METHODS OF RESTRICTING IMMIGRATION.

THE practical immediate questions concerning immigration are: What alarm is felt, what is the real danger, what are our present laws, and what new legislation is needed? The alarm springs from a constantly increasing influx within our borders of classes of immigrants of a most undesirable character. The danger is the reduction of wages, to the injury of the American workman and of his home and family, the debasement of the suffrage, and a wide contamination of society. The existing laws are wisely framed so far as they go, and their present strict enforcement (which should be made even more rigid) will do much to quiet the alarm and avert the danger. Some new legislation is required, more effectually to keep out persons now proscribed. The question of excluding persons now allowed to come will depend entirely upon the views and wishes of the people as expressed by their senators and representatives acting without reference to politics. Party legislation in the Fifty-second Congress is impossible; and partisan discussion in a magazine article would be valueless.

THE ALARM AND THE DANGER.

It is necessary to look at a few statistics. It is estimated that since 1820 there have come to this country between twelve and fourteen millions of immigrants. The arrivals during the decennial years since 1820 have been as follows:

1820..... 8,385	1850.....310,004	1880.....593,703
1830.....23,322	1860.....153,640	1890.....455,302
1840.. ...84,066	1870.....356,303	1891.....560,319

During the ten years from 1881 to 1890, inclusive, the number was 5,246,613. During the past six years the total immigration (not including that from the Canadian Dominions or Mexico) has been as follows:

1886 (year ending June 30).... 334,203	1889..... 444,427
1887..... 490,109	1890..... 455,302
1888..... 546,889	1891..... 560,319

The nationalities for 1890 and 1891 show whence the rapid increase comes:

	1890.	1891.		1890.	1891.
Bohemia	4,505	11,758	Malta	1	6
Hungary	22,062	28,366	Netherlands	4,326	5,206
Other Austria except Poland	29,632	30,918	Norway	11,370	12,568
Belgium	2,671	3,037	Poland	11,073	27,497
Denmark	9,366	10,659	Portugal	158	918
France	6,585	6,770	Roumania	517	957
Germany	92,427	113,554	Russia except Poland	33,147	42,145
Gibraltar	9	13	Finland	2,451	5,281
England	57,020	53,600	Spain	813	905
Scotland	12,041	12,557	Sweden	29,632	36,880
Ireland	53,024	55,706	Switzerland	6,993	6,811
Wales	650	424	Turkey in Europe	206	265
Great Britain—not specified	19	24	Asia—China	1,716	2,836
Greece	524	1,105	All other	2,732	4,842
Italy—continental	51,799	72,704	All other countries	9,357	8,656
Sicily and Sardinia	204	3,351	Total	457,030	560,319

The increase between June 30, 1890, and June 30, 1891, is 103,289, of which come from—

Italy proper	20,905	Russia proper	8,998
Sicily and Sardinia	3,147	Finland	2,830
Poland	16,424	Total	52,304

The total immigration from June 30 to December 31, 1891, is 241,162, of which there come from—

Italy	19,013	Russia	45,362
Poland	15,455	Finland	1,304

About one-half the above increase of 105,017 is composed of the very worst class of immigrants. They are illiterate, coarse, and stupid—utterly unfit for residence or citizenship in the United States. These remarks apply to recent immigrants from southern Italy, Russia, Poland, and also Hungary. The following illustrative specimens came from southern Italy and testified before the Ford Committee of the Fiftieth Congress, First Session (House Miscellaneous Document, No. 572, of January 19, 1889):

Vincendo Ronda, from Campobasso, near Naples, swore as follows:

Q. What was your occupation in Italy? A. Farmer. Q. What did you receive for farming? A. Ten cents and meals. Q. Meals for yourself, or yourself

and family? A. No, sir, the meals were for me, and the family fed on the ten cents. Q. No lodgings were included—you had to lodge yourself? A. I had to bed myself. Q. When you landed in this country, were you in possession of any money? A. Not a cent. Q. Or property of any kind? A. Nothing, sir, no property. Q. Were you able to live on that ten cents a day in Italy and three meals? A. Well, it was bound to be enough by taking the Indian corn on credit, and paying for it as best I could.

