

Washington, D.C., Oct. 11, 1902.

Com. Williams,

Dear Sir:

I see with great pain that Pastor H. J. Berkemier was refused access to the immigrants. The paper states that he has detained peasant girls, against their will, from going to their friends.

Now, Mr. Williams, no one who knows Pastor Berkemier will for a moment believe that he detained them except for their good. He is placed there by the church for the very purpose of protecting them. If he is not a good man, I fear they do not exist. Do reconsider your action, or synods representing millions of people will pass resolutions concerning you. Mr. Berkemier may have made a mistake, but an intentional wrong never. Do look over the matter again or you have struck trouble.

With kind regards and high appreciation for your arduous work, I am

Resptfly,

Mrs. H. E. Monroe,

No. 206 B Street, S.E.

Washington, D.C.

Chicago, Dec. 21, 1902.

Imm. Com. Williams,

Dear Sir:

I am greatly gratified to hear that you have taken steps to check the tide of ignorant, stupid and undesirable immigrants, who have already flooded the country with criminals. If the present scale of immigration is kept up, the ignorant foreigners will in time outnumber our American citizens. The present immigrants are mostly Slavs, Italians and Jews, of whom the Italians are the worst, being murderers and a pest to our nation. These unworthy immigrants constitute a menace to labor, civilization and humanity, and they should be totally excluded. It is the earnest desire of every true American citizen and workingman that you should (use) your power as an Imm. Com. to check this undesirable immigration, and save our country from a disgraceful and humiliating fate. Your work in checking this treathening danger is approved by the press and people of the United States from Maine to Florida. The strictest regulations should be put on the Italian Immigration, and you will be remembered by our people, especially from Chicago.

Yours truly,

(Signed)

Wm. Blakefield,

Chicago, Ill.

4610 S. Division Av.

P. S. Keep a close watch on the border of Canada about immigrants.

985X74

Department of Commerce and Labor

GO P Y .

No. 7364.

Mr. Emil Schamcham,

Interpreter, Ellis Island.

Sir:

I have recommended your dismissal from the service for the reasons which appeared in two interviews which took place in my office this morning. Amongst other facts it was there made to appear that you gave yesterday to an immigrant woman, while she was awaiting release to a friend who had called for her, in the Discharging Bureau, a paper marked M.L.Shawy, 89 Washington Street, New York City. When asked to explain why you did this you stated that it was "for fun", and on the ground that she had asked you for your address. You further stated to me that the address was fictitious. The woman in question and her friend both denied that any such request was made of you, and allege that you handed them this paper of your own motion. Furthermore I caused an investigation yesterday to be made as to whether or not anyone named Shawy resided at 89 Washington Street, and found the affirmative to be the fact. You later admitted that you were in the habit of going there occasionally for your meals. You now insist that this man's name is George, and not M.L.Shawy. This is a mere quibble. Since there is a man named Shawy at the 89 Washington Street the address is not fictitious, and it did not occur to you to make this quibble until after I had shown you that I knew of the existence of

188X74

Schamchan

- 2 -

one Shawy at this place. I do not find it necessary to investigate whether or not this man's initials are M.L. or G. He is a Syrian, and you are a Syrian interpreter at this station. I am further satisfied that the reasons alleged by you for giving this paper to such immigrant woman are false. You are hereby suspended from duty.

Respectfully,

WM. WILLIAMS.

Commissioner.

42838

Copy.

February 8, 1903.

Capt. Peter C. Petrie,
U. S. Local Inspector of Hulls,
Post Office Building, New York City.

Sir:

I beg to call your attention to the following serious conditions which exist in the transportation of immigrants from the different steamship piers to this station:

There are engaged in this work five steamboats and three barges, the latter of the type known as "excursion barges." The steamboats are licensed to carry a specified number of passengers, no mention being made of ~~the~~ baggage. I can hardly think that the license contemplates permission to carry the full number during the inclement winter weather, and I also think it refers to excursionists without baggage. Nevertheless the transportation company makes practically no distinction and carries on the coldest day in winter the full number with their baggage that they are licensed to carry in summer.

