

and he endorsed it. The President of the Immigration Association of California, a man who had taken part in the agitation, and who was at the moment actively engaged in bringing in white immigrants, was a most valuable witness. On the subject of the relative criminality of Chinese, the Chief of Police, a detective, and a Police Magistrate were examined. In regard to charges of personation a late collector of customs was seen. The Chinese side of the question was given by His Excellency the Consul General for China at the port of San Francisco, and by Colonel Bee, the Consul, while on the general question, Mr. Walcott Brooks, an Asiatic scholar and traveller, of high repute in San Francisco, was heard.

Progress of the Chinese question in California.

See p. 339, A.p. A.

A glance at what may be called the progress of the Chinese question in California will be useful. At first the Chinamen were welcomed. In 1852, said a witness before the Joint Committee, they marched in our fourth of July processions; in 1862, they dared not show themselves; in 1872, had they dared to appear on the scene, they would have been stoned. The Joint Committee mentioned above met at San Francisco to report to Congress on the character, extent, and effect of Chinese immigration. They met at the Palace Hotel in October, 1876, and a very full enquiry took place.

Vague ideas on questions capable of being settled with certainty.

Chinese population.

Two independent sources of information.

Chinese population in the U.S. in 1876.

One feature of the early stage of the enquiry is worth noting. On a point which was capable of being settled to a demonstration, the vaguest ideas, even in the case of eminent men, prevailed. We allude to the number of the Chinese population in California. One put it down at 116,000; another at 150,000, and another at 250,000. Not dissimilar were the estimates formed of the number of Chinese in British Columbia. One contractor told us there were 3,000 in Victoria.

Now, there were two independent sources of information which yet, when compared, tallied and thus tested each other. The census showed that in 1870 the Chinese population of the whole of the United States was 63,199. Of course, there may have been an enormous increase in six years. That increase was, however, known. From the records of the Custom House, a tabular statement had been made of the arrivals and departures of Chinese from 1860 to 1876. According to that statement the excess of arrivals over departures, from 1870 to 1876, was 54,595. This, provided none had died, would give 117,794. If we estimate the annual death rate at two per cent. on an average population of 90,000, this would give 12,600 for seven years, and 12,600 subtracted from 117,794 leave the result of 105,194. The tabular statement between 1870 and 1876 is capable of being tested. If that statement for the years from 1860 to 1869 inclusive is compared with the census for the period, we find a substantial agreement. If the tabular statement was right for these years, it was likely to be right for the years from 1870 to 1876. No one, indeed, disputed the correctness of the figures for these years.

This 105,194 has to be spread over the United States. The bulk of the Chinese population is on the Pacific Coast; but not nearly all. In 1870, according to the census, California had 49,277; Nevada, 3,152;