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I. The Problem

It is often charged that Americans too frequently elect men to office only to defeat them at the next election and that just about the time an official learns his job, he is voted into retirement at the end of his first term and another novice put in his place. This attitude on the part of the voter probably stems from Jacksonian democracy, which feared the results of permitting the perpetuation of an office-holding bureaucracy. The fear is reflected in the constitution of many of the states; Pennsylvania, for example, prohibits the immediate reelection of the same man as governor. In the executive departments tenure is sometimes limited to one term; in the lower chamber of the legislative departments the same result is attained by short terms or, in other words, frequent elections. Each member of the lower house of Congress must appeal to his constituents every two years. In politically doubtful northern states the mortality is customarily so high that when the Democrats are in power in Washington, the southerners get most of the important chairmanships because they are won by seniority. The poll tax also helps many southern representatives. Since Pennsylvania is normally Republican, her Democratic congressmen know that their careers are likely to be short. They therefore may be inclined to seek the safety of the judiciary with its longer terms; in recent years Henry Ellenbogen and J. Harold Flannery left Congress to become judges.

It is certainly true that there have been too many single-termers in Congress. These men hardly become acclimated before they are defeated for reelection, and most of them never learn the complicated rules of the House.¹ There can be no doubt that the

¹Compare the arguments of Daniel Udree as discussed by Benjamin Alderfer Fryer, in Congressional History of Berks (Pa.) District 1789-1939 (Reading, 1939), p. 50.
practice is tremendously wasteful; and yet as long as a constituency has the right to choose whom it wishes, it has the right to select a new member at every election if it so desires.

How stable has the Pennsylvania voter been in choosing his congressmen? Inasmuch as the state was normally Democratic for approximately the first seventy years and normally Republican for approximately the next seventy years under the present federal Constitution, the percentage of representatives returned election after election should be high.²

For the purpose of ascertaining the extent of the stability of the Pennsylvania electorate in regard to the selection of its congressmen a check was made of every delegation during the seventy-eight congresses. This, it was thought, would be a type of wartime research which might be easily performed without gasoline because records could readily be secured. To increase the fruitfulness of the investigation another task was added: to discover what percentage of each of the state's seventy-eight congressional delegations were foreign-born, what percentage were born outside the state, and what percentage were born in the state.

The latter phase of the study caused so much trouble that what started out as a few days' checking of lists turned out to be a matter of ten months of research. That the birthplace of so important an official as a congressman should be unknown is probably unbelievable but in some cases true. Superficially it seems that it should be easy to use the two congressional biographical directories;³ in the 1913 volume, however, the notices of at least two dozen Pennsylvania congressmen lack information as to place of birth. In the 1928 edition also the nativity is wanting in a few instances. To make the study complete these lacunae must be filled if at all possible.

Because of the gasoline shortage this phase of the research presented much difficulty.⁴ Various individuals within and with-

²Of course the voters could be stable in their allegiance to one party over a long period of time but might frequently change allegiance to individuals.

³A Biographical Congressional Directory . . . 1774-1911 (Washington, 1913), published as Sen. Doc. 654 (61 Cong. 2 Sess.); and Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927 . . . (Washington, 1928), published as House Doc. 783 (69 Cong. 2 Sess.). The 1913 volume is unreliable and defective. The writer, after using it, was forced to recheck every name in the edition of 1928. Many discrepancies were uncovered.

⁴If the war lasts very long, historical research will no doubt be one of the casualties.
out the state had to be contacted by letter. Despite their aid there still remain a few of Pennsylvania's congressmen whose places of birth apparently cannot be established with certainty. In the statistics they have been counted as natives of Pennsylvania, but there is still a possibility of slight error in the percentages for the congresses in which they served.

II. Directions

The results of the investigation can be found in the accompanying statistics. In the main the figures need no explanation, but the following notations will be of assistance in understanding their meaning:

1. The few congressional delegations, the nativity of some of whose members could not be learned with certainty, are marked with asterisks in column 5.

