

THE RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION.

BY THE HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

THE immigration into the United States from 1874 to 1889, inclusive,—a period of sixteen years,—has amounted to 6,418,633 persons, without counting since 1884 the overland immigration from Canada or Mexico. To put it in another form, the immigration into the United States during the last sixteen years is equal to one-tenth of the entire population of the country at the present time, and has furnished probably every four years enough voters to decide a Presidential election, if rightly distributed. During those sixteen years immigration has fluctuated with the business prosperity of the country, the highest point being reached in 1881 and 1882, 720,645 persons arriving in the former year and 730,349 in the latter, while the average annual immigration has been 401,164. If we divide these sixteen years into two periods of eight years each, one of the two heaviest years coming in the first and one in the second half, we find that for the eight years from 1874 to 1881, inclusive, the average annual rate of immigration was 307,185, and for the eight years from 1882 to 1889, inclusive, it was 482,643—a gain of 57.1 per cent. During the last eight years the exclusion of the Chinese since 1882 has caused the immigration from Asia to decline from over thirty thousand to a few hundreds annually, and in addition to this real loss no attempt has been made since 1883 to compute the very heavy overland immigration from Canada, which, of course, makes a still further apparent decrease. Yet, despite these important deductions, there has been the large gain of 175,458 persons in the average annual immigration of the last eight years as compared with the eight years next preceding. As it is thus apparent that immigration is increasing in quantity, the next point is to determine its quality.

In the consular reports on “Emigration and Immigration,”

published by the State Department in 1887, when Mr. Bayard was Secretary, a table is given which classifies the immigration into the United States from 1873 to 1886, inclusive, as follows :

Professional.....	31,803
Skilled.....	587,349
Miscellaneous.....	2,052,294
Occupation not stated.....	123,782
Without occupation.....	2,596,188

Taking the table as it stands, and throwing out those immigrants "with occupations not stated," it appears that of all the vast immigration during those fourteen years 48.1 per cent., or nearly one-half, are persons avowedly without occupation or training, or, in other words, unskilled labor of the lowest kind, while professional and skilled labor amounts to only 11.49 per cent. of the whole. "Miscellaneous," which is neither skilled nor professional labor, amounts to 38 per cent. It may be assumed that the same proportions hold good for the three years from 1886 to 1889, and it must be noted also that the detailed tables indicate that the number of persons without occupation increases in a slightly larger ratio than the rate of increase of the total immigration.

These figures give an idea of the general character of the foreign immigration into the United States during a long period of fourteen years. It is more important, however, to determine whether the immigration of this general character improves or deteriorates as it increases. This can be ascertained best by examining the rate of increase in the immigration from the different countries from which it chiefly comes during the two periods of eight years each from 1874 to 1881 and from 1882 to 1889, respectively :

	Annual average.		Percentage of	
	1874-1881.	1882-1889.	difference.	
France.....	6,064	4,885	19.4	Decrease.
Norway.....	10,767	16,862	59.5	Increase.
Great Britain and Ireland.....	86,649	145,461	67.8	"
Germany.....	76,416	135,052	76.7	"
Switzerland.....	4,159	7,831	88.3	"
Netherlands.....	2,535	4,847	91.2	"
Sweden.....	18,224	37,730	107.	"
Denmark.....	4,042	8,663	114.3	"
Austria.....	9,272	21,926	136.5	"
Belgium.....	847	2,023	138.8	"
Poland.....	1,691	4,498	166.	"
Italy.....	7,893	30,474	286.	"
Russia.....	5,430	21,567	297.	"
Hungary.....	2,273	13,101	476.4	"

These percentages of increase are interesting and deeply significant. The nations of Europe which chiefly contributed to

STATEMENT SHOWING THE NUMBER AND NATIONALITY OF IMMIGRANTS ARRIVED IN THE UNITED STATES DURING EACH YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, FROM 1874 TO 1889, INCLUSIVE.

