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The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, having under consideration the bill (S. No. 71) to enforce treaty stipulations relating to the Chinese—

Mr. DAWES said:

Mr. President: I am aware that the friends of this measure are impatient for a vote, and that in their opinion the debate is exhausted. I cannot therefore expect, however courteous they may be, to receive a very attentive hearing from them; but, sir, believing that in nothing are the friends of this measure more mistaken than in the belief that they have exhausted and ended the debate upon the questions which they have raised by this measure, however little I may be able to contribute to that debate, I am compelled by a sense of duty to utter what I may, as briefly as under the circumstances it is possible for me, in protest against this measure.

There is some advantage as well as disadvantage in looking at the subject-matter of this debate at a distance. If one does not feel so keenly the evils out of which this legislation has sprung, and fails to be affected by the prejudice and passion and feeling that control those more closely in contact with it, nevertheless a clearer vision of the character of the proposed remedy and a calmer judgment upon its nature and its consequences are some compensation to those who look at it from a distance.

Mr. President, it is confessed upon the record here by supporters of this legislation that it “is invoked under the influence of overmastering passions. Whether justly or unjustly, public opinion upon the Pacific slope, by importunate and inflammatory appeals, has been wrought to that heat of passion that we are not at this time,” in the opinion of such supporters, “capable of taking an entirely unbiased and unprejudiced view of what the social and economical requirements of the country in regard to this question are.”

If this confession of supporters of the measure itself were not furnished us in debate here as the lesson, what we have witnessed this morning sent over the wires from California and Nevada, and Oregon, I believe, furnishes ample proof of the statement. There can be no doubt what the supporters of the bill call a white heat pervades that people; whether, as is said, rightly or wrongly, its existence cannot be ignored and its effect upon our deliberations cannot be disregarded.

What should it teach us? Hasty, unques-
tioned acquisicence in demands made under the impulse of overmastering passion, or call, considerate delay, not diminished, if not increased, as one sees that all reason or judgment upon existing facts in the locality that involves this legislation at our hands is virtually wiped out in a blind and furious darkening passion! And yet what are we told by those supporters of another bill on the other hand, to be taught us as a duty here in this Senate Chamber from the voice that comes up out of the heat of this overmastering passion? Such supporters tell us that they are not disposed at this time to dwell upon what seems to their minds to be "the economical and what may be called the sentimental objections to this legislation." They tell you, sir, when making the very confession to which I have called your attention, that their "instincts revolt at it," and that they would "as soon think of destroying all the males or all the domestic animals in the country, or of destroying all the engines and labor-saving machinery in the country, as to either expel or repel a class of docile, patient, obedient, frugal, and industrious laborers, whether skilled or unskilled."

Mr. MILLER, of California. Will the Senator allow me to ask whom he is quoting from?

Mr. DAWES. Quoting from a Senator here in his seat, declaring that he would vote for this measure.

Mr. MILLER, of California. What Senator was it?

Mr. DAWES. The Senator from Kansas, Mr. INGALLS. The same Senator further instructs us as to our duty out of this measure and out of the circumstances under which it comes into existence here before this body. "But," says he, "I pass that, because..."

Hear this! Because conceding to other localities the same rights that I demand for my own, and for all who have come to the main land and the base of this new immigration act of the time, I am prepared to say that the communities upon the Pacific coast—

"Whom I have described at this moment under an overmastering passion..."—

have a right to judge for themselves as to the propriety in an economical sense of this immigration, and when they have spoken through their authorized representatives, with their declarations I shall be content.

The only condition upon which such supporters of this legislation have declared that their support shall be given to it, from which their very instincts revolt, is that they shall not be required to stand it over ten years.

Mr. TELLER. I would ask the Senator by what authority he says that no one supports the bill except upon that theory! Did he not hear me distinctly announce that I did not support it upon any such theory?

Mr. DAWES. I have not forgotten the ground the Senator from Colorado took, but I should like to inquire of the Senator what he put that question to me for.

Mr. TELLER. I put it because the Senator has made the assertion to go to the country that nobody supports this bill in this Senate except because the people of California want it. That I understand to be his position.

Mr. DAWES. I regret exceedingly that the Senator did so understand, because I did not say so. I said the only condition that such supporters of this measure demanded was that they were not required to endure that at which their very instincts revolted longer than ten years. I am aware that the Senator from Colorado put his support of this bill upon a wholly different and it seems to me quite an indefensible ground, which I hope that I may not forget to state through.