2. For statistical purposes each original selectee, even in case he died or resigned before serving, has been counted. The theory was that if a constituency’s stability in choosing a native son or in reelecting a sitting member was to be tested, its first choice should always be considered. Replacements, no matter for what reason made, have not been counted. Thus in the ninth congress Christian Lower was elected but never qualified because of illness; his district did not choose anyone else, and so the *Biographical Congressional Dictionary* for 1913 lists only seventeen instead of eighteen in the delegation. Lower was counted in this study be-

---

The writer wishes to thank the following people who aided materially in finding the birthplaces of most of the congressmen for whom the information was lacking: Franklin F. Holbrook of the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania; S. K. Stevens of the Historical Commission; B. R. Johnstone of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania; Edith Beard Cannon of the Historical Society of York County; Mrs. Howard Cessna of Bedford; Jessica C. Ferguson of the state library and museum; Miss Audrey North of the library of Susquehanna University; Frank S. Cisna, secretary to the Hon. Richard M. Simpson; Miss Miriam Evans of the library of Bucknell University; Miss Thelma Bratt of the Grosvenor Library of Buffalo; Charles Martyn, librarian of the *Philadelphia Record*; and Edward Thompson and R. P. Banks of the Juniata County Historical Society.

---

* This is an example of the unreliability of the B.C.D. of 1913. The 1928 edition lists Lower. Another instance is in the fourteenth congress, for which the 1913 volume names only twenty-two instead of twenty-three members but the 1928 one gives twenty-three and explains that one member was elected but never qualified. See also Fryer, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
cause, having been elected, he represented his district's first choice. For the purposes of this research that choice indicated the desire to elect a native of the state and a new man, for Lower had been born in Pennsylvania and his predecessor had not been reelected.

The reader must keep in mind, therefore, that only "firsts" have been used. Had replacements been included, the figures might vary slightly. It is later stated that no native New Yorkers were elected from Pennsylvania until 1841, but one or two may possibly have been chosen when the first choice resigned or died. The change in percentage, however, would be negligible.

It is worth saying also that the figures in column 4, which is entitled "% new," make no distinction as to why new men were selected. While the percentages are therefore only estimates of the electorate's stability, they are as close as can reasonably be expected. If a sitting member died, resigned, or refused to run again, the constituency had no alternative but to elect a successor.

3. In cases in which the delegation was increased after a census, the old figure was for obvious reasons used for the first congress in which the delegation was increased. For example, whereas the delegation of eight in the second congress was enlarged to thirteen in the third, in computing the proper percentage for the latter in column 4 the number in the delegation to the former was employed.

4. The figures at the end of columns 4, 14, and 15 are averages, not totals, for all congresses. The others are totals. Thus the figure 2,068 at the bottom of column 3 represents the aggregate from Pennsylvania in the seventy-eight congresses if every single congressman had served only one term. In other words, it is the number of man terms in the congressional history of Pennsylvania. The total number of men who actually served would be quite different because many were elected term after term; and in some instances because of deaths and resignations as many as three members served in one two-year term. About 950 different individuals have represented Pennsylvania in the lower house of Congress. The totals in columns 5 through 13 also are man terms. In column 8 it appears that there was one man from New Jersey and/or Delaware from the fifth to the tenth congress. The figure 1 stands for John Hanna of New Jersey, who was elected from Pennsylvania five times.
III. Stability of the Electorate

The average percentage of new men for the seventy-seven congresses—excluding the first one—is forty-one and eight-tenths. The lowest is about eight per cent in the seventy-second congress of 1931, and the highest is about seventy-six per cent in the thirty-fourth congress of 1855. It is no mean overturn when more than three-fourths of the sitting members are not returned to office. No doubt the heavy toll in the fall of 1854 resulted from dislike on the part of Pennsylvanians for the Kansas-Nebraska deal. In twenty-five of the seventy-seven congresses the overturn was fifty per cent or greater. Those congresses in which half or more of the members of the Pennsylvania delegation were new men are shown in the statistics by bold face in column 4.

