

thorizing the sale to Greece of the battleships Mississippi and Idaho, the proceeds to be used in building a new dreadnought. The vote was 174 to 87. [See current volume, page 590.]



Senator Owens' bill for regulation of stock exchanges was favorably reported to the Senate on June 25 by the committee on banking and currency.



#### **Japan and American Land Laws.**

The correspondence between Japan and the United States over the California alien land law was given to the public on the 25th. The Japanese ambassador protested, May 9, 1913, after the California anti-alien law had been passed, but before it had been signed by Governor Johnson, that the act was unfair and discriminatory, was directed against his countrymen, was inconsistent with the treaty in force, and was opposed to the spirit and fundamental principles of amity and good understanding. In closing, the ambassador said his government "desired to have it entirely clear that they attach the utmost importance to the discriminatory phase of the legislation." The United States replied, under date of May 19, giving the steps taken by the Federal Government to prevent the California legislation, and explaining that "under the constitutional arrangements of the United States, we could do no more than that," pointing out that it was the action of but one state, and that it was not political, but due to the peculiar economic conditions in California.



On June 4 Japan replied that the American note did not remove the disappointment over the alien land law. As the Japanese are not eligible to citizenship, and have not the right to acquire land in California under the new act, the Japanese government is convinced that the measure is "internationally, racially discriminatory" and contrary to the letter and spirit of the treaty of 1911. The ambassador complained that the wrong was directed against his countrymen as a nation, and, though it was the act of a single state, Japan must look for redress to the nation. Calling attention to the laws denying citizenship to Japanese the ambassador said they were "mortifying to the government and the people of Japan." But this he recognized as a political problem of national, and not international, concern. When, however, that distinction is made use of for the purpose of depriving Japanese subjects of rights and privileges of a civil nature granted to other aliens in the United States, it becomes the duty of the imperial government to frankly express its conviction that the racial distinction does not afford a valid basis for the dis-

crimination on the subject of land tenure. The state department, under date of July 16, pointed out that the racial discrimination had been given undue prominence, that the treaty made no reference to land ownership, and that Japan had similar laws. The ambassador met this with a long discussion on the interpretation of the treaty, insisting upon his claim of rights conferred upon the Japanese. He said it was the first time that a nation having a favored nation treaty "had been placed at a disadvantage as compared with nontreaty countries."

The answer of the State Department, and the reply of the Japanese government continued the discussion of the treaty interpretation, the United States contending that the most favored nation clause referred to commerce and navigation, and Japan maintaining that the California act was discriminatory in the most invidious manner. The Japanese communication of Aug. 26 closed with the statement that the imperial government claimed for its subjects fair and equal treatment, and could not consider the matter closed as long as the present state of things continues. On June 10, 1914, the Japanese ambassador reopened the question by conveying from his foreign office instructions reiterating previous arguments, and saying the projected treaty would tend to create new difficulties. They preferred to recur to the correspondence which had been interrupted, and would look for an answer to the last note addressed the American Government, trusting that in a renewed study of the question a solution might be found. The last American note has not been given to the public. [See volume xvi, page 735.]



#### **Roosevelt's Activities.**

On arriving from Europe on June 24 ex-President Roosevelt issued a public statement criticizing the proposed treaty with Colombia. He declared the payment of \$25,000,000 to Colombia and the tender of an apology to be "belated payment of blackmail, with apology to the blackmailers." He said further: "If this proposed treaty, submitted by President Wilson, through Mr. Bryan, is right, then our presence on the Isthmus is wrong. If we as a nation have been guilty of theft we should restore the stolen goods. If we have not been guilty of theft we should not pay blackmail." He spoke contemptuously of the manner in which the administration has handled foreign affairs, saying that it "has been such as to make the United States a figure of fun in the international world." In reference to the attack on George W. Perkins made by Amos Pinchot, Colonel Roosevelt declared that "Mr. Perkins has been, on the whole, the most useful member of the Progressive party." He said further: "When