

**SINNOTT'S ADDRESS  
ON CAMPAIGN ISSUE**

(Continued from Page 2)

trolling forces of its principles and ideals.

What are some of the controlling principles and ideals which have made us a great nation; that enable us when we were assailed and when we saw civilization about to be destroyed, to go to the assistance of mankind, and to go to the assistance of the world? Nothing but the fact that we had lived up to the fundamental principles, to our controlling principles and ideals, and by so doing have become a great nation.

When our government was created, our forefathers saw that the colonies had been involved in nearly every European war that had taken place since the colonization of America. They resolved to keep free from entanglement in European wars. They resolved to take away from any one man the power or the opportunity of throwing us into war, so they provided that only the congress of the United States should have the rights to declare war; they provided further that treaties should be made by the president,—but get this language,—by the president by and with the advice and consent of the senate of the United States. That word "by" had a meaning, and "with" had a meaning; and in addition our constitution further provided that two-thirds of the senate must concur in that treaty after it is negotiated "by and with the advice and consent of the senate of the United States." All these principles President Wilson wishes to ignore.

He brought his treaty back, and without consulting the senate of the United States, which under the constitution has the same responsibility as he has, he tried to force acceptance of that treaty by all kinds of threats, by all kinds of intimidation, and by all kinds of ridicule. He tried to force that treaty down the throats of the senate of the United States. Senators of the United States have a high regard for the oath they took to uphold the constitution and to protect their constituents, and they refused to ratify that treaty without reservations.

What are some of the principles and ideals of our government?

George Washington, himself, in his great farewell message, announced the great principles and ideals that should guide us in years to come. He knew the danger of European entanglement; he knew that the colonies had been involved in European wars since the colonization of the country; and so in his farewell address, George Washington, gave us a veritable "sermon on the mount," for our civic guidance and the best answer that anyone can give, the best argument against the league of nations.

Washington said: "Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, I conjure you, my fellow citizens, to believe me, the jealousy of a free people should be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful forces of republican government. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious while their tools and dupes usurp the confidence and applause of the people to surrender their interest." The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign affairs is in extending our commercial relations with them is to have as little political connection as possible. Where we have already entered into engagements let them be kept in perfect good faith, but here let us stop.

Europe has a set or primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation; hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the cause of which are essentially foreign to our concern; hence therefore it is most unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Why forego the advantage of so peculiar a situation; why quit our own to stand on foreign ground; why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition and rival interest, humor or caprice? It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any part of the foreign world; taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

So spoke the father of his country; so spoke Washington, the soul and spirit of the American Revolution.

And how spoke the father of the Democratic party? Thomas Jefferson; what did he say? Supplementing the sagacity and the eloquence of Washington, Jefferson said, it should be our first and fundamental

maxim never to entangle ourselves in the brails of Europe; and our second maxim should be never to permit Europe to intermeddle with affairs on this side of the Atlantic. Similar advice was given by Monroe, by Adams, by Madison, by Henry Clay.

Is all this to be thrown into the discard and are we to have a new formula? The formula announced by president, that America must make the supreme sacrifice and join our fortunes with the fortunes of the world. Why was not somebody over there, some designer or artificer of the league of nations, willing to make the supreme sacrifice, when they demanded six votes to America's one? That was the time to talk of supreme sacrifices.

What did President Wilson, himself, have to say about Washington's message? Let me read you what this man said as late as 1914,—this man who is trying to get his pet folly adopted by the senate and the people of the United States,—what did he say concerning this wonderful message of George Washington, this sermon on the mount, which the father of his country gave us when retiring from the presidency, he looked into the future as far as human eye could see, and desired to give us a chart for our civic affairs.

On May 16th, President Wilson said: "It was not merely because of a passing and transient circumstance that Washington said that we must keep from entangling alliances; it was because he saw that no country had yet set its face in the same direction in which America had set her face. We cannot form alliances with those who are not going our way; and in our might and majesty and in the confidence of our own purposes we need not, and we should not form alliances with any nation in the world."

In 1914 President Wilson was against such an alliance, as he is now endeavoring to force down the throats of the American senate. In 1916 he said: "the certain prospect of the success of the Republican party is that we shall be drawn in one form or another into the embarrassments of Europe?" Does he hesitate now to put us into the "embarrassments of Europe?" Is it for his own exploitation?