The reader can easily observe three main periods in column 4. For twenty congresses (really nineteen inasmuch as the first is statistically useless) there was a fair amount of stability. From 1797 to 1811 new men averaged about a third of each delegation. From 1791 to 1829 there were five overturns—that is to say, five delegations in which fifty per cent or more of the members were freshmen. The rebuffs to sitting members were fairly well spaced, except in the fourteenth and fifteenth congresses. These two heavy defeats for old representatives probably reflected the social and economic maladjustment that arose because of the War of 1812. The famous western tidal wave of 1810 is barely recognizable in Pennsylvania's delegation.

Next came a half century of unsettled conditions, when most of the elections were productive of high percentages of novices and in some years there were tidal waves. In these numerous instances when fifty per cent or more of the previous delegation were defeated, one can easily trace the party battles of the Jacksonian era, the sectional struggle over slavery, and the factional fights during reconstruction. Interestingly enough, this period terminates with the forty-fifth congress of 1877, the year which is usually given by historians as the end of political reconstruction.

The third period, from 1879 to the present, is one of comparative stability in which, beginning with the forty-sixth congress, there were only three elections wherein as many as half the old members were defeated and in no case did the turnover exceed sixty per cent. The so-called tidal wave of 1890 was
reflected to the extent that exactly half the previous delegation were defeated. The other two examples (in the sixty-third and sixty-fourth congresses) represent the Wilsonian resurrection of the Democratic party and the Bull Moose movement. The era witnessed some of the longest tenures in the history of the Pennsylvania delegations; for example, W. D. Kelley served from 1861 to 1890, John Dalzell from 1887 to 1913, H. H. Bigham from 1879 to 1912, A. C. Harmer from 1877 to 1901, and S. J. Randall from 1863 to 1890. According to the 1928 *Biographical Directory of the American Congress* Bingham’s tenure of thirty-three years was the record for length of service up to that time. Of those named the only Democrat was Randall, whose advocacy of high tariff made him acceptable to the Republicans.

In its over-all significance the period of political stability since 1879 bespeaks the strong grasp of the Republican party on the state. The changes in personnel arose normally from deaths, voluntary retirements, or the victory of one Republican over another. After 1900 the decline in the number of Democrats was severe. Finally in the sixty-seventh congress (1921-23) there was only one, Guy E. Campbell. Evidently he was quite lonesome, for in the third session of the same congress he listed himself as a Republican, and the G.O.P. controlled the entire delegation. Again in the sixty-ninth congress (1925-27) and in the seventy-first (1929-31) there was not a single Democrat from Pennsylvania. However, the depression had its effect in weakening the Republican hold. By 1933 in the seventy-third congress there were eleven Democrats and twenty-three Republicans, and in 1935 the Democrats controlled the delegation twenty-three to eleven. By 1937 in the seventy-fifth congress there were only seven Republicans to twenty-seven Democrats. These changes are reflected most noticeably in the percentages for the seventy-second and seventy-third congresses. In the former the percentage of new men was eight and three-tenths, the lowest in the history of the Pennsylvania delegations. Except for the fact that three Democrats had defeated three Republicans the delegation, at the opening of Congress, was the same as in the previous term. For the seventy-third, however, there was a heavy mortality among the Republicans, and the percentage of new men rose sharply to forty-four and a tenth. But never during the thirties, when the Democratic party was being revived, did the percentage of novices
amount to half the delegation. Since the election of 1938 the Republicans have been slowly regaining their seats.

IV. CHOICE OF CONGRESSMEN BORN OUTSIDE THE STATE

Column 14 shows that during the first twelve congresses the percentage of those not born in the state was very small; indeed, in half the cases it was zero. Since the twelfth congress the percentage has varied. The over-all average for the seventy-eight congresses is thirteen and a half per cent. The peak was during the thirty-first congress, when a third of the members were natives of other states. The rise in the percentage after the twelfth congress demonstrates that the population of the country was becoming more fused and less settled.

