendants of immigrants, and descendants of original settlers, comes from racial stocks of northern and western Europe. The present law, however, only permits 56.33 per cent of the immigrants to come from northern and western Europe. On the other hand, 14.62 per cent of the present—1920—white population of the United States, including immigrants, descendants of immigrants, and descendants of original settlers, comes from national stocks of southern and eastern Europe. The present law discriminates in their favor by allowing 44.64 per cent of all immigrants to come in from southern and eastern Europe.

Let us consider more in detail two different countries representing these two different groups—Great Britain and Ireland and Poland.

From Great Britain and Ireland has come 60.74 per cent of the racial stocks that make up our present—1920—white population, including immigrants, descendants of immigrants, and descendants of original settlers. And yet under the present law Great Britain and Ireland are only allowed to send 21.61 per cent of the immigrants we admit annually.

Poland, an eastern European nation, has only contributed 3.01 per cent to the racial stocks of the present—1920—white population of the United States, including immigrants, descendants of immigrants, and descendants of original settlers. And yet Poland under the present law is allowed to contribute 5.57 per cent of our immigrants.

The contention, therefore, of the gentleman from Colorado is thoroughly sound, namely, that the present law, using the census of 1910 and only taking into consideration the foreign born within our borders, and ignoring the native born, discriminates against northern and western Europe and favors southern and eastern Europe. I submit also that the present law discriminates against the native born. The trouble has been that nobody has heretofore considered the American born in determining what the numerical quotas shall be. We, therefore, should try and devise a quota law against which the charge of discrimination can not be made.

As I have pointed out above, the proposal in this bill to base the quota on a percentage of the foreign born in this country according to the census of 1890 is open to the same objections that I have raised to the present law, namely, that it does not take into consideration the native-born Americans.

It is important to note, however, that the results of using the census of 1890 in this way are practically the same as the results that will be obtained by the proposal that I have outlined above, namely, by first determining the actual composition of our American race by national stocks, and, having determined it, to fairly proportion our immigration in accordance with these national origins, thus taking into consideration those who are native born.

Therefore, it is not so much that I criticize the results obtained by basing the quota on the number of foreign born in this country according to the 1890 census, as it is that I criticize this method because it seems to me to be an artificial method. As a member of the committee I shall support this bill and have been glad to sign the majority report. I know full well that in selecting the census of 1890 the committee had it in mind to end the discrimination caused by using the census of 1910. They had no thought or wish of discriminating against any race or people.

I think they also had in mind, I know I did, that the fairest thing to do was to maintain in future immigration as near as possible the same proportions between races and nations as exist already in our country. In other words, we believed that the native born had at least equal rights with the foreign born in determining future immigration. The census of 1890 unquestionably comes nearer giving these results than any other census. Therefore, I shall support the use of this census. I personally believe, however, that it is an artificial way of reaching fair results. I prefer the more direct way, as I have outlined above, and as I shall describe more in detail hereafter.

If we divide up our immigrants exactly in accordance with the national origins of our whole population, there can be no charge of discrimination. This would do away entirely with the contention that discrimination against any race would result from a percentage based on a particular year. It would give the peoples that have made America in the days when our prosperity and our leadership among the nations of the earth was not so evident as now an opportunity to have their own kind continue to come in in whatever proportion may be decided upon. I can conceive of no reason why those peoples who have sought our shores because of love of liberty and have risked all when hardihood and bravery and the spirit of adventure were most required should not now be able to say to those who come that restriction of immigration should be applied exactly in proportion to those peoples that have already fused into the American stock. This proposal would be to attack the problem from an American point of view instead of from the point of view of the immigrant or from the point of view of alien groups or foreign countries. As I have pointed out above, our problem is to develop a homogeneous, distinct American race. This proposal would preserve the present American race; it would maintain the status quo. This would make for unity.

While it is true that the United States census has not yet prepared an exact enumeration of those who have come to our shores by nationality, it can be done. It is perfectly possible to ascertain the division of races in this country with sufficient correctness. There can then be no question of discrimination, because it will treat all races alike on the basis of their actual proportion of the present population.

This suggestion is therefore exceedingly practical. Its justice may be evidenced by the assurance that it will include in the basic figures all of those men and women of iron courage who braved the wilderness and then the Great Divide to build during the last century on this continent the greatest Nation in the world. It will take into consideration all who crossed the seas and planted a new civilization, and it will take them into consideration in exact proportion to the numbers in which they came. What richer reward could they have asked for than that later generations of the same race from which they sprang should be permitted to emigrate to America in some fair proportion, however small, to their total numbers?

And if some peoples are not permitted to send as large numbers as others, can they possibly complain of discrimination? They themselves, or those who preceded them, are alone responsible for the restriction against those nationalities who failed to come to the United States when conditions were immeasurably more difficult, when the struggle for existence was molding the American people.

I would not discriminate against any people because it is that people. I would not discriminate against any section of Europe because it is that section. I would not discriminate against any religion because it is that religion. But I would do justice to those people who did not wait for the time of sunshine and easy money to come and contribute their store of manhood and womanhood to free America. And I am sure I would do no injustice by voting to impose a proportionate restriction against those people who did wait for an easier day.

We must retain in America that element of independence of character, that individuality and initiative engendered in us by those who in earlier days left the physical comforts of Europe to brave physical hardships and thus to find free play for mental self-reliance and expression in a new world.

Therefore, I believe that it is entirely practicable to determine the actual composition of our distinctive American race, and having determined it, to preserve the existing proportion of those races which have contributed to the present fusion. By doing this there can be no discrimination against any individual race.

Immigration into the United States should be based in the future upon a certain and fair proportion of every race which has come to our shores in the past and become a part of America. In this way, and this way only, will it be possible to adopt a permanent and an American immigration policy.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to close these remarks without briefly mentioning certain other desirable features of this bill. I do not see how we can escape from the logic of the eminently practicable recommendation that certificates issued to immigrants by American consuls abroad be counted rather than the immigrants themselves upon arrival. This would do away with the racing to our ports of vessels in order to get their

cargoes of human freight ashore within the time limit of exhaustion of quota. The last minute of crowding in of vessels during the last year or two has been detrimental to our reputation for national efficiency. It will be done away with by this recommendation of the committee.

It would be decidedly wise also to accept the recommendation of the committee that immigrants be examined overseas as to qualifications rather than have them held up for what seems to them an endless period at Ellis Island. Many thousands of those who are eventually rejected will thus not be compelled to spend many weeks crossing the ocean and returning, and the Government of the United States will save time and money.

Another reform recommended by the committee which should be adopted without question provides that wives of those already here, their children, and their parents over 55 years of age, should be permitted to come in without restriction. And it must be obvious to anybody that those who could not eventually become citizens should not be permitted to enter the country as immigrants. This is also urged by the committee.

Let us have proper restriction of immigration for the benefit of a civilization which surpasses any the world has known and is the hope of mankind for the future. But let us have it in the American spirit of fair play and upon the basis that even those who are to feel its effects will believe to be just and reasonable. A law based upon such broad principles as those proposed by President Coolidge can and should prevail.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to insert a table showing quotas under various different methods of selection. I am also including estimates of the native white stock in 1900, 1910, and 1920, taken from a volume entitled "Increase of Population in the United States, 1900, 1910, and 1920," published by the Bureau of the Census as monograph No. 1, dated 1922, and also a paper entitled, "Preliminary Study of Immigration Problem," by John B. Trevor.

EXHIBIT A

Quotas

Nationality	Present law	Johnson bill—2 per cent of 1890 plus 100	Senate committee recommendation—2 per cent of 1910, with minimum of 100	National origins method of 1920 census plus 100 in each case		
				150,000 base	200,000 base	250,000 base
Albania	288	104	192	118	124	130
Armenia	230	117	152	150	167	184
Austria	7,342	1,090	4,894	1,942	2,557	3,171
Belgium	1,563	609	1,042	359	446	532
Bulgaria	302	100	202	132	143	155
Czechoslovakia	14,357	1,973	9,572	1,419	1,859	2,299
Danzig	301	323	200	149	165	182
Denmark	5,619	2,882	3,746	1,191	1,555	1,919
Esthonia	1,348	202	898	321	395	468
Finland	3,921	245	2,614	597	763	930
Fiume	71	110	100	118	124	130
France	5,729	3,978	3,820	2,863	3,784	4,705
Germany	67,607	50,229	45,072	22,118	29,457	36,795
Great Britain and Ireland	77,342	62,558	51,562	91,210	121,581	151,951
Greece	3,063	135	2,042	636	815	993
Hungary	5,747	588	3,832	1,359	1,779	2,198
Iceland	75	136	100	112	116	120
Italy	42,057	3,989	28,038	5,977	7,937	9,895
Latvia	1,540	217	1,026	353	437	522
Lithuania	2,622	402	1,752	544	692	840
Luxemburg	97	158	100	176	202	228
Netherlands	3,602	1,737	2,404	2,770	3,659	4,549
Norway	12,205	6,553	8,134	2,533	3,344	4,155
Poland	30,979	8,972	20,652	4,610	6,113	7,616
Portugal	2,465	574	1,644	375	467	558
Rumania	7,419	731	4,946	487	615	743
Russia	24,405	1,892	16,270	4,102	5,436	6,770
Spain	912	224	608	241	288	335
Sweden	20,042	9,661	13,362	3,807	5,042	6,277
Switzerland	3,752	2,181	2,502	881	1,141	1,402
Yugoslavia	6,426	835	4,284	702	902	1,102
Other Europe	86	225	100	133	144	155
Palestine	57	101	100	110	113	117
Syria	882	112	588	262	316	370
Turkey	2,654	123	1,770	215	253	291
Other Asia	92	145	100	122	129	137
Africa	104	138	100	120	126	133
Egypt	18	106	100	104	105	106
Atlantic islands	121	141	100	234	278	323
Australia	279	220	196	148	164	180
New Zealand	80	167	100	120	127	134
Japan	[1]	[1]	1,443	280	340	400
Total	357,801	164,983	240,459	154,200	204,200	254,200

[1] No quota.

The quotas under the present law, the Johnson bill, and the Senate bill are based on a percentage of the foreign born in this country according to whichever census is used. No consideration is given to the native-born Americans in determining these quotas.

Under the "national origins" method shown in the fourth, fifth, and sixth columns of the table above the quota is based not only on the number of foreign born in this country according to the census of 1920 but also is based on the number of native born in the country according to this census. By this method consideration is given to everyone in the country, whether American born or foreign born. This is the only method in determining the quota that counts Americans. This method preserves the present status quo amongst the various nationalities that have made up our distinctly American race.

EXHIBIT B

ESTIMATES OF THE NATIVE WHITE STOCK 1900, 1910, AND 1920

The numerical equivalents of the native white stock and the foreign white stock, which together constituted the white population of the United States in 1900, 1910, and 1920, estimated as explained herein, together with the proportions which the two kinds of stock formed of the total white population, were as follows:

Census year	Total white population	Native white stock		Foreign white stock	
		Number	Per cent of total white	Number	Per cent of total white
1900	66,809,196	37,290,000	55.8	29,520,000	44.2
1910	81,731,957	42,420,000	51.9	39,310,000	48.1
1920	94,820,915	47,330,000	49.9	47,490,000	50.1

The estimates for the native white stock also represent the numbers of white persons who presumably would have been living in the United States in the years specified if there had been no immigration nor emigration since 1790 and if the rates of increase for the white population had been the same as the rates representing the natural increase, due to excess of births over deaths, which took place in the white population as it actually existed.

DEFINITION OF "NATIVE WHITE STOCK"

The term "native white stock" as here used refers to white persons who were living within any area now a part of continental United States at the time that area was first enumerated, and to the descendants of such persons. By far the greater part of the native white stock is descended from persons enumerated in 1790 in the New England States, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Kentucky, and Tennessee; but a small proportion is made up of persons whose ancestors were living, or who were themselves living, in other areas when those areas were first enumerated. The original populations of such new areas, however, were very sparse. Moreover, the inhabitants of these added areas consisted in part of migrants from the original area of the United States, or the descendants of such migrants, so that it would be impossible to estimate separately the French and Spanish stock. It has been necessary, therefore, to define native white stock as explained above, with no further subdivision.

It would, of course, be utterly impossible to determine the number of white persons enumerated in 1920 or any other recent census year who were of absolutely pure native stock—that is, all of whose foreign-born ancestors came to this country prior to 1790. A very considerable but indeterminable number of persons classed by the census as native whites of native parentage are of mixed native and foreign stock. These persons would not have existed had there been no immigration, but in their place there would have existed a smaller number of persons representing approximately the same amount of native stock unmixed with foreign blood. For example, if each of four natives of native parentage had one foreign-born grandparent and three grandparents of pure native ancestry, the four persons together would represent the same amount of native stock as would exist in three persons of pure native ancestry. All that can be estimated, therefore, is the numerical equivalent of the amount of native white stock in the country, stated in terms of units representing the amount of native white stock in one person of pure native white ancestry. The actual number of persons whose native blood is included in this total is, of course, much larger, inasmuch as any person who had at least one white ancestor enumerated in 1790 has in his veins some native white blood. For example, it is possible that not more than, say, 20,000,000 persons in this country are of absolutely pure native white stock, while the remaining 27,000,000 of the total of 47,000,000 estimated as the numerical equivalent of the native white stock might be made up of varying proportions of native stock in 45,000,000 persons (native whites of native parentage or of mixed native and foreign parentage).

Moreover, it would be theoretically possible for every native white person of native parentage in the United States in 1920 to be of mixed native and foreign stock.

EXHIBIT C

IMMIGRATION PROBLEM

PRELIMINARY STUDY OF IMMIGRATION PROBLEM, BY JOHN B. TREVOR

[Printed for the use of the Committee on Immigration]

Since it is an axiom of political science that a government not imposed by external force is the visible expression of the ideals, standards, and social viewpoint of the people over which it rules, it is obvious that a change in the character or composition of the population must inevitably result in the evolution of a form of government consonant with the base upon which it rests. If, therefore, the principle of individual liberty, guarded by a constitutional government created on this continent nearly a century and a half ago, is to endure, the basic strain of our population must be maintained and our economic standards preserved.

With full recognition of the material progress which we owe to the races from southern and eastern Europe, we are conscious not only that these people tended to depress our standard of living, unduly charge our institutions for the care of the socially inadequate and criminal, but also that they can not point during a period of seven centuries since Magna Charta to any conception of successful government other than a paternal autocracy. It being demonstrable under the provisions of the emergency legislation that immigration from southern and eastern Europe may enter the United States on a basis of substantial equality with that admitted from the older sources of supply, it is clear that if any appreciable number of immigrants are to be allowed to land upon our shores the balance of racial preponderance must in time pass to those elements of the population who reproduce rapidly at a lower standard of living than those possessing other ideals.

It is hardly necessary to say that we owe impartial justice to all those who have established themselves in our midst, and that they are not only entitled to share in our prosperity but also that we are glad to recognize the contribution of their genius to the advancement of our national welfare. On the other hand, the American people do not concede the right of any foreign group in the United States, or government abroad, to demand a participation of our possessions, tangible or intangible, or to dictate the character of our legislation. The problem then is, How can we frame an immigration law to meet all these conditions?

It has been suggested that the adoption of the 1890 census in lieu of that of 1910 will accomplish an equitable apportionment between the emigration originating in northwestern Europe and in southern and eastern Europe, respectively. This principle has been embodied in the House committee bill now before Congress. On the other hand, it is alleged that the selection of the census of 1890 as the basis for the computation of quotas discriminate unjustly against immigration from what is called the newer sources of supply. Since the late arrivals are in all fairness not entitled to special privilege over those who have arrived at an earlier date and thereby contributed more to the advancement of the Nation, the obvious solution of the problem lies in the racial analysis of the population of the United States. The difficulties of such a proceeding are obviously very great, and the results, owing to the lack of complete data compiled in the earlier decennial enumerations made by our Government, can, therefore, only approximate the truth; nevertheless, such an approximation is of infinite value in demonstrating the falsity of the charges made by those whose interests and sympathies lie abroad rather than in the country of their adoption.

The table which accompanies this memorandum is a preliminary study, subject to such corrections as will be pointed out in the course of explanatory remarks relating to its construction.

[Preliminary draft subject to correction]

Country of birth	Apportionment as of 1790		Apportionment of native born of native parentage contributed by arrivals since 1820		Foreign stock: Foreign born plus native born of foreign parentage plus mixed parentage		Total	Quota			
	Per cent	Of population of 1920	Per cent	Number of persons	Per cent	Number of persons		One-fifth of 1 per cent	One-fourth of 1 per cent	H. R. 6540	Present
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L
Albania			0.0024	286	0.032	10,875	11,161	224	228	204	288
Armenia			.0105	1,250	.088	29,894	31,144	262	278	217	230
Austria			.6153	73,235	3.130	1,063,087	1,136,322	2,473	3,041	1,190	7,342
Belgium			.3162	37,635		122,686	160,321	520	601	709	1,563
Bulgaria					.059	20,045	20,045	240	250	200	302
Czechoslovakia			1.1643	138,579	1.988	675,215	813,794	1,827	2,234	2,073	14,357
Danzig			.1385	16,485	.041	13,931	30,416	261	276	423	301
Denmark			1.7292	205,816		467,525	673,341	1,547	1,883	2,982	5,619
Esthonia			.0634	7,546	.379	128,731	136,277	473	541	302	1,348
Finland			.0901	10,724		296,276	307,000	814	968	345	3,921
Fiume			.0062	738	.031	10,534	11,272	223	228	210	71
France	0.6	279,118	2.0414	242,975		1,181,987	1,704,080	3,608	4,460	4,078	5,720
Germany	5.64	2,623,705	31.0343	3,693,813		7,259,992	13,577,510	27,355	34,143	50,329	67,607
Great Britain and Ireland	91	42,332,836	39.3247	4,680,566		9,160,645	56,174,047	112,548	140,635	62,658	77,342
Greece			.0175	2,083	0.967	328,441	330,524	861	1,026	235	3,063
Hungary			.3032	36,088	2.180	740,427	776,515	1,753	2,141	688	5,747
Iceland			.0223	2,654	.014	4,760	7,414	215	219	236	75
Italy			2.4172	287,704		3,336,941	3,624,645	7,449	9,262	4,089	42,057
Latvia			.0727	8,653	.434	147,411	156,064	512	590	317	1,540
Lithuania			.1877	22,341	.741	251,682	274,023	748	885	502	2,622
Luxemburg			.0360	4,285		43,109	47,394	295	319	258	97
Netherlands	2.5	1,162,990	1.0175	121,107		362,318	1,646,415	3,493	4,316	1,837	3,602
Norway			4.0109	477,392		1,023,225	1,500,617	8,201	3,952	6,653	12,205
Poland			5.5120	656,058	6.258	2,124,811	2,780,869	5,762	7,152	9,072	30,979
Portugal			.2946	35,064		134,794	169,858	540	625	674	2,465
Rumania			.3922	46,681	.565	191,905	238,586	677	796	831	7,419
Russia			1.1138	132,568	6.876	2,335,389	2,467,957	5,135	6,370	1,992	24,405
Spain			.0770	9,165		77,947	87,112	374	418	324	912
Sweden	.26	120,951	5.9428	707,333		1,457,382	2,285,666	4,771	5,914	9,761	20,042
Switzerland			1.2934	153,945		327,797	481,742	1,163	1,405	2,281	3,752
Yugoslavia			.4568	54,370	.932	316,554	370,924	942	1,127	935	6,426
Other Europe			.0776	9,236	.033	11,213	20,449	241	251	325	86
Palestine			.0006	71	.018	6,119	6,190	212	215	201	57
Syria			.0074	881	.292	99,183	100,064	400	450	212	882
Turkey			.0138	1,643	.203	68,954	70,597	341	376	223	2,654
Other Asia			.0279	3,321	.030	10,196	13,517	227	234	245	92
Africa			.0234	2,785	.028	9,515	12,300	225	231	238	104
Egypt			.0037	440	.005	1,704	2,144	204	205	206	18
Atlantic Islands			.0254	3,023	.244	82,878	85,901	372	415	241	121
Australia			.0745	8,867	.061	20,724	29,591	259	274	320	279
New Zealand			.0416	4,951	.022	7,478	12,429	225	231	267	80
Total	100.00	46,519,600	100.0000	11,902,357		33,964,280	92,386,237	192,972	239,165	169,083	357,803

In a book entitled "A Century of Population Growth," published in 1909 by the Department of Commerce and Labor, Bureau of the Census, appears an estimate that out of the population of the United States enumerated in 1900, 35,000,000 people were descended from the original stock counted in 1790. This estimate of 35,000,000 is an average of the results attained by three different methods of computation, whose totals approximate to an extraordinary degree, and for this reason may be accepted as representing with fair accuracy the situation in 1900. Taking this figure of 35,000,000 as a basis of our present calculation, and applying to each decade since that date the rate of natural increase of the population as given for the decade 1910–1920, Volume II, page 16, we get 45,309,600. To this figure is added 1,210,000, to take account of the increase of those persons who entered the United States between 1790 and 1920, this element being derived from the same source as those which contributed to the so-called colonial stock. Now, if we apportion the total on the same basis as it was apportioned in 1790, we get the figures which appear in column "C." It is, of course, granted that this assumption is sub-

ject to some qualifications; nevertheless, it forms a basis on which to construct the table and probably, in general, reflects the facts.

If this figure of 46,519,600 be subtracted from the total native born of native parentage, as enumerated in 1920, we get the figures 11,902,357 as the contribution made to the native born of native parentage by the generations established in our land since 1820. It must be said at this point that commencing with 1840 radical changes began to appear in the contribution to our population from foreign sources. The change particularly to be noted is the increase in the Irish and German immigration in proportion to the immigration from England, Scotland, and Wales. The date 1880, of course, is the turning point in the history of our immigration.

At that time commenced the influx from southern and eastern Europe of elements which tended to submerge all other accretions to our population, until the passage of the present quota law, which reduced the ratio between these two groups, old and new, to approximately a 50–50 basis. The apportionment of this element of native born of native parentage has proved a peculiarly difficult problem, because it is obvious that the earlier arrivals, while few in number, have contributed relatively greater proportions through their descendants to the native born of native parentage than has been possible for the elements who entered from countries subsequent to 1870, particularly since 1880. On the theory that the foreign-born population enumerated in 1890 fairly reflects the composition of the native born of native parentage in this particular group of 11,902,357, and in consideration of the fact that recent computations made for the preparation of tables used by the Immigration Committee of Congress have enabled apportionments to be made corresponding to the divisions of territory since the war, this method of division has been adopted, and the results appear in column "E."

It should be noted that in this preliminary draft no account has been taken of the contributions made by the Mexicans, Indians, Chinese, and Japanese to the native born of native parentage. It is, however, believed that such correction as may be necessary will not affect the totals in column H to any very great extent.

Column C enumerates the foreign stock; that is to say, the foreign born, native born of foreign parentage, and native born of mixed parentage in accordance with computations made in the 1920 census. Owing to the fact that an apportionment was not made at the time the tables for these elements were compiled and published in Volume II of the census of 1920 to correspond to the new divisions of territory since the war, a similar method of dividing approximately 25 per cent of the people enumerated in this column has been adopted for those States which are starred in column A. The figures for foreign stock in respect to Germany, France, and Italy have been left intact, because it proved impracticable to properly proportion the changes in population due to cessions or accretions of territory as a result of the war; in other words, the tables as they stand must be considered to represent the principle and an approximation rather than an exact figure.

Column H represents the totals of the preceding columns, and these totals form the basis for the computation of quotas in columns I and J. In order to illustrate the principles involved more clearly it will be noted that two percentages have been selected. Column I gives the quota plus 200 on the basis of one-fifth of 1 per cent, column J on the basis of one-fourth of 1 per cent plus 200. Column K, as the heading indicates, gives the quotas provided in H. R. 6540. Column L gives the quota now in force under the so-called emergency legislation. It should be noted that this compilation is based upon the Senate committee bill presenting Senator REED'S amendments to H. R. 6540.

An examination of the total admissible immigrants under these various quotas indicates that under the provisions of H. R. 6540 the nations of southern and eastern Europe receive more on a basis of only 169,083, total admissible from all countries, than they would get with a total number of admissibles of 192,972 if the population were divided in accordance with the racial contribution made to our population in the past 130 years.

It is interesting to note that the Dutch, who contribute a very desirable class of immigrants, would receive more if the schedule enumerated in column J were adopted than they do under the present law, although the total of admissible immigrants under the schedule of column J is only 239,165, whereas 357,803 are admitted under the provisions of the emergency legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7995, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROSENBLOOM, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

S. 2090. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Regular Army of Second Lieut. Ambrose I. Moriarty;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of J. G. Seupelt;

S. 1021. An act for the relief of the Alaska Commercial Co.;

S. 107. An act for the relief of John H. McAtee;

S. 47. An act to permit the correction of the general account of Charles B. Strecker, former Assistant Treasurer of the United States;

S. 796. An act for the relief of William H. Lee;

SENATE BILL REFERRED

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 2930. An act reaffirming the use of the ether for radio communication or otherwise to be the inalienable possession of the people of the United States and their Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand in recess until 8 o'clock p. m., in accordance with the order heretofore made.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker.

Mr. ZIHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report for printing under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland presents a conference report, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 655) to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed under the rule.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the immigration bill (H. R. 7995).

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7995, with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7995, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7995) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Has the gentleman from Washington some one to put on now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I believe not.

Mr. SABATH. I promised about a half dozen gentlemen some time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the basic immigration law was enacted in 1917. That law is a selective immigration law. It eliminates those who are mentally, morally, and physically unfit; those who are likely to become a public charge; anarchists and others opposed to organized government, and who hold doctrines subversive to law and order. It provides within the above limitations the kind of immigrants who may enter the United States. It in no way limits the number of the acceptable kind.

The act of May 9, 1921, establishes the principle of numerical limitations, and that act, as continued by subsequent action of the Congress, ceases to operate on June 30, 1924.

Under these restrictive measures the number of immigrants of any given nationality admitted into this country in any one year is 3 per cent of the number of foreign-born persons of that nationality within the borders of the United States, as shown by the census of 1910.

If no legislation is enacted between now and July 1, then this country will have only the protection afforded by the act of 1917, and numberless hordes from all parts of Europe will rush to America. This is not conjecture or guesswork.

The hearings before the committee considering this matter show beyond peradventure that once the bars are down America will be flooded by this tide from the Old World, limited only by the capacity of steamships required for transportation. The effect of such a catastrophe is readily apparent and not pleasant to contemplate. Indeed, such an occurrence would spell disaster to American standards and to the ideals which we have cherished from our national beginning.

Under the present 3 per cent quota law 357,803 immigrants are admitted annually; under the Johnson bill 161,184 will be admitted annually. It is interesting to note the number of immigrants from the several countries that would be admissible according to the census of 1890, 1900, 1910, and 1920:

Estimated immigration quotas based on census reports of 1890, 1900, 1910, and 1920—2 per cent plus 100 for each nationality

Country or region of birth	Estimated quotas based on 2 per cent of census plus 100			
	Census of 1890	Census of 1900	Census of 1910	Census of 1920
Albania	104	121	292	212
Armenia (Russian)	117	141	252	419
Austria	1,090	1,891	4,994	11,510
Belgium	609	749	1,142	1,356
Bulgaria	100	100	302	311
Czechoslovakia	1,973	3,531	11,472	7,350
Danzig, Free City of	323	314	300	250
Denmark	2,882	3,298	3,846	3,844
Esthonia	202	337	998	1,484
Finland	245	1,365	2,714	3,113
Fiume, Free State of [1]	110	117	148	210
France	3,978	3,734	3,920	3,177
Germany	45,229	43,081	40,172	28,705
Great Britain and North Ireland	41,772	37,282	34,508	29,152
Irish Free State	20,886	18,641	17,254	14,576
Greece	135	259	2,142	3,625
Hungary	588	1,232	3,932	8,047
Iceland	136	142	150	150
Italy	4,689	10,815	28,138	32,315
Latvia	217	371	1,126	1,681
Lithuania	402	655	1,852	2,801
Luxemburg	158	161	162	352
Netherlands	1,737	2,000	2,504	2,728
Norway	6,553	6,857	8,234	7,425
Poland	8,972	16,277	20,752	22,902
Portugal	574	1,016	1,744	1,616
Rumania	731	1,512	5,046	2,157
Russia	1,892	4,596	16,370	25,161
Spain (including Canary Islands)	224	245	708	1,320
Sweden	9,661	11,772	13,462	12,649
Switzerland	2,181	2,414	2,602	2,477
Yugoslavia	835	1,504	4,384	3,500
San Marino	110	110	110	110
Andorra	100	100	100	100
Liechtenstein	100	100	100	100
Monaco	100	100	100	100
Palestine	101	104	138	164
Syria	112	167	688	1,142
Turkey	123	218	1,870	841
Hejaz	105	105	105	105
Persia	125	125	125	125
Egypt	106	108	112	117
Liberia	100	100	100	100
Abyssinia	100	100	100	100
Morocco	100	100	100	100
Union of South Africa	110	110	110	110
Australia	220	240	296	323
New Zealand and Pacific Islands	167	152	154	178
Total	161,184	178,769	239,930	240,400

[1] Fiume is to be added to Italy.

NOTE.—By reason of alteration of bases of computation, principally the elimination of "Other Europe," "Other Asia," and "black" Africa, certain quotas are materially changed. The German quotas are reduced by reason of the allocation of quotas to Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc. The Danish quota increases at the expense of the German quota by reason of the award of Schleswig to Denmark. The British quota increases by absorption of quotas from Cyprus, Gibraltar, and Malta (heretofore part of "Other Europe"), but is decreased by allocation of a quota to the Irish Free State. The Italian quota increases by reason of absorption of Rhodes, Dodecanese, and Castellorizzo. All these estimates, therefore are subject to considerable revision. They can not be considered as final.

