

New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements
Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations

SATURDAY, JULY 12, 1919

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Offices: 100 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone: Holman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, Including Postage in the United States and Canada:

	Year	Month	Day
Daily and Sunday	\$10.00	\$2.00	\$1.00
Daily only	8.00	1.50	.75
Sunday only	6.00	1.25	.50

FOREIGN RATES:

	Year	Month	Day
Daily and Sunday	\$12.00	\$2.50	\$1.25
Daily only	10.00	1.75	.87
Sunday only	8.00	1.50	.75

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

GUARANTEE
You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS
The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for republication of all news dispatches credited to it or not otherwise credited in this paper and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

The Honest Course

The desirability and the need of a league of nations are not under debate, and attempts to make the contrary appear are deceptive. A long line of American statesmen, including leaders of every party, and an equally long line of public acts and declarations have defined the national policy and established a national tradition in favor of maximum arrangements to limit armaments, to arbitrate international differences, and to systematize a concert of nations. No longer ago than 1916 Congress, by practically unanimous vote, authorized the President to invite the nations to a conference to consider organized peace.

Conspicuous in urging the creation of a new international order have been leaders of the Republican party. Seward, Fish, Everts, Gresham, Hay, Root and Knox, as Secretaries of State, have strongly promoted projects looking to it, and have had the hearty support of their Presidents, not excepting McKinley and Roosevelt. Closing his address to the second Hague conference, Joseph H. Choate said: "Let us unite on this great pacific measure and satisfy the world that this second conference really intends that hereafter peace and not war shall be the normal condition of civilized nations."

The conviction that a league is necessary has been greatly strengthened and energized by the events of the last five years. The New York Republican convention of 1918 emphatically declared for the organization of a league and for our entry therein. If the question were now submitted, no major party, and probably no minor one, would uphold the negative. Senators Johnson and Poindexter, not to speak of Senators Lodge and Knox, are not opposed to a league, and often have so declared.

What is under debate is, first, whether a particular agreement drawn at Paris, which pretends to embody the League principle, is worth adhering to, and, second, if there is adhesion, what interpretative reservations are wise to protect this country's liberty of action and to make it impossible to lodge against it a charge of treaty breaking.

Of these two questions the first, after a period of some doubt, seems practically disposed of. A majority of the Senate has apparently concluded that the covenant, meagre as it is, is worth ratifying; that in providing for periodic conferences, by furnishing a form of organization, even though the organization has little independent power, and by using this organization as a committee to discharge certain administrative duties in connection with the application of the peace, there are gains. The Senate majority indicates its desire to preserve all the affirmative good which is in the covenant and to allow it full opportunity to develop usefulness. It favors reservation, but reservation, it is scarcely necessary to point out, implies a concurrent ratification—in the present instance an acceptance of the proposed league in so far as it is substantive.

The debate thus further narrows to the issue of what interpretative reservations are now required. Concerning this there is a rapid approach toward agreement. It is generally recognized that the Monroe Doctrine, whose status is left in some doubt, must be definitely reworded; that notice must be given that the covenant will not be construed by us as pledging our participation in every petty squabble or as guaranteeing every existing national boundary; that should we wish to withdraw from the agreement we, and not others, must be the judge of whether our obligations have been respected—the language now permitting a majority of the covenant council to deny us the right of withdrawal, which is nominally conceded, by voting us in contempt.

Touching these matters the discussion

has taken a peculiar turn. It is denied that the Monroe Doctrine is impaired or that we are committed to unwilling participation in wars, or that we guarantee national boundaries, or that there is any real limitation on the right of free withdrawal. The controversy is thus between those who hold certain things should be made explicit and those who hold they are already implied. As a certain animal is said to cut its own throat when swimming, so the opponents of reservation seem to cut the throat of their own argument when they assert that the agreement comes to the same thing whether or not reservations are made.

The residue of the debate is as to whether other nations will so object to our reservations as to withdraw or withhold ratification, at a cost of prolonging the period of nominal war. Not a shred of evidence is furnished that they will. Even now arrangements are being made to lift blockades and to resume trade. Our State Department, it is said, will make a formal announcement within forty-eight hours of the resumption of commercial relations with Germany. If we say we shall construe the covenant as outlined in a ratification resolution, we may expect a tacit assent such as met our reservations to the Hague and Algeiras treaties. No formality is required, as Henry W. Taft admitted in a recent article. Reservations by us do not require other countries to accept them as the true ones—they are merely binding on our courts and set forth the way we understand the covenant.

