

US 10589.12
~~US 10602.25~~
(Arch)

THE INJUSTICE
OF A
LITERACY TEST FOR
IMMIGRANTS

" I am on record as being unqualifiedly opposed to the literacy test. * * * I care more for the sound body and the sound mind and the straight look out of the eye and the ability and willingness to work as a test than for any other test that can be given. I have been asked whether illiteracy stands in the way of assimilation. I say unqualifiedly in my opinion it does not." From an address by the Honorable Charles Nagel, Secretary of Commerce and Labor, delivered at New York, January 18, 1911.

By **MAX J. KOHLER, L. L. B.**
NEW YORK
1912



Pres to Eliot.

The Injustice of a Literacy Test for Immigrants

The Dillingham Bill (S. 3175) which has passed the Senate and the Burnett Bill (H. R. 22527) which has been reported to the House of Representatives, represent a radical departure from the historical policy of our Government respecting immigration legislation. These bills, if enacted into law, would for the first time restrict immigration, whereas, heretofore, all legislation has been regulative. The method resorted to for the restriction of immigration in both of these bills is that of a literacy test, which is the sole provision of the Burnett Bill.

In addition, the Dillingham Bill contains many radical innovations. Principal among these are (1) Section 3, which provides for the exclusion of all persons not eligible to naturalization; (2) Section 18, which requires that all aliens admitted to the United States shall be provided with certificates of admission and identity; (3) the abolition of the time-limit of three years within which persons may be deported; and (4) the consolidation of the general immigration statutes with the Chinese exclusion laws. There are other minor changes from existing law which tend to render the admission of aliens difficult when not excluding them entirely.

In support of the adoption of legislation to restrict immigration, its advocates base their arguments in the main upon the report of the Immigration Commission. This is a report in forty-odd volumes, only abstracts of which have to some extent been circulated, and there has been no opportunity for the Commission to properly digest the material collected by it.

With respect to the opportunity for properly weighing the material gathered by the Commission, its own editorial adviser, Professor H. Parker Willis, has stated: (*Survey*, Jan. 7, 1911, p. 571.)

"With so much actually collected in the way of detailed data, and with but scant time in which to summarize these data; lacking moreover a sufficient number of trained writers and statisticians to study the information acquired and to set it down with a due proportion of properly guarded inference, it is a fact that much of the Commission's information is still undigested, and is presented in a form which affords no more than a foundation for the work of future inquirers. Such inquirers ought immediately to take the data in hand before they become obsolete and while they still represent existing conditions with substantial accuracy. Pending the results of such inquiry, however, those who would judge what the Immigration Commission has done and would fain find there material in support of their own preconceived ideas should be careful. And those who wish simply to appraise the work of the Commission, with a view to forming some well-founded conclusion as to its meaning and its

merit, must confine themselves to very narrow limits. They must recognize that only in the broadest way can conclusions as yet be drawn from the masses of statistics and the very general textual treatment to be presented in the reports of the Commission. The question may be raised whether the Commission would not have done better had it limited the field work more narrowly, and increased the relative amount of expenditure devoted to 'overhead work' in the office. It did not do so, however, and the result has been, instead of a small and finished study, a large and uncompleted body of data."

Nevertheless, a majority of the Immigration Commission recommend the restriction of immigration and the adoption of the literacy test as the most feasible method of accomplishing this purpose.

The Dillingham Bill provides for the exclusion of all aliens over 16 years of age who cannot read and write the English or some other language, but permits an admissible alien to bring in or send for his wife, his children under eighteen years of age, his parents or grandparents over fifty years of age, whether they can read and write or not. The test of an immigrant's ability to read and write is to be applied by requiring him to read and write twenty to twenty-five words of the Constitution of the United States.

The Burnett Bill excludes all aliens over sixteen years of age, who are unable to read English or the language or dialect of some other country, and permits an admissible alien to bring in or send for his father or grand-father over fifty-five years of age, his wife, his mother, his grand-mother, his unmarried or widowed daughter whether able to read or not.

It will be noted that the Dillingham Bill requires reading and writing and admits only those children of an immigrant who are under eighteen years of age; whereas the Burnett Bill requires only reading and permits an immigrant to bring in or send for his daughters irrespective of age, though sons over sixteen years of age will be excluded, thus dividing a family.

Both the Burnett Bill and the Dillingham Bill would in practice exclude almost all those females unable to read and write over sixteen years of age, coming alone and who may desire to enter domestic service.

If the provision for the literacy test contained in the Dillingham Bill, requiring words from the Constitution of the United States to be read and written, is enacted into law, it would in practice exclude a great many to whom the terms of the Constitution are unknown and for many of which there is no equivalent in their language. They would find it impossible to read the language of the Constitution, and on this account the percentage of exclusions would probably be double that estimated.

On the face of the statistics compiled by the Commissioner-General of Immigration, twenty-six per cent. of all immigrants would be excluded by the literacy test, though in the case of some immigrants more than fifty per cent. would be excluded.

The following table shows the percentages of aliens over 14 years of age who would be excluded by a literacy test:

(Abstract of reports of Immigration Commission, Vol. I., p. 99. Number and percentage of immigrants admitted to the United States who were 14 years of age or over and who could neither read nor write, during the fiscal years 1899 to 1910, inclusive, by race or people. Compiled from the reports of the Commissioner-General of Immigration.)

RACE OR PEOPLE.	Number 14 years of age or over admitted.	Persons 14 years of age or over who could neither read nor write.	
		No.	Per Cent.
African (black)	30,177	5,733	19.0
Armenian	23,523	5,624	23.0
Bohemian and Moravian	79,721	1,322	1.7
Bulgarian, Servian and Montenegrin	95,596	39,903	41.7
Chinese	21,584	1,516	7.0
Croatian and Slovenian	320,977	115,785	36.1
Cuban	36,431	2,282	6.3
Dalmatian, Bosnian and Herzegovinian	30,861	12,653	41.0
Dutch and Flemish	68,907	3,043	4.4
East Indian	5,724	2,703	47.2
English	347,458	3,647	1.0
Finnish	137,916	1,745	1.3
French	97,638	6,145	6.3
German	625,793	32,236	5.2
Greek	208,608	55,089	26.4
Hebrew	806,786	209,507	26.0
Irish	416,640	10,721	2.6
Italian (north)	339,301	38,897	11.5
Italian (south)	1,690,376	911,566	53.9
Japanese	146,172	35,956	24.6
Korean	7,259	2,763	38.1
Lithuanian	161,441	79,001	48.9
Magyar	307,082	35,004	11.4
Mexican	32,721	18,717	57.2
Pacific Islander	336	83	24.7
Polish	861,303	304,675	35.4
Portuguese	55,930	38,122	68.2
Roumanian	80,839	28,266	35.0
Russian	77,479	29,777	38.4
Ruthenian (Russniak)	140,775	75,165	53.4
Scandinavian	530,634	2,221	.4
Scotch	115,788	767	.7
Slovak	342,583	82,216	24.0
Spanish	46,418	6,724	14.5
Spanish-American	9,008	547	6.1
Syrian	47,834	25,496	53.3
Turkish	12,670	7,536	59.5
Welsh	17,076	322	1.9
West Indian (except Cuban)	9,983	320	3.2
Other peoples	11,209	5,001	44.6
Not specified	67	5	7.5
TOTAL	8,398,624	2,238,801	26.7

But these figures are based on the voluntary statements of the immigrants, and a literacy test would in practical application probably keep out a great many more than the figures above given would indicate,

especially with the Constitution as the test, since they are probably under-estimates rather than over-estimates; and they do not make allowance for the nervousness of the immigrant at the time of examination. Instead of excluding only 2 per cent. of the Jews as stated on page 6, of Report No. 559, 62d Congress, 2d Session, House of Representatives, the above statistics show that 26 per cent. of the Jews would be excluded.

