an educational qualification, that I think is all right, and I agree to it. I agree that suffrage will be sufficiently exclusive in those islands with that qualification, but it ought not to go any further.

I have seen some of the operations of a poll tax. We had it in Nevada as a condition of voting, and it was very demoralizing and detrimental to the government. The people grew sick of it and repealed it. There is a general sentiment against it in the country where it has been tried. Any man who wants the vote will pay the tax, and the rich man will have it all in his hands. The poor man cannot pay the tax, and it is just like buying his vote with money. I believe that the conference report will be returned and that that will be made certain. I could not vote for a conference report where there was any doubt on that question.

Mr. CULLOM. As the Senator from New Hampshire has made inquiry whether I intend to go through with my remarks before Tuesday, I should like to be let alone until I can make them and see whether there is anything seriously in the way of the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The Senator does not object to the whole or any additional taxes, as far as I go alone.

Mr. CULLOM. I certainly have not shown any disposition not to give all the information I could.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I thought the Senator said he did not want to be interrupted.

Mr. CULLOM. I have adopted this course, referring to each section and calling the attention of the Senators to each provision, so that when they come to vote they may have, so far as I am able to give it, the exact information in reference to the action of the conference.

Mr. STEWART. Has the Senator any objection, when he calls up a particular subject, to have us make some remarks in regard to it with a view of having it understood? If we wait until he gets clear through and then take it up, we would have to make long speeches before we would get to understand it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CULLOM. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to direct the attention of Senators to the parliamentary status. If I am correct, it is that the Senate passed the bill and the House amended it. Now, I understand that the conference cannot bring in anything that is outside of both bills unless it is germane to the subject under consideration. Can they bring in anything outside and not germane?

Mr. CULLOM. No, sir; after it has been disposed of by both Houses. This provision, however——

Mr. TILLMAN. The conferences must either take the House provision or the Senate provision or some compromise that is germane to both.

Mr. CULLOM. So far as the provision under discussion is concerned, it is clearly within the control of the Senate as to what it shall do with the provision.

Mr. TILLMAN. You mean that you could strike out all taxes?

Mr. CULLOM. I mean to say that if it was referred back to the conference they would have jurisdiction of it so that they could do as they chose about striking out the provision requiring that the poll tax be continued in the present bill, or striking both provisions out. There is no question about that, I think.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is possible that the Senator is correct; but if I understand the powers of a conference committee, he is absolutely wrong. The provision as passed by the Senate was that——

Prior to such registration have paid, on or before the 31st day of March next preceding the date of registration, all taxes due by him to the government.

Mr. CULLOM. But the Senator does not seem to understand that that provision was taken cognizance of by the conference, and that the conference can reconsider it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President——

Mr. TILLMAN. Let me get through.

Mr. CULLOM. There is no doubt about the fact that the subject is open to discussion by the conference. The House added the poll tax. The Senate took hold of the provision and struck that out and put in another. The conference can strike both out if they reconvene.

Mr. TILLMAN. They can strike the whole provision out?

Mr. CULLOM. The whole provision as to taxes.

Mr. TILLMAN. Very well, if that is within your power. I just wanted to find out whether you could do it or not.

Mr. CULLOM. There cannot be any doubt about that, I think. The President pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator in Connecticut?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes, sir.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. As I understand the parliamentary situation, it is that the Senate passed a bill for the establishment of a government in Hawaii. It went over to the House and the House struck out the entire Senate bill and passed another bill.

Mr. CULLOM. It passed another bill.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The two bills are in disagreement between the Senate and the House, and the conference in the report is going in any bill that they chose, and an entirely new one if they chose to do so.

Mr. CULLOM. Of course they could; but confining the conference to this particular paragraph, we can agree to either the poll tax or the property tax.

Mr. PETTIGREW. What about the no tax?

Mr. CULLOM. Or to no tax, just as we choose.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The power is unlimited in that respect.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If the Senator will allow me to make a suggestion in regard to what the Senator from Connecticut just now said, I think it is technically true, but I think it is a violation of all reasonable parliamentary precedence. I do not believe it was ever intended that the whole of a bill should be stricken out and another bill brought in similar in terms, so as to leave the whole matter open. For instance, as I understand this paragraph, as it went first from the Senate there was a provision that——

Prior to such registration have paid, on or before the 31st day of March next preceding the date of registration, all taxes due by him to the government.

That is printed in roman and the words "a poll tax of $1 for the current year" are stricken out. I do not understand how that was done.

Mr. CULLOM. That is the House amendment. The conference struck it out.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The conference struck that out?

Mr. CULLOM. The conference struck it out.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It was in the bill then as it was passed by the House?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then the Senate conference would have the power to make that House amendment and leave that in?

Mr. CULLOM. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. They would have a right to disagree to it and to leave the whole out?

Mr. CULLOM. Or substitute anything else.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Such a provision is just as true as that paragraph as we do.

Mr. CULLOM. I believe that it is a fair parliamentary practice to strike out a whole bill, and without reference to what was passed in the Senate and to what was passed in the House, say that the entire subject is open for legislation in conference committee.

Mr. CULLOM. We have no right to criticise what the House has done.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. It has been ruled so over and over again. It may not be good practice, but it is in the parliamentary power of the conferences.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not dispute that, but I say it is bad practice.

Mr. CULLOM. I thought myself when it was done that it was not exactly the right thing to do in dealing with the bill, especially as the greater part of the bill was retained by the House. So it enhanced the whole situation as to the conduct of the proceeding. But still we are trying to deal with it the best we can.

Mr. SPOONER. We do that every day.

Mr. CULLOM. We do it almost every day between the two Houses, but it is not usually done on a bill so large and so important.

If it may be allowed to go on—I do not know exactly where I quit.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. You were on page 27 of the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. The sixth paragraph of the section was stricken out by the House and the conference agreed to the same. That refers to the whole section.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Does the Senator say that was stricken out?

Mr. CULLOM. The sixth paragraph.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then I do not understand.

Mr. CULLOM. I believe that is the section we were discussing.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have in my hands the print of the 15th, which is said to be——

Mr. CULLOM. You have the wrong bill. The 19th is the last print.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I know the 19th is the last print, but the 18th——

Mr. CULLOM. The 19th has the House amendments in it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Certainly; but I wanted to get the proposition of the conference.

Mr. CULLOM. Well, I shall have to read the conference report to show what I mean. What section is the Senator on?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I was trying to find the section the Senator was reading. I understood he was reading the sixth paragraph of section 60.