No persuasive reason has yet been adduced as to why any one should object to the proposed reservations. What life the league has it would still have. The league would still be a going concern, for no one would "reserve" against naming representatives, or the assemblage of the conferences, or the performance of the administrative acts laid on the league's council. The league would function under one kind of ratification as freely as under the other. The only difference would be that our people and the world would know our attitude toward attempts to interpret the covenant as confiding control of our destiny to alien hands.

If this nation would lead the world, as we are told it should and may, the best course for it to pursue is the honest one of declaring our purposes openly and lucidly.

The Process of Ratification

President Wilson was evidently speaking in a reconditio sense when he said that a two-thirds vote would be required to qualify or alter the peace treaty. The rules and practice of the Senate admit of amendment, qualification and reservation by a majority vote. A two-thirds vote is necessary at only two stages of the consideration of a treaty—on the final resolution of ratification and on a motion for indefinite postponement.

What the President evidently had in mind was that the ratification of the treaty, after it had been qualified or altered, might be defeated by a minority exceeding one-third of the members present. In that sense the modification effected by a bare majority must be approved eventually by a two-thirds majority. But in order to annul the modifications made the minority opposing them would be obliged to vote to reject the treaty.

It is not yet certain that the Administration wants to push its programme of ratification, without additions or subtractions, to the point of killing the treaty. Yet that is the logic of the contention against alteration in case a majority of the Senate decides to alter. Mr. Phelan suggested the predicament of the "sign here" Senators when he said rather dubiously:

"I should think that the Senate should be allowed to vote on the treaty with or without amendments. By no rule could the Senate be denied the right to vote for the league in its purity; in other words, the majority could not force the Senate to vote for an amended treaty and nothing else."

Yet it is clearly within the power of a majority of the Senate to determine whether the league covenant shall be voted on "in its purity" or as altered and qualified with the purpose of better protecting the interests of the United States. A majority can force the Senate to vote on an unamended treaty and nothing else or to vote on an "amended" treaty and nothing else.

In a letter published elsewhere on this page Mr. George W. Wickersham calls attention to a "reservation" supposed to be attached by a majority vote to the treaty with Spain ratified in 1899. This was the famous McEnery resolution, passed by the Senate in deference to the wishes of the senior Senator from Louisiana. He had voted for the treaty, and if he had voted against it it would have failed. The resolution was, however, no part of the treaty. It was a separate legislative act—a mere declaration of opinion on the part of Congress (for the House of Representatives also passed it). The Supreme Court naturally held that it was in no legal sense an interpretation or qualification of the Treaty of Paris. To attain such a status it would have had to be inserted in the ratification resolution by a majority action and then consented to by two-thirds.

The implication that a minority may prevent ratification with reservations in-

dicates a swift change of programme on the part of the Administration. In the President's absence the argument has been made much of that any delay in ratification would prevent the resumption of trading with Germany. On that ground the Senate was urged to overlook imperfections in the draft of the covenant and to approve it on sight.

Now the President announces that trade may be resumed before ratification on our part occurs. In that case the appeal for urgency loses its force.

The Voracious "Big Five"

The Federal Trade Commission in a special report shows to what extent the "Big Five" of the meat packing industry are permeating the business of purveying all kinds of food. The "Big Five," jointly or separately, now control 574 companies, have a minority in ninety-five others, and have what is called an "undetermined interest" in ninety-three more. The packers now deal in such various commodities as fresh tomatoes and banjo strings, leather and cottonseed oil, grape juice, curled hair, pepsin, breakfast foods and washing powders. Thus branch houses are not only stations for the distribution of meat and poultry, but are wholesale grocery houses, and besides groceries they handle ice, salt, fertilizers, butter, eggs, rice, grains and countless other articles. The invasion has arrived with inundating force. The combined sales were above \$3,000,000,000 last year, and go up about a billion a year.

The Trade Commission is strong on description of conditions but weak on prescription of remedies. There is talk of illegal combinations and rebates, but this is old stuff, and experience has sadly shown that the disease of bigness is not removed when there are successful anti-trust suits or a cessation of special transportation privileges. The packers thrive chiefly through the economies incident to doing business on a large scale and with perfected means.