COUNTRIES.	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.	1888.	1889.
England.....	43,306	30,040	21,051	18,122	19,581	40,987	64,190	76,547	70,893	61,432	53,270	44,710	58,422	83,086	76,040	61,815
Ireland.....	47,688	29,069	16,506	13,701	17,113	27,651	81,799	70,909	72,137	82,654	58,589	49,793	52,912	72,888	71,966	60,492
Scotland.....	8,768	5,739	4,383	3,068	3,700	8,798	11,495	16,451	15,957	10,839	8,791	10,174	13,916	22,067	23,412	14,948
Wales.....	588	419	294	282	311	1,046	948	1,316	1,633	1,430	1,011	931	1,343	1,614	1,714	920
Great Britain, not specified.....	15	12	9	1	1	2	6	7	8	6	95	2	8	4	4	12
Total Great Britain and Ireland.....	100,422	66,179	42,243	36,554	40,706	78,424	164,438	165,230	161,425	157,361	121,756	105,610	126,601	179,609	173,141	138,487
Austria.....	6,891	6,039	6,047	4,376	4,881	6,949	18,952	21,437	18,315	17,998	20,688	16,456	22,096	24,786	28,809	26,424
Belgium.....	708	623	454	367	464	763	1,481	1,630	1,290	1,673	1,792	1,363	1,641	2,981	2,961	2,704
Denmark.....	3,188	1,951	1,624	1,077	2,688	3,582	8,778	8,855	12,769	9,717	7,693	5,870	6,634	9,305	8,756	8,597
France.....	8,741	8,607	6,723	5,127	4,908	4,121	4,389	8,653	5,690	4,016	3,690	3,138	4,085	5,604	6,579	6,118
Germany.....	36,927	36,565	31,323	27,417	31,968	45,561	134,040	249,572	232,269	184,389	155,529	107,668	86,201	111,924	106,975	93,965
Gibraltar.....	5	4	16	1	1	2	22	4	4	7	7	11
Greece.....	20	27	24	18	13	93	17	17	177	95	56	171	108	509	675	217
Hungary.....	832	747	475	540	632	1,578	6,698	6,756	11,602	12,308	10,708	9,181	18,100	14,301	12,856	15,746
Italy (continental).....	5,787	3,315	2,862	3,610	5,163	9,027	12,756	20,101	29,949	28,512	14,441	15,480	30,472	46,185	47,424	29,609
Italy (insular):																
Sardinia.....	72	29	116	1	228	14	25	2	75	25	52	5	93	71	432	629
Sicily.....	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Islands of the Mediterranean:																
Corfica.....	10	5	2	7	1	1,199	3,790	10,812	7,880	4,928	3,791	2,499	2,687	5,976	5,457	6,339
Crete.....	1,532	1,073	709	572	632	1,199	23,094	26,867	27,197	24,983	13,906	11,692	13,869	18,322	17,178	11,446
Netherlands.....	6,581	4,466	6,031	4,333	5,216	9,428	23,094	26,867	27,197	24,983	13,906	11,692	13,869	18,322	17,178	11,446
Norway.....	4,396	6,031	5,204	4,774	6,176	16,659	46,723	56,892	60,413	32,586	24,016	21,958	32,252	51,236	48,945	31,005
Sweden.....	52	1,212	816	552	643	576	161	59	89	630	786	538	771	108	21	164
Portugal.....	15	55	81	10	781	301	2,204	635	1,483	421
Roumania.....	7,447	4,369	6,787	3,370	4,216	3,784	5,278	8,193	17,497	6,907	15,122	16,317	25,980	23,321	35,504	31,496
Russia.....
Finland.....	4	23	21	8	22	19	217	320	708	8,107	407	454	840	2,294	1,849	1,892
Poland.....	1,449	707	854	320	554	876	2,458	6,283	4,246	2,511	4,569	3,101	6,396	4,990	5,902	4,866
Spain.....	571	529	597	542	432	534	420	405	328	243	354	319	483	686	656	634
Switzerland.....	2,436	1,611	1,572	1,612	2,051	3,854	8,498	11,628	11,839	11,433	8,215	5,126	4,518	6,561	7,622	7,336
Turkey in Europe.....	21	36	46	25	23	34	62	50	118	80	187	165	178	171	247	234
Holland.....
Total all other Europe.....	107,637	77,999	72,805	59,237	70,676	105,787	277,658	435,101	441,658	341,136	285,860	221,592	238,847	328,651	340,352	281,942
Total Europe.....	208,659	144,178	114,548	94,791	111,332	184,211	442,096	600,331	603,086	498,497	407,606	327,202	385,448	608,260	513,493	420,129

