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To Editor, New York World

New York City

I cannot see that the question of exemption of tolls for coastwise traffic has any bearing on the treaty. It seems to me merely a domestic question, which could not therefore concern the Hague tribunal. My personal preference would be to charge no tolls to any shipping.

The United States could well afford such generosity.

HARRY PRATT JUDSON

Collect
DAY LETTER

ALL DAY LETTERS TAKEN BY THIS COMPANY SHALL BE SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING TERMS WHICH ARE HEREBY AGREED TO

The Western Union Telegraph Company will receive DAY LETTERS, to be transmitted at rates lower than its standard day message rates, as follows: one and one-half times the standard night letter rate shall be charged for the transmission of fifty (50) words or less, and one-fifth of the initial rate for such fifty words shall be charged for each additional ten (10) words or less.

To guard against mistakes or delays, the sender of a message should order it REPEATED, that is, telegraphed back to the originating office for comparison. For this, one-half the unrepeated message rate is charged in addition. Unless otherwise indicated on its face, THIS IS AN UNREPEATED MESSAGE AND PAID FOR AS SUCH, in consideration whereof it is agreed between the sender of the message and this Company as follows:

1. The Company shall not be liable for mistakes or delays in the transmission or delivery, or for non-delivery, of any UNREPEATED message, beyond the amount received for sending the same; nor for mistakes or delays in the transmission or delivery, or for non-delivery of any REPEATED message, beyond fifty times the sum received for sending the same, unless specially valued; nor in any case for delays arising from unavoidable interruption in the working of its lines; nor for errors in obscure messages.

2. In any event the Company shall not be liable for damages for any mistakes or delay in the transmission or delivery, or for the non-delivery of this message, whether caused by the negligence of its servants or otherwise, beyond the sum of FIFTY DOLLARS, at which amount this message is hereby valued, unless a greater value is stated in writing hereon at the time the message is offered to the Company for transmission, and an additional sum paid or agreed to be paid based on such value equal to one-tenth of one per cent. thereof.

3. The Company is hereby made the agent of the sender, without liability, to forward this message over the lines of any other Company when necessary to reach its destination.

4. Messages will be delivered free within one-half mile of the Company's office in towns of 5,000 population or less, and within one mile of such office in other cities or towns. Beyond these limits the Company does not undertake to make delivery, but will, without liability, at the sender's request, as his agent and at his expense, endeavor to contract for him for such delivery at a reasonable price.

5. No responsibility attaches to this Company concerning messages until the same are accepted at one of its transmitting offices, and if a message is sent to such office by one of the Company's messengers, he acts for that purpose as the agent of the sender.

6. The Company will not be liable for damages or statutory penalties in any case where the claim is not presented in writing within sixty days after the message is filed with the Company for transmission.

In further consideration of the reduced rate for this special "DAY LETTER" service, the following special terms are hereby agreed to:

A. DAY LETTERS may be forwarded by the Telegraph Company as a deferred service and the transmission and delivery of such DAY LETTERS is, in all respects, subordinate to the priority of transmission and delivery of regular day messages.

B. DAY LETTERS shall be written in plain English. Code language is not permitted.

C. This DAY LETTER may be delivered by the Telegraph Company by telephoning the same to the addressee, and such delivery shall be a complete discharge of the obligation of the Telegraph Company to deliver.

D. This DAY LETTER is received subject to the express understanding and agreement that the Company does not undertake that a DAY LETTER shall be delivered on the day of its date absolutely and at all events; but that the Company's obligation in this respect is subject to the condition that there shall remain sufficient time for the transmission and delivery of such a message on the day of its date during regular office hours, subject to the priority of the transmission of regular day messages under the conditions named above.

No employee of the Company is authorized to vary the foregoing.

THEO. N. VAIL, PRESIDENT

BELVIDERE BROOKS, GENERAL MANAGER

MONEY TRANSFERRED BY TELEGRAPH AND CABLE TO ALL THE WORLD
President Harry Pratt Judson,
University of Chicago,

Dear Sir:—

I see that you, as did I, and other college Presidents from whom the New York World asked opinions, replied to their inquiry in regard to Panama Canal tolls. Long prior to the World's inquiry I took an active interest in this matter and with others protested last summer when the first form of the Canal tolls bill passed the Senate,—against the obvious breach of faith under our Treaty Contract, in exempting all American shipping traffic, that from and to foreign parts, as well as our coastwise traffic, from the payment of tolls.