The packers are unpopular, but even more unpopular are high prices of food. If the packers give more for less they will get the customers, and railing at unfair competition will not head them off. If other food distributors would keep the packers within bounds they must develop ways of lessening the margin between what is paid to producers and what is charged to consumers. On this vital problem the commission is practically silent—has apparently nothing constructive to offer—and this means that its report, while interesting, is of little practical value.

A Needed Warning

Edward S. Walsh, State Superintendent of Public Works, calls attention to a matter, much neglected, which vitally affects the future of New York and the country as a whole. There is still failure to provide adequate terminals for the large canal in Oswego and New York City. We have spent \$150,000,000 on a great waterway that lacks outlets and inlets.

The war suspended Canada's work on the new Welland Canal. But it will now go forward, and soon the largest vessels can pass through it; thence, via Lake Ontario and a canalized St. Lawrence, to the sea. To give American commerce equal facility a canal is not enough—there must be a harbor and harbor works. One has been voted for Jamaica Bay, although little has been done; but there must be another harbor at Oswego.

The creation of a great waterway effectively linking the Great Lakes and the sea should be a national task. But the burden has been assumed by New York and must continue to be carried, in all probability, by the state. And there must be haste if a great trade is not to be diverted in the early future. It is time for all parts of the state to unite to promote the terminal projects, and thus to make usable the canal on which a vast sum has been expended. Superintendent Walsh has issued a needed warning.

Language and Nationalism

In seven American states the legislatures have passed laws forbidding the use of German or other foreign languages in the elementary schools. Similar legislation has been under consideration in seventeen other states. The desire to exclude instruction in alien tongues is a natural reaction from war conditions. It represents an impulse toward nationalization.

The current seems to be running the other way in Paris. The treaty with Austria which the conferees are completing seeks to compel Rumania, for instance, a co-equal in sovereignty with the other Allied powers, to surrender the right to say what language shall be used in her schools. Similar restrictions are to be imposed on Poland, Jugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. The league of nations is to be the arbiter of disputes over the use of competing languages.

Would the government of the United States submit to such an arbitrament? The claims of nationality and internationalism are coming into sharp conflict over this question. Which will prevail? Or will there be one rule for some powers and a different rule for others?

The German navy redeemed itself. It has washed out what seemed to many the black stain of dishonor. German sailors have salvaged their reputation by sinking their ships. It seemed incredible that a navy that had defeated the British in southern waters and off Skagerrak could so tamely surrender.—From *Viereck's Monthly*.

Like praises like. Only the German-minded can understand German.

And in the Second Person

(From the Boston Globe)
"Me" will be tried alone in London.

The Conning Tower

As to the Treaty
"If Woodrow in a million words
Explained for half a year,
Do you suppose," the Borah said
"That he would make it clear?"
"I doubt it," said the Poindexter,
And shed a bitter tear.

Well, just as we thought, the President went to Keith's Thursday night. When we saw the President, at Keith's or at some other theatre, where motley was the wear, we marked how frequently he laughed, how low his boiling point was. But it is hard for so unversed a psychologist as ourself to determine whether he laughs because he actually considers what he hears funny or because he knows he is being watched, and not to laugh would show the superiority, having which, he does not want the people to know he has. And so, as we dope it, he laughs, lest he seem to think the stuff isn't funny, which, in most instances, it certainly isn't.

On the bill at Keith's Thursday night—the papers never carry that part of the news, but to us it seems important—were Lucille Cavanaugh, Irving Fisher, George Austin Moore, Anne and Marie Clark, and, as the phrase goes, others. But we'd rather hear what he thought of the show than read what he thinks about the sentiment of the nation.

It is almost as easy, by John Corbin and the 11,000 virgins of Cologne, to read the President's peroration as blank verse as it was the English version of "The Jest." Allowing for elisions, it can be read thus: The stage is set, the destiny disclosed. It has come about by no plan of our conceiving. But by the hand of God, who led us into this way.

We cannot turn back. We can only go forward With lifted eyes and freshened spirit, to follow [the vision].

It was of this that we dreamed at our birth. America shall in truth show the way. The light streams upon the path [ahead] and nowhere else.

THE WEAKER SEX

IV

DOB

I don't know much what he was like;
I only know he danced.
And when he came,
We wheeled the old Victrola out upon the floor
And twayed and whirled and dipped and
And swayed
Like two swallows in the air.
Dance?
He was the only man I ever met
Who danced as well as I did—and as long.
And then he went away.
And now he's married, so I hear,
After a short two weeks of courtship of his bride.
What hidden side of him did she find?
I'll never know.
Sometimes I wish I'd never learned to dance!
ALICE.

