

inhabitants of Porto Rico and the whites and the negro population of the South and of the Italians and Portuguese can not be promoted if the large holdings of land are to be continued.

It is, perhaps, essential that these large holdings should be permitted for the purpose of development, that is to say, it may be a wise thing to permit a corporation to hold a large tract of land with a view to its development by irrigation works and the construction of a sugar factory and the construction of a railway system for transportation, but when this is accomplished the policy of the State should be to compel the partitioning of this area into convenient tracts, with water rights attached; the waterworks, the sugar factory, and the railroad to be charged with a public use and their rates regulated by law, either through a commissioner or the courts. Such enterprises are to-day conducted all through the arid West and in California. Large areas of land are taken up, irrigation works constructed, and when completed the lands are divided into small tracts of from 20 to 40 acres, with water rights attached, and the land sold to small holders whose rights to the water are protected by law. Such a system could be inaugurated in Hawaii, but it must be compulsory, for the profits of sugar production are so large there as to appeal to the selfishness of monopolies and trusts.

The question is, how can this be done without violently wrenching the business as now conducted? No one, of course, wishes to accomplish reform at the expense of a temporary industrial readjustment which will bring distress or loss to that community, and it is for this reason that I have urged throughout, in the consideration of this bill, amendments which would call the attention both of the governing body in Hawaii and the governing body here to the desired reforms, and which would result in the collection of accurate statistical information that would be a guide to future action both there and here. I have been as anxious that the intelligent thought of Hawaii should be stimulated to action upon this matter as well as our own, for the reason that I fear when this organic act is passed our attention will be so much absorbed in other questions of domestic and foreign relations that the Hawaiian Islands will drift from our consideration, and I wish to plant the seed of an agitation there which will make itself felt in local legislation, and, if necessary, in such a movement as will compel attention at the Capitol of the nation.

The tendency of human nature is to apply remedial legislation rather than to engage in preventive legislation. Whilst preventive legislation may be easier, yet indolence prompts us to wait till abuses cry aloud for a remedy. We are all more likely to take this view as to the questions now under consideration because we have never yet ourselves experienced the evils of land monopoly. We have here a population of 70,000,000 people in a country capable of sustaining 400,000,000. There has been as yet no congestion of population. Land has been the one thing of which we have had a superabundance; but this is not true of Hawaii, Porto Rico, or Luzon, and history tells us that the centralization of land ownership has been the fruitful cause of most disastrous wars and prolonged and violent agitations. We can rest assured that all the disturbances which history accredit to a system of land monopoly will be felt in Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Luzon when the advantages of our extended markets advance the value of the sugar lands in those islands to a point where they will arouse the greed of the trusts and syndicates. History teaches us that unless restrained by law these great monopolies will accommodate themselves to any system of degraded labor which will advance the profits of the land.

Turning for a moment from this general view of the subject, I wish to state that the amendments which I have offered were prepared upon the floor of the House whilst the bill was under consideration. I do not claim that they are as perfect as they might be. I have had no time to go into the details of this question, absorbed as I have been by the questions which have been before the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member; but my purpose has been to insert in this bill certain amendments which can be made the basis of thoughtful consideration by the conferees of the Senate and the House when this bill goes before them, and which can be there shaped in more scientific terms. Now, what are the amendments which I have offered, both successful and unsuccessful?

First. In that provision of the organic act of Hawaii which provides for the organization of corporations by the legislature of Hawaii, I offered an amendment that no corporation, domestic or foreign, should in the future acquire and hold real estate in excess of 1,000 acres. That amendment was carried. I do not pretend that that amendment will reach the entire difficulty to which I have alluded. It will, however, go to the conferees and opportunity be given to shape it in such a way as will gradually and progressively diminish the evils of land monopoly. For instance, they might amend this by providing that corporations could acquire larger areas than 1,000 acres, and could develop irrigation works upon them, construct a factory, and build a railroad, but that when the entire enterprise was completed they should sell the lands so acquired in small holdings at the rate of not less than one-twentieth

or one-tenth of the total every year; the factory, the irrigation works, and the railroad being held and retained by the corporation or its assignees as a public use, with charges regulated by law, so that the ownership of this public use could not be used in such a way as to oppress the land and transfer its value to the owners of the public use. They might also compel the gradual division and sale of existing holdings, or, if the conferees were indisposed to map out any definite system, they could provide the appointment of a commission whose duty it would be to inquire into the condition of land holdings in Hawaii and to report to Congress a method for gradually rectifying its abuses.

