taxes which we pay here in the States; and we put that in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, it will not be one year's time, if this Territory is admitted, before we shall be told by the people of Hawaii that it is not fair to appropriate the customs duties and all the internal-revenue taxes which are collected by us, and put into our own Treasury, and make them pay all, or practically all, of the expenses of running the government.

Mr. CLARK of Wisconsin. Will the Senator from Connecticut allow me to ask him a question, Senator?

Mr. ATTICUS. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wisconsin. Would not that be a just contention, in the view of the Senator?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I do not see upon what principle we propose to take the people of Hawaii tax themselves, and pay them for the support of the government which we give them here, to have them make taxes for the support of our Government. I do not see what principle that is done. There are some great matters in these laws that we do not—

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Will the Senator from South Carolina excuse me for a moment? If this bill passes, we are going to have two systems of internal-revenue taxation in Hawaii. Take the part of the bill which repeals the sections in the chapter referred to in the bill; that does not repeal the chapter about stamp duties, and there we have a schedule of stamp duties in Hawaii, the same as we have a schedule of stamp duties under our internal-revenue taxation, and they are both to go side by side in Hawaii.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I am not sure to myself the detail in which we can make that people pay internal-revenue taxes into our Treasury and turn into our Treasury all the customs duties that are collected there and do not expect them to come here to Congress and ask that we should at least appropriate that amount of money toward the support of their revenue that we shall collect there under the law of taxation to that extent. So let us get to the question that we shall have to provide for the salaries of the judges, if they are appointed by the President, and for the expenses of the courts we need not alarm us at all.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut—

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut to his seat, as he has been discussed so much of the subject, whether or not the Federal relations, so to speak, between Hawaii and the United States are any different from those which exist between the United States and South Carolina other than that one is a Territory and the other is a State? Is it not a fact that we send the mail to those people and distribute that the expense of the Federal Government through postage stamps?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. No; as I understand it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Do they have their own individual postal laws?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. No; and I do not think they have.

Mr. CULLOM. Their postal system passes under the United States laws, if the Senator will excuse me.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then, with the permission of the Senator from Connecticut—or, rather, I believe the floor—I would ask, is Hawaii in the Union, or is it not, if you will?

Mr. CULLOM. It will be when this bill passes.

Mr. TILLMAN. If it was in the United States when we annexed it by joint resolution and extended the Constitution over it, and if it has a postal system of its own, and if the maintenance of a military post there is necessary, and if it is not a heterogeneous little handful of people against the Chinese, Japanese, Portuguese, and Canadians, and others who are dissatisfied with the government now given them?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not know about that, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. I think the Senator can very easily refresh his memory, if he will, by finding out that our troops were there before we annex the islands, and there now, and will be there and are likely to be there for all time.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There is nothing in the bill about it.

Mr. TILLMAN. There is nothing in the bill about it, of course, but it is a Federal expenditure. We are spending money to maintain those soldiers there for the protection of life and property. I do not believe in the principle of having people taxed and having the money spent elsewhere, because that is the kind of a thing that has been going on in my part of the country so long that we have got used to it and quit crying or complaining.

Take the expenditures of the Federal Government at an average of $300,000,000 a year, make all due allowances for our poverty and other things, and we pay at least $100,000,000 of that amount.

How much is spent among us? This subject is entirely foreign to the subject of debate, but then, if Hawaii is to have a special claim upon the little amount of money that is spent for the maintenance of the Federal Government, we are to give it to her, I want to ask you upon what basis of equality or equity or justice you would attempt to do it.

The Senator, of course, knows that he has merely presented a supposititious question as to what this would amount to, but the subject of this bill is to allow people to be turned over to the oligarchy which we all acknowledge exists there and which is being perpetuated by this bill. We seek to give some measure of protection by supreme judges and other judges appointed by the President, supposed to be an impartial man, who will not put those judges in power of the governor, even though the governor be appointed by the President, and let the governor be the head, the judges his tools and underlings, obliged to obey his orders or they will not be reappointed, and the whole machine to be so arranged that the efficiency of the Senator from Connecticut in the effort to protect these people from any such stoppage condition as that.

Now, Mr. President, as I have the floor, I will go on to talk up some other phases of the subject, because, while I did not want to speak out of order on this bill, I want to ask the subject any great amount of examination, and have contended myself with an occasional inquiry or a suggestion as if I sat in my seat here and listened to the debate and the amendments that have been offered. I have felt so indifferent at the treatment I have received, that I, with [Mr. MORGAN] that I have investigated a little more fully, and I want to point out some of the enormities and outrages that are being perpetrated in this very act, or have been attempted to be perpetrated, and to call the attention of the Senate to certain phases of the question that no one has alluded to heretofore.

Before I say that question, the Senator from Alabama—

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to say—

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I decline to yield to the Senator from Alabama. He has put himself outside of the pale of courtesy so far as I am concerned, and I do not feel like going up to him. I will say further, as an explanation of that to those who were not present, that the reason why I feel thus is that it is the second time since I have been a member of this body that I have been treated with indignity and discourtesy and rudeness by the Senator. While he is an old and honored member of the Senate, as worthy of our admiration in a great many respects, I contend that he has not been as courteous and observe as he should have been of the amenities of debate and the politeness due from one member of this body to another.

Now, the reason why I say this is because the other afternoon, in a manner which I am sure is a malicious attack upon anyone, merely for the purpose of inquiry and enlightenment, to get to the subject fairly before the Senate, I asked the Senator some questions and—well, waved me aside with a kind of a sneer that was about all I knew concerning it, and the other afternoon it was quite different.

Then later on he permitted the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] to "make a suggestion," in which there was an assault—a direct, positive assault—upon my State. Very naturally, I rose after the Senator from Colorado got through and asked permission to explain—simply to explain. That was the action of the Senator from Alabama. He simply said, "No; I cannot permit it; take some other time." It is the first time since I have been here that any man's State has ever been mentioned by anyone in an oppressive way, that a refusal was made to allow him, and then there on the floor, to let it go, and then ask the permission to explain, or an attack, to explain or clarify, if he asked permission to have it done.

The attack of the Senator from Colorado was that the vote in my State was suppressed, and he read figures from the Congressional Directory showing that the vote in the last State Assembly election for Congress was only 6000. The Senate, however, apply to the State of Alabama, to almost every other Southern State similarly situated to mine. It applies to Mississippi. It was not new. It had been brought up in debate on the PRITCHARD resolution, and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MORGAN] explained it in regard to his State, and the same explanation here. I was denied it. No Republican would have denied it to me, because there is no man on the other side so lacking in courtesy and fairness and decency as to have permitted a State to be attacked in his time and then refuse to allow its Senator here to explain. If I cannot do it, I will carry out my purpose and show now and here why the vote in South Carolina is so small at the legal election in November. Under our new constitution, in which the suffrage is based on an educational qualification, enlarged to illiterates by the payment of taxes on $200, we have about 114,000 registered voters. In other words, a man who