THE SLICKER SEX

(1)

LAURA

She called me "Honeybunch" the first time
I met her,
But after three weeks objected to my
calling her Laura,
Because I hadn't known her long enough.
Nevertheless I called her Laura,
She played me for a soft thing
And I was all of that; though I didn't
know it.
It was a good deal of a jolt when she
quietly canned me,
Because her fiancé didn't want me hanging
around.
Yet I owe her a debt of gratitude,
For no girl could play me for a soft thing
again.
Well, of course, they did,
But at least I knew they were doing it.
BERTON BRALDY.

War-time prohibition, Chief of Detectives Mooney says, has decreased crime in Chicago 50 per cent. This is the first fact of amelioration we have seen; and we expect to see it disproved before to-night. It probably will be shown that the downfall of Jess Willard is responsible for the decrease in crime; and such is our reverence for statistics that we believe everything anybody tells us, if he only speaks loud enough.

Some predict that the Kaiser will be tried, and some that he will have the royal suite in the Tower of London; and some—and it is with them we string—that he will be dismissed with a suspended sentence and a reprimand.

Still, the Kaiser, as everybody will recall, had the war forced upon him, and no reason is obvious why his punishment shouldn't be forced upon him.

A Chamois Shimmie

Once a Lama and a Swami
Saw a Chamois do the shimmie;
"Twas a yama-yama Chamois,
And she shook a wicked shimmie."
"Oh, Lor 'umme," said the Swami
And the Lama said: "Oh, mamma."
Then the Swami and the Lama
Shouted: "Shimmie, Chamois, shimmie!"
Soon the gay and zany Chamois,
With her dreamy, "show-me" shimmie,
Got the many of the Swami,
And he shouted, "Oh, Lor 'umme,
I'm a horny, Lama, damme,
But that Chamois, oh, that Chamois;
Lor 'umme, oh, you shimmie;
Show me, Chamois; shame me, Chamois;
Shimmie, Chamois, do it!"
TOM TAMPIO.

At the Concourse Theatre to-day there is "The Hearts of Men," described as "A Picture That Will Go Straight to Your Heart and Linger There as Long as It Beats in Six Parts."

OR—

Ashes to ashes, dust to dust,
If the packers don't get you, the landlords
must.

"Of course, it is understood," said Mr. Samuel Untermyer, "that this case is to be tried in the courts and not in the newspapers." We are tempted to fine Mr. Untermyer for contempt of newspapers.

Regard the Marine, Firemen, Oilers, and Water Tenders' Union.

Are these the faces that led a thousand ships?
F. P. A.

COREA—A JAPANESE VIEW



"You can't make a model nurse maid of a sabre merchant."—From "Jiji," of Tokio.
(The sabre is labelled, "Governor General of Korea." Evidently Japan is not blind to the difficulties of colonial policy.)

The Right Kind of King

From The Tribune's Paris Bureau

BERLIN, June 19.—When a group of American newspaper men is impressed by a crowned King it may be taken to mean that the King in question has qualities quite distinct from the accident of his kingship. And after speeding through Belgium for forty-eight hours in the dusty track of King Albert of the Belgians the representatives of the press of the United States are agreed that if you must have kings that is the kind of king you must have.

President Wilson was coming to pay Belgium his long-expected and long-delayed visit, and in the most natural way in the world the King and Queen of the Belgians jumped aboard an aeroplane at Brussels and flew to a seaside resort called La Panne, landing on the beach among a crowd of surprised bathers. Royalty took it as the most casual occurrence, which set the note for everybody else, so there was an exchange of smiles and greetings, whereafter royalty walked to a hotel.

Bright and early in the morning royalty took an automobile and sped to Adinkorik, the little station on the Belgian frontier where President and Mrs. Wilson were to be greeted. Thither came also Brand Whitlock, who is Minister to Belgium; Baron Mouchour, who was Belgian Minister to Washington once upon a time; the Military Governor, General Verbiest; the Civil Governor, Janssens de Bisthoven, and all the local functionaries, including the stationmaster, arrayed like the lilies. Royalty spent the time of waiting in chatting with all these—and a number of others who are not official enough to be mentioned—and it was noticeable that, whether baron or brakeman, royalty gave each and all the same greeting.