Recent statistics of Jewish immigrants to Galveston give the following figures:

Of 1,333 males,	
Can read Yiddish and Russian.....	53.89%
Can read Yiddish only.....	24. %
Can read Russian only.....	2.83%
Can read Yiddish, Russian and Hebrew.....	0.71%
Cannot read any language	12.55%
Of 220 Females,	
Cannot read any language.....	37.73%

These are in the main the victims of Russian religious persecution, to whom the schools are closed on account of the faith they profess. The recent volume by Mary Antin, "The Promised Land" shows from her personal experience that to the Jews of Russia the United States typifies, above all else, the land where their children may have the benefits of education, denied them by the Russian government.

As respects the inadequacy and injustice of a literacy test as the measure of a man's desirability for admission, the following expressions of opinion are submitted:

(Extract from an address by Honorable Charles Nagel, Secretary of Commerce and Labor, delivered on January 18, 1911, at New York.)

I am on record as being unqualifiedly opposed to the illiteracy test. It is not a matter of sentiment. You may indulge sentiment in an individual case, but you cannot indulge sentiment in governmental policy. You must know why you come to your conclusion. I think I know why I have come to mine. I care more for the sound body and the sound mind and the straight look out of the eye and the ability and the willingness to work as a test than for any other test that can be given.

I have been asked whether illiteracy stands in the way of assimilation. I say unqualifiedly in my opinion it does not. On the contrary, to be entirely frank about it, I believe that the ability to read and write a foreign language, aided by your foreign press in this country, tends to perpetuate the spirit of colonization longer than it can be if a sound mind and body comes in without the ability to read and write and is forced of necessity to resort to our own language.

(From the Annual Report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, 1909, page 5.)

* * * It cannot be stated as a hard and fast rule that the desirability of an alien is always to be measured by his ability to read and write.

From the Annual Report of the Commissioner-General of Immigration, 1910, page 5.)

There may be some merit in the proposals to fix a "literacy test" and to increase the head tax; but, as was explained in last year's report, neither of these projects is likely to be as efficacious as their advocates think; for the first is not in the direction, necessarily, of raising the general standard, and is not as practical as it looks on the surface, and the second, under the existing system of lending money or selling passage on credit, would to some extent increase opportunities for the exploitation of aliens, and bring many of the lowest element into the country in a more impoverished state than they now come.

(Extract from the views of Mr. Bennet of New York and Mr. O'Connell of Massachusetts, House of Representatives, Report No. 1956, Part 2, 61st Congress, 3d Session.)

* * * The educational test * * * will keep out some able-bodied men and women of irreproachable moral character and filled with the desire to work, but who have not had early educational advantages; and will admit practically every foreign-born criminal, who has misused early advantages, and also that small, but dangerous, class, who come to this country with no intention of engaging in an honest occupation, but of maintaining themselves through the exploitation of their fellow-countrymen. Education is the principal means through which this class obtains the confidence of its victims.

We do not, however, principally oppose the literacy test because of its being a sham, nor entirely because it keeps out many who should be admitted and lets in some who should be debarred, but because the reasons given for restriction are slight and those for selection do not exist. It is true that the Immigration Commission reported that in some basic industries there was a surplus of labor, which indicated that there was an overplus of unskilled laborers in the industries of the country, but the Commission unanimously recommended that so far as restriction was concerned it should be applied to unskilled laborers either single or coming here leaving their families behind them. The sole recommendation of the Immigration Commission in regard to the educational test was that it was the most feasible, from which we assume the majority meant that it was the easiest to secure, and even in this we think that that majority was in error. As to the character of the immigrants who have come to this country in the past 25 years, the Immigration Commission—nine men of differing views—reported unanimously that conviction for crime is no more common among the new immigrants than among the native born; that they are far less the victims of disease than any other class of immigrants of whom statistics have ever been kept; that they are rarely found among the victims of alcoholism; that pauperism is relatively at a minimum among them; that in the most congested blocks of cities having the largest foreign-born populations five-sixths of the homes of the foreign-born are well kept and two-fifths are immaculate—and this on the report of women investigators; that their children attend school in large numbers; and that such new immigrants are much more rarely found in the insane asylum than their predecessors.

While we concur in the evident opinion of the commissioner-general that the literacy test would not be effective, there is no question about its effectiveness concerning one class, and that is the illiterate aliens who in prior years have been admitted to this country and who are not yet naturalized. In past years, when times have become hard in this country the alien who had but recently arrived, who was an unmarried man, or who had a family in the country of his birth went back at the first sign of economic distress, thus relieving this country of any question as to his support. The most recent and impressive example was had during the years of 1907 and 1908, and these returning aliens went cheerfully because they understood that when there was a demand again for labor in this country, they could return.

* * * * *

The moment the literacy test is enacted every alien in this country who cannot comply with it, and who has the slightest desire to attach himself to our country will be attached to this country by the fact that if he once goes out he cannot certainly come in, for even the method of administration of the new test is uncertain. And, therefore, if another period of economic distress should come, we would not have the benefit of the economic relief which we had in the recent years through the emigration of those who were least competent to succeed. This would make any subsequent panic or business depression much more disastrous and the recovery much more slow.

* * * * *

It has been our boast since the days of Roger Williams, Lord Baltimore, and William Penn that this country was the refuge for the oppressed. On that sentiment, in large part, has been built up our national idea of free America, and because of that sentiment, we have attracted here the ambitious of every nation. The free and unrestricted immigration of the able-bodied has not injured our country in the past, but has helped it, and the maintenance of our shores as an asylum for the oppressed has made us an example for liberty everywhere and a continued menace to tyranny. We cannot afford, after our emphatic success as exponents of liberty and freedom, to adopt at this time any measure based upon an avowal of our belief that lack of opportunity of any alien people has made them our inferiors, nor can we afford to close our doors to fugitives from oppression and injustice still unfortunately existing. The Russian-Jewish mothers who have seen their husbands and their children killed and maimed in the pogroms have just as much right in this country in the twentieth century as the Puritan and the Pilgrim had in the seventeenth. The Pole and the Finn who has seen his country enslaved, have the same rights to come here to freedom and liberty as had William Penn and his Quakers.

The denationalized Roumanian Jew, proscribed because of race and religion in the country of his birth, has the moral right to enjoy our country's Constitution guaranteeing religious freedom. The family of the murdered Armenian Christian from Asia Minor cannot be barred without a reversal of all our previous professions and practice, and the South Italian, coming to this country to escape the burden of medieval landlordism, puts his claim on exactly the same grounds as the Irish immigrant of the fifties. In the past, the peoples coming to us because of similar reasons have risen among us to standing and success, and

there is no reason to believe that those now coming will not do so also. The rigid bill, ordered to be reported, against which we protest, would bar out, irrespective of every other consideration, the people of any of the classes we have mentioned. * * *

(Extract from the views of Representatives Gustav Küstermann, Adolph J. Sabath, Henry M. Goldfogle, presented to the House of Representatives on January 28, 1911, House of Representatives, 61st Congress, 3d Session, Report No. 1956, Part 2.)

