

LET GOVERNMENT DEAL WITH JAPS

Roosevelt Appeals to Solons,
Saying He Seeks What
They Desire.

NO MORE JAP SETTLERS

Telegram to Speaker Stanton Puts
Argument Against State Action
Forcibly—Bills Would
Violate Treaties.

(Continued From First Page.)

dent and Congress it can be made entirely
efficient.

Doing What California Wants.

"I am sure that the sound judgment of
the people of California will support you,
Mr. Speaker, in your efforts. Let me re-
peat that at present we are actually doing
the very thing which the people of Cali-
fornia wish to be done, and to upset the
arrangement under which this is being
done can do no good and may do harm.
If in the next year or two the figures of
immigration prove that the arrangement
which has worked so successfully during
the last six months is no longer working
successfully, then there would be ground
for grievance and for the reversal by the
National Government of its policy. But
at present the policy is working well and
until it works badly it would be a grave
misfortune to change it, and, when
changed, it can only be changed effec-
tively by the National Government.

Only Kahn Backs Roosevelt.

During the day the entire California
delegation in the House with the ex-
ception of Mr. McLaughlin met at lunch-
on and discussed the Japanese question.
Mr. Kahn was the only member of the
delegation who manifested an inclination
to support the Administration in its at-
titude toward state action on the Japan-
ese question. It was apparent that while
the delegation was disposed to be con-
servative, its sympathies were largely
with California's efforts to keep Japanese
out by means of state legislation if it
was not done by the action of the Fed-
eral Government.

Members of the delegation declare
that large numbers of Japanese are com-
ing into the United States by way of
Mexico and Canada. The House delega-
tion generally supports Senator Perkins
in his attitude on the question of Japan-
ese exclusion.

Lane Stands By Roosevelt.

After the conference at the White
House, Mr. Lane said:
"I have read the President's state-
ment on the Japanese question, and I
think he is following the line of policy
that will work out best for the people
of the Pacific Coast. This is not a
partisan question, but one involving a
great National one, and I believe that
only the National Government can
deal adequately with it. To my per-
sonal knowledge the President has been
endeavoring for the last two years to
meet the demand of our people for
more effective laws to exclude the
Japanese. He has been a success thus far.
It demands a longer test, and state co-
operation is necessary to achieve the
results we all desire."
"I am in favor of the exclusion of
Japanese laborers so as to avoid an
other race question in this country,
which is inadvisable if they come in. I
think the President's method of reach-
ing this result is practical and will
prove more effective than more aggres-
sive and radical methods. I think
as a labor leader in San Francisco re-
cently said: 'We are in favor of ex-
clusion and not of reprisal.'"
"I am for standing by the President,
because his policy has been one of Na-
tional importance and international
good feeling."

DELAY ANTI-JAPANESE ACTION

California Solons Appeal to Congress
During Brief Interim.

SACRAMENTO, Cal., Feb. 8.—Only five
Senators favored agitation of the anti-
Japanese question when the matter was
called up this morning by Mark Anthony,
of San Francisco.

The Senate decided by a vote of 25 to 6
to defer until next Thursday its action
upon the report of the committee on ex-
ecutive communications advising against
legislation aimed at the Japanese.

Senator J. R. Sanford introduced a joint
resolution asking Congress to include Ja-
panese in the provisions of the Geary ex-
clusion act. The resolution reads:

Ask Congress to Change Act.

Whereas, The recent attitude of some
California officials and others in high
positions, has given the people of the East
and the United States generally a
wrong impression as to the real sentiment
of the people of the Pacific Coast relative
to the Japanese question; and
Whereas, We think it right and proper
that the people of the Pacific Coast should
be advised as to our true position on that
question, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate and the Assembly
of the State of California jointly, That we
are unalterably opposed to further Japanese
immigration, and we urge our Representatives
in Congress to extend the provisions of the
Geary exclusion act, so as to include the
Chinese, Koreans, Hindus and all other Asiatic
races. Be it further

Resolved, That we condemn the propo-
sition to naturalize the Japanese and extend
the elective franchise to the alien-born of
that race as being inimical to the welfare
of the American people.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions
be transmitted to our representatives in
Congress by the Secretary of the Senate.

Approve Appeal to People.

Senator Anthony's bill providing for
submitting to the voters at the next state
election the question of permitting or pro-
hibiting Asiatic immigration was favorably
reported this morning by the com-
mittee on labor.

Senator Edward J. Wolfe started a
movement for repeal or amendment of the
Carterwright anti-trust law passed two
years ago. He introduced a resolution
calling for the appointment of three Sen-
ators to investigate the "steadily increas-
ing cost of living in California."

JAPAN LIKES ARBITRATION

Sees in It Easy Way Out of Pa-
cific Coast Troubles.