In states newly carved out of the frontier the early delegations were probably almost entirely from outside. Ohio's first delegation, in the eighth congress, consisted of one man, Jeremiah Morrow, who was a native of Pennsylvania. For the thirteenth congress its delegation was raised to six, and not one was Ohio-born. One was from South Carolina, one from Virginia, one from Connecticut, and one from New Jersey; and two were from Maryland. In 1789 Pennsylvania could hardly be classed as a frontier state, even if the western portion was still frontier in character; therefore, those members of the early delegations who were not native sons were foreign born (see column 15).

From the standpoint of representation by men from other places interesting trends are evident. There were no New Englanders in Pennsylvania delegations until 1815 in the fourteenth congress (see column 6), after which there was usually at least one. The peak was from 1851 to 1855, when five of the twenty-four members, including of course Thaddeus Stevens, were New Englanders. This large percentage probably had some connection with the development of abolitionism in Pennsylvania. The only representatives from Pennsylvania in the thirty-second congress (1851-53) designated as Free-soilers were natives of New England, one having been born in Connecticut and one in New Hampshire. Galusha A. Grow, born in Connecticut, served in the House for Pennsylvania from the thirty-second through the thirty-seventh and from the fifty-third through the fifty-seventh congresses. Since 1815 New Englanders have been elected fairly constantly
from Pennsylvania, as shown in column 6. That fact indicates heavy immigration. The strongest New England influence in the Pennsylvania delegations has always been from Connecticut. The Wyoming valley provides a partial explanation.

New York, like New England, has had heavy representation in Pennsylvania's delegations; but it started later and stopped earlier. Column 7 indicates that no native New Yorker was elected from Pennsylvania until 1841. From about that time until 1913, however, New Yorkers must have been coming to Pennsylvania in sizable numbers, for in the fifty-third congress, 1893-95, five of the thirty representatives were natives of the Empire State. New York's contribution was lengthened to some extent because of the long tenure of John Dalzell, a native New Yorker who served Pennsylvania in Congress from 1887 to 1913.

After 1913 New York's dominance passed to Ohio. Most of the figures in column 12 represent Ohio-born men. This countermigration from west to east became important in 1891, and by 1913 four of the state's congressmen were from the west—three from Ohio and one from Michigan. Western representation has continued strong until the present congress, most of the western-born congressmen representing districts around Pittsburgh.

Column 11 demonstrates that the South has sent quite a few of its natives to Pennsylvania if its contribution to congressional delegations is any proof. Most of the figures, however, stand for men born in Maryland. As the statistics show, the contribution of the South has been spotty.

Migration from New Jersey and Delaware has produced some effect on Pennsylvania's delegations (see column 8). Most of this influence probably results from cross and countermigration around the metropolitan area of Philadelphia.

V. Choice of Foreign-born Congressmen

It has been seen that up to 1813 the percentage of Pennsylvania's representatives from outside the state was small or non-existent and that on the contrary the foreign-born element was quite numerous. Pennsylvania had been getting immigrants from Europe and in turn was sending many migrants to Ohio. Her first congressional delegation contained not a single member born in any other state or colony, but twelve and a half per cent were
foreign-born. A glance at column 15 shows that the foreign-born representation amounted to over thirty per cent in the second, third, and fifth congresses. It was not until the twentieth congress in 1827 that the Pennsylvania delegation was entirely native American. Never has there been a congress, however, in which every member from Pennsylvania was a native of the state. Thus no juxtaposition of X's in columns 14 and 15 occurs. The delegation which came closest to being one hundred per cent Pennsylvanian was in the forty-fourth congress (1875-77), when there were twenty-six native-born Pennsylvanians and one New Yorker. In contrast Virginia's very first delegation was composed entirely of Virginia-born men.\(^8\) The long-continued cosmopolitan character of Pennsylvania is well known.

Columns 9 and 10 will explain the high percentage of foreign-born representatives elected from Pennsylvania during the early decades. Most of them were from the British Isles, principally Scotch-Irish, with a few English. In the third congress four of the thirteen members were from northern Ireland. The length of the influence of the Scotch-Irish element can be partly explained by the long periods of service by John Smilie and William Findley. Continuous first-generation British-Island influence ceased with the nineteenth congress. After the Civil War the Catholic Irish began to appear. Names like McAleer, McLane, and Donohoe came to be as common as Findley, Smilie, and Fitzsimons. Since 1923 the election of native British Islanders has declined.