The application of a literacy test would serve to exclude from admission some able-bodied men and women of good moral character, capable of self-support, and industriously inclined, but who owing to the unfortunate, and in many instances deplorable, conditions existing in their native lands, have not had the advantage of education. In some of the countries from which many of the immigrants, at which this bill is manifestly aimed, come the opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of reading and writing is quite meager, while in some localities in those countries the opportunity for education is to such persons practically denied. And yet these people may be thoroughly honest, thrifty and enterprising, industrious and self-supporting. When admitted to our shores, thousands and thousands of them avail themselves of the means of the popular and liberal school system almost everywhere afforded in the Union to get a rudimentary education. Certainly, at least sufficient to enable them to read and write.

In every large city—indeed, in every city and almost every large town—men and women of foreign birth are to be found who, when they landed in this country could neither read nor write, have learned to do so in the schools (either the day or night schools) or obtained their knowledge through private instruction or, as is frequently the case, by being taught by their own children. Hundreds of thousands of such persons have become good farmers and mechanics, storekeepers and tradesmen and successful and prosperous business men in different lines of industry and have contributed to the general welfare of the communities in which they settled. Myriads of such persons have made desirable acquisitions and became, after they had availed themselves of the opportunities this country affords, desirable citizens.

The children of immigrant parents, whether born here or abroad, quickly acquire an education in our schools. They exhibit eagerness to learn. Statistics demonstrate and experience proves that these children have great aptitude for study and make rapid and, in fact, remarkable educational progress. Very large numbers of them graduate from the schools with honor, many of them go to high schools and colleges. Yet their parents, if illiterate when knocking at the doors of our country for admission, would have been turned away under an educational test such as the bill reported proposes. * * *

We cannot but regard the bill as un-American. It is opposed to all the traditions of our country and subversive of the broad principles we have always professed in the past. Our national boast has been that this country was the refuge for the downtrodden and the oppressed, who when coming in a healthy bodily and mental condition and with law-abiding spirit should be permitted to enter our gateway and to receive the hospitable shelter of our land. That sentiment in very large part has

built up our national idea of free Americanism. We attract through its means the ambitious from other nations. The immigration of the able-bodied and honestly inclined has heretofore contributed in a very large degree to the greatness and prosperity of this Republic.

The maintenance of our land as an asylum for the oppressed and those who are compelled to escape from scenes of tyranny and persecution has made us an example for true liberty everywhere. In the line of our traditions and of the principles that have guided us in the past, through means of which our country stands pre-eminent as the land of liberty and freedom and equal opportunity, we cannot afford to close our doors to those who still unfortunately suffer from oppression existing in foreign lands, merely because they cannot read, although otherwise qualified for such admission under existing law.

(Extract from the Veto Message of President Cleveland, March 2, 1897.)

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

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

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

* * * * *

It is said, however, that the quality of recent immigration is undesirable. The time is quite within recent memory when the same thing was said of immigrants who, with their descendants, are now numbered among our best citizens.

* * * * *

The best reason that could be given for this radical restriction of immigration is the necessity of protecting our population against degeneration and saving our national peace and quiet from imported turbulence and disorder.

I cannot believe that we would be protected against these evils by limiting immigration to those who can read and write in any language twenty-five words of our Constitution. In my opinion it is infinitely more safe to admit a hundred thousand immigrants who, though unable to read and write, seek among us only a home and opportunity to work,

than to admit one of those unruly agitators and enemies of governmental control, who cannot only read and write but delights in arousing by inflammatory speech the illiterate and peacefully inclined to discontent and tumult. Violence and disorder do not originate with illiterate laborers. They are rather the victims of the educated agitator. The ability to read and write as required in this bill, in and of itself, affords, in my opinion, a misleading test of contented industry and supplies unsatisfactory evidence of desirable citizenship or a proper apprehension of the benefits of our institutions. If any particular element of our illiterate immigration is to be feared for other causes than illiteracy, these causes should be dealt with directly instead of making illiteracy the pretext for exclusion to the detriment of other illiterate immigrants against whom the real cause of complaint cannot be alleged.

(Extract from the remarks of Professor Emily Greene Balch, Wellesley College, author of "Our Slavic Fellow Citizens," at meeting of the American Economic Association, Washington, D. C., December 29, 1911.)

I do not include the illiteracy test among the measures that I desire, because I believe that it would effect exclusion along a line that would cause great hardship and that is not coincident with desirability and undesirability from our point of view. The miner who cannot read Ruthenian and whose son came over from Harvard recently to consult me about the social work that he wants to do among his people in Pennsylvania was better stuff and better fitted to prosper in America than the unsuccessful "intellectual proletariat" who come to America to recoup their failure at home. Of course I am citing an exceptional case, but I believe that it is a fact that most Americans have an entirely false conception of the real significance of peasant illiteracy, which need not connote a lack of either energy or intelligence. The advantage, too, when here, of the ability to read and write in a foreign language is vastly over-rated and the barrier that it sets up to assimilation is quite overlooked.

(Extract from the testimony of Miss Grace Abbott, Director of the Immigrants' Protective League, Chicago, before the Committee on Immigration, House of Representatives, January 11, 1912.)

I feel very strongly that it would be a great mistake to have a literacy test, because of the fact that there are many parts of Europe, notably in Galicia, and in parts of Russia and Hungary, as well as in southern Italy, where the possibility of getting an education is often extremely difficult. To exclude them would mean excluding a group of people who are eager to advance their position, who are willing to make great sacrifices in order to do it, but who happen to lack the ability to read and write. Great numbers of them supply that lack immediately upon coming here, and some come in order to supply it. The literacy test is no guaranty of character, and it seems to me its adoption would be a departure from American traditions which would not be beneficial to the American industrial situation.

(Extract from the testimony of Herman Stump, Former Commissioner-General of Immigration, before the Industrial Commission. Report of the Industrial Commission, Vol. XV., p. 6.)

My idea of immigration is this: We have, in my mind, the most skilful and best laboring class in the world, I think American workingmen are superior to others. It may be in some of the finer arts, where it takes long to acquire the skill that is required, it is not so, but for the production of work, with our improved machinery, we can beat the world. We are also an educated people. We want our sons to become our clerks, accountants, and business men and find employment on the higher walks and occupations. We must necessarily have a certain other class to do our manual work—not menial exactly, but work which is honorable but at the same time of a lower order, which requires no skill or education. We want laborers upon our roads, upon our railroads, to clean our sewers and streets, and everything of that kind, and when you look around, I think you will find that Americans are getting beyond that. A young able-bodied man who comes from a foreign land to settle here, with energy and willingness to work, is an acquisition to the country, and while we do not want him to occupy the positions which education would enable him to occupy, we want him to occupy the positions where it does not matter much whether he knows his A B C's, or the simple rule of three or anything else.

(Extract from the testimony of Dr. Joseph H. Senner, former Commissioner of Immigration at the Port of New York, before the Industrial Commission. Report of the Industrial Commission, Vol. XV., p. 168.)

Based on my extended practical experience in charge of the paramount immigration station, I state that with the present number of inspection aisles and of available registry clerks, an introduction of the Lodge bill would much more than double the time for examination, and thereby double the hardships of steerage passengers. Its practical effect would, therefore, in my opinion, come dangerously near to an annihilation of immigration from nations of higher grade.