This same greeting served for President and Mrs. Wilson, and it did not appear that the President found anything lacking in it. Perhaps this was because it had warmth without heat, cordiality without gush and sincerity without show—in short, because it was the sort of greeting that is known and generally popular in the United States of America.

Through all the bleak waste of the country that had been burned gray by war pathetic little groups stood at doorways and cheered faintly, and to them the King and the Queen smiled and waved hands. Sometimes we stopped, and at once a crowd gathered. There was no charmed circle in these crowds for the King. He moved about among his subjects and his guests distinguished only by his great height, and—let it be said—by his very good manners. If he desired to speak to some one among us he did not, as was traditional with kings, summon that person haughtily to him. He moved through the crowd and spoke to the person very simply and very pleasantly.

And so we came to Brussels, where the station was banked about with flowers and carpets were laid. Yet even here the man who contrived to make the occasion simple and democratic was the prince by birth and the crowned head by inheritance. Everything was ordered and arranged—well ordered and well arranged, let it be said—yet this tall young man in the general's uniform contrived to give it an air of spontaneity, of homely cordiality.

There is a story going the rounds that when he goes again to America he wants to travel in an aeroplane. If he does one can imagine him dropping casually out of the clouds on to the beach at Coney Island just as he descended among the bathers at La Panne. And nothing at Coney, or anywhere else in the United States, would disturb his simplicity, his directness, his unself-consciousness.

He has been sentimentalized over for nearly five years, but when you have seen him you are not surprised that this should be so. And when he goes again to America there will be one hundred and ten million of people to agree with the decision of the American newspaper men who travelled with him—that if you must have kings that is the kind of king you must have.

Worse Than Mexico

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have read with much pleasure your editorial in to-day's Tribune entitled "Fooling the Filipinos." I have been connected in a business way for some twelve years with a large plant on the Island of Negros, P. I., and have just returned from a four months' trip to the islands.

The matter of the "independence" of the Philippines could not be more clearly and forcibly stated by the writer of this editorial if he had spent years in the islands. I am especially pleased with your statement that "independence" would leave the Filipinos in the condition of Mexico, or worse, inside of two years. They are less capable of self-government than the Mexicans and not a homogeneous people, as the latter are, nor have they nearly as large a leaven of educated and able men.

A cable despatch published in some of the papers yesterday morning shows the present condition in the Philippine Islands, and this is largely due to the feeling of discontent and unrest which has been aroused by all this "independence" talk. It also shows that the plan of giving them control of the various departments of the government at Manila has been granted very much too fast and far ahead of the ability of the Filipinos for self-government.

Also, few people in this country realize that Japan is a very serious menace, as (due to their rapidly increasing population and the crowded conditions at home), the Japanese are trying in every way to get new possessions that are suitable for their people.

You have brought out in your editorial an extremely important point, viz., that the Philippine Islands would be a delicate spot in our relations with Japan. If the Filipinos are granted independence we should almost surely, within a few years, have to prevent Japan from seizing the islands. Most men who have lived in the Far East long enough to understand this situation tell me that Japan is already planning to get economic control of the Philippine Islands as soon as they get independence. This would make it extremely difficult for the United States to interfere.

It therefore certainly behooves our government to look ahead and prevent this situation before things have gone to the point where we should have to step in by force of arms. WILLARD WINSLOW.
New York June 27, 1919.

Hating Music

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Nearly every one gives his children a few music lessons to see if they are musical or not. The mistake that is usually made by the parents is that of saying that they will begin the children with a cheap teacher and then later on give them to a better teacher if they show any talent.

The big point is to find out if the children are musical or not. Now, to prove this the teacher must be thoroughly trained in his work and have had considerable experience. He must know how to secure the interest of the children from the first lesson, and he must be familiar with the best proven means of gaining the results he is working for without turning the children against music. Many grown up people have confessed to me that they do not care much for music because their first and only teacher gave them a "hate on music" at their first lesson. Parents find it hard to realize that the first lessons are far more important than the advanced ones, and they cannot understand how much thought and study it takes before the teacher is prepared to give them.

RUSSELL S. GILBERT.
Allenhurst, N. J., July 10, 1919.

But Mildly Administered

(From The Charleston News and Courier)
About all that Germany got out of world-politics was a series of welts.

The Arithmetic of Ratification

To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: There seems to be considerable confusion of thought respecting the action of the Senate in connection with the treaty of peace. The statement by the President that it would require two-thirds of the Senate to adopt reservations is challenged, and attention is called by Senator Lodge to the rules of the Senate, which provide that on a final question to advise and consent to the ratification in the form agreed to by the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present shall be necessary to determine it in the affirmative, but that all other questions and motions on a treaty shall be decided by a majority vote, etc.

