

Mr. MCALDER. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish at this time to speak on this bill, but perhaps later on I may say something on the subject. I find there are a large number of gentlemen on this side anxious to be heard, and I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Before the gentleman from Indiana begins, I would like to suggest that an attempt be made to make another agreement as to the time.

Mr. KNOX. I thought that would have to be done in the House. I will say that if there is no objection we will act as if the agreement was made, and when we come into the House again I will ask unanimous consent.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to make the request that he made this morning. The gentleman from Colorado was under a misapprehension.

Mr. KNOX. I will do so, and in the meantime we will act as if the request had already been made and granted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If the gentleman does not make the request I will do it. The gentleman from Tennessee was going to do it.

Mr. KNOX. Very well, we will follow it as if it had already been granted.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would ask if the committee can not now rise and let that agreement be made in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the committee has the power to control the time.

Mr. KNOX. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the time be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCALDER] upon that side of the House, and by myself upon this side, and that the time be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the remainder of the time be divided equally between the two sides of the Chamber, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KNOX] and the other by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCALDER].

Mr. KNOX. And that gentlemen who make remarks have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the committee has not the power to do that. But the House having made no order as to the time, it is in order for the committee, by unanimous consent, to agree to the proposition of the gentleman from Massachusetts. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MCALDER. Now I yield one hour to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON].

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in these troublous times of acquiring and governing outlying island possessions and efforts at once to sustain the Constitution the interest of labor seems neglected.

I yield to no man a superior regard, but am willing to concede to each an equal regard, for labor as that which I have myself.

Here and now we have our opportunity, not by promises, but by performance, not by words, but acts, to show our fidelity to that great cause not only in the Hawaiian Islands but here at home.

I approach this subject of labor in those islands with feelings of sadness as well as of responsibility.

The American Federation of Labor on December 19, 1890, in convention assembled at Detroit, Mich., resolved as follows:

We affirm our previous position on this question, namely, that there must be no slavery or serfdom by ownership or contract tolerated under the American flag, and that we will make anyone whose action shall in any way militate against this principle of human freedom responsible for such action in every legitimate manner open to us.

On the 7th day of July, 1898, a joint resolution of the House of Representatives and the Senate was approved by the President. Among other things, it provided "that the said Hawaiian Islands and their dependencies be, and they are hereby, annexed as a part of the territory of the United States and are subject to the sovereign dominion thereof;" and "the municipal legislation of the Hawaiian Islands not enacted for the fulfillment of the treaties so extinguished and not inconsistent with this joint resolution, nor contrary to the Constitution of the United States nor to any existing treaty of the United States, shall remain in force until the Congress of the United States shall otherwise determine;" and further, that "the President shall appoint five commissioners, at least two of whom shall be residents of the Hawaiian Islands, who shall, as soon as reasonably practicable, recommend to Congress such legislation concerning the Hawaiian Islands as they shall deem necessary or proper."

Under this resolution the President appointed Senators CULLOM, of Illinois, and MORGAN, of Alabama, and Mr. HITT, of Illinois, to this country, and ex-President Sanford B. Dole and Judge W. F. Frear, of the Hawaiian Islands. A hundred thousand dollars was appropriated to carry out the purpose of the resolution. The resolution also provided that "there shall be no further immigration of Chinese into the Hawaiian Islands."

That commission, after an excursion to the islands, filed their report in December, 1898, and with it presented a bill with their recommendation, which is the same as the bill presented by one of the commissioners in the Senate and one of the commissioners in the House of Representatives. Never before has a commission presented a measure to either body with provisions so un-American, so hostile to the genius of our institutions, as the bill recommended by this commission.

The bill now before the House is that bill torn to pieces and dismantled by the committee, and, save on the subject of contract labor, it might be identified as American.

This Hawaiian bill nowhere and in no wise protects or encourages American labor, here or there, and this policy is in keeping with the actions of this and last Congress dating back from this hour to the hour of the admission of the Hawaiian Islands. It is time to call a halt and to make an inquiry.

You of the majority have done nothing, absolutely nothing, to prohibit the importation of contract labor into the Hawaiian Islands, because influences there and here believe they can exploit them for commercial ends—the only motive that moves them—better by contract labor, and I will prove it.

You call caucuses to pass party measures. Why not go to some extremes to protect labor and destroy this infamous contract-labor system?

On the contrary, you provide by section 10 of this bill "that all obligations, contracts, and rights of action shall continue to be effectual," and that "penal proceedings shall be carried on," etc., without destroying the slave contracts already existing. Are they so inviolate that you dare not put your finger upon them?

This means that 40,000 laborers' contracts shall be continued in force and that the penal proceedings to enforce them shall continue; that slave men and women shall be imprisoned for failure to keep a civil contract. It means that involuntary servitude shall exist in the mills and on the plantations; that involuntary imprisonment with a felon's stripes shall be the remedy for enforcing civil rights between the favored masters of Hawaii and the cringing contract-labor slaves. It means that you would crucify labor on the cross of landlordism and money in Hawaii. True, the Senate amendment, which I hope will prevail here, strikes these contracts down.

Yielding to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, than whom none is more popular here or in his State, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT]—yielding to him the highest character for probity and good intentions, ability and skill as a lawmaker, and as to his colleagues on the commission in the Senate I say the same, yet—I measure my words—these three American lawgivers, as commissioners, were seduced and buncoed by their Hawaiian conferees and by the influences on the islands.

Passing over the wining and dining of the commission over on those delightful islands by the notables and the government officers, I pass to the result of the inspiration produced, as reflected in their report. First, on page 17, they say:

The question whether white labor can be profitably utilized in the sugar plantations is yet a problem, but the planters are preparing to give such labor a trial, and some of them believe it will prove superior to the labor of either Chinese or Japanese.

S. M. CULLOM, Chairman.

Most remarkable language for an American commission. Again they say in this report, on page 2:

The commission visited several of the most important islands of the Hawaiian group in company with persons representing important agricultural and commercial interests and others representing the government.

Under this influence they found, in the absence of any representatives of labor, that white labor "is yet a problem," not yet solved, but that some think that white labor will prove superior to "Chinese and Japanese labor."

Disagreeable as it is, the proof is clear to me that those in power here and interested in profit and dollars in Hawaii seek to have this Government sanction the contract-labor system, and will claim, as the proof shows they do claim now, that only by contract labor can Hawaii be worked. It is probably more profitable to work the islands thus, but it remains to be seen whether this Congress will put money above manhood, contract slave labor above free labor. If so, better for labor that those islands had never rose from the bottom of the sea, or that some volcanic convulsion had sunk them, than that they should have been a part of our territory and be a constant menace to our labor.

The bills introduced in Congress by the representatives of that commission and set out and recommended in this report are out-landish and un-American, and amount to a rape and destruction of American labor.

Those who are ready to pass a bill to exclude the best class of immigrants from this country had better scan well the policy that has invited undesirable oriental contract labor to our islands and the system of slave contracts by which they are held.

We were told in both Houses as a reason for annexation that the climate was temperate and salubrious, the soil fertile, and that