In order to dispose right here of the Lodge bill, I wish to state that our opposition to the same is principally based on our conviction that the proper time for such an educational test is at the time of naturalization and not upon admission to the country. We further regard its application to women as not only generally unjust, but practically, also, as a severe aggravation to our much vexed servant-girl question. We believe that its introduction for immigrants stands in a rather curious contrast with the present policy of expansion and its consequence as to wholesale reception of illiterate, if not savage, co-citizens. And finally, as a protective measure for American workingmen, the Lodge bill would be simply a farce, because the skilled laborer, whose competition organized labor wishes to restrict, could at any time pass any such examination.

(Extract from an editorial in New York "Christian Work," March 18, 1911.)

Every year there are attempts to foist upon Congress bills to prevent immigration. Now it is one form of test, now another. At present

it is the so-called educational test that the perpetrators of these bills would insert in our immigration laws. As a matter of fact there could hardly be a more deceptive test of real worth. The public school system is not developed in many parts of Europe as it is here, or had not been until very recent years. Consequently many who have been coming here have not been what one might call scholars. Not always could they read and write. But these very ones have often been our best immigrants—strong, lusty, ambitious, good natured, hard-working young men. The proposed educational test would shut out just these men who are tilling our farms, building our houses, laying our railroads and bridges, digging our coal from the earth. Many of them, under the stimulus of American surroundings and since it is necessary if they would have a share in the American Government, learn to read. The New York night schools are full of adults learning reading and other useful accomplishments. Their children learn with greatest avidity. The test of immigration should be health and morality. We cannot afford to be the hospital for those Europe has made sick so long as Europe can afford to care for them, neither can we act as the penitentiary for her criminals; but apart from this we should welcome the immigrants freely, for they are our wealth.

(Extract from a Protest against the proposed new immigration law, presented to the President by a Delegation of Citizens of Philadelphia, after Conference with Speaker Cannon and the Pennsylvania Congressional Delegation, June 23, 1906.)

It is submitted that an immigrant should not be denied admission to our country if he is morally, physically, and mentally sound; that inability to read is not a fair measure of a man's moral worth, nor of his economic value nor of his mental capacity; in short, it is not a fitting test of a man's honesty, nor of his capacity to work with his hands nor of his ability to learn. Experience proves that moral soundness—simple honesty—is independent of intellectual culture; many men are morally sound notwithstanding their ignorance, and many others are morally unsound in spite of their education.

The ability to read is not a fair measure of a man's economic value, because experience proves that a man's capacity to earn a living is not necessarily dependent on intellectual culture.

* * * * *

A man's inability to read is not a fair test of his intelligence nor of his ability to learn. Many men are so circumstanced as to be precluded from learning how to read. This occurs in some cases, as in that of the Jewish inhabitants of Russia and Roumania, through governmental measures enforced for that very purpose or, as in the case of other subjects of those governments and of some of the inhabitants of other European lands, through hindering causes of a sociological nature. Such privation, though preventing a man from learning life through literature, does not prevent him from learning through experience; on the contrary, it quite frequently enhances this latter capacity, as numerous instances prove. It is therefore in the highest degree unreasonable to assume that a man's inability to read so strikingly impairs his value as a factor in the social economy that he must be completely debarred from taking part in it.

(Extract from an article on "Adjustment—Not Restriction," by Miss Grace Abbott, Director of the Immigrants Protective League, Chicago, Survey, January 7, 1911, p. 529.)

As for the literacy test, it is difficult to find anything to recommend it as the best means, or even as a good means of selecting our future citizens. What we desire is a character test, and the ability to read and write has never been regarded as a means of determining honesty or thrift. It is not even a test of ambition, for the immigrants come without the meager educational equipment because they have been given no opportunity to attend school in the countries from which they come. There is nothing which is so much the result of conditions over which the immigrant has no control as his ability to read and write, and no deficiency which we are so well equipped to supply.

(Views of Hon. J. Hampton Moore of Pennsylvania, House of Representatives, Report I., 1956, Part 2, 61st Congress, 3d Session, January 28, 1911.)

I am opposed to restriction of immigration by the illiteracy test, because the enforcement of such a test would tend to exclude worthy but uneducated immigrants who are willing to work, and of whom we stand in need, and would admit unworthy, educated immigrants who will not work and of whom we already have more than we need. In my judgment the desirable immigrant is the law-abiding worker who comes to this country in good faith, and the undesirable immigrant is the clever and educated schemer who, immediately upon his arrival, begins to find fault with our institutions.

(Extract from a speech of Hon. John C. Keliher, of Massachusetts, in the House of Representatives.)

I would ask you to follow me in your mind's eye under the bed of Boston Harbor, where Yankee enterprise and energy have bored an immense tunnel with an opening of sufficient size to permit of a double-track road-bed that brings inestimable joy to the denizens of a great section of the city, in the form of convenience and comfort in reaching their homes from the business locality of the city. Could this work have been done as economically and with the dispatch that characterizes it if countless sons of sunny Italy had not been at hand? Go with me also into the subway we are now building in Boston, which will be a boon to all the people of that congested city. Toiling like beavers in a cut, the arch of which is scarcely 15 feet under the foundation of a 13-story building, can be seen by night and day myriad Italians toiling with no apparent thought of the great danger that ever hovers over this hazardous enterprise. It is safe to say that if a knowledge of the art of reading were the test demanded, rather than a sound body and willingness to swing a pick, there would be scarcely a mother's son of them engaged upon that great public project. Now, with what class of labor do these Italians interfere? The Irishman of to-day won't go into the trench unless it is to act as a boss; the German cannot be induced to grasp a pick; the native American's physical make-up would bar him if he did not consider such menial labor beneath him; the Scandinavian finds ample demand for his service in

more congenial branches; the Englishman answers the call of the mill proprietor, and the Scotchman goes with him.

If you shut the door to the dark-skinned son of Italy, where will we go to get the commodity which to us is an essential? The second generation, the son of the trench-digging Italian, won't follow his father's footsteps in those fields. He goes to school, absorbs book-learning quickly, and becomes imbued with a laudable ambition to better himself, and he does. You could no more coax him to wield a pick or handle a shovel than you could a Sioux Indian to imbibe water as a social beverage if whiskey were available. This being so, if you bar out the Italian, Pole and Hungarian from whence are we to recruit our trench-diggers?

(Extract from a speech of Hon. Bourke Cockran, of New York, in the House of Representatives.)

We who oppose the educational test believe the man who works with his hands, who is trained to efficiency in labor, is the desirable immigrant. The test that we wish to impose is one that will establish his ability and his willingness to work. * * * There is not a vicious man in any community outside of the poorhouse that is not more or less educated. He cannot live by his wits rather than by his hands unless those wits are trained to some extent. Any unlettered immigrant shows that he must have virtuous instincts by the very fact that he comes here, for he can have no other purpose than to support life by his toil. I believe that it is more important that the applicant for admission to these shores should be made to show by the calloused palms of his hands that he is accustomed to work than to show glibness of tongue in meeting a literary test.

