

in Hawaii just as I had stood for it in Mississippi, and I will. The gentleman speaks of restricted suffrage, as if restricted suffrage were dishonest or unfair suffrage. He knows better. There is nobody in the United States that ought to know better than a Connecticut man about that. I do not know of a better State government in the Union to-day than that of Connecticut, with the possible exception of that of the State of Mississippi, speaking politically, and yet in the State of Connecticut the town of New Haven and other cities are represented in the State legislature, under old antediluvian charters of the kings of England, by a few representatives, and many superannuated villages are represented by two or three times as many representatives.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, why? The gentleman speaks of restricted suffrage and I speak of restricted representation, and the two things go together.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman pardon me a moment? I spoke of unrestricted representation and a restriction of votes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am speaking of that, too, and Connecticut is with unrestricted representation upon this floor, with a restricted representation in the State of Connecticut of your cities compared with your rural districts. And, by the way, that you are right in having it just as you have it I do not dispute. It is your affair, and I have nothing to do with it, and I am not quarreling with it.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman allow me to correct him?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. We have no restricted suffrage in Connecticut.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am speaking of restricted representation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. KNOX. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended, and that he be given such time as he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks that the time of the gentleman from Mississippi be extended without limit. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman has misunderstood me.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. There is no restriction as to that. Every qualified voter may cast a vote for Representatives in Congress, for State officers, and members of the general assembly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand you think I have said restricted suffrage. I meant restricted representation.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. We have unrestricted representation and we have unrestricted suffrage. Our system of representation in our State legislature is two hundred and fifty years old. We elect our Representatives in Congress by an unrestricted suffrage.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I know it is over two hundred years old.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. But everybody votes. There is no disqualification except for crime.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand the gentleman from Connecticut. But there is also in Connecticut, if I have learned its system right, an educational qualification.

Mr. Chairman, in expressing myself if I used the phrase "restricted suffrage" with regard to Connecticut, I meant to use the phrase "restricted representation." What I meant to say was that "restricted representation" is essentially the same as "restricted suffrage," and unequal representation is essentially the same thing as unequal suffrage.

Now, we might just as well be honest with one another, my friends, upon both sides of this House. Let us lay aside for a moment the fact that I am a Democrat and you are Republicans, and let us talk as men who have had forced upon us, and also in your case forced upon yourselves by your own action, a problem which we must solve, and which we must solve as wise men, as statesmen, as men with some view to the future, as men with common sense, and not merely as Republicans and as Democrats.

Now, taking that view of it, I am prepared to say that the very worst thing that can happen to the Hawaiian Islands to-day or to-morrow would be to have Kanaka rule or colored-race rule in Hawaii. I speak advisedly, not only with my own personal observation and experience, but with all history behind me. Now, then, how are you going to avoid it? You must avoid it by restricted suffrage.

I am not talking to you as Republicans or Democrats. And what sort of restricted suffrage must you have? Something which, while it is not based upon an express discrimination on account of race or color, is based upon something which actually discriminates against color and race. Else you must have Kanaka rule. Take your choice. For my part I have taken mine long since. I asked you, in God's name, to relieve me, as one of the

representatives of the American people, of this additional problem; but you annexed Hawaii.

Do you imagine that I do not recognize that the symmetry, the rounded proportions of a Democratic system are marred by the necessity of a restricted or qualified suffrage, even though the end and purpose, the aim and object, be the preservation of civilization itself? No wonder California did not want Hawaii as a county in California and part of it. Why? Because California has had some little experience with race problems, too.

Soon after I came to the Congress of the United States I said to the Representatives of California and the Pacific slope, from my place upon this floor, that I was willing to leave to the white people of the Pacific slope the business of attending to their Chinese race problem, and was willing to vote with them with that aim in any measure they desired enacted here—believing that, while they had the strength of a giant, they would not be brutish or foolish enough to use it like a giant; and that I arrogated to myself and my own people the claim that, when faced with a problem of the same kind, we would not use the power intrusted by circumstances to us with the force of brutish giants.

I say now, as I said then, that it is the duty of the white race everywhere to lift up those below them so far as they can, but that there is no injunction in sacred or in human law calling upon me or calling upon you to "herd with narrow foreheads, ignorant of our race's gains." They will progress as time passes, and so will we; and as we mount one rung higher on the ladder of civilization we will hold our hands down to them and raise them to the rung next below. I have no idea on my own part that they will ever be on the same rung; and I have no hypocrisy about it.

Now, then, having taken the position that there must be restricted suffrage in Hawaii, I come to the question of whether representation ought to be restricted. It ought not. Why, it is bad enough to be compelled by the exigencies of the situation to deprive the people there of an equal partnership in the destinies of their own country. For remember that it is not a problem of governing a white man's country with white supremacy, as it is here, but there you have carried yourselves over to a colored man's country. You have superimposed yourselves there until as a matter of necessity you must now govern them in accordance with your ideas, and your ideas are those of Caucasian civilization.

It is bad enough to be compelled by the exigency of the situation, I say, to restrict the suffrage. It would be absolutely mean to deprive them of a representation, merely by speech in your presence; to refuse even the poor right of petition to somebody standing here speaking for these people, saying, as such an one will have the right to say, "I represent not only the white people of Hawaii, but I represent Hawaii. I know the conditions of whites and Kanakas alike and have authority of knowledge to call your attention to them."

Why, does the gentleman imagine that because New Haven has not a proper representation in the Connecticut legislature that therefore New Haven ought to have no representation in the Connecticut legislature at all?

Mr. HILL. I will answer the gentleman that he fails to comprehend the state of representation in the State of Connecticut.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. How many representatives has the city of New Haven?

Mr. HILL. We have two representatives. The senate is the popular body in the State of Connecticut, and the house of representatives is the representation of towns. It is precisely the reverse of the Congress of the United States, and when the gentleman makes the statement that there is no popular body in the general assembly in the State of Connecticut, he states that which gives a false impression; and I will say further, that if there are any inequalities in the popular body it is due to Democratic legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I have not made the statement that there is no popular body in your general assembly, but I do state that your general assembly as a whole is not a body of either popular or equal representation. I am not quarreling with the fact that Connecticut manages her own affairs to suit herself. I think as a rule she has managed them wisely and well. I differ with the gentleman in politics, but I do believe that Connecticut has had one of the most honest and one of the most incorrupt State governments in the nation, mainly owing to the fact, perhaps, that her rural vote and country gentlemen have dominated her politics.

Understand me, I am not quarreling about that, but I am merely illustrating the idea that you, of all men, can not stand upon this floor and contend for the idea that the people ought to have no representation, because you are unwilling to give your own people equal representation.

Mr. SPERRY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPERRY. Mr. Chairman, as my distinguished friend from