

# HINDU IMMIGRATION

---

---

## HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

## COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

RELATIVE TO

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION OF  
HINDU LABORERS

---

FEBRUARY 19, 1914

---

PART 2



WASHINGTON  
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

1914

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIXTY-THIRD CONGRESS.

JOHN L. BURNETT, Alabama, *Chairman.*

ADOLPH J. SABATH, Illinois.

JOHN A. M. ADAIR, Indiana.

HENRY M. GOLDFOGLE, New York.

JAMES L. SLAYDEN, Texas.

WILLIAM A. OLDFIELD, Arkansas.

JOHN E. RAKER, California.

JOHN A. KEY, Ohio.

FRANKLIN BROCKSON, Delaware.

AUGUSTUS P. GARDNER, Massachusetts.

EVERIS A. HAYES, California.

J. HAMPTON MOORE, Pennsylvania.

EDWIN A. MERRITT, JR., New York.

JAMES MANAHAN, Minnesota.

ALBERT JOHNSON, Washington.

P. W. BURNETT, *Clerk.*

The CHAIRMAN. Does the article have reference to the Hindus?

Mr. RAKER. It relates to all of them.

Mr. SABATH. I will tell you why I objected. Only a few days ago my attention was called to a law adopted, I think, by Bolivia, a health measure, in which they provided that no Bohemian or Hungarian should be admitted to that country, and people who know, understand that Bohemia in point of sanitation is a thousand years ahead of Bolivia. Some scientific people in writing articles go quite a distance in prejudicing the minds of people that the legislators do not know anything about.

Mr. RAKER. It is a fact, and it can be demonstrated before the committee before we get through, as he says, that—

History proclaims Asia as the fountain from which has flowed the most destructive pestilences that are recorded. Asiatic cholera, bubonic plague, typhus, smallpox, and malaria are reported weekly as being present in the ports of China, India, and Japan.

Mr. SABATH. I withdraw the objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The article will go in the record. It has been customary in the House and in the committees to let articles go in; and I do not know that we should draw the line, but it should be confined to the matter under discussion.

Mr. RAKER. The article deals with all of them, and I can not segregate the one from the other. It says:

The Chinese, Japanese, and East Indians are racially alien to us. The question of the protection of the health of the white race makes a study of the diseases of these people of more importance to us than even their economic or social characteristics.

Then he takes up the question of the diseases coming from those countries. It is impossible to segregate a particular race without dealing with all of them.

(The article submitted by Mr. Raker follows:)

#### THE HEALTH MENACE OF ALIEN RACES.

HOW THE NEGROES AFFLICTED US WITH HOOKWORM AND MALARIA—WHAT DISEASES THE CHINESE AND JAPANESE HAVE—THE LESSONS OF HISTORY.

[By Dr. Charles T. Nesbitt, Health Director, Wilmington, N. C.]

The most serious problem that Americans face when any large numbers of an alien race enter this country is the menace to the health of the people of the entire Nation.

We are just learning how terribly the negro has been revenged upon us for his enslavement. He brought malaria and the hookworm from his native jungle, and though he showed little effects of them himself he has spread them among us with fearful results.

When the negroes were brought from Africa they came practically immune to the effects of malaria. They unconsciously carried the organisms of this disease and furnished a never-failing source of infection for the nonimmune whites. For centuries the negroes' ancestors had carried infection until their red blood cells had accepted the masses of malarial protoplasm as permanent guests and had provided for their occupancy. The southern whites had chills and fever annually and blamed the mists from the swamps until the discoveries of Lavarán and Ross disclosed the true source of infection and mode of transmission, and Miller's studies in the Delta of the Mississippi River proved that the immune negro could carry virulent malarial organisms in his blood stream without discomfort to himself. In the same way negroes carry various intestinal parasites. The poorer white children of the South became pot-bellied, anemic, and dull-witted by thousands. They were in many cases even pitifully inferior physically and mentally to the little negroes of the same region. Many did not improve as they grew older, but continued in much the same condition. The medical men treated them for every ailment that could possibly produce the presenting symptoms without improving their condition in the least. They settled

into the hopeless state of apathy that has checked progress in every line, individual and otherwise.

In 1902, Dr. Stiles discovered that the hookworms, so common in Africa, which were carried in the American negroes' intestines with relatively slight discomfort, were almost entirely responsible for the terrible plight of the southern whites. It is impossible to estimate the damage that has been done to the white people of the South by the diseases brought by this alien race. Physical inefficiency and mental inertia are its results. Every enterprise that locates in the South to-day, if it uses the available white labor of the South, must reckon on not more than 40 to 60 per cent of normal efficiency. As this phase of the race problem continues to be studied, it is inevitable that further investigation will produce still stronger evidence that the races can not live together without a great damage to both; so great that even now the ultimate extinction of the negro in the United States is looked upon by many as assured. We also know that as his extinction progresses it is carrying tremendous damage to the white race.

The Chinese, Japanese, and East Indians are racially alien to us. The question of the protection of the health of the white race makes a study of the diseases of these people of more importance to us than even their economic or social characteristics. If eastern immigrants are likely to deplete the vitality of our people, as the negro has done, it is a far more serious question than if they merely force an unwelcome economic competition upon us. Let us examine for a moment the destructive potentialities of the Mongolian race.

History proclaims Asia as the fountain from which has flowed the most destructive pestilences that are recorded. Asiatic cholera, bubonic plague, typhus, smallpox, and malaria are reported weekly as being present in the ports of China, India, and Japan. The United States Public Health Service reports that 2,721 cases of cholera occurred in Japan during 1912. For many generations the Mongols have been afflicted with these diseases. May not they have acquired such a high state of immunity to their effects that they could be the unconscious carriers of virulent infective organisms, and as unconsciously transmit these diseases to the whites of America, just as the negroes have transmitted hookworm and malaria to the whites of the South?

One of the most serious problems in preventive medicine is the typhoid carrier. It is estimated that 3 out of every 100 people who recover from typhoid continue to carry in their intestines and elsewhere in their bodies active and virulent typhoid germs for months and even for years. Many serious epidemics of typhoid have been traced to this source. These carriers have been rendered immune and unconsciously tolerate the germs. Carriers of diphtheria and pneumonia are common among us, and it is now claimed by responsible authorities that the infection of scarlet fever, measles, and whooping cough is perpetuated by the continued presence of virulent organisms in the noses and throats of persons who have acquired immunity. The longer the race carries an infection, the greater the possible number of immune carriers. Is it, in the light of these facts, unreasonable to assume that the Mongolian race, by reason of many generations of infection with cholera and plague, has developed within itself a number of immune carriers of these diseases, who may, if they are allowed to come among us, become centers of infection wherever they may go?

Is it possible for the Mongols to introduce among the whites of the Pacific slope an insidious chronic disease which will subject them to the same sort of physical deterioration as that which the hookworm has produced in the South?

In Japan the Japanese liver fluke (*Opisthorchis*) is as common in some parts as the hookworm is in Africa. Katsurada, a Japanese investigator, reported 654 infected persons in 1,075 persons examined, or 60.8 per cent. The disease which is produced by this infection is serious, chronic, and devitalizing, and, among the Japanese, has a death rate 16 per 1,000. This is even more serious than the hookworm, for, despite the immense damage hookworm does, it rarely appears as a cause of death in the South. The result of the infection of the white race which has no hereditary immunity of liver fluke would be almost sure to be very serious. And about 20 cases of the disease have already been recognized in the United States.

Japan and China appear to be the especial homes of the lung fluke (*Paragonimus westermani*). The parasite in this disease invades and destroys the lungs. The disease produced is extremely chronic, is accompanied by more or less serious hemorrhages, and is often mistaken for consumption. Various Japanese physicians report that from 2 to 4 per cent of all of their patients with disease of the lungs are infected with lung fluke. It is stated that in certain parts of Formosa 15 per cent of the inhabitants have this disease.

There are still two other insidious and destructive parasite diseases which are extremely common in Japan and China: Blood fluke disease, called "wading fever" in the Orient, which is extremely hard to recognize by the ordinary methods of

examination; and amebic dysentery, already known to be widely distributed in the United States.

Every one of the parasitic diseases mentioned above is quite as capable of destroying the efficiency and lives of the white race as is the hookworm disease. To be able to recognize these parasites the physician must have especial training in the microscopic study of parasites. There is no known treatment for any of them that is positively curative. For the first three there is no treatment whatever known.

According to the Public Health Reports, "during the months of November and December, 1912, among the intending emigrants from Japan to the United States about 70 out of every 100 were found to have hookworm disease." Although there are no statistics on hookworm in Japan, it is probable that the infection is generally disseminated by the use of human excrement in fertilization.

The citizens of the Pacific slope are not only in danger of being exposed to the effects of hookworm infection, which has already damaged so seriously nearly one-fourth of our white population, but in addition they are being exposed to not less than four other dangerous parasites which produce diseases difficult to recognize, which slowly and surely destroy human efficiency and life and for which there is no known positive cure.

The last paragraph of the quotation from the Public Health Reports contains the key to the method of transmission of the parasites. All are conveyed from one person to another through excreted matter. It is possible to control excrement infection of this kind only in thoroughly sewered cities where there is complete sanitary disposal of sewage. Wherever human excreta is disposed of otherwise these parasites must be spread, for the life cycle of everyone of them is nicely adjusted so that they may exist both inside and outside of the body in one or more of their transitional stages.

It is obvious that in the country microscopic disease carriers may reach new human victims in several roundabout ways, as the hookworm is distributed in the South. When, as is the habit among oriental gardeners everywhere, the infected excreta are mixed with water and actually applied to growing edible plants which are being prepared for the public markets, it requires no imagination whatever to understand how tremendously the chances of general infection are multiplied. At least two of these parasites enter the body through the skin, one from water and the other from the earth. The pollution of the soil with which we must come in constant contact and the pollution of streams and water supplies generally with infected excreta is made doubly certain when the deliberate distribution of excrement is made an important element of agriculture.

There is but one way to deal with the untreatable parasitic disease. It must be prevented, and it is only through the most unremitting and conscientious public health regulations that this can be done.

With one experience with the subtle death-dealing proclivities of an alien race, it is certainly the part of wisdom to run no further risks. And even the suffering which the negro has inflicted upon the South is light compared with what history shows other people have suffered when exposed to the diseases of alien races.

The revelations of modern scientific research indicate that the true history of the decline and fall of the great ancient civilizations will be written by the students of contagious and infectious diseases.

The importation of epidemic and parasitic diseases from Africa is now urged as an important cause of the downfall of the Roman Empire. It would tax the imagination but little to apply the same reasoning to the fall of Greece. The terrible plague which broke out in Rome, B. C. 466-463, is recorded as having begun in Ethiopia, south of Egypt. It was carried into Italy by the invading Peloponnesian army, the gift of an alien race. Thirty years later the Peloponnesians carried the same plague to Athens—the sickness so carefully described by Thucydides.

During the 30 years, B. C. 405-375, in which Sicily was invaded by the Carthaginians, four distinct epidemic distempers, all of frightful severity, which afflicted Carthage and its armies without touching either Syracuse or the Sicilian Greeks, became the most destructive enemies of the Carthaginians.

"The plague of Antonius" (A. D. 164-180) swept the whole Roman Empire from its eastern to its western boundaries. It was brought from Syria by troops returning from that region. In the year 166 this plague appeared in Rome itself, and again in 168. "Entire cities and districts were depopulated, forests springing up where had been populous places. In its last year it became terribly destructive, often killing as many as 2,000 a day."