In 1914 he approved the advice of Washington;—he stated that this country "should not form alliances with nations who are not going our way." "Not going our way." Is Japan going the way of America? Japan entered into a secret alliance—made in 1917,—with England and France, which gave to her the province of Shantung in China, with 40,000,000 people to hold as vassals. Is that going America's way?

President Wilson is ready to forget what he said in 1914 in praise of the message of Washington to the American people. In 1917 England, France and Japan entered into a secret treaty, the consideration of which was that Japan was to get Shantung, a territory almost as large as England, with 40,000,000 people. President Wilson in his tour through the west last fall stated: that England and France were forced to enter into that treaty in order to get Japan into the war. When that statement was made Senator Norris immediately sent a telegram to President Wilson telling him he was mistaken; that Japan went into the war in 1914, and that the treaty was made in 1917. President Wilson immediately wired back to Senator Norris thanking him for correcting an unintentional inaccuracy. Yet four times after he had wired to Senator Norris, acknowledging that he was mistaken, President Wilson made the same statement, reiterating that Japan forced this treaty,—this secret treaty,—out of England and France, before she would go into the war. Yet that treaty was made three years afterward.

President Wilson going to the peace table, proclaiming the conditions of peace, stated that no secret understandings should be acknowledged or ratified; yet one of the very first things we are asked to ratify in the Versailles treaty, of which the league of nations is a part is the surrender of Shantung to Japan—Shantung which was owned by one of our allies in the war,—not our enemy,—and they took it away from China, our friend, and gave it over to Japan.

The senate of the United States was unwilling to condone that rape on the part of Japan; yet president was willing to do so. Secretary Lansing was asked about the matter in the senate committee and he said that he and Mr. White and Mr. Bliss, the three American commissioners—Col. House and President Wilson being the other two members,—were all against the ratification of that secret treaty, made without the knowledge of President Wilson who knew nothing at all about it until he sat at the peace table, but Secretary Lansing said they were under the direction of President Wilson and they had to acquiesce in his ideas.

Now under this league of nations

If the 300,000,000 people in China wake up and realize that they have been raped, and robbed, and should endeavor to get back their own territory, the United States would be compelled to go over there and fight our friend China in order to enable Japan to keep the territory of Shantung. That is the league of nations.

President Wilson says that the senate of the United States is false in its duty to the world because it will not ratify and condone that robbery and rape upon China. George Washington, with prophetic eyes and prophetic tongue looked into the future, when he said:—Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favored, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and the confidence of the people to surrender their interest. The real patriots are rendered odious or are intended to be rendered odious, by the very president who shares with them the treaty-making power. What did President Wilson say in attempting to render the real patriots odious, as George Washington foretold? Listen to the language used by him with reference to the senate of the United States.

"They are men of infinite timidity. They are scufflers from the nation's duty. The pro-German element has lifted its head. I hear the hiss of the hyphen. The only objector to the treaty is the hyphenated American. I cannot understand the cover process of the opposition. They are pigmy-minded. They are infected with curious aberrations of thinking. They are jaundice-eyed. They are afflicted with amazing ignorance. They are contemptible quitters. They are living in a half forgotten age. Their heads are only fit to serve as knots to keep their bodies from unravelling."

He said he would like to see them hang on a gibbet as high as heaven, but he pointed in the opposite direction.

Was George Washington right, when he said that real patriots were liable to become suspected and odious while their tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests.

I am ready to follow the principles, the maxims and the admonitions of Washington and Jefferson, rather than the maxims of the man, the first president of the United States to leave our shores for foreign shores, the first president that ever disregarded the warning of Washington about the insidious wiles of foreign influence and his advice against our entering into entangling alliances. The president endeavored to have these senators held up to scorn, but the American people believe that his attitude and his efforts justify the wisdom of Washington. But, thank God, he has failed. The American people will ever look upon these senators as real American patriots, and will ever look upon the annals of the senate relating to the peace treaty as one of the imperishable annals of our country's history. Ever will they look upon Senator Lodge, and Knox, and Reed, and Borah, and Senator Johnson, as real patriots, who deserve a place among the immortals of our country. They were reviled "but their reviler reviled him not."