Mr. Chairman, let us consider in the light of ordinary experience what must happen to the man who comes here with nothing except the capacity to work. He must work to live, and he must work hard all day. No man who spends all the hours of the day in work can be vicious. Even if he had vicious propensities, he would have no time to indulge them. How can any man work from morning until night, increasing the production of the soil, and be other than a valuable citizen? The man who comes here where no mode of living is possible to him except by the work of his hands gives a bond to society that his life, if it be supported at all, must be spent in actively serving the common welfare. The unlettered man can live only by work. The educated man never wants to live by manual labor. If I were reduced to a choice—and I do not want to exclude anybody—but if I were reduced to a choice between the man who could stand this educational test and the man who could not—if I must exclude one or the other—it would be the man with such a literary qualification as the bill provides, for he may lead a vicious life, while the man who works with his hands cannot lead other than a useful because an industrious life.

(Extract from an address made by Judge Nathan Bijur at the Massachusetts Reform Club, on January 28, 1907.)

On the other hand, it is a matter of common knowledge that thousands of honest, sturdy and intelligent natives of many European countries are illiterate, due solely to the lack of educational facilities in the country of their origin and residence. The fact is well known to every

person having experience with this class of immigrants that in this country they rapidly acquire sufficient familiarity with our language to overcome their early disability.

(Letter of President Eliot of Harvard University.)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., February 14, 1910.

MY DEAR SIR:

I beg leave to invite your attention to the following statement of the principles which should govern the national legislation on immigration:

(1) Our country needs the labor of every honest and healthy immigrant who has the intelligence and enterprise to come hither.

(2) Existing legislation is sufficient to exclude undesirable immigrants.

(3) Educational tests should not be applied at the moment of entrance to the United States, but at the moment of naturalization.

(4) The proper education test is capacity to read in English or in the native tongue; not the Bible or the Constitution of the United States, but newspaper items in some recent English or native newspaper which the candidate cannot have seen.

(5) The attitude of Congress and the laws should be hospitable and not repellent.

The only questions which are appropriate are, is he healthy, strong, and desirous of earning a good living? Many illiterates have common sense, sound bodies and good characters. Indeed, it is not clear that education increases much the amount of common sense which nature gave the individual. An educational test is appropriate at the time when the foreigner proposes to become a voting citizen. He ought then to know how to read.

Very truly yours,
CHARLES W. ELIOT.

Hon. Jos. F. O'Connell,
House of Representatives.

(Letter of President John Cavanaugh, C.S.C., of Notre Dame University.)

NOTRE DAME, IND., February 26, 1910.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'CONNELL: * * * * *

I am not in favor of any educational test as applied to immigrants desiring to enter the United States, though an educational test is entirely proper before naturalization.

* * * * *

Very sincerely yours,
JOHN CAVANAUGH, C.S.C.,
President.

The Hon. Joseph F. O'Connell,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

(Letter of President Harry Pratt Judson, of the University of Chicago.)

The University of Chicago, February 28, 1910.

DEAR SIR: * * * I am not in favor of the restriction of immigration on the basis of the ability to read some European language. There is no doubt that the ability in question is desirable. At the same time, the conditions of workingmen in the old country and their conditions in our country are radically different. If they are industrious and honest and thrifty they will make useful citizens, and their children, having the opportunity of attending our free public schools, will acquire the needed education. * * *

Very truly yours,

HARRY PRATT JUDSON.

Hon. Joseph F. O'Connell,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

(Letter of President Joseph Himmel of Georgetown University.)

Georgetown University,

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 28, 1910.

SIR: Regarding the educational test as a means of restricting immigration, on which question there is an agitation to report out a bill, I beg leave to submit the following:

(1) The educational test should be applied to the voter, not to the immigrant.

(2) The laws restraining immigration are sufficiently drastic and, if put into execution, will safeguard the country. Those who have openly taught immorality and favored anarchy should be excluded rather than the illiterates.

An illiterate artisan is not necessarily an ignorant or undesirable immigrant. Our whole past history proves that such men may serve the country in their proper sphere.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH HIMMEL, *President.*

Hon. Joseph F. O'Connell,
House of Representatives.

(Letter of President J. G. Schurman of Cornell University.)

Cornell University,

ITHACA, N. Y., March 4, 1910.

DEAR SIR: I have your communication of February 23, with the enclosed copy of the letter of ex-President Eliot of Harvard University on the subject of the admission of immigrants into the United States.

I fully concur in the views expressed by President Eliot, and I do not think I can express them in clearer, more forcible or appropriate language.

Very truly yours,

J. G. SCHURMAN.

Hon. Joseph F. O'Connell,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

(Letter of President T. I. Gasson of Boston College, Boston, Mass.)

Boston College,
BOSTON, MASS., February 25, 1910.

MY DEAR MR. O'CONNELL:

* * * * *

(1) Does not the country need the toil of every intelligent, active and moral worker who comes to us?

(2) The proper time for the educational test is when the immigrant seeks to be naturalized.

(3) Let existing legislation be enforced before new laws are enacted. The wise regulations already made, if enforced, would bar out undesirable subjects.

(4) There are millions of acres in the West waiting for these farm-loving immigrants. I am sure that you will insist upon these truths.

Ever yours sincerely,

T. I. GASSON, S. J.

Hon. Joseph F. O'Connell,
Washington, D. C.

(Remarks of Senator James E. Martine of New Jersey in the United States Senate, April 18, 1912.)

MR. PRESIDENT: I cannot vote for the literacy test in this bill as a passport to this country. Forty to fifty years ago 90 per cent. of the immigrants that came to this country came from Ireland and Germany, and scarcely one of them could have stood this test; and yet all those immigrants, or practically all of them, became industrious citizens, amassed money, yes, fortunes through their thrift and ambition, and their children to-day are among the best citizens of this country. Education to a man or woman of evil character and disposition will make him or her most dangerous.

Mr. President, this test would have kept my mother, from whose bosom I drank the milk of justice and liberty, from this fair, fair land. I believe that this great country, blessed of God, can digest and assimilate all of the nations of the earth. I have no fear. Let our test be clean morals, sound and clean bodies, and, with a public school system, we can safely trust the rest to God. As Heaven is my witness, I will never vote to pass a measure that makes this ungenerous and unjust exaction on the part of a free people.

RATIO OF FOREIGN BORN TO NATIVE BORN UNCHANGED

Much is made by restrictionists of the supposed enormous influx of foreigners and especially of the change in the racial character of immigrants. For their purposes, they characterize the immigration which arrived here before 1890 as the "old" immigration, and that which has arrived since then as the "new."

But there has been no change in the ratio between foreign born and

native born as is demonstrated by the following table taken from the annual report of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor for 1908:

Census Year	Total Population Considered	Native Born		Foreign Born	
		Number	Per Cent. of Total	Number.	Per Cent. of Total
1860.....	31,443,321	27,304,624	86.8	4,138,697	13.2
1870.....	38,558,371	32,991,142	85.6	5,567,229	14.4
1880.....	50,155,783	43,475,840	86.7	6,679,943	13.3
1890.....	63,069,756	53,761,652	85.2	9,308,104	14.8
1900.....	76,303,387	65,843,302	86.3	10,460,085	13.7

The change in the source of our immigration is due to the simple fact that in the countries from which the United States before 1890 drew the bulk of its immigration, there has been an enormous industrial and economic expansion. And this, as is well known, is particularly true of Germany, which has become a country of immigration instead of one of emigration. Owing to the industrial development of that country so many agricultural laborers have been drawn into skilled industries that great numbers of unskilled laborers are attracted from Austria-Hungary, Russia and Italy—the same countries that supply the United States with the bulk of its unskilled labor.