CHICAGO, Feb. 8.—The Record-Herald
today prints the following on the anti-
Japanese agitation from a special corre-
spondent at Washington, under date of
February 7:

"Arbitration is Japan's solution for all
the questions which may be raised be-
tween that nation and the United States
by the action of state legislatures on the
Pacific Coast."

"This is Japan's answer to the theory
that trouble with the United States is im-
minent and that even war would not be

unwelcome if the rights of Japanese sub-
jects in America are too far encroached
upon."

"The determination of Japan to main-
tain peace and to have none but an am-
icable adjustment of all controversies be-
came more than ever apparent in official
circles here today when it was disclosed
that arbitration is the policy of the Ja-
panese government."

"If, through the action of Western Leg-
islatures, the treaty rights of Japanese
shall be violated and the American Gov-
ernment is not able to enforce treaty ob-
ligations on account of the peculiar dual
system of Government in this country, it
is seriously announced that the Tokyo
government will propose to the United
States that the questions at issue be sub-
mitted to the international court of arbi-
tration. The Hague. Whether or not
the United States Government would as-
sent to such submission is another ques-
tion not to be determined until the case
arises, which is hoped never will be."

"It was learned today in diplomatic cir-
cles that the British government is much
alarmed over the fierceness of the anti-
Japanese sentiment now among the people
of British Columbia. Ambassador Bryce
has been informed that the situation there
is threatening and that outbreaks of vio-
lence against the Asiatics are considered
probable. The Ambassador is in constant
touch with his government and it thus ap-
pears that England as well as America,
has a Japanese question on her hands."

NEW YORK DOES NOT APPROVE

Thinks California Is Usurping Fed-
eral Power on Japanese Matter.

ALBANY, N. Y., Feb. 8.—That the
contemplated legislation in California
relative to the Japanese is inadvisable
and that California's grievance, if any,
should be submitted to the State De-
partment at Washington, was the sub-
ject of a resolution introduced tonight
by Assemblyman C. N. Stein, of New
York. The resolution, which went over
under the rules until next week, says in
part:

"The Assembly of the State of New
York considers that the proposed legisla-
tion is a usurpation of the Federal
power, and further that the Department
of State of the United States, in which
this body has the utmost confidence, is
able to cope with and dispose of the
questions involved to the satisfaction of
all with honor to all parties concerned."

MINISTERS JOIN IN PROTEST

Methodists and Baptists Object to
California Anti-Jap Action.

LOS ANGELES, Feb. 8.—The Meth-
odist and Baptist ministers of Southern
California, at a meeting in this city
today, took resolutions protesting
against the anti-Japanese legislation
now pending at Sacramento. The posi-
tion in the matter of President Roose-
velt and Governor Gillett and Speaker
Stanton is indorsed, and it is hoped
"that the entire matter will be voted
down."

The resolutions adopted by the Bat-
tist churchmen say the exclusion of the
Japanese from the public schools of
California is an unjust discrimination
"against the rights of the people of
California and against the rights of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

The resolutions also say that the
legislation is "a violation of the rights
of the people of California and of the
people of Japan."

INSURGENTS READY FOR WAR ON CHAIR

Power of Speaker of House to
Be Radically Curtailed
by Changes.

EXPECT DEMOCRATIC AID

Congressmen Opposed to Present
System Would Have Speaker but
a Mere Figurehead, Shorn
of All His Power.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 8.—The House "in-
surgents," who are agitating a change in
the rules governing the body, will intro-
duce a resolution tomorrow providing for
radical changes which are proposed to
limit the power of the Speaker.

The resolution will be signed and jointly
introduced by all of those who have come
out against the present rules, and these
claim that many more have expressed
their intention of helping the movement.
Because of the plank in the Democratic
platform in the recent Presidential cam-
paign which pledged the party in favor
of a change in the rules of the House, the
"insurgents" are counting on the aid of
the majority members, although they
claim that no effort to join forces has
been made.

The changes proposed by the resolution
would make it impossible for the Speaker
to be a member of any standing or com-
mittee. The Speaker is now a mem-
ber of the committee on rules, to which
the resolution will be referred. It also
takes from the Speaker power to ap-
point the standing committees, this power
being given to a committee on rules and
committees. The latter committee is or-
ganized to consist of 15 members, nine of
whom shall belong to the party having a
majority. The members will be selected
according to geographical groups of the
House. The members from each group
shall select their representation on the
committee on rules and committees.

Tuesday of each week is set aside as
"Speaker's day," for consideration of
the business of the House. The Speaker
is now the chief executive officer of the
House, and he is the one who is re-
sponsible for the conduct of the House.
The resolution would take away from
him all of his power, and he would be
left with only a figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power, and he would be left with only a
figurehead position.

The resolution would also take away
from the Speaker the power to appoint
and remove members of the House. This
power is now vested in the House, and
the Speaker is the one who is responsible
for the conduct of the House. The resolu-
tion would take away from him all of his
power,