Angelo Antonio Di Dierro, of Campobasso, swore:

Q. What was your occupation in Italy? A. Countryman. Q. Farmer? A. Digging. Q. Digging at what? A. Farm work. Q. Can you read or write Italian? A. No, sir. Q. You cannot read nor write? A. No, sir. Q. How old are you? A. Twenty-three. Q. What wages did you receive as an agricultural laborer in Italy? A. Food and half a franc. Q. Half a franc is equal to about ten cents of our money? A. Yes, sir.

Antonio Angionicola, also from Campobasso, swore:

Q. Can you read or write? A. No, sir. Q. What was your occupation in Naples? A. Countryman. Q. Farm work? A. Yes, sir. Q. Give us the lowest and highest wages that prevailed during any given time. A. For farm work always ten cents. Q. And meals? A. And meals.

Dominco Ramone, also from Campobasso, swore:

Q. How much wages did you receive working on a farm? A. Ten cents and meals, and when I worked for my own account then I made 24 or 25 cents.

Gaetaro Braccio, from Avellino, Southern Italy, swore:

Q. What was your occupation in Italy? A. Farm work by the day. Q. How much did you get a day? A. Ten cents and meals.

Nicolla Di Alve, from Chieti, Italy, swore:

Q. What was your business or occupation in Italy? A. Farm hand. Q. What pay or compensation did you receive for your labor there? A. From ten to fifteen cents a day and meals. Q. Does that mean meals for yourself or does it include your family? A. For myself alone.

And so on with numerous other southern Italy farm hands.

Nasief Abonazin, of Mt. Lebanon, Syria, swore:

Q. What are the wages of an ordinary common laborer in your country? A. Ten or 15 or 20 cents a day. Q. And board? A. No, sir, nothing at all. Q. How much would it take you to live economically? A. About 20 cents; 15 cents if I wanted to live in an honest way, if I didn't want to spend out all the money. Q. What do you live on? What food do you eat? What do you have for breakfast or dinner or common daily life? What did you use to eat? A. Well, sometimes bread and lebin, that is made out of milk and dry meat and kidneys, and something which they cook with corn. Q. Did you eat meat every day? A. No, once or twice a week. Q. Is once or twice a week all you would have meat? A. Some weeks three times and some weeks twice. Q. By meat do you

mean poultry, chickens? Do you include that in the meat, or do you mean beef? A. They don't eat beef, only mutton and lamb. Q. Do you mean poultry and mutton? A. No, we can't eat chicken.

Not only are the wages of labor lowered and society degraded by the inroads of foreigners like the foregoing, but it may fairly be said that they become immediate additions to our voters and begin to elect the rulers of America. All the male immigrants who remain in New York City become voters without regard to the prohibitions of our naturalization laws whenever a great political party determines to bring them to the polls.

In New York City during October, 1891, and before the November election, about seven thousand naturalization papers were issued, nearly all by one judge, who examined each applicant and his witnesses to his satisfaction, and signed his orders at the rate of two per minute and as many as six hundred and eighteen in one day. There were many classes of frauds committed. Papers were issued where the aliens named in them had not been in the country five years; where there should have been preliminary declarations, but no proof of such was required; where there had been such declarations, but final papers were issued without their production, on the false assumption that the applicants had arrived under the age of eighteen; where witnesses were recorded as testifying to the five-years' residence, when they had known the applicant only a few hours, the witnesses being professional perjurers, each swearing in hundreds of such cases; where the applicants were not sworn to make true answers when under examination; where a clerk of a court, on orders signed by the judge, gave out full naturalization papers without the appearance in court of any applicants or any witnesses; where the minutes showed that subjects of Great Britain renounced their allegiance to the Emperor of Germany; where, upon names being handed outside the court to persons engaged in making fraudulent naturalizations, papers for those names were brought back on orders signed by the judge either without any evidence or upon evidence wholly fictitious; and where the face of the papers showed to the judge that preliminary declarations had been made less than two years before he signed the orders for naturalization—in some cases less than four months before! If it is difficult to credit the foregoing assertions, a few irrefragable cases may tend to induce belief.

Patrick Hefferman, of 556 West 40th Street, New York, was 21 years old September 2, 1891, and came to this country on the Ger-

manic August 1, 1888. He was naturalized October 20, 1891. On that day he was introduced by Thomas Keeler to a stranger who went with him to court and signed a paper; then both went before the judge, who asked the stranger something. Hefferman signed nothing, said nothing, but kissed a book and came out a citizen, having taken no oath except that of renunciation and allegiance.