The characterization of the present-day immigration as coming from a source out of harmony with the spirit of American institutions and not readily assimilable on that account, can be matched almost word for word by a similar characterization of the "old" immigration dating back to the beginning of the 19th Century. (See Report of Industrial Commission 1901, Volume XV, pp. 449-491, and Hearings before House Committee on Immigration, 62d Congress, 2d Session, pp. 95-98.)

This fact has been well presented in a speech of Senator James A. O'Gorman delivered in the Senate on April 18, 1912:

I am opposed to the imposition of an educational test upon those born in foreign countries who desire to come to the United States. I think it would be regrettable to exclude thousands of able-bodied, honest, and industrious men otherwise desirable who might not be able to meet the requirements of this proposed qualification.

It is said in behalf of this amendment that the large number of foreign-born who pass through the ports of the United States enter into competition with American labor. That is true; it has always been true; it was as true a generation ago as it is to-day, and yet in its results the entire country has benefited.

This proposal to exclude foreigners has no novelty. This Republic had but completed the first decade of its existence when, in the administration of John Adams, the same sentiments which I have heard expressed on this floor to-day and yesterday were uttered against the foreign born. To discourage immigration, as far back as 1798, under the influence of the Federalist Party, the period of naturalization was extended from 5 to 14 years, and during the same session of Congress and under the same influences the odious alien and sedition laws were passed, which conferred upon the then President of the United States the power to exclude at his will any foreigner found upon American territory. It is to the honor of our institutions and to the glory of the Republic that the shame and

infamy of that legislation was wiped out when the Democrats of this country elected Thomas Jefferson to the Presidency.

From time to time in every succeeding generation there have been those who were opposed to the admission of the foreign born into the brotherhood of the Republic. The same arguments were used then that are used now. Within the memory of men in this Chamber it was said of the races which are now glorified and alluded to as the "old immigration" that they could not be assimilated with the American body politic. That those accusations in those days were unfounded has been demonstrated by the experience of the American people. That the aspersions now cast upon the races from southern and eastern Europe are equally unfounded will be established in time.

We are not crowded on this continent. The population of all Europe might be placed in the single State of Texas, and there would be less congestion than now prevails on the Continent of Europe. If there ever come a time when the American people may deem it necessary to impose restrictions upon desirable immigration, the time will not come in our generation; and if a restriction should be required, if it should be deemed wise as a national policy to discourage immigration, let us proceed upon a safe and sound theory; let us make the qualification that of character and not educational attainments.

Our country is enriched every time an honest, able-bodied man enters the United States. Our institutions are threatened, our safety imperilled, when we become careless respecting those who, possessing an intellectual qualification, are devoid of that which is far more essential, a character qualification. Washington himself spoke of the need of preserving the morality of our people. With this proposed test you ignore the morality of your citizenship; you ignore the question as to whether in character the man is worthy to take his place in this great Republic and help to work out those problems that promise so much for the betterment and happiness of mankind.

For many years in our history we claimed to be the country that extended a welcome to the oppressed from every clime. Why have we changed? Are we so content with our own insulation and with the blessings of our institutions that we would exclude the rest of the people of the world from sharing in their advantages? Our marvelous prosperity, unexampled in the history of governments, a growth in a century and a quarter from 3,000,000 to 90,000,000 people, was made possible only by the policy of free immigration that this country has so generously and so wisely observed in the past. The foreign born have contributed their share of energy, devotion, and patriotism to the greatness of the Republic.

I can find nothing in the suggestions of Senators who have spoken on the other side of this proposition to incline me to yield to their view. I shall vote against every educational test. Impose only character test, and it will have my support.

CONGESTION IN LARGE CITIES

With regard to congestion in large cities, which is also put forth as an argument for further restriction, the following taken from the

abstracts of the report of the Immigration Commission shows how much this has been exaggerated:

(*Extract from Reports of the Immigration Commission, Vol. I., pp. 36-37.*)

Of late years the general impression that owing to immigration the poorer districts of the large cities are greatly overcrowded and that in consequence the living conditions are unsanitary and even degrading, has been so prevalent that it seemed desirable to make a very thorough investigation of this question. In consequence, in seven cities—New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Boston, Cleveland, Buffalo, Milwaukee—a very careful study was made of the conditions prevailing in the poorer quarters of the city inhabited by immigrants of various races. As was to be expected many extremely pitiful cases of poverty and overcrowding were found, at times six or even more people sleeping in one small room, sometimes without light or direct access by window or door to the open air. On the whole, however, the average conditions were found materially better than had been anticipated. Moreover, a comparison of the conditions in a great city like New York, or Chicago, with those in some of the smaller industrial centers, such as mining or manufacturing towns, shows that average conditions as respects overcrowding are very materially worse in some of the small industrial towns than in the large cities. For example, the per cent. of households having six or more persons per sleeping room of the race which showed the worst conditions in these large cities was only 5.2, whereas in the industrial centers studied in several cases the proportion was higher than this, and in the case of one race, as high as 9.5 per cent.

Moreover, in the large cities the population changes much more frequently than is generally thought. New immigrants are attracted to these poorer residential quarters by the presence of friends or relatives and the necessity of securing living quarters at the lowest possible cost, but as their economic status improves after living in this country for some time, they very generally move to better surroundings. The undesirable districts of the cities that are now inhabited largely by recent immigrants were formerly populated by persons of the earlier immigrant races. Few of these are now found there, and these remnants ordinarily represent the economic failures—the derelicts—among a generation of immigrants which, for the most part, has moved to better surroundings.

In many instances, too, where deplorable conditions were found they were due in part, at any rate, to circumstances over which the inhabitants have little direct control, such as a poor water supply or insanitary drainage—matters that should be attended to by the city authorities.

While instances of extreme uncleanness were found, the care of the households as regards cleanliness and an attempt to live under proper conditions was usually found unexpectedly good, about five-sixths of all the families visited in the poorer quarters of these large cities keeping their homes in reasonably good or fair condition.

There seems to be little doubt that the various races, owing presumably to their differing environments in Europe, differ somewhat as regards overcrowding and the care of their apartments, but the differences are less than might have been anticipated. The reports seem to indicate clearly that the chief cause of the overcrowding is a desire of the families to keep well within their income or to save money, even at the

expense of serious discomfort for the present, in order that they may better their condition in the future. The worst conditions were found among those who live in boarding groups, largely unmarried men, whose purpose in the main is to save money in order that they may send it back to their home country or return thither themselves as soon as a sufficient amount has been secured.

(RECENT COMMENTS ON IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE PENDING DILLINGHAM BILL, S. 3175.)

ADMINISTERING THE IMMIGRATION ACTS

The ideal immigration law, like the ideal law on any subject within the competence of Congress, should embody certain elementary principles. It should state its purpose plainly instead of by implication. It should go at its purpose directly and not circuitously. It should be so worded as to give the least possible opportunity for the arbitrary exercise of administrative discretion, compatible with the execution of the people's will as expressed through their representatives in Congress. If, at any time, the majority of our people comes to be in favor of restricting immigration, such a policy should be frankly stated and honestly carried out. To legislate by means of administrative regulation is a common enough practice in every country. But it is a method that is peculiarly objectionable when applied to so human a problem as the right of free entry into this country. We cannot deal with men and women as Germany's tariff authorities deal with American cattle. When tariff relations between the two countries are pleasant, Germany's "sanitary" precautions against American meat products function kindly. When tariff difficulties arise, Germany need not resort to formal reprisals; the sanitary inspection of American food imports merely becomes very rigid. This is a form of law-making by bureaucracy which we ought never to think of in connection with our immigration problem.