Mr. TELLER. I hope not.

Mr. DAWES. So, sir, the voice of these States thus expressed is clear and plain. The basis, the ground of this measure is stated in the bill itself. Those who took it have chosen in their frankness, for which I commend them, to tell the whole what necessity there is for it; and it is in these brief words:

"Whereas it is in the opinion of the Government of the United States the coming of Chinese laborers to this country endangers the good order of certain localities within the territory thereof: Therefore...

In the opinion of the Government of the United States."

We are told by Senators that instead of taking only our instinct as their guide to their duty here as Senators of the United States they are to take an expression of it from a locality controlled by an overmastering passion. My friend on my right [Mr. JONES, of Nevada] inquires how I know it is a fact. The Senator did not hear me read the confession of supporters of this bill, to which I would add and did add the evidence which Senators have themselves produced here this morning of a legal holiday enacted on the Pacific coast for the purpose of gathering together whatever could be put into the form of a testimony here, and telegraphed to the Senate of the United States as instructions to them upon their duty.

Mr. President, the whole basis of this legislation is that the coming of Chinese laborers to this country endangers good order in certain localities. It is not that Chinese laborers are here; that Chinese laborers are working evil in the midst of any locality in these United States; it is not that any evil has grown out of their coming here in the past. It is all that has come to the attention of the local government of the State, and after all the means and degrees of local government. It is not that the coming of Chinese laborers here endangers good order. No one has told us how the coming of Chinese laborers here endangers good order; nor does any one tell us whether they endanger good order by being themselves the disturbers of order, or whether they endanger good order merely by being the temptation to some such lot irreparable to cast a stone at innocent and docile human beings. That is not explained. I have never known produced here as evidence of the disturbance of good order in any of these communities that any of these docile laborers have ever assailed any one or committed a breach of the peace against any individual; but I have heard everywhere that they have been the occasion of others committing breaches of the peace and disturbing good order, and it is on that account that they must be removed, upon the principle that the justice fined Mr. Jones for giving Mr. Smith so much in court that Mr. Smith insulted the court. [Laughter.] They have no business to be there any irreparable community, disregarding the peace and good order, are tempted by their presence to disturb it.

Therefore, as the basis of this bill, the coming of Chinese laborers here gives somebody an opportunity to disturb the peace, and they must be stopped and the temptation removed—a liberal construction of the Lord's prayer, "Lead us not into temptation!"

Just as the authority to enter into this legislation in order that the community into which a Chinese laborer may come will not hereafter be tempted to commit a breach of the peace upon him is derived, if anywhere, from this clause of a treaty we have made with China:
That is the spirit of the Burlingame treaty. And that, those gentlemen say is, whether it be of the Burlingame treaty or not, the spirit and the letter of the law we are called upon this day to record our vote in favor of. I do not wonder the Senator from Kansas says that his very instinct revolted from it. I only wonder that he could find it consistent with his duty afterward to say that he would be willing to take it if he were not required to endure it longer than ten years.

Sir, one thing more. It is "Chinese laborers" that disturb the good order of certain localities in the United States. It is not Chinese per se. If a Chinaman will come here and only pledge himself to be idle, if he come here clothed in "purple and fine linen," and brings with him an army of adherents, he may travel throughout the length and breadth of the land; if he will agree to keep a gambling shop, though it be under the very shadow of the sanctuary, though he and his followers darken the sun with the rabble that come and occupy their dens where they smoke in idleness their opium and play cards and gamble and lose upon the venture of the die, though they bring vile women with them, provided they do not work for a living, they may come. Yes, as is suggested by my colleague, they can even join the band of saints in California that throw stones at Chinese laborers, saying: "None of this; procul, O procul ate profanat; get behind me ye hordes of Satan; let the godly people of Massachusetts and Rhode Island and the other States of this Union enjoy the elevating influence and pious association of all other Chinese; but do not let them be contaminated by one who is vile enough to earn his living by labor!"

This is the bill. Is there not as much danger to society, to social and political institutions in this country, from the arrival of a idle, worthless, dissipated Chinaman, as there is from the humble, docile laborer who earns his daily bread by the sweat of his brow and uses those earnings in the United States? For what he consumes and what he wears?

Mr. SLATER. I should like to ask the Senator, if it would not be an interruption to him, if the condition he deprecates is not the condition the treaty itself affixes upon the coming of the Chinaman? The law is only following the treaty.