Another immigrant arrived from Ireland, June 18, 1891. In July he made his preliminary declarations. Being a bartender and desiring to be a policeman, he inquired about naturalization and was promptly passed through the naturalization mill, and obtained his final papers October 21, 1891, political agents being prompt to make false affidavits for him without his signing or taking any oath except the final one of renunciation and allegiance.

Charles Hoffstedt was admitted to naturalization on October 20, 1891, on the testimony of George W. Doran, who never saw him until that day.

Patrick Dermody came to this country after he was twenty years old, and never had any first papers, but obtained his final papers October 20, 1891, on the testimony of Doran, whom he had never seen before.

Doran has been convicted of perjury in the Hefferman, Hoffstedt, and Dermody cases.

William Henry Boydell, of 59 West Street, obtained his final papers October 19, 1891. The documents submitted to the judge, on which he signed his order, showed that Boydell made his preliminary declaration December 18, 1889, less than two years before the judge naturalized him. Giacomo Lorenzo had been here two and one-half years and was thirty-two years old, but was naturalized as having come under eighteen and as having lived here five years. So was Francesco Barbarretto, who came two and one-half years before and was twenty-four years old. So were naturalized the Russians Mendel Walser, a new-comer, forty-two years old; Marcus Felson, forty-five years old and here for nine years; and Hyman Jospe, forty-five years old and here for five and one-half years.

At these October naturalizations there were made citizens from Attorney Street, from one house, seven persons; Cannon Street, from one house, five; Clinton Street, from one house, six, from another nine; Delancey Street, from two houses, each six; Elizabeth Street, from one house, seven; Essex street, from one house, five; Forsyth Street, five; James Street, seven; Ludlow, seven; Madison, five; Mott Street,

from seven houses, five, nine, five, six, eight, nine, and eleven respectively; Norfolk, six; Oliver, five; Pitt, five; Rivington, from three houses nine, five, and six respectively; Rutgers, five; Sheriff, five; Suffolk, from two houses, five each; Sullivan, five; Washington, eight; and Mulberry Street, from six houses, five, eleven, nine, nine, six, and five respectively—thirty-seven houses, in streets all on the east side, except Sullivan and Washington, furnishing two hundred and forty-two aliens for naturalization. And so on without limit.

It must be apparent to every candid and patriotic American, whatever may be his politics, that there is cause for alarm, and that there is real danger if hordes of degraded foreigners accustomed to work for ten and twenty cents per day are to be allowed to swarm into our country, fill the avenues to employment, and reduce the wages of labor to the standard of the countries they have left, and in addition are to be naturalized and become voters without regard to legal conditions. There ought to be no political differences to prevent a united demand for an honest, faithful, and effective enforcement of our present immigration and naturalization laws, and for all helpful additions thereto which can be devised.

Our Existing Laws Restricting Immigration.

Until about the time of the passage of the national statute of 1882 the idea of preventing the landing and causing the return of undesirable immigrants does not seem to have found any foothold. The plan in New York and Massachusetts, where most of the immigrants entered, seemed to be to provide for the diseased and the destitute in state hospitals, and to impose a head tax from the proceeds of which the expenses could be paid. In New York as early as March 30, 1798, the Staten Island hospital was established, and in the Revised Statutes of 1830 it was provided that the health commissioner should collect from every vessel arriving from a foreign port, from the master and each cabin passenger, $1.50, and from each steerage passenger and seaman, $1.00, the sums received to constitute "hospital moneys," to be used mainly for the expenses of the marine hospital.

The Massachusetts statute of April 20, 1837, provided for the examination of alien passengers, and that, if there should be found any lunatic, idiot, maimed, aged, or infirm persons, incompetent in the opinion of the officer examining to maintain themselves, or who had been paupers in any other country, a bond good for ten years against their becoming a public charge should be exacted, and also that a

head tax of $2.00 should be imposed upon all other alien passengers, the sums collected to be used for the support of foreign paupers.

