

## CHINAMEN MUST REGISTER.

THE FEDERAL SUPREME COURT UPHOLDS THE GEARY LAW.

Five of the Justices Declare the Act Perfectly Constitutional—Messrs. Brewer, Field and Fuller Dissent—The Matter Not Finally Settled.

WASHINGTON, May 15.—The supreme court to-day, through Justice Gray, sustained the decision of the New York courts in favor of the constitutionality of the Geary exclusion act. Justice Brewer dissented.

The announcement that a decision in the case was expected attracted a large attendance and the fact that it was the last day of the term accounted for the presence of an unusually large array of attorneys within the bar, including Attorney General Olney, Solicitor General Aldrich, Senators Pugh, Dolph and Cockrell. Ex-Justice Strong and several members of the diplomatic corps were interested spectators.

Justice Gray, in announcing the judgment of the court, said that the power of the nation to restrict or prohibit the immigration of any aliens into the country or to require such aliens already in the country to remove therefrom was a well settled principle of international law and it was confirmed by an unbroken line of decisions in this court. The legislative power of the government had not transcended any of its constitutional limitations in the act under consideration. It was within its power to determine the regulations under which these aliens should be permitted to remain in the United States or failing to observe these regulations, they should be required to leave the country.

### THE PROVISIONS STRICTLY LEGAL.

The provisions of sections 6 of the act the judge said, which were the part of the law particularly at issue, were not inconsistent with the duties of the legislative and judicial departments of the government. The mode of procedure set forth in the section, the judge held, was similar to that in other well established proceedings, such as the habeas corpus and naturalization, fixing the requirements of citizenship and the like in which the judicial branch of the government accepted the determination of the executive upon the questions involved. As to the requirements that the Chinese entitled to remain in this country should establish that right by the evidence of one credible witness it was within the power of the legislature to determine the character of evidence that might be received in a case at law and what force should be given to the testimony so offered. Not discussing the wisdom nor the justice of the act in question, which was beyond the province of the judicial branch of the government, it remained only to say that the judgment of the circuit court for the Southern district of New York in refusing to grant writs of habeas corpus to the several petitioners was affirmed.