Mr. KNOX. Section 29 has reference to the registration, and reads as follows:

For the purpose of examining applicants for registration as voters and determining their eligibility, there shall be five boards of registration, one for the county of Oahu, one for the county of Maui, one for the county of Kauai, one for the county of Hawaii, one for the county of Molokai, and one for the county of Lanai; one for the county of Oahu, and one for the island of Kauai and Nihoa.

I trust I make myself intelligible. [Laughter.]

Then follows this language:

Such boards shall consist of three members each, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, to serve for the President of the United States, no one of whom shall be a member of the same political party. I take it for granted that we are going to have politics there, just as we have in the various States and Territories of our Union.

Yesterday we had a very learned discussion here, and my friend from Iowa—I am sorry I do not see him in his seat at present, perhaps he is listening to me, however—my friend from Iowa insisted that in no State or country subject to the jurisdiction of the United States would he ever consent that there should be a board with powers such as are conferred upon this board. He said that all the boards shall be nonpartisan. All three members may be of the same political party. I take it for granted that we are going to have politics there, just as we have in the various States and Territories of our Union.

I call attention to this provision in a nonpartisan spirit. I think it ought to be amended and that representation on the board ought to be accorded to both of the great political parties. I submit this consideration to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KNOX. I agree fully that all registration boards and all boards in charge of the conduct of elections ought to be nonpartisan; each party should be represented. Under the old provision these registrars were appointed with the consent of the Hawaiian government and the choice. The trouble about any amendment to this provision now is that there are no political parties in Hawaii, so far as I know.

Mr. RICHARDSON. How long does the gentleman think that state of felicity will continue?

Mr. KNOX. If you are going to organize a Democratic party there, I have no objection to electing such a provision. We have no Republicans there yet, so far as I know.

Mr. RICHARDSON. We are not legislating for to-day merely; we are legislating perhaps for a long period. It has occurred to me that this board ought to embrace not more than two members of each political party. I do not know that there is going to be a Republican party or a Democratic party out there; I am not saying that. But in the interest of good legislation and fair elections, this board ought to be nonpartisan.

Mr. KNOX. If the gentleman will use his distinguished ability to crystallize a demand to carry out your view, we on this side will support it unanimously.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOREING obtained the floor.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope the gentleman from Iowa will offer an amendment.

Mr. LACEY. That is just what I am going to do. I desire to offer an amendment to line 23, to insert after the word "each."—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BORING] has been recognized.

Mr. BORING. Mr. Chairman, I very heartily agree with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON]. I am very glad to know that he is so thoughtful and so fair-minded. I trust we shall incorporate his view into this law, and that it may be lived up to, and may be a precedent for the future.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will offer an amendment, unless the gentleman from Iowa amends it.

Mr. LACEY. I desire to offer this amendment: To insert, after the word "each," in line 12, page 75, the words "not more than two of whom shall be of the same political party."

The amendment of Mr. Lacey was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I desire to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KNOX] whether, if there is any reason for designating the sheriff as "high sheriff," my conference with the people there over resulted in the belief that there is no reason for this designation, even though it is "English, you know."

Mr. KNOX. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana that so far as the words are concerned there is no reason for designating the sheriff as "high sheriff," but in Hawaii the custom has prevailed of having the head executive officer of each island called the sheriff, and in order to make a distinction we have called the principal officer the high sheriff.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I understand they have never had an officer designated as "high sheriff" heretofore. The designation has been "marshal."