The constitutionality of these two statutes came before the United States Supreme Court, and they were, at the January term, 1849, decided to be unconstitutional. The cases were those of Smith against Turner and Norris against Boston, known as the Passenger Cases, reported in 7 Howard 283. The decision was given, however, by a closely divided court, Justices McLean, Wayne, Catron, McKinley, and Grier being the majority; and Chief Justice Taney and Justices Daniel, Nelson, and Woodbury dissenting in full opinions. And the controversy continued.

The New York case of Smith against Turner had arisen in 1841. In 1847, 1848, and 1849 New York passed laws designed to evade the objections raised to her Revised Statutes of 1830, and the validity of those new laws came before the Supreme Court in the case of Henderson against the Mayor of New York, which was decided in October, 1875 (92 U. S. 259). In the case of New York City against Miln (11 Peters 103) the Supreme Court had sustained as within the police power of the State a law of New York, of February 11, 1824, requiring the master of every ship or vessel, within twenty-four hours after its arrival, to report to the mayor of the city of New York a list of all persons brought in as passengers; although Mr. Justice Story had dissented and had stated that Chief Justice Marshall, who died before the decision was made, had concurred in the conclusion that the law was void because it was an encroachment upon the power of Congress to regulate commerce. The new laws of New York which were contested in the Henderson case had added to the law of February 11, 1824, the provision that the mayor should indorse upon every list furnished by the master of a ship a demand that he should give a separate bond of $300 for each passenger landed, indemnifying for four years against expenses for the support of such passenger, but with the further provision that the ship-owners might commute for such bond and avoid giving it by paying $1.50 in the case of each passenger. The Supreme Court held these provisions to be mere evasions of the decision in the Passenger Cases, and re-examined and affirmed the doctrine of those cases, Mr. Justice Miller delivering the opinion, and there being no dissent by either Chief Justice Waite or Justices Clifford, Field, Bradley, Swayne, Davis, Strong, or Hunt.

Notwithstanding the decision in the Henderson Case, the State of New York continued to attempt to evade the force of the decisions

that the State could not tax incoming passengers, and passed a further law of May 31, 1881, imposing a head tax of $1.00 upon every alien arriving in New York City. The validity of this law was negatived in the case of the People against the Compagnie Générale Transatlantique (107 U. S. 59), Mr. Justice Miller delivering the opinion, from which there was no dissent. It had been claimed that the new tax was only to aid in carrying out the inspection laws of New York.

The Supreme Court decisions against the power of any State to collect head money from passengers left the States without the means, except by taxing their own citizens, of paying the expenses of caring for destitute immigrants, and of suitable inspection of immigrants. New York, however, continued such care and inspection down to 1882, and paid many expenses therefor from state funds until the national act of August 3, 1882, was passed. This act was decided to be constitutional in the Head Money Cases (112 U. S. 580).

The prohibitions of Chinese immigration are contained in laws applicable only to the Chinese. The first law excluding European laborers or workmen coming under contract is that of February 26, 1885, and it is re-enforced by the act of February 23, 1887. The first general United States law for the exclusion of immigrants is the above act of August 3, 1882, and this and the contract-labor acts are amended by the new act of March 3, 1891. The present excluded classes (besides Chinese) are: (1) idiots, (2) insane persons, (3) paupers or persons likely to become a public charge, (4) diseased persons, (5) convicts, (6) polygamists, and (7) persons coming under a contract to labor. Persons whose fares are paid or who are assisted to come are subjected to a special inquiry, and if it does not "affirmatively and satisfactorily" appear that they do not belong to one of the above seven classes they are excluded.

A careful examination of all immigrants by sea is made by surgeons and inspectors, and all aliens unlawfully coming are sent back in the same vessel if practicable. Owners of vessels are required under penalty to support while here and to carry back excluded immigrants, and this rule applies to all who may become a public charge within one year after arrival from causes existing prior to their landing. If the ship-owners cannot be compelled to return the alien, he is sent back at the expense of the United States. A penalty is provided for the punishment of any person who shall bring in or aid in bringing in any unlawful immigrant by sea or land. As to immigration across the Canadian and Mexican borders, the secretary of the trea-

sury is authorized to prescribe rules for inspection which shall not obstruct or unnecessarily delay, impede, or annoy passengers in ordinary travel. No rules have yet been formulated, and the law itself is for the present the only guide to the customs officers on the border.