Mr. DAWES. I know it. Our friends made the treaty and then they make the law, and there is no more virtue in the treaty they made in this respect than there is in the law they propose. They were satisfied, they were satisfied when the treaty was made which enabled them to put their foot upon a laborer and exalt an idle dissipated Chinaman if one could be found. They hold mass-meetings to-day; their Legislatures enact a legal holiday in which all of them can come together and shout "pass a law that will enable us to trample with the iron heel of power every man of Chinese blood who has the presumption to degrade this land of liberty by earning his daily bread by the sweat of his brow." And we are called upon to do this and we resolve to do this (so says the Senator from Kansas and the Senator from Delaware, and others) because these localities are of one mind demanding it. But suppose some other locality should demand the opposite; suppose some State engaged in great public works, desires of carrying them through, should demand that public order among its citizens not be derailed, that such a bill as this should be enacted, are they not entitled to the same heard and to the same consideration as these localities? Is not our duty something else than to yield an instant and unquestioned obedience to the demand of any locality? While I am no advocate for the Chinese of the United States to listen to and weigh well the demands and the petitions to the exact
ing power of any locality, they should be weighed by the standard of the whole Union. We are not here to legislate for New England nor for California. We are here—

Mr. FELIX. Will the Senator allow me to ask him one question only? Is not the Senator, and are not most of the Representatives from the portion of the country he hails from, asking protection against European cheap labor? Does the Senator propose to bring Asiatic cheap labor here to compete with the laborers of this country?

Mr. DAVIES. I propose, as well as I may know how, to govern my actions here upon every bill by such a policy as will benefit the whole country, whether it be a bill for protection or some or a bill like this, is evoked from an overmastering passion kindled and led by European foreigners against Asiatic foreigners. The same communities who now implore deliverance from Asiatic foreigners have surrendered and put themselves under the lead of European foreigners, who have led them on to the sand-hills and hanged them until the good and order-loving people of those communities were unable to be heard; until the fire-brand and the torch and the bloody weapon rules those communities in spite of the calm, order-loving people, such as their Representatives and Senators here are. And, sir, this is a vain attempt to bring peace there by a surrender of principle and good order to the beholds of those who commanded those communities within the last three years who were themselves foreigners.

Mr. SLATER. Will the honorable Senator allow me a moment? I wish to enter my statement here that the condition of the opposition to Chinese labor in the States of California and Oregon and the Pacific States, generally does not warrant the statement that this opposition is led or engendered by foreign elements. There is no discrimination of sentiment there, and the opposition is essentially American in every particular.

Mr. DAVIES. The Senator could not have forgotten that scarcely a dozen years have passed since that treaty was ratified which opened China to our trade and our shores to all Chinese, under which every Chinaman that has come to this country has come with the pledge and welcome of a treaty-covenanted, not a treaty-keeping, Government, and that that pledge and welcome is now given by the Pacific coast with open arms, with shout and plaudits and welcomes.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. I should like to correct the Senator in that. The universal sentiment on the Pacific coast when the Burlingame treaty was ratified was against it, and while the Republican party was in a majority of 20,000 in California when the election took place in 1867, the fact that the nominees for governor and for Congress had been in favor of Chinese immigration, beat him with 10,000 votes at the next election. In 1867 Mr. Haight was elected, and from the very fact that he sat down and in a speech made in a speech made by himself he denounced this treaty that Mr. Burlingame had made, Mr. Burlingame being on a sort of junketing tour with the Chinese showing them around, when Mr. Haight was reelected in 1872 he was defeated by thousands of votes by one who was opposed to Chinese immigration. The California people have never ceased their opposition to Chinese immigration from the earliest times until now. And yet we hear here, sir, that it is an overmastering passion just engendered to-day! It is their calm judgment that it is against the interest of the people of the United States, and more especially against the interest of the people of that coast, that Chinese should come here, and there is no passion about it. It is a feeling that pervades all sections of the community and all classes of the community, the church member, the foreigner, the native, and all alike. The Senator does injustice to the Pacific States when he says it is an overmastering passion led by foreigners alone.