As for the barges, I understand that they are not licensed for any number of people. The practice is to crowd as many immigrants upon them as possible without regard to their comfort or safety or to the condition of the weather. These boats are unsuitable in their present condition for the purposes for which they are used. I will refer to the barge "Laura" as a fair sample of the barges now in use. This boat has 2374 square feet on the lower deck and 1789 square feet on the upper deck, or a total of 4163 square feet of deck surface. The lower deck has some protection against the weather, but the upper deck practically none, yet I am informed that nearly one thousand immigrants, with an enormous amount of baggage are herded together on this barge, and after one, two or three hours, as the case may be, brought to this station. And this without regard for the weather. Furthermore the toilet arrangements on these boats are inadequate, and they are not properly supplied with drinking water. I will be obliged if you will send an Assistant Inspector to this station on or after Tuesday, to confer with me as to the regulations which it may be necessary to adopt or enforce in order that immigrants may be brought to this station in a decent and safe manner. Several of these barges can generally be found tied to our docks, but I suggest that your assistant make an appointment over the telephone so as not to waste his time coming here at an hour when there might be no barge here. I shall ask you to determine what regulations are necessary, although I will be very glad to give your representative some suggestions as to the same if he desires any.

Respectfully,

WM. WILLIAMS,

Commissioner.

COPY
FWCM

088X7A

No. 12303

Department of Commerce and Labor

IMMIGRATION SERVICE

OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION

NEW YORK, N. Y.

February 27, 1903.

The Secretary of the Treasury,
(Through Bureau of Immigration), Washington, D. C.

Sir:

I write you further concerning the barges upon which aliens are brought from the steamship docks to Ellis Island annexing hereto a copy of my letter of the 19th instant, and also of the reply thereto of the Supervising Inspector-General of the Steamboat Inspection Service, from which it appears that his Bureau has no power to remedy the obvious evils to which I have called your attention.

I now repeat all that I have said in my letter of the 19th instant, and respectfully recommend that you direct me to confer with the steamship companies and the owners of such barges with a view to obtaining some immediate relief for the immigrants from the conditions complained of. That you have the power to compel the granting of such relief seems to me beyond question. Under Section 8 of the Act of 1891, the immigration officials may inspect all aliens on the vessel "or the inspection officers may order the temporary removal of such aliens for examination at a designated time and place." I submit that you have the right to attach proper conditions to such order for removal.

I beg to assure you that I do not propose recommending anything at all radical. My suggestions would be along the following lines:

1. That there be set aside on each barge a place for baggage and that it thereafter be determined how many people can be properly carried in the remaining space;
2. That substantial seats be provided for all women and children (in almost all cases every one is now obliged to stand, and even such standing room is wholly inadequate);
3. That a proper number of closets shall be provided both for female and male passengers. Such closet accommodations at the present time are absurdly inadequate;
4. That tanks filled with good drinking water shall be placed on each deck. The absence of such drinking water was last summer, frequently made the subject of complaint to me. On certain occasions real suffering ensued from its absence. It should be remembered that two to three hours are sometimes spent on the barges, due to unavoidable delays both at the steamship wharves and at Ellis Island;
5. That a proper number of life preservers shall be placed on each barge.

In view of the enclosed reply from the Supervising Inspector-General, I would not write you further were it not that I think it unfortunate if the Government allow existing conditions to continue without at least some attempt to change them. If you are

982X7A

in accord with me, I respectfully request (1) that you direct the Supervising Inspector-General to send here someone qualified to determine what regulations are reasonable in view of all the facts, and (2) that, having determined what those regulations should be, I be authorized to confer with the steamship companies and the owners of the barges in respect to their adoption. Such conference would, of course, be useless unless it were understood that, in the event of a refusal on their part to voluntarily comply with the Government's reasonable request, you would take appropriate action to compel them to do so.

Respectfully,

(Signed) Wm. Williams,

Commissioner.

D
Enclosures.

Office of Commissioner of Immigration,

New York, N. Y.,

~~xxxxxx~~,
May 26, 1903.

Copy.

Mr. N. J. Sparkling,

Ellis Island

Sir:

I was very much displeased at the rough and unkind manner in which I heard you address two immigrants in the Discharging Bureau this afternoon. Do not let this occur again.