The nativism of the forties and fifties is reflected in the long list of delegations, from the twenty-ninth congress to the thirty-eighth, when only one foreign-born man was elected from the state.\(^9\) Another era of almost purely American-born representation—from 1923 to 1933—coincided with the revival of the Ku Klux Klan. The election of a few nonnatives after 1933 is to be

---

\(^8\) Investigation is necessary before it can be determined whether Virginia continued to elect its own sons. A sampling made of the 1937 Virginia delegation revealed all except one (who had been born in West Virginia) to be natives of Virginia.

\(^9\) This one man was Ner Middleswarth of Scotland. The B.C.D. of 1913 names his birthplace as New Jersey. If this is correct, then not one foreign-born person was elected from Pennsylvania during that time. It is interesting that in this period of nativism Pennsylvania was feeling her most powerful New England influence. Columns 6 and 15 show that while foreign-born representation was slight, considerable numbers of New Englanders were being chosen.
attributed chiefly to the rebirth of the Democratic party. The Exclusion Act of 1924 will without doubt end completely the practice of electing foreign-born persons to office. Three per cent of the present congressional delegation from Pennsylvania are foreign born, a high figure in comparison with the percentages in the delegations of the late twenties but a low one in contrast to the second congress, which contained a Pennsylvania delegation thirty-seven and a half per cent foreign born. Such a large nonnative representation can never occur again. The average foreign-born percentage for the seventy-eight congresses is six and one-tenth.

The so-called new immigration from central and southern Europe since the 1890's, much of which came to Pennsylvania, is only slightly reflected in Pennsylvania's congressmen. Perhaps the Poles and Italians and Greeks of the first generation—unlike the Scotch-Irish of an earlier day—were too illiterate or otherwise unfit to serve. Column 10 indicates that for long periods not a man born in continental Europe was elected from Pennsylvania. The only exceptions in recent years are Samuel A. Weiss and Henry Ellenbogen, mentioned in footnote 10. The former was born in Poland in 1902 and came to the United States with his parents the next year; the latter had not been naturalized long enough to be permitted to take the oath when he presented his credentials to the House.

One might expect that the second generation of central and southern Europeans would now be represented in Congress. None, however, can be found in any Pennsylvania delegation. Weiss comes nearest, but he was born abroad and is not technically of the second generation. Nevertheless these second-generation Americans are elected in sizable numbers to the state legislature; witness names such as Petrosky, Komorofski, Kolankiewicz, Gryskiewicz, Di Genova, Cavalcante, Di Silvestro, Haluska, and many others in the 1941 general assembly. The same legislature had David H. Weiss (born in Czechoslovakia) and Paul D'Ortona (born in Italy). Every one of these is a Democrat, a fact which

---

9 The number of foreign-born representatives elected since 1933 is small. It consists of Ellenbogen of Austria, Stack of Ireland, Rutherford of Canada, and Weiss of Poland. Of these Rutherford was a Republican.

11 Some can be found in the delegations from other states. In the seventy-eighth congress there are Sadowski and Lesinski (born in Pennsylvania) from Michigan, Monkiewicz from Connecticut, D'Alessandro from Maryland, Marcantonio from New York, and many others.
suggests that if the leaders of the new immigration wish to be elected to Congress, their vehicle will not be the Republican party. It seems evident that the Republicans of Pennsylvania speak largely for the older stocks\textsuperscript{2} while the Democrats gather much of their strength from the newer strains. In the early congresses foreign-born representatives were for the most part Democrats. Their descendants are likely to be Republicans.

As the vacant spaces in column 13 show, other North American countries have offered little. The first Pennsylvania congressman born on the American continent but outside the United States was elected in 1897. In all there have been only two, one a Canadian and the other a Nova Scotian.