Such general considerations must enter into any just opinion of the bill for regulating immigration introduced by Senator Dillingham last summer, and reported with amendments by the Senate Committee on Immigration last week. Several of the provisions in this measure are objectionable, because they contravene the requirements of an honest, above-board immigration policy. The bill contains clauses that are apparently intended as entering wedges for restriction. Ingress into this country is to be surrounded with increased administrative formalities. The right of re-entry for aliens is put into question. By defining "aliens" for all administrative purposes of the law as all persons not native-born or naturalized citizens of the United States, questions are raised with regard to the wives and minor children of citizens. The provision for the exclusion of "persons not eligible to become citizens by naturalization" is intended as a restatement of the Chinese Exclusion acts, but contains the germs of possible misunderstanding with regard to Japanese, Koreans, Malays, and other Asiatics. More than that, it raises the danger of assimilating the execution of our general immigration laws to the methods pursued under the Chinese Exclusion acts. Administrative regulations that have hitherto come into play against the Chinese may tend to become general. Restriction will be apt to become exclusion. That may be the intention of the framers of the bill. If so, it should be honestly stated.

Objections of a like nature rise against that clause of the bill which

provides that all immigrants shall secure certificates of admission and identity, as well as return certificates upon leaving this country. This not only builds up very serious difficulties about the process of entry and egress, in this country, but tends to create a registry or passport system which is alien to the spirit of our institutions, and, being applied only to one element in the population, takes on the character of class discrimination. In 1882, President Arthur in a well-known veto message declared:

"Without expressing an opinion on that point, I may invite the attention of Congress to the fact that the system of personal registration and passports is undemocratic and hostile to the spirit of our institutions. I doubt the wisdom of putting an entering wedge of this kind into our laws. A nation like the United States, jealous of the liberties of its citizens, may well hesitate before it incorporates into its policy a system which is fast disappearing in Europe before the progress of liberal institutions. A wide experience has shown how futile such precautions are, and how easily passports may be borrowed, exchanged, or even forged by persons interested to do so."

We need only think of the merry game of evasion that attends upon the execution of the Chinese Exclusion laws, to foresee the opportunities for fraud and the miscarriage of justice under a similar practice applied to our vast European immigration.

To a policy of regulation that is indeed regulation no objections can be made. Restriction upon European immigration so far has been almost entirely based on reasons of public health and public morals. It is stated that the deportations of aliens from this country constitute one per cent. of the total number of arrivals. Though this means a large number of persons in the aggregate, it is perhaps not too large a percentage of insurance against alien disease and crime. But to make medical inspection and administrative routine part of an unwritten scheme for checking immigration is quite another thing. The intelligence and conscience of the country are not behind such measures.

—*New York Evening Post*,
January 24, 1912.

OUR IMMIGRATION POLICY

To the Editor of The Evening Post:

Sir: Your recent editorial on the Dillingham Immigration bill (S. 3175), now pending in the United States Senate, should appeal to all Americans. As the purpose of that bill is to amend and codify our immigration laws it should be carefully scrutinized. In addition to the objections named by you, it would give warrant to the average inspector to exclude more than a majority of the incoming immigrants. Under the law as it now stands at least forty thousand were deported during the last two years. The act of 1907, after enumerating several excluded classes, names beggars, paupers, and persons likely to become a public charge. Now, in addition, it is proposed by this bill to add in section three, a new class, denominated "vagrants." Under this head, inspectors must deport persons (otherwise admissible), "homeless," "wanderers," "who go from place to place," without occupation, and beggars, as defined by the dictionaries. Will not a large majority of immigrants, for the time being homeless, wanderers, without occupation, come under one of these de-

finitions? Would it not have excluded many of our best citizens of foreign birth if adopted earlier in our history?

We all agree that undesirable aliens should be excluded; but home-seekers, otherwise admissible, should not be excluded even though "homeless and wanderers from place to place, and without actual occupation," even though illiterate, for such are needed to develop the unoccupied acreage of the South and West, and the abandoned farms of the Eastern and Middle States, with the intensive farming to which they were accustomed in the fatherland; and to open our mines and to build our roads, aqueducts, tunnels, and canals.

The term "vagrants" is otherwise unfortunate, as it is used by the police in making arrests of suspects and persons sought under extradition proceedings against whom no charges are brought for offences against local laws. When requested by chiefs of police in other jurisdictions to make such arrests, the charge of "vagrant" is used, for want of something definite. It is too elastic and can be used by immigration officials to exclude multitudes (otherwise admissible), to suit a policy of extreme restriction, on the part of biased immigration inspectors.

My point of view is that of a citizen, a taxpayer, a member of many patriotic ancestral societies, who loves his country, and honors its flag. As such I object to the proposed policy of extreme exclusion; I object to the proposed literacy test as applied to robust young farmers, and I believe that good results will follow the adoption of admitted aliens, as wards of the nation, until they acquire English and learn the rights and duties of citizenship.

J. AUGUSTUS JOHNSON,
New York Evening Post,
January 29, 1912.

INJUSTICE IN IMMIGRATION BILLS

Strong disapproval of the Dillingham bill reported by the Senate Committee, further restricting immigration, was expressed yesterday by Max J. Kohler of 30 Broad Street, who is a member of the Committee on Immigration of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, of which President-Emeritus Eliot of Harvard is Chairman. Since the bill was reported by Senator Lodge a similar bill, only more restrictive in that it restores the illiteracy test for immigrants which was dropped by the Senate Committee, has been introduced in the House by Representative Focht of Pennsylvania. Mr. Kohler took exception to both bills, as well as to the Lodge report on the Senate measure.

"That report," he said yesterday, "was calculated, very likely unintentionally, to keep the public in ignorance of radical changes of a revolutionary character in the proposed law. The vague language of the report and its failure to call attention to the important provisions of the bill are probably responsible for the failure of the press to refer to these radical changes which would not otherwise have escaped strong comment.

"One very important provision of this sort is veiled in the report by language referring simply to a proposed 'consolidation of the Chinese immigration service with the general immigration service in the interest of economy.' As a matter of fact, Section 3 of the bill, to which the report here alludes, excludes all persons not eligible to become citizens by naturalization, with specified exceptions, and provides for certificates

of admission and identity for all admitted aliens against which certificates of readmission upon the departure of such aliens from the United States are to be issued.

WOULD VIOLATE TREATIES

"This provision is in substance a re-enactment of the Chinese exclusion laws, except that it extends them to other Asiatics such as Japanese, Koreans, Malays and the like. The statute would violate our treaties with China, with Japan (with whom we have now a 'gentleman's agreement' excluding only laborers), and with other countries, and would cause much friction. While it might ameliorate the Chinese exclusion laws somewhat, in some respects, and make them more oppressive in others, it would have a very bad effect in consolidating these laws with our general immigration laws, and accustom the immigration authorities—who would then enforce all these provisions in common—with the practice in vogue under the Chinese exclusion laws, of rejecting uncontradicted evidence in favor of aliens.