And the protests of the honest men and press of the country had their effect, and Congress wisely modified this provision so as to restrict the exemption to our coastwise traffic only. I cannot see how such exemption, that is, of our coastwise traffic only, is in contravention of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty and our Contract therein, and I think it is a mistake to so insist.

Under the laws of the United States, no vessel flying a foreign flag may engage in our coastwise trade. This is no new provision. Wise or unwise, it is and has been for years the fixed policy and law of the United States. The language of the Hay-Paunce-
A Treaty in regard to discrimination is:

"The Canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war, of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation or its citizens or subjects, in respect to the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable."

Undoubtedly the form in which the Canal Bill first passed the Senate, relieving all American shipping from tolls, made a gross and palpable discrimination in favor of our vessels and against those of foreign nations in respect to traffic from or to foreign ports, and this called forth a storm of indignation from the honest men and honest press of our land, highly creditable to our sense of national honor and honest dealing; -- but, -- as the bill finally passed, this was changed, and the exemption from tolls confined to our coastwise trading vessels, doing business only between ports of the United States. As no foreign vessels are engaged, or can be engaged, in this trade, how can an exemption from tolls to American bottoms be considered a discrimination against foreign vessels that cannot engage in such trade.

I deplore the unreasoning outcry that many good men are making, conveying the idea that our Nation is acting in bad faith in this matter, -- whereas Congress corrected the first proposed act involving bad faith, and what was done is entirely within our treaty rights. But, unquestionably, if Great Britain argues that what was done involved a breach of our treaty contract, we should be willing and ready to arbitrate the question. One of the telegraphic opinions to the World characterizes the exemption of our coast-
wise shipping from tolls as a "subsidizing of a monopoly in defiance not only of sound public policy but of our legal and moral obligations." But even if it can be properly termed a "legalized monopoly" that is a matter wholly disassociated from the Panama Canal Act and Treaty, existing prior to both, and one to be dealt with at home. Actually far from being a monopoly prejudicial to trade and the public policy of the United States, this aid, by remission of tolls to our coastwise traffic passing through the Canal between our East and West Coasts, is intended to promote the competition of this water traffic with our trans-continental railroad traffic and to reduce the railroad charges, or keep them within reasonable limits. My personal view is strongly that the Canal should be thrown open free of tolls to all traffic of all countries as a world gift from our great country to the commerce of the world. We could well afford to do it and nothing could more justly enhance our prestige and world influence for good than such an act. It would obviate all questions of discrimination, and would be an act worthy of our great Nation.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

President of Lehigh University.
a minute. Suppose we should be at war with a given nation. Would not that fact alter the circumstances that we should be authorized to refuse passage to the Chicago, December 26, 1912 war vessels of our enemy through the canal? Should we be obliged to submit the question of our right to do that to the Hague tribunal? Again, in case of war we should feel free I am sure to throw our fleets through the canal rapidly from ocean to ocean, as circumstances might warrant, and the question of tolls could hardly I am unable to see how the exemption of our coastwise arise under such circumstances. Should we be obliged traffic from the canal tolls in any infraction of the to refer that right to arbitration? The exemption of treaty. The treaty must be construed reasonably our coastwise shipping from tolls is a part of a general The opening of the canal "on terms of entire equality" is policy of Congress with regard to competition with the subject to the express purpose that "there shall be no trans-continental railways. Whether this policy is discrimination against any such nation or its citizens wise or not I am not saying, but merely pointing out or its subjects in respect to the conditions or charges that it is a part of that policy. If we must submit of traffic or otherwise." Obviously this question this question to arbitration therefore we are submitting of equality cannot apply to traffic of such nature as to arbitration a question that may be regarded by Congress as vitally affecting our domestic policy, and as to a matter of our domestic policy, which can have no bearing on foreign nations. It seems On the question of submitting this point to me that the attitude of Great Britain in this matter arbitration I confess I am not so clear. Let us think is entirely unwarranted.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

President Henry S. Drinker, Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.
OFFICE. December 6th, 1915

Dear Sir:

Your favor of the 26th inst. is received.

I am unable to see now the opportunity of any conferences

Greatly to the company unless I can find time for a visit.

The company would be compelled to surrender

the opening of the meeting on account of extreme difficulty in

obtaining the necessary amount of money from or to the company.

I am opposed to the conclusion of a truce or any

negotiations with respect to the conclusion of a truce or

negotiations for the conclusion of a truce or agreement.

Opposition to the conclusion of a truce or agreement.

As difficulty cannot apply to satisfaction of the requirements

not to affect further negotiations, if any, and be to be supplied

a matter of our own domestic policy.