VI. NEED OF STUDIES FOR OTHER STATES

The results of the investigation under discussion indicate some of the trends in the history of Pennsylvania's congressional delegations. Similar studies are needed for other states before a composite picture of the entire country can be attempted. Generalizations on how unique or how common has been Pennsylvania's experience in regard to the developments herein outlined cannot be made until figures for more states are available. If there were statistics for New York, Massachusetts, a southern state, a middle-western state, and a far-western state, some tentative conclusions might be drawn. Too, an attempt might be made to answer certain interesting questions. For instance, how long after the first congress did South Carolina, Georgia, and New York continue to have higher percentages of foreign-born representatives than Pennsylvania?\textsuperscript{213} For how many congresses did the other states have dele-

\textsuperscript{2}Political advantage is sometimes taken of this fact. In a recent campaign between F. Clair Ross (Democrat) and Frank L. Pinola (Republican) for state treasurer a handbill was put out by the "Better Voters League against Fascism and War" which appealed to Republicans to "Be Americans[.]

Before you vote a STRAIGHT Republican ticket read the names on your ballot and then VOTE AMERICAN[.]

The appeal to Republicans was to vote against Pinola and "KEEP Mussolini's hands out of the State Treasury."

\textsuperscript{213}The figures as to foreign-born representation in the first congress are as follows: South Carolina 40%; Georgia 33%; New York 16%; Pennsylvania 12%. In Pennsylvania the percentage of state-born men in the delegation was about 87; in Connecticut and Massachusetts 80; in New Jersey 75; in New York 66; in North Carolina 60; in South Carolina 40; and in New Hampshire 33. Georgia's delegation had not one man born in Georgia.
gations that were made up entirely of native-born persons? How long were the delegations of Maryland, Rhode Island, Delaware, and Virginia composed altogether of men born in the state they represented? When did Virginia lose the leadership which she exercised in the first congress, in which Virginia-born men held more seats than did those from any other state?14 To what extent did northern states contribute men to southern ones such as South Carolina?15 How frequently did middle-western states such as Ohio choose foreign-born representatives? Probably very seldom in early Ohio history, but has the industrialization of that state changed the trend? Have other states of the East contributed their natives to Ohio's delegations to the same extent as Pennsylvania has?26 Did other eastern states supply as many congressmen for New York and New Jersey as did Pennsylvania?17 To what degree have Pennsylvania's able men been drained off to the West (as in the cases of Ickes and Landon) with a resulting loss

14 Men born in Virginia held 14 seats; in Massachusetts 10; in Pennsylvania 9; in Maryland and Connecticut 6 each; in New York 4; in New Jersey and North Carolina 3 each; in Delaware, England, Ireland, and South Carolina 2 each; and in New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Bermuda 1 each. A sampling made in the fortieth congress showed natives of New York leading with 40 seats. Pennsylvania-born men held 35, Ohio-born 19, Massachusetts-born 18, and Maine-born 10.

15 During radical reconstruction the percentage of northerners elected to congress from southern states was large. But this was a temporary and an unnatural situation. In order to indicate the abnormal condition a sampling of the Senate of the fortieth congress was made. North Carolina was represented by a native and a man born in New Hampshire; South Carolina by a native and a man born in Massachusetts; Florida by natives of Connecticut and New Jersey; Louisiana by a New Yorker and a Vermonter; and Alabama and Arkansas by New Yorkers and Pennsylvanians. If the delegations to the lower house were polled, there is little doubt that a similar result would be secured. Up to 1913 natives of Pennsylvania had been elected from southern states to the House of Representatives in the following numbers: Virginia 7; Kentucky 6; Maryland 5; North Carolina, Tennessee, and Louisiana 4 each; South Carolina 3; Florida and Texas 2 each; and Georgia, Mississippi, and West Virginia 1 each.

16 Up to 1913 natives of Pennsylvania had been elected from states west of Pennsylvania in the following numbers: Ohio 58; Indiana and Iowa 15 each; Illinois 12; Missouri 10; Kansas 7; California, Minnesota, and Wisconsin 4 each; Michigan 3; Nebraska and Washington 2 each; and Colorado, Idaho, North Dakota, Oregon, and Utah 1 each.

