

TRUTH *versus* FICTION

JUSTICE

versus

PREJUDICE

MEAT FOR ALL, NOT FOR A FEW

A PLAIN AND UNVARNISHED
STATEMENT

WHY Exclusion Laws against the Chinese
Should NOT be Re-enacted.

RESPECT TREATIES, AND MAKE GENERAL,
NOT SPECIAL, LAWS.

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University



WHY NOT GIVE
THEM AN
EQUAL CHANCE?

DONT LET
THEM COME
IN!

E
184
.C5
T78
1901

20071784

INTRODUCTION.

Inasmuch as the laws excluding Chinese emigration are not only to be re-enacted but made more drastic in their enforcement, it behooves thinking men and patriotic Americans to calmly review the history of this legislation, and the present condition, which, instead of calling for severer laws, should under all the circumstances demand less restrictive legislation and more humane interpretation by the executive branches of our Government. It is most unfortunate that questions of vital moment, such as call for the exercise of the highest statesmanship, are always discussed from the standpoint of party politics or local conditions, and that right of independent judgment is made subversive to catch the votes of the mob. The labor union organizations of the country, especially of the Pacific Coast, have formulated documents to prove that the Chinese emigration is a menace and danger to our institutions, undermining the fabric of our Government, and will destroy, if permitted, American labor. They have issued through their Washington branch a pamphlet that appeals to the prejudice and the baser passions of the American people, without one single thought of strengthening their position, and to bring home to the American people the facts that surround this Chinese exclusion legislation is the aim and object of this pamphlet. It is inspired by no thought to array class against class or to foment prejudice; on the contrary, it is to allay differences, and to show, if possible, that it is unwise and unpatriotic to discriminate in legislation; that whatever laws are to be enacted by Congress are to be uniform in their application and should not discriminate against any human being, no matter where he may have been born; that if emigration should be restricted, it should apply to every emigrant, whether born in Europe or Asia, for through such legislation only can laws be respected and enforced.

The pamphlet of the labor union, among other things, says:

On the 5th page, it is stated that there had arrived in California in 1868 about 80,000 Chinese.

This is wrong. According to the United States Census there were in the whole United States, in 1860, 34,933 Chinese, and, in 1870, 63,249 Chinese.

The statement that the Chinese who came to California were slaves of the Six Companies, and practically chattels, is absolutely false.

The so-called Six Companies are really benevolent associations. They give relief to the needy and take care of them in trouble. They do not control the persons or movements of the Chinese in this country in any way. It is true that there are some Chinese secret societies in San Francisco called "Tongs." These "Tongs" have aims something like those of the labor unions, and have just as much control over their members as the labor unions have over their members.

As to the Chinese in other parts of the country than the State of California, they have nothing to do with the Six Companies or Tongs.

Page 7. It is true that there are a few highbinders in San Francisco. These are desperate characters who came to this country some years ago after committing serious offenses in China. They are really fugitives from justice. It is learned that the Chinese Minister is willing to co-operate with the United States Government to have these men arrested and sent back to China for trial and punishment.

Pages 8, 9, and 10. In regard to Chinese competition, it may be said that Chinese do not work for less wages than other people. According to the information furnished by an employment bureau, a Chinese cook cannot be had for less than \$40 or \$50 a month. This does not look like cheap labor.

Baron von Hubner, former Austrian Ambassador to France, was only a traveller passing through the United States. He

only gave his impressions in his discourse delivered at the Oriental Museum, in Vienna. He cannot be cited as an authority. But what he says about the Chinese in Singapore and other British settlements in the Far East clearly shows that Chinese make desirable immigrants. The English are certainly good colonizers. They know the value of the Chinese in their Eastern Possessions, and give them every inducement to come and settle there. Singapore, Penang, and other English colonies in the East could not have attained their present prosperous condition without the Chinese.

Page 12. It is stated that both Gen. Otis and Gen. McArthur were opposed to unrestricted Chinese immigration into the Philippines. In his report, Gen. McArthur takes the strange position of recommending the exclusion of Chinese from the Philippines on account of their virtues. This only serves to stir up race prejudice. The Filipinos are certainly not so enterprising as the Chinese. No statesman would think of excluding them from the islands. All the reliable authorities agree that Chinese labor is indispensable to the development of the Philippines. So long have the Chinese been resorting to those islands for purposes of trade and residence that they have now a vested interest there. Free intercourse and commerce were guaranteed to the Chinese by a treaty between China and Spain. But as soon as these islands passed under the control of the United States, Gen. Otis, in his capacity as military commander, issued an order excluding all Chinese from landing, in plain violation of law and international usage, without the knowledge and previous sanction of the President and the Secretary of War.