Respectfully,

Wm. Williams,

Commissioner.

45X38

Department of Commerce and Labor
No. 20565.

Department of Commerce and Labor

IMMIGRATION SERVICE

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

NEW YORK, N. Y.

October 12, 1903.

Supervising Inspector,

Ellis Island.

Sir:

All immigrants in the excluded room who have been here over three days shall be given an opportunity to have a bath. The Chief of the Deportation Division will, under your supervision, carry out this order and see to it that the present bath service is improved. It will probably be necessary to detail one of the laborers to look after the male bath-room while it is being used. At other times he can probably be assigned to duty in cleaning the adjoining hallway or staircase. See that this order is put into effective operation.

Respectfully,

Commissioner.

VL

982X74

Department of Commerce and Labor

IMMIGRATION SERVICE

NEW YORK, N. Y.

No. 7364.

Department of Commerce and Labor
IMMIGRATION SERVICE

SUBJECT:

OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION
NEW YORK, N. Y.

November 3, 1903.

Mr. John Bell,

Gateman, Ellis Island, N.Y.

Sir:

For having used vulgar and abusive language this morning to an immigrant, I have suspended you from duty for two weeks, and shall recommend to the Department that during this time you receive no pay.

Respectfully,

WM. WILLIAMS,

Commissioner.

S

Ellis
Department of Commerce and Labor
IMMIGRATION SERVICE

RECEIVED
No. 19916.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER
NEW YORK, N. Y.

April 5, 1904.

Commissioner-General of Immigration,
Washington, D. C.

Sir:

I acknowledge receipt of your endorsement of March 23, 1904, No. 43358, forwarding for comment a request by the Austro-Hungarian Society that the action dismissing it from Ellis Island be reviewed by the Secretary.

A careful perusal of the papers submitted with such request, particularly of the paper entitled "Statements and Facts", compels me to refer you back to my letter and enclosures No. 19916 of October 28, 1903, to the Home and its reply of November 21, 1903, and my reply No. 19916 of December 30, 1903, approved by the Commissioner-General, as constituting ample justification for the action taken by the Government in debarring the Home "until such time as the Government can be satisfied that it is managed exclusively in the interest of the immigrant."

The usefulness either of a missionary, an immigrant aid society, or a home at Ellis Island comes to an end the moment any of them ceased to maintain a high standard of disinterested work on behalf of immigrants requiring

assistance. It is vital that the Government should not have occasion to lose confidence in the sincerity of such work. The Government might well have excluded the Austro-Hungarian Home on its general course of conduct and the bad reputation it enjoyed at Ellis Island. Nevertheless, prior to dismissal it was given a hearing of the same character as is afforded a Civil Service employee against whom charges are to be preferred. On October 28 I called its attention to the report of the New York Health Department and to a number of instances of alleged improper treatment of immigrants and their friends "in order that you may offer any explanation that you wish in regard to any of them." The explanation submitted November 21 was shown in my letter of December 30, 1903, to be utterly inadequate. It is true that in submitting this explanation the Trustees offered to call upon the Commissioner and furnish "further information." But in view of the character of the explanation, it was not deemed necessary or profitable to pursue the subject further.

I will briefly review some of the reasons upon which the Government based its action, although the same are fully set forth in my two letters above referred to, and to call to its assistance in administering the immigration

First of all I will again quote an extract from the report of the Health Department of the City of New York dated October 14, 1903, in relation to the premises to which the Managers of this Home were taking immigrants, compelling them in a large majority of instances to pay a consideration for the services rendered:

The Home occupies the entire house at No. 14 and only the first floor in No. 16. The buildings are very old and dilapidated, the roofs leak badly, rendering the plaster on the walls and ceilings wet and loose; the outside eaves, gutters and rain-leaders leak, rendering the walls damp; the walls and ceilings throughout the house are very dirty, and have not been cleaned, painted or whitewashed in a long time; the yards are not properly flagged or drained, rendering the basement floor decayed and damp; the wooden steps leading from the first floor into the yards are defective and dangerous; the doors floors throughout the houses are old, defective and difficult to keep clean; the glass in the window on each floor is broken, allowing cold draughts and rain water to enter the rooms; the bowls and seats and floors of the water closets are filthy with excrement and urinary deposits. On the second floor in No. 14 there is a wooden trough lined with filthy sheet-metal, which is used as a lavatory. The trap of the sink in the basement of No. 14 is corroded and allows the escape of sewer air. The woodwork over the sinks in No. 16 is wet and offensive and not protected by metal flashings.