the upbuilding of the original thirteen colonies were the English, the Scotch-Irish, so called, the Dutch, the Germans, and the Huguenot French. With the exception of the last they were practically all people of the same stock. During this century and until very recent years these same nations, with the addition of Ireland and the Scandinavian countries, have continued to furnish the chief component parts of the immigration which has helped to populate so rapidly the territory of the United States. Among all these people, with few exceptions, community of race or language, or both, has facilitated the work of assimilation. In the last ten years, however, as appears from the figures just given, new and wholly different elements have been introduced into our immigration, and—what is more important still—the rate of immigration of these new elements has risen with much greater rapidity than that of those which previously had furnished the bulk of the population of the country. The mass of immigration, absolutely speaking, continues, of course, to come from the United Kingdom and from Germany, but relatively the immigration from these two sources is declining rapidly in comparison with the immigration from Italy and from the Slavic countries of Russia, Poland, Hungary,* and Bohemia, the last of which appears under the head of Austria. Of the generally good character of the immigration from the United Kingdom, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries it is hardly necessary to speak; but I will quote a single sentence from the State Department report already referred to, in regard to the immigration from the United Kingdom and Germany:

“The diagrams show the remarkable predominance of the United Kingdom and Germany in supplying the United States with skilled labor, and also the fact that the Germans represent those industries that depend upon hand labor or the requirements of everyday life, while the English supply the mechanical element. While Germany sends blacksmiths, butchers, carpenters, coopers, saddlers, shoemakers, and tailors, the United Kingdom supplies miners, engineers, iron- and steel-workers, mechanics and artisans, weavers and spinners. This distinction is clearly marked and is certainly important.”

Now as to the immigration from the other countries, which has been increasing so much faster than that to which we have been accustomed, and which we know from experience to be in the

* The Hungarian immigration appears to be mainly Slavic, and not Magyar, and hence I have classified it with that of the Slavic countries.

main valuable. Consul-General Jüssen says in his report (1886) in regard to the Austrian immigration :

"The young men who want to escape military service, the ultra-socialist, the anarchist, the men who have lost all social and business footing here, the bankrupt, embezzler, and swindler, stop not to obtain permission of the government, and naturally the authorities have no sort of record here either as to the number or the place of destination of this class of emigrants. . . . The government would, as a matter of course, prohibit, if it could do so, the emigration of all young men subject to military duty, but it is quite natural that it feels no regret to get rid of the ultra-socialists and anarchists, and that it is quite willing the bankrupt and swindler should depart for foreign countries and that the paupers should find support away from home."

He also speaks as follows in regard to the Bohemian emigration, which forms a large part of that which is classed under the head of Austria :

"The labor and agricultural classes of Bohemia probably supply the greatest number of emigrants to the United States, and among the Bohemian industrial laborers some of the most violent ultra-socialists are to be found. The great majority of these Bohemian laborers, both of the industrial and agricultural class, are illiterate and ignorant in the extreme. They stand in great awe of the police authorities at home."

