with such subjects, and his perfect familiarity with statistics, makes him the man above all others to speak about immigration.

The members of the Club take a great interest in the proceedings, and debates are lively and entertaining. Following are some of the arguments in favor of restrictions, showing no inconsiderable amount of thought upon the subject: (1) Condition of immigrants at home does not prepare them for good citizenship in this country. (2) The United States is not a general almshouse for European paupers. (3) Immigrants were needed once, but the country now is over supplied, and further increase is only a burden upon the people.

The best arguments upon the negative were: (1) From moral and social reasons immigration should be unrestricted. (2) Foreigners are necessary to do the low work. (3) The economic gain in productive power is enormous, and this without the expense of maintenance during unproductive period of infancy and youth. (4) Native labor is elevated to a higher plane, leading to an increase of inventions and of material prosperity.

Following are some of the chief features of General Walker's talk:

**First.**—Immigration is a good or bad thing according to the settlement of the country. During this century it was looked upon as a patriotic thing to support immigration by state agents, because then our country was new and required new hands. The question now is, are those immigrants who are here now to be made poorer by further immigration. The question has gone into the labor classes, and action has been taken in this matter by trades unions, Knights of Labor, and others. The question of diminishing returns in agriculture also comes in to play a most important part. It has always been assumed that immigrants are a net addition to the population of a country. It can be shown, however, that the decline in the rate of native increase corresponds to the increase of immigration; so had it not been for immigration, perhaps, native stock might have peopled this land. If we had maintained the rate of increase during the first half of this century our population would be about seventy-seven millions, instead of sixty two. But increase of immigration kept pace with native decrease of births. This may have been due to one of three causes: (1) Pure coincidence. (2) The increase in foreign population was the effect of the decrease in native population—foreigners came to fill vacancies. (3) Or increase of foreign arrivals was the cause of the native decrease. The latter is the most plausible.

**Second.**—Immigration is good or bad according to the state of the country. If the country could have been peopled with native stock, we can hardly say it would be better to have foreigners.

**Third.**—It is good or bad according to the ability of our country to assimilate them, and make good citizens of foreign riff-raff. One great evil and danger is in politics where the foreigner may become the sharp-edged tool of ring bosses and low politicians.

**Fourth.**—It is good or bad according to the distribution of arrivals. If they could be transported immediately to the West where there is room for them, it would be a great thing, but they stick in our large cities, which makes it harder and harder for new arrivals to get beyond. The tide of immigration washes down a vast shoal of foreigners into our cities; this grows continually until it becomes a nuisance and a clog.

**Fifth.**—It is good or bad according to the standard of living of immigrants and their capability of responding to the spirit of civilization about them. When they are incapable of this response they are a source of untold danger, and this is the case with our immigrants of late, especially the Italians, Bohemians, and Russians. Self-defense is the law of nature and of nations, and we should defend ourselves from all that will be menacing to the best good of our posterity.