The attic in No. 14 Greenwich St. is used as a sleeping room for the women; there are thirteen beds in this attic. The attic rooms are insufficiently ventilated and not of sufficient area to allow of as many beds. The walls and ceilings of the attic are damp and the plaster is loose.

The foregoing report speaks for itself. A Manager who will tolerate such conditions in a house over which he has charge is clearly not a person whom the Government desires to call to its assistance in administering the immigration

... (including the actual proof or testimony) laws, and yet the trustees or directors are still persisting in retaining him in their employ. The effect of this report is sought to be minimized in some particulars by the inspection the statement that it occurred the day following a heavy storm. A careful reading thereof will make it clear that

the worst conditions therein described are not due to such storm. Besides the same conclusion had been reached a few days before the storm by Inspector Cowley, whose report I enclose.

But in its desire to treat with entire frankness even a society whose reputation and premises were both bad, the Government called its attention to six specific cases, dealt with fully in my letters above referred to, and asked it to explain them. I will briefly summarize these

cases: Commissioner inadvertently stated that it had been called Case No. 1. In his letter of October 28, 1903, the Commissioner stated this case as follows:

Maria Paloezi was sent last spring by the Home as servant to a Mrs. Fort, No. 30 Van Buren Street, Brooklyn, and thereafter to Mr. Joseph Mayer, No. 1028 169th St., New York City, one of your directors. I am informed that Mrs. Fort deposited at the Home the sum of \$14, wages due the alien, which money has not been delivered to her, although request for such delivery has been made.

I refer to my comments on this case annexed to my letter of December 30. In this, as in most or all of the other cases, the Government named the witnesses

(giving in some instances the actual proof or testimony) upon whom it relied. Here the facts were confirmed by a Director of the Home. Within the past few days he has twice reiterated such confirmation, as will appear from the following copy of his letter to the Commissioner

dated March 31, 1904:

I have received your letter of March 31 and acknowledge herewith that when I called at Ellis Island last fall, upon the request of an immigration official, there had been laid before me by the Government officials facts in the case of Maria Palocz which were true, and the substantial correctness of which I confirmed.

At the same time I declare that when the girl could not receive her money at the Austro-Hungarian Home, and I gained knowledge of this, I was really incensed about this action of the Home. I did personally pay the \$14 in question to the girl and was later reimbursed by the Home. It is a fact that at various Directors' meetings I stated, and I now repeat it, that I have been very dissatisfied with the action of the Home in this case and in many other cases.

In commenting on this case in his letter of December 30, the Commissioner inadvertently stated that it had been called to his attention by Mr. Mayer. This was inaccurate, but the inaccuracy was of no material importance, excepting that it placed Mr. Mayer in the light of an informer, in which, among other things, it is said that those members before the other Directors. To correct this error he appeared in the affairs of the investigation against the common Home verified his affidavit of March 9, 1904, submitted to and have certified this allegation by giving affidavits. For the Secretary with the appeal made to him by the Home, on Mr. Robinson, I hereby declare, as a proof of the His subsequent letter of March 30, 1904, shows that Mr. Mayer in this country, he could not and has not forced me to Mayer intends to stand by everything he said to the Com-

missioner when he came to Ellis Island in the fall of 1903, and to anyone at all familiar with the case, the facts as stated by the Government are necessarily correct.

Case No. 2. In his letter of October 28, 1903, the Commissioner stated this case as follows:

Ilona Kacas, who arrived by S.S. "Konig Albert" Sept. 14, 1903, and was thereafter discharged to the Home. This girl was going to Trenton, N. J. I am informed that she was not allowed to proceed, although her relatives wished her to do this and sent her \$6 for traveling expenses.