In 1333 the "black death" appeared in the interior of China. It reappeared in the island of Cyprus in 1347, and from there spread throughout Europe, even to Iceland and Greenland. It reached Russia in 1351, and it was then a marvel that it was

checked by the Caucasus Mountains, which separate Europe from Asia. We can understand now that, having arrived at the point of its departure, Asia, this infection found a people who had an acquired immunity, and its course was checked. Hecker estimates the loss of life in Europe from this plague at 25,000,000.

Beginning in 1703, bubonic plague appeared in Europe, from Asia. In 1709 300,000 persons died from this disease in East Prussia alone. Thirty thousand died in the city of Danzig. It disappeared in 1714, and again reappeared in 1720 in southern France. This disease is still endemic in Asia and has been prevented from spreading over the earth only by the utmost vigilance.

The historian and the economist are concerned only with the facts and effects of these plagues. The student of these diseases, in the light of recent discoveries, knows that every pestilence was the result of the introduction of a disease common to one race into the midst of a different race which had never known it.

And all these facts are but a warning to the people of the United States. All these visitations, from the plagues that attacked Rome to the spread of the hookworm in the South, are a warning of the dangers of the diseases of an alien race.

The CHAIRMAN. I have here a letter from a gentleman who is the city passenger agent of one of the great western railroads. I do not know, until I have had an opportunity to communicate with him, whether I have authority to put the letter in the record in full, giving his name, because I do not know what the views of the railroad on these questions are, and it might possibly get him in trouble with his people, but I want to read a little extract in regard to the Hindus:

I desire to call your attention to the question of Asiatic immigration now before your committee, particularly the point bearing upon the admission of Hindus to the United States of America.

After a residence of several years in British Columbia, during which I have had ample opportunity to study these people, I feel it my duty as an American citizen to vigorously protest against the admittance of these, the most decrepit, filthy, disease-bearing race that has yet invaded our shores.

These scheming Orientals take delight in overriding the white man's laws, their oath in court is perjury, and they are to-day planning to invade our shores in countless numbers.

Later on, perhaps, I will put in the entire letter with the name of the writer. He is the representative of one of the great western railroads.

Mr. JOHNSON. I can give you a great many letters of that order.

Mr. RAKER. I think the members have all agreed on that point.

The CHAIRMAN. He does not seem to be a member of any order, but simply a man who has been among them for many years.

Now, Mr. Church, you may proceed.

#### STATEMENT OF HON. DENVER S. CHURCH, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I represent the seventh congressional district of the State of California, and on account of the peculiar geography of the district, I presume there are more Hindus in my district than there are in any other district of the same size in the United States. I will explain that in this way. There is a great valley in California, as those of you who have been there know, a sort of inland valley, about 450 or 500 miles in length and something like 60 to 70 miles in width. It is the garden spot, in a way, of California. In this valley they grow all manner of fruits—citrus fruits, and all the raisins of the United States are grown there. There are hundreds of thousands of acres of lemons and oranges, hundreds of thousands of acres of grapevines from which they make wines as well as raisins, and all kinds of fruits. That brings these people into that section of the country probably more than into any other sec-

tion. So I have received, oh, numerous requests to try to do something to prevent the immigration, especially of the Hindus, into this country, because those of us who come into contact with the Hindus, and I think it is universal, regard them as a menace.

Now, regardless of how people feel on the immigration of other nationalities into this country, I stand here to say that I believe that everybody who is in touch with this class of immigrants, who sees them and knows them, is in favor of their exclusion. I do not think there would be a dissenting voice among the members of this committee if you had all come into contact with them.

The Commissioner General of Immigration appeared before you last Thursday in reference to this matter and went into the details of the subject. I only desire to impress upon you a few facts that I know from personal observation. I believe the records show there are only a few thousand of these people in the United States—6,000.

Mr. RAKER. Something over 6,000.

Mr. CHURCH. The Commissioner General of Immigration made the statement before this committee the other day that he believed there were at least 30,000 in California alone. I also wish to say that would be my judgment. There are certainly at least 30,000 of these people in the State of California.

The CHAIRMAN. How do they come in?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I can not say in regard to that, but they come in. They come from British Columbia; they come across the border.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they come in surreptitiously?

Mr. CHURCH. They do not have to come in surreptitiously, because there is no law to prevent their coming in.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they not have to undergo inspection to come through the regular channels?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir.

I want to call your attention to the fact that last Thursday the Hindu who spoke here, intelligent as he was; you remember he refused to answer the question as to where in South America his people were landing. Do you remember that? That signified something to me. The committee can draw its own conclusion; he at least refused to answer that question, to go into the question of where they were landing. I take it for granted they are landing at places where they are not anxious to have disclosed. The commissioner also said in his opinion there were between 6,000 and 7,000 of these people in the district that I represent. I agree with him in that view. Now, Mrs. Patterson, who testified before you, spoke about certain characteristics of these people that I have to dispute. For instance, she said they were law-abiding people, and told about leaving the doors open, etc. I was the district attorney of my county for six years before coming here a year ago, and during the time I was district attorney frequently I was called upon to prosecute Hindus for violations of the laws of our land.

Mr. SABATH. What offenses are they guilty of or what crimes do they commit?

Mr. CHURCH. I will answer that. During the last year, that was in 1912, I prosecuted and sent to the penitentiary of our State, I remember, three of these fellows for robbery. I took the pistol away from

one myself; that is, when he was brought in I took it out of his pocket, the pistol with which he had committed this robbery. Three of them were convicted and sent to the penitentiary for throwing down their countryman, covering him with a pistol, and taking the money out of his pocket. That is one case. I remember on another occasion a Hindu came into the office with his head cut open saying that another Hindu had made an assault on him. It is almost impossible to secure a conviction in these cases because of the fact they do not speak the English language, that they are clannish, and they cover up their crimes. In the case I now have in mind a conviction was not had because of the fact we could not get at the real facts of the case. They are guilty of drunkenness. In the lower courts they are frequently hauled up charged with disturbing the peace on account of drunkenness.

Mr. SABATH. Are they guilty of that.?

Mr. CHURCH. They are, Mr. Sabath.

Mr. SABATH. I was under the impression that the Hindus do not drink.

The CHAIRMAN. Those who are Mohammedans do not drink.

Mr. CHURCH. Out in our country there are lots of wine cellars and they work in the vineyards, and they will go and buy four or five gallons of wine on Sunday, and these countrymen come in from all sections of the country and drink it. That is a well-known fact, and I have definite knowledge of situations of this kind.

Mr. RAKER. What is the condition as to crimes against nature? Have you observed anything of that kind?

Mr. CHURCH. Well, they are hard to convict, of course, of those crimes. I remember one fellow who was charged with sodomy, but I do not think they ever succeeded in getting a conviction for that crime.

I want to call your attention to another thing that possibly your attention has not been called to, that there are no Hindu women in my section of the State. I have never seen a Hindu woman in my life. While there are thousands of these men, the women do not seem to come to this country.

Mr. SABATH. You do not want them?

Mr. CHURCH. I certainly do not want them; but in time they will come.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a very important fact. How is it up nearer the Canadian border? Do the Hindu women come there?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; none of the lower caste Hindu women. You sometimes see a tourist.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know of the low-caste women coming?

Mr. JOHNSON. Not one.

Mr. RAKER. Did you observe in your observations down through the San Joaquin Valley any of these Hindu women dressed like men and working with the men, side by side?

Mr. CHURCH. I have never made a personal examination, but none of them look good to me. I can not answer that question. I have heard they do work that way.

Mr. RAKER. I was informed that there were a number of women dressed like men working with the men, side by side.

Mr. CHURCH. I have heard of that, but of course I can not verify that statement in any way.

The CHAIRMAN. You have never seen a Hindu woman in woman's attire?

Mr. CHURCH. No, sir; I never have.

Mr. SABATH. What Judge Raker states now is new to you?

Mr. CHURCH. No; I have heard of it, but I can not vouch for it. You can see that such a statement is very easily made and hard to prove. I have frequently heard that stated.

The very estimable lady who was here, Mrs. Patterson, spoke about them being so cleanly. They are not cleanly out in California. They are a dirty lot of fellows, you can see the grease and dirt on them whenever you see them. While in the office of the district attorney, I have had my office swarmed with them, trying to get at the real facts in regard to the commission of an offense, and also I have had them there as witnesses in cases, and they are so strong; they smell, and sometimes a person can hardly stand it. I do not think they can follow out their national tradition of bathing, or at least they do not when they get to California. I think they, like a great many other people who come to California, forget some of their early ideals.

The CHAIRMAN. They do not keep up their ablutions there?

Mr. CHURCH. No, sir; I am satisfied they do not. I certainly have never seen one who looked like he had ever had a bath.

Now, while we are on the court matters, they do not believe, of course, as we all know, in our form of religion, and our oath absolutely means nothing to them. I would just as lief have one of these fellows testify in court without being under oath, because the oath absolutely means nothing to them.

Mr. SABATH. You do not impress upon them the fact that they are liable to be guilty of perjury if they do not tell the truth?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. That might mean something to them, if not from a religious point, from a legal point of view?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir; that is true. It is a very hard matter, however, to impress anything on these people. They are a thick-headed and obtuse sort of people and can hardly appreciate those things.

The CHAIRMAN. They are British subjects; do they not speak the English language?

Mr. CHURCH. In the prosecution of these criminal cases from time to time it has been a real task to find an interpreter who could properly interpret; half of them can speak a little, but practically none of them can speak so they can be understood; they are unable to act as interpreters. We hunted all over that country to find an interpreter, and I remember we had to continue one of our cases. Finally we located an interpreter and used him in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. Was he a Hindu?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they literate or illiterate, most of them?

Mr. CHURCH. In their own language?

The CHAIRMAN. Can they read?

Mr. CHURCH. They can not read our language any more than a horse can.

The CHAIRMAN. Can they read their own language?

Mr. CHURCH. I think they can. I understand they are all educated in their own language. That has been my understanding of

the matter. I think they can read their own language. I have noticed frequently they have some books and papers, Hindu, and I have always understood they could read their own language.

The CHAIRMAN. Does not the British Government require them to go to school and study the English language?

Mr. CHURCH. I am sorry that I can not answer that question. They have their religion; in fact, that seems to be about all there is to a Hindu, his religion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the Mohammedan religion?

Mr. CHURCH. As I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. My understanding has been that a part of the fundamental teaching of the Mohammedan religion is abstinence entirely from wines or whiskies or strong drink?

Mr. CHURCH. I have had the same understanding. While I know what the Mohammedan religion is in a general way, I am not an expert and I can not answer these questions. I do not want to be placed in the position of answering any question in regard to their religion other than this, that they are bound down by a strange religion, a strange religious fanaticism, a fanaticism which prevents them from eating what American people prepare. When in jail, some of them absolutely refused to eat the jail food until almost driven to eat by starvation, on account of the fact that it had been prepared by people who were not Hindus. I never saw one go into a restaurant to eat. I do not think they ever do. I think they would know how to get in or out of a restaurant. So far as my observation goes, they do not go to lodging houses or to hotels in my country. I think there is not a lodging house or a hotel which would permit them to come in.

Mr. SABATH. That is a good reason why they do not go there?

Mr. CHURCH. That is one reason, certainly; it is a pretty good reason. If they would just adopt our styles of clothing they would not be subjected to that exclusion.

Mr. RAKER. Right there, so that it will appear in the record, is it not a fact that under our State law a man running a public hotel can not exclude anyone from his hotel?

Mr. CHURCH. He can not; that is right. I am glad you spoke of that. So I guess that statement was a little strong. I am sure our hotel men and our lodging-house keepers are not bidding for that class of patronage.

Mr. SABATH. They are not spending a great deal of money advertising to get that class of trade?

Mr. CHURCH. No; they do not want it.

The CHAIRMAN. They do not encourage it?

Mr. CHURCH. They do not encourage it, and they do not want them to come.