We can not intelligently consider the question of immigration without calling to our assistance some statistics and figures. Our total population, according to the 1920 census, was 105,000,000. There were practically 58,000,000 native whites of native parentage; approximately 37,000,000 foreign born or of foreign-born or mixed parentage; approximately 10,000,000 colored people. While there are 37,000,000 foreign born or of foreign-born parentage, the number of foreign born is placed at 14,000,000. Of this 14,000,000 foreign born less than half are American citizens, and 1,500,000 of our foreign-born population can not speak English. Foreign-language newspapers in the United States have about 5,000,000 subscribers. There are to-day in the United States nearly 13,000,000 persons over 21 years of age who were born in foreign lands. We are told that since 1890 immigrants have been landing at the average rate of 1,000,000 per year. We are also reliably informed that there are now 600,000 in Russia who have made application for passports to America, and that 70,000 of this number are now in Warsaw alone, seeking transportation to our shores; and we must not forget that we now have approximately 6,000,000 aliens in our midst who have not taken the oath of allegiance to the American flag, and that we must assimilate this number before we take on more.

The Johnson bill (H. R. 7995), which we are now considering, is a splendid measure, and the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization is entitled to the thanks of the country for the careful and conscientious study given to this important matter and for this well-considered and well-prepared measure. By the terms of this legislation the law of 1917 is preserved as our basic immigration law. The feature of numerical limitation, as set forth in the act of 1921, is retained. The number of immigrants to be admitted in the future is based upon the census of 1890 instead of the census of 1910. A base quota of 100 is permitted to each country, and to this quota is added 2 per cent of the number of nationals from that country residing in the United States according to the census of 1890. Wives of American citizens and their children under 18 years of age, as well as parents over 55 years of age, are admitted independent of the quota. Preliminary examinations of immigrants will be made overseas, and only those will be permitted to embark for America as immigrants who have certificates, and certificates will only be issued to a number coming within the quota of the particular nationality, so that there will be no more racing of steamers loaded with immigrants, each attempting to get into an American port for the opening of the monthly quota. Those who are permitted to come will be assured of entry so far as quota is concerned.

The administrative features of the bill are workable. Unnecessary hardships are not placed upon the immigrant. He is plainly told under what terms he can enter this country. The burden of proof is placed on the alien rather than on the United States, and while the measure is clear and explicit and not burdensome on the immigrant at the same time it is an American bill and is prepared with the idea of caring for our own household.

True, Americans have no prejudice against persons born in any foreign land. Our ancestors were all born in foreign lands. We appreciate the distress in Europe. We sympathize with those people and we do not wonder that the peoples from the oppressed nations of the earth seek America as an asylum, but we are not unmindful of the fact that unless we take action now the time is not far distant when this country will be no different from other countries. Water seeks its level, and without a dam at the border the overflow will inundate us and the time will soon be when the salient features of our Government will be obliterated and when we will be more foreign than American. Self-preservation is the first law of nature, and if we are to be a distinctive nation, as we always have been, we must act to-day, now, and not in the years that are to come.

The interests in this country that are leading the fight against this legislation are the same interests that led the fight against the immigration act of 1917, against the restrictive act of 1921, and against the continuance of that act in 1922.

They favored the open door in the beginning; they favor the open door still. However, driven by the force of public opinion and the demand of American citizens, they are forced to abandon one position and then another. Who are the Members of this body who are leading the fight against this measure? From where do they come? The answer is simple: They are the Representatives of the districts populated by those of foreign birth and where the foreign element controls. New York, Chicago, and other centers where our more recent immigrants have settled, where they colonize, where they retain their foreign societies and associations. I have heard gentlemen on the floor of this House state that at least 75 per cent of the people living in their districts were of foreign birth; and, of course, these people, even though naturalized, in many instances still cling to the manners and customs of the fatherland, and instead of fitting themselves to the American form of Government, to our way of doing things, are wont to change the American form of government to their ideals. They do not understand our ways, they do not want to understand our ways, and I for one am ready to take a position that will prevent any additions to their numbers until we at least teach those already here the American lesson.

One of the greatest problems in America to-day is to induce our people to remain on the farms and in the agricultural and rural districts. The alien who comes to us at this time is not a farmer. During the last year less than 2 per cent of those entering America under the quota law even claimed to be

farmers, and many less than that number actually sought employment in agriculture. Therefore, immigration at this time does not inure to the benefit of the farmer, and no intelligent survey of the situation can be made that will lead to any other conclusion.

It is said that there will be no one in America to do the drudgery, to do the common labor which is necessary to be done. We might as well face this situation now as later. If young America is to be taught that honest labor is degrading and that the second generation resident in this country is not to do labor, then our civilization is doomed. The time has arrived when more attention should be given to industrial education, when the young men and the young women should give more attention to mechanics, and the education of the youth must be shaped along this line.

There are those representing certain nationalities who have spread an insistent propaganda that the Johnson bill is discriminatory, that it discriminates against certain nationalities, provided the quota is based on 1890 instead of 1910. Their reason for this claim is that there were more people of their nationality in the United States in 1910 than there were in 1890; and this statement is undoubtedly true. At the same time let it be remembered that if the nationalities represented in 1890 and their descendants are considered, any quota based on any year later than 1890 would be a rank discrimination in favor of those recently coming to our shores.

I have no prejudice against the peoples from southern Europe. We remember the splendor and glory of ancient Rome; we know of Greek culture of the past; at the same time we can not forget that the early pioneers to our shores, the men and the women who sought America for the express purpose of building for themselves homes, where they could be free, where they could prosper, did not come from southern Europe. The early pioneers, who with the ax in the forest and the plow in the prairie transformed the great American wilderness into this modern Garden of Eden, were men and women from northern Europe. When they bid farewell to their native lands they faced a life of hardship, of sacrifice; they were men of stamina, who pushed forward, who initiated, who worked, but with one thought in mind—a home in America, a government different than the governments from whence they came.

On the other hand, the modern immigrant from southern Europe comes to America principally for one of two reasons: First, to escape the unbearable conditions in Europe—they are not willing to rehabilitate their war-torn lands—and, second, because more money can be made here, and many times with the ultimate hope of getting rich and returning to the home land. We have too many of this type to-day.

It is true that under the Johnson bill the quota from northern Europe will be larger than the quota from southern Europe, and this is as I believe it should be. The Nordic people laid the foundations of society in America.

They have builded this Republic, and nothing would be more unfair to them and their descendants than to turn over this Government and this land to those who had little part in making us what we are. We want no discrimination. Personally I believe that if all immigration was stopped for three or five years the effect would be most wholesome. The committee in its wisdom has thought otherwise, and to that judgment I accede.

In the early days of the Republic we were in a way one people—Anglo-Saxon—to-day we are a collection of racial groups, no one of which outnumbers all the others, and our supreme task is to weld together these several peoples into one group, with a single national consciousness, distinctly American. During the last few years assimilation has not kept pace with immigration; we are suffering from national indigestion, and this law prescribes a reasonable diet. No more important measure has been before Congress during my service here, and, gentlemen, our duty is plain. We are to-day legislating for America, for our children, and our children's children. We must be faithful to that sacred trust.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOONEY].

Mr. MOONEY. Mr. Chairman, I have studied this bill most carefully, have earnestly listened to the debate upon it, and am most ardent in my conviction that the measure should not pass.

The future of our Nation will depend upon its citizenship. Immigration, one of the important elements that enter into this question, is therefore a matter of greatest importance and deserves most careful and unbiased study. I personally would like to have the committee go still further with its hearings. I would like to have them listen not only to those who ask to be heard but to seek advice and counsel of other outstanding citizens, to the end that no one may even suspect any purpose other than the country's good. If we are to depart from a system that in 150 years has transformed this land from a wilderness to the greatest nation of the world, I want to do it following advice and counsel of men of the type of Chief Justice Taft, Justice Brandeis, Dr. S. Parks Cadman, Rabbi Wise, Bishop Schrembs, and Newton Baker; not on the judgment of the Laughlins, Hennings, Stoddards, and Speranzas.

I can not forget that I myself am an American citizen because of the Nation's immigration liberality, for my grandfather came to our shores an immigrant. I believe that the present-day immigrant comes for the same reason, and comes prepared to love as he did this land of opportunity and freedom. I know that every unkind statement, every immoderate prediction made to-day was made of him, and I believe that there is no more ground for these predictions now than when he came, 90 years ago.

My heart goes out to the immigrant of to-day.

I rise to speak upon the bill, however, not so much because of my interest in the immigrant as because of my love for American institutions and ideals. I can not help but feel that Americanism is on trial, that the age-long traditions of our country are being tested. When the present law passed it was regarded as most drastic. It is now proposed to reduce by 33⅓ per cent the quota then adopted. Is it in the interest of labor? Let us go to the Department of Labor to learn their attitude.

Assistant Secretary Henning says:

> It is not so much the quantity as the quality of the immigrant.

We all agree upon selective immigration, that no one should enter without good morals and good health—the selective immigration act of 1917 covers this. Henning further says:

> Originally the immigrants who settled this country came from northern and western Europe and were a stable, wholesome class of people. In recent years the greatest influx has been from southern and eastern Europe and has consisted in the main of a far lesser element.

This bill proposes to go back to 1890 for its census figures.

The obvious purpose, therefore, is to shut off immigration from other parts of Europe than the north and west.

It is at this point of the bill that one sees the recrudescence of prejudice and hatred in the country. The question that has recurred to my mind again and again was shall America after 300 years of such glorious traditions continue to look upon Root, Johnson, Grant, Wise, and Marshall as equals, or will it introduce discrimination? The bill as it is proposed, it must be remembered, does not strike only those who seek America as a haven of refuge in the future, but is hitting most unmercifully many of those whose parents and grandparents have toiled and labored with the sweat of their brow to help the upbuilding of America. Remember, that there are millions of men and women in this country whose race stock came from central and eastern Europe. This bill deliberately tells these citizens that they are of inferior American stock. You can not turn the hands of time backward. Those men and women are to-day part and parcel of our body politic. They are in the House, in the Senate, in our colleges and universities, and in our fields of commerce. They are there as Americans. Remember, this bill labels all of these as inferiors. You are dealing a veritable deathblow to the heart of Americanism if you declare that one part of its citizenry is inferior to any other.

Now, as to those seeking admission to our shores. It seems that it seldom occurs to many of us that the immigrant as seen in many of our cities, is not a detached entity, that he does not come from air; he comes from some racial stock. He comes from a group that has its traditions. There was a time in his life when he was not a foreigner, not an immigrant. When he was a part and parcel of civilization, a state, a culture. We seem to forget that it was a spirit of adventure or rebellion against autocracy and oppression, or it was economic pressure that made of many a wanderer, that forced him to forsake his hearth and go knocking at the gates of other countries. If we are to judge the immigrant, then let use judge the entire race stock. While the proposal seriously affects the Hungarians, Czechs, Lithuanians, Poles, and north Slavs, it even more seriously affects the south Slavs, Jews, and Italians, and of these I should like to say a word. As to the Slavs—we who knew them best, like them most—we know how readily they assimilate and no one hears complaint of Slavish people in communities of which they are part. I believe that it is only fair to the Italian to judge him by the great illustrious people from which he comes. Is there any among my fellow Congressmen who will dare to speak of Italians, a people with a history 2,700 years old, that has given to the world some of its greatest artists, poets, singers, statesmen, and philosophers, as an inferior people? There have

been many people who could not forgive the Jew his unwillingness to die—to disappear from the world's stage. Calumny and hatred has been heaped upon his head, but his fitness has never been denied. The mere fact that, like Gibralter, he has remained unmoved, unshaken by the waves of persecution and hatred, prove his fitness. It is in this wise that I like to think of our immigrants. I want to take into consideration their whole racial background, the history of their successes and failures, their struggles and achievements. And when we look at peoples that way, not a racial group on earth but whom the Eternal Father has endowed with intellectual, moral, and spiritual gifts. The least of God's creatures is fulfilling a definite purpose in life and surely every racial stock is under the guidance of a divine Providence. How can mortal man introduce discrimination and differences?

I came to think of the immigrant in this wise because of my refusal to pass judgment on him through the eyes of exaggerated newspaper reports. I sought personal contact. I should therefore like to speak of my own personal experience with immigrants and descendants of immigrants. It is my honor in this Congress to represent a part of the Nation's greatest city—a city whose people, a great family, are partners in their public enterprises and whose municipal affairs and philanthropic and educational institutions have become an example to the cities in the country. It is a city with a civic conscience—the finest American example of municipal government.

My district, 10 miles along the shores of Lake Erie, is represented in all municipal activities. It holds within its borders the great financial district, and in large part the factories which have given to Cleveland its high rank in the industrial world. But, more important than all this, it is a district of comfortable homes, filled with healthy, happy children and contented men and women. While the vast majority of our people are native born, there is not a nation in Europe that has not contributed to its citizenship; and I treasure among my intimate friends immigrants and children of immigrants from each one of them. It has been my proud privilege to meet many of our good foreign people in their homes. My heart was filled to overflowing to see their deep-seated love for our country and its institutions, to learn of their ambitions and struggles and hopes for their children. The principals of our public schools have informed me that the children of these homes rank very well in the schools of the neighborhood.

I am not basing my judgment on newspaper articles or motion-picture characters, but upon personal and intimate acquaintanceship. I remember that some time since the Slovenian Americanization class in my district was the largest in the Nation, and I say from personal knowledge that no one American born or otherwise more deeply treasures his citizenship than any of these good people, or the Poles, Slavs, Czechs, Hungarians, Croatians, Rumanians, or other race stocks who in great numbers are in attendance at naturalization schools.

I do not for one instant ascribe to the Committee on Immigration any racial or religious prejudices. I do not maintain that the Department of Labor consciously entertains this sentiment, although Assistant Secretary Henning, Commissioner Landis, and others are given to most intemperate language. I am convinced that it is the intensive propaganda against immigration that has had its effect both on the department and the committee. It is a most peculiar and dangerous germ, this anti-immigration sentiment. It changes the heart of a community overnight. It blinds the eyes of the normally fair and intelligent.

We have recently emerged from the greatest war in history in which we may proudly say that our Nation reached spiritual heights never attained by any other nation. I challenge anyone to point out one race stock more patriotic or self-sacrificing than any other, and in this statement I include Americans of German ancestry.

It seems to me but yesterday that in my home town in Cleveland I saw a great parade of war-service mothers. There were in that group, marching side by side, decendants of men who had been with Washington and representatives of every country on the other side. Religion, color, and social differences were forgotten. All mothers were actuated only by the loving interest of their boys, who in the same khaki, side by side, and equally fearless, braved death together. How proud and satisfied an American I was at that moment! How generously I indulged in the hope that our Nation was one great family and that no one would ever dare again try to create discrimination because of racial or religious differences.

This was the spirit of our country and the hope of all good Americans but a few years ago. To-day, Commissioner Landis is quoted as saying "that most of the aliens, at least 85 per cent, were those whom this country could not assimilate properly. Until 1890 the Nordic races led in immigration, and then the Slav and Latin races began to come. The ideals and beliefs of the latter races are very different from those of the Nordic races, and they know very little of religion or political liberty." No student of history could make such a statement. I wonder what Commissioner Landis thinks of the 400,000 young men who waived exemption and willingly entered the service of this country in the World War? In his opinion, have those men become properly assimilated, and do they understand the value of political liberty?

It is a mean and dangerous germ, I repeat, blinding the eyes of the normally fair and intelligent. The chairman of the Committee on Immigration is honest, earnest, and sincere. In a speech made in the last Congress, commenting upon the great work of the committee, he said:

> Petitions come on one side from the patriotic orders, and on the other side—for freer immigration—from the so-called hyphenated alliances and societies.

This is an example of a fair man, who, because of propaganda, has gotten into a mental state where he believes the person who is friendly to the immigrant is hyphenated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOONEY. In just a minute.

How rapidly a falsehood will spread, particularly if malicious tongues are busily engaged in the godless work. Suddenly a new word made its way into the English language—"Nordic," "Nordic," "Nordic"—everywhere you turned. There is not a fifth-rate extension lecturer but does not speak of it with scientific exactness. Newspaper editorials, magazine articles, know exactly what the word means, what it implies, and yet the hearings before the committee have established beyond a doubt that this word "Nordic" is an invention of the anti-Semite Chamberlin, an English subject who expatriated himself at the time of his country's need. He went so far in his rabid anti-Semitism as to make of the Christ a "Nordic." But suppose, for the sake of argument, there is such a race as the "Nordic." Has its superiority been established? Has the superiority of any race been established? It is a thing of common knowledge among ethnologists and anthropologists that this talk of racial superiority is largely verbiage. Prof. Franz Boas, America's leading authority on anthropology, in his book "The Mind of Primitive Man," shows that notion to be a most ridiculous one, and on page 208 of this remarkable book states:

> The tendency to value one's own civilization as higher than that of the whole race of mankind is the same which prompted the actions of primitive man who considers every stranger as an enemy and who is not satisfied until the enemy is killed.

But—

Say the enemies of the immigrant—

> Here are statistics. Here are figures.

It is an axiom that any man given a set of complicated figures can prove anything he wants to prove. Admiral Benson never said anything more true than when he stated in a recent naval investigation that there are three kinds of liars—liars, damned liars, and statisticians.

Any fair-minded man knows that the vast majority of our immigrants are living in peace, are sending their children to the public schools of the country, are building up our larger cities, very many of them prospering. They are raising healthy families, which will be the bulwark of America generations hence. Immigration is not our most serious problem. I hope my fellow Congressmen will read in the American Journal of Sociology for the month of January, 1924, pages 430 to 442, an article dealing with the vital statistics of one of the most prominent women's colleges in the country, a college that admits practically only native Americans of good stock. You will there read that out of 4,424 women who have graduated from that institution since the year 1867 only 2,458, or 55.6 per cent, are married. And of this number 754, or one-fourth of the total number married, have no children. Six hundred and thirty-five more have only one child in their family. After reading that article you will perhaps realize that we need some of these good old mothers of yesterday, who are satisfied in bringing into the world, through pain and sacrifice, a family of stalwart boys and girls. No one here will deny that such mothers are found among our immigrants.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for just one statement there?

Mr. MOONEY. I would like to in a moment or so; however, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like very much to say on behalf of the committee that through the strenuous times of the hearings this committee undertook not to discuss the Nordic proposition or racial matters.

Mr. MOONEY. I have tried to make that clear, that it is propaganda. There is no doubt in my mind as to the fairness of the committee, and I am only speaking of the propagandist. I meant to say that before.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. MOONEY. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. Are we to understand from the gentleman's discussion that he does not favor fixing a limitation on immigrants?

Mr. MOONEY. Not at all.

Mr. MORGAN. No limitation whatsoever?

Mr. MOONEY. That the gentleman is not to understand that at all. I am trying to make it clear that I object to the census of 1890.

Mr. MORGAN. What is the gentleman's view of a proper percentage?

Mr. MOONEY. My view of a proper percentage is that whatever percentage is started upon it should be based upon the census of 1920.

This is the first time, to my knowledge, that Congress has been called upon to recognize its many racial stocks. It is, I maintain, the result of the intolerance which follows war. There have always been, it is true, men in America who believed the early racial stocks more valuable and superior to all others. I have yet to meet an American of German or Irish ancestry who lays claim to "Nordic" blood, but for the moment it pleases the propagandists to include both in this so-called most desirable class. Let us see what the "Nordicologists" said of the German and Irish at the time immigration was heavy from those countries. I find in an essay by Chickering in the forties the following:

(On page 2)

These foreigners have been educated under influences very different from those in our country; and when mixed with our citizens and forming an integral part of our population, are likely essentially to modify the social and political character of the mass of our people, and the character of our institutions and laws.

(On page 65)

These foreigners have come here to benefit themselves, not from any love of us or our country. They are admitted to be partakers of the fruits derived from the institutions of our fathers.

(On page 66)

The majority of those who come know nothing of rational or regulated liberty.

The future destiny of these States none can tell. Every accession of newcomers introduces new elements of moral and political power into the community, besides the insensible changes which are constantly taking place.

In 1856 Doctor Bussy pays the following compliment to the German. He says:

(On page 13)

Patriotism is natural in a native, but it must be cultivated in a foreigner. Their minds are filled with a vague and indefinite idea of liberty. It is not the liberty of law, but of unrestrained license.

(On page 21)

These organizations have not stopped with the mere enumeration of their principles. They have boldly entered the political arena, asserted their rights to share with us in legislation.

The oath of allegiance to our country has not infused into them the spirit of our Government.

(On page 32)

Did true democracy admit of a German construction in this country, the Revolution would long since have proved a curse instead of a blessing.

When foreigners enjoy our hospitality, as they do; assume to set up a standard of "democracy" which proscribes a portion of their benefactors, it is high time that the birthright qualification for office and voting should be established.

Of the Irish he says:

(On page 43)

Who can calculate the strength of these organizations? The Irish population of this country now numbers a million. Of that number nearly 600,000 are males, and who knows but there are 600,000 armed Irishmen in our midst, bound together by a solid oath and sworn to keep their secrets inviolable.

(On page 64)

They live upon our substance, yet they want our political blessings, and seek to model them after their own crude ideas of liberty, freedom, and equality.

"Self-preservation is the first law of nature." The time is not far distant when we shall be compelled to forsake the old homestead and leave it to the vandals.

Here is what the Lothrop Stoddards thought of our Irish and German "Nordics" some 75 years ago. And how history has belied their silly predictions. How it has disappointed their misgivings. Those men did not understand the true spirit of America and Americanism.

In 1890 the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], in magazine articles, expressed the same fear of immigration from southern and eastern Europe. Now, what has happened in the 34 years since 1890? In all frankness, has his prediction not been equally as far afield as the earlier ones of Bussy and Chickering?

Some few days ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BOX], for whom I have both respect and affection and in whose judgment on any other matter I have confidence, went on to show the superiority of the so-called "Nordic" immigrant, and to that end he quoted at some length to show that the Central and New England States owe their progress to civil self-government brought from England.

Surely no person, save some patriotic citizen whose forebears braved the wilds hundreds of years ago to make America, should pass upon our race stocks. Do we find some Adams, Hale, Stark, or Putnam quoted in this statement? Ah, no; it is Viscount Bryce, an Englishman. I wonder how the judge would feel if I should quote Mussolini to show that if the Italians left New York the city would most deeply suffer.

Friends, let us not prate about racial superiority. It is only the outgrowth of egotism. The Babylonian, the Persian, the Hebrew, the Greek, the Assyrian, the Egyptian, and the Roman all suffered from this complex. We are told in the story of Joseph that when his brethren came to Egypt the Egyptian "Nordics" refused to break bread with the members of Joseph's family.

Well, we have now discovered the tomb of one of these royal Egyptians, Tutankahmen, of blessed memory. I leave it to you as to what race has been exercising more wholesome influence in your life, in my life, and in the lives of our children, the lowly Hebrew or the Egyptian "Nordic." It is a stupid and ungodly notion, this idea of superiority. Individually, we arrogantly and selfishly consider ourselves better than our neighbor, and, collectively, we look upon our group as superior to all others. Science and religion condemn such a wicked notion. These "Nordics," if they ever did exist, did not create the world and did not develop the sum total of humanity's civilization and culture. If these "Nordics" are God's chosen people, why did they borrow their religion from the hills of Judea, their laws from the Roman forum, and their arts from the galleries of Athens?

Jefferson and Lincoln would have understood the language of this bill but never its spirit. Let us return to their principles and stand with them upon the holy proposition that all men are created equal.

After all, despite ravages of war, assaults of masked bigotry, and the propaganda of organized hate, the truth conceded by the prophets of old still stands:

Have we not all one Father?
Hath not one God created us?

[Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it was Dean Swift, about a century and a half ago, who said we have just enough religion in us to hate each other, but we have not enough to love each other, and to my mind no truer saying ever came from the wit of man, because, judging from what has happened since this bill was referred out of committee, many of the proponents of this bill have indulged in a veritable pæan of hate against our alien population, and there has been let loose the dogs of racial and religious hatred and animosity. It has all resulted from the wretched error made by the committee in going back to the census of 1890 as a basis for immigration quotas. Keep the 1910 basis and I am sure the immigration calm will not be disturbed.

Many who have heretofore spoken on the bill have boasted of their ancestry and have in glowing terms referred to the

Anglo-Saxon forbears and wonderful family trees of some of the racial stocks now here. In answer I say most family trees are like ordinary trees; the best parts are underground.

OUR ECONOMIC PROGRESS

I have here an interesting chart, showing our economic progress over a period of 70 years, from 1850 to 1920, in comparison with our growth in population—population including our native growth with increments as a result of immigration. The population line is black; mining line, orange; telegraphs, violet; railroads, green; manufacturing and agriculture, light green; shipping, yellow:

The chart is a so-called "ratio chart," which means that it is plotted on a logarithmic scale, on which the same distance on the vertical scale means the same rate of change and not the same actual change. Thus if a curve increased from 100 to 200, the distance would be the same as from 200 to 400, or as from 400 to 800. It would double in each case. The angles of the lines on the chart therefore show the relative rates at which the curves are changing. It makes no difference whether they are high or low on the chart.

The chart shows, for instance, that while telegraphs increased greatly from 1850 to 1880, during their period of early development, from then on they increased at a much slower rate, although still much faster than population.

Railroad mileage also increased greatly from 1850 to 1880, but from 1890 to 1920 the rate of increase was less than the rate of increase in the population. Railway tonnage has, of course, greatly increased since 1890—the earliest date for which figures are available—in spite of slight increase in mileage of line. Both manufacturing and mining increased relatively much more than population. Agriculture increased at somewhat greater rate than population up to the beginning of this century. Shipping has shown a greater rate of increase than the population since 1900, and especially during the war. "Telegraphs" represent miles of line from 1850 to 1900, messages sent from 1900 to 1920. "Mining" represents number of tons of minerals produced. "Manufacturing" represents actual physical units of production of goods in basic manufacturing industries from 1900 to 1920. Previous to 1900 it represents the value of manufactures as reported by the census deflated by an index number of change in prices. "Agriculture" represents bushels—or other physical units—of crop produced. "Shipping" represents tonnage of merchant vessels built, both sail and steam, and Great Lakes as well as ocean vessels.

This ratio chart proves beyond peradventure of a doubt that our great industrial, commercial, and agricultural development and prosperity came during the periods of our greatest additions to population by immigration. The conclusion is inescapable that immigration has played a material and all-important part in this prosperity that has descended upon us.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. MORGAN. This chart is of great interest, because manifestly it shows that the percentage proposed in the proposed immigration bill is correct, because the greatest development was previous to 1890.

Mr. CELLER. I will explain that readily. If you take the line that plots the development of telegraphs you find that in the early stages of an invention like the telegraph there was a tremendous impetus given to the number of messages carried, but the point of saturation was reached about 1890, and then there was a normal growth, and in the other lines you will find a similar condition.

Now, this chart shows, if anything, that instead of this so-called phantom of immigration peril, we have had accompanying immigration this unparalled prosperity; and I challenge any man in the House to say anything to the contrary. And, mark you well, these lines of progress and prosperity were not retarded after 1890, which marked the coming of those aliens from southern and eastern Europe.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CELLER. I yield for a question.

Mr. RAKER. How can the gentleman answer the fact that all of these developments had started before this great immigration started in about 1900?

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman knows, if he knows the history of immigration, that immigration started in 1850 in large and goodly numbers, and from 1850 on that was the inception of our real prosperity and the opening up of the great West, the opening up of the mines of the Appalachian Ranges and of the Rocky Mountains, and the building of the railroads and the development of our great ind stries, and all of it paralleled the great numbers of immigrants who came to our shores, and they have done yeoman service in reference to the development of the country and in giving our large and prosperous increment of agriculture, railroads, and everything that makes for the material welfare of the country.

UTTER DISCRIMINATION OF THE BILL

Now, I was interested in the chart of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE], where he tried to show, with all the sophistry known to man, that there was no discrimination in this bill. I have a chart here which shows by columns the various censuses, and shows the proportion that came from what is known as the new immigrant sections of Europe and the old immigrant sections of Europe; and if you will run a line down this column, which represents the 1890 census, you will find that all the portions that are shaded green, light or dark green, from this point down to that point [indicating], represent the proportion of immigration from the old sections of Europe—that is, the places where the so-called Nordics came from—whereas that part of the column that is tinted orange, shading into yellow or lemon, represents the proportion of immigration that comes from the southern and eastern parts of Europe. This other shade represents immigration that came from North and South America, and not known as the old or new immigration.

Now, I defy any man, after examining that column closely, to tell me that there is no discrimination with reference to the old and new immigration.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. In a moment. You see this is the proportion that will come to us if we adopt the 1890 census. From here to here [indicating] will be the proportion that will come to us from the south and east of Europe, and from this point down to that point [indicating] is the proportion that we will receive from northern and western Europe. Is there discrimination? Is there discrimination between a pigmy and a giant? That is the giant portion of the column, and that is the pigmy portion of the column. The Nordics get 85 per cent and the so-called non-Nordics 15 per cent. And they have the hardihood to say there is no discrimination.

Let us at least be truthful. In fact, deception is futile. It is as clear as the sun that the majority of the Immigration Committee and most proponents of this measure like the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER], who blurted out his true feelings while talking on the bill, do not want the "wops," "dagoes," "Hebrews," "hunkies," "bulls," and others known by similar epithets. Just so, in 1840, 1850, and 1860 you did not want the "beery Germans" and "dirty Irish." The Germans and Irish were mongrels, self-seekers, disreputable, and would not assimilate. We know now how good a citizenry they have become.

In those turbulent days the Irish were called "paddies" and "clodhoppers," and, although they spoke English, their convents were destroyed in New York, Massachusetts, Maryland, Kentucky, and Alabama. Astounding to relate, entire Irish quarters in those States were pillaged and burned. We might call these outrages "Irish pogroms." Although the German immigrants were Protestants, they likewise suffered and were ostracized for their attempts to make Sunday a day of pleasure. We were mistaken then. Let us not make any more mistakes. Let us profit by our previous experience.