This case was formulated as a result of a complaint made by Father Perenyi, a Director. He was named, and some of his testimony quoted, in my letter of December 30, 1903. The officers of the Home have since endeavored to obtain from Father Perenyi a withdrawal of his oral and written statements to the Commissioner, but with poor result, as is shown by the following letter which he recently caused to be published in a New York paper:

To the Esteemed Editor of the Austro-Hungarian Gazette.

Very esteemed sir:

In the last issue of your paper you published a letter of Dr. Senner, the President of the Austrian Society, in which, among other things, it is said that those members of the directory of the Hungarian Aid Society who appeared in the affairs of the investigation against the common home at Ellis Island, have been morally forced to do so, and have certified this allegation by giving affidavits. For my part, because I am one of those gentlemen who called on Mr. Robinson, I hereby declare, as a proof of the truthfulness first that in the third year of my residence in this country, he could not and has not forced me to appear before him.

Second. That Mr. Robinson did ask me, through one of the employees of the Bureau of Immigration, whether I was willing to call on him at the Island. Whereupon I, from my own free will, and because it suited me to do so, went to see him.

It is, therefore, untrue that I gave Dr. Semner an affidavit signed by me, setting forth the alleged compulsion.

Moreover, I have signed at Ellis Island a statement, in the English language, which deals with the case of Ilona Kakas and other affairs of the Home. And I answer for the truthfulness of everything contained in the same. Today more than ever. Why? That will be shown in the nearest future. So much as a statement of the truth of which you will kindly take cognizance. If you, Mr. Esteemed Editor, care to inform your readers about the truth based upon objective facts, will you kindly publish my letter. Recommending myself in your good graces.

I am,

Very respectfully,

(Signed) LADISLAW PERENYI,
Hungarian Roman Catholic Priest.

When the character of this proof is considered, the present attitude of the officers of the Home can be regarded only as evidence of a desire to embarrass the Government and to consume the time of its officials in further useless discussion.

Case No. 4. In his letter of October 28, 1903, the

Commissioner stated this case as follows:

Commissioner stated this case as follows:

Berta Arpad, who arrived September 5th, 1903, by S.S. "Katarina Fedak, who arrived by S.S. "Zeeland" June 7th, 1903, and was thereafter discharged to the Home, was sent to the bakery of John Foster, No. 44 Greenwich Street. At the expiration of her services at this place, representing the balance of wages due her, was, as I am informed, deposited at the Home, but this money has not been delivered to her.

Reference is made to my comment on this case annexed to my letter of December 30. The proof upon which the Government acted, including the affidavit of immi-

Government acted is submitted. In this, and all other cases, it should be remembered that the Home had the same opportunity to procure the evidence of the witnesses produced by the Government as the Government had itself. It not only failed to do this then, but it does not now even attempt to prove, excepting as to Mr. Joseph Mayer, that such evidence is wrong. Enclosed will be found a large number of affidavits in support of the Government's conclusion in this case. The chief complaint was that this girl could not obtain back from the Home the \$6 left there for her by an employer. Government officials have actually seen the cancelled check by which this was finally given to her several months after it became due, such check having been delivered and paid after the Government had made written representations to the Home.

Case No. 4. In his letter of October 28, 1903, the Commissioner stated this case as follows:

Barta Arpad, who arrived September 9th, 1903, by S.S. "Grosser Kurfurst" was taken to the Home by one of its agents, and while in his charge was also taken, together with other immigrants, to a restaurant near the Home, where he had dinner at his own expense. I am told that he was thereafter compelled against his will to pay for another dinner.

is made to disprove the foregoing by any facts.

Again I refer back to my comments attached to my letter of December 30, and elsewhere I submit the proof upon which the Government acted, including the affidavit of im-

As another indication of bad faith of his informers we beg to refer to the Worebycz case (decision pages 8,9) where several officials gave instructions that were at

grant Arpad. This case was cited as typical of a number of cases in which immigrants who had been sent to the Home for the purpose of being placed in rapid contact with their relatives, were compelled to incur sundry petty expenditures against their will, aggregating sometimes considerable sums. The second-hand book which was sold to this immigrant in a dilapidated condition can be seen at any time at Ellis Island:

Case No. 5. In his letter of October 28, 1903, the Commissioner stated this case as follows:

Julia Kositska and Martha Worobyecz, who arrived by S.S. "Frederich der Grosse" Sept. 30, 1903, were discharged to the Home October 2nd, for the purpose of finding their relative, Tekla Kositska. Although the whereabouts of this woman were known to you, you refused to permit the aliens to go to her, stating as an excuse that she was maintaining improper relations with her employer, which statement was not true.

