

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

they read Perkins out they will have to read me out, too." [See current volume, pages 587, 609.]



Although ordered by his physician to take a four-months' rest and drop all political activities, Colonel Roosevelt declared this to be impossible, and that he will deliver a promised address at Pittsburgh on June 30 in favor of Gifford Pinchot and other Progressive candidates in Pennsylvania. He declined to indorse the candidacy of District Attorney Charles S. Whitman for the governorship of New York, and opposed fusion with the Republicans.



In reply to Roosevelt's defense of Perkins, Amos Pinchot formally stated on June 25:

"The Progressive party is pledged by its platform to strengthen the Sherman law and fight private monopoly. Mr. Roosevelt in his confession-of-faith speech said: 'The anti-trust law should be kept on the statute books and strengthened so as to make it genuinely and thoroughly effective against every big concern tending to monopoly or guilty of anti-social practices.'

Mr. Perkins, on the other hand, is enthusiastically committed to killing off the Sherman law and protecting monopolies. There seems to be an irreconcilable conflict with Mr. Perkins on the one side and the party and the colonel on the other.

"If it were the consensus of opinion among Progressives that the party should side with the trusts against the public Mr. Perkins' leadership would be appropriate. It is absurd to place the reins of leadership in his hands."

[See current volume, page 587.]



### Commission on Industrial Relations.

The Federal Commission on Industrial Relations began hearings at Philadelphia on June 22. Professor Scott Nearing of the University of Pennsylvania was the first witness, and his testimony is thus reported in the Philadelphia North American:

"The total income derived from the cotton industry in Massachusetts last year," said Professor Nearing, "added \$81,000,000 in value to raw cotton. The salaries to officials totaled \$2,500,000. The salaries to wage-earners amounted to \$41,000,000. There is nearly \$30,000,000 remaining.

"A small part goes to machinery and repairs. A large part to rentals and dividends. Of the \$81,000,000, the people who did the work got only about five-eighths, and the other three-eighths went some place else.

"When I described this condition in Fall River some time ago the board of trade there got hot about it. I have nothing against Fall River, but it is the only example we have to draw from.

"I do not believe the situation in Fall River is any different from that in the Mohawk Valley and every other textile town in the northeast,

"As regards other industries, I think we can safely say, from federal investigations, that half of the adult wage-earners in the United States get less than \$500 a year; that three-fourths get less than \$750 a year, and that nine-tenths get less than \$1,000 a year.

"Rarely do we find a wage-earner getting \$1,500 a year. There are exceptions in the allied building trades, telephone companies, etc., but we must consider industries as a whole."

"What would you suggest as a remedy?" asked Commissioner O'Connell

"As I see it," replied Professor Nearing, "we must stop this exploiting of the many for the benefit of the few. The people who hold mortgages and stock certificates and flaunt them before the eyes of civilization are contributing to this great unrest which is sweeping the country.

"At no time have the privileged few had such an effective scheme of living on the labor of the many."

Asked if he believed the establishment of a minimum wage would offer a solution, Professor Nearing replied:

"The thing to do, as I see it, is to establish a relation between wages and the standard of living. When a man applies for a job, his prospective employer never inquires the number of his children. He offers the married man just the same wages as he does to the single man, and no more.

"Every child after the second is an economic calamity, according to the New York board for the bettering of the conditions of the poor. Every child in the city is an economic liability. In the country children used to be an asset. Now they are liabilities."

Professor Nearing was applauded when he intimated that the workers would not stand for the continuance of the present system. He showed his conviction on that point when Commissioner Weinstock asked:

"If such conditions go on, what forecast would you make for the worker thirty or forty years hence?"

"If he stands for it, you mean?" inquired Professor Nearing, with a significant inflection in his voice. Then he said that, in his opinion, if such a condition did continue to exist, 50 per cent of the net product would go into dividends for the privileged few.

"What suggestions would you make for a remedy to conditions?" asked one of the commissioners.

"Every man is entitled to what he earns," replied Professor Nearing, "and if I had anything to do with this investigation I would start it right there. The blatant evil of monopoly should be wiped out."

"Are you a believer in the doctrine of socialism?" asked Commissioner Weinstock.

"What are the doctrines of socialism?" asked Professor Nearing.

"The doctrine of socialism," said Mr. Weinstock, "is the belief that there should be one employer, and that employer the people, and that all rents, interests and profits should be abolished."

"I am a believer in such a doctrine," said Professor Nearing, "so far as the abolishment of rents and interest is concerned. The worst form of unearned profit is the ownership of land. I would take for