Mr. VAILE. In the gentleman's chart on the 1890 figures the yellow portion gives only 11.9 to the countries of southern and eastern Europe. My chart gives 14 per cent. Does the gentleman claim that the yellow part of his map should be there in the period before 1890?

Mr. CELLER. In reference to the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Colorado, I can give him reasons but I can not give him an understanding. [Laughter.]

Mr. VAILE. I thought so.

THOSE FROM SOUTHERN EUROPE ASSIMILATE MORE READILY

Mr. CELLER. This particular chart I purposely brought into the well of the House. I had it in here once before, and I brought it in the second time because it was necessary in view of what the distinguished chairman of the committee said. He spoke on the question of assimilation by virtue of the doctrine of citizenship. This is a most instructive chart, and it deserves patient attention on the part of those who are inclined to vote for the 1890 census. And why? If you will examine this chart you will find that it typifies the length of time the various immigrants of this country remained here prior to their taking out their final papers. This chart is the result of an examination of 26,000 naturalization papers for the year 1914, the first normal pre-war year in wide-flung areas of this country, in the cities and towns and the rural sections, by John Palmer Gavitt, for the Carnegie Foundation, author of "Americans by choice."

These tabulations now have the imprimatur of the Senate Immigration Committee. From them we find that the average stay of an immigrant in this country before he becomes naturalized is 10.6 years. How does that compare with reference to the stay of an immigrant from north and western Europe and the immigrant from south and eastern Europe? On this chart we find that those countries which are termed new immigration countries are yellow and those termed old immigration countries, like England and Germany, are green. You will note that the Finlanders remain in the country 10.5 years; the Austrians, 10.5 years; the Danes, 10.2 years; the Hollanders, 10.1 years; Hungarians, 9.9 years; Rumanians, 9.8 years; Russians and Poles, 9.6 years; Greeks, 8.6 years; Turkey in Asia, 8.5 years; and Turkey in Europe, 8.1 years. So, of these countries whose nationals remain in this country less than the average period—and there are 11 of them—we find that only 3, Denmark, Holland, and Ireland, are from that part of Europe toward which in this bill, we assume a sort of "benevolent neutrality," whereas 8 of these countries—Greece, Russia, including Poland, Rumania, Hungary, Austria, Turkey in Asia, Turkey in Europe—are the countries against which we bend most heavily if we pass this particular Johnson bill.

Now, what do we find with reference to the countries above the average period? We find, for example, that the men from Scotland remain here the average time. They remain here 10.6 years; the man from Norway remains 10.8 years; the Italian, 11.4 years; the man from England, 11.7 years; the German, 11.9 years; the Frenchman the same period; the man from Switzerland 12.2 years; the man from Sweden, 13.1 years; and the Canadian, 16.4 years. In other words, we have 8 countries whose nationals remain in this country more than the average period, and we only have 1 of those countries whose nationals come from the southern or eastern part of Europe, and that is Italy; all the others—the Englishman, the Norwegian, the Frenchman, the Swede, the Swiss, and the Canadian—remain in this country for periods far beyond the average. And they are the favored ones in the bill. Is their naturalization record such as makes them worthy of preference?

You know as well as I do that the assimilation of an immigrant into our body politic or into our mode and manner of living is difficult of determination. This change is just as imperceptible as is the twilight going into the night or the night going into the dawn. You can not put your finger on it. It is a most difficult process to fathom. But I say that if you want a test of all other tests, which involves a desire on the part of the immigrant to embrace our institutions and to assume the obligations of citizenship, here is a rough-and-ready test. I do not say I want to adopt it as a final test, but nevertheless it is an indication, at least, that we should assume toward those who stay here less than the average period a more kindly consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAILE. Will not the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] yield the gentleman one minute, as I would like to ask him a question?

Mr. SABATH. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for one additional minute.

Mr. VAILE. If the gentleman will pardon a suggestion—which I hope avoids the sophistry that seems to me not entirely inherent in my remarks to the exclusion of others—I might suggest a reason why people from Turkey in Europe and Turkey in Asia are naturalized in less time than people from Canada.

Mr. CELLER. I will tell the gentleman why.

Mr. VAILE. Let me suggest a reason, which the gentleman has avoided, namely, that the people from Canada have something to give up; they are like ourselves; they have a government like our own; but the people from Turkey have nothing to give up.

Mr. CELLER. In reply let me say that the distinguished chairman of your committe made similar remarks. He said:

> I will give you an answer. Those people from southern and eastern Europe change their citizenship like one who takes off his coat, off with the old and on with the new.

You and your chairman would have them wait 16 years like the Canadian. Then if they do wait that long you complain most bitterly. So you damn them if they do and you damn them if they do not. In other words, if these men are anxious to become citizens and go to the extreme of abjuring allegiance to their king or potentate and assume allegiance to this country—and they must wait a five-year period to perfect their citizenship—all honor to them. We must not make it a vice—this embracing of citizenship within the proper time. The quicker they do it the more power and glory to them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. LITTLE. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Is it not a fact that the people from the Orient and Turkey are naturalized quickly and then go back home to enjoy the benefits and protection of the American flag there?

Mr. CELLER. If they do go back, they do not take the results of their productivity. They build the subways and erect our buildings, but they do not take them back with them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired and the gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. CELLER. Under leave to extend my remarks I point out the following:

THE VICIOUS LAUGHLIN REPORT

Under leave to extend my remarks I can not avoid criticizing the committee for sending out broadcast copies of the so-called "Analysis of America's Modern Melting Pot," by Harry H. Laughlin, dated November 21, 1922. It is redolent with downright and deliberate falsehoods. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] admitted to me that it contained certain inaccuracies, yet the committee has made no attempt to check its circulation.

Verbatim parts and extracts from this vicious report are found in periodicals and magazines and newspaper articles all over the country, and so the errors and falsehoods of this report are permitted to spread. Even as late as April 5 the gentleman of the committee from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS] reproduced in the RECORD a chart from Laughlin's report. Why do I lay such heavy strictures on Mr. Laughlin?

He claims that he has made an impartial investigation of the social inadequacies contained in our custodial institutions, so as to make an appraisal of the foreign born and native born in the United States.

In truth and in fact Laughlin is predisposed in favor of the so-called Nordic superiority. He started out with the determination to show that the Nordics are a superhuman race. He supports this argument by the most dishonest methods. He has hoodwinked the Immigration Committee into believing his conclusions.

> The method followed in the investigation is as follows: A survey is made of the inmates of certain State institutions for the care of defective, feeble-minded, insane, criminalistic, epileptic, tuberculous, blind, and deaf. Under these heads the nativity of each inmate is noted.
>
> A percentage distribution of the population of the United States is then worked out, showing the proportion which the population of each nationality is of the total population. These percentages are taken as the theoretical quota which any given group may be expected to show.
>
> The method assumes that if 14 per cent of the total population are foreign born, it may be expected that 14 per cent of the inmates of insane asylums will be foreign born. The same percentage holds for the feeble-minded, tuberculous, blind, and all other types of defectiveness.
>
> To the method itself no objection can be made, but in this investigation it produced some ludicrous results. Without going into too many details, an example of its logic can be had in a statistical demonstration that, as concerns nearly all forms of defectiveness, "the Negro race appears to be superior to the white." The findings are stated for each nationality in terms of what the report calls "quota fulfillment."

The quota-fulfillment figures given in the report for Negroes and for native whites are as follows:

Quota fulfillment

Type of defectives	Negro	Native white
Feeble-minded	16.32	125.82
Insane	52.49	82.60
Criminalistic	207.85	86.55
Epileptic	12.16	118.71
Tuberculous	39.85	98.68
Blind	5.49	130.52
Deaf	83.64	119.25
Deformed	16.67	129.42
Dependent	25.27	103.48

One hundred per cent of quota fulfillment means that the number of persons of a given nationality found in the institutions for defectives equals the number to be expected on the basis of the proportion of this nationality in the general population. One hundred and twenty per cent quota fulfillment means that the group of defectives exceeds the number expected by 20 per cent; 80 per cent quota fulfillment means that the group of defectives is 20 per cent below the number expected.

These figures would indicate that among native whites feeble-mindedness is eight times as common as it is among negroes, epilepsy nearly ten times as common, and blindness twenty-four times as common. The tuberculosis rate is 148 per cent higher among whites than among negroes, insanity 57 per cent higher, and deafness 43 per cent higher. The number of deformed is nearly eight times as great, relatively, among native whites as among negroes, and white dependents, in proportion to population, outnumber negro dependents 4 to 1. On only one count—crime—does the quota fulfillment of the negroes exceed that of the whites.

Do these figures correspond with our everyday experience?

The 1921 mortality statistics of the United States census show a tuberculosis death rate of negroes of 244 per 100,000, against a rate of approximately 86 per 100,000 for whites—that is, deaths from this disease are nearly three times more common among negroes than among whites, notwithstanding the findings of this study, which shows a ratio of over 2 to 1 in favor of the negroes. Comprehensive census statistics for negroes in the Northern States, where adequate institutional care is provided, indicate that the insane rate among negroes is much higher than among whites. The result of the censuses of the blind made by the Census Bureau show that in 1910 the frequency of blindness among negroes was 55 per cent greater, and in 1920, 25 per cent greater, than among whites. Yet the study made for the Committee on Immigration reports that, relative to population, there are twenty-four times as many blinds among native whites as there are among negroes.

What is the explanation?

The low ratios for negroes are due to the fact that only a small proportion of the negro defectives are found in State institutions. In general, the States of the South, where most of the negroes live, make little provision for taking care of negro defectives unless such defectives are criminals. As the survey included only the negro defectives in State institutions, naturally the number reported for such types of defectiveness as feeble-minded, insane, epileptic, blind, etc., was far below the quotas based on the ratio of negro population to total population.

According to a "Directory of State Institutions for the Defective, Dependent, and Delinquent Classes," published by the Census Bureau for the year 1916, only two of the States south of the Potomac and Ohio Rivers and east of the Mississippi provided at that time institutional care for the feeble-minded and only five for the tuberculous. There were no institutions in any of these States for the epileptic and the deformed. These facts constitute presumptive evidence of what is really a matter of common knowledge, that, in general, the States in the South do not provide institutional care for defectives on any such scale as do the States of the North and West.

* * * The result of this fundamental error in the study is to exaggerate the ratios of quota fulfillment—in other words, to make everything look worse than it really is. * * *

The effect of this is to make a better showing for the "native whites—native parentage" stock, and a relatively poorer showing for the foreign born and foreign white stock, the great bulk of which is found in the North and West. * * *

The inclusion of the negro population in the comparisons has biased the results, so that not a single ratio in the report can be taken as a reliable indication of the relative frequency of any type of defectiveness.

But this is not all. As a typical illustration of the extreme methods pursued by Laughlin to show how inferior the "new" immigrants are, let us examine his tables with reference to feeble-mindedness. Thirty-two institutions for feeble-mindedness reported and 17 did not. Twenty-two States reported in full; four States made partial reports—that is, Pennsylvania reported only two out of her three institutions; New York two out of her four institutions; New Jersey one out of her three institutions; and Massachusetts one out of her two institutions. Eleven States made no report whatsoever. Twelve States were not even considered. The incompleteness of this investigation affects quite materially its claim for any sort of scientific recognition. Most of the immigrants from southern and eastern Europe are found in those States which only made partial reports. Most of those States which made full reports contained little or no foreigners from the southern and eastern parts of Europe. Yet Laughlin correlated his figures with the entire population of the entire country. His method is deceitful and his conclusions are useless. With reference to epilepsy we find that nine States supplied data, namely, Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, and Texas. These nine States have a total population of 35,469,151. Yet Laughlin spreads the data supplied by these nine States over the entire country and over the entire population.

Furthermore, the data collected is dated for the year 1921, whereas the population figures were for the census of 1910. There is a discrepancy of 11 years. It is incumbent upon the Committee on Immigration to explain why the data was taken for 1921 and correlated with the census 11 years earlier.

In addition, only 26 States out of the 48 reported in this survey.

Only 445 institutions out of a total number of 657 State and Federal custodial institutions reported. Yet this is supposed to be a survey applicable to the entire country.

With reference to the survey of crime, the figures were not corrected for (1) age, (2) sex, (3) character of crime. Any sort of a statistician knows that the average age of the immigrant is 28 years, and he usually comes here without children. In figuring up the total native population there is, of course, included persons below the age of 28 years as well as children.

Usually crime is committed by adults and not children. Therefore the native whites in the Laughlin survey would necessarily make a better showing because there is included all children, whereas the immigrant did not have the advantage in this worthless Laughlin survey of the inclusion of children to any extent. This, of course, throws askew the entire crime figures. Secondly, crime is generally prevalent among males rather than females. The immigrant when he comes here usually leaves his women folks behind and calls for them when he has been in the country some time. Here again the native white population had the advantage of inclusion of great numbers of females. This made the native white record of crime appear much better than it really was and conversely it made the criminal record of the foreigner much worse than it was. Thirdly, criminal laws differ in all States. What is a crime in one State is not a crime in another. Laughlin included all sorts of petty crimes in his figures in the various States. This failure to correct the figures confuses the whole survey.

Yet despite all this the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WATKINS] includes Table 4 from Laughlin's report—the table on crime. Thus, again, he puts the stamp of approval on the absurd and erroneous survey.

I must also call attention to the remarks of the chairman of the committee:

I have examined Doctor Laughlin's data and charts and find that they are both biologically and statistically thorough, and apparently sound. (See p. 731, Laughlin report.)

As well might Chairman JOHNSON have said that the moon is made of green cheese.

The quota provisions of the immigration bill as drafted by the Immigration Committee are in part founded upon this vicious Laughlin report. They are therefore, like a house built upon the sand. *Should not an immigration commission be formed to go into this subject scientifically* and in a manner most unlike the investigations conducted by Doctor Laughlin for the Immigration Committee. Let us meanwhile keep our present law and extend its provisions for another year until a fact-finding commission can report its deliberations and conclusions.

THE NORDIC MYTH

The fallacy of "Nordic supremacy" was made popular by one, Madison Grant, who wrote a book called "The Passing of a Great Race." This book has had a great vogue, and correspondingly it has created a great mischief. The opinions expressed in his book are most dangerous. The opinions are rendered more dangerous because they come from a man who has contributed a great deal that was good to the subject of zoology. When he entered the realm of anthropology he was like a fish out of water. He was out of his element.

It is a dithyrambic praise of the blonde, blue-eyed white and of his achievements; a Cassandric prophecy of all the ills that will befall us on account of the increase of dark-eyed types.

His argument is very much like the following: The "Nordics" are superior. They are superior because they have a light skin, a narrow skull, and blue eyes. All those who have a light skin, narrow skull, and blue eyes are superior. Therefore the "Nordics" are superior. He assumes the very thing that he starts out to prove. His book is about as fine an example of dogmatic piffle as has ever been written.

Another pseudoscientist who has made the "Nordics" thoroughly popular is Lothrop Stoddard. He is a sort of a "Saturday Evening Post scientist." Stoddard appeared before the Immigration Committee, and the chairman of that committee

(on page 469 of the hearings) read a letter from Madison Grant wherein Grant regretted that he could not accept the invitation to appear but submitted a statement, which is found in the hearings on pages 570-571. It is pertinent to ask the members of the committee why they did not ask some well-known anthropologist to appear and enlighten the committee. We have heard a great deal in the discussions of the subject of races, race types, ethnic strains, heredity, germ plasms, and so forth. What efforts were made by the committee to know something of these important phases of the subject? Instead of calling Lothrop Stoddard and inviting Madison Grant, why did they not call Dr. Ales Hrdlicka, curator of physical anthropology, National Museum at Washington, D. C.? Doctor Hrdlicka is well known to the chairman of the committee.

Why did not the committee call Ernest Hooten, professor of anthropology, Harvard University; or Franz Boaz, professor of anthropology at Columbia University; or Robert Bennett Bean, of the University of Virginia; or Prof. A. E. Jenks, of the University of Minnesota, who is also chairman of the division of anthropology and psychology of the National Research Council, Washington, D. C.; or Prof. George Grant McCurdy, of Yale? Any one or all of these scientists would have gladly come before the committee. No; the committee only wanted those who believed in "Nordic" superiority; men who deal in buncombe, like Grant and Stoddard.

These latter would-be scientists claim that the brain of man, and therefore his native intelligence, is dependent upon his physical characteristics. Certain brains go with certain anatomical markings. They say, for example, good brains go with narrow skulls, light complexions, and blue eyes. The whole thing is outrageously absurd. We know that the very weight of the brain is no index whatsoever as to the brain's capacity or intelligence. The brains of women, for example, are lighter than the brains of men. Can one, therefore, say that the intelligence of a man is superior to that of a woman?

Professor Boaz, in his book The Mind of Primitive Man, page 6, states that the skulls of 35 eminent men were examined and their brains were found to have weighed less than the average, whereas the brains of 45 murderers were measured and the weight of each was superior to the average. There is, therefore, no relationship of intelligence to the size and shape of the head. Furthermore, narrowness of skull is produced as a result of environment. For example, in the primitive ages men had to struggle for existence in a way more dangerous and more arduous than now. His food was difficult to obtain, and when obtained it was difficult to chew. It was usually raw flesh or bone or roots. He had to use the muscles of his jaws and his teeth to a greater extent than now. The hard and constant use of the temple, jaw, and facial muscles kept the skull from broadening. The constant exercise and use kept the skull narrow. With modern inventions and better methods of cooking and food preparation, these muscles are used to less extent, with the result that the skulls of all, no matter what the race, are broadening and are becoming less narrow. Even the "Nordics" are becoming broader skulled. How under the sun, therefore, if skulls can so change, can there be any relationship between the form of the skull and the brain inside the skull?

It is sometimes stated, although in error, that the farther man advances from the animal stages the less similar to animals are his physical characteristics. So that the farther away he gets the more intelligence he is alleged to possess. This theory is readily shown to be absurd by the fact that the negro has redder lips than the white man. The farther away we get from animal life the redder become the lips. Few, if any animals have colored lips. Shall we say, therefore, that the negro because he has redder lips is more intelligent than the white man whose lips are not quite so red? On the other hand, most animals have their noses flattened. The negro has a flatter nose and broader nostrils than the white man. Is the white man, therefore, superior in intelligence to the negro? All these anatomical changes are the result solely of environment. They have no relation whatsoever to intellect. To show the tremendous influence of environment upon the formation of the human body, permit me to quote Boas, as follows (pp. 53, 54, 55, 56, Mind of Primitive Man):

On the other hand, it has been my good fortune to be able to demonstrate the existence of a direct influence of environment upon the bodily form of man by a comparison of immigrants born in Europe and their descendants born in New York City (Boas). I have investigated four groups of people—the south Italians, representing the Mediterranean type of Europe, which is characterized by short stature, elongated head, dark complexion and hair; the central European type, which is characterized by medium stature, short head, light hair, and lighter complexion; the northwest European type, which is characterized by tall stature, elongated head, light complexion, and blond hair. Furthermore, I have investigated an extended series of east European Hebrews, who resemble in some respects the central European group. The traits which I selected for examination are head measurements, stature, weight, and hair color. Among these only stature and weight are closely related to the rate of growth, while head measurements and hair color are only slightly subjected to these influences. Differences in hair color and head development do not belong to the group of measurements of which I spoke before, which depend in their final values upon the physiological conditions during the period of growth. From all we know they are primarily dependent upon heredity.

The results of our inquiry have led to the unexpected result that the American-born descendants of these types differ from their parents, and that these differences develop in early childhood and persist throughout life. It is furthermore remarkable that each type changes in a peculiar way. The head of the American-born Sicilian becomes rounder than that of the foreign born; this due to a loss in length and an increase in width. The face becomes narrower, the stature and weight decrease. The head of the American-born central European loses both in length and width, more so in width, and thus becomes more elongated. The face decreases very much in width; stature and weight increase. The modifications of the American-born descendants of the Scotch type are not marked, except that stature and weight increase. The American-born Hebrew has a longer and narrower head than the European born; the head is therefore considerably more elongated. His face is narrower; stature and weight are increased. In none of the types have marked differences in color of hair between American born and foreign born been found.

In order to understand the causes which bring about these alterations of type it is necessary to know how long a time must have elapsed since the immigration of the parents before a noticeable change of type of the offspring is brought about. This investigation has been carried out mainly for the cephalic index (cephalic index is the ratio of the greatest width of the skull taken at its widest part above the ears, as compared to its maximum length. Thus if the width of the skull is three-quarters of its length it is said to have a cephalic index of 75. Skulls with indices of 75 or less are termed dolichocephalic, or long skulls. Skulls having indices of 80 or over, or round skulls, are brachycephalic. Skulls between the two—that is, skulls with intermediate indices—are considered mesocephalic), which during the period of growth of the individual undergoes only slight modifications. The investigation of the Hebrews shows very clearly that the cephalic index of the foreign born is practically the same, no matter how old the individual at the time of immigration. This might be expected when the immigrants are adult or nearly mature; but it is of interest to note that even children who come here when 1 year or a few years old develop the cephalic index characteristic of the foreign born. This index ranges around 83. When we compare the value of this index with that of the index of the American born, according to the time elapsed since their immigration, we find a sudden change. The value drops to about 82 for those born immediately after the immigration of their parents, and drops to 79 in the second generation; i. e., among the children of American-born children of immigrants. *In other words, the effect of American environment makes itself felt immediately, and increases slowly with the increase of time elapsed between the immigration of the parents and the birth of the child.*

I have gone to the trouble of examining the various races of men that have long skulls. I here state certain ethnic groups throughout the world that are long-skulled, that is, they are to be classed in that respect with the so-called "Nordics." (Appendix 2, J. Deniker, pp. 585, 586, and 587.)

OCEANIANS

Islanders of Viti Levu (Fiji).
Natives of the Caroline Archipelago.
Papuans of Misore Island.
New Caledonians.
Maoris of New Zealand.
Papuans of the Fly River (New Guinea).
Tasmanians.

ASIATICS

Badagahs of the Nilgiris.
Cashmerians.
Brahmans, Rajputs, and other high castes of the Northwest Province.
Sikhs of the Punjab.
Hindus of various castes (Northwest Province and Oudh).
Gypsies of Lycia.
Bengalese.

AFRICANS

Hottentot-Orlans.
Arabs of Algeria.

AMERICANS

Eskimo of Greenland.

EUROPEANS

Portuguese.
Corsicans.

Can it be said that the Tasmanians, Bengalese, and Hottentots have the same intelligence as "Nordics." If that is so, then I will agree to the superiority of narrow-skulled people.

Doctor Hrdlicka has made an interesting study of "old" Americans. He has examined the head formations of almost a thousand Americans whose ancestors have been in this country for over a hundred years and whose forbears run back to 1620. None were examined whose blood was in this country for less than a hundred years. The examinations were conducted at the National Museum, Washington, D. C., and included a great many important personages, among them some Congressmen of this very Chamber. The work covered 12 years. I would say this was an examination of the so-called blue bloods of America. If the narrow-skulled "Nordic" idea were sound, then most of these old Americans examined would have narrow skulls. Strange to relate, the result is as follows:

	Males		Females	
	Number of cases	Per cent	Number of cases	Per cent
Narrow skulls	121	16.6	17	8.1
Medium skulls	448	61.7	105	50
Broad skulls	158	21.7	88	41.9

In other words, the whole system boils itself down to this: The shape of the skull has nothing whatsoever to do with native intelligence. Nor has complexion or blondness anything to do with intelligence. Pigmentation is nature's protection against the sun's rays. That is why Italians are dark. But the time was when even "Nordics" were dark. We are told that in the Neolithic age the "Nordics" had skin pigments because they lived at the end of the glacial period in the north where the glare of the snow—like other variations of strong light—was a stimulus to pigmentation. So it is known that the early "Nordics" living in the northern tundra areas were not blond—see page 80, Fleure on Races of England and Wales. Thus environment causes a change in color and complexion. How can one, therefore, say that the blondness of the "Nordic" gives him greater intellect when environment can change so easily his complexion and blondness?

Nor is it true that the "Nordics" have all the narrow-skulled people and that the Mediterraneans have all the broad-skulled people. There is no sharp line of demarcation anywhere. Fleure—page 18—states that in any reasonable large British sample of individual skulls you will find values almost from one end of the cephalic index to the other. In other words, skulls of all kinds and shapes are to be found in the British Isles. So it is in every country.

Emerson pointed out the composite make-up of the English race in his essay on race—chapter 4, English Traits:

> Neither do this people—English—appear to be of one stem; but collectively a better race than any from which they are derived. Nor is it easy to trace it home to its original seats. Who can call by right names what races are in Britain? Who can trace them historically? * * * I incline to the belief that as water, lime, and sand make mortar, so certain temperaments marry well, and by well-managed contrarieties develop as drastic a character as the English. On the whole, it is not so much a history of one or of certain tribes of Saxons, Jutes, or Frisians, coming from one place and genetically identical, as it is an anthology of temperaments out of them all.

Doctor Hrdlicka, curator of the National Museum, tells me that the notion of any pure stock in Europe is merely a great illusion, and, in part, said as follows:

> The people of Great Britain, as well as those of Germany, France, central Europe, and even Italy, are all greatly mixed up and built up of much the same racial elements. These Latin peoples, who are sometimes looked upon as less valuable stuff than the Nordics, only yesterday ruled the world and have in their veins the blood of Kelts, Goths, Germans, and Slavs, as well as that of the Mediterraneans.
>
> On the other hand, the Alpines, as well as the Mediterraneans, enter into the composition of the people of Great Britain, while the Germans are probably one-third Slav, one-third Alpine, and one-third Nordic. There is nothing in the notion that in any of the European nations any part of the white stock is either superior or inferior to any other, except in economic conditions, in education, and in habits, which are all temporary matters that can be evened up by new environment and education. The history of the children of immigrants in this country shows ample confirmation of these facts.

I think the essential point to stress is that there are a great many inferior strains in every race, including the "Nordic," and that there are many superior strains also in other races, no matter what they may be. Then let us take the best in every race. Let us have selection and not racial restriction of any sort.

"NATIVES" VERSUS "FOREIGNERS"

HOMICIDE

The homicide rate in our States varies inversely with the proportion of foreign white stock; or, to put it in another way, the greater the proportion of natives of native parentage in the white population the higher the homicide rate.

The proportion of foreign white stock—foreign white stock is the foreign born and native born with one or both parents born abroad; the figures exclude all negro population—by State groups in our total white population is as follows:

Group 1 (over 60 per cent): Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Minnesota, New York, and New Jersey.

Group 2 (50 to 60 per cent): Wisconsin, Michigan, and Illinois.

Group 3 (40 to 50 per cent): New Hampshire, California, Montana, Washington, Utah, Pennsylvania, and Nebraska.

Group 4 (30 to 40 per cent): Oregon, Maine, Vermont, Colorado, and Ohio.

Group 5 (20 to 30 per cent): Delaware, Maryland, Kansas, and Missouri.

Group 6 (10 to 20 per cent): Indiana, Florida, and Louisiana.

Group 7 (under 10 per cent): Kentucky, Virginia, Mississippi, Tennessee, South Carolina, and North Carolina.

The Census Bureau has homicide figures for year 1921 from 34 States.

The homicide rate per 100,000 white population in—

The State group 1 is 4.1 where the proportion of foreign white stock is over 60 per cent.

The State group 2 is 5.5 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 50 to 60 per cent.

The State group 3 is 6.1 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 40 to 50 per cent.

The State group 4 is 6.6 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 30 to 40 per cent.

The State group 5 is 6.6 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 20 to 30 per cent.

The State group 6 is 7.9 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 10 to 20 per cent.

The State group 7 is 10.1 where the proportion of foreign white stock is under 10 per cent.

If the proportion of foreign white stock in States like Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, New Jersey (group 1) is over 60 per cent, one would expect a homicide rate in those States—if we can believe the extreme restrictionists—to be six times heavier than the homicide rate in States like Kentucky, Virginia, Mississippi, Tennessee, South Carolina, North Carolina, where the proportion of foreign white stock is 10 per cent. Instead of being heavier, it is far less. It is 4.1 in New York, for example, 10.1 in Tennessee or Kentucky or South Carolina.

To repeat, the homicide rate varies inversely with the proportion of foreign white stock. *The more foreigners we have the less homicides we have.*

Mark Twain said that there is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us that it ill behooves any of us to talk about the rest of us. I commend that to the majority of the Immigration Committee.

WHAT DID THE ARMY PHYSICAL EXAMINATIONS SHOW

MENTAL DISORDERS

The Army physical examinations were the greatest cross section examinations of American population ever taken. It involved physical examination of 2,750,000 drafted men, the greatest number of persons scientifically examined. The draft men ranged in age from about 20 to 32 years of age. The men came from all States. The tabulations of the examination did not differentiate color or race. Let us take the numbers of drafted men by States afflicted with mental disorders—insanity—and correlate the result with the proportions of foreign white stock found in those States. If we follow the Johnson restrictionists we would suppose that the insane draft men from Kansas, New Mexico, and Indiana, where the foreign white stock is under 30 per cent, would be one-half the number of insane draft men found in States like Rhode Island, North Dakota, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Connecticut, and New York, where the proportion of foreign white stock in total population is over 60 per cent. Yet the situation is quite the contrary.

The proportion of foreign white stock in total population, within the approximate draft age, by State groups, including only States in which the proportion of negro population is less than 5 per cent, is as follows:

Group 1 (over 60 per cent): Rhode Island, North Dakota, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Connecticut, and New York.

Group 2 (50 to 60 per cent): Wisconsin, New Jersey, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Michigan, Nevada, and Illinois.

Group 3 (40 to 50 per cent): Montana, Utah, California, Washington, Nebraska, Arizona, and Pennsylvania.

Group 4 (30 to 40 per cent): Maine, Oregon, Iowa, Ohio, Wyoming, Vermont, Idaho, and Colorado.