The act of August 3, 1882, imposing a tax of fifty cents upon each alien passenger coming to this country by sea, except from Canada or Mexico, whether steerage or cabin passenger, whether to stay or return, constituted the sums received an immigration fund, declared what classes of immigrants should be excluded, and provided that the secretary of the treasury might administer the immigration laws through contracts with state boards and commissioners. This method was adopted until the New York contract was abrogated by Secretary Windom, in April, 1891, and the laws are now administered in New York City and in all the seaports by the direct action of treasury inspectors, the New York City station having been changed first from Castle Garden to the Barge Office, and on January 1, 1892, to the new buildings on Ellis' Island.

The act of March 3, 1891, was the outcome of the investigations and action of the two committees on immigration of the Senate and House under a concurrent resolution of March 12, 1890, and the reports of the committees are printed as Senate Report No. 936, Fifty-first Congress, First Session; House Report No. 3,472, Fifty-first Congress, Second Session; and House Report No. 4,048, Fifty-first Congress, Second Session.

What New Laws are Needed?

A natural method of considering what new laws are needed is to inquire what suggestions for new legislation have been made by persons who have studied the subject or have views thereon. With a view to concentrating opinions for use by the Senate Committee on Immigration, there was published on the 20th of August, 1891, a circular making various inquiries grouped as twelve questions. These, omitting some statements and comments which accompanied them, were as follows:

I. Shall the list of excluded persons be enlarged; and if so, by what new exclusions?

II. Shall anarchists and socialists be excluded; and if so, how shall they be defined?

III. Shall an educational qualification for admission be required; and if so, how shall it be applied to families?

IV. Shall a property qualification be prescribed?

V. Shall immigrants from any particular countries (besides China) be excluded?

VI. Shall stricter methods of inspection be used; if so, what?

VII. Shall more cubic feet of space for each passenger be required on the steamships, and the cost of coming be increased?

VIII. Shall the head tax be increased above 50 cents up to $3.00, $5.00, or $10.00?

IX. Shall a consular certificate of his right to come be procured by the immigrant before starting, either at his pleasure or compulsorily?

X. Shall passengers by land over the Canadian or Mexican borders be examined with the same strictness as passengers by sea from Europe?

XI. Concerning naturalization; shall aliens give three months' notice of their intention to apply for final papers, and shall there be any other restrictions on naturalization?

XII. Can any improvement of the contract-labor laws be suggested?

The answers to these inquiries are not numerous, nor are many specific suggestions made, and opinions widely differ. The extreme view on one side is doubtless that of Mr. Henry George, who is reported in the New York *Recorder* of August 24, 1891, as saying: "I do not believe any restriction whatever upon the immigration of people from Europe of the Caucasian race, who are not diseased and who are not chronic paupers or criminals, is needed, or is in accordance with the spirit of our institutions. We should have room enough for the whole population of Europe, were not our lands monopolized, and were they taken from the grasp of those who hold them for no other purpose than the hope of profiting by their increasing value. The effect of the coming here of the whole population of Europe would be but to raise wages, increase our prosperity, and augment our strength. I do not deem it necessary that immigrants should be compelled to read, write, or speak the English language before becoming naturalized. They can become good citizens without it." The extreme opinion on the other side appears to be that of a citizen of New Jersey who says of immigration: "My own opinion is that it should be stopped entirely and immediately; that it is dangerous to admit

more till those that are here are fully Americanized, which it will take years to accomplish."

It cannot be asserted that there is a consensus of opinion in favor of any specific addition to our statute laws. There may be said to be an almost universal alarm at the character of many recent immigrants, and a belief that there is a real danger to the best interests of the country therefrom, which ought to be arrested by new methods; but to the inquiry what those methods should be there is no satisfactory answer.

Among the plans which do not meet with any considerable favor is the enlargement of the list of classes already excluded. The difficulty of defining anarchists and socialists is the great obstacle to inserting them among the proscribed classes. To begin now to adopt the new and radical policy of excluding those who in general terms may be called good immigrants, for the reason that however good they are we want no more of them, instead of continuing to limit our exclusions to bad immigrants, is a change not seriously advocated by any one. We may come to such a decision in the future, but not now. A property qualification beyond the necessities of the journey to the ultimate destination in this country of a good immigrant or a good family, is not urged by many, nor the exclusion of any particular European races, nor any increase of the head tax beyond the expenses of properly administering the immigration laws, for the purpose by such tax of deterring immigration.

