

**SINNOTT'S ADDRESS  
ON CAMPAIGN ISSUE**

(Continued from Page 2)

In the domestic jurisdiction, council shall so report and make no recommendation as to settlement. Now there is no provision of international law defining what is a domestic question. Japan today is denying that our question of immigration is a domestic question. You see that in the headlines of the newspapers every day. We want the senate to make that question absolutely sure, and also, we want no league of nations, or anybody outside of the United States, to have any right to interfere in our tariff matters, or in the matter of our right to control what aliens shall land upon our shores, and what aliens shall or shall not become citizens under the stars and stripes.

Another important matter involved in the matter of our coastwise traffic, and our tariff. There is a provision in article 23 that members will make provision to secure and maintain the freedom of communication and transit, and equitable treatment for the commerce of all members of the league. What would "equitable treatment for all members" mean in connection with our Panama Canal? We had two treaties with respect to that canal. Under the first, the Clayton-Bulwer treaty, both England and the United States agreed to secure necessary finances for building the Panama Canal, they both agreeing to protect the canal at their joint expense.

That treaty was abrogated, and a new treaty the Hay-Pauncefote treaty was entered into, giving the United States the exclusive right to build the canal. That second treaty contained a provision that the canal should be open to the commerce of all nations on terms of entire equality. We naturally supposed that, as builders of the canal, at an expense of nearly \$700,000,000, were agreeing to let all other nations use that canal on terms of entire equality; that we would not discriminate in favor of one country and against another country. England contended: It means that the United States is to be treated just exactly as every other country, and whatever tolls are imposed upon English ships must be imposed upon American ships; that American ships engaged in coast-wise trade from the Atlantic to the Pacific coast should

pay the same toll as required of foreign ships. England came in with that contention. You will all recollect how President Wilson had said that the farmers on the Pacific coast could deliver their goods that much cheaper, and that that plank in our platform providing for free tolls was not molasses to catch flies.

After President Wilson was elected, and England made her protest,—I am not sure she made a formal protest,—that free tolls be abolished, but while the matter was being discussed, and President Wilson came to congress and said that as long as the matter is debatable,—the matter is debatable,—the matter of free tolls,—he was unwilling to debate it.

Unless you secure the appeal of this act of a democratic congress repealing the free tolls provision at Panama, you will continue to pay tolls on your coastwise trade.

I don't know whether some other president will come to congress and make the same statement about our immigration affairs, about tariff matters, and about Panama Canal again; because here is a plank in the republican platform which if enacted, will immediately present what we consider a domestic question to the league of nations.

"We demand that all ships engaged in coastwise trade and all American vessels shall pass through the Panama Canal without the payment of tolls." If the republican party is placed in power, and carries out the provisions of that plank, you immediately have a matter between England and the United States arising out of a treaty. The question, when raised, will first go to the council of the league of nations and the question as to whether or not we have a right in our own canal and waterways to let our own ships through free, will be decided by Japan, by France, by Italy, by Belgium, by Brazil, Greece, Spain,—all foreign powers having a direct interest in the question. It doesn't take a prophet to determine the result if such a question is submitted, and so we make this reservation: that such questions as coastwise traffic, tariff, immigration, etc. are domestic questions which we will not submit to the league of nations.

Another reservation is, that the United States will not submit to arbitration or enquiry by the assembly, any question which in the judgment of the United States depending upon or relating to its long established policy usually known as the Mon-

roe Doctrine, which said doctrine is to be interpreted by the United States alone, and is declared to be wholly outside the jurisdiction of the league of nations and unaffected by any provision contained in the treaty of peace with Germany.

The reason for this reservation is this: The Monroe Doctrine is the doctrine enunciated by Monroe and approved by Thomas Jefferson, when he said that that doctrine was almost second in importance to the declaration of independence, the doctrine that European countries should not be permitted to intermeddle in American affairs. President Wilson says that this league of nations extends the Monroe Doctrine to the world.

Let me read to you what the British delegation had to say about the provisions in the league of nations concerning the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine and similar understandings are to be put in the same category. They have shown themselves in history not to be the instruments of national ambition, but guarantees of peace. The origin of the Monroe Doctrine is well-known. It was proclaimed in 1823, a theatre for intrigue of European absolutism \*\*\* "In its essence it is consistent with the spirit of the covenant and indeed the principles of the league expressed in article 10. \*\*\* While should any dispute as to the meaning of the latter (Monroe Doctrine) ever arise between American and European powers,—the league is there to settle it."

That last proposition is the one we dispute, and America has always disputed it. She has always claimed the right to herself to define the scope and the meaning of the Monroe Doctrine, the doctrine that we enunciated to protect ourselves; and the senate of the United States is unwilling to surrender the interpretation of that doctrine to any foreign power or to any league of nations.

Here is what editor Loussonie of the "Matin" and Clemenceau's chief spokesman says about the Monroe Doctrine:—"When the American states shall be obliged to take a hand in every war, or menace of war in Europe, (art. 11) they will necessarily fall foul of the fundamental principles laid down by Monroe.\*\*\* If the league takes in the world then Europe must mix in the affairs of America; if only Europe is included then America will violate of neces-

(Continued on page 7)



*"Strads"*

Only the truly great achieve the distinction of name-diminutives. Such names, spoken often and with loving intimacy, grant the originals the fullest measure of their greatness.

"Strads" denote those most prized musical instruments—violins made by Antonio Stradivari and—

The **STRADIVARI**  
"KNOWN FOR TONE"

Test the Stradivari. Make the test the most exacting you can think of. See the beautifully designed models. Learn to your own satisfaction why it is called "the Master Musical Instrument." Look for the Stradivari Store.

FRANK M. UPP, Jeweler  
511 Main St.

Khaki Breeches  
O. D. Blankets  
And Other Army  
Goods

Get Your Winter's Supply

at

**HALF PRICES**

Overcoats  
O. D. Shirts  
Woolen Underwear  
Woolen Breeches

**ARMY GOODS  
SALE**

Main Street, Next to Mondale Theater