enforce any contract heretofore or hereafter entered into for personal service or to criminally punish a violation thereof. That is the law.

Mr. MORGAN. The repeal of the statutes on that subject in Hawaii and the introduction of the laws of the United States over the whole case absolutely and make the amendment unnecessary.

Mr. SPOONER. I am speaking of that amendment. I am speaking of the language in which it is couched is a dangerous one to personal rights and private interests there that are legitimate. But I do not care to stop the course of my argument upon this matter to enliven upon that point. I am addressing myself entirely to the question of the justices.

Mr. SPOONER. I beg the Senator's pardon for interrupting him.

Mr. MORGAN. But in regard to the enforcement of the law restricting immigration from China and restricting labor-contract immigration from Japan, there is nothing there to be in the islands of Hawaii a jurisdiction that has unquestionable power to deal with that question. Now, the jurisdiction that is conferred in this bill or the jurisdiction that was conferred in the statute giving the power to the supreme court of the Territory is not adequate to these two questions to which these restrictions are related, and the control of immigration from China, which is prohibited, and all contract-labor immigration from Japan or any other country. The difficulty we have had in restricting Chinese immigration is that it has scattered itself along the whole coast of the United States and has been a thing of not only the boundary with Mexico, and the persons who are prohibited from coming in from China have percolated through these boundary lines, and we have had to exercise a good deal of vigilance and to employ a number of officers in order to check and prevent an influx of Chinese immigration. If the immigrant power—I was about to say arbitrary power, and it would be arbitrary but for the statute in the control of this immigration.

Now, sir, can we have a better protection against these two evils—for they are so declared by the national law—that have to have a part at a point where all the ships coming from the United States are examined by our statutes to deal with this question; and if we have a district court, is it not one that naturally and necessarily is independent of all local influences in Hawaii which might be in favor of the admission of Chinese immigration for the sake of its labor and of labor-contract immigration? And what of the United States where the power of the district court would be more available or more useful or more necessary than in Hawaii for this very purpose?

Now, we take the importation of diseases from the Orient, that is a great pestilence, that is a great evil of all the greatest...in the United States there ought to be an establishment of quarantine in Hawaii subject to the power and control of a Federal court. I do not mean this hastily. I do not mean that it will do very soon. We will find an absolute necessity for a court of this kind at Manila; and with a court of that kind at Honolulu and another one at Manilla and with the district courts that are on the coast above it there, we shall have our coasts remarkably well guarded, so far as the exercise of the jurisdiction of the courts is concerned, and but for that power we would not have them guarded at all.

I will not go over the argument. I made upon this question yesterday, and yet it is an inviting field to me. I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Wisconsin that if the bill in question be passed the United States Supreme Court judges in Hawaii to four years and are willing to assume the expense of the judicial establishment there that they have provided for in the amendments that are proposed, if the Senators will withdraw their objection to this Federal court and let it stand there, I will feel that the people of the United States and its Government have it a part of the line that can be exercised properly and completely by those local courts of four years' tenure in Hawaii. Let us have in that part of the earth of which we are now taking jurisdiction and control a judicial establishment that is in some sense adequate to the wants of this great region. Shall we have supreme or circuit judges in the Territory, with short tenures of office, and have come before them all these great questions of admiralty law and maritime contracts, collisions, and questions about violations of the customs laws and the internal revenue laws? Shall we impose upon those courts, that are now full of business and have all the work they can do, the difficulty of conducting this administration of justice in which the United States as a Government is so conspicuously and immediately concerned? Shall we pack it up upon them and trust to a poor, weak, frail establishment the adjudication of all these great questions which must necessarily arise in Hawaii in consequence of its isolated position?

We are going very far indeed, if, consulting the past, we determine in our own minds that we will not grow or improve or increase it in any direction at all, and if we conclude that a court that is fit for Arizona, in the great American desert, is really fit for Hawaii, out in the bosom of the Pacific Ocean, 2,000 miles from us. Perhaps we can agree about that, but as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, after this subject has been so maturely considered I can not consent to do less than to have the Senate understand the whole field and vote upon it, as far as I am able to inform them, intelligently.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senate is pretty thin. I do not know whether there is a quorum here or not. I doubt if there is, but— Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator can find out by having a call of the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. It is evident the Senate does not desire to vote upon the question to-night, and I am inclined to think we may as well

Mr. MORGAN. I hope the Senator from Illinois will ask for a day to decide this matter. Senators will never be in their seats until a day is appointed.

Mr. CULLOM. I should be very glad to have a day fixed when we can discuss the question. If it is possible to have a day fixed.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is it not appropriate time to fix a day by a unanimous-consent agreement by which all Senators will be bound?

Mr. MORGAN. We have been doing it all the time.

Mr. CULLOM. Would there be any objection to such an arrangement?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be done in the morning, when Senators are all present, so that all Senators may hear and understand the agreement.

Mr. CULLOM. Unless there is a disposition to have an executive session, I will move that the Senate adjourn to tomorrow. We did not get the amendment to the bill, so that I can have it printed and in shape for Senators to examine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). It will be in the form of an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. TILLMAN. No, sir. It is a separate amendment to a separate and distinct part of the bill. I was speaking of the particular part under discussion now. I wish to offer it and get it in shape.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, by unanimous consent the amendment will be received.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to strike out sections 58, 60, 61, and 62 of the bill. It will be the question of an change, and to substitute therefor the provisions of the present constitution of the State of South Carolina as existing under the same article of our State constitution, including the registration laws of our State.

As the subject of the suppression of the colored vote in South Carolina has been brought up into the discussion, and I have nothing to conceal and am ashamed of nothing in connection with it, and in order to give it the widest possible circulation, I ask that the parts that I have marked here, which offer as an amendment, from the constitution of our State and the parts of the bill which I ask to be stricken out shall be published in the Record in the following words:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina desires to have printed a proposed amendment. If there is no objection, the amendment will be printed and lie upon the table for future consideration.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not know if it printed in the Record also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will also be printed in the Record. That is the understanding of the Chair, that Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I hope the Senator will not ask to have them printed in parallel columns, as I do not want to get that practice in the Record. The Senator does not carry with me the amendment.

Mr. CULLOM. Yet I have no objection to the two going in one after the other. Let the provisions of the Hawaiian bill precede the provisions of the South Carolina constitution, and then people can compare them.

The amendment proposed by Mr. TILLMAN is as follows:

Beginning on page 33 of the bill, strike out sections 58, 60, 61, and 62 in the following words:

Sec. 59. That each voter for representatives may cast as many votes as there are representatives to be elected from the representative district in which he is entitled to vote. He may cast them all for one representative, or he may cast them among the several representatives in such manner as he