The CHAIRMAN. You spoke of the man who appeared here refusing to answer the question as to what South American port they came to. Have you any idea how they are coming in surreptitiously?

Mr. CHURCH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Are any of the Mexican ports admitting them?

Mr. CHURCH. I do not know. I have not investigated that phase of the subject.

Mr. SABATH. Where do they come from to your State?

Mr. CHURCH. I do not know where they come from any more than I know where the fishworms come from that we see after a rain. We see them. I have wondered ever since I was a boy where the fishworms came from. We see them on the sidewalks after a heavy rain; that is all I know about it. Where the Hindu comes from, I do not know. You can see him every day and every hour of the day and night. You can see them traveling the public highways in droves. You can see them working in the fields. You can see them bidding for jobs. You can see them camping on the ditch banks. They are there and they are an eyesore to every man who has high ideals. They dress differently. That, of course you can not hold against them, only to show they will not assimilate with our people; they do not want to. They have what is called a turban, which is made of calico or some similar material which they wrap around their heads, 10 or 12 feet in length. That is a religious duty, I understand. You notice these people on the public highway on account of the peculiarity of their dress and the swaggering way they go down our streets, taking possession of the middle of the road.

Mr. JOHNSON. For what pay do they work in the field?

Mr. CHURCH. They work by the job. They have bosses who get the jobs. They bid below what our American laborers ask for employment. That is the only reason in the world why they get employment, because there are plenty of Americans and people of other nationalities who are anxious to receive employment. There is not one person, I suppose, in our country who would employ the Hindus were it not for the fact that he can get them by bunches and get them for less than he would have to pay Americans.

Mr. SABATH. Will they work for less than the Japs?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Sabath, a Jap would starve to death where a Hindu will get fat. A Hindu will live on parched corn and live on other stuff which will cost him \$2.50 or \$3 a month.

The CHAIRMAN. Mrs. Patterson stated the other day that they paid their servants \$1 a month.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the statement was made that \$1 was worth as much as \$10 over here. It seems to me like that was rather an exaggerated statement, but even at that \$10 a month, and a man boarding himself, strikes me as peculiar, whether that is anything like a correct statement or not. She was the widow of the former consul general at Calcutta, and she said that they had 13 servants employed in their household, and that they paid them \$1 a month, and that \$1 a month was worth at least as much as \$10 here.

Mr. CHURCH. I would not like to make any statement in regard to that, because I have no positive knowledge.

The CHAIRMAN. In regard to their robberies and crimes, are most of them committed on their own people or on Americans?

Mr. CHURCH. Mostly on their own people. In fact, all, as far as I know.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they clannish about telling on each other?

Mr. CHURCH. It is almost impossible to get information.

The CHAIRMAN. Even the man beaten up or robbed, you can scarcely get him to tell?

Mr. CHURCH. It is very hard. We have been compelled to dismiss several cases on account of the fact that we could not get into the heart of the case and find out about the case. They are very mum

and quiet, owing to several reasons, of course. They are clannish. There is certainly no class of people which has ever invaded California who are as clannish as the Hindu. Their religion holds, buckles, and binds them together.

I am not thoroughly posted on the subject of disease, but I know they have not the same ideas of health that we have. For instance, they will sit down flat on the ground and have a big pipe in front of them, a revolving pipe, and each one will take a whiff from the pipe. One will take a whiff and pass it to the next. It turns on a pivot; another will do the same, and so on. They sit there as so many owls.

The CHAIRMAN. Smoking what?

Mr. CHURCH. Smoking tobacco.

Mr. RAKER. As to the conditions of the people, how they live and their habits—from your observation are they assimilable at all, as you view it?

Mr. CHURCH. They stand aloof and alone. They always seem to be in company with each other and are never seen in company with the American people.

Mr. SABATH. There is a reason for that?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir. The reason is they have religious ideas and religious notions which compel them to keep away. They have the old idea that you must not touch things lest you become unclean, and they absolutely refuse to eat food prepared by anybody other than a Hindu. They have no earthly excuse in dressing as they do, other than to show they are Hindus and that they do not want to be contaminated by the people with whom they come into contact. In our country none of these laborers ever wants to go to school because they are generally full-grown men.

Mr. SABATH. Do you not think that many of these foreign people dress differently from the people in your district?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir; they do. That is very true.

Mr. SABATH. And some of your people would not want to dress the same way that some of the ladies dress in some of the nations abroad where they just put on a little skirt that is open to the waist and that comes below the waist, and that is about all they wear; at least, I have seen pictures of them once in a while.

Mr. CHURCH. These people dress differently because they are Hindus and they want to follow the customs which they have in their own land and which they think are better than the customs of any other land, and so they propose to carry them into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they acquire property?

Mr. CHURCH. I have not investigated that particular matter in California, except to a very limited extent. This is more important probably than anything which I wish to say, and that is, they save their money and send it to India to help others in India to come here. I have some statistics on that point. I have never investigated the fact, but I know of one Hindu purchasing a couple of town lots down in a little town about 20 miles below the city in which I live, and it was the talk of the country there for several weeks, the idea of a man selling a piece of land to a Hindu. It is a rare thing that they actually buy any land.

Mr. SABATH. Is the man who sold the Hindu the lots still alive?

Mr. CHURCH. I do not know about that.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the laws of California prohibiting the ownership of land by certain people apply to the Hindus?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir; the laws apply.

The CHAIRMAN. So that the laws will check that?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it not true that the activity of our immigration officials out there has very much checked the influx of these people, and are they not turning them back because they are liable to become public charges?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir. As the Commissioner General of Immigration testified the other day, they are sending them back, and that is the only weapon we have, the only way by which we can prevent them from coming here, and so these vigilant officials are doing everything they can to enforce what little law we have on the subject.

Mr. SABATH. You find the present officials more efficient in enforcing the laws pertaining to these immigrants, especially the Asiatics?

Mr. CHURCH. Since Mr. Caminetti, the Commissioner General, has been at his post, coming from California as he does, and knowing the conditions that prevail in California, he has used every possible means in his power to prevent these people from coming, but they are still coming. I am sorry you were not here last Thursday, Mr. Sabath, and that you did not hear the Commissioner General's statement, that he had persuaded the steamship companies to withhold bringing these people here, that the companies had an arrangement in some way to bring thousands, and he had personally appeared before them and requested them to desist in this, that there would probably be a law which would prevent them from coming, and so they are holding back and simply waiting for the passage of some sort of an exclusion act in reference to the Hindus.

Mr. JOHNSON. That agreement was made with the Pacific coast steamship people after Mr. Caminetti visited British Columbia and was the result of a general agitation on the western coast against the Hindu?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir; as I understand.

Mr. JOHNSON. The Tacoma meeting?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it just within the last 12 months that they have been coming in in such large numbers?

Mr. CHURCH. No, sir; I will not say they have only been coming in within a few years, but within the last few years they have been multiplying very rapidly.

Mr. SABATH. They must like your section of the country?

Mr. CHURCH. I do not know why they should; we do not like them.

The CHAIRMAN. They like your climate, because they can sleep out in the open.

Mr. JOHNSON. Have the people ever risen up and driven them out of any particular community?

Mr. CHURCH. No, sir.

Here is a statement that was published in the Stockton Daily Evening Record of December 6, 1913. It is very short:

International (foreign) money orders to the amount of \$26,282.82 were sold by the Stockton post office during the month of October. Of this amount, \$18,489.27 was sent to British Indian offices.

The CHAIRMAN. How much?

Mr. CHURCH. \$18,489.27.

Mr. SABATH. How long a time?

Mr. CHURCH. One month.

Mr. RAKER. In addition to the territory you have described, I might as well say that the general climatic conditions in and about Stockton and of the territory around Sacramento and from there north to Marysville and to Red Bluff are of a similar character.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir. Stockton is not in my district. Stockton is about in the center of this great inland valley that I spoke of that is about 500 miles in length, and the climatic conditions, the crop conditions, and the fruit conditions—grapes, raisins, and all those things—are about the same from one end of this valley to the other. This particular office is in the center of the State, and there is no reason why there should be any greater drain upon that office by the Hindus than in 20 or 30 other cities in that district, although it is really larger than a great many of the other cities.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you covered that subject?

Mr. CHURCH. No, sir; Stockton is about 125 miles above.

The CHAIRMAN. In whose district?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Curry's.

Mr. JOHNSON. What is the population of Stockton?

Mr. CHURCH. About 65,000.

It was the Hindu.

Three-fourths of all the money sent from Stockton to foreign countries went to India.

Formerly it was thought that the Japanese, among all aliens, absorbed the most money, spent the least, and sent the most home. But during October the Japanese "sent home" only \$3,909, or about one-sixth as much as the Hindus; and the Japanese in this part of the State outnumber the Hindus 10 to 1.

Mr. RAKER. There are no Japanese in that country.

Mr. CHURCH (reading):

The small amount—\$150—which the Greeks forwarded through the office is likewise a surprise.

The October sales of international orders were not exceptionally large. The total is a low average. Twelve such monthly totals mean easily \$315,000 and more. And if the Hindus do not fail of their prosperity during the closing two months of the year, they will probably have sent \$213,000 to their native land. Most of this money will have been earned in the vicinity of Stockton.

That is not in my district at all. It is just as great down below.

Mr. RAKER. Just that one community?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir; one city.

It is gone—gone far—lost to the community.

A study of the full report of international money-order sales for the month of October, as compiled by Myra Ellsworth, superintendent of the money-order division of the Stockton office, is worthy of attention. The report shows money-order sales as follows:

Great Britain.....	\$358. 01
British India.....	18, 489. 27
Germany.....	303. 93
Italy.....	1, 628. 00
Greece.....	150. 25
Sweden.....	105. 00
Japan.....	3, 908. 00
Norway.....	97. 00
France.....	81. 01
Austria.....	853. 10
Russia.....	86. 75
Switzerland.....	39. 00
Denmark.....	110. 00
Turkey.....	15. 00
Azore Islands.....	50. 00
Hungary.....	3. 50
Holland.....	5. 00

Total..... 26, 282. 82

Of this \$26,282.82 that was delivered to this office for the purpose of being sent to foreign lands during that month the Hindus sent \$18,489.27. That, I think, gentlemen, bears out the statement that these people are working for less wages and are cutting wages in our country for the purpose of getting employment, and live on starvation wages, and what to other people would be starvation food in order to save their money and send it back to their own country, and from conversing with these people, in regard to the subject, I find the purpose they have in sending the money to their own country is to buy transportation to this country for their cousins. They always talk about their cousins. I have talked with a great many of them when they could talk or could talk through interpreters in the courts, and I have asked them, "What do you do with your money?" and they say, "Why, I send it to India, back home, to my cousin." That is the general explanation these people make, wherever you ask them, in regard to what they do with their money.

That brings me to this proposition: While we can get along with them now, possibly, although they are a menace to our people, yet there are 350,000,000 of them over there, and they are coming and they are going to continue to come, because conditions are so bad over in their own country. It is a self-evident fact that sooner or later we will have to exclude them. Why not do it now when we are masters of the situation?

The CHAIRMAN. Have you heard of any of the leaders teaching any anarchistic ideas?

Mr. CHURCH. Of course, the Hindus down in my country, in the interior of California, are there for the purpose of getting jobs so as to earn money to send back to India. I have heard that that occurs in the sections around the bay. I can not give you any definite information as to whether they teach revolution and anarchy. There is no doubt from what I have heard that they do and that these people are acquiring all the knowledge they can so as to be in a position in the future to rebel against the form of government under which they are at the time living.

Mr. BROCKSON. What kind of work do these Hindus engage in?

Mr. CHURCH. They engage in anything, of course, that they can get employment at; but they seek the most menial labor.

