

of \$1,000 or the receipt of an income of \$600 for the year preceding registration. This requirement of property ownership is somewhat less than that of the constitution of the republic of Hawaii, which, by article 76, is made the ownership of real estate, above incumbrances, of the value of \$1,500, or of personal property of the value of \$3,000 above incumbrances, or the receipt of a money income of \$600 for the year preceding registration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAPRON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island asks that the time of the gentleman from Connecticut be extended for ten minutes? Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. HILL. I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman believe in taxation without representation?

Mr. HILL. There are 100,000 people in the Hawaiian Islands; there are 300,000 in the District of Columbia that are taxed without representation. There are 100,000 in the Territory of Alaska to-day that are taxed without representation.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. But does the gentleman believe in that principle?

Mr. HILL. I believe the best government on earth to-day is that of the city of Washington in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. But does the gentleman believe in the principle of taxation without representation?

Mr. DRIGGS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HILL. I have but ten minutes. The people of Hawaii do not ask for this. They ask for a restricted suffrage and wish to be controlled and governed by the educated and intelligent portion of the people of the islands of Hawaii.

The report further says:

The question of a property qualification of any kind for a voter or member of the senate is an important one and is calculated to excite antagonism in the United States, but such a qualification has long prevailed in Hawaii, and, as far as can be ascertained, meets the approval of the people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what else did we do? After annexing Hawaii we sent an able and distinguished commission to those islands. They went there and examined the conditions, a commission of which the gentleman the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs was a member, and came back and reported in favor of this restricted suffrage, by which the Caucasian race should have and continue in the unrestricted control of those islands. This committee has utterly ignored the recommendation of that commission which we sent to investigate the matter. That is not all; that restriction was so severe that out of 14,000 eligible voters, under the terms of this bill, the republic of Hawaii itself only allowed 2,800 to be registered—less than one-quarter—and it was absolutely necessary that they should do it, or else the Kanaka control would sweep them out of the island. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is not all.

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

Mr. HILL. I can not now; perhaps I will later. Not only did the commission report in favor of this, but this very committee which now brings in this bill brought in a bill last year in favor of a restricted representation.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. And with a property qualification.

Mr. HILL. Yes; with a property qualification; but that is a matter of no importance, because it was not put there for the purpose of a property qualification, but as the best method of preventing the Kanaka control of these islands. It was put there because there was a population there which the gentleman himself [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] likened to the tribes of Africa yesterday, which was unjust, when the question was up on the saloon amendment. It was this Kanaka control that they desired to prevent. Not only did the committees of both Houses last year make this recommendation, but the chairman of that commission, representing the chairman of the committee in the Senate, this year brought in a similar bill, and it was only for the first time since this question has been considered that this committee now brings in a bill sweeping away all restrictions and admitting to suffrage everyone in these islands who can read.

Now, what is the nationality of these people? I want to give it to you. There is a total population of 109,000, according to the census of 1896. There are of voters about 3,000 Americans, Germans, French, and English; about 3,000 Portuguese, and, according to the statement of the gentleman from Michigan, there are 9,000 Kanaka votes, so that according to his own statement on the question of elections the American, German, French, and English voters will be simply buried under a vote of 4 to 1.

The amendment I have offered proposes a commissioner appointed by the governor of the islands, who himself is appointed by the President of the United States, and makes a business proposition of what this bill, as it now stands, makes a political proposition, and it is the political feature of it that I object to.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the people of the United

States are yet ready to take the first step toward statehood for these insular possessions. It may be said that it makes no difference in this respect whether this man is elected by the people of Hawaii or whether he is appointed by the appointee of the President of the United States. The sentiment is there that if you make the islands of Hawaii a full-fledged Territory, but one more step, and that a short one, is necessary to be taken under the political exigencies that might arise with either party, Republican or Democratic, that would thereby get control and help to maintain control of the United States Senate, if this island and Puerto Rico should be swept in as States in the Union. I for one am utterly opposed to taking the first step until we have more and better knowledge as to the characteristics and the peculiar traits and the capacity of these people than we possess to-day.

Now, am I right about that? I want to call attention for just a moment to the report made by this committee last year. It was not a unanimous report; the report this year is unanimous. Now, why was it not unanimous last year? Because the Democratic members on that committee said last year:

We can not agree to the majority report of the committee for the reason that it indicates an intention on their part to make a new departure from our well-established custom of governing Territories. We believe that the newly acquired Territories should be governed as other Territories of the United States have been governed from the foundation of our Government, with a view that they may be ultimately admitted into the Union of States.

This year that objection is all swept away; Democrats and Republicans alike on that committee come up here and ask for the admission of Hawaii as a Territory of this Union.

Gentlemen, I want you to recall an incident which occurred here in this Chamber yesterday afternoon. To the proposition granting unrestricted suffrage to the Kanakas and the foreigners in Hawaii no opposition was made on the other side of the House; but the moment the question of the qualifications of voters comes up, the Mississippi plan, the plan of the Southern States, of restricting votes under an unrestricted representation, is again endeavored to be fastened upon this bill.

That is the proposition. I did not vote with my friend from Mississippi. I do not criticise his action. I did not so vote, because I would not attempt by a device to take away that which I was willing to grant by law. I would not vote for unrestricted, uneducated, unintelligent suffrage and then attempt to take it away by a device. I refused on that ground to vote for the proposition. I have no criticism to make upon the action of other gentlemen.

I refused on the same ground to vote for the proposition of the committee. I have no criticism to make upon the action of the gentlemen on the other side of the House. Perhaps I would do as they do, if I were in similar circumstances. I am not prepared to discuss that question; but as a New Englander who believes in a fair suffrage, an honest suffrage, an intelligent suffrage, I stand here now to say that neither in Puerto Rico, nor in the Philippines, nor in Hawaii, nor anywhere else, will I vote to put a Representative upon the floor of this House who is not elected by a constituency that knows what it is doing. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HILL. I will take further time on the other amendment.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, the section giving Hawaii a Delegate in Congress, which is objected to, is one for the insertion of which in the bill reported by the commission I am in part responsible, as I was the sole person on the Hawaiian commission representing or in any way related to the House of Representatives. I asked on behalf of the House, as I believed its interests and the interests of Hawaii required that such a provision be inserted. The country we were providing for was of enormous wealth, of great energy, of contending interests, for which Congress would have to legislate.

I desired that in the case of this Territory, as in all instances that have preceded, we should have upon the floor of this House a representative man who was responsible, a man who could speak for those people, who could be questioned at any instant on aught that concerned them, a man who could be held accountable by the House, and who, if he stated aught that his constituents disapproved, could be visited by the reprobation of his own constituency—that public scorn which is the most dreaded punishment of public men. If Hawaii is denied a Delegate on the floor, we are certain to have here instead abundant delegates in the lobby, paid by private interests in that Territory to secure favors in legislation, as we have often seen in our experience here in other matters. [Applause.]

Mr. HILL. I should like to ask the gentleman a question at his convenience.

Mr. HITT. I have only five minutes, and then I will yield the floor to anyone else who wants to talk.

Mr. HILL. I will seek an opportunity to ask my question before the gentleman sits down.

Mr. HITT. We know that when a person is here representing special interests he is selected for experience, ability, adroitness,