In the conclusion of any further facts, for to

negotiation I content I am not in agree. for no facts.

Yours very truly,
a minute. Suppose we should be at war with a given nation. Would not that fact so alter the circumstances that we should be authorized to refuse passage to the war vessels of our enemy through the canal? Should we be obliged to submit the question of our right to do that to the Hague tribunal? Again, in case of war we should feel free I am sure to throw our fleets through the canal rapidly from ocean to ocean, as circumstances might warrant, and the question of tolls could hardly arise under such circumstances. Should we be obliged to refer that right to arbitration? The exemption of our coastwise shipping from tolls is a part of a general policy of Congress with regard to competition with the trans-continental railways. Whether this policy is wise or not I am not saying, but merely pointing out that it is a part of that policy. If we must submit this question to arbitration therefore we are submitting to arbitration a question that may be regarded by Congress as vitally affecting our domestic policy, and which can have no bearing on foreign nations. It seems to me that the attitude of Great Britain in this matter is entirely unwarranted.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

President Henry S. Drinker,
Lehigh University, South Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.
Suppose we quickly go over the motion.

Resolution

Whereas the sense of the Board for the Caesarea Regional Council have requested that the Board of Directors take action to set up a committee to investigate the feasibility of a project to establish a new town in the *specific area* mentioned in the resolution of the Caesarea Regional Council of 1960,

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Board of Directors hereby authorize the establishment of a committee to investigate the feasibility of the project mentioned above.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

The Executive Director

Caesarea Regional Council, Department of Development, Municipalities.
CONCERNING THE PROPOSED REPEAL
OF THE "COASTWISE EXEMPTION" IN THE PANAMA BILL

Dear Sir:

A movement is on foot to further the repeal by Congress of the provision of the Panama Canal Bill exempting the coastwise trade of the United States—on these grounds:

(1) That it is in contravention of our contract in the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty that there shall be no discrimination in tolls or conditions, all vessels having been placed upon an equality in that document.

(2) That it has already gravely injured the prestige of our country abroad and if not repealed is sure to prove an obstacle in many quarters to the extension of our foreign trade.

(3) That its retention would compel us either to agree to arbitration, which could not honorably be refused, and with the certainty of defeat and consequent national humiliation, or to decline arbitration, which course not only would place us in a lamentable position in the eyes of the rest of the world, but would be a heavy blow to the arbitration movement, and at the very time when the value and need of it is being demonstrated by the unspeakable horrors of the Balkan war.

With a view to aid in this movement, I have been requested by prominent advocates of arbitration to collect for use with Congress expressions from the press and distinguished citizens against the coastwise exemption. Will you have the kindness to send me, in the inclosed envelope, such an opinion, either already published or one which you may be willing to give, however brief. The suggestion is respectfully made that your continued activity in favor of the repeal of the exemption will contribute greatly to that result. Some members who voted for it have expressed their regret and their intention to vote for repeal.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT UNDERWOOD JOHNSON

33 East 17th Street, New York
CONCERNING THE PROPOSED REPEAL
OF THE "COASTWISE EXEMPTION" IN THE PELICAN BILL

Dear Mr. Johnson,

A movement is on foot to further the repeal by Congress of the provision of the
Preliminary Survey Container which examines the coastwise ships of the United States—on three
occasions.

I am in communication with our Congress in the House. It is an important matter at the
present time, and I am asking for your cooperation in furthering its passage.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert Underwood Johnson

33 East 14th Street, New York
Chicago, December 13, 1912

Dear Sir:

Your circular as to the coastwise exemption in the Panama Bill is received. I am at a loss to understand why that should be held to conflict with the treaty. It seems to me wholly a domestic matter, with which other nations cannot be concerned. If coastwise trade comes under the rule of the equality of opportunity for all in the Canal, if that implies anything it would imply that that trade should be open to foreign vessels. So far as arbitration of the matter is concerned, again I cannot see why we should arbitrate a domestic matter.

Very truly yours,

R.F.J. - E.

Mr. R. U. Johnson,
December 19, 1948

Dear Sir:

Your circular as to the conference example

soon to the frame will be received. I am at a

lose to understand why that should be held to con-

ference. It seems to me wholly a

generic matter, with which other nations cannot be

concerned. If conference should come under the rule

of the majority of opportunity for all to the circuit

it that implies reparation to many imply that the

space should be open to toto the nation. However I can

not see why we should accept a generic matter.

Very truly yours,

R.L.L. Jr.

Mr. H.U. Johnson

"The Central", 23 E. 37th St., New York
Corona, Long Island.
June 5, 1913.