The fact, however, cannot be overlooked that there is a general feeling in favor of passing any suggested laws which may tend more strictly to enforce the present exclusions; also that better steamship accommodations should be required, even if the number of immigrants is thereby lessened. The one specific measure which finds the most favor is the establishment of some system of certificates issued abroad by which the immigrant may before he leaves his own country prove his right to enter the United States.

It is difficult to give a trustworthy answer to the question whether Congress will pass more restrictive laws. The question is put in this form rather than whether Congress ought to pass more restrictive laws, in order to call attention to the exact present situation. We are at the beginning of a presidential canvass. The House is overwhelmingly democratic, the Senate strongly republican. The subject of immigration and naturalization is a delicate one for both political parties, and no laws can be passed at the present session to subserve any

political purpose, or without the almost unanimous consent of both parties.

The report of the commission appointed by Secretary Foster, which visited Europe during last summer, composed of Messrs. John B. Weber, Walter D. Kempster, Judson N. Cross, Joseph Powderly, and Herman J. Schulteis, is not yet received, nor has the secretary of the treasury or the President made any recommendations for legislation. However, there should be, I think, general concurrence by the committees of the two Houses and in Congress (if we go no further) in the following propositions:

I. All laws should be passed which the secretary of the treasury may recommend to enable him fully and efficiently to enforce the existing statutory exclusions of bad immigrants. No person advocates the repeal of any of those exclusions. The decisions of the inspecting officers as to the right of any person to land is final unless reversed on appeal by the superintendent of immigration acting under the supervision of the secretary; and this power of final decision has been recently upheld by the Supreme Court in the case of the Japanese, Nishimura Ekiu, decided January 18, 1892. The secretary may not ask for further powers, but if he does his reasonable requests should be granted. A rigid enforcement of existing laws, not only in our seaports but along the Canadian border, across which stricter administration in our seaports may lead undesirable immigrants to attempt an entrance, may result in quieting the alarm and averting the dangers from bad immigration, and in satisfying our people of the sufficiency of our present rules of exclusion. If we can surely keep out every person and family "likely to become a public charge," we shall have erected a strong and perhaps sufficient barrier against undesirable immigration. This we have not hitherto done; but there is great improvement and marked success attending our present administration of the statutes.

II. The greatest embarrassment in our present system of inspection being the painful necessity of often sending poor and miserable immigrants back three thousand miles over a weary waste of waters to a lot hopeless and helpless, new legislation should be so directed as to tend to prevent excluded persons from ever leaving their own country. Therefore, heavier responsibilities should be placed upon the steamship companies. Laws and regulations should be so framed and enforced that before long it may appear that no immigrants will have to be sent back, for the simple and satisfactory reason that the

steamship companies will not dare to bring any about whose right to admission there is the slightest doubt.

III. A law should be passed increasing the number of cubic feet of space on each steamship for each immigrant, and requiring better sanitary arrangements, going sufficiently into details to make sure there shall be few evasions and that violations of the law shall never go unpunished. There will be found needed for such immigrants as will be welcome to this country more and better accommodations on shipboard than the laws now require. They should not be demanded merely in order to make immigration more expensive and thereby to diminish its volume; but if humanity suggests the improved methods, they should not be omitted because such results may incidentally follow.

IV. In further pursuance of the exceedingly meritorious idea of stopping immigrants on the other side of the ocean, instead of forcing them back from this side after their long and weary journey to the land of promise, there ought not to be any objection to allowing persons intending to come to the United States to prove to the satisfaction of our consuls or special officials abroad that our laws do not prohibit their immigration, and to obtain certificates accordingly. Such a bill is now before the Senate, No. 134, introduced December 10, 1891. Under this a certificate does not give to any person the right to enter, but further inquiries may be made by the inspection officers on this side. Neither is the immigrant compelled to obtain the certificate. He may come without it if he choose, but in that event the inquiry here will be more rigid. Persons intending to come, usually take plenty of time in preparation, and will gladly secure certificates, especially those who come in families.

