Anglo-Saxons. Now, the Anglo-Saxons are the people that are responsible for the development of Hawaii. The moment this bill is passed and becomes a law they can be voted down three to one because of these propositions in lieu of material considerations. If the Anglo-Saxons had the entire control, personally I should be willing to leave this proposition with them; but they have not the control, and they can be outvoted by the Hawaiians and Portuguese.

Mr. KNOX. But it is the Anglo-Saxons who do the most of the drinking.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That may be. If the Anglo-Saxons do it, I would prohibit it, as far as they are concerned, in this Territory. I am ready to stand on the proposition that the United States is prepared to declare as its policy that it is against the sale of intoxicating liquors in saloons. With these suggestions I am ready to vote on the amendment.

Mr. FINLEY. The Chairman. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that he may have two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of principle and conviction I would vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina. There are reasons peculiar to the native Hawaiian which, if understood by this House, I believe would cause each and every member here to vote for the amendment. I regret, Mr. Chairman, that I can not go into these reasons or discuss them here. But it is evident that these people are wasting away, the number decreasing; disease has dealt hardly with them, and I believe the best thing the American Congress can do for these people is to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors as a beverage in the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, coming from a State that manufactures a very fine old beverage [laughter], I do not feel that it is necessary in legislating for the Hawaiian Islands that we should limit the use of that product, even to satisfy the fanatical State of Maine, from which we once had a Maine liquor law. My observation is that where you have prohibitory legislation, such as you had in the State of Maine, the liquor is always worse and more of it is drunk than in a State where the people have the right to drink with the authority of law. [Laughter.]

I recall a story told to me in the State of Massachusetts where there was a prohibitory law, and I stepped into a very quiet little place where you could get a drink for 15 cents, but you paid only for a sandwich or an egg; you did not buy the liquor. I went in there for the purpose of satisfying my thirst, and when I got there about to take his drink, I insisted—as it is a Kentucky custom not to allow any man to drink alone—that he drink with me, which he promptly declined, considering that his acquaintance with me was not sufficient to permit him to do so. So he took his egg and I took my egg. Each of us took a drink of whisky, and I found it very wholesome.

Now, if you go into the State of Kentucky, where the moral sentiment of the community is about as good, I presume, as in Maine, especially in the logging country, you are always sure of getting a good glass of whisky, because there is no reason for giving a glass of whisky to any other kind. But when you pass the Ohio River they begin to adulterate it and compound it, and by the time it gets up to Maine it has been adulterated three or four times between the place of production and the place of consumption. That, I presume, is the reason why gentlemen from Maine object to it. [Laughter.]

Now, although the popular idea is that every Kentuckian drinks a good deal of whisky, I will guarantee that the average Kentuckian knows how to control his appetite—knows when to drink and just how much to drink—while farther north you find men inclined to drink and consequently become tipplers.

Now, I do not believe in undertaking in this way to restrict the sale of liquor. And I do not believe that this is the place to adopt any regulation to control the consumption of liquor. This is a legitimate matter which ought to be left to the people themselves of that locality—not regulated by the United States Government.

I do not think the people of Maine or the people of Kentucky ought to dictate to the people of the Hawaiian Islands or the Philippines, or wherever else our dominions may extend—and they seem inclined to go around the world. I do not think it is the duty of Congress to regulate the character of the liquor that people drink, or how much they shall drink or when they shall drink. Why, we have a good many of them that six cans start from my town, carrying a cargo marked "Wiedenhein's Beer," which was being sent across the continent, bound for the Philippines. Sir, we are now shipping the very finest quality of malt liquor to the Philippine Islands and to Hawaii for the benefit of those people. We would be a poor country if we could not do that.

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment, there were—aye 66, noes 57.

Mr. HILL. I call for tellers.

The tellers were ordered, and Mr. KNOX and Mr. Gillett of Massachusetts were tellers and returned—aye 66, noes 60. So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting, after the word "association," in line 23, page 70, the words: "Provided, That no corporation, domestic or foreign, shall acquire or hold real estate in Hawaii in excess of 1,000 acres, and that real estate acquired or held by said corporation shall be subject to the operation of the general law regarding the Territorial Government," as a proviso which limits the real-estate holdings of religious and charitable organizations to a value of $50,000. The House of Representatives under discussion, a House with which the Territorial Government of Hawaii from the operation of the general law regarding the Territories, a provision which limits the real-estate holdings of religious and charitable organizations to a value of $50,000. The House was of the opinion that the conditions in Hawaii do not necessitate the application of the limitations which are expressed its disposition to allow the religious and charitable organizations to extend their good work in that island without limit as to real-estate holdings. But this proposition reaches the vital question whether we shall allow in those islands a system which makes of them a market for all the lands in large holdings either in the hands of individuals or of corporations, the mass of the population being attached to the soil in a semi-servile capacity without right to a foot of land upon which they stand.

This amendment respects vested rights. It does not propose to exclude the religious or charitable organizations from that island at the present time, though those old holdings are large.

The general custom there is to organize a corporation for the purpose of running a sugar plantation. That corporation acquires a large tract of land, introduces extensive irrigation works, and at once takes possession of what was a wild waste, and then sells it to the public. Now, the limitation in this amendment is not too large or too small. The purpose of this amendment is to get the subject-matter into this bill in some form, so that the committee of conference which will perfect the bill later on can take it up, and, having the subject-matter before them, cover it by some corporation, and at the same time it constitutes a limitation, and this will not be too large or too small. The purpose of this amendment is to get the subject-matter into this bill in some form, so that the committee of conference which will perfect the bill later on can take it up, and, having the subject-matter before them, cover it by some corporation, and at the same time it constitutes a limitation. This amendment does not interfere with that corporation. It simply limits the holdings of any corporation to 1,000 acres. I cannot see how any objection to this amendment can be brought. I believe it is a proper and constitutional amendment, and I have no doubt but that this kind of cooperation leads to the economical conduct of that business.

This amendment does not interfere with that cooperation. It simply limits the holdings of any corporation to 1,000 acres. I cannot see how any objection to this amendment can be brought. I believe it is a proper and constitutional amendment, and I have no doubt but that this kind of cooperation leads to the economical conduct of that business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RIDGELY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I was saying that we should extend this legislation further, and provide for a system of reports, through the surveyor-general of the Territory to the Secretary of the Interior, showing the holdings of these lands, by whom held, whether individuals or corporations, the number of acres held,