Another amendment which I offered was one defining the duties of the surveyor-general of Hawaii and providing that he should report annually to the Department of Labor of the United States and to the governor of Hawaii and the legislature the owners of all holdings not less than 100 acres in extent, by whom owned, the character of the cultivation, the number of laborers employed on each holding, their nationality, the wages paid, and such other information as the Department of Labor might prescribe. This amendment was adopted by the House. It simply provides for the statistical information which will enable the legislature, of Hawaii and the Congress of the United States to act.

I also offered an amendment declaring it to be the purpose of the United States to promote the increase of white labor in Hawaii, and to discourage the employment of Asiatics, and enacting that every corporation employing labor in Hawaii should, within one year, employ at least one-tenth of its laborers from citizens of the United States, citizens of the Territory of Hawaii, and other white persons, and that such corporations should increase the number of such laborers one-tenth annually, until at least three-fourths of their laborers should be citizens of the United States, citizens of the Territory of Hawaii, or other white persons. It was the purpose of this amendment to control the question of labor by reason of the unquestioned power of the State over corporations, for, as I have already stated, almost the entire agricultural business of these islands is done by corporations. It provided that gradually they should employ laborers other than Asiatics and spread the gradual increase of such labor over such a long period of time as would create no inconvenience to employers.

It opened up the entire labor employment of corporations to the Kanakas who are now there, the Portuguese and Italians who are now there, and other white persons who are now there, to white immigrants from any country who may land there in the future, and to citizens of the United States, which would include both whites and negroes, and which would also include the people of Porto Rico, from which overcrowded island it should be our policy to transfer a part of the congested labor. I regret to say that this amendment was lost, notwithstanding my statement that I presented it in order that it might form the basis of consideration and action by the conferees, who could enlarge it or contract it or modify it and whose judgment would finally be submitted to both the Senate and the House. It worked no injury whatever to the existing Asiatic labor there, for it must be recollected that the population of these islands must be steadily increased, and it is entirely probable that the Asiatic labor now employed there, and displaced by the gradual system which the amendment provides for, would be absorbed by new enterprises, such as rice plantations, etc., or in domestic labor, or would be glad to return to their homes with their accumulations, as most of them do. But unfortunately this amendment was defeated.

I also offered an amendment providing that there should be a commissioner of labor who should be appointed by the President of the United States and whose duties were identical with those of the various commissioners now provided for by the intelligent legislatures of the various States of the Union. It was made his duty to acquire and diffuse among the people of Hawaii useful information on the subject of labor, and especially upon its relation to capital, the hours of labor, the earnings of the laboring men and women, and the means to promote their social, intellectual, and moral prosperity. It was made his duty to make annual reports to the legislature of Hawaii and also to the United States Department of Labor. He was charged with the duty of investigating the causes and facts relating to all controversies and disputes between employer and employee and to report thereon both to the Hawaiian government and our own. He was to require such statements as might be prescribed by the United States Department of Labor from all the employers of labor. This provision, moderate yet full and ample and molded upon the best legislation in this country, was, to my great surprise, lost.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I have presented to the committee the amendment which has just been read regarding a commissioner of labor. It is not as full and complete as the one that I desired. It was drawn hastily by the Commissioner of Labor, with whom I communicated by telephone. I am inclined to think that he would have made it fuller in its details if I had had an opportunity of conversing with him, but I now submit the amendment as presenting the views of Mr. Wright, the Commissioner of Labor of the United States, and ask its adoption.