I refer to my comments attached to my letter of December 30. They are very full and contain copies of indorsements on the detention cards showing that the Home received these girls to enable them "to find cousin." They also contain extracts from some of the actual proof, a full copy of which is submitted herewith. No attempt is made to disprove the foregoing by any facts.

The officials of the Home in their paper entitled "Statement and Facts" say of this case:

As another indication of bad faith of his informers we beg to refer to the Worobyecz case (decision pages 8,9) where several officials gave instructions that were at

variance with one another and it seems as though such contradictory instructions had been given intentionally for the purpose of thereby embarrassing the Home.

This criticism is entirely untrue and not based upon facts. No contradictory instructions were given by Government officials. The only ones given are matters of record and appear on the back of the immigrants' cards, copies of which are enclosed. I have heretofore had occasion to state that their explanation of the case offered in their letter of November 21 was false.

Case No. 6. In his letter of October 28, 1903, the Commissioner stated this case as follows:

Anna Hrobacsek who arrived by S.S. "Neckar" October 23, 1903, was delivered to your agent on or about October 24. She had friends and relatives at 72 and 101 Greenwich St., New York, in your neighborhood. The Home not only failed to endeavor to ascertain the whereabouts of such friends and relatives but upon repeated requests by such declined to deliver the girl to either.

No new proof is presented except the affidavit of I refer back to my comments of December 30 on this Mr. Mayer above referred to. Much of the paper will be case, in which are named the chief witnesses upon whom found to consist of such statements as the following: the Government relies. Enclosed elsewhere will be found Pursuant to such investigation and report, an answer full copies of their affidavits. An important extract wherein the special charges were disproved and explained from Mrs. Obsajts's affidavit was quoted in my comments investigating Committee. of December 30. The further proof consisted in the state- The charges were not disproved. ments made to the Commissioner in person by such witnesses Under point II of its paper the management says that and referred to in his above mentioned comments. "it was not allowed to be heard in its own defence."

plain them. In this connection the

It appears from the foregoing that the Home was dismissed from Ellis Island on very good evidence of specific misdeeds, including an official report of the Board of Health, a serious written complaint of Father Perenyi, one of its Directors, the oral confirmation (since reduced to writing) by another Director of failure to pay an immigrant money due her, its own admission of attempts to retain control over inmates for a year in violation of specific instructions of the Commissioner, Mrs. Ob-sajts's affidavit of abusive treatment at the Home, etc., etc.

The grounds on which it now asks for a revision of the Government's carefully considered action are not calculated to enhance the opinion formed of the management.

No new proof is presented except the affidavit of Mr. Mayer above referred to. Much of the ^{new} paper will be found to consist of such statements as the following:

Pursuant to such investigation and report, an answer was sent to the Commissioner dated November 21, 1903, wherein the special charges were disproved and explained in accordance with the facts established by the Investigating Committee. "If any specific cases were cited by

you The charges were not disproved. we could refer to the Under point II of its paper the management says that "it was not allowed to be heard in its own defense." This plain them. In this connection the enclosed statement

is an extraordinary assertion in view of its letter of November 21.

Under point III it is said "that the charges against the Home are misrepresented," and under point IV that "the proceedings against the Home were instituted and pursued in bad faith." These are the Home's conclusions, as is also the further statement that "we explained some points at issue in a way that in our opinion should satisfy the mind of an unprejudiced person."

Reference is then made in the paper to pages 3 and 4 of the Home's answer. They contain bare assertions, shown by the Government to be untrue, that the Manager of the Home and his assistants treated all persons with courtesy and consideration, that it was only when persons applying for information or favors used coarse, vulgar and insulting language that employees at the Home lost their self-control; that no instances had occurred where the Home had declined "to take proper steps to ascertain the whereabouts of the relatives or friends of the inmates of the Home" and that "if any specific cases were cited by you (referring to the Commissioner) we could refer to the merits of each individual case." A number of such cases were actually cited, but the Home was unable to explain them. In this connection the enclosed statement

made to three Government officials by the Home's agent at Ellis Island and its clerk, while they were both still in the Home's employ, are interesting.