Mr. BROCKSON. Are they in the country and the cities?

Mr. CHURCH. They work in the country. You do not see them working in the cities; the people do not want them.

Mr. BROCKSON. What sort of homes do they have?

Mr. CHURCH. They have no homes at all. When they live on a ranch, they occupy the bunk house. They camp along the ditches and along the road. I have never known of any houses in which the Hindus lived, except in the bunk houses on a ranch.

Mr. BROCKSON. Do the Hindus intermarry with anybody in California?

Mr. CHURCH. No. I understand they consider it a crime to touch an American with their hands. They do not mingle with persons of any other nationality; their religion forbids and their natural ideas forbid them doing so.

The CHAIRMAN. When they camp out that way, do they just sleep on the bare ground, or do they have little tents?

Mr. CHURCH. They have tents, but generally they sleep out, excepting during the wet weather.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they have any covering?

Mr. CHURCH. Nothing except some old, dirty cloths.

Mr. BROCKSON. What food do they eat?

Mr. CHURCH. Anything they prepare themselves.

Mr. BROCKSON. Do you know what that is?

Mr. CHURCH. I have seen a Hindu eating parched corn. It is like going into a strange community. You see a strange mixture in a strange vessel, and you do not know what it is and you do not care to know.

Mr. BROCKSON. Do they camp much on the land that belongs to somebody else without any permission?

Mr. CHURCH. They will camp in the road or on the side of the road. Our county roads are about 80 feet wide, and we have ditches. It is a great country for irrigation. We have the cottonwood trees and the umbrella trees, as we call them there, and these fellows will monopolize the places along the road. You can not imagine anything more strange as a human being than a Hindu.

Mr. BROCKSON. What is the color of the Hindu?

Mr. CHURCH. He has black hair and black eyes, and a dark, swarthy skin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Have the courts naturalized them in your State?

Mr. CHURCH. No.

Mr. JOHNSON. None of them?

Mr. CHURCH. No, sir.

Mr. BROCKSON. Does their dress entirely cover their flesh?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you known of any of them applying to be naturalized in your State?

Mr. CHURCH. No; not in our country.

Mr. RAKER. They have at San Francisco?

Mr. CHURCH. So I understand. This is the great agricultural region of the State.

Mr. BROCKSON. When they camp along the road, how long do they stay there?

Mr. CHURCH. Until they get a job or find another place more inviting.

Mr. BROCKSON. They must leave a lot of rubbish around the road when they go?

Mr. CHURCH. Like any other campers; they leave dirt wherever they go.

Mr. BROCKSON. They must of necessity under those circumstances?

Mr. CHURCH. They do. We have plenty of people out in California to do our work, we always have—I mean people of other nationalities, American people—there are always a lot of idle people, and it is generally understood that a self-respecting white man does not like to think that he is working at the same kind of work that a Hindu does. He does not like to work alongside of these people in the same occupation, people who are so different in every sense of the word, and that brings down wages and degrades labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Americans employ them?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir; because they can get them cheaper. Please bear this in mind, for every pound of fruit which they pick or every bunch of grapes they pick, there is the hand of a good American somewhere who would like to do that picking and gathering; for every job they have there is an American in the country who would like to have it, and every job they have they are simply taking away from our own people; and, worse than that, they are sending the money they get over to their own country.

Mr. JOHNSON. In that regard they are at least the equal of the Japanese?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. Just one minute. What you have said applies equally to the Japanese?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, I think it does. I did not file this Hindu bill because I was not in favor of Asiatic exclusion, but I was a little afraid the whole matter might not be disposed of in one bill, and I considered Hindus such a menace I filed this bill asking for the exclusion of laborers among them.

Mr. BURNETT. I believe it was intended this hearing should be in regard to the Hindu question; that was the reason of the hearing.

Mr. JOHNSON. This bill of yours is identical, I believe, with the bill of Representative Humphrey, of Washington.

Mr. CHURCH. I never read Mr. Humphrey's bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. They seem to be identical in language. This bill was prepared after a conference with the department officials?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON. The same preparation of this bill was gone through with also with the Humphrey bill filed last June.

Mr. CHURCH. I do not know about that. I know this: I felt it my duty to get in and take an active part in the exclusion of the Hindus.

Mr. BURNETT. I want to state in this connection that I informed Mr. Humphrey last Thursday we would have this matter up, and invited him personally to be here if he desired.

Mr. JOHNSON. I will say, Mr. Chairman, that Representative Humphrey is in another meeting to-day, and has telephoned me that any statement I would make here would represent him. I do not, however, desire to take up the time of the committee.

Mr. BURNETT. I just want it understood that I was not ignoring Mr. Humphrey in this matter.

Mr. RAKER. So that your position may not be misunderstood, or mine either, because of the fact of the chairman of the committee stating that this hearing was upon the Hindu question, I want to ask you if you are confining your statement wholly to the Hindu Asiatic laborers at the present time?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. And the provisions provided for in the other bills are as vital as this?

Mr. CHURCH. All Californians are in favor of all Asiatic exclusion.

Mr. RAKER. Now, take the question of the labor situation as you explained it, supplementing the other questions. They are not building up, or assisting in building up, the community in any way, are they?

Mr. CHURCH. They never built any houses in our county, or aided in any way, shape, or form in developing the country except by simply doing the drudgery and manual labor.

Mr. SABATH. And that is pretty near all farm work?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. They are not mechanics?

Mr. CHURCH. None that came to this country that I know of.

Mr. SABATH. The objection that some people have in regard to immigration, that it comes and goes, does not apply to the Hindu. The Hindu goes out in the field, does he not?

Mr. CHURCH. My section is a farming country, and I only speak of the farming country.

Mr. RAKER. They work on the railroads?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. They are in the lumber camps. I have seen them in the woods and in the mills in northern California.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. From your observation as to assimilation, from the marriage standpoint, it is unthinkable.

Mr. CHURCH. Indeed, it is.

Mr. RAKER. That is my impression from what I have observed in California.

Mr. CHURCH. They would not want to marry with our people, and I am sure our people would not want to marry with them.

Mr. BURNETT. You heard the statement made here the other day, that one Hindu was like all the rest in appearance belonging to his race, except that the poor Hindus might occupy a different position in India, and the rich ones have a little better digging, as it is called.

Mr. CHURCH. They all look alike to me. I can not see any difference between them in any way. I would get the complaining witness and the defendant frequently mixed in court. They are all of the same mold.

Mr. RAKER. Just one other question. In regard to the statement you make, that it is almost impossible to distinguish one from the other, those that are already here we could not send away—those that are here legally?

Mr. CHURCH. I suppose not.

Mr. RAKER. Is it not your opinion it would be advisable to give the administration officers a law that they might register those that were here and exclude those that come in here surreptitiously and otherwise?

Mr. CHURCH. I have not given any thought along that line. I suppose it would be. I would not like to be quoted on that, however, just now, as I have not considered it.

Mr. RAKER. That is all.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. A. CAMINETTI.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I do not think I have much to add to what I have already said. However, there might be one suggestion that I might make. A member of the Hindu race called at the bureau the other day and suggested that a great deal of the objection to these bills in regard to Hindu immigration came from the fact that the bill brought certain classes

together. On the first page of the bill, line 8, it reads, "All Hindu laborers, all idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons," etc., shall be excluded. They do not like to be associated with idiots and imbeciles, and the suggestion was made that if any bill that might be recommended by this committee could remove the association of the expression "Hindu laborers" from what follows in the bill it would be greatly appreciated by representatives of that race. In view of such representations I think it proper to suggest that if this committee in its wisdom find that this measure, or a measure like this, should be reported, that it might be separated from the language to which objection seems to have been made by some people of that race.

Mr. BURNETT. Is not that language principally embraced in the existing law anyway?

Mr. CAMINETTI. I explained that to the gentleman, who is a cultured man and a graduate of Oxford University. He said: "You do not have to satisfy me on that, but many of our people in California do not and can not understand that phase of it. They have seen the bill quoted in the newspapers and it has gone back to their country. It looks as though we are united with all idiots, imbeciles, feeble-minded persons, and so forth, and I only say this," he told me, "in order to satisfy them on that point." Of course I only give this for what it is worth and only as a suggestion. Legally speaking, of course, I appreciate that that is the proper place to have that expression, but if the existing law could remain as it is and a separate bill providing for all that you desire in relation to the Hindu laborers can be made as a substitute for any pending measure it will reach the same point and remove, I am sure, a great deal of the objection they are now making.

Mr. BURNETT. Right in that connection, I would say that what I intended to inquire about was, if it is an existing law why have any of that in this bill?

Mr. CAMINETTI. As I understand it, this was the place where that expression could be more easily inserted. The balance of the section is in the existing law. It is also found in section 3 of the immigration bill that passed the House.

Mr. BURNETT. Therefore why would there be any necessity for having any of it in this bill? I do not mean with reference to the bill that passed the House—that may not become law—but if it is in the existing law, why not stop there and say all Hindu laborers are excluded?

Mr. SABATH. Suppose the bill is so drafted that it reads this way: After the word "laborers" start out that the following shall be excluded from admission to the United States. I can put that wording right here on page 3.

Mr. BURNETT. It could come in right in the middle of line 16 just before the word "Provided," and then say "all Hindu laborers."

Mr. SABATH. That would cure that.

Mr. BROCKSON. I do not see any need of repeating these words in the law.

Mr. JOHNSON. As I understand it, not only this bill, but Mr. Humphrey's bill, introduced last June—and they are identical in words—were prepared after conference at the Department of Immigration.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir; It might be well to consider also this proposition: That if the pending immigration bill that passed the House should become a law—and that, I suppose, repeals all existing laws in conflict therewith—then, in case you pass this House bill 9094 in its present shape, it would be an amendment to section 2 of a law already repealed. But if the committee amends it so as to provide that it is an amendment to section 3 of the Burnett bill and pass it subsequently to the enactment thereof, that would accomplish the object you desire. If, however, you provide a bill that shall exclude only Hindu laborers, it might be considered as a separate measure, hence not subject to any existing measure, or be made invalid by the passage of the Burnett bill now before the Senate.

Mr. SABATH. I know you have worked mighty hard and have tried hard to eliminate and stop the immigration of all these people, but do you think that by merely saying "excluding the Hindu laborers" that that would stop the immigration of the Hindus? There are a great many of these people who do not come here as laborers. They may come here as tradesmen or as teachers or professors or as students, the same as the Japanese do, and we will have the same trouble over again.

Mr. BURNETT. And afterwards they get to be laborers.

Mr. SABATH. Yes. Not being able to find employment in their various lines and professions, they turn and do the menial work. So would not that, perhaps, be a little broader than laborers?

Mr. BURNETT. Ought there not to be some such provision, as in Judge Raker's bill, in regard to those that come in under the admissible clause and afterwards become laborers? Ought there not to be some provision for their deportation if they abandon their professions. It seems to me something should be done to prevent those coming in under the admissible professions and who then go into the labor market.

Mr. CAMINETTI. That would be an excellent safeguard.

Mr. RAKER. Whichever way you draw the bill, whether you say all Asiatic laborers, which, of course, can be for the present modified by saying Hindu laborers, they would be Asiatic just the same, would they not?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Now, we have the Chinese exclusion law and we then make certain exemptions in favor of students, ministers, and professional men, and in the Chinese law there is an attempt at registration identification. Is that right?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Which is ineffective, so far as the administrative features are concerned.

Mr. CAMINETTI. To a great extent, owing to the lack of officers to efficiently administer the law due to limited appropriations.

Mr. RAKER. Now the provisions in H. R. 102, so far as registration is concerned, which bill covers up the loopholes, the administration has found could be applied to a bill that this committee might desire to report so as to give relief along the whole line, both as to Hindus and Chinese, and give the administrative officials an opportunity to carry out the provisions of the law.