Mr. DAVIES. Mr. President, I did not say it was an overmastering passion, though I believe it is.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada. It was so said, and the Senator indorsed it. Mr. DAVIES. No doubt about it; and I read it from the supporters of the bill as stating, in stronger language than I was capable of stating, what its purpose was. It may be that the Burlingame treaty was never popular in California, yet that its author was unpopular there, but they had a strangled way of showing it. They banqueted him in San Francisco, all their officials and all their dignitaries being there, at such a banquet equal to Belshazzar's, was never before seen in this country. Older Belshazzar's will find before they get through with this method of legislation that their doom will be written on the wall. Those of them who undertake to maintain under the Constitution and the laws of the United States such a sort of doctrine as undoes this bill, will see Mene, mene, tekel, upharnim upon the wall. They bought for him a great estate in California, large enough for a duke or an earl, and they held it for him until he could come back from his tour of treaty-making around the world. We, here in Washington, invited him and his associate embassadors to an official reception in the Halls of Congress, and we marched to and fro, with our officers as our head, in their presence to pay our respects to men who had achieved so much in breaking down the barriers that had existed to commercial intercourse and trade and emigration throughout the world. A strange way, sir, to manifest their hostility to what they had done!

I have called your attention, Mr. President, to the class of men that give such offense. I have shown you that it is not the character of the people to be against Chinese immigration, but it is not the fact that they are Chinamen that gives offense. It is not the fact that they are barbarians, sanny friend at the right. [Mr. Jones, of Nevada,] prompting me so well, helps me to say, because a barbarian in "purple and fine linen," with abundance of money, and no necessity to toil, with a revenue equal to that of the Sultan and his harem, can come and go lither and thenier where he will without offense to this law. So it is not that they are barbarians, it is because, as this bill says in so many words, and which I intend to repeat so that the American people should know what it is—it is because the poor victim of it is compelled to earn his living by his daily toil, and this people will have none of that kind of barbarians among them!

But, sir, that is not all. If any merchant vessel of the British Government, or of any other shall unluckily have on board a Chinese coolie, and shall approach the coast of the United States anywhere from Eastport, Maine, to the Rio Grande, or from the Gulf of California to the furthest cape of the Alentien Islands, within a month of the shore, the master of the vessel and his poors, unlucky coolie shall fail a sacrifice to good order and go to the penitentiary, and the vessel and all on board are covered into the Treasury. They are not to wait till he comes into a harbor even. If, in traversing the broad ocean in the lawful pursuit of commerce he approach the coast where not a solitary human being may be live to be disturbed, within a marine league of it, he falls a victim and goes to the penitentiary, and his vessel is confiscated. Sir, I am quite sure that there would never but one such case arise. The State Department of this Government would have business enough on its hands when that
should come, and the balance of the Geneva award would be distributed without any further trouble. Let me put upon the record the evidence of what I say. The second section of the bill provides—

That no vessel of any vessel, of whatever nationality, shall be on any vessel being within the jurisdiction of the United States any Chinese laborer from any foreign port or place shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction of being so shall be punished by a fine of $500 for each and every such Chinese laborer so brought, and may be also imprisoned for a term not exceeding one year.

And again:

Sec. 11. That every vessel whose master shall knowingly violate any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed forfeited to the United States, and shall be liable to seizure and condemnation in any district of the United States into which such vessel may enter or in which she may be found.

Sir, I should like to hear from the authors of this bill why they do not attempt to provide against the evils arising from those Chinese who are here; why they have not secured such provision in the treaty as would enable them to protect themselves, if protection be needed, against the Chinese who are here. They made their treaty; they prescribed its terms; the Chinese ambassadors struggled against it, but struggled in vain. They were told that the limitation should be reasonable; that the prohibition should not be absolute; that no legislation should be indulged in that was not in the very spirit of the Burlingame treaty, and they trusted; and forthwith we tell them that what we meant by those honeyed words was that while we do not absolutely prohibit, we only told them they shall go to the penitentiary if they come. My distinguished friend on my right [Mr. Jones, of Nevada] says that is right. Out of that spirit so graphically described by a supporter of this bill comes the announcement that it is right to tell a Chinaman that story and supplement it by such legislation. Sir, let it go on the record to be dispised of hereafter, when the storm shall have subsided, and when men shall judge our acts not in the white heat of passion, but by the calm, deliberate consideration of that moral law which requires us to do unto others as we would have them do unto us.