In regard to Hungarian emigration, Mr. Sterne, consul at Budapesth, speaks (1886) as follows :

"I am of the opinion that with the present condition of the labor market in the United States there is no room there at present for this class of people. I even believe that under more favorable conditions in the United States these Slovacks are not a desirable acquisition for us to make, since they appear to have so many items in common with the Chinese. Like these, they are extremely frugal, the love of whiskey of the former being balanced by the opium habit of the latter. Their ambition lacks both in quality and quantity. Thus they will work similarly cheap as the Chinese, and will interfere with a civilized laborer's earning a 'white' laborer's wages."

The emigration from Italy comes largely from the southern provinces—from Naples and Sicily ; a smaller proportion being drawn from the finer population of northern Italy. In regard to this Italian emigration, Mr. Alden, consul-general at Rome, says (1886) :

"As to the habits and morals of the emigrants to the United States from the northern and central portions of Italy, both men and women are sober and industrious, and as a rule trustworthy and moral. They are generally strong, powerful workers, and capable of enduring great fatigue. A less favorable view may be taken of the emigrants from the southern districts and Sicily. These are the most illiterate parts of Italy, and in these districts brigandage was for many years extremely prevalent."

In regard to the emigration from Russia, Mr. Young, the consul-general, says (1886) :

"The government of Russia does not encourage emigration. On the contrary, it prohibits all Russian subjects from leaving the empire of Russia, except Poles and Jews. . . . The Mennonites have emigrated perhaps more extensively than any other class of Russian subjects. . . . The lowest classes generally form the greater part of emigration."

Thus it is proved, first, that immigration to this country is increasing, and, second, that it is making its greatest relative increase from races most alien to the body of the American people and from the lowest and most illiterate classes among those races. In other words, it is apparent that, while our immigration is increasing, it is showing at the same time a marked tendency to deteriorate in character.

It has been the policy of the United States until very recent years to encourage immigration in all possible ways, which was, under the circumstances, a wise and obvious course to pursue. The natural growth of the people established in the thirteen colonies was not sufficient to occupy or develop the vast territory and valuable resources of the Union. We therefore opened our arms to the people of every land and invited them to come in, and when all the region beyond the Alleghanies, or even beyond the Mississippi, was still a wilderness, the general wisdom of this policy could not be gainsaid. To the practical advantages to be gained from the rapid filling-up of the country we also joined the sentimental and generous reason that this free country was to be a haven of refuge for the unfortunate of every land.

This liberality toward immigration, combined with the normal growth of the population, in the course of the present century rapidly filled the country, and the conditions under which, at the outset we had opened our doors and asked every one to come in changed radically. The first sign of an awakening to this altered state of things was in the movement against the Chinese. When that great reservoir of cheap labor was opened and when its streams began to pour into the United States, the American people, first on the western coast and then elsewhere, suddenly were roused to the fact that they were threatened with a flood of low-class labor which would absolutely destroy good rates of wages among American workingmen by a competition which could not be met, and which at the same time threatened to lower

the quality of American citizenship. The result was the Chinese-Exclusion Act, much contested in its inception, but the wisdom of which everybody now admits. The next awakening came upon the discovery that employers of labor were engaged in making contracts with large bodies of working people in other countries, and importing them into the United States to work for a remuneration far below that which American workmen were accustomed to receive. This resulted in the passage of the Alien Contract-Labor Law, intended to stop the importation of this low-priced labor. No one doubts to-day that the general principle of that law is sound, although its details are defective and its enforcement so imperfect that it has little practical effect.

Such have been the actual departures thus far from the former policy of the United States in regard to immigration. That they were needed is certain. That they are insufficient appears to be equally so. The committee of the Fiftieth Congress appointed by Speaker Carlisle to investigate the subject of immigration say at the close of their report :

"Certainly the effect of the present unrestricted system of immigration, as applicable to the conditions under consideration, upon the industrial situation of this country, has been very bad, and the committee believe that the time has come when immigration should be more effectively regulated ; that persons who immigrate to the United States should at least be composed of those who in good faith desire to become its citizens and are worthy to be such."