Mr. CAMINETTI. That might be done, of course. But the department at the present, considering this question only from the stand-

point of the immigration of Hindu laborers on this particular bill, which is supposed to be an emergency measure at this time, I think the preference would be, if it would meet with the approval of this committee, to confine it entirely to Hindu laborers.

Mr. BROCKSON. It might be objectionable to exclude all Hindus except the few that might be acceptable.

Mr. CAMINETTI. I have no hesitancy in saying the department, as well as the bureau, does not look upon this question from a racial standpoint, but more from an economic point of view, and it might be advisable in drafting a measure, to take the place of the pending bills on this subject, to state that all Hindu laborers are to be excluded under the provisions suggested by the chairman awhile ago, and also eliminating from such provisions the classes that are excluded from the Chinese exclusion bill, namely, merchants and other classes that ought not to be affected, then you would complete the measure.

Mr. SABATH. I did not study this bill, but I notice, on page 4, line 7, there is a proviso:

*And provided further,* That for the purposes of this act all Hindu aliens shall be regarded as laborers unless it is shown that they are in their personal capacity of the following status or occupation: Government officers, ministers of the gospel, missionaries, lawyers, physicians, chemists, engineers, teachers, students, authors, editors, journalists, merchants, bankers, capitalists, and travelers for curiosity or pleasure.

Mr. CAMINETTI. That is what I had reference to. Add that feature to that suggested by the chairman to the new measure and avoid the balance of the present section 2 of the law.

Mr. BURNETT. An amendment at the end of section 1 would meet that; that in case they became laborers within a certain time—those that are among the accepted classes, ministers and lawyers and physicians, engineers, teachers, etc.—then they shall be excluded.

Mr. CAMINETTI. That would meet it.

Mr. BURNETT. Now, in regard to the registration, I rather agree with you. I think we ought to consider this proposition. But would there be anything in our international agreement which in any way, so far as the Hindus are concerned, would make registration objectionable?

Mr. CAMINETTI. I have not informed myself on that subject. Anything that might be said on that would only be conjecture on my part. We have a registration feature in the Chinese exclusion laws.

Mr. BURNETT. But that is not in force. There is no law requiring the registration of Chinese now.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Not as to those who come here now, but all who were here at the time fixed in the original bill had to be registered, and to that extent has this Government gone in requiring registration of people here from any nation outside of the United States.

Mr. RAKER. I do not quite understand you, Commissioner. Taking the provisions of H. R. 102, which the department has gone over fully relative to the registration of Hindus, which cover them by virtue of the language of the bill, also the Chinese who are excluded under the provisions of the bill, and as to the question of registration the department from these reports heretofore finds there are a number of loopholes that ought to be plugged up. There are many who have come in surreptitiously from Mexico and Canada and landed at the various ports. Ought not the provisions, or similar provisions of H. R. 102 relative to registration, be enacted into law, and is not

that a matter of as great importance as some of the other features in this bill?

Mr. CAMINETTI. I do not want to be understood as saying that anything that was said by the Secretary of Labor in his communication of January 20 last to this committee upon that subject is not agreed to by me. I do not want to be understood as saying that. Of course the position taken in relation to bill 102 is the position of the department. Now, there is no objection on the part of the department, or on the part of the bureau, to inserting that provision in this particular measure. As to whether or not it should be inserted is a matter for the committee. If you do insert it, it is going to require quite a number of provisions necessary to make the law effective, and that might make it an involved measure.

Mr. CAMINETTI. A complicated measure, as we found when the Chinese-exclusion bill was passed. You might also have to provide the means; that is, not only the machinery, but appropriations, whereby that can be done. Whether the committee desires to do that in this particular bill or wait and accomplish it in some other bill is for the committee to determine. The department has no objection to the registration of these Hindus. A registration of those now in the country would have the effect of determining those that are here legally and those that are here illegally, and the latter could be deported under the existing law as well as under the bill now pending in the Senate. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. RAKER. There is no law to exclude those that come from Canada at the present time.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Those that come from Canada surreptitiously, yes, sir; if we find out where they are and who they are.

Mr. SABATH. It makes no difference where they come from. If they do not come in legally they can be deported.

Mr. BURNETT. Unless they are deported under the general law. If they come in surreptitiously, is that a cause for deportation?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir. Anyone who comes in illegally is subject to deportation.

Mr. BURNETT. I understand that, if he is diseased or a public charge or a fugitive, but merely because he does not come in through the ports of entry designated by you, would that make him subject to deportation?

Mr. SABATH. Yes, sir. He is here illegally. He has not been properly admitted, and being here illegally, we have a right to deport him. Is that not right?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Then there is no method of finding out how many are here and how many may come later, and whether or not they are the same parties that could be deported?

Mr. CAMINETTI. There is no method now prescribed by law except to ascertain from evidence that appears satisfactory to our officials that a certain individual has come in illegally, and when that is done an arrest may follow. He is given a hearing and an investigation is had. The action of our officials is based on that investigation. He has the right to appeal to the department, and if after such appeal the ruling of the officials is sustained he is deported.

Mr. RAKER. There have been a large number of deportations made of those who have been found here illegally in the United States. Is that not correct?

Mr. CAMINETTI. I did not catch your question exactly.

Mr. RAKER. There have been many deported who have been found illegally in the United States.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir. I am not referring to Hindus, but generally to people from various countries.

Mr. BURNETT. Take stowaways who come in surreptitiously. Do you deport them because they do?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Absolutely. However, there are cases where the facts ascertained may warrant the department in exercising discretionary power. The circumstances vary. For instance, a case occurs to me now where a European had been in this country 15 years. He had come here surreptitiously, established a good business, and made himself a respectable citizen in the community. He himself notified the department and stated that he desired to become a citizen of the United States. The law provides that persons who do come here illegally can not be naturalized. In such cases a hearing is granted, and if it appears from the evidence that the alien would have been admitted had he come in legally, that his character is good, and that he will make a good resident, proceedings that might be taken against him are waived and he is permitted to remain. But if his character is shown to be such that he would not merit such exercise of the discretion of the department he could be subjected to arrest for his improper entry and deported.

Mr. RAKER. There is something in the report here that says that something over 6,000 Hindus were admitted. Does that show those that came in illegally?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. Take your statement—and it has been confirmed by Mr. Church—that there are something like 30,000 in California. Has there been any deportation of the Hindus?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes. In 1899 there were 15 admitted; in 1900 there were 9 admitted; in 1901 there were 20 admitted and 1 excluded; in 1902 there were 84 admitted; in 1903 there were 83 admitted and 1 deported; in 1904 there were 258 admitted, 7 excluded, and 2 deported; in 1905 there were 145 admitted and 13 excluded; in 1906 there were 271 admitted, 24 excluded, and 2 deported; in 1907 there were 1,072 admitted, 417 excluded; in 1908 there were 1,710 admitted, 438 excluded, 9 deported, and 124 departed of their own volition; in 1909 there were 337 admitted, 331 excluded, 1 deported, and 48 departed of their own volition; in 1910 there were 1,782 admitted, 411 excluded, 4 deported, and 80 departed of their own volition; in 1911 there were 517 admitted, 862 excluded, 36 deported, and 75 departed of their own volition; in 1912 there were 165 admitted, 104 excluded, 20 deported, and 164 departed of their own volition; in 1913 there were 188 admitted, 236 excluded, 32 deported, and 213 departed of their own volition, making the total of admissions 6,656, exclusions 2,844, deported 107, and 704 departed.

Mr. RAKER. During the whole period from the beginning of their admission there has only been 107 deported?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. That makes how many that came here altogether?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Six thousand six hundred and fifty-six that came during those years, according to the record. If we subtract from that number 704 it will give the number that are supposed to be in the country legally.

Mr. BURNETT. The 704 are those who are supposed to have gone back of their own volition?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. If you will pardon me just a moment. The report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for 1912 shows there were 477 that were deported, due to the fact that they entered without inspection. They would be the ones that came here in violation of the law or by stealth?

Mr. JOHNSON. When a man is deported for coming in surreptitiously, where is he sent?

Mr. SABATH. To the country from which he came.

Mr. BURNETT. Your figures do not correspond, Mr. Sabath, with the figures given by Mr. Caminetti.

Mr. SABATH. That is the total not only of Hindus but of all people, and it shows there is law upon the subject, as I stated.

Mr. CAMINETTI. That is the total of all nationalities. There is no question about the law. That is the law on the subject.

Mr. BURNETT. Where they enter places unauthorized, the law is that they are illegally here and can be deported?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Let us go back to that question of the number in California, presumed to be from 25,000 to 30,000.

Mr. CAMINETTI. But that is only an estimate.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Church comes from that district and he estimates the same as you do.

Mr. CAMINETTI. There is no question that there is far more than double the number of those that are credited as the number legally admitted.

Mr. RAKER. I am willing to assume that there are 30,000; 5,000 in the State of California legally, to say nothing about those in Oregon and in Washington and other States. The law in California would assume 30,000 as the number there, and there would be 25,000 illegally there.

Mr. CAMINETTI. That would be the assumption.

Mr. RAKER. What has been done relative to excluding or deporting them?

Mr. SABATH. If you will pardon me, Judge Raker, for a moment.

Mr. RAKER. If you will permit me, I dodged this question all morning, and I want to settle it now.

Mr. SABATH. There are very few things you dodge, but I would like to answer because the commissioner was reading a paper and did not pay much attention, and I desire to say this, that the law provides that we can deport those who are unlawfully within the United States, those that came in within the last three years. You can not deport those who have been here four, five, or six years, but all those who have unlawfully come in within three years past. Is that clear?

Mr. RAKER. No; it muddies the water more than before, for this reason: It not only covers up the question, but shows the absolute necessity for legislation in regard to it. From your statement you

could not deport them because they were here over three years. Therefore, there must be 20,000 in California illegally here who can not be deported at the present time. Now, shall we continue that method of the administration of the law? That is what I want to put up to the commissioner.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Of course, it is not a proper administration of the law to permit infractions of the law. All infractions of the law, no matter by what people, should be remedied by prosecution or deportation, and there are different ways of doing that. One way would be to enact, as you have suggested, a registration system.

Mr. RAKER. Is there any other known method at the present time that you are aware of that can bring results because of the similarity between the different men of the Hindu race and enable the department to apprehend and deport those who are illegally here?

Mr. CAMINETTI. There is no way that would be as perfect as registration, but there are ways that could be utilized for the purpose.

Mr. RAKER. What are they?

Mr. CAMINETTI. One method is to ascertain and ferret out the individual who is here illegally; that being accomplished we have the authority, if it happens within the time prescribed by the statute.

Mr. RAKER. How will you verify it? You would have to have a registration or a census of these people?

Mr. CAMINETTI. We can do it this way, as we have done with the Chinese, in case provision is not made for registration. For instance, we have an inspector in a certain town in New York; he is instructed to occasionally take note of the Chinese within his jurisdiction, and take up the papers under which they claim the right to remain. Those who can produce the proper papers, of course, are not interfered with, and nothing is said to them. If the papers are not all right, or if they have none at all, then the inspector has evidence of illegal entry and he proceeds against them under the laws and regulations.

Mr. BURNETT. Do you require a certificate?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Those that were registered have a certificate.

Mr. BURNETT. I mean, as to the Hindu who comes in now?

Mr. CAMINETTI. No; he does not get a certificate.

Mr. SABATH. But is it not possible for your department to easily ascertain whether any Hindu or any Chinese or Japanese is illegally in the United States?

Mr. CAMINETTI. It is not easily ascertained. It is possible, provided the bureau has a suitable appropriation and a sufficient number of officers.

