The decisions rendered in the cases of Peacock & Co. vs. Republic of Hawaii (ante, page 27), Republic of Hawaii vs. Edwards (ante, page —), and Hawaiian Star Newspaper vs. Saylor (ante, page —) apply to these cases and practically dispose of them.

The fundamental question raised in the case of the United States above cited is not in force here during the present transition period. Hawaiian law should be extended to the personal effects and the personal property of vessels in the name of the republic of Hawaii, under section 3, article 92, constitution of the republic of Hawaii, which provides that "all civil and criminal proceedings arising out of actions or omissions committed during the course of the execution of the duties of the public prosecutor," affirmed in the Honoulo Sugar Company vs. Saikawa and Zelich cases, decided 1886.

The appeals are dismissed and judgments affirmed.

Kioke, Ballon & McClanahan for plaintiff.

Hitchcock, Flood & Shaughnessy for defendants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Carter in the chair). The question is one of agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Pettigrew].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I have an amendment which I send to the desk to take the place of section 100. It gives the names of a certain number of vessels which have been licensed in the name of the section in general terms as it is in the bill. The friends of the amendment are very anxious that it shall be adopted, and I understand that the Committee on Commerce or several members of it have made the same request. I ask that it be read. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

In lieu of section 100 it is proposed to insert the following:

That all vessels carrying Hawaiian registers, permanent or temporary, on August 12, 1888, together with the following-named vessels claiming Hawaiian registry, Star of Bengal, Queen of Hawaii, South of Cape, The Winito and Star of Bengal, be entitled to register as American vessels, with the benefits and privileges appertaining thereto.

Mr. CULLOM. Those are all the vessels, I understand, and it is desired that they shall be named so that there shall be no question about the amendment.

Mr. BACON. I hope the Senator from Illinois will explain in what particular, if any, this varies the general law.

Mr. CULLOM. It does not vary from the general bill, except—

Mr. BACON. I am not speaking about the bill. I am speaking about the general law, the present law.

Mr. CULLOM. The general law, of course, requires that the vessels shall be built in the United States or a certain proportion of the value shall have been put on in the United States. But these vessels are now in Hawaiian waters or on the Pacific coast, and are already within the jurisdiction of the Hawaiian government, and are now under Hawaiian register, and a great many Americans are interested in them. It simply recognizes the registration that they are under there now, under the Hawaiian government.

Mr. BACON. That is the point I desire to have elucidated.

Mr. BACON. They are engaged in the same trade.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Is not this the fact about it, that the section provides that all vessels having Hawaiian registers on the 12th day of August, 1888, shall be admitted, but those vessels having attempted to register since the 12th day of August, 1888, have been refused, although they are in exactly the same condition as to ownership as to the other vessels which are admitted before that time?

Mr. CULLOM. I understand each of these five vessels is under Hawaiian register now. I get that information from the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Nelson] who is on the Committee on Commerce, and I think the list was submitted to the chairman of the Committee on Commerce and consented to by him.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me for a moment, I desire to know why these vessels do not come under the general designation which is employed in the bill and why they have to be specifically named, while vessels under Hawaiian registration, and are now under Hawaiian government, and a great many Americans are interested in them.
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