responsibility for the care of the helpless is perhaps more pressing than in many other communities, and it certainly would seem to be unwise to provide a step that is encumbrance established for such purpose and will result in the expenditure of the means which may be provided for their maintenance.

Mr. McRAE. Just a word.

Mr. MCRAE. I am as much in favor—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] is recognized.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I ask that the gentleman’s time be extended five minutes.

Mr. MCRAE. I am as much in favor—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks the time of the gentleman from Michigan be extended five minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The time of the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCRAE. It will only take a moment to say what I want to say. I am as much in favor of missionary work and charitable institutions as anyone can be. I believe firmly in the Christian religion, but I want it kept separate from governmental affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that he understood that it was the time of the gentleman from Michigan which was extended.

Mr. MCRAE. I understood the gentleman to yield to me.

Mr. HAMILTON. I have no time to yield, as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] is recognized.

Mr. MCRAE. I hope I may be permitted to finish my sentence.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas one minute.

Mr. MCRAE. I thought the gentleman from Michigan had five minutes given to him by the committee and that he yielded to me.

Mr. HAMILTON. Very well. Let the gentleman from Arkansas conclude.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order for gentlemen under the five-minute rule to yield time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. What becomes of my request for unanimous consent that was granted?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the request of the gentleman from Indiana to be that the time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HAMILTON] be extended.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. No; the gentleman from Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the error of the Chair, then. For the purpose of bringing the matter back to its proper place.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from Michigan allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] is now recognized and has the floor.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE].

Mr. MCRAE. I want to state that while I am in favor of religious and charitable institutions, and while I am a firm believer in the Christian religion and all proper missionary work, I do not believe it is right for those who entertain the same opinions to tax those who do not agree with us for the support of such institutions or to exempt large estates held by them to be relieved from all taxes. If you want to teach the people of Hawaii the fundamental principles of government, you must divorce religion and government. Missionaries must understand that their work should be confined to spiritual matters and not to acquiring large estates and hold them free of taxes for the support of the Government.

The statement of the gentleman from Michigan shows large accumulations of money, running up into the millions already. The complaint that is made to-day is against the questionable methods of some missionaries who went to the country for the alleged purpose of benefiting them spiritually, but who took advantage of their ignorance to get title to their lands. Many of those people claim that they have been robbed of their land, treated by alleged missionaries, and now you propose to exempt the estates thus acquired from taxes and thus enable these people to accumulate great fortunes without any limitation. If they own more property than is absolutely necessary for use as churches and charitable institutions, no excess should be taxed; but such concern could not own more.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] in his amendment, the purpose of which, as I understand it, is to prevent these charitable and religious institutions from accumulating large fortunes in the excess of the sum of $80,000. That limitation is the one which is now contained in the general law of the United States regarding Territories, which this Territorial act seeks to repeal so far as Hawaii is concerned.

Mr. SNODGRASS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Let me finish this sentence, please.

Section 1890 of the Revised Statutes provides that existing vested rights in real estate shall not be impaired by the provisions of this act.

Mr. HIIT. At what date was that act passed?

Mr. NEWLANDS. It is section 1890 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. HIIT. That applies to institutions in existence the day that the act was approved.

Mr. SNODGRASS. I should like to ask the gentleman upon what principle vested rights are protected unless the Constitution is there? If we have absolute power to act and legislate for these islands, what principle protects vested rights?

Mr. NEWLANDS. So far as I am concerned, I am not one of those who believe in the theory that the Constitution does not apply to the Territory of Hawaii.

Whether it applies or not, I imagine that the disposition of Congress would be to protect vested rights; and if, as the gentleman supposes, [Mr. MCRAE] intimates, only those vested rights existing at the time of the enactment of this section 1890 of the Revised Statutes are recognized, we can certainly insert a provision in this bill which will recognize vested rights now existing.

Mr. KNOX. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. NEWLANDS. What I do wish to reach—I have only a few minutes, and then I will answer questions—what I do wish to meet is the tendency toward land monopoly in these new possessions on the poorer third. That it was sought to meet it with reference to Hawaii, we ought to meet it with reference to Puerto Rico, and if we are ever called upon to legislate in regard to the Philippines we ought to meet it with reference to those islands at the very threshold of legislation. The Insurrection in the Philippine Islands was caused by the fact that there was so much protest against the United States as it is against a system of land monopoly which has grown up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KNOX. Now, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. NEWLANDS. Does the United States maintain a system of land monopoly that has grown up in the Philippine Islands, of which the religious organizations of those islands are the beneficiaries. Now, that is a question as old as time; and if we look at the economic causes of most of the wars that have visited the world, we will find at the bottom of almost every war a protest against the monopoly of land. It led to the French Revolution. The land of France prior to the revolution was held one-third by the nobility, one-third by the church, and the other, and the poorer third, was held by the masses of the people, and was owned of the people, and was owned by the people. That is the revolution of blood and carnage of destruction. Puerto Rico to-day is one of the most thickly inhabited islands in the world—a million of people occupying an island 100 miles long and 40 miles wide.

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman is here talking of an island that is relatively small; but freer trade with the United States and the commercial advantage gained by access to our markets will give a great advance to the value of those lands, and we will see a gradual centralization and concentration of ownership in the hands of a few, who will build up a system that will be as objectionable as that which we have in the United States. We will have 900,000 or a million people on those islands without a foot of land which they can call their own, all of them serfs attached to the soil, subject to the control of the landlords.

The reason why the war in the Philippines is being waged to-day is that vast tracts of land are held by the religious organizations of Luzon, in whose hands they have been gradually concentrated, and the Filipinos, though devoted to the church, have been in repeated revolts against this system and have demanded its reform. They are at war with the church, and we are to take upon us a war largely the same. The Government will maintain and protect this monopoly, and their resistance would be greatly diminished and the islands would be speedily pacified if an assurance were to-day given that efforts would be made to relax that land monopoly. The mission property is not being assessed to the owners, being assured, by issuing bonds at a low rate of interest and for a long period of time for their payment, the lands to be thrown open to the Filipinos in small tracts, to be paid for on long time and at low rates of interest. This is the economic cause of this insurrection. It is not a religious cause; it is not a question of legislation here, conditions of land monopoly that exist there by wise action regarding it.

Now, so far as the Hawaiian Islands are concerned, the tendency there is toward land monopoly. The tendency always is to employ in these semitropical countries either slave labor or