Mr. SABATH. Let me ask you this question: Is it not a fact that every one who comes here is obliged to be entered on the ship manifest, and in that way there is a record kept of every man who is brought over here by any line?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. I am perfectly willing—

Mr. SABATH (interposing). I want to make this clear.

Mr. RAKER. I am perfectly willing to wait until all the gentlemen get through. It has been my disposition all the time; but I do not want to ask this committee to come back here again, and if the chairman is willing, I think we ought to confine ourselves to this matter

alone. The matter that Judge Sabath is speaking about has no relation to eastern immigration, has no relation at all to the Asiatic immigration and the question of registration and the surreptitious entering.

Mr. SABATH. Of course I know you have devoted a great deal of time and study to this subject, but I want you to know I have been on this committee, and I have studied this question thoroughly, and I am fairly well acquainted with the immigration laws. I know this: That it is possible for the department to ascertain whether anyone is legally or illegally within the United States, because of the perfect system that is in vogue or in force at this time. I do not, however, wish to go on record as not favoring anything else that would improve this matter; but I desire to bring that to your attention, that there is a way of ascertaining the fact whether a man is legally or illegally within the United States, due to the fact that he has registered, and I will show you how it works. When you come over here to-day on a ship or steamer——

Mr. JOHNSON (interposing). Say, one landing at Vancouver.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I will turn this around and say there is a Japanese or a Hindu in your city, and there is a question in your mind whether he has been legally admitted or not. What is the necessary thing to be done? You go and ask him when he arrived in this country, on what boat and on what day. He will be obliged to answer.

Mr. BROCKSON. Suppose he answers "None of your business"?

Mr. SABATH. If an officer comes there he will answer that. If he does not answer it, or if he gives an answer and you go to the record and find out that he did not come on that boat, then you are nearly in a position to know he did not come in legally, and I know the department has been able to deport a great many people due to the fact that they have stated they came in on such and such a steamer on such and such a day, and when the record was looked up it was found that they did not come on that steamer on that day, and they were deported.

The CHAIRMAN. Suppose a man refuses to answer, how are you going to make him?

Mr. CAMINETTI. I think the department has the right to ask such questions. In answer to the other question, as to Chinese admitted, under the provisions of the Geary Act, which has been modified since its passage, he receives a certificate similar to the certificate prepared for the entry of the Chinese. [Presents blank certificate as an exhibit.]

Mr. BURNETT. With his photograph on it?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. And he is supposed to have that?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. That is, in reference to those who came in previously?

Mr. CAMINETTI. But those who come in now have a certificate like this [presents blank certificate as an exhibit], which practically carries out all the essential features of the Geary law.

Mr. BURNETT. In regard to teachers, and so on?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Now, Mr. Commissioner, those Chinese that have come in surreptitiously, there is no record of?

Mr. CAMINETTI. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Has the department any money to ascertain all that are here illegally?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Not enough to ascertain all. It has, to some extent ascertained them and has deported quite a number.

Mr. RAKER. You are aware, are you not, from your information, that within the last 8 or 10 years there has been quite a good many laborers smuggled in from Mexico and also from Canada?

Mr. CAMINETTI. There is no question about that. A number have been smuggled in and we have deported a number of them, coming in from both borders, as well as from the coast line south, east, and west.

Mr. RAKER. Have you any statement with you as to the number of Chinese alone that have been deported?

Mr. CAMINETTI. I have not here, but if the committee desires it I can have a statement prepared as to the number of deportations as far back as the record has been kept of the Chinese.

Mr. RAKER. Have you, from your general estimate or information that you have received, any idea generally as to the number that have entered surreptitiously?

Mr. CAMINETTI. I could not with the limited experience I have had in the last six or seven months in the office. Mr. Parker has been in the office a number of years and he might give you a better approximation than I could. I can supply you by to-morrow morning with a statement as to the number that have been arrested and deported because of illegal entries.

Mr. RAKER. What method have you now for ascertaining those that are here illegally? Is there any method at all?

Mr. CAMINETTI. We have a method, of course, but that method is entirely dependent on the number of officers we may have, as well as the amount of money that may be at our command for the purpose of putting it into execution.

Mr. RAKER. There has been practically no effort made in the west—in California or Washington?

Mr. CAMINETTI. (f course, efforts are made constantly, and all our officers are under standing instructions to apprehend people who have come here illegally—they are always on the watch for them; but, of course, the officers in the service have so many duties devolving upon them that they are able to devote but a short part of their time to the apprehension of people who are there illegally. A great many of these people are apprehended not so much because of the work done directly by our officers, although that is considerable, but often from information that comes to our service that a certain man is here illegally, and when that information is received of course our officers go and apprehend him.

Mr. RAKER. What I was getting at is this: Suppose at one time a hundred within a week should come over from the border of Mexico and no effort was made to exclude them, would there be no method now or no action taken now to go out through the various farming districts and ascertain whether or not those people were here illegally?

Mr. CAMINETTI. There would be, and we do if we had information.

Mr. RAKER. If you had direct information, nevertheless, no one has gone through the various farming and mining communities to ascertain that?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Not as a general thing, but it has been done to a degree, and on the border it has been done every day, as far as our means permitted. We want to do it as much as possible, but it is impracticable for us to keep up the balance of the service throughout the Republic and elsewhere where we have offices with the amount of money at our command to devote any considerable time with the necessary number of officers to carry that out practically. We will do, and are doing, it to the fullest extent with the number of officers we have, as well as to the extent that our funds allow.

Mr. RAKER. Taking, now, the Hindu exclusively, supposing a law was passed to exclude him, would it be conducive to a proper administration of the law if those who were here were registered?

Mr. CAMINETTI. It would be a great aid for the ascertainment of those who are now here illegally, and it would be a check upon those who come in hereafter surreptitiously, because thereafter when we meet one who would be unable to present his certificate of registration, and the subsequent records of the department do not show his legal entry, then the department would know he is a person who has come in illegally. To that extent it would be a great aid.

Mr. RAKER. From the report made by the department on that subject, I take it that you are in hearty accord with such registration?

Mr. CAMINETTI. The department has expressed its approval of that feature.

Mr. RAKER. Is there any international complication that might intervene?

Mr. CAMINETTI. I do not know of any complication at present. Of course, I can not apprehend what the future may bring forth.

Mr. RAKER. Surely. Is there any international question involved, or that might be involved, as to fixing or providing in proper shape the question for the registration of Chinese?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Of course, that is a difficult question for me to answer, because I can not be supposed to know what objection any representative of any foreign nation might see fit to make; hence it would be a matter beyond my power to anticipate.

Mr. BURNETT. Judge, you had reference to the Hindus.

Mr. RAKER. No; I said Chinese. What I meant was, whether or not the amendment suggested in the bill to the present Chinese law would not be better for administrative features than leaving the loopholes that now exist.

Mr. CAMINETTI. I have already answered that such a system as that would be a great aid in the administration of the law if it is passed.

Mr. RAKER. In regard to the question of the expense of this examination that you have now, where does that money come from—the expense of exclusion?

Mr. CAMINETTI. It comes indirectly from the money collected, as I understand, from the head tax.

Mr. SABATH. That was the case up to 1909, but in 1909 that fund was merged with the general fund and is now taken from the general appropriation.

Mr. BURNETT. That is correct.

Mr. CAMINETTI. I was going to say that it indirectly comes from this four dollar head tax. As a matter of fact, there is enough collected from the head tax from aliens who enter, to pay for the entire

administration of the Bureau of Immigration as well as the entire expense of executing the law for exclusion of the Chinese who are here illegally or who violate the law.

Mr. SABATH. Still, there is something like \$2,000,000.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Last year there was something over \$1,900,000 in excess of expenditures that went into the Treasury.

Mr. BURNETT. They slipped that in on us in appropriations. It was the law that all this head tax goes to keep up the Immigration Bureau, and in some way they got it in the appropriation bill that no one would notice, and turned it all into the General Treasury. Our committee never reported it.

Mr. SABATH. I desire to ask just one or two questions. Commissioner, you and all the people from your State are vitally interested in this Hindu proposition and Hindu immigration, and it seems to me you are desirous, or rather these members here are desirous, of having some method for ascertaining all those who are here in violation of law. Now, in view of the fact that your State is so vitally interested, could not the State order a census to be taken of all the Hindus and of all the different nationalities that are within the borders of your State?

Mr. CAMINETTI. The State could do that, but I am not prepared to answer that the State would do it.

Mr. SABATH. Inasmuch as the State is so vitally interested and we hear so much about this question, is there any reason why they could not pass a law providing for a census to be taken of the foreign born, by nationalities, in the State of California?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Of all the people?

Mr. SABATH. Of the foreign born; yes.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Have you ever heard of that being done?

Mr. SABATH. If they are so vitally interested, the State has the right to do it.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Have you ever heard of it being done where all foreign-born people were listed in that way?

Mr. SABATH. I secured the adoption of a resolution in the Sixty-first Congress. It was the unfortunate resolution that brought about some trouble when it was held that it was not in order. We afterwards overruled Speaker Cannon and started that celebrated fight on him. I secured the passage of an amendment to the census law to provide information respecting the nationalities of all persons born in foreign countries residing here.

Mr. CAMINETTI. It can be done, but the probability of it being done by any State is so far removed that it is hardly worth considering.

Mr. SABATH. But if you are so vitally interested?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Further, let me tell you, Mr. Sabath, no matter how much interest is felt in this matter, the legislature will not meet until a year from last January.

Mr. RAKER. It will meet next January.

Mr. CAMINETTI. So that nearly a year would have to elapse before anything could be done along that line. You were not here the other day. The situation is, in my judgment, an emergency, because while there is a cessation of this immigration now, it is practically because the steamship companies upon the Pacific coast have shown good will toward the Government and have, during the

last four or five months, practically desisted from bringing this kind of people here.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to say right there that the people of the Northwest appreciate and know your interest in the matter.

Mr. CAMINETTI. They have been very kind and the steamship companies up there have been exceedingly kind. The bureau has not seen fit to ask them to desist because the Secretary of Labor did not think this Government should ask any transportation company to stop any part of their business. But these companies have voluntarily offered themselves, and the question is, How long will they continue to desist? My judgment is that they will wait until the present session of Congress ends, then possibly some—I will not say all—may start the business again. If they should, then these people would come in upon us again. The result would be that our stations upon the Pacific coast would become congested with these kind of cases and the courts would be resorted to, as they have been in the past. There would follow unnecessary delay, and pending that delay and uncertainty the law could not be effectively enforced. Even now, with all that has been done and the fact that the steamship companies have aided and with the further fact that the courts have sustained the efforts of the Government in this direction, the utmost we have been able to exclude under the existing law is 50 per cent of those that have come in.

Now the question is up to Congress and it is within its power to pass a bill of some kind to reach this question, and then it will be settled once and for all. But the condition is urgent. I will not say there were only 6,656 admitted. When you go back and consider the history of the Chinese in this country you will find that in the first year of their advent only few came. The second year a few more, and so on. By and by their numbers gradually grew, so that they became a menace to the whole Pacific coast as well as to the Nation. Now, let us profit by past experience with the people of this class. I am not talking now about people in general. I am talking about people of the class known as coolies, in regard to which the policy of the nation has been fixed; and having been settled, the question is shall we wait upon the pleasure or good will of these steamship companies, or shall we, acting in this emergency, meet it as provided by pending bills?

Mr. SABATH. Commissioner, in your modesty, I am afraid you are trying to give too much credit to the steamship companies. I know better. I know it was your hard work and your honest and conscientious efforts to stop that immigration which made it possible for you to bring about the conditions which you claim the steamship companies had voluntarily brought about. I never saw them do anything voluntarily whereby they would be obliged to give up any profit they could make, but I think if anyone is entitled to any credit you are.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Mr. Sabath, let me say something in regard to these steamship companies. When I find they are fair, when I find they wish to work in the public interest, I want to acknowledge it; and I am proud to be able to do so here in this public way, as I have done up in your State, Mr. Johnson, and elsewhere.