Not only that, while we say in this bill that we will not touch a Chinaman who is here, although he may commit the offense of doing manual labor, yet we tell him that if he departs from this country in the opinion of any official of the United States contrary to law, he shall go to the penitentiary. If he wishes to go out of the county contrary to law what has he got to do to conform to this law? He is in non-conformity to the treaty! He has got to do this: He shall before such departure cause himself to be duly registered at a custom-house in the United States. That is all he has got to do. Another section says that when he goes to register, if a consul-ular officer, on examination of the claims and identity of any Chinese proposing to depart to the United States, shall be satisfied that such person seeks to do so in violation of this act, he shall not be registered, which is all the act calls on him to do, if he is satisfied that this man is registering contrary to this act he shall not let him go out.

So that, whether a man who has come here by a passport or by a ticket can come here without going to the penitentiary, and nobody can get out of here without going there. "We have got him anyhow," my distinguished friend on my right kept helping me to say. "They have got him anyhow!" The free people of the United States, a government of constitution and of law, which till now boasted that the humblest of all

under the flag that floats over this country was as safe in his home and in his person as the most powerful in the land, are told here in the Senate, in the language of my distinguished friend voicing that locality now reeling in that overmastering passion, that "we have got him anyhow." My distinguished friend from Colorado [Mr. Teller] said that if the Chinaman would only come here to be a citizen and to work and to cast his lot among us, we would welcome him, but this bill says he shall not.

Mr. TELLER. I did not quite say that, as I recollect. I said that if he fled from oppression and tyranny intended to better his condition by coming here with reference to his liberty, &c, I would not close the door against him, no matter what might be his color.

Mr. DAWES. This bill says that if my friend from Colorado should induce a Chinaman to come here even for that purpose, a laboring Chinaman, he would get into the penitentiary too.

Mr. TELLER. There is no danger of any such thing.

Mr. DAWES. No; I do not think there is the slightest danger of his doing it, notwithstanding what the Senator said yesterday. So when you come to prove it all, it is hatred of a Chinaman (not universally of Chinamen, but of a class of Chinamen) who so degrades himself in the eyes of those who apply this rule to him as to earn his bread by the sweat of his brow.

This bill fails to provide how you shall distinguish between a Chinese laborer and a Chinese aristocrat. When they appear here upon the shore of the United States they have got to prove themselves, I suppose.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator must certainly have overlooked one of the material parts of this bill. As was said yesterday, the whole subject is left to the Chinese Government to say what the man is. Nothing could be more fair. We had a right to claim that right ourselves; we had a right to say, "We will apply the test; we will say whether he is a laborer;" but we said on the contrary, "If your government certifies that you are not a laborer, then the case is yours and the burden is upon you to show that you are a laborer.

Mr. DAWES. Will the Senator call my attention to that wise provision of the bill?

Mr. TELLER. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that under the bill a Chinaman who comes here brings a passport which is issued by our officer and that is all we have to do with it.

Mr. DAWES. Will the Senator put on record, so that we may look at it? Will the Senator read the clause upon which he relies for the protection of that class of Chinamen toward whom he has hatred?

Mr. TELLER. I cannot undertake to go through a long bill of this magnitude; but when the Senator attacks a bill on that ground he ought to know what it is in the bill. I will call his attention to the provision, I think it is in section 5, but I am not certain. I will look it up.

Mr. SLATER. If the Senator will allow me, it is the provision commencing on the last line of page 11 and proceeding on page 12.

Mr. DAWES. In section 5, line 8, page 11, I read:

Mr. TELLER. Or who shall have come within the United States within sixty days next after the passage of this act, shall obtain the privilege of the Chinese Government in every way and have all the rights granted by said government, which passport shall be in the English language, &c.

The treaty gives us authority to keep them out; but when the
Chinese Government says that a man does not come within the provisions of the treaty, the bill allows him to come.

Mr. DAWES. How do we do this all this?

Mr. TELLER. I should say no, Mr. President.

Mr. DAWES. A Chinaman who has been here and after returning to China comes back, can take care of himself, if he can get the passport required. A Chinaman does not have to work for a living is the only other Chinaman who is allowed to come anyhow.

So there is no such thing as a Chinese laborer coming over with a passport or accept the Chinese laborer who has been here before.

Mr. TELLER. Of course; I never said that there was nothing about that.

The object of this bill is to see that the Chinese laborer does not come. There can be no misunderstanding about that.

Mr. DAWES. Exactly. A man is found in the streets of San Francisco or Detroit, bearing evidence in his physiognomy that he is a Chinaman, I suppose he has got to prove himself, or else he cannot walk the streets of Detroit, or of San Francisco, or Boston, any longer.