17 Up to 1913 natives of Pennsylvania had been elected from other eastern states in the following numbers: New York 15; New Jersey 12; Massachusetts 3; Delaware 2; and Maine and New Hampshire 1 each. The one Pennsylvania-born congressman from Maine was James G. Blaine.

18 The writer is cognizant of the fact that the "loss" cannot easily be proved and that the idea should not be pressed too far. Any analysis of the influence of Pennsylvania-born men in a new environment is subject to two weaknesses. In the first place, how do we know that a man like
Pennsylvania and a gain to other states? Have labor organizations of other states succeeded in getting their members and officials elected to Congress to the same extent as in Pennsylvania? Has there been a countermigration of western-born men to all eastern states? Is it possible that future countermigration from west to east may permit Pennsylvania to be the gainer? Perhaps the sizable percentage of western-born Pennsylvania congressmen in recent years may mean a reversal of Greeley's dictum.

The South is producing more people than it can educate and find economic opportunities for; the frontier is ended; large cities with their industries are acting as magnets to draw population from rural areas; and foreign immigration has been cut to a trickle. As a result of the census of 1940 three southern and

Landon, who left Pennsylvania when he was young, would or could have risen to prominence had he stayed in his native state? Perhaps he would have, perhaps not. As a matter of fact, most westward migration arose from a desire to get out of crowded conditions at home and seek opportunities elsewhere. In the second place, if a child born in Pennsylvania is taken to another state when quite young, his native state can have little or no influence on him, except possibly through his conversations with his parents. Thus the Pennsylvania Manual claims Harold L. Ickes as one of the "Principal United States Government Officers from Pennsylvania, 1783 to 1941"; but Ickes has spent most of his life elsewhere and was appointed Secretary of the Interior not from Pennsylvania but from Illinois. It is reasonable to suspect that Thaddeus Stevens, on the other hand, brought abolitionism with him from Vermont because he came to Pennsylvania after he reached his majority.

Whether it can be said that Pennsylvania lost or that others gained, the list of native Pennsylvanians who have made good in other states is quite large. Some of the well-known western leaders who were born in Pennsylvania are Justice Joseph McKenna of California; Senator Simon Guggenheim of Colorado; Speaker M. C. Kerr of Indiana; Governor Joseph A. Wright of Indiana; C. C. Carpenter and A. B. Cummins, both of whom were governors and senators from Iowa; Senator W. A. Peffer of Kansas; Ignatius Donnelly of Minnesota; Alexander Ramsey of Minnesota, who was governor, senator, and secretary of war; Senator W. A. Clark of Montana; and Senator C. F. Manderson of Nebraska. See Frederic A. Godcharles, Pennsylvania Political, Governmental, Military, and Civil (N. Y., 1933), ch. XVII of the "Political, Economic and Social Volume." Lists of Pennsylvania men who have served in high official capacities in other states are given. The author says that eighty native Pennsylvanians have served as governor in thirty different states. Names of native Pennsylvanians who served as United States senators from other states are printed, as well as figures for those who served as representatives.

Labor officials began to appear in the Pennsylvania delegations after 1900. This fact illustrates a significant trend which promises to increase in importance. William J. Burke (Republican), Patrick McLane (Democrat), William B. Wilson (Democrat), Mahlon M. Garland (Republican), John J. Casey (Democrat), and Thomas D. Nichols were typical.

In 1942-43 foreign immigration was the lowest in eighty years.
four western states gained nine seats in the House at the expense of two northeastern and seven Mississippi-valley states.\textsuperscript{22} These considerations make it appear that many studies of the character of this one are desirable. Not only would they give to the historian new perspectives; they would also provide important side lights to the student of population.

\textsuperscript{22}Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma lost one each. With the exception of Massachusetts these states form a solid band of contiguous territory (shaped like a huge L) where population is increasing, if at all, more slowly than in Arizona, California, New Mexico, North Carolina, Oregon, Tennessee, and Florida. An increase of one congressman was received by each of these except California, which was granted three new ones.