"More revolutionary still is the provision in Section 18, requiring all alien immigrants whatsoever to procure in duplicate 'certificates of admission and identification,' and return certificates, thus establishing a sort of 'ticket of leave' system for all aliens. What the use of the certificate would be is not apparent, as, unlike the Chinese exclusion laws, it is not made the exclusive method of establishing right of residence here—in which event it would be very oppressive, because of loss of certificates, changes in appearance, and impossibility of segregating aliens from American citizens and aliens who are now here, who are not required to have any certificates—and is not authority for readmission of such aliens, after trips abroad. Its enforcement would cost millions of dollars in the way of additional government employees to make out such certificates, and it would seriously retard ingress of all aliens into the country while the certificates are being prepared, and retard their egress on visits abroad while arranging to secure return certificates, and ignorance of these silly requirements would lead to many thousands of exclusions and deportations. A general discriminatory anti-alien feeling would be engendered by these provisions and even in the present form they probably are violative of treaty obligations toward foreign countries.

"We do not want to have paupers come here, nor persons likely to become paupers; nor anarchists, criminals, contract laborers, or persons mentally or physically defective. On the other hand, we do not want our laws to be so phrased as to keep out others who are desirable and whom this country needs."—*New York Times*, January 27, 1912.

(*Rev. Percy S. Grant, Minister of the Church of the Ascension, New York City, in the "North American Review," April, 1912:*)

The rapidity with which the democratic ideas are taken on by immigrants under the influence of our institutions is remarkable. I have personally had experiences with French-Canadians, Portuguese, Hebrews and Italians. These races have certainly taken advantage of their opportunities among us in a fashion to promise well for their final effect upon this country. The French-Canadian has become a sufficiently good American to have given up his earlier programme of turning New England into a new France—that is, into a Catholic province or of returning

to the Province of Quebec. He is seeing something better than a racial or religious ideal in the freedom of American citizenship; and on one or two occasions, when he had political power in two municipalities, he refrained from exercising it to the detriment of the public school system. He has added a gracious manner and a new feeling for beauty to New England traits.

The Portuguese have taken up neglected or abandoned New England agricultural land and have turned it to productive and valuable use. Both the French-Canadian and the Portuguese have come to us by way of the New England textile mills.

The actual physical machinery of civilization—cotton-mills, woolen-mills, iron-mills, etc.—lock up a great deal of human energy, physical and mental, just as one hundred years ago the farms did, from which later sprang most of the members of our dominant industrial class. A better organization of society, by which machinery would do still more and afford a freer play for mental and physical energy and organization, would find a response from classes that are now looked upon as not contributing to our American culture; would unlock the high potentialities in the laboring classes, now unguessed and unexpended.

The intellectual problems and the advanced thinking of the Hebrew, his fondness for study and his freedom on the whole from wasteful forms of dissipation, sport, and mental stagnation, constitute him a more fortunate acquisition for this country than are thousands of the descendants of colonial settlers. In short, we must reconstruct our idea of democracy—of American democracy. This done, we must construct a new picture of citizenship. If we do these things we shall welcome the rugged strength of the peasant or the subtle thought of the man of the Ghetto in our reconsidered American ideals. *After all, what are these American ideals we boast so much about? Shall we say public schools, the ballot, freedom? The American stock use private schools when they can afford them; they too often leave town on Election Day; as for freedom, competent observers believe it is disappearing. The conservators and believers in American ideals seem to be our immigrants. To the Russian Jew, Abraham Lincoln is a god. If American ideals are such as pay honor to the intellectual and to the spiritual or foster human brotherhood or love culture and promote liberty, then they are safe with our new citizens who are eager for these things.*

Among the large number of prominent persons who have signified their opposition to any restrictive legislation are the following:

- MISS JANE ADDAMS, Hull House, Chicago, Ill.
- RT. REV. EDWARD P. ALLEN, Bishop of Mobile, Ala.
- JOHN BIGELOW, author, former United States Minister to France.
- WALLACE M. BELL, President Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce.
- RT. REV. FR. BERNARD, New York City.
- RT. REV. THOMAS BONACUM, Bishop of Lincoln, Neb.
- CHARLES F. BORZILLERI, M. D., Buffalo, N. Y.
- RT. REV. BONAVENTURE F. BRODERICK, Tit. Bishop of Juliopolis.
- REV. EUGENE M. CALLAGHAN.
- JOSEPH CARABELLI, Esq., Cleveland, O.
- HON. GEORGE P. CODD, Detroit, Mich.
- RT. REV. CHARLES H. COLTON, Bishop of Buffalo.

RT. REV. FROWIN CONRAD, Conception, Mo.
 RT. REV. IGNATIUS CONRAD, Speilerville, Ark.
 RT. REV. JAMES HENRY DARLINGTON, Protestant Episcopal Bishop of
 Harrisburg.
 RT. REV. P. J. DONAHUE, Bishop of Wheeling, W. Va.
 RT. REV. ALBERICK DUNLEA, Dubuque, Ia.
 HON. E. F. DUNNE, Chicago, Ill.
 CHARLES W. ELIOT, President-Emeritus Harvard University.
 CARDINAL FARLEY, Archbishop of New York.
 RT. REV. JOHN S. FOLEY, Bishop of Detroit, Mich.
 HON. ALAN C. FOBES, Mayor of Syracuse, N. Y.
 RT. REV. P. J. GARRIGAN, Bishop of Sioux City.
 CARDINAL GIBBONS, Archbishop of Baltimore.
 MOST REV. JOHN J. GLENNON, Archbishop of St. Louis.
 HON. FRANK W. GNICHTEL, Trenton, N. J.
 RT. REV. THOMAS GRACE, Bishop of Sacramento.
 RT. REV. THOMAS HESLIN, Bishop of Natchez.
 RT. REV. LEO HAID, Bishop of Belmont, N. C.
 EDWARD L. HEARN, Supreme Knight, Knights of Columbus.
 RT. REV. JOHN Y. HOGAN, Bishop of Kansas City.
 JOHN J. HYNES, Supreme President, Catholic Mutual Benefit Association.
 MOST REV. JOHN IRELAND, Archbishop of St. Paul.
 RT. REV. NEPOMUCENE JAEGER, Chicago, Ill.
 HON. TOM L. JOHNSON, late Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio.
 RT. REV. MATHIAS C. LENIHAN, Bishop of Great Falls, Mont.
 RT. REV. CAMILLUS PAUL MAES, Bishop of Covington.
 RT. REV. JAMES A. McFAUL, Bishop of Trenton.
 RT. REV. CHARLES H. MOHR, St. Leo, Fla.
 DR. S. M. NEWMAN, President Eastern College, Front Royal, Va.
 W. W. NILES, Bishop of New Hampshire.
 RT. REV. CHARLES SANFORD OLMSTED, Bishop of Colorado.
 FREDERICK J. PAXON, President, Atlanta Chamber of Commerce.
 MOST REV. J. E. QUIGLEY, Archbishop of Chicago, Ill.
 BERNARD J. ROTHWELL, Ptesident, Boston Chamber of Commerce.
 RT. REV. JAMES SCHWEBACH, Bishop of La Crosse.
 REV. THOMAS R. SLICER, All Souls' Church, New York.
 RT. REV. PAUL SCHAENBLE, Covington, La.
 RT. REV. JOHN SCARBOROUGH, Bishop of New Jersey.
 RT. REV. J. W. SHANNAN, Bishop of Harrisburg.
 JOHN J. D. TRENOR, Member of National Board of Trade.
 RT. REV. DANIEL S. TUTTLE, Bishop of Missouri.
 RT. REV. A. VAN DE VYVER, Bishop of Richmond, Va.
 P. VERDAGNER, Vicar Apostolic of Brownsville, Tex.
 ELI S. WARNER, President, Commercial Club of St. Paul.