Dear Sir:—

Four years careful study of the controversy between the United States and the Republic of Colombia over the secession of Panama has convinced me that this country is in honor bound to satisfy the claims of its weaker neighbor or to submit them to arbitration.

Knowing your great interest in Latin-American affairs, I take the liberty of writing to ask what, in your opinion, would be the most dignified and proper method of promoting the settlement of a dispute that for nearly ten years has been a prolific source of anti-American feeling throughout the Southern republics. Do you think that a petition to the Senate would be of any avail?

Thanking you in anticipation of your kind assistance permit me to assure you, albeit unnecessary, that I am seeking the benefit of your advice in my private capacity — not as a journalist — and that your reply will be held by me in confidence.

I have the honor to be, dear Sir,
Yours respectfully,

Henry Pratt Judson, Esq.
Dear Sir:

Your letter dated April 15, 1918, expressing the views of the United States concerning the future of the recently acquired territory of the Philippines, has been received. I have had the opportunity to examine the correspondence between the United States and the Philippines, and I am inclined to support the position of the United States as expressed in the correspondence. In my opinion, the United States has a vested interest in the Philippines and should take steps to maintain the territorial integrity of the country.

Knowing your great interest in Latin-American affairs, I feel the United States should consider the welfare of the Filipino people in shaping policy. I am of the opinion that the United States should not interfere with the internal affairs of the Philippines unless there is a justifiable reason for doing so. However, I think that a petition to the Senate would be of great benefit to the Filipinos.

Thanking you for your interest and understanding.

Yours respectfully,

Henry I. Trask, Governor.
Chicago, June 7, 1913

Dear Sir:

Your favor of the 5th inst. is received.

I think it would be entirely proper for the United States to make a treaty with Columbia in which some reasonable amount should be paid in satisfaction of all claims. I do not believe that the exaggerated claims of that state are entitled to any consideration at all. A petition to the Senate would not be very valuable.

Very truly yours,

H.P.J. - L.

Mr. Henry N. Hall,
Corona, Long Island.
Corona, Long Island.
June 9, 1913.

Dear Sir:-

Four years careful study of the controversy between the United States and the Republic of Colombia over the secession of Panama has convinced me that this country is in honor bound to satisfy the claims of its weaker neighbor or to submit them to arbitration.

Knowing your great interest in international affairs, I take the liberty of writing to ask what, in your opinion, would be the most dignified and proper method of promoting the settlement of a dispute that for nearly ten years has been a prolific source of anti-American feeling throughout the Southern republics. Do you think that a petition to the Senate would be of any avail?

Thanking you in anticipation of your kind assistance permit me to assure you, albeit unnecessary, that I am seeking the benefit of your advice in my private capacity - not as a journalist - and that your reply will be held by me in confidence.

I have the honor to be, dear Sir,
Yours respectfully,

Pres. Harry P. Judson,
February 14, 1914.

Dr. Harry P. Judson,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:

Believing that the exemption of American coastwise shipping from the Panama Canal tolls was objectionable from the point of view of our national obligations and of our national interests, we respectfully suggest that you can render a patriotic service at this moment by urging upon your senators and your representative the duty of supporting President Wilson in his announced intention of doing all that he can to procure the repeal of the unfortunate provision which has proved so great an impairment of our national prestige and embarrassment to the government in its foreign policies.

Mr. Root's cogent speech in advocacy of repeal can doubtless be obtained by addressing him at the Senate Chamber, Washington, D.C.

Respectfully yours,
THE NEW YORK PEACE SOCIETY,

By Special Committee
Horace White, Chairman
John Bates Clark
Robert Underwood Johnson
Frederick Lynch
Report No. 14, 1914

To: Mr. Henry J. Halsey,

111

Dear Sir,

Sincerely yours,

The New York Olympic Society

Mr. Foot is very anxious to have the Olympic Flag of the Games carry your endorsement in opposition to our national policy.

Washington, D.C.
Chicago, February 18, 1914.

Dear Sir:—

Your favor of the 14th inst. is received. I do not believe that the provision in the Panama Canal Bill to which you refer contravenes the treaty. On the other hand I do not believe that it is economically advisable. If the matter were taken up on its merits as an economic question I should be glad to cooperate with you, but on the other matter I cannot concur.

Very truly yours,

M.P.J. — L.

Secretary, The New York Peace Society,
507 Fifth Avenue, New York City.
Office, September 18, 1914.

Dear Sir,

Your favor of the 17th Inst. is received.

I go not believe the proposition in the letter.