Group 5 (under 30 per cent): Kansas, New Mexico, and Indiana.

The insanity rate per 10,000 drafted men in—

State group 1 is 39.3 where the proportion of foreign white stock is over 60 per cent.

State group 2 is 28.1 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 50 to 60 per cent.

State group 3 is 27.6 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 40 to 50 per cent.

State group 4 is 33 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 30 to 40 per cent.

State group 5 is 24.3 where the proportion of foreign white stock is under 30 per cent.

It would thus appear that, contrary to Doctor Laughlin, at best there is no direct relation between insanity and the numbers or lack of numbers of foreigners in our States. It disproves what we hear, so often hear, that the more foreigners we have the greater is our insanity rate.

MENTAL DEFICIENCY

We shall take the same State groups for proportion of foreign white stock as in paragraph under mental disorders and discover the rate of mental deficiency—imbecility, feeblemindedness, idiocy—among drafted men from those States.

The mental deficiency rate per 1,000 drafted men in—

State group 1 is 10 where the proportion of foreign white stock is over 60 per cent.

State group 2 is 10.4 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 50 to 60 per cent.

State group 3 is 9 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 40 to 50 per cent.

State group 4 is 12.9 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 30 to 40 per cent.

State group 5 is 11.3 where the proportion of foreign white stock is under 30 per cent.

It is readily discernible that mental deficiency is pretty constant throughout the country and is practically unaffected by the presence of either natives or foreigners or foreign stock in any proportion.

EPILEPSY

We take the same State groups and discover the rate of epilepsy among drafted men from those States.

The epilepsy rate per 10,000 drafted men—

State group 1 is 57 where the proportion of foreign white stock is over 60 per cent.

State group 2 is 43.8 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 50 to 60 per cent.

State group 3 is 47.8 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 40 to 50 per cent.

State group 4 is 55.6 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 30 to 40 per cent.

State group 5 is 52.1 where the proportion of foreign white stock is under 30 per cent.

Thus there is probably more of epilepsy in Kansas, New Mexico, Indiana, Maine, Oregon, Iowa, Ohio, Wyoming, Vermont, Idaho, and Colorado where the foreign white stock is from 30 to 40 per cent, than there is in Rhode Island, North Dakota, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Connecticut, and New York, where the proportion of foreign white stock is over 60 per cent. That is, if we assume that where there are aliens and their stock there is more epilepsy. In truth and in fact, we see that according to the Army physical examination tests epilepsy is proportionately less frequent in those States or group of States where the foreign white stock is greatest.

VENEREAL DISEASES

The venereal disease rates per 1,000 drafted men in—

State group 1 is 27.1 where the proportion of foreign white stock is over 60 per cent.

State group 2 is 39.5 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 50 to 60 per cent.

State group 3 is 33.5 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 40 to 50 per cent.

State group 4 is 32.3 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 30 to 40 per cent.

State group 5 is 41.8 where the proportion of foreign white stock is under 30 per cent.

There is thus less of these diseases proportionately among drafted men of the so-called "foreign" States than among drafted men of the so-called "native" States. Note that the rate is 41.8 in Kansas, New Mexico, and Indiana, whereas it is only 27.1 in States like New York and Rhode Island.

SYPHILIS

The syphilis rate per 1,000 drafted men in—

State group 1 is 4.5 where the proportion of foreign white stock is over 60 per cent.

State group 2 is 8.4 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 50 to 60 per cent.

State group 3 is 5.9 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 40 to 50 per cent.

State group 4 is 4.6 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 30 to 40 per cent.

State group 5 is 8.1 where the proportion of foreign white stock is under 30 per cent.

Syphilis is thus pretty constant throughout the States regardless of the kind of population.

TUBERCULOSIS

The tubercular rate per 1,000 drafted men in—

State group 1 is 25.2 where the proportion of foreign white stock is over 60 per cent.

State group 2 is 22.3 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 50 to 60 per cent.

State group 3 is 27.2 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 40 to 50 per cent.

State group 4 is 23.5 where the proportion of foreign white stock is 30 to 40 per cent.

State group 5 is 26.2 where the proportion of foreign white stock is under 30 per cent.

Here again we have a social inadequacy (tuberculosis) which has no relation whatsoever with kind of population. It is practically the same in number throughout the States.

CONCLUSION

The United States census homicide figures and the Army physical tests thus show that our foreigners and foreign white stock are not so bad after all, and compare very favorably with our natives, and that our foreign people are no whit worse in deficiencies or diseases, both mental and physical, than our natives.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER]. [Applause.]

Mr. TINCHER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want to compliment the committee that has had this matter under consideration for the careful investigation and, in my judgment, conscientious consideration they have given the matter. It is my judgment that it is hard to conceive of a more important proposition to this country of ours than the proposition of immigration.

I do not intend to go back to the discovery of the country to find the condition that exists in America to-day. Some one said early in this debate that we, from the interior, who were somewhat unfamiliar and did not have contact with the immigrant direct, were exercising too much power with reference to this bill. I have no apology for myself to offer for my interest in this bill, and I want to call attention to the fact that we are not to be blamed for exercising our votes in this matter because of the horrible example that we have by reason of the sections that are abused by immigration. [Applause.]

I wonder how many people in this country to-night want this to be an American country and want the people living in the United States to obey the Constitution of the United States as the fundamental law of the land. I wonder how many are giving that serious consideration. Now, what examples have we? I have just listened to two or three speeches from New York. I love New York [applause], and I love the Members of Congress from New York, including my friend LAGUARDIA, and others, but I love them for what they are and not what they sometimes say they are. [Laughter and applause.] I realize our friends are loyal to this country, and it was easy to be loyal to this country in our recent trouble. It was easy to be loyal to this country and the fatherland at the same time, because we happened to be together, but immediately after the war we had occasion to find out how this proud foreign-born population stood with reference to the Constitution of the United States.

We passed an amendment that a majority of the people—and a vast majority of the people—thought was for the betterment of humanity and for the benefit of the race and for the benefit of our country—the eighteenth amendment. New York, with

her boasted foreign population, is the only State in the Union which, by her votes, has said she would nullify that amendment to the Constitution. [Applause.] We do not want any nullification. If they want to come to this country, if they want to migrate here to be citizens, let them come because they know of our Constitution, because they love our form of government, because they approve of our Constitution and institutions, and not to try to reconstruct them for us. This is no place for a nullifier, no matter what race he is of or from what country he comes. This country is America, and the sooner the immigrant understands it and understands that we mean it shall be for America the better off he will be.

Oh, you say there is no danger of anything like that. I can quarrel with men on this side of the aisle just as easy as anyone in America. I quarrel with you about the way we run this country of ours. I quarrel with you about who we will have run this country of ours, but I quarrel with you because I say my fellow will run it better than your fellow will, and I attribute to you the same honest purpose in your quarrel; and when President Harding died last summer on the Pacific slope there is not a man who was a Member of Congress of the Democratic Party that I know as my friend that did not stand in sorrow and mourn his loss, and when ex-President Wilson died, although I might have criticized his policies, I never questioned his integrity or his Americanism, and I do not believe there is a man in my party in the United States but what mourned his loss. But let us see what effect immigration has even on a subject like that.

Take the town—and you want to leave it to the towns where they have immigrants sufficient in numbers to govern—take the town in the United States where they had an immigration sufficient to govern, and the mayor refused to sign a proclamation of sorrow concerning the death of Woodrow Wilson, and the foreign born rushed to the ballot box and reelected him as mayor of that great city. Shame to such a population, and pray God that the day will never come when this Government, like that city, will be ruled by such men. [Applause.]

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TINCHER. We can be Democrats and we can be Republicans, but we must all be Americans first. [Applause.]

Mr. BERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BERGER. The mayor of Milwaukee was reelected because he gave the most honest and most efficient administration Milwaukee has had in 50 years.

Mr. TINCHER. He may have been reelected, but had he been in a real American community, his action in refusing to sign that proclamation would have defeated him. [Applause.] I know your defense is that that was not the main issue. I wish to God that every community in America to-night would make that a sufficient issue to defeat any man that showed such a lack of appreciation for the great men of this Nation [applause], because, after all, my friends, that is a sufficient issue. You can not split. I have no patience or time for those who want a little this and a little that. If they believe in a little this and a little that, they will believe eventually in a little flag, and there is room on this side for but one flag. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman know that the new immigration is in a hopeless minority in Milwaukee, and that a very small percentage of it there can vote? A majority of the people are the older immigration, older Americans.

Mr. TINCHER. Let me answer the gentleman. When Congress was called upon to pass an enforcement statute (the Volstead Act) for the eighteenth amendment, I remember one day in the hot summer we were working in the House and being somewhat delayed by the gentlemen in the passage of that law, they had a parade in town. They advertised in the papers that it would be miles and miles long. I remember a colleague of mine came to me and said, "Let us go out and see the parade." They had buttons and badges, and they said, "No beer, no work." They had come to the Capitol to tell the lawmakers of America that they could not make a law to enforce the Constitution.

Mr. SABATH. Who were they?

Mr. TINCHER. I will tell you. My colleague said, "Let us see if they can talk English." We stood there for 10 minutes and asked men as they came along, and all we got was a shake of the head. The next morning the paper stated that in the 2 miles of parade less than 20 per cent could speak English. Still they were parading in the National Capital to bulldoze the American Congress into not passing a law to enforce the basic law—the amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Let me tell you something else: Sixty of you gentlemen have introduced beer bills. We have got a list of the beer bills, and you will get a few votes out of the 60. A lot of them did not want to introduce a bill, but their population back home made them do it. A lot of good Members did not want to introduce the fool bills. You watch the roll call on this bill.

Mr. SABATH. We will get 150 votes for it.

Mr. TINCHER. You will never live to see the day, you will never import enough men into America to see the day that in the American Congress you will have more than 75 votes to repeal prohibition. [Applause.] This country is American today and will continue to be American. America is dry and she will never import enough of these immigrants to make it wet. If that is what you are figuring on, take down your sign. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of New York. Is it not a fact that America is only legally dry but actually wet?

Mr. TINCHER. America is legally dry and wherever American sentiment prevails she is dry. However, we are having trouble in getting rid of foreign bootleggers, but, thank God, the officers are going forward all the time. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER of New York. And you want to get rid of the American bootleggers.

Mr. TINCHER. Now the gentleman from the Bronx—and I admire the Bronx for the Congressmen they send—and I hope that there was nobody from the Bronx in this fool parade.

Mr. OLIVER of New York. No; it was too hot.

Mr. TINCHER. Yes; it was too hot, or we would have had a still longer parade and still less English. [Laughter.] My friend, there is not a Member of this House that will live to see the day that the American Congress will have any language other than the English language.

You know, a couple of fellows were walking along the streets of New York the other day when one stopped, and the other said, grabbing him, "Come along; what is the matter?" The other said, "I thought I heard a couple of fellows talking English back there." [Laughter.]

That is not true here and it is not going to be true here. I am in favor of being charitable to all nations and all people.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Does not the gentleman think with his wonderful charity that the parents who are here in the United States ought to be allowed to bring in their wives and minor children?

Mr. TINCHER. I will say this, if that parent is a good citizen, yes. However, if he is like a lot of Bolsheviks here now, then I say send him back to his wife and children, and not have this Republic torn down by a sympathetic plea that he wants to bring his wife and children over to America so that they can all be together. I remember once conducting a little investigation with reference to the impeachment of a public officer. The excuse given for not deporting the fellow was that if we sent him back to the old country they would execute him for being an anarchist. [Applause and laughter.] That was argued in all good faith. I think this Chamber here is a place where we ought to think, act, and do real Americanism. [Applause.] That is what we are elected for, and if you thrust open the gates, the districts such as we have examples of here will keep on increasing until finally when you get up and say "Mr. Speaker" you will have to speak in Italian or some other language.

We do not want that. We want to preserve our individuality in any event. Why, your boy and my boy have to live 21 years in this country before they can even vote to modify the basic law of the land, the Constitution of the United States, but the foreigner can parade down Pennsylvania Avenue with a nullification threat on his breast, "No beer, no work," after he has been here for 30 days, when not one of them even knew what he was talking about. Some one boasted here this afternoon that his district had more deposits in the postal savings bank than Mr. VESTAL's district did, and for that reason we ought to have more people here like his.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Oh, hello. There you are. I knew you would come. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TINCHER. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman was not in the Chamber when I made the statement, and he does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. TINCHER. Oh, I was here, and I apologize to you. I forgot the gentleman's personality for a moment.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If the gentleman will bear with me, what I stated was this: Reference was made to aliens becoming

public charges, and I took the report of the Postmaster General and showed the deposits. There is nothing wrong in that. If these aliens save, the gentleman criticizes them, and if they do not save, he criticizes them, and the gentleman talks about being charitable.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman has made a comparison and I will make one. Mr. VESTAL's constituents are buying homes and becoming part of America, and the gentleman's are hoarding a little money and sending it back to the old country which they love. [Applause.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, that is not true.

Mr. TINCHER. I have the same right to make a comparison on behalf of my friend VESTAL as the gentleman has to criticize his constituents and where they put their money. [Applause.]

I think the issue is fairly well drawn. On the one side is beer, Bolshevism, unassimilating settlements, and perhaps many flags. On the other side is constitutional government; one flag, the Stars and Stripes; America, "a government of, by, and for the people"; America, our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I shall take a few minutes to reply to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER], who amused himself, and believed he amused the House, when he described the anti-prohibition parade held before the enactment of the prohibition law in Washington, and designated the marchers as a bunch of foreigners, incapable of understanding the English language. Being my desire for the House to have authentic information, and for the purpose of setting some reckless Members right, I want to say that the marchers in this antiprohibition parade were composed of delegates to the convention of the American Federation of Labor, who had adjourned their convention in Atlantic City and, with their president, the Hon. Samuel Gompers, had come to Washington to protest, as now recognized on all sides, against the makeshift Volstead Act. I resent this libelous statement against the leaders of the American Federation of Labor, and leave it to the membership of this House how much credence can be given to the statement of the gentleman from Kansas that only 20 per cent of these marchers, who were the delegates to the national American Federation of Labor convention, could understand the English language. It is on a par with numerous other statements made on the floor of the House to create resentment against foreign-born citizens.

It is indeed amazing how some Members will speak of an organization when that organization advocates their viewpoints and how offensive, on the other hand, they will be against the same organization when it takes a position to stand by their constitutional rights to voice their protest against legislation that deprives the American people of their civil and personal rights. The gentleman from Kansas and others, with poisoned minds and reckless tongues, in order to create resentment in the minds of the American people against the foreign born, will charge them with being law violators and being opposed to the eighteenth amendment to our Constitution. With screaming patriotic plea they charge as if the foreign born alone are violating the Volstead Act. But let us see, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. In the gentleman's own State—Kansas—we only find a small percentage of foreign born. According to the 1920 census the population of that State is 1,769,257, and of that 110,578 are foreign born, or about 6 per cent of its population. I quote these population figures to call attention to a situation in just one of the larger cities in the State of Kansas which has quite obviously escaped the attention of the gentleman. The police department of Wichita, a city almost purely American, reports 402 convictions for violations of the liquor laws in 1922, with nearly as many more cases transferred on State warrants to the county and Federal governments. Thirty raids by the police department of Wichita in the same year netted 11 stills and unnumbered gallons of liquor and barrels of mash. How many arrests have been made I do not know nor can I state how much larger were the number of arrests and convictions in 1923. I would not be surprised if the number had doubled in that year, as it has happened in nearly all other cities.

It is fair to Kansas to say that her own native-born people refuse to sail under false colors in the face of existing conditions, although the professional prohibitionists continue to point with pride to that State as a shining example. A recent editorial in the Wichita Eagle, however, tears off the mask and lays bare present conditions in the following words:

> These two concoctions (reclaimed alcohol and corn whisky) are being sold almost openly in Wichita. Boys of high-school age may buy as readily as the old soak or the confirmed drunkard.

I wonder how it is possible to have old soaks and confirmed drunkards in a State that has been legally dry for nearly 20 years, or since 1907. And yet, Mr. Chairman, with these conditions existing in the gentleman's own State, he will stand on this floor and denounce a lawful and orderly protest against proposed legislation that all sane persons fully realized was bound to create greater abuse than sane regulation, and artfully and blandishly impugning that such demonstration was overwhelmingly foreign born. I resent his uncalled-for statement that there never will be enough aliens imported to bring about a change in the Volstead law. With the reported conditions in his emblazoned dry State as indicating the feeling of the American born, he will see in the near future when the rational native born will vote to wipe out the impossible-of-enforcement, hypocritical Volstead law, which has brought about more crime and disregard for law than anything else that has occurred in the United States since the adoption of our Constitution.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad I could not understand the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE].

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I notice that most of those who have spoken on this subject have had manuscripts and prepared addresses. I have no manuscript, and I have no prepared address. I did not intend to speak upon this subject, but after listening to the discussion here I find some things that have been said have gotten under my skin, and I have asked for the floor to unburden myself, and I propose to do so very frankly.

I have been in favor of the Johnson immigration bill and I would like to vote for it. I hope I can vote for it with certain modifications. I did not think that I would vote against any part of it until I had listened to some of the arguments in favor of the bill. If I were to follow the dictates of sentiment and of humanitarian considerations, I would vote for an open door, because our forefathers, yours and mine—and whether they came here a hundred or even two hundred years before mine matters not—came here and enjoyed all of these blessings, material and political, such as no other nation on earth affords. Then after we have come in and enjoyed these things we shut the door and shut out all others, who in a moral and ethical way, it seems to me, have as much right as we have. Yet I know that we can not consult our hearts only, but that we must consult our reason as well, and that tells me that there must be a restriction. For that matter I can also quote the Bible, as did the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HILL], who quoted the parable of the laborers in the vineyard. I would quote the Biblical injunction of the Apostle Paul, wherein he says that if you do not provide for those of your own house you are worse than an infidel. And I think that, in a large sense, I can apply this to my Nation and my country.

I will cheerfully join with the committee in restricting our immigration. Indeed, I will go so far as to bar it altogether for 5 or even 10 years, if that is found to be advisable. But I do not like the discriminating provisions of the bill.

And what I like least of all is the reason given by some gentlemen for these discriminations. I do not say any member of the Committee on Immigration has advanced these reasons, but many Members have used the words "foreigners" and "aliens" in a way that has aroused my ire.

It all depends on what you understand by these terms. I have noticed a slight allusion—oh, sometimes it has been more than an allusion—to the supposed fact that because a person has some remote connection with the *Mayflower* and its people he has in a way preempted the United States and has a certain aristocracy of birth that entitles him to look upon all other nationalities in this world melting pot as interlopers and aliens, and as lacking in true Americanism. To my way of thinking, the people whose forbears came over in the *Mayflower* have no better right to be called Americans than have they whose ancestors came across in the *Restaurationen*, if you know what that refers to.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. When I am through. What I am trying to say is this: When you have put into practice the discrimination that you have in this law—and I am not so sure but that some discrimination may be justifiable—but when you have succeeded in making this discrimination some one will arise here a few years hence and propose a law that we go a step further. If I vote against the discriminatory provisions of this bill, it will be because I fear it is but the entering wedge for another and more drastic provision. Some day a law may be enacted containing the provisions that no one shall be allowed to enter here unless he has some remote connection with some distant relative of somebody who knows somebody who has seen some

one who came here in the *Mayflower*. In other words, we may have a restriction here barring all people except those of Anglo-Saxon stock. I do not like some of the inferences and some of the implications that I have heard on this floor during this discussion. You can do as the gentleman from New York said, you can take all my worldly goods—and I think when the Federal reserve and the tariff barons and railroads get through with their program out West there will not be anything left to take [applause]—you can take that and all I have in life; but when you try by inference to take away my Americanism and my patriotism, I say you come a little too near me. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas and a few other gentlemen in this House, this talk about foreigners and aliens has gone just a little bit too far.

Mr. RAKER. I will yield the gentleman a minute if he will yield to me.

Mr. KVALE. Very well.

Mr. RAKER. Has the gentleman heard any Member of the committee which has reported the bill criticize aliens?

Mr. KVALE. I said I had not heard this from the committee.

Mr. RAKER. Just a moment. Our only purpose is to treat every alien alike, but shut the door until we assimilate those that are here.

Mr. KVALE. I said to the gentleman I did not criticize the committee for what they have said, except the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. RAKER. I enjoyed what the gentleman said.

Mr. KVALE. Very well; perhaps the gentleman and I might agree on this: I referred to some expressions on the floor of this House to which I take exception, and rightfully so as an American citizen. I have heard expressions about foreign languages being spoken as though that were a crime.

Mr. TINCHER. It is in some places.

Mr. KVALE. Since which time in the history of civilization has it become a crime to know and to speak more than one language? And one gentleman here, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. TAYLOR], spoke of some people who were "not very many generations removed from Europe." Perhaps the gentleman in question does not know enough about his ancestry to figure out how many generations he is removed from Europe.

Mr. TINCHER. Will the gentleman let me answer him?

Mr. KVALE. I will when I get through.

Mr. TINCHER. The gentleman asked a question.

Mr. KVALE. Very well; answer it.

Mr. TINCHER. The time, in my judgment, to speak the English language in America is when Members of Congress get up and complain about the last war and state on the floor it was to save J. Pierpont Morgan's coupons that the boys offered up their lives.

Mr. KVALE. That statement has not been made, and I hurl it back in the teeth of the gentleman.

Mr. TINCHER. What is the gentleman talking about——

Mr. KVALE. I decline to yield. The gentleman understands plain English. Read the RECORD I said the time would come when women would refuse to yield up their boys for any such purpose, referring to the hundred million dollar loan J. Pierpont Morgan lately extended to the European countries to help promote another war.

Another slur on my patriotism, because I am in favor of a smaller Army. How many sons did the gentleman from Kansas have in the war?

Some people were so patriotic during the last war that they were willing to sacrifice all their wife's relatives on the altar of their country. I believe some of these patriots live in Kansas. I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. KVALE. I recall an experience I had with a gentleman who came from England. He came to a community that was settled by people who trace their ancestry to the Vikings of old, and these descendants of the Norsemen had refused to Smithify and Taylorize their names, because they were proud of their Viking blood.

Also they had endeavored, and sometimes successfully, to teach their children more than one language. To the gentleman just arrived from across the waters these names and the two languages, as well as their ability to cook certain kinds of food which the gentleman had never eaten in London, were indisputable evidence of a sad lack of Americanism and patriotism. And so this newcomer but lately arrived on our shores at once conceived it his mission to give to these benighted natives lectures on Americanism and to instruct them in patriotism. You can readily imagine how it felt for these young people who were born here, whose parents were born here, and in many instances their grandparents, to be lectured on Americanism by this arrogant self-constituted American patriot who was so fresh from England that you could smell the East End of London from the very clothes he wore.

I say there is more than a suggestion in what has been said by some of the gentlemen here of this overbearing attitude which grates on those whose names or whose color of hair and eyes may indicate some other ancestry than the Anglo-Saxon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. KVALE. I will try to close. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of restriction, and I want to make this country a country for Americans, and for Americans only. I know no other flag. I have seen no other country. But I do not want anyone to slur my patriotism because, forsooth, my great-great-great-great-grandparents did not come over in the *Mayflower*. To you who are solicitous about this country—and I commend it, for we can not be too solicitous for the welfare of our Nation—I suggest that you pay more attention to the particular brand of Americanism that you find in your native American stock. I suggest that you worry less about foreign blood and foreign customs and foreign languages as being injurious to the welfare of this Nation, and worry more about native customs and native habits growing up all around us.

We have heard much about hyphenated Americans—Italian-Americans, German-Americans, Norwegian-Americans, Irish-Americans, and many others. Gentlemen, these have never betrayed America. [Applause.] These "foreigners" and "aliens" are the very people who have helped build America—on farm, in shop and factory. I will tell you of the kind of hyphenates you had better worry about, a new breed that is fast springing up, and they are your native-born dollar-a-year, loud-mouthed, flag-waving, 100 per cent "paytriotic" "graft Americans." These, and not your Americans of foreign blood and language, are the menace to America to-day. If you would be more concerned about cleaning out these blue-blooded, native-born graft Americans and less about the so-called aliens, it would be a great deal better for our country. [Applause.]

I would like five minutes in which to answer the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] about the eighteenth amendment. Who are your violators of the eighteenth amendment? Take Mrs. Willebrandt's chart and find the States where they have only 5 per cent compliance with the eighteenth amendment.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. No; I can not yield.

Mr. RAKER. But will not the gentleman——

Mr. KVALE. I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. KVALE. You will find that in the South they do not observe the eighteenth amendment, but out West, where you have so many foreigners and aliens, they stand on the eighteenth amendment. It is your native-born stock that flouts the eighteenth amendment at your fashionable dinners and banquets, where the men appear in full dress and the women in half dress. That is where they break the eighteenth amendment. [Laughter and applause.] You should worry less about these foreigners and aliens and worry more about these old American types. Then you would have a better America.

Now I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RAKER. Has the gentleman read the record given on pages 893 and 894, which reads:

> Do not take away citizens from your fatherland by permitting your heirs to lose their Italianism and be assimilated by the people in whose midst you have immigrated. Educate your children to pay reverence to Italy. Compel them to speak, read, and write the paternal language and to study the history of Italy; send them preferably to Italian schools; buy good Italian books. Try to spread among strangers the knowledge of Italy, love for her culture and her language.

Mr. KVALE. I decline to yield further. I do not care where they come from. If they come here and want to make America their home, I want them to be American citizens in every respect, or else go back where they came from.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman tell the gentleman from California if he knows what he is reading from? It is from an Italian chamber of commerce in Tangier, Africa.

Mr. RAKER. This is taken from an Italian paper published in New York. It is a reprint from Il Popolo, of New York, translated from an article in the Italian language. The trans-

lation is made by the Congressional Library and it was testified to in the committee.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It is taken from a document emanating from the Chamber of Commerce of Tangier.

Mr. McDUFFIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KVALE. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. The gentleman refers to the enforcement of the law in the South.

Mr. KVALE. Yes.

Mr. McDUFFIE. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the President of the United States last week congratulated the Governor of Alabama on the record made by that State, saying that it was the first in the Union in the enforcement of prohibition. [Applause.]

Mr. KVALE. Alabama is a notable exception. But let the gentleman, and especially the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER], study Mrs. Willebrandt's map, and he will find that States like Vermont, New Hampshire, North and South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana are all among the blackest on the map, and that the simon-pure native American stock in these States are far and away below the "aliens" of Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, North and South Dakota in their utter disregard of the eighteenth amendment.

Let the gentleman from Kansas obtain some much-needed information before he essays to lecture the House on the subject of law enforcement, and he will make the discovery that not so-called foreigners and aliens but native Americans, whatever that may mean, are the worst offenders in regard to the eighteenth amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado is recognised for five minutes.

Mr. VAILE. Mr. Chairman, it seems that my friend from Minnesota [Mr. KVALE] always stirs up some excitement and I have to pour a little oil on the troubled waters.

Mr. KVALE. What kind of oil?

Mr. VAILE. The kind that the gentleman is talking about. I did not think there is any sophistry in this oil. I am sorry that the gentleman from Minnesota seems so much worried by statements made by others than members of the committee. The gentleman mentions foreign-language newspapers. I want, without any criticism at all, to present a point of view that I think is sound. There is an advertisement used in the street cars in the city of Buffalo which——

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is not that the chart framed by you in the committee room?

Mr. VAILE. Yes. I read:

> A Polish everybody's daily, Dziennik Dla Wszystkich, daily and Sunday, Broadway near Fillmore Avenue, Buffalo, N. Y. According to United States census there are more Polish people in Buffalo than of any other nationality. A $100,000,000 market of 181,300 energetic people. "The medium of the largest retail field in western New York."

I have not the slightest doubt in the world but that that is a splendid paper, loyal to the United States, and that its editor is a good American. But here is a plain proposition for you. The editor of that paper and the publisher have as subscribers the people who speak the Polish language. Is it not a matter of business sense for them to induce their Polish readers to learn any other than the English language?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is there any card published in Buffalo in Polish?

Mr. VAILE. I have not seen any in Buffalo. I have seen many foreign-language signs in New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is it not a fact that that paper publishes an English column daily?

Mr. VAILE. It may publish an English column, but I do not know.

Will the editor of this paper, loyal and splendid American as he may be, be undisposed to encourage the emigration from Europe of other people who speak that language? The very fact that there is a foreign-language paper, or group of papers, is bound, by the nature of things, to build up foreign-speaking communities. Without the slightest criticism in the world of people who naturally want to speak and who have to speak their mother tongue, who even have to get their knowledge of America in a foreign language, I do not think it is a healthy condition in the United States.

Now, that brings me to a point of view which seems to lurk in the back of the minds of a great many gentlemen who have spoken here. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], for whom I have the highest respect, says he stands by every word he uttered in a recent speech at Philadelphia. I quote from the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 25, this year:

> There is no secret about this bill. It is aimed against the Italians and Jews. They are not wanted. We must unite to defend our rights. As long as these persons backing this bill discriminate against us as a racial group we will unite against them as a racial group and retaliate against them.

The gentleman, of course, was mistaken in saying that the bill is aimed against those particular groups, unless he means that it is aimed to take away special and unequal privileges now enjoyed by those or other groups.

Such a doughty opponent of "special privilege" as our friend from New York should not raise his voice now in favor of the very thing which he has so often and so eloquently condemned.

But the interesting thing about his statement is that "We must unite to defend our rights." What rights of any naturalized citizen or of any unnaturalized resident of the United States are violated by this bill? The right of freedom of the press or freedom of speech? The right of assembly? The right of the free exercise of religion? The right to bear arms? The right to be secure against unreasonable searches and seizures? The right of trial by jury?

Go through the Bill of Rights of our Federal Constitution or of the constitutions of all the States, go through our Federal statutes and the statutes of all the States and show me, if you can, any single right of any person prescribed therein which is even scratched by the pending bill. If you can show me no such right of any citizen or resident here which this bill violates, then the "rights" to which the gentleman refers must be rights existing outside of our constitutions and statutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VAILE. May I have three minutes more?