The temple has a snare for all, and pitying tears, not scorn and wrath; befit his fallen fall.

All else is gone, from those great eyes; the soul has fled.

When faith is lost; when honor's gone, the man is dead."

Let's take a short review of this treaty,—this league of nations. Let's see whether the senators of the

United States deserve the censure and the odium that has been put upon them.

When you examine the treaty and when you examine the reservations, you will find that all the senators endeavored to do was to Americanize the treaty, gesyering to the congress of the United States the right to say whether or not our boys should be sent across the waters, reserving to the united states the right to say what the Monroe Doctrine is, reserving to the congress of United States the right to say whether the taxpayers money shall be spent in European warfare or not.

What is the first reservation that the senate of the United States put on the treaty? The United States so understands and considers article one; that in case of notice of withdrawal from the league of nations as provided in said article, the United States shall be the sole judge as to whether all its international obligations under said covenant have been fulfilled, and notice of withdrawal may be given by concurrent resolution of congress.

Anything wrong about that? What was the purpose of that reservation? Article one provides that any member of the league may after two years' notice of intention withdraw from the league provided that all its international obligations and all its obligations under this covenant shall have been fulfilled at the time of the withdrawal. Under this as written, the United States could not withdraw from the league of nations if one nation objected. The matter of the determination of whether or not the United States could withdraw rests in Siam, in Hayti and in those other of similar calibre countries. The United States might contend that it had fulfilled all its international obligations, but under the terms of the league of nations covenant, the

United States could not withdraw until it satisfied every member of the league that it had fulfilled all its obligations. Is there any reasonable objection to such a reservation as that? The senate was wise in putting in the provision that in case we joined the league of nations, and it was found that others were not going in the same direction that we were going in, we could withdraw when we wanted to, unless this provision was put in we would not withdraw from the league if Siam or Hayti or others objected.

What is another reservation: The second one is that article one of the covenant be so amended so as to provide that the United States shall be granted the right to cast the same number of votes as any other member of the league. In other words, that United States will not be bound in any case where England has six votes, her own vote and the additional votes of five of her colonies are cast.

The next reservation is; that in case the colonies cast five votes in a matter in which England and the United States are in controversy, even though England refrains from casting her vote and United States refrains from casting its vote, that the United States will not be bound. The United States is unwilling to go into this treaty although the big brother England may not vote if the five little brothers each have a vote. That is the meaning of this provision.

The next reservations is that no person is or shall be authorized to represent the United States, nor is any citizen of the United States to be eligible as our agent, except pursuant to an act of congress of the United States providing for his ap-

ANDROSS-GLOVER

**Style Shop**

707 Main St.  
Corner Main and 7th

We Are Pleased to Tell You  
We Have Phoenix Hosiery

A Dainty Showing of Silk Under-Garments Modestly Priced

**Autumn's Modes Are Mirrored in Every Department in Our  
Style Shop**

**PICTURESQUE CHARM IN DRESSES**

of Gabardine, Tricotine or Poret Twill for street or business—  
Crepe-Meteor, Satin, Velvet or Georgette for afternoon or dinner

**\$29.50, \$35.00 TO \$110.00**

**WONDERFULLY DESIGNED SUITS**

of Vel-de-Cyne, Veldyne, Velour, Silvertone or Tricotine.  
Fur or Self Trimmed

**\$35.00, \$45.00 UP TO \$115.00**

**GORGEOUS COATS**

in beautiful soft "fabrics," in rich Forest Shades or the "youthful" new "blues"

**\$29.50, \$35.00 TO \$185.00**

**LUXURIOUS FURS**

in Coat, Wrap, Stole or Cape in Fox, Mink, Hudson Seal, Squirrel,  
Skunk, Beaver or Nutria

**\$25.00, \$35.00 UP TO \$575.00**

**EXCLUSIVE SKIRTS, SWEATER OR JERSEY COATS**

for Sport Wear

**\$12.50, \$15.00 TO \$29.50**

**FASCINATING BLOUSES**

Crepe de Chine, Georgette Net, Tricolette, Taffetas. Tailored  
or over-styles. Suit shades, white or flesh

**\$5.75, \$6.50 UP TO \$21.50**

**Andross-Glover Style Shop**

CORNER MAIN AND SEVENTH