former Republican Congress and this Republican Congress have been very considerate of the interests of the sugar syndicates of the United States.

What have we secured by this acquisition of territory? Let me enumerate some of the most tangible things: Forty-five thousand Japanese contract laborers; 23,000 Chinese; 16,000 Portuguese; 1,000 Spanish; a notorious bete noire; the bubonic plague; a class of politicians who were planning to have an oligarchy under the protection of Uncle Sam.

Your committee has endeavored, so far as possible, to frame a bill that would rectify many evils existing in these islands. But there are very many bad conditions which can not be changed by legislation. Only time itself will make many desired changes possible. It will be along time before the conditions of the islands will afford any remunerative employment to any considerable number of American laborers.

I do not believe it is further amended relative to the labor system and the land system. We should legislate now to prevent the enforcement of contracts under the contract-labor system, no matter whether the contracts were made heretofore or shall be made hereafter. We want no semilaborers or serfdom among the Chinese to bear the burden of the sugar planters or rice growers, and mill owners of Hawaii to understand that they are under the Constitution of the United States and that they must respect our laws. I shall favor the following amendment to section 10:

Amended. That no suit or proceedings shall be maintained for the specific performance of any contract heretofore or hereafter entered into for personal labor or service, nor shall any remedy exist or be enforced for breach of any contract, either civil or criminal, which shall suit or proceedings instituted solely to recover damages for such breach.

There should also be specific legislation to put in force the laws of the United States prohibiting the creation or continuance of school districts of less than the legal subdivision of all the public lands as a part of the heritage of the people. The commissioners in their report, in speaking of this subject, say:

"The large holdings [of land] have become larger, and the small ones have become smaller and poorer. Thus the prime object of American citizenship, the making of homes and the complete development of the family as the unit of our social system, seems to have been lost sight of in the Hawaiian Islands."

HAWAI AND PUERTO RICO.

It seems that Hawaii is to fare far better at the hands of the American Congress than poor, starved Puerto Rico. It would probably take a ponderous statesman from New York, or a profound expounder of the Constitution from Pennsylvania, or an Athenian lawyer from Ohio to tell why this should be. The Committee on Territories has tried to do its "plain duty" in this matter, guided by the injunctions of the Constitution and the promptings of the sense of justice, honor, and right. No tariff customs are to be imposed on products coming from Hawaii into this country or on products going from this country into Hawaii.

There will be free trade. It is unfortunate for the Puerto Ricans that the matter of legislating for them was not referred to the Committee on Territories. I can only say to the members of this House that I can safely count a majority of our committee in favor of free trade with Puerto Rico, and the others, I believe, are open to conviction without any sugar-coated, tobacco-steeped, or rum-soaked influence. [Applause.]

Had the legislation for Puerto Rico been intrusted to the Committee on Territories, no doubt the Republican party would have been saved from the sorry predicament that it is now in. The President's recommendations as to our plain duty would have been more readily accepted by the House, and we could be spared from the humiliating position in which he is now placed. How distressing it must be to him to be misrepresented by his friends! How harassing it must be to him to note the contradictions of those who profess to speak for him!

An article in the Washington Star of March 37, a consistent and ardent Administration paper, speaks thus editorially:

"The President has, in his annual message, made recommendation to Congress, and that calls for legislation. The people expect and demand legislation. If, therefore, Congress shows itself incapable of action, what is more likely to ensue? A new Administration will be soon formed, and the House of next year will be disposed to do what the country manifestly wants done. As this crisis approaches, the responsibility that now embarrasses the situation in the Senate, the alternative naturally is a Democratic Congress. Are the Republicans maneuvering to lose the next House? Are the Democrats maneuvering to lose the White House? The President is committed to free trade with Puerto Rico. His message was intrusted to the Committee on Territories, of which he is a member and that, after a visit to the White House, has said this thing and that, going to show that the President has changed his mind, but the message is collected and the committee is still willing to vote for free trade. In the campaign, he will have to succeed himself in the White House. The House is evenly divided. The White House is in the hands of a man and that, after a visit to the White House, has said this thing and that, going to show that the President has changed his mind, but the message is collected and the committee is still willing to vote for free trade. The White House is in the hands of a man and that, after a visit to the White House, has said this thing and that, going to show that the President has changed his mind, but the message is collected and the committee is still willing to vote for free trade."

Mr. MCALEER. I yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. DE ARMOND).

Mr. DE ARMOND. Mr. Chairman, there are a few features of this bill to which I desire to call the attention of the House. One is the concluding section with relation to the Chinese now in Hawaii. It provides:

"The laws of the Hawaiian Islands when this act takes effect may within one year thereafter obtain certificates of residence as required by an act to prohibit the coming of Chinese persons into the United States," approved May 22, 1882, and an act to amend an act entitled "An act to prohibit the coming of Chinese persons into the United States," approved May 22, 1882. The act to amend said act shall not be deemed to be unlawful in the United States if found therein without such certificates.

Everyone is aware, I suppose, that the Hawaiian Islands are filled with thousands of people of Chinese extraction and that the number of people of that race were there when those islands came under the dominion of the United States, and that great hordes of Asiatics have been imported since.

All are also aware, I suppose, that after a few short years since Chinese immigration shook this country, and especially the Pacific slope, over the menace of Chinese cheap labor, and that it was thought necessary that legislation, extremely drastic and denounced by some as uncivilized and cruel, should be reenacted in order to deal with the Chinese problem and exclude the competition that threatened our white domestic labor.