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. VAILE. Of course this can mean only one thing. It means that the gentleman, and those who think as he does, conceive that it is the right of people of foreign birth to bring in other people from the countries of their origin, or that it is the right of those countries to send people here, or the right of people in those countries to come here.

Such a theory of rights not based on our Constitution or laws but conceived to exist outside of them, even though held from the loftiest of motives, is a very erroneous and dangerous theory to be held by a Congressman of the United States.

But it is a theory which naturally springs from our own loose admissions of the past. Our generosity in giving is now conceived as a requirement that we must continue to give. Because we have freely given half of our estate we must now be compelled to give it all.

Mr. Speaker, the problem has ceased to be one of the "assimilation" of aliens. It is only a question of whether we shall be assimilated by them. We have imported them to do our hard and dirty and unpleasant work and the time is now upon us when they will insist on doing all the work, and especially the work of government.

And there are some gentlemen on this floor to-day who know that when they vote their convictions they will be punished because that vote will conflict with the supposed right of people in some other country.

Commissioner of Immigration, Mr. Henry H. Curran, said in a recent speech in New York City:

> I had a telegram from a Congressman the other day, who demanded the admission of a certain Greek immigrant, because he said the Greek vote in his city depended upon the admission of that immigrant, and there were 8,000 Greek votes in that city. Just what is a "Greek vote" in America? What is it doing here, and what business has it to be here?

I can answer part of the commissioner's query—the question "What is it doing here?"—by narrating a conversation which I had with a New York Congressman shortly before the pending restriction bill was reported to the House by the committee of which I am a member.

> I believe in the principle of the Johnson bill—

Said he—

> but don't you think it is mighty poor politics to pass it on the very eve of a presidential election? The Republican Party will have to take the responsibility for it, because this is a Republican administration.

That means that the Republicans will lose New York State, because the Italians, Poles, and Greeks will vote solidly against us.

In contrast to this, but expressing the same opinion, another eastern Congressman said to me:

I am going to vote for your immigration bill, because I believe it is right, but when I do it I'll be kissing myself good-by. The foreign vote in my district will retire me to private life next fall to punish me for such a vote.

That man has been in Congress nearly a dozen years. He is an able man. He is the chairman of an important committee. His legislative experience is a very substantial asset to his country and to his district, and no matter how able may be the successor who may be elected by the "foreign vote" to fill his place, it will be a number of years before such successor can possibly be of the same value.

I hope that my friend has overestimated the strength of the sentiment in his district against restriction of immigration, but I fear he has estimated it correctly. A man who has weathered half a dozen campaigns gets to know the sentiment of his constituents pretty well. Now, what does this mean? It means that we have been parting with control of our own affairs until to-day there is a question whether we can run our Government by American votes, whether we can run it for the benefit of American people, or whether we shall have to run it for the benefit of other peoples. The time has arrived when American officials who act, as they believe, for the best interests of the United States may be, and in many instances will be, defeated because their acts are deemed incompatible with the interests of some other country or its nationals.

There are in this country 25 cities of more than a quarter of a million population, but there are only six of the smaller of these in which the foreign stock does not exceed the native stock. Those six are Washington, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Kansas City, Denver, and Portland, Oreg.

New York City is four-fifths foreign stock and those who were themselves foreign-born outnumber the native stock two to one.

And these foreign communities control the politics of States and threaten to control the politics of the Nation. Take it through the country north of Mason and Dixon's line and the normal vote is about 25 per cent of the population. That is to say, out of 100,000 people there should be about 25,000 votes cast. In my own congressional district the 1920 vote was 27 per cent. But in some districts the percentage rises much higher. In Mr. GRAHAM's Illinois district, containing six counties, mostly agricultural, it was 37 per cent of the population. (I am using the 1920 vote in order to compare it with the 1920 census.) In the first district of Iowa, consisting of seven counties, the vote was 33 per cent, and in Mr. TINCHER's district, comprising 32 rural counties in western Kansas, the vote was 31 per cent. But in Mr. DICKSTEIN's district, the twelfth New York, it was 12 per cent, and in Mr. SULLIVAN's district, the thirteenth New York, it was only 9 per cent.

Now, of course the 9 per cent of the population of crowded New York City which sent our friends, Mr. SULLIVAN and Mr. DICKSTEIN, to Congress are Americans, and I am sure they are good Americans. But they have the interests of other countries prominently in mind. And those districts are foreign communities. The reason why only 9 or 12 per cent of the people vote is because most of the people are unnaturalized aliens. But if anybody thinks the vote does not represent the sentiment of the whole community, he is greatly mistaken. The voter of course is influenced by his neighbors and by members of his own family who are not voters.

All I can say is that we are very lucky, so far, in the quality of the Representatives we have from those districts. We may not always have such good luck.

The time will come when we will get men who are not inspired by the same high ideals of patriotism and fairness as are these gentlemen.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAILE. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. I heard the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] read a statement with reference to what Italians are doing in countries other than the mother country. Was not that statement issued in the Province of Tangier, which is a French Province, telling the Italians to adhere to their mother country as against France?

Mr. VAILE. I think it was, but I think it was used here as well.

But you say, "What if they are foreigners? We were all foreigners once. We are all immigrants or the sons of immigrants."

That has a very familiar sound. Most of us have used that argument. I know I have. Our dear old colleague, "Billy" Mason, of Chicago, always began an immigration debate in the House of Representatives with the salutation, "Fellow immigrants."

Now, that argument, as an appeal to our common duties and responsibilities, as an invocation of our national unity, has a definite forensic value. Furthermore, as a statement that all the white people who are here now, or their ancestors, came from Europe, it is, of course, literally true. But as an argument on our immigration policy it is not only valueless but actually misleading, because it ignores and directs attention away from an essential point, which is that the American people represent a distinct European stock, having a distinct language and a distinct history, and that they brought with them, not from Europe generally, but from a small part of Europe, certain definite ideals of life and of the functions and responsibilities of government, which they have embodied in a Constitution of their own and with which they have built the happiest country and the most just and liberal laws in the world.

At this point I am not making an argument. I am merely stating facts. It may be argued, of course, that the distinct stock which formed this Nation is not the best stock in the world. It must be conceded that there are other good stocks. But the fact is that the people who made this Nation did come from the countries of northern and western Europe. It may be argued that there are better languages than English. Very likely. The fact remains that the English language was the original language of this country, and is still our official language, even if it can not be found in some parts of our greatest city and even if it is disliked in other parts of the country. I met in Wisconsin, during a lecture tour there three years ago, a clergyman who very bitterly resented being compelled to preach in English and to abandon the use of German, which he evidently regarded as the only adequate and, indeed, the only decent medium of religious expression.

It is also the fact that our history is the history of the self-governing constitutional countries of northwestern Europe, and, particularly, the history of England, from which we derive our jurisprudence.

Let me emphasize here that the "restrictionists" of Congress do not claim that the "Nordic" race, or even the Anglo-Saxon race, is the best race in the world. Let us concede, in all fairness, that the Czech is a more sturdy laborer, with a very low percentage of crime and insanity, that the Jew is the best business man in the world, and that the Italian has a spiritual grasp and an artistic sense which have greatly enriched the world and which have, indeed, enriched us, a spiritual exaltation and an artistic creative sense which the Nordic rarely attains. Nordics need not be vain about their own qualifications. It well behooves them to be humble. What we do claim is that the northern European, and particularly Anglo-Saxons, made this country. Oh, yes; the others helped. But that is the full statement of the case. They came to this country because it was already made as an Anglo-Saxon commonwealth. They added to it, they often enriched it, but they did not make it, and they have not yet greatly changed it. We are determined that they shall not. It is a good country. It suits us. And what we assert is that we are not going to surrender it to somebody else or allow other people, no matter what their merits, to make it something different. If there is any changing to be done, we will do it ourselves.

Fortunately, it is very easy to prove that this country, whatever its faults, is the best country in the world. The proof is that people come here from every other country of the world, that they do not go in anything like the same numbers to any other country, and that they do not go in any appreciable numbers from this country to establish themselves elsewhere.

Now, what is the reason why this is the best country? Would anybody seriously prefer the climate of New York or Chicago, or even Denver, to that of Italy? Is it our natural resources? We have not many undeveloped resources left. Russia beats us in her wheat fields and her forests, Rumania in her oil wells, Mexico in her gold mines. But there does not seem to be any hammering at the gates of Russia, Rumania, and Mexico by great crowds of people frantic to take up their residences permanently in those countries.

No; the thing that makes this country the best country in the world is its government.

That wise statesman, that patriotic instructor of his fellow citizens, the Hon. Elihu Root, says in his admirable lecture on "The task inherited or assumed by members of the governing body in a democracy":

If it [government] is bad, ruin comes to all; if it is good, success comes according to capacity and courage. The fairest and most fertile parts of the earth have been for centuries wilderness and desert because of bad government; not only lands capable of supporting multitudes in comfort and prosperity but lands that have actually done so in the past are to-day filled with wretchedness and squalor, with ignorance and vice, because of bad government, while under good government industry and comfort flourish on the most sterile soil and under the most rigorous climate.

If you want examples, look about you. The people of Massachusetts supported themselves in sufficiency, if not in luxury, by agriculture on as thin and rocky soil as you can find anywhere, and to-day that State is filled with industries of all kinds and with schools, churches, and magnificent universities. Haiti and Mexico, blessed with continual sunshine and a prodigal soil, have produced nothing but revolution and wretchedness.

Now, governments are made by the people who live in the country which is governed. This happens everywhere, but faster in Republics.

And consequently it ought to be self-evident that we can not continue to absorb large numbers of people of a different physical and mental make-up, different language and different history, without our Government, and consequently our country, becoming entirely different from what they are now. Suppose we should move out of the United States all the hundred and six million people who are here now and put in their places one hundred and six million people who are to-day vegetating in darkest Africa. How long do you suppose that America would retain any similarity whatsoever to its condition of the present time?

The picture appears plain enough when we paint it in such broad lines of black and white. But is it not essentially the same picture if we use shades—if instead of bringing in people who are entirely different we bring in people who are somewhat different?

By the pending bill we accept the changes that have already taken place. We merely declare that the change in our population has progressed far enough and that we propose at least to keep the present proportions. It is eminently fair to all who are here now. It violates no rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PERLMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PERLMAN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, about the last thing the gentleman from Colorado said was that in New York there is a large foreign population and that we have foreign representation in the House. This is the first time in American history, I think, that it has been said that in an American Congress there is foreign representation. Let me say to the gentleman from Colorado that I represent a district in New York City where the foreign born are not in the majority but in the minority; I was elected by the votes of the foreign-born citizens and the native-born citizens. The native-born citizens living in my district—in fact, in all of New York—are tolerant, fair, and just, and are not prejudiced against the worthy foreign born, whether they are citizens or declarants.

Mr. VAILE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERLMAN. Yes.

Mr. VAILE. I did not mean to say that these districts had foreign representation, because I think they have splendid American representation, but I do not think we shall always be so lucky.

Mr. PERLMAN. The gentleman's language was "foreign representation in the House."

Mr. VAILE. I said that some of you gentlemen represented communities which were foreign communities.

Mr. PERLMAN. But, after all, those who are of foreign birth and who are good citizens are entitled to representation in this House by one who may have been foreign born or native born.

I wonder whether the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. VAILE], when he first ran for public office, was given the test of nativity or of ancestry to determine his qualification for public office. Is it going to be the policy in this country, as a result of the propaganda in favor of this bill, that in the future it shall not be a question of whether a man is competent, able, honest, and sincere, but rather whether he was born in this country and his ancestors born in this country and of a certain racial stock?

Some of the gentlemen on the committee, especially the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], denied that the members of the Committee on Immigration reflected in any way on the foreign born or aliens and did not want to be charged with what was said by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER]; but I noted with disgust that when the gentleman from Kansas did make his charge against the foreign born and against New York, the gentleman from California and every Nordic member of his committee applauded vociferously. I admit that some of the members of the Committee on Immigration are more diplomatic and do not openly give vent to their feeling of hatred against the foreign born as did the gentleman from Kansas. Now let me say to the gentleman from Kansas that New York and people living there need no defense. I know that it is fashionable for some gentlemen from the West to attack New York, but you must admit that the people of New York have contributed a great deal to the prosperity of the country, and the foreign born and the native born of New York are as law-abiding as any class of people anywhere in America. The only time that perhaps there is violation of law en masse is when some of the gentlemen from Kansas and from other parts of the country come to New York and violate the law.

Some gentlemen talked about foreign-language papers, and some one said that it is a crime to publish foreign-language papers. I should judge logically from what the gentleman from California and all those who believe it is a crime to publish a foreign-language paper said that what they would like to have is that after an immigrant is admitted here that he be blind, know nothing about our Government, for after all it is not expected that he should know how to speak and read the English language on the day of his admission into the United States. And how is he to learn of our ideals, of our institutions, unless he first learns of them in the language that is best known to him. The foreign-language papers have contributed a great deal in Americanization work, and we need more Americanization, not only of the foreign born but of the native born, and the foreign-language papers, not through scandal sheets but their decent literature and their English pages, have brought about the Americanization of the foreign born in this country, and all the more credit to them for it.

Let me tell the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VESTAL] something about the Russian immigrant of to-day; and I appreciate that a great many of the Members here are opposed to immigration because of their feeling against the Russians and the Bolshevists. Some years ago, during the war, I recall a great many native-born *Mayflower* Yankees who came to New York City from Kansas and Colorado and other places and preached I. W. W. and Bolshevism in New York City. They were not the foreign-born Russians at all. They were our native-born American citizens, and they ought to be Americanized, as much as if not more than the foreign born. The Russian immigrant who comes to America to-day can easily be assimilated, because he left Russia on account of conditions in Russia, because he wants no more Bolshevism, because the dream he once had has been exploded, and he can be better assimilated here than some of the foreign-born from the Nordic countries.

The question was raised about naturalization, and the gentlemen from Colorado [Mr. VAILE], trying to explain why the foreign born of Nordic countries take longer to be naturalized than those from southern and eastern Europe, said that the immigrant that comes from the oppressed lands can easily throw off his allegiance to his native country, but that the immigrant who comes from Canada takes longer to become naturalized, because he lived in a country having a liberal government. That may be, but he always has a mental reservation in favor of his native country. I am against any American citizen who has any mental reservation. I much prefer the man who says, "The country I came from had a government not as good as that of my adopted country," because we are more sure of having better citizens from that stock than from those who come here and become American citizens for business purposes only, always with a mental reservation that his native country is much better. [Applause.]

There is one other feature of this bill that I want to call attention to. Chairman JOHNSON in February of last year presented a bill passed on the census of 1890, but he did appreciate that there was a great need for uniting the families, and he provided under that bill that the nonquota immigrants should be the wife, the husband, the father and mother, the unmarried child, and unmarried brothers and sisters. Most of these relatives have been eliminated from the bill except the wife, the husband, and parents over 55 years of age, and minor unmarried children. I wonder whether that was not put in the bill as a bait, as one good feature in order to have this House adopt the vicious principle of the census of 1890, whereby here in America we will have two classes of

people, one an inferior class, because, unfortunately perhaps, their cradles were rocked in southern or eastern Europe, and the other a so-called superior class, because they had a choice of birthplace in northern or western Europe? I am wondering whether, when this bill passes, even the humane features of this bill, some of which I am very much in favor of, will not be dropped in conference and all that will be left will be the 1890 census?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I yield the gentleman two more minutes.

Mr. PERLMAN. There is one other provision I want to call your attention to, and that is the provision providing for examinations abroad, with autocratic power in the American consuls.

I have had numerous complaints, and I think the State Department and the Labor Department have records of numerous complaints, of discrimination by our American consuls abroad. The American consuls abroad are now autocrats and czars and discriminate. They are so far away from the United States we can not supervise their work, and I, for one, would much prefer to have the visé or the certificate plan within control in the United States of the State and Labor Departments, rather than in the hands of the American consul miles and miles away whom we can not supervise, and who in the past, according to the proof, have been bribed and have discriminated because of likes or dislikes. I think an investigation will prove that to be the fact.

There are some features in this bill that are most desirable, but I think they were placed in the bill with the intent of making the public believe that it is a restrictive immigration bill when in fact it is not, when in truth the only purpose to be served by it will be to keep the doors open for all Mexicans, for all Canadians, for all of South and Central America, Great Britain, and Germany, and shut the doors against the immigrants from southern and eastern Europe. I protest against the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FREE].

Mr. FREE. Mr. Chairman, in order to understand the dangers of Japanese immigration to the United States I desire to call attention first to a few general facts.

The world is politically nine-tenths white; in other words, the whites control the politics of nine-tenths of the world's surface, whereas in blood the world is but four-tenths white. The colored world might be said to contain 31,000,000 square miles, while the white world contains 22,000,000 square miles.

The population of the world to-day is approximately 1,700,000,000; of this the whites number 550,000,000, while the colored races number 1,150,000,000; in other words, the colored people of the world outnumber the whites more than two to one. To make this problem more acute, I may say that four-fifths of all the whites are on less than one-fifth of the world's surface.

Another matter worthy of consideration is the proportionate increase of the various races. The white races double in 80 years, the yellow races double in 60 years, and the black races double in every 40 years. Formerly famine, disease, and tribal warfare eliminated a considerable increase in population of the colored races, but our increased civilization, the improvements in medical science and hygienic matters, together with the ease of communication, have largely eliminated these deterrents of increased population.

The natural stress of congested populations will cause the colored races to strive for other lands, particularly those occupied by the whites. On this point let me quote from the book entitled "The rising tide of color," by Dr. Lothrop Stoddard, a professor at Harvard University, in which he says:

A Japanese scholar, Prof. Ryutaro Nagai, writes:

"The world was not made for the white races, but for the other races as well. In Australia, South Africa, Canada, and the United States there are vast tracts of unoccupied territory awaiting settlement, and although the citizens of the ruling powers refuse to take up the land, no yellow people are permitted to enter. Thus the white races seem ready to commit to the savage birds and beasts what they refuse to intrust to their brethren of the yellow race. Surely the arrogance and avarice of the nobility in apportioning to themselves the most and the best of the land in certain countries is as nothing compared with the attitude of the white races toward those of a different hue."

Of the colored races, the Japanese are the most aggressive, and their population is rather congested. Their attitude in the matter of securing additional lands can be seen in the part they played in the late World War. They associated themselves on the side of the Allies and immediately took over the German possessions in the Pacific. This additional territory having been acquired, they then declined to send armies to Europe or western Asia, and contended that their sphere was the Far East.

Through these acquisitions they had secured a stranglehold on China and Korea and had secured great points of vantage in the Pacific. No further activity was shown until Russia collapsed, then very quickly Japan sent an army into Russia and took control of Siberia. This army remained long after the war was over and after the protest of their allies at the end of the war. Japan's position in the war and what she gained is most ably expressed in the book The Rising Tide of Color, from which I have just quoted, and Professor Stoddard, on page 42 of that book, makes the following comment:

The unexpected ending of the European war was, as we have seen, a blow to Japanese calculations. Nevertheless, the skill of her diplomats at the ensuing Versailles Conference enabled Japan to harvest most of her war gains. Japan's territorial acquisitions in China were definitely written into the peace treaty, despite China's sullen veto, and Japan's preponderance in Chinese affairs was tacitly acknowledged. Japan also took advantage of the occasion to pose as the champion of the colored races by urging the formal promulgation of "racial equality" as part of the peace settlement, especially as regards immigration. Of course the Japanese diplomats had no serious expectation of their demands being acceded to; in fact, they might have been rather embarrassed if they had succeeded, in view of Japan's own stringent laws against immigration and alien land-holding. Nevertheless, it was a politic move, useful for future propagandist purposes, and it advertised Japan broadcast as the standard-bearer of the colored cause.

The notable progress that Japan has made toward the mastery of the Far East is written plainly upon the map, which strikingly portrays the broadening territorial base of Japanese power effected in the past 25 years. Japan now owns the whole island chain masking the eastern sea frontage of Asia, from the tip of Kamchatka to the Philippines, while her acquisition of Germany's Oceanican islands north of the Equator gives her important strategic outposts in mid-Pacific. Her bridgeheads on the Asiatic Continent are also strong and well located. From the Korean Peninsula (now an integral part of Japan) she firmly grasps the vast Chinese dependency of Manchuria, while just south of Manchuria across the narrow waters of the Pechili Strait lies the rich Chinese Province of Shantung, become a Japanese sphere of influence as a result of the late war. Thus Japan holds China's capital, Peking, as in the jaws of a vise and can apply military pressure whenever she so desires. In southern China lies another Japanese sphere of influence, the Province of Fukien, opposite the Japanese island of Formosa. Lastly, all over China runs a veritable network of Japanese concessions like the recently acquired control of the great iron deposits near Hankow, far up the Yangtse River in the heart of China.

Whether Japan will cast her eyes on the North American Continent is readily seen from another quotation from the book which I have just mentioned. On page 50 of that book, Professor Stoddard states that still more striking are the following citations from a Japanese imperialist pronouncement written in the autumn of 1916:

Fifty millions of our race wherewith to conquer and possess the earth! It is indeed a glorious problem! * * * To begin with, we now have China; China is our steed! Far shall we ride upon her! Even as Rome rode Latium to conquer Italy, and Italy to conquer the Mediterranean; even as Napoleon rode Italy and the Rhenish States to conquer Germany, and Germany to conquer Europe; even as England to-day rides her colonies and her so-called "allies" to conquer her robust rival, Germany—even so shall we ride China. So becomes our 50,000,000 race 500,000,000 strong; so grow our paltry hundreds of millions of gold into billions!

How well have done our people! How well have our statesmen led them! No mistakes! There must be none now. In 1895 we conquered China—Russia, Germany, and France stole from us the booty. How has our strength grown since then—and still it grows! In 10 years we punished and retook our own from Russia; in 20 years we squared and retook from Germany; with France there is no need for haste. She already has realized why we withheld the troops which alone might have driven the invader from her soil! Her fingers are clutching more tightly around her Oriental booty; yet she knows it is ours for the taking. But there is no need of haste; the world condemns the paltry thief; only the glorious conqueror wins the plaudits and approval of mankind.

We are now well astride of our steed, China; but the steed has long roamed wild and is run down; it needs grooming, more grain, more

training. Further, our saddle and bridle are as yet mere makeshifts; would steed and trappings stand the strain of war? And what would that strain be?

As for America, that fatuous booby with much money and much sentiment but no cohesion, no brains of government, stood she alone we should not need our China steed. Well did my friend speak the other day when he called her people a race of thieves with the hearts of rabbits. America to any warrior race is not as a foe but as an immense melon, ripe for the cutting. But there are other warrior races—England, Germany—would they look on and let us slice and eat our fill? Would they?

But, using China as our steed, should our first goal be the land, India, or the Pacific, the sea that must be our very own, even as the Atlantic is now England's? The land is tempting and easy but withal dangerous. Did we begin there, the coarse white races would too soon awaken and combine and forever immure us within our long since grown intolerable bounds. It must, therefore, be the sea; but the sea means the western Americas and all the islands between; and with those must soon come Australia, India. And then the battling for the balance of world power, for the rest of North America. Once that is ours, we own and control the whole—a dominion worthy of our race.

North America alone will support a billion people; that billion shall be Japanese with their slaves. Not arid Asia nor worn-out Europe, which, with its peculiar and quaint relics and customs should, in the interests of history and culture, be in any case preserved, nor yet tropical Africa, is fit for our people. But North America, that continent so succulently green, fresh, and unsullied, except for the few chattering, mongrel Yankees, should have been ours by right of discovery; it shall be ours by the higher, nobler right of conquest.

NOT MERELY A CALIFORNIA PROBLEM

Sometimes this problem is looked upon merely as a California problem. This, however, is not true; it is a national problem. The situation has, of course, become more acute in California, as two-thirds of the Japanese in the United States reside in California.

Exclusion laws have been passed in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, while alien land laws have been adopted in California, Louisiana, Arizona, Delaware, Washington, New Mexico, and Texas, and primary steps are being taken in Colorado, Nevada, Nebraska, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, and Utah.

The problem became an acute one in California in 1908. The unusual spectacle of the wife of a Protestant minister seeking a marriage license for her daughter to marry a Japanese servant in her house was called to the attention of people of the Pacific coast by the newspapers. A few months later when the daughter gave birth to a child the reason for the unusual action of the mother became apparent. This instance also aroused Californians to the fact that grown Japanese men were attending school in the same rooms, in the same classes, and occupying the same playgrounds with their young daughters. The California Legislature proposed to pass some laws providing for separate schools for the Japanese. Roosevelt was then President of the United States and promised if California would desist from handling the matter herself that the Government of the United States would handle the problem satisfactory to California. The result was some very loose correspondence between our Secretary of State and the Japanese Government, resulting in the so-called gentlemen's agreement, an agreement which has no justification in law or under our Constitution.

It is not a treaty, is not ratified by the Senate, was never acted upon by Congress, and has no validity under our Constitution; yet we are considered as bound by it. Interpreting the very loose correspondence called the gentlemen's agreement, we elicit this general proposition: That Japan will issue no passports, good for the American mainland, to either skilled or unskilled Japanese laborers except to those who have previously resided in the United States or to parents, wives, or children of Japanese residents. The first criticism I make of this is that Japan, not the United States, passes on the passports. If a Japanese comes to this country with a passport, we have no authority, under this so-called agreement, to go behind the passport and determine whether the Japanese is entitled to enter this country. We must take the passport as establishing all the facts, even though we know it is based upon fraud.

Under this clause, thousands of Japanese who never had resided in the United States, but who fraudulently claimed they had, were admitted into the United States.

Another means of at least morally violating the agreement was in the matter of adoption. The Japanese living in this country would sign an agreement to adopt a Japanese living in Japan. Under the Japanese law he merely had to be one day younger than the Japanese adopting him. Once adopted he could come to this country and then send for his parents, his wife, and his children. Out of 176 cases investigated 13 per cent were adoptions.

Another revolting moral evasion of the so-called agreement was the entrance into this country of picture brides. Japanese women would send their pictures to this country. A Japanese living here would sign an agreement to take her as his wife, she would then go through some sort of ceremony in Japan, take the steamer for the United States, and for the first time she would meet her so-called husband when she reached the United States. She would then be taken out onto some farm, her good clothes taken from her, dressed up in a working dress and heavy shoes, and put out to work in the field.

The so-called agreement was also violated by smuggling Japanese across the borders of our country. Just the number thus gaining admission can not, of course, be told, but the census will tell part of the story. The census of 1910, which was taken about two years after the so-called gentlemen's agreement was in effect, gave the Japanese population in the United States as 72,157. The census of 1920 gives the Japanese population as 111,010. This great increase of nearly 40,000—38,853—took place while the so-called gentlemen's agreement was in full force and effect.

The number of Japanese aliens departing from the United States for the years 1908 to 1923 are as follows:

	Emigrant	Nonemigrant	Total
1909			[1] 3,590
1910			[1] 3,133
1911			[1] 4,982
1912	1,501	6,529	8,030
1913	733	7,707	8,440
1914	794	8,109	8,903
1915	825	7,662	8,487
1916	780	8,638	9,418
1917	722	8,440	9,162
1918	1,558	9,282	10,840
1919	2,127	9,106	11,233
1920	4,238	11,415	15,653
1921	4,352	11,193	15,545
1922	4,353	10,925	15,278
1923	2,844	8,328	11,172
8 months July, 1923, to February, 1924	1,616	6,154	7,770
Total	26,443	113,488	151,636

[1] Not segregated by classes of departures.

This shows that they are not living up to the terms of the so-called gentlemen's agreement. How could such a number have departed the United States if they had not either entered surreptitiously in violation of the so-called gentlemen's agreement or dodged the census taker, and yet have our census show that there remain in the United States over 111,000? In one city in California when a recount was made in taking the 1920 census over 2,000 Japanese were found who had successfully dodged the census taker when the census was first taken.

We know there are between 15,000 and 20,000 Japanese children born in the United States, now being educated in Japan, who will return to the United States.

Another serious phase of this matter is the great increase in Japanese births. During the year 1910 there were 719 Japanese births in California, while in 1919 the number of births was 4,378. The year 1919 showed an increase of 252 per cent over 1910. During that period the increase in white births was but 18.5 per cent.

In 1910 the Japanese births were 1 out of every 44 children born in California, while in 1919 the Japanese births were 1 out of every 13 children born in the State.

In the rural parts of Sacramento County—a very rich agricultural county—49.7 per cent of all the births were Japanese in the year 1919. In 1921 there were 5,257 Japanese births, or 344 per thousand, or 34.4 per cent, while in the same year the white births were 127 per thousand, or 12.7 per cent. Those figures are the more amazing when you realize that only one Japanese out of three has a wife in California.

British Columbia furnishes some amazing figures on this phase of the subject. In 1910 there was but 1 Japanese birth out of every 252 in British Columbia, while in 1920 there was 1 Japanese birth out of every 17 births.

There is another phase of this subject which is startling. California has, of course, a very large area, but much of it is mountainous. In California there is no rain from the middle of May to about the middle of October, so irrigation must be

resorted to. Our richest lands are our level irrigated lands. There are 3,893,500 irrigated acres. Of these, in 1920, the Japanese had control of about one-sixth.

In some counties they had control of from 50 to 75 per cent of the irrigated lands. In San Joaquin County, out of 130,000 acres, the Japanese controlled 95,829 acres; in Colusa County, out of 70,000 acres, they controlled 51,105; in Placer County, out of 19,000 acres, they controlled 16,321; in Sacramento County, out of 80,000 acres, they controlled 64,860 acres.

Realizing that it would be but a short time when the whites would be driven from the lands of California if the Japanese continued to get possession of the lands of the State, the people, by initiative petition, passed a law which prohibits aliens ineligible to citizenship from owning or leasing lands. The law is very similar in effect to one Japan has upon her own books, and she is therefore in no position to complain.