If the voluntary-certificate system after an adequate trial works satisfactorily, it can be made compulsory later if necessary, but it may never be deemed necessary. Steamship companies will protect themselves by requiring a certificate in every doubtful case, and the immigrant will not be allowed to start without it. Heavy responsibility of steamship companies, certificates abroad if asked for, and strict inspection on this side of the water, will make almost impossible the evasions practised at the present time.

It is fair to state that objections deemed cogent are raised even to a system of voluntary certificates, to the effect (1) that through the unfaithfulness of our consuls or inspectors abroad false certificates may be issued which will prevent strict scrutiny by our home inspec-

tors and admit many immigrants excluded by law; and (2) that even where consuls or inspectors abroad are faithful, false testimony may be easily imposed upon them when a country wishes to get rid of bad citizens; while (3) the publicity of the proceedings will make it difficult for good citizens to get away from countries desirous of retaining them for military or other reasons. The objections, however, are not sufficiently well founded to overcome the arguments in favor of the voluntary-certificate system.

V. The bonding system should be wholly abolished. When the inspectors, the superintendent of immigration, and the secretary of the treasury have decided, after summary proceedings, that aliens asking for admission are "likely to become a public charge," these aliens should go back. No bond that, if persons so adjudged to be unfit to come do actually become paupers, some benevolent person or some charitable society will reimburse the public treasuries for the poor-funds expended, should be allowed to open our gates for the admission into our communities of persons likely to become a public charge. The question of immediate or remote pauper expense is not the whole question nor the main question.

We certainly have no desire to attempt to absorb into our body politic any persons of this description who have failed to pass the prescribed ordeal. The injury they do us goes far beyond any money loss. They are undesirable immigrants, condemned as such by our laws and the authorities directed to administer the laws. We sympathize deeply with a race impoverished and driven from home by a cruel edict; but our duties to our own citizens are imperative. We cannot take the vast numbers who wish to come. We must not take any whom our laws exclude, merely because a noble charity helps them to come and offers bonds for their temporary support. These very charitable deeds and offers prove that the objects thereof are by legal command barred from entrance into the United States. If so, there is no statutory authority for admitting them under bonds, the bonds taken are practically useless, and they should not be authorized, but should be disallowed by law.

VI. Concerning naturalization: The present laws passed in 1802 and 1824 allow aliens to become naturalized after five years' residence. If they come when over eighteen years of age, they must make a preliminary declaration at least two years before receiving their final papers. Whatever difference of opinion there may be as to the wisdom of adding to the above provisions an educational qualification or

imposing other new conditions, there should be a general agreement to a requirement that an alien seeking his final papers shall give three months' notice in the court from which he asks such papers, so that the case may be inquired into, and opposition made if the facts warrant it. The greatest abuses in naturalization grow out of the absence of such a notice. The aliens are not heard of a single minute before they appear with their witnesses; nobody is prepared to represent the other side, and in a moment the valuable franchise of American citizenship is conferred, practically irrevocable even if fraud or falsehood is subsequently discovered, while a presidential election may have been decided by the votes of a few among the thousands of such aliens.

If the foregoing suggestions for new laws should be found acceptable and should be embodied in legislation, the people and their senators and representatives might perhaps wisely wait a year or more before seriously considering new exclusions of immigrants and more radical limitations of naturalization.

WM. E. CHANDLER.

WRITERS AND SUBJECTS IN THE MARCH FORUM.

CHARLES J. BONAPARTE (*Political Corruption in Maryland*) was born in Baltimore in 1851. He was graduated at Harvard University in 1871 and at the Harvard Law School in 1874. He is a prominent member of the National Civil Service Association, and has been active in other movements for political reform.

CLARENCE KING (*The Education of the Future*) was born in Newport, R. I., in 1843, and was graduated at the Sheffield Scientific School of Yale University in 1862. For four years he was connected with the geological survey of California. He then made geological surveys for the government over the routes of the Union and Central Pacific railroads. In 1878 he organized the United States Geological Survey, having secured the passage through Congress of the act to establish it. Mr. King is a member of several of the leading scientific societies in this country and in Europe.