Referring to the economic conditions of the Philippine Islands, United States Consul-General Wildman, of Hongkong, says in a report in 1898 :

“Broadly speaking, there is not an industry in the Islands (Philippines) that will not be ruined, if Chinese labor is not allowed.”

Again, in the following year, speaking of the possibility of competing at Manila with the extensive manufactories at Hongkong, he says :

“It would only be possible if Chinese labor were admitted freely.”

Page 14. In regard to the general sentiment said to be against the Chinese on the Pacific coast, it is not strictly true.

Joaquin Miller, says in the *North American Review* for December, 1901 :

“I repeat that all the tax-paying and substantial citizens of our cities and the real laborers of our Pacific Empire, from Alaska to San Diego, want and need these people (the Chinese) with us. * * * My work as a teacher, talker at teachers' institutes, colleges and so on, has, in the last four years, taken me into nearly every county in Washington, Oregon, California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and Louisiana, and I have nowhere heard one voice in favor of the Chinese Exclusion Act, but the contrary, at all times and places. The Chinese are particularly wanted in the great Southwest.”

Page 15. The table purporting to give the class of labor, average wages, etc., of Chinese in California, compiled by John S. Enos, Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the State of California from 1883 to 1886, is not particularly reliable. In any case he describes the condition of things of nearly twenty years ago. The times have changed since then. It is a fact that Chinese appreciate the value of their labor now, and they will not work for less than white laborers.

It is absurd to say that the Chinese in the United States obtain 75 per cent. of their food from China and send 75 per cent. of their earnings to China. Chinese have acquired extravagant habits from contact with the American people. It is a well-known fact that thousands of Chinese in California,

who have been in this country many years, have spent all that they have made, and saved nothing.

Pages 18 and 19. It is stated that Chinese labor degrades labor as slave labor did. This is not so. It is a well-known fact that there is a scarcity of labor in the agricultural districts. Owing to the exclusion law, fields lie uncultivated for lack of labor. It is to the interest of farmers to be able to obtain any other kind of labor when white labor cannot be had.

Senator Morton, when he was at the head of the Congressional Committee which investigated the Chinese question, said :

“That they have injuriously interfered with the white people of California, or have done them a serious injury, may well be doubted. The great fact is there is to-day and has always been a scarcity of labor on the Pacific coast. There is work for all who are there, both white and Mongolian, and the State would undoubtedly develop much more rapidly were there more and cheaper labor. There was much intelligent testimony to the fact that the Chinese by their labor opened up large avenues and demand for white labor. The Chinese performed the lowest kind, while whites monopolized that of a superior character.”

Pages 19-21. The old story about the Chinese, in their habits and customs, violating every principle and rule of hygiene is here repeated, but the Chinese in this regard, are no worse than the Italians or the Hungarians, in cities or places where there are no Chinese. Sanitary laws have to be enacted and enforced to meet such a situation. In every country there are some people who are filthy in their habits.

Pages 22-28. It is not necessary to say much in reply to what is said there in regard to the moral standard of the Chinese. Suffice it to say that any one who takes up a copy of the *New York Journal* can find a state of things equally bad among the people of other nationalities in New York.

Pages 28-29. Opium is imported into this country by Americans. Chinese are prohibited from bringing opium into this country by treaty between China and the United States. If there are opium dens in San Francisco and other American cities, the Americans have only themselves to blame, for China has done her utmost to put a stop to that traffic.

Page 29. It is stated that the Chinese buy very little from the United States, their entire trade amounting to but 77 cents per head, against \$1.03 per head of the people of Australia. This shows only that the trade between China and the United States is still in its infancy, and is capable of vast development. Now that the United States, by the acquisition of the Philippines, has practically become the next-door neighbor to China, the development of trade between the two countries is not a matter of small moment. It concerns the future growth and prosperity of the Pacific slope. It affects the demand for labor on the Pacific coast. The consequences are very far reaching.