But the Japanese mind is fertile in the art of subterfuge and a way to evade this law was concocted. A Japanese child born in the United States is a citizen of the United States and entitled to all the rights and privileges of every other citizen of the United States, although also a citizen of Japan and subject to military duty in Japan. To evade the alien land law the Japanese buy land in the name of such child, the Japanese father applies to be appointed the child's guardian, and thus accomplishes by indirection what could not be done directly.

California also had a law prohibiting a corporation from owning agricultural lands unless 51 per cent of its stock was owned by citizens. This was evaded by the Japanese hiring a shyster lawyer, who holds the stock in his name and turns the dividends over to the Japanese, who in reality owns the stock.

The Japanese got control of many crops in California, as the following figures will show:

	Per cent
Celery	80 to 85
Berries	90 to 95
Asparagus	70 to 75
Cantaloupes	65 to 70
Onions	80 to 85
Tomatoes	75 to 80
Florists' products	72
Seeds	52
Sugar beets	45
Mixed vegetables	90 to 95
Grapes	25 to 30
Rice	25
Potatoes	20
Beans	15
Cotton	15
Fruits	12

FISHING

The Japanese are rapidly getting control of the fishing business in California. In 1916 there were 491 Japanese fishermen out of 3,758, or 13 per cent, while in 1919 there were 1,316 Japanese out of 4,671, or 28 per cent. This assumes large proportions when I tell you that in 1919 the catch of fish in California was 250,453,244 pounds. The increase in the operation of fishing boats by Japanese in those three years was from 355 in 1916 to 796 in 1919.

BANKING

In California there are seven banks owned by Japanese organized under California laws, and there are two branches of the Yokohama Specie Bank of Japan. A very favorite custom is to buy a sort of certificate of transmission payable in Japan. This, of course, has a string to it, and can be withdrawn here, but a creditor is not able to attach the money.

STORES

They not only own their own stores, where they purchase goods raised or made in their own country and brought here by their own ships, but they are rapidly going into all sorts of merchandising business and crowding out Americans, particularly in the fruit and vegetable business. Japanese are rapidly opening up stores and displacing American merchants. In the city of Los Angeles, Calif., 4,000 business licenses have been issued to Japanese. Of this number 1,100 are for vegetable stores and 500 for grocery stores. As the Japanese absolutely control the growth of green vegetables in that section, it is impossible for Americans to secure these, preference being given by Japanese to Japanese stores, and the Americans have actually been forced out of business.

SCHOOLS

The Japanese attend the American schools, and in many instances the Japanese are in the majority in attendance. In addition they have their own Japanese schools, where the Japanese language, customs, religion, and loyalty to Japan is taught.

DUAL CITIZENSHIP

Another dangerous phase of this question is the fact that a child born in this country of Japanese parents is a citizen not only of the United States but also of Japan, and is subject to military service in Japan. They can only become expatriated before 15 years of age through their legal representative, or between 15 and 17, but never after 17 until they have presented themselves for military duty.

THEIR RELIGION

Most of the Japanese are Buddhists.

Buddhism refuses to recognize an indestructible soul eternity, and analyzes consciousness into a mere series of transitory states. They learn from Supreme Buddha, who appears periodically. They believe in a long array of supernatural beings, such as gods of various ranks, demons, terrestrial spirits, and ghosts. They have 16 heavens of pure form, 6 sensuous heavens, the world of men, demons, ghosts, and animals, respectively, and the realms of hell.

SHINTOISM

Most of the Japanese are Shintoists.

Shintoism really means worship of one's ancestors. They belive their Emperor is the direct descendant of the sun goddess. They believe Amaterusu produced by magic a son, Ho-mimi. whose begotten son, Ninigi, at her command descended from heaven, deposed O-Jumi-Nushi, and founded the imperial dynasty, which, after two millenia, rules in Japan in lineal succession for ages eternal. There are 75 Buddhist temples in California.

LYING APPROVED

Some of the Japanese peculiarities may be understood in reading the Teachings of Shinran, the founder of Japanese Buddhism, which says:

If a man consecreates his whole life as a thank offering for Amida's mercies, in what light are we to consider the lies and sharp practices which form an inseparable portion of that daily life? We are told in reply that lies and sharp practices are not in themselves thank offerings, but when a man is very jealous for the propagation of his religion and offers his whole life, lies, sharp practices, and all to that end, the whole offering is acceptable, and lies and sharp practices, seeing that they become aids to the propagation of the faith, become parts of an acceptable offering and are thus accepted.

LIVING CONDITIONS

The housing commission of California made the following report on the living conditions of the Japanese:

The Japanese are very clean about their persons, not so much about the living quarters; open toilets, open drains from the kitchen sink, unscreened dining and cooking quarters, and living quarters generally littered with boxes, bags, etc. Their sleeping quarters are, as a rule, a platform built the length of the structure and as many men as can pile on to the platform. The camp inspectors have remedied this condition wherever found by separating the platform into spaces and allowing for a certain number of occupants. Frequently we find the sleeping quarters darkened as much as possible by boarding over the windows in the structure and the bunks closed in by boards or burlap, a small opening being left in the wall, which has a sliding board. Camp inspectors order the removal of all such inclosures and insist that light and fresh air be permitted into the sleeping quarters.

In California there are hundreds of Japanese farmers who do not come within the labor camp act, living in shack houses not fit for human habitation.

In the cities the Japanese select some district to live in. Frequently it is a district where the former residents have been outlawed. From the first they start to move into the better parts of the cities. A Japanese quarter in any city of California will show the same conditions—houses crowded, ill smelling, cluttered up with various foodstuffs, a store in front, and living quarters in the rear. Near Santa Monica, in Los Angeles County, is a Japanese fishing village, which I had occasion to investigate. Shack houses, each a fish-drying place; open toilets; open sewers; and a stench that made the salt air from the ocean negligible was the condition that I found. I merely use this as an example of what the usual conditions are where Japanese live.

Most of the Japanese are tricky, and many decidedly dishonest. For many years Chinese were used as tellers and cashiers in Japanese banks. The Chinese are fundamentally honest. If a Japanese is losing money on a contract he will disregard his signature, violate the contract, and give as his reason that he is making no money.

HAWAII

Hawaii is an example of what may happen to the mainland of the United States. Approximately one-half of the population of Hawaii is Japanese, and they have gained such influence that it is found impossible to pass a law through the Hawaiian Legislature fixing English as the language to be taught in the schools. The Japanese think they should teach their language in the State schools in place of English.

The present immigration law contains a provision excluding any further Japanese immigration into the United States. A similar law was passed many years ago in regard to the Chinese. The people of the West contend that no more should be admitted, as, first, it is impossible for white people economically to compete with people of that sort who live in squalid quarters, make their mothers, wives, and children work in the field, live on such a limited diet that no white man could exist on it, and work long and unusual hours which would break down the health of any white person. Second, because they can not be assimilated. Marriage between the yellow and white races is impossible to consider, would tend to lower the standard of both races, and create a lot of poor individuals hated by the Japanese and not accepted by the people of the United States. Third, even though born in this country, they are always loyal to Japan, her laws, customs, and traditions, and are subject to military service of that country. Fourth, they are not a Christian people and, except in very rare instances, hold to their own fantastic religious beliefs rather than accept any of the principles of Christianity.

The attitude of the western people is to afford protection to those who are already here, but to shut the gates so that no more may come to our shores. By so doing it is the belief that we will prevent another race problem from arising in this country. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether my colleagues or the country will be interested in the views of a descendant of the aborigines of this country on this question of immigration, but this is a country of many different viewpoints and this is a many-sided question, so I have thought that a few brief words on that phase of this knotty problem might not be out of place at this time.

The first of my ancestors, the Indians, came to this country long before the white man's history records. At least that is what I have been told. I can not give first-hand information on that subject, for I was not with them at that time. [Laughter.] As a matter of fact, diligent research has failed to disclose whether they really came here at all or were brought into existence with the balance of God's creation on this continent. Be that as it may, many generations after their coming some other of my turbulent progenitors came. They were the Irish, and they have been coming ever since. [Laughter.] Then still other of my worthy forbears came from England and from Scotland, and they have been coming every since. Other hardy pioneer souls from many other lands with whom my lineage has no connection also came, and these are still coming.

On this question of restricting immigration my pale-faced brothers are several generations behind the Indian. Five hundred years ago my progenitors not only espoused the cause of rigid restriction, but for a time undertook to maintain absolute prohibition of immigration into this country and deportation of those aliens already here. [Laughter.] These efforts of those venerable old warriors, as we are all aware, did not meet with marked success, and the white man came from all over northern Europe, first to the eastern shore of the American Continent, then scaling the Allegheny Mountains, spreading out over the fertile Mississippi Valley, and finally penetrating to the Pacific coast, until the country has become thoroughly absorbed by a race somewhat alien to its original citizenship and the entire scheme of things on the Western Hemisphere completely and radically changed.

It is not my purpose to discuss the benefit or detriment that this wonderful change has wrought. That is immaterial to this discussion. It will be admitted by all that the change is an actual reality; so, without praise or criticism, the situation that confronts us now is that there seems to be imminent danger of history repeating itself on perhaps a much larger scale.

This vast multitude of invading humanity which came to America has been assimilated into our body politic, constituting a composite citizenship of which each and every one of us serves as one individual unit, and which, while not perfection, of course, is said to be the admiration of the world and, to say the least of it, is satisfactory to most of us.

We have a form of government which may not satisfy the Utopian dreamer but which has come to be the model after which the world's best political economists fashion their arguments, and its form is also satisfactory to most of us. We, the citizenship of this Republic, have our beliefs; we have our conceptions; we have our ambitions; we have our ideals. So the question now confronting us is not whether our country or the world has been benefited by this marvelous transformation on the American Continent up to this time, but without animosity toward any of those splendid nationalities now composing our citizenship, without prejudice to their many-sided views, the real question is, Shall we preserve our American institutions and ideals, or shall we continue to invite the immigration of a mass of people with adverse conceptions and foreign ideals until the standard of our citizenship has become so changed and diluted as to again upset the scheme of things American and imperil these cherished institutions and ideals? [Applause.] Shall we keep America American or shall we surrender our institutions and our ideals to embark upon uncharted seas the end of which no man can definitely foretell? That and that alone in my judgment is the question that must be answered by a vote on this bill.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I will.

Mr. SABATH. If I am not mistaken the gentleman has in his district a certain element of the more newer immigrants. Are they dangerous to the community or to the section or to the country?

Mr. CARTER. We have not had very much immigration in that immediate section of the country since the World War. I will say to my friend that our Bohemian immigration has been satisfactory. [Applause.]

Ah, but, say our friends opposing this measure, by this bill you violate the traditional American immigration policy, and in justification of that statement they cite Washington, Jefferson, Hancock, and many other founders of this Republic. But these gentlemen overlook the marvelous change which conditions have undergone since the days of those illustrious forefathers. Why, when Washington lived this country, with its population of only 5,000,000 people, was seeking immigrants, and now with a population of 110,000,000 it would certainly seem the time has come to call a halt. We are facing new conditions. They are unprecedented and therefore can not be governed by any fixed precedent of the past. It would be just as reasonable to argue that we should not legislate to regulate railroad crossings because Washington had not so declared in 1789, when there were no railroads. It would be just as reasonable to cite the principles of Jefferson as an objection to the traffic cop holding up a line of automobiles on one of our busy street crossings until other vehicles had opportunity to pass without danger because Jefferson, who never saw an automobile and usually traveled horseback, had not so decreed.

I have tried to read and analyze this Johnson bill as carefully as my time would permit. It does not completely meet my views in all its important details. Some of its most essential features are based on grounds not entirely satisfactory to my view. There are many changes which might, in my opinion, be made to strengthen and improve its working. But I realize that such legislation as this must necessarily be the result of compromise. It has the purpose to preserve the integrity of our citizenship. It has the purpose to preserve America for Americans, and I shall therefore unreservedly give it my cordial and hearty support. [Applause.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I wish for the time not to be interrupted until I shall have finished my statement. The gentleman from California [Mr. FREE], who preceded the last speaker, discussed the Japanese problem, which, of course, is peculiar to his State; but I prefer to discuss this question first from the viewpoint of the world trade, because my native city of Detroit is one of the great industrial centers of the world.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we are discussing to-night, the so-called Johnson immigration bill, is known as a restriction bill. It is a restriction measure in more senses than one. It will restrict American trade and prosperity.

If made into law instead of the more fair and statesmanlike bill reported out of the Senate Immigration Committee and now being debated on the floor of the Senate, it will restrict agriculture and the prices which farmers get for their products. Heaven knows the farmer gets little enough for his products now and is crying to the Congress for help to save him from utter destruction.

KILLS OUR MARKETS ABROAD

But this immigration bill aims only to deepen the farmers' distress. For the farmer's trouble is that he can not sell his surplus products abroad, those that he can not sell in this country. Also, because the world market is depressed, his price for his products in this country is lower.

But this bill does not aim to open foreign markets. It aims to close them still further. It aims to anger many countries of Europe; its purpose will be to close European markets to American goods, agricultural, manufactured, and raw materials.

It places a stigma on many great nations of Europe and says they are inferior to certain other European nations and must be discriminated against in access to our country. These nations are protesting against the unwarranted insult.

HUGHES GIVES WARNING

Our Secretary of State, Mr. Hughes, a man of very broad experience and one who is closely in touch with our Consular and Diplomatic Service abroad, also patriotic Americans and men trained to advance American interests, particularly trade and commerce—Mr. Hughes and his force are very much alarmed at this bill.

Secretary Hughes warned the committee about the racial discrimination features of this bill, but the committee chose to go ahead with these features despite the warning.

So this bill aims to restrict American prosperity; to restrict American markets; to restrict American trade, American manufacturing, and agriculture and mining and lumbering.

It aims to cripple the Shipping Board fleet which cost us so much money. Surely no bill purposes to be so truly restrictive.

NATIONAL HONOR AT STAKE

For the stigmatized nations of Europe will not take the insult lying down. They are going to bridle up, for all peoples have deep-seated national pride and national honor that must be satisfied.

Already Italy, which is most grievously hurt by this proposed law, points to its war record as our ally and to its treaty claims and rights. Already Italy is turning to look over the Russian field for raw materials, and it will turn to other countries for manufactured products such as we have been selling Italy.

For you gentlemen should know that during the last calendar year of 1923 the United States sold to Italy $167,531,956 worth of goods. You should ponder that your country may lose that boon.

DETROIT LOSES HEAVILY

I should keep in mind that my city, Detroit, specializes in world export, and particularly it is the automobile, the drugs and medicines and adding machine center of the world. Italy in 1923 bought $1,186,314 worth of autos, $585,759 worth of drugs, medicines, and chemicals, and $84,386 worth of adding machines.

If we lose that trade through outcries in this House against Italy and Italians, Detroit suffers to an appreciable extent. Much money will be lost to my constituents, many workingmen will get less wages, and many may be thrown out of work.

The country at large will suffer in this loss of trade and in other losses of Italian trade. This is one country and what hurts one part hurts another.

You may call these people scum, riffraff, unassimilables, but they sure do buy an awful lot of very fine American goods. This scum sure does know how to skim the cream of the world's goods, and this riffraff sure does know how to assimilate American goods, even if they can not assimilate any other Americanism. As a matter of fact they can assimilate anything American.

SPANISH TRADE ENDANGERED

So it goes with Spanish trade. We sold Spain $61,869,855 worth of goods in 1923. And in autos, we sold Spain $7,838,505 worth; drugs, medicines, and chemicals, $355,691; and in adding machines, $29,515. To that extent you can hurt American trade and Detroit workingmen and manufacturers and the people in this country from whom Detroit buys its raw materials.

For the Spanish are deeply stigmatized by this law. They also are Latins and unassimilables.

Remember, too, when you stigmatize Spain you stigmatize South and Central America and throw away all the decades of honest and intelligent effort by our statesmen from Presidents down to win the friendship and trade of South and Central America. Remember that the Argentine, Chili, and the great Republics to the south are proud that they are Spanish.

In my district is the drug center of the world, and I was talking recently to the president of one of our biggest drug and medicine firms.

I asked him about South American trade and said he should have it solidly because Germany must have lost it during the war. I knew the situation in years past because I was in the executive offices of the Department of Commerce from 1913 to 1917 when this country and that department first saw the significance of world trade and made desperate efforts to capture it. I did my bit in that cause.

Up to 1913 Germany had been spending more money in New York City alone to capture our trade than we were spending all over the world. And Germany was capturing the markets of the world and building up its prosperity, later thrown away in the World War, because it was spending vast sums of money and going after world trade in a scientific way.

But my Detroit drug manufacturer threw up his hands in a discouraged manner. He said:

We Americans have a way of offending the South Americans and particularly the Spanish-descent element. We tread on their sensibilities. We had the markets, but the Germans treat them better apparently, and now we are losing all our trade in drugs and medicines and pharmaceutical products to the Germans, crippled as they are by the after-war effects.

So, gentlemen, this immigration bill is a bill to further restrict and cripple American trade in the Spanish-American republics and is a bill to expand and promote German trade in those countries as well as in European countries.

True, indeed, as its sponsors say, is it a bill to favor the Nordics of Europe, of whom the Germans are the backbone.

POLAND IS STIGMATIZED

Deeply offended, too, are the Poles, and we helped to give birth to the new Poland. Last year the new nation bought from us over $12,000,000, and in autos they bought nearly $200,000 worth. Just getting on their feet, and full of rosy prospects for the American drummer abroad!

But the Poles are riffraff, too, and endanger our institutions. Well, they may see that they do not inflate our prosperity anyway and turn to Germany or France to buy goods.

In a few days the Department of Commerce bill to develop foreign trade abroad will come here. Congress has spent millions in that noble cause. But why spend millions of the people's money and throw it away in a bone-head play like this immigration bill?

Why heed the warnings of the Secretary of State or the Department of Commerce through its agents abroad if racial hatred is to rule the day?

I was trained in the Department of Commerce, and I come from the greatest purely manufacturing city in this Nation, a city whose future is unbounded if you do not willfully stir up the world to hate the very name of America and American products.

I helped to advertise the slogan "Made in America," which has since gone all over the world. Formerly that slogan sold goods in every city in the world. Do you want to make it a stench in the nostrils of the world, so that your goods rot on the docks, your farmers get thinner through worry, and your factories are dusty with cobwebs?

MILLIONS AT STAKE

Now, I append a table showing that we sold last year to the countries stigmatized by this bill, just the European countries, goods worth $285,847,710 worth of goods.

Exports of specified commodities to Europe during calendar year 1923

	Imports from United States	Adding and calculating machines	Drugs, medicines, and chemicals	Automobiles and parts
Bulgaria	$613,425	$68	$2,114	$418
Czechoslovakia	1,080,090	63,459	93	8,602
Esthonia	1,416,961		3,618	79,646
Finland	11,213,852	32,668	9,522	307,607
Greece	11,899,763	9,773	50,954	198,323
Hungary	127,701			16,518
Italy	167,531,956	84,386	585,759	1,186,314
Latvia	5,285,134		137,483	62,448
Lithuania	105,113			11,696
Malta, Gozo, and Cyprus Islands	1,066,798		229	88,175
Poland and Danzig	12,110,515	6,025	6,376	196,359
Rumania	1,177,758	560	3,128	129,665
Russia in Europe	3,547,055	12,110	21,766	110,050
Spain	61,869,855	29,515	355,691	7,838,505
Turkey in Europe	2,947,086	1,701	6,010	26,720
Ukraine	2,758,337		16,507	42,936
Yugoslavia, Albania, etc	1,096,311	3,428		15,623
Total	285,847,710	243,693	1,199,250	10,319,605

Let me now show what the sponsors of this stigmatizing movement tried to do to Canada and to our Canadian relations and to our Canadian trade.

CANADIAN RELATIONS ATTACKED

Canada is one of the best customers the United States has. During 1923 we sold $651,920,821 worth of goods and considerable of our national and our Detroit prosperity is due to Canada.

Now, the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Davis, recommended to the committee that they put a quota on Canada, and I was

told there was a probability of Canada being stigmatized in that way.

For Canada has never been put on a quota. The relations have been ultrafriendly between us and Canada. We had no forts, no military protections on that border—by treaty. We were brotherly and sisterly nations. But guards were on the borders to prevent smuggling or secret entry of immigrants from Europe and Asia.

Then the restrictionists started the Canadian-quota business. I knew how deeply it would offend Canada because I had been a war official doing business with them, and for five and a half years I was United States customs appraiser for Michigan on the Canadian border.

I beat the Canadians to their own roar. For roar they did over the quota stigma.

I took the question up in the Foreign Relations Committee of the House and I showed the members what the Canadians would do to us in increasing the prices of wood pulp and curtailing our supply, for they control this print-paper industry. I showed what they would do to the Chicago drainage canal and the connection of Lake Michigan with the Mississippi, and which lowers the level of Canadian waters they contend. I showed what they would do on Niagara Falls power.

I showed what they could do on the nickel supply which they control and of which we need considerable for our iron and steel and metal industries. I showed what they could do on Alaskan and Pacific and Newfoundland fisheries. I made a great point of the Lakes to the Gulf waterway—Great Lakes to St. Lawrence.

Nobody in the Foreign Affairs Committee spoke for the Canadian quota, nobody contended with me. They all seemed to agree with me that it was a dangerous thing.

I spoke to Secretary of State Hughes about it, and he said I was absolutely right; that the State Department was working hard to cement better relations with Canada, and the quota was a very bad thing. He was much worried over the attitude of other countries on the pending immigration bill.

The chairman of our committee, Mr. PORTER, of Pennsylvania, said he would see the chairman of the Immigration Committee, Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, and a few days later it was announced that the Canadian quota was dead.

But the mere mention of the Canadian quota by big officials of our country did great harm to the friendly relations between Canada and the United States. It led them to believe that they continually have to fear our jingoes, and they were reminded of Champ Clark's speech about annexation.

It was not long after the quota talk that Canada's officials at Ottawa gave the Great Lakes to St. Lawrence waterways project a black eye.

SENATE COMMITTEE DID BETTER

Now, gentlemen, these are some of the reasons why I would not vote for the racial discrimination features of this bill. I would vote for the Senate committee report, the so-called Colt bill, which provides for a 2 per cent quota on the basis of the 1910 census.

I would rather vote for total prohibition of immigration for three to five years than the Johnson bill. I would vote for 2 per cent or 1 per cent of the 1920 census—anything to get away from the dangers of this bill.

This bill not only hurts our prestige abroad, it embitters the 6,000,000 of foreign born here in the United States and drives them closer together for protection against their bitter enemies in this country. It prevents assimilation of what we have here.

So few immigrants come in now under the present law that they are but a slight menace. Fewer yet will come in under the Colt bill; many less. One hundred and twenty millions of Americans will soon swallow up and assimilate them, especially since they are eager and anxious to be assimilated.

I know that there are some pledged to this bill who are fearing the consequences of its passage by the House. They would be glad to be given a chance to vote for a wiser and more liberal bill.

NO SMALL-TOWN STUFF FOR DETROIT

It is a strange thing that this bill is urged and sponsored by the agricultural and small-town districts, which have but a very slight percentage of foreign-born citizens and aliens.

I would like to give you more in detail the attitude of my city.

I believe that fully 80 per cent of the people of my district are opposed to the racial discrimination features of the Johnson immigration bill. Detroit is an unusually tolerant city, vigorously opposed to all forms of bigotry, fanaticism, hypocrisy, jingoism, "blue laws," racial and religious oppression and persecution.

Not only are all nations and races of the world found represented in Detroit but the city sells to all the countries of the world. Wherever on this planet human beings are found you will see an actual or prospective customer of Detroit.

We have the world viewpoint, not in the sense of favoring a League of Nations or a World Court but from the view of making the burdens of mankind lighter and making their lives easier and happier—from the viewpoint of establishing trade, commerce, and industry and human rights.

We Detroiters are not little Americans but world Americans in the sense that the people of England are no longer little Englanders but imperial Englanders with the world outlook, although we Americans do not covet world power in the territorial or governmental aspects, as do the English. The white man's burden is easier for us when we merely sell to the world and buy from the world. That is real service—to place our research and manufacturing genius at the command of the world.

DETROIT AGAINST RACIAL STIGMA FEATURES

Detroit sentiment is fairly represented by the Detroit Common Council, which unanimously passed recently resolutions protesting against the racial discriminations of this bill pending before the House.

So did the Americanization committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce, and so did the Michigan State Council on Immigrant Education. The officers of these two associations are in the main as American in name and antecedents and patriotism as any Americans in the country. They are among the leaders of the entire people of Detroit and of Michigan and include many public-school educators and officials.

As to the national organizations against the discriminatory features of the pending bill, I quote from the minority report of the House of Representatives Immigration Committee, issued this session. It runs as follows:

> Within the past few days the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, giving consideration to House bill 6540, asked that it be amended so that the census of 1910 and the 3 per cent rate should be continued. The organizations represented by the committee are: The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Board of Missions, the National Lutheran Council, the Home Missions Council, the Baptist Board of Home Missions, the National Congregational Council, the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, the International Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, the Council of Women for Home Missions, the Travelers' Aid Society, the Immigrant Publication Society, the Near East Relief, the New York City Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Committee of Reference and Counsel, the Foreign Mission Conference of North America, the National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches.
>
> Many other prominent organizations are likewise opposed to the bill in its present form, among them the American Bankers' Association, as shown by its report, which appears on pages 305 and 306 of the hearings before our committee, and the Association of Manufacturers of the United States and its affiliated organizations in various parts of the country.
>
> In addition to protests from the above organizations, we have on record also the protests of the Catholic Welfare Conference, the American Jewish Congress, the Polish-American Alliance, the American-Italian League, the Czechoslovakia National Council, the National Industrial Conference Board, and other organizations, State and National in character.

DOG-IN-THE-MANGER ATTITUDE

Since the foundations of the American commonwealth were laid in colonial times over 300 years ago, vigorous complaint and more or less bitter persecution have been aimed at newcomers to our shores. Also the congressional reports of about 1840 are full of abuse of English, Scotch, Welsh immigrants as paupers, criminals, and so forth.

Old citizens in Detroit of Irish and German descent have told me of the fierce tirades and propaganda directed against the great waves of Irish and Germans who came over from 1840 on for a few decades to escape civil, racial, and religious persecution in their native lands.

The "Know-Nothings," lineal ancestors of the Ku-Klux Klan, bitterly denounced the Irish and Germans as mongrels, scum, foreigners, and a menace to our institutions, much as other great branches of the Caucasian race of glorious history and antecedents are berated to-day. All are riff-raff, unassimilables, "foreign devils," swine not fit to associate with the great

chosen people—a form of national pride and hallucination as old as the division of races and nations.

But to-day it is the Italians, Spanish, Poles, Jews, Greeks, Russians, Balkanians, and so forth, who are the racial lepers. And it is eminently fitting and proper that so many Members of this House with names as Irish as Paddy's pig, are taking the floor these days to attack once more as their kind has attacked for seven bloody centuries the fearful fallacy of chosen peoples and inferior peoples. The fearful fallacy is that one is made to rule and the other to be abominated—all Caucasians and worshipping the same God, preaching the fatherhood of that God and the brotherhood of man under Him.

THE IRISH DO NOT STAY DOWN

The old Irish in Detroit have told me that when they first came to Detroit they found signs up on the factories where they went to look for work:

"No Irish need apply."

The idea was to starve the Irish and drive them onward into the wilderness. That was the idea of the "Know-Nothings"—to make the Irish outcasts and the scorned of the community.

But two young Irishmen, Jerry and Jimmy Dwyer, saved their pennies, built stove factories which became the greatest in the world, and laid the foundation of Detroit's fame the world over as a center for mechanics, as a good place to start iron and steel factories.

And another Irishman from Cork came over and weathered the "Know-Nothing" fury and brought forth a grandson in the outskirts of Detroit; and that grandson built the most wonderful factories the world has ever seen and the most stupendous fortune the world has ever seen—greater than that of Darius and Alexander and Caesar put together.

That grandson is Henry Ford, and his great factories are open to workers of all races. He employs more Jews alone than any other employer in the world, I am informed.

JEFFERSON TAUGHT LIBERALISM

So the racial hatred campaigns have been frustrated and brought to nought in this good old country of ours—at least since Thomas Jefferson's time, when he laid down the principles of the brotherhood of man as they should be worked out in a democracy, founded and dedicated as was ours. He gave the country, even bigoted New England, to his party for 40 years; and after the fearful mistake of the Civil War his party did not change its name but came back to power on Jefferson's principles of racial and religious freedom, written into the platform of Samuel Tilden, who won the Presidency.

But when one of the hard-boiled statesmen from my town—and my State, too, often raises hard-boiled statesmen—when old Senator Zack Chandler sent the famous telegram from Detroit to Washington, "Claim everything and admit nothing," they held the fort until Zack arrived and did the trick here in this very Chamber.

Tilden was counted out, but Grover Cleveland took up the same platform and was counted in to stay, and took two terms—all charged to the account of Thomas Jefferson and his principles of Americanism, which are getting such rough treatment here to-day in this immigration bill. But Jefferson's principles proved before and will prove again that this country will not stand for racial hatred.

In this bill we find racial discrimination at its worst—a deliberate attempt to go back 34 years in our census taken every 10 years so that a blow may be aimed at peoples of eastern and southern Europe, particularly at our recent allies in the Great War—Poland and Italy.

JEWS IN DETROIT ARE GOOD CITIZENS

Of course the Jews too are aimed at, not directly, because they have no country in Europe they can call their own, but they are set down among the inferior peoples. Much of the animus against Poland and Russia, old and new, with the countries that have arisen from the ruins of the dead Czar's European dominions, is directed against the Jew.