Mr. TELLER. Oh! there is nothing in the bill of that kind.

Mr. DAWES. There is nothing in the bill that requires him to prove himself, but there is something in the spirit which made the bill that would require him—the spirit which haunts a Chinaman, which caused the peaceable and law-abiding citizens of San Francisco the other day (when 30,000 people were assembled to cry out, “Put down the Chinaman!”) to trouble for the safety of those Chinamen in their quarters. That is the spirit which haunts a Chinaman; and all the rules of law are to be reversed or a Chinaman will go to the penitentiary. He has got to prove his right to remain here against the accusation of any European foreigner like Kearney who may spring up in San Francisco, or in Detroit, or in any other place near the boundary lines of the United States.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. DAWES. Yes, sir.

Mr. TELLER. When the Senator makes an attack, not upon the principle of the bill but upon the details of the bill, he ought to show wherein there is anything in the bill that justifies him in making such an assertion. There is nothing that requires a Chinaman to prove, when he walks the streets of San Francisco, that he has a passport under the provisions of this bill. When he attempts to land in this country, he is to be asked for his passport. If he is a laborer it is supposed that he has not got it, if the Chinese Government has kept faith with us with respect to this treaty. If he has a passport it is declared in the bill that he shall be admitted without any further examination.

The presumption is in his favor. When he has landed on our soil his right under the bill is equal to that of any other man to travel all over the country. He need not stay in the communities where he is not wanted; he can go to the communities where he is desired.

When the Senator says that this bill is in a spirit of hatred, and when he intimates that it should be understood that the Senators who support this bill are actuated by the same sentiments that actuate the sand-lotters of San Francisco, he does me injustice. I am for the protection of every Chinaman by every means known to me. I would give him the same trial by jury and the same protection at the expense of the Government that I would give the best citizen of Massachusetts or any other man who lives in this land. It is not quite fair for the Senator to attempt to make it appear that we, who be-
from this statement, then of course the Senator will maintain himself to his own satisfaction, at least in the position he takes.

Mr. President, this is not a new feature in legislation. It is an application of an old feature of legislation to a new case. The language of the bill to carry out the principle in the interest of the Chinese is familiar to those who recollect the history of the country in the past. It is evoked from the dead past. It is evoked from a system of legislation in disregard of human laws, the consequence of this people once adhered, and whose consequences have been deep and lasting upon the history of the country and the character of her institutions. I had hoped that it would have recurred to the dead past. I for one, having some recollection of the commotions and disturbances bred of it in times now happily gone, hoped we might never hear of it again; but I do not choose that this renewal of it shall go into history without there being along with it the source from whence it comes. There have been times in the history of this country when her people have attempted the same thing about other races, and in language so like this that the provisions of this bill could almost be seen by one familiar with laws that have been, but which have been swept away by an omnipotent public opinion and doomed to that oblivion in which sooner or later this is as sure to be consigned as that the eternal principles upon which this Government is founded will survive.

Let me put upon record by the side of this proposed legislation what others heretofore have vainly attempted to do, and see how like it is in principle and almost in language. A half century ago a State of this Union enacted "An act for the better regulation of free negroes and persons of color, and for other purposes," which provided:

That if any vessel shall come into any port or harbor of this State, from any other port or harbor foreign, having on board any free negroes or persons of color; as cooks, stewards, mariners, or in any other employment on board of said vessel such free negroes and persons of color shall be liable to be seized and confined in jail until such vessels shall clear out and depart from this State; and that the master of such vessel shall be bound to bring away the said free negroes or free persons of color, and to pay the expenses of his detention, in the case of his neglect or refusal so to do, he shall be indicted, and, on conviction thereof, shall be fined in a sum not less than $1,000 and imprisonment not less than two months; and such free negroes or persons of color shall be deemed and taken as absconded slaves, and sold in conformity to the provisions of the act, &c.