Mr. SABATH. I am mighty glad there are some of them that sometimes yield to reason. Why I asked this question of you, Commis-

sioner, is this: We hear that there are perhaps 30,000 of these people in your State. Our census shows there is only about 5,000 or 6,000 of them. Is it possible that under the former Republican administration the work of the Census Department was so valueless that they would omit 80 per cent of people being taken in that census? Of course, if they were inefficient, we ought to know it.

Mr. BURNETT. That was four years ago when the census was taken.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think if Mr. Sabath understood the situation on the Pacific coast, the great distances, and the short number of Federal employees, not only in the Immigration Department but in the Census Department, he would make allowances. Some of our census people out there were arrested for counting too many people in the cities and not enough in the country.

Mr. SABATH. Knowing that they counted too many, I can not understand how it is possible that they should have counted only 6,000 people when there were over 30,000 present.

Mr. JOHNSON. Have you ever seen these Hindus—the way they live, with their little tin plates and various articles of equipment? They may be in one place one day, and then they disappear over night and turn up perhaps 40 miles away. If you could see them, you would understand why the census officials could not catch them.

Mr. BURNETT. Those were not the census figures that you gave, but the figures from the records of the bureau?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. We have not the census figures in relation to this matter. May I ask, do you take a census of your own in your State?

Mr. CAMINETTI. No, sir; we follow the United States census for all purposes.

Mr. SABATH. Do you not do it for school purposes so that you will know how much to provide for the maintenance of your schools?

Mr. CAMINETTI. We had a census for school purposes until three years ago; since then our appropriation for school purposes has been based upon average daily attendance of pupils. Up to three years ago we took a census of the children.

Mr. RAKER. Right in that connection, supposing a census was taken, as suggested by my friend and colleague from Illinois, it would be of very little value to the immigration officials because of the inability to determine one Hindu from another, or one Chinaman from another. Is that not the condition?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. Let me ask you a question in regard to the matter of entry. Suppose any person was suspected of coming in illegally—a Hindu or anyone else—and he was questioned as to what ship he came on and what port he came in, and he refused to answer, could you force him to answer those questions? It seems to me there would be trouble right there. One member suggested he might answer that it is none of our business how he came in. Unless there was some system of registration, how could you force a man to give this information?

Mr. JOHNSON. Could you ask an Armenian?

Mr. BURNETT. You could ask anyone who enters these questions. Of course the burden would be on the Government.

Mr. RAKER. It has been admitted that it has been one of the troubles—one of the troubles existing in the courts—in California in

dealing in various matters with the Hindus and particularly the Chinese, that they resemble each other so much that you can not tell one from the other when he turns around the block.

Mr. CAMINETTI. That is true.

Mr. RAKER. And it is a serious trouble.

Mr. CAMINETTI. It has been in endeavoring to locate these people and in identifying them.

Mr. SABATH. Can you tell, without looking over the report, how much money is appropriated for the enforcement of the Chinese-exclusion law?

Mr. CAMINETTI. \$500,000 was formerly directly appropriated for that purpose.

Mr. SABATH. Half a million dollars is appropriated annually for that purpose?

Mr. CAMINETTI. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. Last year there was \$2,225,000 to be devoted to this whole immigration proposition—for the Chinese——

Mr. RAKER (interposing). There is no special fund for the Chinese?

Mr. CAMINETTI. No, sir; there used to be.

#### STATEMENT OF MR. A. WARNER PARKER.

Mr. BURNETT. You are the law officer in the Bureau of Immigration?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. What is your title?

Mr. PARKER. My title in the official register is special immigration inspector. My title by position and occupation and courtesy is law officer of the bureau.

Mr. BURNETT. If any immigrant comes into this country through a wrong port, do you have any right to go and force that immigrant to disclose when and where he came in?

Mr. PARKER. No, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. Now, suppose there is a transfer of these registration certificates; would that not be easy to avoid in the registration law?

Mr. PARKER. I think not, Mr. Chairman. The registration act, known as the Geary Act—that is, the Chinese exclusion law of 1892, reenacted in 1893—provided for the registration. The first act did not provide for photographs, but it was immediately found that without the photographs the registration was of no practical value. Therefore, in November, 1893, the amendatory act was passed and provided the photograph should be attached to each certificate. That registration act has been fairly effective. There have been great numbers of attempted substitutions; all kinds of most interesting schemes for removing the photograph on the certificate and attaching the certificate of some other man who could answer substantially to the personal description contained in the body, notwithstanding the fact that the photographs were required to be put under the seal of the internal-revenue collector. That was sweated off, the photograph, and another inserted in its place, and then by a careful system of ironing, with which the Chinese are experts of course, they would get the impression of the seal back through the new photograph. However, when these cases came up, as our officers became experts, they were able to detect them.

In 1908, when in the bureau we started this system of registry of all who came in—a system which is a matter of regulation and not of law, and, therefore, permissive and not mandatory on the Chinese although most of them avail themselves of it because it gives them a certificate which they carry on their person always afterwards—

Mr. BURNETT (interposing). For their own protection.

Mr. PARKER. We devised a certificate, with the aid of the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, which is practically unsusceptible of forgery or substitution. You gentlemen have seen it, as we passed it around. It is printed on a secret-process paper similar to the paper used in the printing of our bank notes and Treasury notes, and the photographs are attached in such a way and the descriptions are made so complete and are taken so carefully that we have never known, in the five years that that system has been in operation, of any actual perpetration of fraud in the use of that permissive certificate.

I would like to add to what has been said about the proposition of arresting aliens who would not answer questions, that our situation in regard to that matter has often been extremely embarrassing, especially when we encounter aliens who are of the educated classes. Of course, the ignorant alien will usually tell. He has greater respect for the man with a badge on his coat and will usually tell you something, but the man who is really sophisticated can evade arrest by merely standing mute and refusing to give us information, or by giving us erroneous information, and we have always considered, as the immigration act is worded, that, even in the case of the alien, applying for admission and a *fortiari*, in the case of the alien who is in the country and who has to be arrested and thrown out, that the burden of proof is upon the Government. In that respect the immigration law differs from the Chinese exclusion law. The Chinese exclusion law puts the burden on the alien all the way through, whereas the wording of the immigration law, which says that the following classes of aliens shall be excluded from admission to the United States and the following shall be deported, means that all those who are not members of those classes may be admitted and can not be deported.

Mr. BURNETT. Let me understand. Do you mean by that, after a Chinaman gets in here that the burden is on him to show he is in here lawfully?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. That is the difference?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. And you can go and demand of him that he prove his right to be here?

Mr. PARKER. Yes sir.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that frequently you receive communications or information that some people or some alien is here illegally in the United States?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir; we frequently receive such information.

Mr. SABATH. And the moment you receive such information you notify your inspector and the inspector goes and makes an investigation?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. SABATH. And it is due to the investigation that he makes that you obtain the information, and, based on the information which

he receives from the steamship company or from some other source, it enables you to deport such alien?

Mr. PARKER. That is true, Judge, in general. It is not true, however, where we encounter a case in which either from his own inherent intelligence or from the fact that the alien has been coached by some one else who knows the ropes he has the capacity to give us trouble, and where we have to get the information from the alien himself in a case of that kind we are up against it. Of course, if we can get information from other parties that the man came in illegally we have the basis for cross-questioning him pretty closely; but cases quite frequently arise in which we have nothing except the suspicion that the man has come in unlawfully, and the only place we can get the accurate information is out of the man's own bosom, and if he says he will not give it to us we are helpless.

Mr. SABATH. The Chinese exclusion act as amended gives you the absolute power and right to demand of him any and all information as to his proper admission into the United States.

Mr. PARKER. Yes; that is true.

Mr. SABATH. If you had the same provision as to the Hindus that would be satisfactory, would it not?

Mr. PARKER. If we had the same thing with regard to Hindus and the other measures that go with it in the Chinese exclusion law, it would accomplish the purpose, but I doubt whether a mere assertion, without the attendant working out of the details, that the burden of proof was placed on the Hindu, would accomplish much.

Mr. SABATH. Could you not amend the Chinese exclusion act by adding the word Hindus?

Mr. PARKER. That is practically what this bill does.

Mr. SABATH. Then you have everything that is embraced in the Chinese exclusion act with the Hindus thrown in?

Mr. PARKER. That is practically what this bill would do, of course, provided it was worked out in its details, as I said a moment ago.

Mr. BURNETT. But even at that, a great many Chinese are here illegally, and it is on account of their being so much alike, even with the rules and regulations that you have, that it is a difficult matter to detect the illegality.

Mr. PARKER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, for two reasons, one of which has been explained in detail by the commissioner, and that is the lack of the necessary funds with which to make the required investigations, and the other is they look so much alike. That was true more 20 years ago than it is to-day. The Chinamen dressed more alike and looked more alike then. A great many Chinamen nowadays are adopting western ideas, and when they do that they do not look so much alike. Their looking alike was partly this similarity in the method of their dress and the wearing of their hair, etc.

And then I might say this, in answer to the last question by the Chairman, that our trouble in this regard does not arise so much with the Chinaman who was registered under the Geary Act or registered under our permissive certificate as it does with the very Chinaman that we want to get, namely, the Chinaman who has entered surreptitiously. Then we have no photograph with which to compare him.

Mr. SABATH. You stated that they have these certificates on their person, and the mere fact that they would not have the certificate

of entry for lawful admission would in itself show that he was here in violation of law.

Mr. PARKER. The fact that he did not have the certificate?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. PARKER. It would not necessarily show, but would indicate that he was here in violation of law. It would be a cause of suspicion that he was here in violation of law. Of course, our permissive certificate does not go back far enough to make that absolute, having only been adopted in 1908, and more Chinamen have come in prior to that than since and they are not covered by these certificates. Our hope was, in adopting that certificate, to get all the Chinamen in this country in possession of a paper that when shown would save us from bothering with them any further.

Mr. BURNETT. The registration of these Chinamen and the Hindus would enable you to get back at those who came in surreptitiously in those days, would it not, to a great extent?

Mr. PARKER. I hardly think so.

Mr. BURNETT. Could you not trace them back to the steamship manifest and the records at the ports of entry?

Mr. PARKER. After all, that would be merely negative evidence, the fact that we could not find the names on the steamship manifest, and I doubt very much whether we would be helped materially. Of course, when we started out to do the registration, if such a scheme was adopted by Congress, we would inquire about this -- that is, if the law was worded so as to contemplate it -- as to when and where and under what circumstances they got into the country, and could develop evidence along that line; but as I understand it, every bill of this kind that was ever introduced in Congress, including the Geary Act -- at least in its practical operation -- included a scheme to let by-gones be by-gones and start over again.

Mr. RAKER. How could that be remedied now so as to properly provide for the Chinese here and for those who may come later legally and illegally, as well as the Hindus? Would this provision in bill 102 practically cover it?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Would such legislation be advisable for the proper administration of the law as well as for the proper protection of the Chinese that come here, the exempt class as well as those who are here under the law legally?

Mr. PARKER. In answer to that I would like to say this: The department is on record in its comment on bill 102 as being favorable to that scheme. Moreover, so far as I know, the bureau in the past, has always favored a re-registration proposition. It has repeatedly been recommended in the annual reports.

Mr. RAKER. Recommending it and the department feeling that way, do you think of any better scheme or one more advisable than that of the present?

Mr. PARKER. No, sir.

Mr. RAKER. It should be made to apply practically as it does now to the Hindu as well as the Chinese?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And it does, in fact, with a few changes in the words?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir; I think so.