As one example of the practical effect of unrestricted immigration the committee cite the case of the coal-mining country.

"Generally speaking, the class of immigrants who have lately been imported and employed in the coal regions of this country are not such, in the opinion of the committee, as would make desirable inhabitants of the United States. They are of a very low order of intelligence. They do not come here with the intention of becoming citizens ; their whole purpose being to accumulate by parsimonious, rigid, and unhealthy economy a sum of money and then return to their native land. They live in miserable sheds like beasts ; the food they eat is so meagre, scant, unwholesome, and revolting that it would nauseate and disgust an American workman, and he would find it difficult to sustain life upon it. Their habits are vicious, their customs are disgusting, and the effect of their presence here upon our social condition is to be deplored. They have not the influences, as we understand them, of a home ; they do not know what the word means ; and, in the opinion of the committee, no amount of effort would improve their morals or 'Americanize' this class of immigrants. They have been brought here in such numbers, and have been employed at such low wages, that it has resulted in their replacing the American citizens who formerly performed

this class of labor, until now there are comparatively few Americans engaged in mining coal in Pennsylvania."

The state of facts thus set forth by this committee, of which Mr. Ford, of Michigan, was chairman, grows out of changed conditions. We no longer have endless tracts of fertile land crying for settlement. Many parts of the United States, it is true, are still unsettled, and much of our territory is sparsely inhabited as compared to the standards of Europe. None the less, the conditions have changed utterly from the days when the supply of vacant land was indefinite, the demand for labor almost unbounded, and the supply of people very limited. We have now a large population, the natural increase of which is quite sufficient to take up our unoccupied lands and develop our resources with due rapidity. In many parts of the country the struggle for existence in large cities has become as fierce as in the old world. Our labor market, if we may judge from the statistics of the unemployed, is overstocked in many places, and that means a tendency toward a decline in wages. This tendency is perilous both socially and politically. In a country where every man has a vote, and where the government is of and by the people, it is as essential as it is right everywhere that the rate of wages should be high and the average standard of living good. If it comes to be otherwise, our whole system is in serious danger.

That this is not a fanciful anxiety is only too readily proved. Any one who is desirous of knowing in practical detail the degrading effect of this constant importation of the lowest forms of labor can find a vivid picture of its results in the very interesting book just published by Mr. Riis, entitled "*How the Other Half Lives*." The story which he tells of the condition of a large mass of the laboring population in the city of New York is enough to alarm every thinking man; and this dreadful condition of things is intensified every day by the steady inflow of immigration, which is constantly pulling down the wages of the working people of New York and affecting in a similar way the entire labor market of the United States.

In a word, the continued introduction into the labor market of four hundred thousand persons annually, half of whom have no occupation and most of whom represent the rudest form of labor, has a very great effect in reducing the rates of wages and disturbing the labor market. This, of course, is too obvious

to need comment, and this tendency to constantly lower wages by the competition of an increasing and deteriorating immigration is a danger to the people of the United States the gravity of which can hardly be overestimated. Moreover, the shifting of the sources of the immigration is unfavorable, and is bringing to the country people whom it is very difficult to assimilate and who do not promise well for the standard of civilization in the United States—a matter as serious as the effect on the labor market.

The question, therefore, arises,—and there is no more important question before the American people,—What shall be done to protect our labor against this undue competition, and to guard our citizenship against an infusion which seems to threaten deterioration? We have the power, of course, to prohibit all immigration, or to limit the number of persons to be admitted to the country annually, or—which would have the same effect—to impose upon immigrants a heavy capitation tax. Such rough and stringent measures are certainly neither necessary nor desirable if we can overcome the difficulties and dangers of the situation by more moderate legislation. These methods, moreover, are indiscriminate; and what is to be desired, if possible, is restriction which shall at the same time discriminate. We demand now that immigrants shall not be paupers or diseased or criminals, but these and all other existing requirements are vague, and the methods provided for their enforcement are still more indefinite and are perfectly ineffective. Any law, to be of use, must require, in the first place, that immigrants shall bring from their native country, from the United States consul or other diplomatic representative, an effective certificate that they are not obnoxious to any of the existing laws of the United States. We ought, in addition, to make our test still more definite by requiring a medical certificate in order to exclude unsound and diseased persons.