It is further stated that from 1880 to 1901 the trade of the United States with China amounted to \$578,165,159, of which \$429,081,555 was the value of imports, and but \$149,083,604 the value of exports, leaving a balance of \$279,997,951 in favor of China. This only shows that during the period of exclusion, partial and absolute, the Chinese bought their goods mostly from Europe, and bought from the United States only such things as they could not possibly obtain elsewhere. Though trade may not be a matter of sentiment, sentiment, after all, often determines where we go to buy.

As to the complaint that Chinese send money out of the country, it is sufficient to say that they have a perfect right to do what they will with their own. Don't American millionaires spend millions of dollars in European travel every year? What is the difference between the act of the millionaires and that of the Chinese in this respect? In any case it is absurd

to think that every dollar sent out of the country is a dead loss to the country. In the first place, money in the form of silver and gold coins seldom goes out of the country. Even small amounts are usually sent by draft, which is only an instrument of credit, and bankers invariably make something in that operation. As a general thing, the money sent out of the country usually comes back in the shape of goods to supply the wants of the country. Thus it is difficult to see where the loss comes in.

What San Francisco has suffered from the exclusion of Chinese! In this connection, it is worth while to see what Joaquin Miller, in the article above referred to, says in this regard:

“Do the real proprietors of the Pacific coast, the owners of property and the tax-payers, want the Chinese with us? They do, almost without exception, and it would be strange if they did not; for, since the exclusion of the Chinese, property in our large cities has, in the main, been at a standstill. And behold, our chiefest city, San Francisco, has slid back from its proud place as the seventh city in the Union to that of the ninth! Of course, if we had excluded all other foreigners along with the Chinese we might have held our own, perhaps advanced as at the first; but these remaining foreigners have kept up such a turmoil that capital, always very sensitive, has been afraid to come, and in many cases has moved out, and moved out to stay.”

The days before the exclusion of Chinese were the heyday of San Francisco's prosperity. During the seventies, when there was no exclusion, the value of exports from the port of San Francisco to the Chinese Empire rose to \$9,617,766 in 1879, and from 1882 to 1901, when there was partial and absolute exclusion, the value of exports from San Francisco to China fell to as low a point as \$99,385 in 1886 and \$99,950 in 1890. The above figures are taken from a table compiled by the United States Bureau of Statistics, and are, therefore, official.

The fact is, that owing to the rigid enforcement of the exclu-

sion laws, Chinese merchants have found no end of trouble in coming to this country for the purpose of buying. How can, therefore, an increase of trade be effected, if every obstacle is thrown in the way of those who are concerned in that trade? They have no choice but to go elsewhere.

Page 33. Reply to Memorial to Congress.

“When Chinese flocked in.” The Chinese have contributed largely to the opening up and development of California and the Western States. They worked mines, they reclaimed waste lands, they constructed the transcontinental railroads connecting the Pacific coast with the Atlantic seaboard.

“Effects of the Geary Act.” Its effects are disastrous to California. According to the fifteenth report of the Commissioner of Labor, the average rate of wages in California fell to \$1.73 per day in 1893, the year when the Geary Act went into effect, while the average rate of wages in California was \$2.00 per day before the exclusion of the Chinese.

“Chinese are not assimilative.” Americans do not give them a chance. They are not allowed by law to become citizens; it is hardly fair to deny them the right to become naturalized and, in the same breath, find fault with them for not being assimilative.

“Deter desirable immigration.” It is stated here that “all Chinese immigration of the coolie class is both pauper and contract labor.” There is an alien labor contract law and also a general immigration law excluding paupers on the statute books. These laws are sufficient to keep out the undesirable elements of the Chinese population without the enactment of a special law for the purpose. It is the unjust discrimination that is the most objectionable feature of the exclusion laws.

“Protection for American labor.” American labor needs no protection from Chinese labor, because Chinese labor does not come into competition with American labor. As Senator Morton says in his report above referred to, “The Chinese performed the lowest kind, while the whites monopolized that of a superior character.” Joaquin Miller again says: “There

is work for all who want to work. There will be work for all who really want to work until the Western States are entirely inhabited. It will be ages and ages before our last acre is plowed and planted ; let come to us all who care to come and labor and obey the laws. Now, do these real laborers, the men who work in content, want and need the Chinese with us ? They both want them and need them."