The impotence of this law having been demonstrated, the makers of it rallied again some twenty years after and enacted:

And after the passage of this act it shall not be lawful for any free negro or person of color to migrate into this State, or be brought in or introduced into its limits, under any pretext whatever, by land or by water. And in case any free negro or person of color (not being a seaman or laborer in the vessels trading in this State) shall migrate into, or be introduced into, this State, contrary to this act, it shall and may be lawful for any white person to seize and convey him or her before any magistrate of the district or parish where he or she may be taken; and it shall be the duty of the sheriff and any constable in the parish in which said entry shall be made, and of the city marshals in the city of Charleston, upon information of the migration or introduction of any such free negro or person of color, to arrest and bring before some magistrate of the district or parish, where said free negro or person of color shall be taken, with the same form and process as in case of a warrant, or, at his discretion, to hold to bail, such free negro or person of color, and to summon three freeholders and a form of court, as the law directs for the trial of persons of color; and examine such free negro or person of color, within six days after his or her arrest, as the law directs, to order him, or to order him, or to leave the State, and to sell or to sell or to put the said negro or person of color so convicted, to clear prison, until such time as he or she can leave the State; or to release him or her on sufficient bail, for any time not exceeding fifteen days, at the discretion of the magistrate. And every free negro or per-
them, the people of Mississippi could in their good time determine for the people of the United States what should be the political character and condition of those who live among them. There is no concealedness in the Senator from Mississippi. He has not only followed the logic of this bill to its conclusion, but he publicly avows it, so that they who support this bill do it with their eyes and their ears open, and know that they are supporting a principle which leads to the determination of the political condition of those who live in Mississippi, when Mississippi shall so decide.

I desire to put again upon the record what the Senator from Mississippi said there yesterday, and ask my friends here if they are prepared to accept his pledge and commit themselves by support of this bill to the doctrines the Senator from Mississippi announced yesterday.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I do not know that I clearly understand the doctrine imputed to me by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. If he desires to put on the record any position which I took yesterday upon this question, I will say that it would be fair to me, and fair to those whom I represent, as my language was carefully guarded, to read what I said, and not to indulge in what the Senator is pleased to call logical deductions from my remarks.

If the gentleman means to impute to me the expression of an opinion or of a wish to assume for the people of Mississippi or for the people of any other State the power or right to determine for themselves the political status of any portion of the citizens of the United States, he imputes to me an opinion which I do not entertain and which I did not express.

I did not say yesterday that the people of the Pacific States had a right to determine this question for themselves. Dealing with foreigners, dealing with persons who had no rights in this country, except such as we, the people of the country, see proper to concede to them, I did say that upon that question, so far as it concerned the Chinese, who were in their midst, their opinion as to the advisability of Chinese immigration should have great weight in our deliberations; that I preferred the experience, the trial, which these people had had with the Chinese immigrants to the speculations of persons who knew nothing about it; and that is as far as I went on that subject. That is all I want to say.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator from Mississippi saw me about to read what he did say, and sprang to his feet to explain or expound his own language.

Mr. GEORGE. I did not see that you were about to read what I did say.

Mr. DAWES. Just before the Senator got on his feet I had told him that I desired to put him on record again. I do not intend to misrepresent the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think you do. I did not impute such an intention on your part.

Mr. DAWES. I do not. I admire the Senator's boldness. I knew that he wrote out his remarks with care, and I knew that he was not a Senator to shrink from the consequences of what he said. I proposed to request those who were asking me to vote for this bill to listen to what the Senator from Mississippi said were its logical consequences, and I shall now read what he said. The Senator, if he chooses, may look over me.

Mr. GEORGE. I have no doubt you will read it correctly, sir.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator from Mississippi said yesterday:

And, Mr. President, before I take my seat I wish to congratulate the Senator from the Pacific States on the bill—

That is the first thing—and moderation—

Which is very commendable—

With which we have discussed the relation of the American people with this inferior race. For once, sir, this subject has been discussed in a calm and philosophical spirit without exciting sectional animosities or reviving the passions engendered by past contests and discriminations.

Two times may come—237: it is not here now—when the relations of another race to American citizenship must be, as all other relations ought to be, dealt with in the like spirit.

Just as these Senators have discussed the Chinese question:

In the mean time, while discharging our duty freely in educating that race into a proper discharge of their duties as American citizens, advancing them to their full political equality, it will also be our duty to observe with care and impartiality the experience of African citizenship. No man shall strive harder than I will to make that experience successful, and no man will be more rejoiced if in the end it shall be all that those who initiated it shall desire. All that I ask for the white people of the South on this subject is that I am willing to grant and I believe a majority of this body is willing to grant to the white people of the Pacific States.

What I ask for the white people of Mississippi is what we are granting to the white people of the Pacific States—

That their testimony, their experience, and their judgment shall not be discredited in a matter so deeply affecting their welfare.