In reference to this matter of medical inspection, Surgeon-General Hamilton, in his report just published, states, as an illustration of the inefficiency of the present law, that of fifteen insane persons and eleven idiots reported by the medical officer at New York, four of the insane and all of the idiots were permitted to land. In this same report, which is one of the ablest and most important papers that have appeared on the subject of immigration, Dr. Hamilton says further that every emigrant should “produce to the consul a certificate from a legally-qualified resi-

dent physician to the effect that such emigrant is at the time suffering from no contagious or chronic disease or disability." Dr. Hamilton also states that at the present time there is no medical inspection whatever of immigrants except at the port of New York, and thus we have practically no protection against the importation of disease or insanity.

We ought also to insist that the consular certificate be given only after careful inquiry and due proof, and we must make a further definite test which will discriminate against illiteracy if we desire any intelligent restriction or sifting of the total mass of immigration. It is a truism to say that one of the greatest dangers to our free government is ignorance. Every one knows this to be the case, and that the danger can be overcome only by constant effort and vigilance. We spend millions annually in educating our children that they may be fit to be citizens and rulers of the Republic. We are ready to educate also the children who come to us from other countries; but it is not right to ask us to take annually a large body of persons who are totally illiterate and who are for the most part beyond the age at which education can be imparted. We have the right to exclude illiterate persons from our immigration, and this test, combined with the others of a more general character, would in all probability shut out a large part of the undesirable portion of the present immigration. It would reduce in a discriminating manner the total number of immigrants, and would thereby greatly benefit the labor market and help to maintain the rate of American wages. At the same time it would sift the immigrants who come to this country, and would shut out in a very large measure those elements which tend to lower the quality of American citizenship, and which now in many cases gather in dangerous masses in the slums of our great cities.

The measure proposed would benefit every honest immigrant who really desired to come to the United States and become an American citizen, and would stop none. It would exclude many, if not all, of those persons whose presence no one desires, and whose exclusion is demanded by our duty to our own citizens and to American institutions. Above all, it would be a protection and a help to our workingmen, who are more directly interested in this great question than any one else can possibly be.

HENRY CABOT LODGE.

THE DOWRIES OF WOMEN IN FRANCE.

BY MADAME ADAM.

A DOWRY! The one important word which fills the imaginations of young French girls from earliest childhood! Before the little girl has any idea of what a dowry is she begins to benefit by it, because the nurse of a child whose parents are moderately rich takes better care of her little charge than the nurse of a child of tradespeople or of those who "have not yet made their fortunes." The servants very soon teach the child that she is to have a dowry; that it will be easy for her to find an attractive husband. And among the children of relatives and friends of the family, her nurse does not fail to assert that "*She* is more important than you are," or "*She* is very rich," or "Your mothers and fathers will never let you marry a man without a cent, as they will let her."

At meals, in the drawing-room, the little girls often hear this grave subject discussed. A relative or a friend will some day say, either in fun or seriously: "This little one has nothing to complain of; with her dowry she will have no difficulty about getting married." Or, if the dowry is small: "Your daughter is pretty, and with her little dowry she is sure of not having to *coiffer Ste. Catherine*." *Coiffer Ste. Catherine*—that is, not to be married—is the one great fear that induces many who could find no one good enough for them formerly to marry what La Fontaine calls the *malotru* of proud girls.

A rich father in the middle class in France frequently tells his daughter: "You know, my child, your mother and I have managed well. Your future is assured. You do not need to throw yourself at the head of the first comer. Don't fall foolishly in love with a poor man. A girl in your position can at least look for an equal match." The French middle classes have always