"Exclusion an aid to industrial peace." From what has been said, it is not the real laborers who do not want the Chinese, but the walking delegates, and others of that class. They are the real disturbers of the industrial peace, not the Chinese."

"Answer to opponents of exclusion." Let Joaquin Miller answer this. He says :

"The man with a home, whether he has a little shop or a little farm, does not want his wife and growing children to cook, wash, and do chamber work, when he can get a silent and submissive little Mongolian to do it for a song. For our ambitious and splendid white boy or girl cannot get on nearly so well at school if kept at home to do washing, do chamber work, and help mother to do what Senator Morton called 'the lowest work' about the house."

"Experience with slave labor." Chinese labor is voluntary, and not slave labor.

"Our civilization is involved." The historical allusions are rather far-fetched. They have no bearing whatever on the question at hand.

The Americans have often boasted of their fair dealing and consideration for the oppressed of mankind. The exclusion laws against the Chinese give a lie to their professions. They do not dare to do the same thing to a stronger power. They simply take advantage of the weakness of China and do as they please about this matter. This is like kicking a man when he is down. Nothing is more cowardly than this.

The Chinese do not come here to commit any criminal

offence. They come to trade and to work. But it is the practice for custom officers to look upon their attempt to enter the country as criminal offences, and treat them worse than thieves or robbers. Is this fair? Should it be done by a civilized people?

So much in answer to the pamphlet of the labor union. The religious press of the country is almost a unit against the rigid enactment and enforcement of Chinese exclusion.

Thus the *Church News* Association of New York says:

“The Christian Missions of San Francisco and Portland, which represent almost all religious bodies, have appealed to Gen. O. O. Howard, and through him to the churches of the whole country, to do what he and they can to mitigate the rigors of the Chinese exclusion law. These missions, and especially such managers of them as are leading Chinese citizens of the coast, claim that in the execution of the exclusion law great injustice is done. Certain classes of Chinese are exempted by the original act as students, merchants, and travellers, but in different re-enactments, and especially in the rulings attending the execution of the law, various terms have been employed, and confusion about terms is the outcome. Out of this confusion many persons get into prison, and are compelled to prove themselves entitled to their liberty, which is contrary to all Anglo-Saxon legal practice. In the judgment of Gen. Howard a large proportion of the people of the coast are not in favor of the exclusion act. The law expires next May, hence the present agitation on the part of coast missions interested in the Chinese to defeat its re-enactment.”

The *Jewish Exponent*, published in Philadelphia, after deploring the fact that President Roosevelt recommended more stringent immigration laws; especially against illiterate persons, at the close of the article has the following:

“When legislation such as this is proposed against European immigrants it would be idle to expect Congress to refuse to re-enact the law excluding Chinamen from this country. Consideration of justice and consistency

are not likely to enter into the matter. We say in effect to the Chinese, 'you must take our goods, the missionaries and anything else we choose to send you, and you must protect our interests on peril of your lives; but you must not show your faces within our borders, for you are too far beneath us to be fit company for us.' And we expect the Chinamen to smile and cheerfully acquiesce. He will no doubt smile broadly at the proposal of one Senator to permit Chinamen who have 'embraced' Christianity to enter the country when the others are excluded, for he knows that even a childlike and bland 'disciple' of Confucius can 'embrace' a religion one day, and let go of his fond embrace as soon as he is over the border."

The *American Israelite*, published in Cincinnati, says, after quoting from President Roosevelt's message on emigration :

"It is well to remember that pitiful cases arise in every part of the country owing to a harsh construction of the laws on immigration, and laws to be respected should be uniform and specific."

General O. O. Howard, the Havelock of the American Army, and whose reputation for sincerity, piety, and all that the word patriotic American embraces, is well known, writes from Burlington, Vermont, to a comrade in this city as follows :

"In your letter received to-day you ask me to give some reasons why I am opposed to the re-enactment of the old exclusion laws, that is, the original law and its amendments passed ostensibly for the benefit of the Chinese. The original act of Congress was intended to apply to laborers, and there were exempted all other classes such as students, merchants, travellers, etc. But the re-enactments and especially the rulings of the administrative department, which have been had from time to time in the execution of the law and in the carrying out of the treaty of 1894, have brought additional hardship to faithful laborers and quite as much to the persons who were intended to be exempted. It is com-