Mr. KNOX. There is no question that the existing laws of the United States regulating immigration and the importation of contract labor will apply.

Now, in section 7—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Before the gentleman goes to the provision in the bill which I notice on the bill a provision that section 1890 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall not apply to the Territory of Hawaii. That is the statute, as I understand, which prohibits any religious corporation from owning more than $50,000 worth of real estate in a Territory or District of Columbia. What was the idea in the minds of the committee when they prohibited the application of that statute to Hawaii? It seems to me it would be a good idea to provide against the dangers of mortmain, and to some extent, whether $50,000 or something else some sort of limitation. I notice there is some amount of real estate that may be acquired by any such institution.

Mr. KNOX. The reason for that provision in the bill was that there are now existing in Hawaii quite a number of charitable institutions which are very largely endowed, which are performing a very meritorious charitable work in the islands; and if this provision were extended it would militate against those institutions, which all the people there and all the Americans who have ever been there consider to be of the highest and most meritorious and beneficial character to the people of the islands.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That, if the gentleman from Mississippi will bear in mind, it is, being once admitted—and I think he himself admits that the policy underlying the statutes of mortmain and the policy underlying all of our prohibitions against the ownership of property beyond prescribed amounts by religious corporations and charitable corporations, is a good policy—it being once admitted that, in my judgment, the fact that there is a good many charitable institutions in Hawaii which are doing a great deal of good does not militate against the wisdom of the statute.

If any of these corporations now own over $50,000 worth of real estate, they can fix the idea of fixing that particular amount, because that particular limit might act as taking their property without due process of law, and might interfere with their vested rights; but why not fix some limit in the statute?

Mr. KNOX. There is great force, of course, in the gentleman's suggestion that I do not think that the House would probably limit it to any sum that would cover these large charitable institutions in Hawaii. For instance, they run up to very large amounts—$500,000. They hold that property now, and a greater amount probably.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand that we cannot interfere with those who already own it, but why not say that charitable and religious corporations shall not hereafter acquire an amount exceeding $50,000, leaving those that have vested right the land which they now possess.

Mr. KNOX. Of course, considering the small number of people in Hawaii who constitute the clergy class, the intelligent and controlling class there, and the great demand made on account of those who may become or are subjects of charity, and the great work these institutions do, it seems that the reason for the limitation upon the amount does not exist. There is another thing to which I call the attention of the gentleman—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In that connection—

Mr. KNOX. Just a moment. There is another thing that I call the attention of the gentleman to, and that is that while in America we have a vast country, consisting of many States, Hawaii is a small community, with probably less than half the number of people in the entire district, and while the benefits are great in so small a community the evils can be but small.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, they may be coextensive with the territory and with the population. Now, is there not an actual danger that the majority of the real estate of Hawaii shall fall into the hands of charitable and religious institutions?

Mr. KNOX. There would be nothing for anybody if the majority of the property of Hawaii went into the hands of such organizations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is a very bad condition for a country to be in, no matter how small.

Mr. KNOX. Well, it is very small, and I think the evil does not call for legislation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNOX. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman please state what charitable organizations are, how they are organized, and for what purposes?

Mr. KNOX. I have a statement on the charitable institutions in the bill. IListItem religions and charitable institutions, of which there are a number, Protestant and Roman Catholic, there are several institutions of a charitable and educational nature—

Mr. RIGDELEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. It is absolutely impossible for us to hear a word, and many of us are interested in this presentation of facts.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of you have the right to make objections?

Mr. KNOX. I would state to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, as this is quite a long list and we have a perfect list here, would it answer or satisfy him if this should be inserted in the Record?

Mr. HAMILTON. I simply suggest to the gentleman that I will incorporate that statement into some remarks which I shall have occasion to make during the consideration of the bill. It covers all of these charitable institutions and the conditions surrounding each of them.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I notice that the opening paragraph of that statement is in language like this: Aside from the religious and charitable organizations there are certain others.

Mr. KNOX. Aside from the religious and charitable institutions in Hawaii there are some religious and charitable institutions in Wisconsin.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is just what I want to know. What are the religious and charitable institutions? You say there are certain other institutions aside from those. How much property on the islands do the charitable and religious institutions own?

Mr. KNOX. I am unable to answer that. I have received no figures.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is not the vital question that is raised by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WILLIAMS)?

Mr. KNOX. I can say to the gentleman that education in the United States is a matter of great moment and in all the States, but is absolutely uncertain. Under the laws of Hawaii the schools are entirely separated from sectarian control.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Is there any limitation in the bill on the amount of property that a religious charitable institution organization can owns or acquire?

Mr. KNOX. There is none.

Now, in section 7 we undertake to give a list of the laws of Hawaii that are for the present in force on account of this provision that all laws must come up to the standard of the United States. I think the very names of these laws will suggest a reason for their repeal. That is by looking at the names of them you will see that they apply to an independent republic other than the United States, and would not be applicable to a country over which the laws of the United States must be carried, and without which, as I have said before, there is a statement of the laws which are repealed, with a brief description of them, so that any gentleman may find out for himself on examination the laws that have been repealed by this bill.

The offices which are abolished by this bill are no longer applicable to the United States territory. They are the president of the Republic, the minister of foreign affairs, of the interior, of finance, etc. The amendment to official titles requires no explanation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit another interruption right there?

Mr. KNOX. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Section 7 of this bill says that chapter 38, relating to same, and chapter 39, relating to taxes, are repealed. Why are they repealed? What is the nature of them?

Mr. KNOX. They have no relevancy to anything existing now under United States laws. The report explains every one of these. Section 7 of this bill we simply undertake to keep all officers of the United States or the Territory. The same provision applies both to civil and criminal proceedings, pending and unfinished, in the courts of Hawaii at the time that this bill shall take effect.

The report provides for the legislative power. I would say that this whole provision in regard to a legislature for Hawaii does not differ from the general legislative provision as to Territories of the United States, nor does it differ from the provisions of our general Territorial laws as to legislatures.

The number of the legislature is made by the number of the senate 18. I believe under the republic of Hawaii both houses were made up of 15 members. We have simply doubled the number in the popular branch, making it 30 instead of 15, and keeping the old number of 15 in the senate, preserving the names of house of representatives and senate, although the represents Territorial law provides that the upper house shall be called the council and the lower house of representatives.