The Constitution was ordained and established by white men, as they themselves declared in its preamble, "to secure the blessings of liberty to themselves and their posterity," and I cannot doubt that this great pledge thus solemnly given will be as fully realized in favor of the white people of the South, should occasion for action arise, as I intend on my part and on their behalf to redeem it this day in favor of the white people of the Pacific States, by my vote to protect them against a degrading and destructive association with the inferior race now threatening to overrun them.

Sir, that is the logic of the bill. "The time may come." It is not safe to say it has come now, but "the time may come."

Mr. GEORGE. That is the wrong word, to say it is not safe. That seems to imply that I would say so if I had what the gentleman imputed to me a few moments ago—the courage to say it.

Mr. DAWES. If the Senator understood me as intimating that he used that word—

Mr. GEORGE. You said "it was not safe to say it had come now." Mr. DAWES. Yes, sir; it is not safe.

Mr. GEORGE. I said the time had not come yet, not from any considerations of safety or policy, but I simply announced an existing fact, that it had not come now.

Mr. DAWES. I quoted the Senator, not to intimate that the Senator would fail in his duty, as he indicates it there, to contribute all in his power to make African citizenship a success. I do not impute any such thing. I do not impute to the Senator any desire that African citizenship in his State shall fail. I do not intend to do the Senator any injustice, or to leave him dissatisfied with anything, save what he has himself said.

Mr. GEORGE. I am perfectly content to rest upon what I have said.

Mr. DAWES. Of what I know the Senator will not be dissatisfied. I think the Senator says "the time may come;" and I am willing to add, if the Senator desires it, that he hopes it never will come; but when, in the opinion of his people, it has come—

Mr. GEORGE. I think the gentleman imputes to me there an opinion not expressed. I did not say that the coming of the time was to be determined by the opinions of the people of Mississippi.

Mr. DAWES. I should like to know what the Senator did mean in what he said.
Mr. GEORGE. I meant exactly what I said.
Mr. DAWES. So I supposed.
Mr. GEORGE. I will read that part of my remarks:
The time may come—
Not "will"—
it is not here now—when the relations of another race to American citizenship must be, as all other questions ought to be, discussed in the like spirit.

There is nothing there to suggest that I make the people of Mississippi or of the South the arbiters of the time.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator from Mississippi allow me to ask him if he did not say when he uttered his speech "but it will come;" and whether that is not to that extent an erroneous report in the Record of what he actually uttered?

Mr. GEORGE. It is a verbatim report.
Mr. HOAR. I ask the question for my information. Did not the Senator from Mississippi when he said the time has not arrived, utter the words, "but it will come?" I saw the manuscript. I will state to the Senator, which was in the possession of the Reporter. Perhaps I am stating from an entirely erroneous recollection, but I thought he said "but it will come."

Mr. GEORGE. I said "it may come."

Mr. HOAR. Very well, the Senator undoubtedly states it correctly.

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President, it is not worth while for the Senator from Mississippi and myself to undertake to argue between ourselves what is the true interpretation of the language which is put upon the record where the people of the United States can judge for themselves whether the interpretation which I put upon it is the correct one or not. According to my judgment, if that statement means anything, it means (and the people of these United States will put that interpretation upon it) that the Senator has announced here upon the floor that the doctrine of the pending bill, carried to its logical end, can be availed of by any community of people in the United States to invoke the general law of the land to eliminate from its social and political existence such element as it shall determine is unsafe. That is the interpretation I put upon the words; the words themselves I have put upon the record to justify it; and I leave this discussion here with that endorsement of it.

I call the attention of the American people to the fact that we have evolved from the dead past to apply to these people doctrines and provisions of law which the irresistible logic of events had trodden into oblivion amid the fire and smoke and conflict of war. We are indebted to this movement for an invitation to embark anew upon a vain and futile attempt to establish under the flag of the United States and the Constitution that shall govern us the right to distinguish between those who live here, who come here to obey our laws and abide by our destinies, and say to some, "You may remain," but to others, "You are outcasts, and shall choose between the penalitatory and banishment."

Sir, we have gone too far to take that retrograde step. However our friends may succeed for the moment, I tell them again that the debate is not exhausted. It will not die. It will live, an active, moving principle, stirring the liberty-loving and law-abiding people of this broad land to the very depths, till every human being who leads our soil and breathes our air can appeal to our laws and our Constitution for protection and for peace.