Mr. BURNETT. There is something else in that connection in regard to the expense. Of course the expense of registration would be very considerable. The expense of more inspectors would be very considerable. Now, as a practical proposition, is it not true that after the registration has been had, that then the expense of inspection would not be so great as it would be to undertake the inspection without the registration?

Mr. PARKER. Undoubtedly, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RAKER. From your observation in the department, there have been quite a number who have come in surreptitiously?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir; a large number.

Mr. RAKER. And it is practically impossible, under the appropriations, with the men provided and the general conditions, for want of knowledge and for want of being able to ascertain the particular individuals, to deport the guilty parties, is it not?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir; to quite a considerable extent. In that connection, merely as an indication of what has been done in that direction, I will read from the Annual Report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for the year 1912, page 19:

During the year 616 Chinese were arrested on judicial warrants, compared with 669 in the fiscal year 1911. There remained pending from the previous year 289 cases, so that the total number of cases considered was 905. These were disposed of as follows: In 29 the Chinese died or escaped, in 108 the court or commissioner ordered defendants' discharge, in 397 deportation was ordered, and 371 cases remain pending. From Table 7 it will be seen that, as in previous years, most of the arrests were made in districts immediately contiguous to the land boundaries. That deportation orders were obtained in so large a percentage of the cases as here shown (44 per cent) is due mainly to this fact, for experience has demonstrated that it is extremely difficult to obtain orders of deportation in the cases of Chinese arrested at interior points, where it is not easy to persuade a United States commissioner that a Chinese has entered the country in violation of law.

The arrests occurred principally along the land borders. Then we go on and point out there that once they get into the interior, notwithstanding all the safeguards that we have thrown around them, that they claim American citizenship, or some other claim of legal residence, and can bring almost unlimited Chinese evidence in substantiation of their claim, so that even with all that has been done, with those photographs accomplishing so much, at the same time a great many get past us.

Mr. RAKER. Just one word further on that in regard to the Chinaman who is here legally. It would give the Government less trouble and be a great saving if those who were here were determined, so that hereafter you could easily ascertain the one who came here illegally for want of his certificate.

Mr. PARKER. Do you mean Chinese or Hindus?

Mr. RAKER. Chinese first.

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And the same would apply to the Hindus?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thought this hearing was to be devoted entirely to the Hindu matter.

Mr. BURNETT. Yes; that is true. I understood these questions to pertain possibly to an amendment that may be desired in regard to registration, and possibly it might be desired to amend the bill to embrace the registration of both Hindus and Chinese.

Mr. JOHNSON. I was going to ask a question about that.

Mr. RAKER. The Government of Canada keeps a record of the number of Asiatics that come there?

Mr. PARKER. Yes; I understand they do.

Mr. RAKER. I asked you to get me that the other day.

Mr. PARKER. I submit this table, secured from our commissioner at Montreal, on that subject:

*Oriental immigration to Canada during the 8 years Jan. 1, 1906, to Dec. 31, 1913.*

Year.	Chinese.	Japanese.	Hindus.	Year.	Chinese.	Japanese.	Hindus.
1906.....	308	2,930	2,317	1911.....	6,817	727	3
1907.....	1,868	7,608	2,415	1912.....	7,145	675	5
1908.....	2,432	858	296	1913.....	6,054	886	88
1909.....	1,642	244	5				
1910.....	4,851	420	10	Total.....	31,117	14,348	5,139

Mr. RAKER. The number admitted to Canada. Then I was going to get information as to the matter of naturalization. How many of these Asiatics are permitted to naturalize in Canada?

Mr. PARKER. The Canadian law is broad in the highest sense. Any one can be naturalized in Canada who meets the requirements and is of a moral character. No distinction is made in regard to race in Canada.

Mr. RAKER. And all these people could become naturalized citizens in Canada?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. And come to the border as Canadian citizens?

Mr. PARKER. I say that because we have in experience encountered a number of cases of Chinese who held papers as citizens of Canada.

Mr. RAKER. Would the fact of their naturalization in Canada as Canadian citizens, if they were otherwise qualified, give them any better opportunity to enter the United States?

Mr. PARKER. I think not. It certainly has not in the experience with the Chinese exclusion law, because that law relates to the Chinaman, not politically, but racially.

Mr. RAKER. A Chinaman can become a naturalized citizen of Canada?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. The Hindu is already one of the subjects of the British Crown?

Mr. PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURNETT. Could they not come there and become citizens, in view of the fact that they are subjects of the British Crown, without naturalization?

Mr. PARKER. I think not.

Mr. JOHNSON. Did not the courts hold that they were entitled to citizenship? Was that not what caused the suspension of immigration into British Columbia?

Mr. BURNETT. It seems to me I saw something of that.

Mr. JOHNSON. I thought immigration was suspended there until the 1st day of April of this year.

Mr. PARKER. I think, Mr. Johnson, if you will pardon me, that arose in a different way. What the supreme court of British Columbia

held was that the order in council, under which the Canadian immigration officials attempted to exclude the Hindus, was ultra vires. The Canadian law says that by order in council there may be excluded from Canada laborers of any race. In reading their order in council the governor and his councilors used the expression aliens of Asiatic origin, and the contention in the court arose on the difference between the expression "Asiatic race" and "Asiatic origin," and the court held that the possibilities of the matter were such that it was obliged to come to the conclusion that the order in council was ultra vires, because, it says, the son or daughter of a British officer stationed in India might be excluded from Canada, whereas the law intended to exclude people of these peculiar races rather than people of the Anglo-Saxon race; and thereupon the order was issued at Ottawa suspending the immigration of laborers into British Columbia until the 31st day of March of this year.

Mr. RAKER. That included all Asiatic laborers?

Mr. PARKER. All laborers coming to the ports of British Columbia.

Mr. CAMINETTI. Each man entering there must have \$200 in his possession, and he must come direct by one continuous passage from the country from which he hails to Canada.

Mr. RAKER. I would like to ask Mr. Johnson a question. What is your estimate of the number of Hindus in Washington?

Mr. JOHNSON. I can not say. They move around a great deal. In our State we have kept them on the move.

Mr. RAKER. You keep them moving?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, sir. I think if we had not had local agitation commencing four or five years ago that the very large number that worked their way down to California would have remained in our State. I would like to ask Mr. Caminetti a question, and that is if does not think a straight bill of this kind, without the registration feature, would be easier to enact into law?

Mr. CAMINETTI. You ask the question in relation to the exclusion of the registration feature?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. CAMINETTI. I believe from an investigation of the subject by the Canadian authorities and by the British Government, as indicated in this report, that there would be no objection on the part of the United States dealing with this subject in this way, as Canada has done. As to whether or not the English Government might object if we included in it at this particular time the registration feature, of course that is very hard for me to say. It might be possible that a bill, such as is now before the committee, would pass unnoticed by the British Government.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is what I wanted to ask you, and I make the supposition now that a bill bearing the registration feature and barring the Hindus might lead us into diplomatic complications that would delay us indefinitely.

Mr. RAKER. How could that come about? If we can diplomatically exclude them entirely, why can not we adopt a rule that those who are here illegally be sent out?

Mr. JOHNSON. I will say this, that I think the United States has been absolutely cowardly in regard to the restriction of all immigration, and before we get through with this and other measures, which

we hope will follow our bill, we will still be cowardly as a nation if we do not take care of a provision for the exclusion of all Asiatics.

Mr. RAKER. Then why should we hesitate, if we conceive we have the power to exclude the Hindus? Why should we not, at the same time, register the fellows who are here and those that come later, so that we may have the opportunity to exclude all that are here illegally?

Mr. JOHNSON. We only have the right to exclude the Hindu by an agreement with Great Britain.

Mr. RAKER. I differ with you on that. We can exclude all Asiatic labor, if we wish to.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think we can; but before we could adopt any such bill we would have to go through long diplomatic negotiations.

Mr. RAKER. What do you mean by that?

Mr. JOHNSON. We have a Chinese-exclusion bill, and if we take the next short step and exclude the Hindu, if we put any clause into that bill that can be criticized by diplomats all over the world, they will hang the bill up somehow. We have heard at this very hearing that the Hindu situation is an emergency one.

Mr. BURNETT. Is there anything else? It is about adjournment time.

Mr. SABATH. I desire to state, in view of the remarks Mr. Johnson made, that it was quite an unfortunate statement for any gentleman to make who comes from the State he hails from, where the population is very small, where one-half of the people living in the rural districts are of a foreign origin, and the chances are whose ancestors were immigrants themselves. I do not think the Government has been cowardly. I think the country has displayed excellent judgment and has been vastly benefited. I am in favor of a wise measure that would eliminate the entry of those people who are detrimental to our country. If, as the gentleman claimed, the people in his State are liable to suffer on account of the Hindus, I am willing to aid them any way I know how in reporting a bill that would eliminate the Hindu immigration.

Mr. RAKER. As I understand at the present time, if I may be permitted to state, the hearing was on the Hindu proposition so as to specialize, but there has been no determination yet by the committee as to whether or not they would go into the matter in a broader sense, following upon the general question of the exclusion of all Asiatic laborers?

Mr. BURNETT. The matter has not been settled, it is true.

Mr. SABATH. I want to add that, notwithstanding the statement of the gentlemen from Washington, neither the membership of this committee, nor the membership of the House, nor the people of this country has been cowardly in this matter. Whenever it is made clear to this committee and to the House that this legislation is needed, not only in regard to Hindus but in regard to Chinese or any other people, the necessary action will be taken.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to state, in answer to the gentleman from Illinois, who made some strictures in relation to my State as to its population, and I want it in the record, that if it had not been for the eternal vigilance of the people of California and Washington our west coast would have been full of Asiatics to-day. Thirty

odd years ago the citizens chased every Chinaman out of the city of Tacoma, and there has not been one there since. It is not fair on the part of the United States to force the people of the coast to be eternally on guard in this matter.

Mr. SABATH. I do not see that the people of the coast have done a great deal in this respect, with the exception of creating a lot of turmoil. They have not done anything, except to make a great deal of noise. The Government has been doing very nicely. The people out there have not spent much money to regulate the laws as to matters pertaining to the Asiatics, and they want the United States to do things for them that they could easily accomplish themselves.

Mr. RAKER. Not at all. The Chinese question resulted in riots in the State of California, as we all know. Then there followed questions of legislation and of international complication, and we do not want to have that experience again with the Japs and Hindus coming in. And, another thing, when you talk about the people of California trying to do something, I want to say that the moment they pass a law on this matter everybody is on top of them, saying California has no right to do these things, when, in fact, we are only trying to protect ourselves.

Mr. BURNETT. I think the country owes the Pacific coast a debt of gratitude for keeping undesirable people out, because when they overrun California the whole country suffers.

Mr. PARKER. At the suggestion of the commissioner general, I would like to submit the following extract from a letter I recently received from Hon. Daniel J. Keefe, the former commissioner general, who has been on a pleasure trip to the Orient:

THE ORIENTAL HOTEL (LTD.),  
Kobe, Japan, January 26, 1914.

Mr. WARNER A. PARKER, *Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR PARKER: Since writing you last we have seen a great deal of Manila and vicinity, including Baguio, the summer capital of the Philippines, concerning which I shall write you more fully later.

The day following that on which I wrote you from Hongkong I was informed by an official of the steamship company that there were more than a thousand Hindus in Kongkong who were determined to get to the United States either directly, or through Mexico or Canada. In a conversation with one of the officers of the steamer *China*, en route for Manila, he stated some Hindus were getting into the interior of the Philippine Islands, and after remaining there a certain period they would endeavor to pass the immigration officials of Manila, who are under the collector of customs. \* \* \*

(The committee then adjourned.)