We have many American citizens of Jewish descent in Detroit, tens of thousands of them—active in every profession and every walk of life. They are particularly active in charities and merchandising. One of our greatest judges, if not the greatest, is a Jew. Surely no fair-minded person with a knowledge of the facts can say the Jews of Detroit are a menace to the city's or the country's well-being.

The Jews of every land and clime have been hounded and persecuted for centuries. They have been regarded as strangers and as foreigners by every nationality outside Palestine, and they were oppressed by invaders in Palestine since the time of the Roman Empire, as well as in the days of the Old Testament.

DOCTRINE OF SUPERIOR AND INFERIOR PEOPLES

Now, much of the terrible distress of the world to-day is due to race consciousness, to the imminence of the national spirit, with its penchant for selfishness and its aggressions upon other races, their right to exist and hold their lands and wealth. I wish to do a rather daring thing, one that may be misunderstood. I undertake briefly to show the vanity and vexation of the urge of the theory of racial superiority and inferiority by pointing to what is happening to the nations which have flaunted that theory to the utmost.

First, take the Jews. They developed par excellence in Judea many centuries ago the theory of a chosen people favored by God to inherit the earth and all the good qualities of mankind, with all the other nations surrounding held subject and conquered. Read the militant Psalms of David and then listen to the current debates in the House and Senate on the immigration bill. What glorifications of chosen peoples arrogating to themselves God's undivided attention to the utter confusion and destruction of all other peoples! Hear the psalmist of Judea plead for the people of Israel, and hear the brass-lunged psalmists of Capitol Hill roar for the Anglo-Saxon, latest favorite of the Deity.

Christ lived and died for the redemption of mankind, to bring peace and good-will to humanity. He gave up His life partly to combat the theory of chosen peoples and establish the doctrine of the brotherhood of man, just as Socrates underwent his bloody sweat 300 years before Christ to destroy the chosen-people theory of the Greeks. He handed the torch of enlightenment in behalf of tormented mankind to his brilliant pupils and youthful companions, Plato and Aristotle, before he quaffed the bitter cup of hemlock, and all through the Middle Ages Plato and Aristotle are quoted with Saint Paul in the upbuilding of Christianity, whose essence is love and tolerance, antihate and antibigotry.

But now, ironic jest of history, it is the followers of Christ who are applying the chosen people theory as mercilessly as with a red-hot branding iron, and among the inferior peoples, as proved to the satisfaction of the framers and backers of this bill, are the Jews. The Greeks whose preachers of yore cried for the saintly Socrates's life; the Italians, descendants of the Romans who fed fat on the chosen-people theory and threw followers of Christ to the lions in the ampitheater for believing that "foreign devils," barbarians, as the Romans called them, had a right to a place in the sunshine.

Proud Spain, finder and conqueror of the western world, and savior of European civilization against the Moors. Yea, the people of haughty Castile and Aragon, they are of the riff-raff, the scum of the earth, the unassimilable, the mongrels! Of course it was not such a bad Republic they founded in the Argentine, nor indeed in other parts of South America, and they did not do so bad in the tropics of Central America, considering it all. But they are unassimilables nevertheless. They are an inferior people and come under the ban of the last word in statesmanship—the Johnson bill.

ITALIAN CITIZENS ARE NOT INFERIOR

Forty or fifty thousand Italian-Americans live in my district in Detroit. They are found in all walks and classes of life—common hard labor, the trades, business, law, medicine, dentistry, art, literature, banking, and so forth.

They rapidly become Americanized, build homes, and make themselves into good citizens. They brought hardihood, physique, hope, and good humor with them from their outdoor life in Sunny Italy, and they bear up under the terrific strain of life and work in busy Detroit.

One finds them by thousands digging streets, sewers, and building foundations, and in the automobile and iron and steel fabric factories of various sorts. They do the hard work that the native-born American dislikes. Rapidly they rise in life and join the so-called middle and upper classes.

Why should they be dubbed an inferior race, for very truly a recent writer has said of their country of origin and of them:

> Italy, the mother of civilization, of art and of science, and the cradle of intellectual liberty, began fighting the invaders of the north 1,000 years before the discovery of America. She has given to the world Marcus Aurelius, Dante, Columbus, John Cabot, Leonardo da Vinci, Galileo, and, more recently, Volta, Galvini, Mazzini, Garibaldi, Verdi, and Marconi. Just as the New West was given to civilization by her great navigators, Columbus and Cabot, so were the infinite realms of space revealed to men through the gift of the telescope from Galileo, that monumental genius who also helped to perfect compound microscopy which made medicine and modern chemistry possible. Likewise, it was the Marconi gift of wireless telegraphy which makes the observation airplane a truly potent factor in battle.

One of the marvels of history is this extraordinary Italian race that for 2,000 years has blessed the world with a succession of geniuses—musicians, authors, creators of inspiration and advancement from which all other people were benefited.

The Italian-Americans of Detroit played a glorious part in the Great War. They showed themselves as patriotic as the native born in offering the supreme sacrifice.

In all, I am informed, over 300,000 Italian-speaking soldiers enlisted in the American Army, almost 10 per cent of our total fighting force. Italians formed about 4 per cent of the population of the United States and they formed 10 per cent of the American military force. Their casualties were 12 per cent.

They were most highly praised by General Pershing and General Henry Allen, who both said there were no braver soldiers found in the American Army.

DETROIT SATISFIED WITH THE POLES

I wish to take the liberty of informing the House that from my personal knowledge and observation of tens of thousands of Polish-Americans living in my district in Detroit that their Americanism and patriotism are unassailable from any fair or just standpoint.

The Polish-Americans are as industrious and as frugal and as loyal to our institutions as any class of people who have come to the shores of this country in the past 300 years. They are essentially home builders, and they have come to this country to stay. They learn the English language as quickly as possible, and take pride in the rapidity with which they become assimilated and adopt our institutions.

Figures available to all show that in Detroit in the World War the proportion of American volunteers of Polish blood was greater than the proportion of Americans of any other racial descent; that during the operation of the draft law the number of exemptions sought by men of Polish descent was smaller in proportion than the proportion which population of Polish descent bears to the general population of the country; and that the purchase of Liberty bonds by people of Polish descent was far in excess of the proportionate wealth of these purchasers. In these great and significant tests of war time their Americanism was so well established that it can not be injured even by misinformation and misrepresentation.

Detroit sent thousands of Polish-Americans to the Great War. None excelled them in patriotism. Wayne County, in which Detroit is situated, shows a roll of honor of 874 dead. Of these heroes 145 bear Polish names, and, undoubtedly, there were other Poles of the 874 whose names did not betray their nationality. The "Polar Bears," who played a heroic part around Archangel in the desperate American expedition, which tried men's souls during the World War and after the armistice, were very largely Polish-Americans, and from Detroit, too.

Kosciusko, who planned the defenses of West Point and gave aid and comfort to Washington, was a Pole. Niemcewicz, who wrote the first biography of Washington, was a friend of the first American. Pulaski died at Savannah during the Revolutionary War that Americanism might be born. The Poles, under John Sobieski, drove back the barbarous Turks who threatened European civilization. Poland has been during the recent centuries the buffer State of Europe, repeatedly protecting with its blood and treasure the more fortunate Nordic peoples of further west.

Polish-Americans do not merit slander nor defamation. If not granted charitable or sympathetic judgment, they are at least entitled to justice and to the high place they have won in American and European history and citizenship.

The forces behind the Johnson bill and some of its champions in Congress charge that opposition to the racial discrimination feature of the 1890 quota basis arises from "foreign blocs." They would give the impression that 100 per cent Americans are for it and that the sympathies of its opponents are of the "foreign-bloc" variety, and bear stigma of being "hyphenates." I meet that challenge willingly. I feel my Americanism will stand any test.

EVERY AMERICAN HAD FOREIGN ANCESTORS

The foreign born of my district writhe under the charge of being called "hyphenates." The people of my own family were all hyphenates—English-Americans, German-Americans, Irish-Americans. They began to come in the first ship or so after the *Mayflower*. But they did not come too early to miss the charge of anti-Americanism. Roger Williams was driven out of the Puritan colony of Salem to die in the wilderness because he objected "violently" to blue laws and the burning or hanging of rheumatic old women on witchcraft charges. He would not "assimilate" and was "a grave menace to American institutions and democratic government."

My family put 11 men and boys into the Revolutionary War, and I am sure they and their women and children did not suffer so bitterly and sacrifice until it hurt to establish the autocracy of bigotry and intolerance which exists in many quarters to-day in this country. Some of these men and boys shed their blood and left their bodies to rot on American battle fields. To me real Americanism and the American flag are the product of the blood of men and of the tears of women and children of a different type than the rampant "Americanizers" of to-day.

My mother's father fought in the Civil War, leaving his six small children in Detroit when he marched away to the southern battle fields to fight against racial distinctions and protect his country.

My mother's little brother, about 14 years old, and the eldest child, fired by the traditions of his family, plodded off to the battle fields to do his bit. He aspired to be a drummer boy and inspire the men in battle, but he was found too small to carry a drum and was put at the ignominious task of driving army mules, hauling cannons and wagons.

I learned more of the spirit of American history at my mother's knee than I ever learned in my four years of high-school study of American history and in my five and a half years of study at the great University of Michigan.

All that study convinces me that the racial discriminations of this bill are un-American.

BILL FRANKLY DISCRIMINATES

That the bill was frankly intended to be discriminatory may be gathered from a statement by the chairman of the committee, Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON, after whom the bill is named. He said in the New York World of February 16, when the bill was being considered in committee:

And we may say, better than that, we have narrowed down the immigration field to the area of northern and western Europe. Virtually all the rest of the world is barred.

It must never be forgotten also that the Johnson bill, although it claims to favor the northern and western European peoples only, does so on a basis of comparison with the southern and western European peoples. The Johnson bill cuts down materially the number of immigrants allowed to come from northern and western Europe, the so-called Nordic peoples.

The following tables make more clear my statements and show the number of immigrants allowed to enter the United States under various plans:

Based on the 3 per cent quota of the census of 1910

Great Britain, North Ireland, and Irish Free State	77,342
Germany	68,059
Sweden	20,042
Austria	7,451
Belgium	1,563
Czechoslovakia	14,282
Greece	3,294
Hungary	5,638
Italy	42,057
Netherlands	3,607
Poland	25,827
Rumania	7,419
Russia	34,284
Yugoslavia	6,426

Based on the 2 per cent quota of the census of 1890

Great Britain, North Ireland, and Irish Free State	62,658
Germany	50,329
Sweden	9,761
Austria	1,190
Belgium	709
Czechoslovakia	2,073
Greece	235
Hungary	688
Lithuania	502
Italy	4,089
Netherlands	1,837
Poland	9,072
Rumania	831
Russia	1,992
Yugoslavia	935

On a 2 per cent basis, according to the census of 1910, the quota for the following would be:

Great Britain, North Ireland, and Irish Free State	51,762
Germany	45,272
Italy	28,238
Lithuania	1,952
Poland	20,852
Russia	16,470
Sweden	13,502
Czechoslovakia	11,572
Austria	5,094
Belgium	1,242
Greece	2,242
Hungary	4,032
Rumania	5,146
Yugoslavia	4,484

Aliens, civilian and military, admitted to citizenship during fiscal year ending June 30, 1923, arranged by nationalities

Country	Number	Per cent
Italy	24,874	17.14
Poland	22,621	15.59
Russia	17,190	11.85
Great Britain (except Canada)	16,953	11.68
Germany	12,064	8.31
Canada	6,546	4.51
Czechoslovakia	6,334	4.37
Austria	6,211	4.28
Hungary	5,850	4.03
Sweden	4,068	2.80
Serbs, Croats, Slovenes	3,032	2.09
Greece	2,920	2.01
Turkey	2,515	1.75
Rumania	2,367	1.63
Norway	2,346	1.62
Miscellaneous	2,030	1.40
Denmark	1,650	1.14
Holland	1,381	.95
France	1,010	.70
Finland	825	.57
Belgium	811	.56
Switzerland	762	.53
Portugal	386	.27
Spain	212	.15
Luxemburg	126	.09
Total	145,084	100.00

Citizenship granted during January, 1924

Country	Number	Per cent
Italy	2,465	18.40
Poland	2,227	16.62
Russia	1,370	10.23
Germany	913	6.81
Czechoslovakia	713	5.33
Hungary	421	3.13
Greece	391	2.29
Austria	384	2.87
Yugoslavia	343	2.56
Sweden	298	2.31
Turkey	256	1.91
Rumania	255	1.90
Norway	166	1.24
Denmark	136	1.02
Holland	105	.78
France	97	.71
Finland	79	.59
Switzerland	75	.55
Belgium	64	.47
Portugal	39	.29
Spain	29	.22
Bulgaria	17	.13
Central and South America	17	.13
Mexico	12	.09
Luxemburg	4	.03
Montenegro	2	.01
Reinstated Americans	219	1.57
Different nationality	146	1.09
Total	13,399	100.00

In conclusion, I hope I have made clear to the gentlemen of this House why I will not vote for the racial-discrimination features of the Johnson bill.

I am in favor of restriction of immigration. I would rather vote for total exclusion of all immigrants for three or five years than vote for the Johnson bill.

There has been much misapprehension and much misrepresentation on the immigration question. There never was a chance in the past few years to have the United States overwhelmed by aliens. The present law in effect, passed in 1921, cut down immigration to 357,803 immigrants per year. That was divided 55 per cent for Nordic peoples and 45 per cent for southern and eastern Europe peoples.

In 1913 and 1914 over 900,000 immigrants came to the United States from southern and eastern Europe alone, and that was what caused the outcry. But that was stopped by the law of 1921.

The Colt bill, satisfactory to everybody but the radical exclusionists, cuts immigration still further from 3 per cent to 2 per cent of the 1910 quota, or to 238,539 persons, a loss of 119,264. The proportion is still 55 per cent Nordic and 45 per cent other peoples.

Senator COLT figures that when proper deductions are made about 80,000 only per year of southern and eastern Europeans can enter the United States, and all of these are highly hand picked, physically, morally, and mentally. Surely these are no menace among 120,000,000.

I think the Colt bill, reported by the Senate Immigration Committee, is much more fair than the Johnson bill. I would vote for the Colt bill or a percentage of the 1920 census, such as 1 or 2 per cent quotas, rather than the Johnson bill.

Then I would be true to the principles for which my forefathers fought and true to the real spirit of the magnificent United States of to-day. I can not stultify myself by voting for the present bill and overwhelm my country with racial hatreds and racial lines and antagonisms drawn even tighter than they are to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. RAKER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VARE]. There are two gentlemen who desire five minutes apiece, and I have to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We can not do that. We will be a little bit liberal when we get under the five-minute rule.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have listened with much interest to many speeches made this afternoon and to-night.

I wish to join in protesting against the reflection on the vast number of good Americans that this legislation obviously casts. The reasons for the passage of such legislation, in the main, are selfish or local. A broad view of the situation reveals no logical reason for our great Nation to discriminate against any people.

The Constitution of the United States insures the citizens of this Nation religious liberty, freedom of speech, and the right of assembly. This is the basis of our free Government. It stands also as an invitation to the peoples of the world to come here that they might enjoy this freedom.

The legislation under consideration and against which I wish to state my objections denies the freedom of our shores to those for whom it is most needed. The cry is that great numbers of immigrants from the soviet lands of Russia will spread Russian ideas to the minds of our unthinking. In this the advocates of restrictive legislation are wrong. Practically all of the Russians and Poles and the Jewish peoples of other nations coming to this country are satisfied that the so-called liberal forms of government are bad and so inform us when they arrive.

PERSONAL OBSERVATION

There is another phase of this matter to which I wish to call attention, and that is this: My observation of the foreigner—and I have had considerable to do with him, both in private life as well as in the execution of great contracts in Philadelphia and places adjacent thereto—I used to pay off on pay day sometimes to the extent of 5,000 persons, and I never yet had a foreigner of Italian extraction seek more pay than he was entitled to. I say that from my observation of these people, when you are forming your opinion about immigrants, unless you have had something personal to do with them, you should not form your conclusions from what you may read in newspapers. [Applause.]

Another argument used against the incoming of the peoples of southern Europe is that the average family of these people is large. Why this should be raised as an objection I can not say. It has not been so long since Theodore Roosevelt, while President, was cheered for his advocacy of just this.

Dr. Harry H. Laughlin, an investigator for the Government, tries to explain this objection by saying that the nation will be flooded by people of an inferior race. This can not be substantiated, and from personal experience of more than 35 years with the immigrant from southern Europe, both in business and in politics, I wish to say there is no ground for this base libel on a good people.

The average immigrant from southern Europe—and I might say there are but few exceptions—has a sense of honesty comparable to any native-born American; has a love for his adopted country greater than many who have descended from our first families, and a spirit to progress that is commendable.

In my experience of 10 years as recorder of deeds of Philadelphia I had in my employ in that great office force many men of Italian and Jewish extraction. The high order of efficiency of that office was due in a measure to the splendid, honest, and intelligent service given by them.

I was especially impressed with the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] when he referred to the fact there is absolutely no provision in the bill to prevent the virtual unloading of Mexicans into our country. One other Member from an agricultural section of the country referred to immigrants of Italian and Jewish extraction. I happened to have had considerable experience and personal contact with this class of immigrants. In my home in Philadelphia I virtually have kept open house for the last 30 years, and people of all classes come there. In times of panic and in times of distress I have a great many more visitors than in

times of great prosperity. I want you men from the agricultural sections to know that in all my experience I never have had an Italian immigrant or one of Italian extraction come to my door soliciting alms. I have never had a man or woman of Jewish extraction, either, come and ask for aid, regardless of what the conditions of employment may have been. I can not say that about some of the so-called native Americans. I was born in a section of Philadelphia almost adjacent to my present home. Some other speaker has said that these men of foreign extraction deposit their money in saving funds for the purpose of sending it to foreign shores. Why, gentlemen, my next-door neighbor, a man of foreign extraction, lives in a $50,000 house. Along South Broad Street, which is our main thoroughfare in Philadelphia, men of foreign extraction, the sons and daughters of these immigrants, live in homes costing anywhere from $10,000 to $45,000 and $50,000. They are among the most prosperous people in the community—men who come from those southern and southeastern European nations.

NOT HONEST RESTRICTION

If this bill was to honestly restrict immigration of all peoples, less could be said against it. We find, however, in actual figures that the difference between 2 per cent of the 1890 census figures and the 3 per cent of the 1910 census—now effective, and which I also opposed—is only 19,000 persons. It does not materially restrict immigration, but the change in the basis of calculation does restrict a class of immigration which includes in the main the Italian and Jewish peoples. That should not be.

The question of the American labor market, as it is some times called, is one which should not be overlooked. The immigrant proposed for exclusion is among the best that can be had. Our great national projects of road building, construction of homes and public buildings, great subways, and railroad lines depend on the Italian immigrant. He is able to follow both skilled and unskilled trades the American-born boy has been taught to avoid.

The second generation attends school and enjoys the same advantages as any other American-born youth and takes the same opportunity to enter the white-collar class, so called. So it further reflects the great need of industry for the immigrant, who is an important part of our national system.

The State of Pennsylvania has laws restricting child labor. It is those laws that insure to every child in that State enough education to make him strive for something better. It is those laws which keep the American-born youth from our unskilled trades. If immigration is stopped the only salvation this Nation will have for meeting this great need for unskilled labor is the repeal of the child labor laws. This all of us would deplore.

Philadelphia sees no objection to the immigrant. It takes him in and makes a good American of him. Communities not able to do this should find the wrong in themselves and correct it. The immigrant is educated, and I am proud to say, in a large number of cases by my political friends, to purchase his home; to file his intention to become a citizen; and to study the rudiments of loyalty to our flag. If this was done—and it should be done in all parts of our land—there would be no outcry against immigration except from the very selfish who believe their opportunities are hampered by the ambitions of new blood.

Let us defeat this effort to further curb the coming to this country of the friends and families of our citizens and citizens to be of Italian and Jewish extraction. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY] has waited all of yesterday and all of to-day for the opportunity to speak.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We will be a little bit liberal in the debate under the five-minute rule. I now yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL]. I have to do that.

Mr. SABATH. How much time does the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The time runs out by limitation at 11 o'clock.

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, do not do that.

Mr. RAKER. Five minutes will suffice for the gentleman from Mississippi. Let us give him five minutes.

Mr. BUSBY. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ASWELL. I yield him five minutes, if I am permitted to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. BUSBY. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. RAKER. Then yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, like the gentlemen who preceded me, I have been, I am, and I will continue to be for America and for everything for which America and American institutions stand. [Applause.] I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from Louisiana, who states he has so thoroughly studied the question abroad, has not seen fit to come before the Committee on Immigration and give it the benefit of his views, his experiences, and the information which he has obtained. However, I have been given to understand that he has been extremely occupied in delivering speeches throughout the country on the question of immigration; also, several other gentlemen have been circling the country, delivering attacks against the immigrant. In view of such activity, is it any wonder that the Members of the House have heard from people who have been carried away by denouncements and, I am obliged to say, gross misstatements that the restriction lecturers have been and are making?

The gentleman from Louisiana informed us that in conjunction with Secretary of Labor Davis he made a trip to Europe last year aboard the palatial steamship *Leviathan*, occupying, as I am informed, the most sumptuous suite to be had. Naturally, after enjoying all the luxuries and comforts of such quarters, he could not so easily adjust himself to the conditions he described as having seen among the poor, unfortunate, suffering people of Poland and other sections of Europe that he visited. However, I surmise that if the gentleman would visit the laboring districts of the larger towns and cities of his State, he would also find places that are not fitted out as lavishly as those in the richer and more prosperous other sections of his State. I wish to inform the gentleman that many years ago, long before 1890 and several times since, I visited some of the cities of his State, and I was amazed at the conditions under which the people, not only in his but also in the adjoining States, lived. And there was none of the newer immigrants in those cities that I visited either. But I shall not attempt to make capital out of the misfortunes of the poor people of his or any other State. However, I sincerely hope that since that time the deplorable conditions in the gentleman's State have improved as much as they have in States and sections of our country to which immigrants are welcomed and live. I also hope that the unfortunate conditions which the gentleman witnessed abroad are improving and that there is less suffering, less misery, less want, and less hardship.

With regard to the conditions which the gentleman described, let me say to him, though I have never been in Poland nor in the other countries he has mentioned, I do know the people coming from those countries. I have lived among them and with them and I know that the sanitary conditions he has described abroad do not exist here. Oh that the gentleman had given a portion of the time that he spent in Europe to investigate the foreign-born here in our own country. I know that he would have been compelled to admit that their living conditions equaled and, in many instances, excelled that of communities where none of the foreign born reside. It is unfortunate indeed that the gentleman has not taken into consideration that the deplorable conditions he found these people in was not of their own making. They were not responsible for the cruelties and the hardships of the war, or the misery that wars bring about. They did not deliberately leave their homes or destroy their belongings. They were the victims of a cruel war, and if the gentleman will read the history of the reconstruction periods of war-ridden countries he will find that without exception they have been stalked by want and misery. It is because of these unfortunate conditions under which these people are obliged to live, especially since the war, that they must now endure their present hardships, trials, and tribulations. Their hope and dream is that they may be permitted to go to some other country where they again before they die have an opportunity to earn by honest labor enough to provide a living for those near and dear to them. They read of great America, of what a wonderful and prosperous country it is, and can anyone wonder that they endure hardships and misery, without murmur, in their efforts and while awaiting opportunity to come to this great, glorious country of ours? Oh, I realize that we can not receive all of those who

would like to come. All I ask is that we do not discriminate against them just because they have suffered so much.

Mr. Chairman, knowing the American people as I do, I am inclined to the belief that if there had not been so many exaggerated and, in many instances, willfully distorted charges made in favor of this legislation, many of the members of the so-called patriotic orders that the gentlemen from Texas, Tennessee, and Washington describe as favoring this legislation would not have urged its passage.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I could talk the entire evening about the gross misstatements that have been made to create prejudice against the foreign born, and especially against the newer immigration, but time does not permit. All I wish is that some day I will have the privilege and opportunity to show the gentleman from Louisiana and others what the newer immigration has accomplished in the short period of time they have been here.

I know if I took them to my own city and to the adjoining towns, made up of not only American, German, Irish, and Scandinavian but of Polish, Bohemians, Slovenes, Jewish, Lithuanians, and other stock, and they could observe the children of these newer immigrants and their homes, their cleanliness, and their typical American spirit, it would cause them to exclaim, "What wonderful progress these thrifty people have accomplished in such a short time!" The gentleman has stated that there are hundreds of millions ready to come, and of course subtly impresses the House with the imagined imminent danger of their coming if we do not pass the proposed legislation.

Mr. ASWELL. I said 100,000,000.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman knows that under the present law, even if we did not do anything with the proposed bill, they could not come in under the 1917 restrictive immigration illiteracy act.

Mr. ASWELL. I said that 100,000,000 were eager to come; and if the restrictions were thrown down, they would come.

Mr. SABATH. I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana that not one-hundredth part of the number he has stated, namely, 100,000,000, could come, even though there be no legislation, because the 1917 act is restrictive and selective. It debars the criminal, the physically and mentally defective, paupers, persons liable to become public charges, and the illiterate and every possible class of undesirables. Mr. Chairman, let me point out that since that act was enacted, seven years ago, the net increase of immigration from Europe has been only 761,000, and consider, gentlemen, that only during the past two years the 3 per cent quota act has been in operation.

During the latter part of 1918 and early in 1919 the leader of the restrictionists, the late Mr. Burnett, of Alabama, introduced a bill to suspend immigration, having charged that millions were ready to come. At that time also the gentlemen from Washington and California made statements that 10,000,000 were in foreign ports waiting for transportation. All the professional publicists and propagandists, such as Kenneth L. Roberts, Trevor, Patten, Dawes, Wallis, as well as all of Lord Northcliff's periodicals and magazines, the same as now, worked overtime on the "imminent danger" of the influx of millions if we did not immediately close the doors. Yes; the newspapers of the country were filled with accounts of the thousands of typhus infected that were waiting to be unloaded and the many more thousands who were on the way. The country was greatly excited, and fears were entertained and expressed that an epidemic would sweep the country. The House passed the Burnett bill, but the Senate was not so easily carried away by this false hue and cry, and no legislation was enacted. And what happened, and what are the facts? I ask what are the real facts? Did these millions arrive? Did the terrible epidemic set in? I ask the chairman of the committee. I ask the gentlemen from California, Colorado, and Texas how many arrived? Were the statements and articles published at that time justified and warranted? Has not time proven they were but vicious, libelous propaganda? You will not state the number that actually came, but I will.

Mr. Chairman, for the fiscal years 1919, 1920, and 1921, the three years after the war and before the 3 per cent quota law was enacted, 923,285 arrived from all the European countries and 556,209 departed, leaving a net increase of immigration for the three years before the quota percentage law went into effect of only 367,077, and most of these were the wives and children of American citizens. I challenge anyone to question the correctness of these figures, including the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Davis, his assistant secretaries, Mr. Henning and Mr. White, and their assistants, all of whom are not only writing articles of a prejudicial nature and reflecting upon the immigrant from eastern and southeastern Europe, but who are also delivering addresses and speeches in all parts of the country extolling British immigration.

Mr. Chairman, for weeks—yes, months—I have been observing how the professional propagandists, with their continuous multiplied figures and ridiculous charges, have been inflaming the membership of this House, not only with the undesirability of the so-called newer immigration but with the "grave and imminent" danger that they claim our country to-day faces. Consequently, I suggested and advocated the creation of a commission to investigate conditions and to secure information to enable us to legislate intelligently. I have even urged a reduction from 3 per cent to 2 per cent, based on the 1910 census, a reduction from 357,000 to 248,000. I have agreed to nearly all other restrictive provisions in the bill, and consequently there is no justification on the part of anyone to charge that millions will come if the bill is not adopted. I repeat, all these statements that are made are unwarranted and are not based on facts, but are made wholly for the purpose to a still greater degree to inflame and increase the resentment against the newer immigration. The gentlemen who are making these statements outside of those professional publicists do not realize the harm and injury they are causing. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I implore you to disregard these manufactured and alarm-creative statements and to examine sanely the actual facts and conditions.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] has also stated that over 300,000 have entered the United States illegally. Again, I do not know upon what grounds he bases these statements. Why, even the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], who from time to time makes extravagant statements as to the number coming, would not make such an assertion. If some come illegally, they nearly all come from Mexico and Canada, which is not due to the law but to the failure of enforcing it. May I ask what has the gentleman from Louisiana or the committee done to protect our borders against surreptitious entry and smuggling outside of talking about it? While I am discussing Mexico and Canada I want to place in the RECORD statistics of immigration and emigration from those countries from 1917, the year the restrictive illiteracy act was enacted, to March, 1924. I wonder if the gentleman will express astonishment when he learns that the net increase of immigration from Canada and Mexico nearly equals that of Europe for the same seven-year period. I hope this table will at least claim his passing attention, because the figures therein are compiled from the United States census reports and that of the Commissioner of Immigration:

[From Report of Commissioner of Immigration, 1923]

Canadian and Mexican immigration and emigration, 1917 to 1923, inclusive

IMMIGRATION		
CANADA		
1917	105,399	
1918	32,452	
1919	57,782	
1920	90,025	
1921	72,317	
1922	46,810	
1923	117,011	
		521,796
MEXICO		
1917	17,869	
1918	18,524	
1919	29,818	
1920	52,361	
1921	30,758	
1922	19,951	
1923	63,768	
		233,049
Total Canadian-Mexican immigration		754,845
EMIGRATION		
CANADA		
1917	18,994	
1918	27,170	
1919	10,726	
1920	7,668	
1921	5,456	
1922	4,480	
1923	2,775	
		77,269
MEXICO		
1917	812	
1918	25,515	
1919	18,000	
1920	6,606	
1921	5,705	
1922	6,285	
1923	2,660	
		65,583
Total Canadian-Mexican emigration		142,852
Total Canadian-Mexican immigration, 1917 to 1923		754,845
Total Canadian-Mexican emigration, 1917 to 1923		142,852
Net increase immigration, 1917 to 1923		611,993

Mr. Chairman, I want to make this observation in connection with the above table: I have given the immigration and emigration figures for Canada and Mexico for the seven-year period—1917 to 1923. I have just obtained the figures for nine months of the present fiscal year; that is, from July 1, 1923, to March 31, 1924, and find that the net immigration from Canada for the nine months is 161,330 and the net immigration from Mexico for the same period is 62,077, making a grand total of net immigration from Canada and Mexico of 223,407. And who will deny that the immigration from these two countries for the remaining three months of the fiscal year will not bring the number to above 300,000? Where, oh where, Mr. Chairman, are those champions of "Keep America for Americans" and those who are advocating this legislation to protect American standards and wages? The gentlemen from Texas, Louisana, Colorado, California, Oregon, and Washington, suffering with immigration dangeritis, with their visions glued to our front gateways of entry, have totally overlooked the ingress of Mexican and Canadian immigrants through the side and back portals of entry. And, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, consider that this immigration has not been made subject to the quota limitations. The door is kept open for them.

