Mr. FINLEY. I think that is why the sugar and tobacco trusts are in favor of the Porto Rican bill. I take it that the trusts reasonably suppose that by proper effort on their part during the continuance of the tariff that the trade of Porto Rico will be hampered by the iniquitous and unlawful burden imposed upon her by the sugar and tobacco trusts, or the States of Pennsylvania and California. If the tariff continues, so, and they will be enabled to obtain possession of the greater part, and then they will be most anxious for Congress to treat Porto Rico as we propose to treat the Hawaiian Islands in the bill under discussion.

Mr. STOKES. A pretty good deduction.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think that we are treating the Hawaiian Islands as we should treat them in this bill, as I understand the Constitution of the United States and as I believe its meaning. The bill before the House extends the Constitution of the United States over the Hawaiian Islands. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with this argument. In my judgment, the Constitution extends its provisions over territories by an act of Congress, for the reason that under all territory of the United States the Constitution extends by its own force, and any act of Congress for this purpose is a nullity.

Mr. Chairman, in admitting the products of Hawaii to our ports, without taxation or any discrimination whatever, we oblige Congress and the States to extend the Constitution over the Hawaiian Islands. In every respect they treat the Hawaiian Islands as do the other territories of the United States.

Why this discrimination? Why treat the island of Porto Rico differently to the way we treat and deal with the Hawaiian Islands? If one is a part of the United States and under its jurisdiction, is not the other? Both are entitled to all the benefits, privileges, and immunities conferred by the Constitution of the United States upon any citizen. In the matter of impost duties or taxation the products of the Porto Rican island must be treated the same in all respects as we treat the products of Pennsylvania or California.

Mr. Chairman, in a few words I will give my opinion as to why the Hawaiian Islands have been treated as a part of the United States and why Porto Rico has been treated as a foreign territory. In my judgment, the Constitution of the United States guarantees to the people of the Hawaiian Islands the privilege to come into our ports, because Porto Rico is a part of our territory.

As to the second proposition, in my opinion no good, but only harm, can result to the Porto Ricans from the imposition of this tax.

As to the third proposition, I think it amounts to jesting with a serious question. If this is true, would it not be equally a blow at the trusts to impose a tax upon the products of the Hawaiian Islands coming into the United States? Why, if it is necessary in dealing with Porto Rico, to impose a tax upon our products in order to strike a blow at the trusts, is the necessity and the argument not equally as strong in the case of Hawaii? If it is necessary to strike a blow at the trusts in one case, it is in the other.

Mr. Myrick. I have no fault to find with the Constitution of the United States. I do not know any reasons for the imposition of a tax upon the products of Porto Rico.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, the reason is that in the Hawaiian Islands the greater part of all that is valuable and productive to any great or considerable extent, including the land and from the results of labor, are held in absolute dominion by the Porto Rican Government.

Mr. Myrick would never have been heard of in connection with Porto Rican legislation.

Mr. STOKES. Will it disturb the gentleman to interpose a question?

Mr. FINLEY. Not at all.

Mr. STOKES. Do I understand you to imply that that probably is the reason why the tariff was imposed upon the products of Porto Rico?