E. O. LEECH (*Would Free Coinage Bring European Silver Here?*) was born in Washington, D. C., about forty-two years ago. He was graduated from the National University of Washington, D. C., and entered the service of the Mint Bureau about 1873. He is now at the head of the bureau. He has frequently appeared in the House before the Committee on Coinage, Weights and Measures, and is regarded as authority on all matters pertaining to coinage.

RICHARD P. BLAND (*Free Coinage and an Elastic Currency*) was born in Kentucky in 1835 and was self-educated. He taught school, studied law, and then settled in Missouri. Later he removed to Nevada, where he practised law and became interested in mining. He returned to Missouri in 1855, and since 1873 he has been a member of Congress from that State. He is the author of the well-known "Bland Bill," passed in the Forty-fourth Congress for the coinage of $2,000,000 in silver per month, and is the most prominent advocate of free silver coinage in this country.

FRANCIS G. PEABODY (*A Case of Good City Government*) on graduating from Harvard College studied for the Unitarian ministry. After his ordination, he became an instructor at Harvard, where he is now professor of social science. He has also been for several years a preacher to the university. He has devoted much of his life to the study of questions of social reform.

E. P. ALEXANDER (*Industrial Progress of the South*) was graduated at West Point in 1857 and appointed second lieutenant of the U. S. Engineer Corps. He entered the Confederate army as Captain of Engineers in 1861 and served through the war, being promoted to the rank of Brigadier General of Artillery. Since 1871 he has devoted himself to railroad interests in the South and West. He is the author of a work on "Railway Practice" and various pamphlets and magazine articles on railroad and military subjects.

JOHN EARLE (*The Study of English*) was graduated at Oxford in 1845.

He was ordained for the ministry in 1849. Most of his life has been spent in teaching English at Oxford, in writing on his subject and in editing. Since 1876 he has been professor of Anglo-Saxon at Oxford. He has written "The Philology of the English Tongue," "English Prose: Its Elements, History, and Usage," and other works, and has contributed numerous articles to periodicals.

COURTNAY DE KALB (*The Intercontinental Railroad Problem*) was born in Virginia in 1861. He is a mining engineer, has travelled much and has lived in Mexico, and in Central and South America, of whose affairs he has been a close student. His writings on South American subjects in "The Nation" and other periodicals have attracted attention both here and abroad, and many of them have been translated into Spanish and republished in South America.

WALTER BESANT (*The Work of the British Society of Authors*) was born at Portsmouth, England, and was educated at King's College, London, and at Christ's College, Cambridge. He is one of the best known of living English novelists. He wrote in collaboration with James Rice many novels. Since the death of Rice, he has written "All Sorts and Conditions of Men," "The Revolt of Man," "Dorothy Forster," and other novels and stories. He is the originator and the chief supporter of the British Society of Authors.

CHARLES BURR TODD (*The Case of the American Author*) was born in Connecticut in 1849. He is the author of "A General History of the Burr Family in America," a "History of Redding, Conn.," "Life and Letters of Joel Barlow," and "The Story of the City of New York." He has also contributed various articles to the magazines.

COL. ALBERT A. POPE (*An Industrial Revolution by Good Roads*) was born about forty-five years ago. He joined the Thirty-fifth Massachusetts Regiment in 1862 and won by his good service the title of colonel. He was one of the first Americans to become interested in bicycling in this country, and has done as much as any one to make it popular. He founded the company for the manufacture of bicycles well known by his name, and has made a fortune in this industry. He has also devoted much time and money to the improvement of roads.

DAVID SWING (*What the American Sunday Should Be*) was born in Cincinnati in 1830, and was graduated at Miami University in 1852. He was professor of languages in this university for twelve years; in 1866 he became pastor of a Presbyterian church in Chicago. He was tried for heresy in 1874, and was acquitted. He then withdrew from the Presbyterian Church. He is now independent of denominational relations. Professor Swing has frequently written for reviews and magazines.

WILLIAM E. CHANDLER (*Methods of Restricting Immigration*) was born in Concord, N. H., in 1835, and was graduated at the Harvard Law School in 1855. He was reporter to the Supreme Court of New Hampshire, and later a member of the legislature, serving two terms as speaker. In 1865 he was appointed assistant secretary of the treasury, but resigned after two years. He was appointed secretary of the navy in 1882. He is now serving his second term in the United States Senate.