Mr. Chairman, I do not hear from them that there is grave danger of "Little Mexico's" and "Little Canada's" pushing back the native stock of these States beyond their boundary lines. But the time is not too late for the gentlemen to act and to stand by that doctrine of "Equal justice to all, special privilege to none." I assure them of my heartiest cooperation and that of nearly a hundred of my colleagues, representing cities and industrial centers, who will join hands in amending the law so that these countries will be placed on an equal percentage basis of quota limits as recommended by restrictions, who, however, do not favor this discriminatory bill. Time does not permit me to inquire for the main reasons why the majority of the committee who have so "arduously" investigated the present immigration situation overlooked a phase of the question which I feel should be of great importance to the States they represent. Or did the facts, as given by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HUDSPETH] which appear in the hearings of the Committee on Immigration, influence them? The part of the report which I shall quote appears on pages 70 and 71 of the hearings entitled "Emergency Immigration Legislation," Sixty-sixth Congress, third session, 1921:

In making this comparative statement your investigators are of the opinion that a dire and imperative need was met in making the exceptions and permitting Mexican labor to enter this country on easy terms to meet the abnormal demand for common labor. The fact that this country comprises a large area, and that our industries, particularly agriculture, must expand to meet an increasing population, makes imperative a similar increase in common labor to meet the demands of expansion.

The increase of sugar-beet acreage of the country indicates the growing demand for labor in that industry alone. The following table is a summary of the United States sugar-beet acreage, as compiled by the statistical divisions of the sugar companies:

State	1920	1919	1918	1917
Colorado	260,514	230,348	141,508	183,600
Michigan	153,000	138,298	123,627	109,450
California	136,783	130,168	126,989	190,200
Utah	112,000	110,200	90,478	91,100
Nebraska	81,689	67,644	46,069	54,194
Idaho	56,500	54,700	40,500	46,500
Ohio	52,050	47,462	45,376	21,300

The number of sugar-beet refineries in operation this year will aggregate 98. Utah will hold first place by operating 20 refineries, Colorado next with 18, while Michigan will operate 17.

According to the generally accepted estimate that one laborer is needed for each 10 acres, the growing and harvesting of the 1920 beet crop will require 97,500.

In some quarters there has been developed a strong opposition to immigration, and in some of the arguments against the immigration of certain aliens there is a general acquiescence in the opposition; but it can be said so far as the Mexican is concerned, he presents certain economic advantages not possessed by other nationalities.

The acreage of sugar beets, and likewise cotton, is expanding, and these two industries require manual laborers in increasing numbers.

Other elements enter into this problem. They are questions of wages and conditions. The southern portion of those States resting on the Mexican border has been known as the low-wage section. Mexicans coming across the border in normal times have not always been able to secure adequate remuneration for their labor in the sections referred to; but as the war created new demands for labor in all sections, wages of Mexican labor rose in accordance therewith. It would be presumptuous to make the positive statement that Mexicans in all parts of the West were receiving adequate remuneration for services performed, but it can be said that the remuneration received by the large body of Mexicans now employed in the beet fields, cotton fields, and upon the railroads is a wage which ranges from 100 to 300 per cent greater than before the war. It undoubtedly is true that in some localities where Mexicans are employed the conditions are not what they ought to be, but the fact that there has been such an imperative need for laborers has brought home to the employers of this class of labor the imperative necessity of continually improving conditions, so that the laborers employed can be retained.

Another feature of the situation is the illegal entry of Mexicans. It has been impossible for the Immigration Service to maintain an adequate patrol on the Mexican border because of lack of funds, thus opening the way for illegal entrance.

This report shows the deplorable practice, but the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] has insisted that conditions on the Mexican border are now still worse. Consequently, I have frequently been asked why these gentlemen who are the most persistent and insistent to restrict European immigration do not accept the recommendations of the Secretary of Labor and subject Mexico and Canada also to the quota limitations? Especially as the evidence also discloses that Mexicans are imported in great numbers to Texas, and to Colorado and Michigan, where they are needed in the sugar-beet industry, and there is no limitation on Canadian immigration because it helps to supply the labor needed in fishing and other industries in New England. The substance of these inquiries directed to me was whether these facts had any bearing on the action of members of the committee. These inquiries I have been unable to answer, but I will state that I feel that the Pacific Coast States, Texas, and Colorado, as well as some of the other Western States close to the Mexican border, and the Canadian border States, such as Maine and Michigan, will be benefited and will have the advantage over the manufacturing sections in the Northern and Middle Western States, because it goes without saying they will be enabled to continue to draw needed labor from Mexico and Canada. The North Central and the Northeastern States will be denied that advantage and will be compelled, as in the past three or four years, to draw upon the South. What effect this will have on the South, and, on the other hand, on sections drawing this colored labor, has not received the slightest consideration on the part of the committee. I will not charge that the Members of those States have been and are influenced by these facts. As I have stated before, they may have taken these facts into consideration; but my best guess is that the main reason is the prejudice against the newer immigration and the insistence of the Ku-Klux Klan organization, which has served notice that this legislation must pass.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] and others deplore the facts about the "miserable creatures" that are coming into this country now. I hold in my hand the annual report of the managers of the Society for the Prevention of Pauperism, printed in 1820, and which reports on the year 1819. The gentleman from Louisiana and others, I think, must have read this report, because in many instances my friends from Tennessee, Messrs. MCREYNOLDS and TAYLOR, have used to-day the same verbiage that I find in this report. Listen, this is what they said in 1819, 105 years ago:

First as to the immigration from foreign countries, the managers are compelled to speak of this in the language of astonishment and apprehension.

Later on they go on and state:

Many of them arrive here destitute of everything. When they do arrive, instead of seeking the interior, they cluster in our cities or sojourn along the seaboard, depending upon the incidents of charity or depredations for subsistence.

The author of a paper, published in 1835, compares the immigration of earlier years with that of his day, and says:

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 good, from enlightened mechanic and artisan and intelligent husbandman. Now the accession of immigration is that 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.

I also quote from an address delivered at a meeting of delegates of the Native American National Convention, held in Philadelphia, July 4, 1845:

It is an uncontrovertible 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 inbued with foreign feelings and of an ignorant and immoral character.

And that, gentlemen, was 79 years ago. I could read here for half an hour what they said about immigration in the early days of our Republic. The quotations which I have read did not refer to present or the newer immigration. It was about the Anglo-Saxon immigration. By the eternal gods, there is no one here who will say, or dare to say, that those people who came then, though feared and assailed as they were, have not made good! I defy anyone to say that they have not made good, and this applies to those that came after them—the Germans, the Irish, French, Norwegians, Scandinavians, Swedes, Bohemians, Poles, Lithuanians, and other Slavic as well as the Latin races, and of all religious denominations, as they followed each other in turn.

Mr. Chairman, I have only a few minutes remaining, but before I conclude I want to say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TINCHER] that I believe it would be beneficial and interesting to him to familiarize himself with the history, life, and accomplishments of the foreign born in the United States and with the progress of our country since 1880 when the newer immigration began to come to the United States. I feel satisfied that if he would he will not again charge that these newer citizens came to tear down our institutions and as being dangerous to the welfare of our country. He will find that since 1880 our country has made the greatest progress in its history. He will find that the value of farm property in the United States in 1890 was $16,082,376,000 and that its value in 1920 was $77,000,000,000, or four and one-half times as much in 30 years. The value of farm products in 1890 was $2,460,107,454, and in 1920, 30 years later, due to immigration and the wealth which it created, the value of farm products increased to $21,425,623,614, or 10 times as much as it was in 1890.

Mr. Chairman, it is continuously charged that the so-called newer immigrant does not go on the farm. I concede that they will not go on the farm in certain States and sections of our country where they are not appreciated or are not wanted. But let us examine the column of the table, which follows herewith, which gives the number of persons engaged in farming from 1890 to 1920:

Year	Number of farms	Persons engaged in farming	Value of farms and farm property	Value of products
1880	4,008,907	7,663,043	$12,180,501,538	$2,212,540,927
1890	4,564,641	9,038,825	16,082,267,689	2,460,107,454
1900	5,737,372	10,248,935	20,439,901,164	4,717,069,973
1910	6,361,502	12,384,517	40,991,449,090	8,498,311,413
1920	6,448,343	10,661,410	77,924,100,338	21,425,623,614

And what do we find? That in 1880, 7,663,043 persons were engaged in farming and as immigration grew from 1880 to 1890 they increased to 9,038,825, and in 1910 the number of persons so engaged numbered 12,384,517, or an increase in 30 years of over 70 per cent. From 1910 to 1920 immigration slackened and the yearly average for those 10 years was approximately only 165,000. For that period, 1910–1920, we find the persons engaged in farming to be 10,661,410, a reduction from the 1910 figures of 1,723,107. Do not these figures clearly and positively refute the charge that the newer immigrants, who are to be discriminated against in this bill, do not go on the farms? In this contention I am also borne out in the increase in the number of farms from 1880 to 1920, showing the negligible increase in farms between 1910 and 1920, notwithstanding the tremenduous development in the way of the large number of reclamation districts, which bears out the statement of many representatives of various State agricultural organizations that the decrease in the newer immigration has resulted in an increased number of abandoned farms, as is also shown by the report of the Secretary of Agriculture for the year 1923. Appreciating that anything I might say now will not have the weight or carry the force of the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture, I quote from page 8 of his report of 1923:

Our estimates indicate that the net change in population from the farm to the town in 1922 was around 1,200,000. This drift is taking place not alone in those sections where agricultural depression is being felt most keenly just now but throughout the country. This is illustrated in a number of ways. For example, 4.7 per cent of the habitable farmhouses were vacant in 1920; 5.7 per cent in 1921; and 7.3 per cent in 1922. A recent study indicates that in 1922 farmers occupied 86.3 per cent of the habitable farmhouses as compared with 88.4 per cent in 1921 and 89.7 per cent in 1920.

I will append to my remarks detailed statistics as to the wealth of the Nation, individual deposits in savings banks, the number of students in public schools, colleges, universities, and professional schools, and so forth:

From the following statistics you will note that the population of the United States in 1890 was 63,056,000, and in 1920 it was 106,418,000, an increase of about 60 per cent. The wealth of the Nation increased during that period from $65,000,000,000 to $290,000,000,000, or 450 per cent.

Wealth of Nation

Year	Population	Total wealth	Per capita
1850	23,191,000	$7,135,780,000	$307.69
1860	31,443,000	16,159,616,000	513.93
1870	38,558,000	30,068,000,000	779.83
1880	50,155,000	43,642,000,000	870.20
1890	63,056,000	65,037,000,000	1,035.57
1900	76,129,000	88,517,000,000	1,117.01
1912	95,097,000	187,739,000,000	1,965.00
1920	106,418,000	290,000,000,000	2,689.34

The increase in individual bank deposits for the 30-year period 1890 to 1920 is over 400 per cent.

Individual deposits of United States savings banks

1880	$819,106,973
1890	1,550,023,956
1900	2,389,719,954
1910	4,070,486,247
1920	6,536,596,000

I will also ask that you examine the following table, which gives startling figures as to the tremendous increase of students in our colleges and universities. Fifty-five thousand six hundred and eighty-seven students were in attendance at our colleges and universities in 1890, as compared to 441,358 who were enrolled in 1920, representing an increase of nearly 800 per cent. The attendance in the public schools for the same period increased about 90 per cent.

Students in public schools, colleges, universities, and professional schools

Year	Public schools	Colleges, etc.
1880	9,867,505	38,227
1890	12,722,581	55,687
1900	15,503,110	98,923
1910	17,813,852	163,019
1920	21,578,316	441,358

Do these figures indicate that the newer immigration is endangering our institutions or standards of living when since their coming eight times as many people can send their sons and daughters to schools of higher learning? The well-to-do could always send their children to colleges; and therefore this tremendous increase in the last 20 years in attendance in our universities is due to the improved conditions of the middle and laboring classes. Consequently the charges that immigration is endangering our standards of living and citizenship is hardly justifiable—in fact is just as preposterous and deserves as much credence as the celebrated Laughlin eugenic and anthropological and the Trevor Army intelligence tests.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my time is nearly up, but I hope during the debate under the five-minute rule I shall be able to further enlighten you and give you additional facts which will prove that the new immigration has not been detrimental; that the country does not need to fear the coming of about 240,000 white people that will be permitted to enter if the 1910 in lieu of the 1890 census is adopted; and that our institutions will not be undermined and our country destroyed.

Any man who is not warped with prejudice must concede that to-day we are a better and stronger race than any in the world. We have surpassed every other nation in commerce, wealth, and progress, as well as in art, science, literature, and culture, in which to no small degree we have been aided by the newer immigrant whom you would treat so unjustly in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SANDERS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7995) to limit the immigration of aliens into the United States, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Washingon. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 9, 1924, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 21. A bill to amend the patent and trade-mark laws, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 470). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2736. A bill authorizing use of Government buildings at Fort Crockett, Tex., for occupancy during State convention of Texas Shriners; without amendment (Rept. No. 471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LaGUARDIA: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 3261. A bill to authorize and provide for the payment of the amounts expended in the construction of hangars and the maintenance of flying fields for the use of the Air Mail Service of the Post Office Department; with an amendment (Rept. No. 472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SINNOTT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 8366. A bill to add certain lands to the Santiam National Forest; without amendment (Rept. No. 474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TEMPLE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. J. Res. 204. A joint resolution requesting the President to invite the Interparliamentary Union to meet in Washington City in 1925, and authorizing an appropriation to defray the expenses of the meeting; with amendments (Rept. No. 475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. COLE of Iowa: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1698. An act granting permission to Commander Dorr F. Tozier, United States Coast Guard, retired, to accept a gift from the King of Great Britain; without amendment (Rept. No. 473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the consideration of the bill (S. 667) granting to the State of Utah the Fort Duchesne Reservation for its use as a branch agricultural college, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 8518) to amend the act entitled "An act to readjust the pay and allowances of the commissioned and enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service," approved June 10, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 8519) to regulate the interstate shipment of firearms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PRALL: A bill (H. R. 8520) providing increased facilities and improvements at the United States Marine Hospital, Stapleton, Staten Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 8521) to establish a national military park at the battle field of Yorktown; to the committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 8522) granting to certain claimants the preference right to purchase unappropriated public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNG: A bill (H. R. 8523) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Jamestown, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia (by request): A bill (H. R. 8524) to amend an act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: A bill (H. R. 8525) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to amend, in his discretion, contracts for the erection of the Edward Hines, jr., Hospital; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ROMJUE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 238) providing for the calling of a conference of governors of the various States for the purpose of furnishing relief to the masses of the taxpayers of the country, and particularly to furnish relief by lessening the burdens of taxation to a more reasonable status on the agricultural lands of the various States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 8526) for the relief of Hiram T. Duncan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 8527) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Bender; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 8528) granting a pension to Ruth Crouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FREE: A bill (H. R. 8529) for the examination and survey of Redwood City Harbor, Calif., with a view of securing increased depth and width in the channels in the bay and river and across the bar; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GLATFELTER: A bill (H. R. 8530) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8531) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8532) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Strayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 8533) to make a preliminary survey of the Arkansas River and its tributaries, Grand River and Verdigris River, and the Canadian River and its tributaries, including the North Canadian and Deep Fork Rivers, in Oklahoma, with a view to the control of their floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: A bill (H. R. 8534) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 8535) for the relief of T. T. Newlee; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 8536) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TINCHER: A bill (H. R. 8537) granting a pension to Mary E. Metlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 8538) for the relief of Frank A. Forsland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WARD of New York: A bill (H. R. 8539) for the relief of Edward J. Wortman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8540) for the relief of Helene M. Hubrich; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8541) granting a pension to Charles Trowbridge, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELSH: A bill (H. R. 8542) for the relief of the Delaware River Towing Line; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WYANT: A bill (H. R. 8543) granting an increase of pension to Harriet E. Brothers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2229. By Mr. ALDRICH: Petition of Court Libia No. 49, Foresters of America, Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2230. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of Veterans of Foreign Wars, Lynn, Mass., relative to national defense act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2231. By Mr. CRAMTON: Petition of John Skirlo and other residents of Tuscola County, Mich., urging favorable action on the Berger bill (H. R. 4081); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2232. Also, petition of W. C. McPhee and other residents of Huron County, Mich., urging drastic restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2233. By Mr. CURRY: Petition of California Civic League of Women Voters, San Francisco, Calif., against adoption of the women's equal rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2234. Also, petition of certain members of the Shop Associations of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway system, protesting against any change in the transportation act of 1920 at the present time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2235. By Mr. DOYLE: Petition of City Council of Chicago, Ill., protesting against the enactment of the McNary-Haugen export corporation bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2236. By Mr. FREDERICKS: Petitions of citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment into law of the Brookhart-Hull bills, relating to unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2237. Also, petitions of citizens of California, favoring the passage of Senate bill 2000, relating to copyrights; to the Committee on Patents.

2238. By Mr. GARBER: Petition of citizens of Fairview, Okla., urging passage of the Johnson bill on immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2239. By Mr. HUDSPETH: Petition of citizens of Kerrville, Tex., asking drastic restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2240. By Mr. LEAVITT: Petition of 200 members of the Belt (Mont.) union of the United Mine Workers of America, urging passage of the Johnson immigration bill, with immigration on a 2 per cent basis, 1890 census; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2241. Also, petition of Mrs. E. T. Lake and 55 other citizens of Livingston, Mont., urging passage of the Johnson immigration bill, with the 2 per cent quota provision based on the 1890 census; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2242. Also, petition of David Hamptman and 33 other citizens of Gardiner and Jardine, Mont., and Yellowstone Park, Wyo., indorsing the Johnson immigration bill, with the 2 per cent quota provision based on the 1890 census; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2243. Also, petition of Effie M. Barr and 43 other citizens of Livingston and other towns in Park County, Mont., indorsing the Johnson immigration bill, with the 2 per cent quota provision based on the 1890 census; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2244. Also, petition of M. J. Gwinner and 52 other citizens of Livingston, Mont., indorsing the Johnson immigration bill, with the 2 per cent quota provision based on the 1890 census; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2245. Also, petition of Dr. S. E. Leard and 13 other citizens of Livingston and Wilsall, Mont., urging passage of the Johnson immigration bill, with the 2 per cent quota provision based on the 1890 census; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2246. Also, petition of Orpha Baille and 21 other citizens of Livingston, Mont., urging enactment of the Johnson immigration bill, with the 2 per cent quota provision based on the 1890 census; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2247. Also, petition of Yellowstone Park Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Livingston, Mont., urging the enactment of rigid immigration legislation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2248. Also, petition of A. H. Hopkins and 166 other citizens of Billings and Roundup, Mont., indorsing the Johnson immigration bill, with the 2 per cent quota provision based on the 1890 census; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2249. Also, petition of Alfred E. Anderson and 30 other citizens of Sioux Pass, Mont., urging enactment of rigid immigration legislation, using the 1890 census as the basis for determining the number of aliens to be admitted from foreign countries; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2250. Also, petition of Carbon County Trades and Labor Assembly, Red Lodge, Mont., indorsing the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2251. Also, petition of the Red Lodge, Mont., local union of the United Mine Workers of America, urging passage of the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2252. Also, petition of W. B. Denney and 240 other citizens of Billings, Mont., urging enactment of the Johnson immigration bill, with the 2 per cent quota provision based on the 1890 census; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2253. Also, petition of F. J. Ryan and 48 other citizens of Forsyth and Glendive, Mont., urging enactment of restricted immigration legislation, with the 2 per cent quota provision based on the 1890 census; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2254. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Traffic Club of the Brooklyn Chamber of Commerce, favoring legislation embodied in provisions of Senate bill 2704; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2255. Also, petition of Jamaica Branch, No. 562, N. A. L. C., that efforts be made to prevent any method of classifying post offices that would take Jamaica, N. Y., an integral part of New York City, out of the cities of the first class, which would occur if post offices are to be graded according to receipts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2256. Also, petition of W. D. Smith, traffic manager William Wrigley, jr., Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing rigid application of the long-and-short-haul principle of Gooding bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2257. Also, petition of New York State Department, Disabled American Veterans of World War, requesting that legislation in favor of disabled veterans be given precedence over pending legislation; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2258. By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of Buffalo Chapter, American Association of Engineers, urging the passage of House bill 6896, abolishing the Personnel Classification Board; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2259. Also, petition of Chapter No. 6, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Liberty, N. Y., favoring passage of disabled veterans' legislation this Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

2260. Also, petition of 30 citizens of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the Dill bill (S. 2796) regarding radio broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2261. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Petition of A. L. Bigham and other citizens of Minneapolis, urging the enforcement of our present laws and enacting any new legislation that will tend to make the eighteenth amendment effective; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2262. By Mr. PRALL: Petition of Staten Island (N. Y.) Civic League, indorsing the Edge-Kelly bill (S. 1808 and H. R. 4123); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2263. By Mr. ROUSE: Petition of citizens of Covington, Kenton County, Ky., indorsing the immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2264. By Mr. SITES: Petition of members of the Fourth Reformed Church of Harrisburg, Pa., indorsing the Johnson immigration bill, and the 1890 census to be used as a basis in determining the quota; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2265. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of common council of city of Ogdenburg, protesting against the diversion of water from Lake Michigan by the Sanitary District of Chicago; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2266. By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: Petition of citizens of Harrison County, Ky., and Louisa and Glenwood, Ky., indorsing the Johnson immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

2267. By Mr. YOUNG: Petitions of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Ellendale, N. Dak.; Presbyterian Church, Edgeley, N. Dak.; Methodist Episcopal Church, Edgeley, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Edgeley, N. Dak.; City and Study Club, Edgeley, N. Dak.; War Mothers of Leeds, N. Dak.; Community Congregational Church of Leeds, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Leeds, N. Dak.; Bethany Young People's Society, of Rugby, N. Dak.; Kommunity Klub of Kintyre, N. Dak.; and Bethany Ladies' Aid Society, of Rugby, N. Dak., protesting against any modification of the Federal prohibition law which would legalize 2.75 per cent beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2268. Also, petitions of the Civic and Study Club, of Edgeley, N. Dak., and Woman's Literary Club, of Carrington, N. Dak., that production of narcotics should be restricted to the medical and scientific needs of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2269. Also, petitions of 10 citizens of Balfour, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Rolla, N. Dak.; Methodist Episcopal Church, of Ellendale, N. Dak.; Congregational Church, of Carrington, N. Dak.; Lutheran Church, of Cooperstown, N. Dak.; Baptist Church, of Bottineau, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of La Moure, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Bismarck, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Minnewaukan, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Esmond, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Carrington,

N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Towner, N. Dak.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Rugby, N. Dak.; and First Lutheran Ladies' Aid, of Rugby, N. Dak., protesting against any modification of the Federal prohibition law which would legalize 2.75 per cent beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2270. Also, petitions of S. A. Perry and other citizens of Anamoose, N. Dak.; F. T. Cuthbert, attorney, of Devils Lake, N. Dak.; and 233 other citizens of that vicinity, urging drastic restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, *April 9, 1924*

(Legislative day of Monday, April 7, 1924)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Adams	Fernald	King	Shortridge
Ashurst	Ferris	Ladd	Simmons
Ball	Fess	McKellar	Smith
Bayard	Fletcher	McKinley	Smoot
Borah	Frazier	McNary	Spencer
Brookhart	George	Mayfield	Stanfield
Bruce	Gerry	Moses	Stephens
Bursum	Glass	Neely	Sterling
Cameron	Gooding	Norris	Swanson
Capper	Hale	Oddie	Trammell
Caraway	Harreld	Overman	Wadsworth
Colt	Harris	Owen	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Harrison	Pepper	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Heflin	Phipps	Warren
Cummins	Howell	Pittman	Watson
Curtis	Johnson, Calif.	Ralston	Weller
Dale	Jones, N. Mex.	Ransdell	Willis
Dial	Jones, Wash.	Reed, Pa.	
Edge	Kendrick	Robinson	
Edwards	Keyes	Sheppard	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed enrolled bills of the following titles, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 47. An act to permit the correction of the general account of Charles B. Strecker, former Assistant Treasurer of the United States;

S. 107. An act for the relief of John H. McAtee;

S. 796. An act for the relief of William H. Lee;

S. 1021. An act for the relief of the Alaska Commercial Co.;

S. 1703. An act for the relief of J. G. Seupelt; and

S. 2090. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of the Regular Army of Second Lieut. Ambrose I. Moriarty.

ARTICLE BY DR. CHARLES W. ELIOT

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, there appeared in this week's issue of Collier's Weekly a very splendid article written by Dr. Charles W. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard University, entitled "Wanted: A way out of the mud." I ask that the article may be incorporated in the RECORD.

I might say in this connection that there is an article on another page of the same publication, written by GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER, entitled "The tactics of desperation." I do not think anyone on this side of the Chamber would object to having the article incorporated in the RECORD. However, I do not ask to have it so incorporated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From Collier's, the National Weekly, for April 12, 1924]

WANTED—A WAY OUT OF THE MUD

(By Charles W. Eliot, president emeritus of Harvard University)

In 1912 the Democratic Party carried the country at the presidential election with a candidate of Scotch-Irish ancestry and southern birth, who had been all his adult life a student and teacher of history, political economy, jurisprudence, and politics, but in political service only two years, as governor of a State.

Under the leadership of this scholar and idealist Congress enacted into law in two years more helpful legislation than had been given to the Nation in the 30 years preceding. It reformed the currency. It created the Federal reserve system. It reformed the system of taxation, reducing tariff duties and enacting a progressive income tax which was both equitable and safe. It created a nonpartisan tariff commission. It provided legitimate business with a helpful agency in the Federal Trade Commission. It placed on the statute books a water-power law under which the Nation's water power can be utilized by private operators without injury to the public interest. It enacted much legislation to develop agriculture and improve rural life, such as the farm-loan system, the agricultural educational extension bill, and the Federal warehouse act. It promoted cooperation among farmers in their own interest and the public's.

The Republican Party, which displaced the Democratic Party in the control of the Government in March, 1921, has not attempted to set aside or modify substantially any of these admirable enactments, and no significant additions have been made to them. They still stand as unexampled contributions to the financial, industrial, social, and family interests of the Nation.

THE UNFORTUNATE ARMISTICE

When the Democratic administration had been only 17 months in power, the World War broke out, and soon diverted the attention of the administration from domestic to foreign affairs, and particularly to the threatened interferences with American trade. The old American doctrine, "free ships make free goods," had to be revived under very adverse conditions. Before long still larger subjects forced themselves into the daily thoughts of the American Government and people—the safety of democracy in the world, the righting of wrongs committed by old or new autocracies against their own subjects or against other nations whose territory or property they coveted, security for the rights of small states, the abolition of militarism, and the substitution of open conference and arbitration for secret diplomacy, concealed treaties, and war as means of settling international disputes or preserving a "balance of power" in Europe.

By the time the second term of Woodrow Wilson began he was ready to put every fiber of the American people's strength, both material and spiritual, into the terrible struggle going on in France for the maintenance in the world of political freedom, public justice, and abiding peace. Into this noble adventure the President of the United States carried nearly the entire American people with a superb rush, which declared that they were going to put into the war not only all their physical resources but the lives and prospects of their sons and their very souls. For a year and a half this self-sacrificing spirit animated the American people and their Government.

Then came the unfortunate armistice of November, 1918. From that moment a reaction from the heroic temper set in, first among the American troops in France, and then among the people at home. When the soldiers from France had scattered among the communities whence they came the majority of them declared that they had seen more than enough of the unspeakable horrors of modern war and would never be soldiers again in any European or Asiatic quarrel. The relatives and friends of these returned soldiers, millions of whom had made large savings during the war out of high wages or high profits, began to say to themselves: "Here we are burdened with an immense debt incurred in carrying on this monstrous war in and for Europe. It is time we took care of American interests. Now we must look after our own." Selfishness began to sap the heroic mood.

Meantime bitter political partisanship appeared in Congress. Certain Republican politicians began to scoff at generosity or idealism in international affairs. They supplied the slogan—America first! They misapplied what they said were Washington's words ("entangling alliances"), uttered more than a century ago. They maintained that the oceans still isolated and protected the United States, whereas the oceans plainly do not since the recent tremendous development of means of communication by land, water, and air. In short, a few Republican Senators, aided by the unscrupulous part of the press, completely misled their own party, some Democrats, and many independents. Some of these Senators had the excuse that they were densely ignorant of European affairs, both past and present, but most of them knew better, and were primarily seeking issues on which the Republican Party could be returned to power.

Thereupon the American people experienced a moral collapse of unprecedented depth and duration. After each of the considerable wars in which America has been engaged a moral or spiritual downfall has occurred.

As the Revolutionary War drew on through repeated disasters the people of the feeble Colonies fell into a condition of despondency from which nothing but the steadfastness of Washington and the Continental Army and the aid from France saved them.