Finally, under point V it is said that "the decision is not based on facts."

For the facts on which it is actually based, reference is made to the Commissioner's letters of October 28, and December 30, 1903.

This new paper submitted with the appeal is further evidence of the impropriety of allowing this society to be represented at Ellis Island. Until recently it had seemed that with a new and proper manager it could be allowed to return, and representatives of the Austrian Government were so informed. It now appears that the misconception of its duties lies not alone with the Manager, but with the Directors themselves, and that nothing short of a complete reorganization, resulting in satisfactory assurances that it will work solely in the interest of the immigrants, can qualify it for further work at Ellis Island. Before this occurs, it would also be well to ascertain to what extent its Directors were responsible for the relations it maintained with at least one former official, who in September, 1902, was dismissed from this

Service on serious charges, three of them involving the Home, on facts similar to those stated in the six cases already referred to. Its connection with this same discharged official resulted later in the sending of some six hundred immigrants to certain West Virginia mines of which he became the agent, and the treatment many of these immigrants received there was such that even the Home was obliged to refrain from sending any more to this place.

My conclusion is that to listen to further arguments as to the propriety of the Government's action in excluding the Austro-Hungarian Home from Ellis Island would be only a waste of time.

Respectfully,

(Signed) Wm. Williams.

(Inclosures No. 5261)

Commissioner.

VL

Ellis Island for the purpose of looking after Austrian subjects who were really eligible to land, but who either needed some temporary advice or to be placed in communication with friends or relatives. The Commissioner added, however, (to which of course the Baron agreed) that such institution must be above suspicion in its methods of dealing with immigrants, and the Commissioner called attention to his letter of December 30, 1903, approved

1022X74

IN ANSWERING REFER TO

Department of Commerce and Labor
IMMIGRATION SERVICE

No.

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER
NEW YORK, N. Y.

Regarding Katarina Babic to be adopted

S. S. New York, April 17, 1910.

Katarina Babic, 8 years-old, has one older sister, and five younger brothers and sisters, with a guardian, Stefan Barusa, in Duga Medja, Croatia, Hungary. Her parents are dead. She was brought here by Mrs. Veronika Pohr, a widow with two small children, for the purpose of taking care of them while she is at work. Mrs. Pohr had \$9., no railroad ticket, and was going to her home, #225 West Hanover St., Baltimore, Md., where she has some bedsteads and tables, but no other property or means of supporting herself and family. Her husband Joseph was a U. S. citizen and for this reason the Board permitted her and her two children to land. She had previously resided in the United States seven years. She had sojourned about five months in Hungary, and had made the acquaintance of Katarina Babic about two months prior to embarkation. The child was turned over to her by her guardian, but she took no steps to legally adopt her. *Katarina was held at Ellis Island.*

(who had heard of her helpless condition)
About forty persons, called at the Barge Office stating that they desired to adopt her. Several were permitted to go to Ellis Island and tried to qualify. Among them were some very well-to-do ~~persons~~ who were very anxious to adopt the girl. One insurance man worth \$25,000., with a home in Bay Ridge, L.I., wanted her as a compan-

IN ANSWERING REFER TO

No.

Department of Commerce and Labor

IMMIGRATION SERVICE

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER
ELLIS ISLAND, NEW YORK, N. Y.

-2-

ion for his grown daughter; one lady from Jamaica worth \$10,000., with an income of \$175.00 a month and no children of her own, was especially eager to be her mother, and cried when informed that the girl would have to go to someone of her own religion, and if possible, someone who could speak to her in her own language.

Several women wanted her for a servant girl. Mr. Walter N. Polakov, a consulting engineer, residing at #189 Claremont Ave., New York, and his wife were very anxious to get her and appeared before the Board of Special Inquiry. These people were the only ones found to be of the same denomination ^{Greek Orthodox} as the girl, and able to make themselves understood by her in Russian. They took steps to adopt her in accordance with New York State laws.