Senator Lodge is quoted as referring to the amendments made to the arbitration treaty with Great Britain, when it was ratified by the Senate, March 7, 1912, as showing that a majority vote was sufficient. The reference is hardly helpful, because the amendments thus adopted by a majority vote were incorporated in the resolution of ratification, which was passed by a two-thirds vote, and it was recognized that these provisions so changed the treaty that it would have to be returned to Great Britain for its approval. President Taft, deeming this not expedient, withdrew the treaty from further consideration, and it never took effect.

The fact, therefore, remains that while the Senate as a matter of procedure may, by a majority vote, resolve to ratify only on conditions expressed, or with modifications, that vote becomes effective only as bringing about a failure to secure the necessary two-thirds vote for ratification of the treaty, or as leading to a two-thirds vote which ratifies the treaty with the amendments, or subject to the so-called reservations.

The whole subject was discussed very fully by the Supreme Court of the United States in a case which arose after the peace treaty with Spain (Diamond Rings Case, 183 U. S. 176). The Senate had ratified by the constitutional two-thirds vote the treaty of peace with Spain. Following the ratification by a majority vote it adopted a resolution (in which the House of Representatives concurred), declaring—

"that by the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain it is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands into citizenship of the United States, nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States; but it is the intention of the United States to establish on said islands a government suitable to the wants and conditions of the inhabitants of said islands to prepare them for local self-government, and in due time to make such disposition of said islands as will best promote the interests of the United States and the inhabitants of said islands."

The Supreme Court held that, as this resolution was adopted in the Senate by less than two-thirds of a quorum, it was absolutely without legal significance upon the question before the court. To be efficacious, it was pointed out, such a resolution must be considered either (1) as an amendment to the treaty, or (2) as a legislative act qualifying or modifying the treaty. But it was neither. Mr. Justice Brown, in his opinion, said:

"It cannot be regarded as part of the treaty, since it received neither the approval of the President nor the consent of the other contracting power. A treaty in its legal sense is defined by Bouvier as 'a compact made between two or more independent nations with a view to the public welfare.' 2 Law Dic. 1126; see Nelson, 2 Pet. 272, 273; Head Money Cases, 112 U. S. 680. By the Constitution, (Art. 2, Sec. 2), the President shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. Obviously the treaty must contain the whole contract between the parties, and the power of the Senate is limited to a ratification of such terms as have already been agreed upon between the President, acting for the United States, and the commissioners of the other contracting power. The Senate has no right to ratify the treaty and introduce new terms into it, which shall be obligatory upon the other power, although it may refuse its ratification, or make such ratification conditional upon the adoption of amendments to the treaty. If, for instance, the treaty with Spain had contained a provision insulating (sic) the inhabitants of the Philippines as citizens of the United States, the Senate might have refused to ratify it until this provision was stricken out. But it could not, in my opinion, ratify the treaty and then adopt a resolution declaring it not to be its intention to admit the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands to the privileges of citizenship of the United States. Such a resolution would be inoperative as an amendment to the treaty, since it had not received the assent of the President or the Spanish commissioners."

So that the constitutional provisions applicable are very plain. The Senate by a two-thirds vote can ratify the treaty with or without amendments. If it adopt amendments which change the agreement the ratification would be incomplete without the assent of all the other parties to the treaty who may have theretofore acted upon it, and all future ratifications by other parties must be made upon the same conditions as those expressed by the Senate. If in connection with the ratification the Senate shall by resolution declare its understanding of the meaning of portions of the treaty, and that understanding is not at variance with its actual provisions, then such resolution would not prevent the ratification from taking effect. After all, there is no mystery in treaty-making. A treaty, as the Supreme Court says in the case which I have referred to, is nothing but a contract between two or more independent nations, and it is a well settled rule that contracts are not binding unless all parties to them agree upon the same thing.

GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM.
New York, July 11, 1919.

A Call for the Experts

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: To settle a dispute, will you please state in your paper what day of the month "dog days" come in on and on what day they go out on? DOG DAYS.
Odd Fellows' Home, Trenton, N. J.
July 4, 1919.

While Some Think

(From The Toledo Blade)
Some men talk from the heart and some from the dictionary.