I cannot deny to whom you refer concerning the question.

On the other hand, I go not believe that it is economic.

Tell my respects. If the matter were taken up on the

writings in an economic discussion I think you have

considered with you, but on the other matter I cannot

agree.

Very truly yours,

H. L. G.
CHICAGO March 13, 1914.

Dr. Harry Pratt Judson,
President, University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

Dear Dr. Judson:

I wish to express my thanks to you for your courtesy in outlining for us your views of the Panama Canal Tolls question, and to say that, of course, we shall respect your wish that it should not be published as coming from you.

I venture to express the hope that your approaching long journey may be in all respects a pleasant one.

Yours respectfully,

Edward S. Beck
Managing Editor.
Dear Mr. Johnson,

I have the honor to submit herewith a letter of introduction for my friend, Mr. Young, to the Faculty of the University of Chicago. I trust that you will have the kindness to present this letter to the proper authorities, and to extend to Mr. Young the courtesies to which he is entitled as a representative of the University of California.

I have the pleasure of knowing Mr. Young and am confident that he will make a useful contribution to the University. I am, therefore, in the hope that you will accept the services of Mr. Young as a member of your faculty.

I remain, gentlemen,

Yours truly,

[Signature]

Managing Editor

[Handwritten note]
I cannot concur with the view of those who hold that the statute by virtue of which vessels engaged in the coast-wise commerce of the United States shall be exempted from the Panama Canal tolls is in violation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty.

The basis of the neutralization of the Panama Canal adopted by the United States in Article 3 of such treaty provides as follows: "The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic, or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable." It seems to me that in adopting these provisions, the United States is, as holding and operating the canal, stating itself as one party against all the other nations of the world as the other party. By virtue of this agreement, the United States is bound to treat all these nations alike. There should be no discrimination against Great Britain in favor of Germany,
I cannot estimate the value of labor.

With great respect the author of the letter to the public
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organizing the court, resulting from one branch

will be after the entire of the society as the other branch,

the action of the new organization and the Federal Court

to state if there is any positive effect. Some weight to an

organization should have priority to have a greater.
or against Germany in favor of Russia, for instance. To suppose that "all nations observing these rules" is a term including the United States seems to me not at all to be inferred from the question of the treaty. In Washington's farewell address he urged on the United States the policy of "peace and friendship with all nations: entangling alliances with none." It will hardly be held that Washington was urging the United States to a policy of peace and friendship with itself. He was speaking of the United States as one party, over and against all the nations of the world as the other party. If the treaty is to be construed in the former sense, Washington's principle should be construed in the same sense.

I cannot think that Great Britain is seriously interested in the extension of our coast-wise trade from paying the canal tolls as a separate question. The coast-wise trade of the United States is by statute limited to vessels under the American flag. It is a matter, therefore, which cannot have direct concern with other nations; for British ships can under no circumstances, under the laws which have uniformly
controlled the United States, engage in that trade.
It is, however, distinctly desirable on the part of
Great Britain that American foreign shipping should
not have the advantage of exemption from canal tolls.
Great Britain, by the various advantages in the construction
and operating of iron and steel ships in the first
place, and by the operating of Confederate cruisers
during our Civil War, fitted out mostly in Great Britain,
in the second place, has succeeded in entirely obliterating
the ocean Board of Commerce in the United States under
the American flag. Naturally, she does not desire to
see the recrudescence of that commerce. If the United
States adopts the provision of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty
forbidding the exemption of coast-wise shipping from the
canal tolls, it would be impossible for foreign shipping
to be exempted.

While I do not believe, therefore, that the
United States has by this treaty with Great Britain
forbidden from exempting its shipping from tolls in the
Panama Canal, at the same time I cannot see the wisdom
of the present exemption in this. I do not see any
advantage resulting from the owners of coasting vessels
not paying some toll for the uses of the canal that
are paid by other vessels of the American flag, nor
can I see any economic advantages from such an exemption,
which is generous in its character. It must be a
bounty, and a bounty can only be justified, if at all,
in becoming a general national benefit. Perhaps there
may be sound economic reasons for bettering the develop-
ment of foreign shipping in the United States by freedom
from tolls. Whatever justification there might be
economically for such a policy, I do not believe applies
to our domestic shipping.

I suppose there is

I suppose Congress might do this if it wished for our
shipping. If it is the desire of Congress to encourage
foreign shipping by bounty, it would seem to me wiser
and better policy to provide bounty in lieu of exempting
tolls directly, for direct and open action is always
better that indirect and concealed action.

In brief, then, I do not believe that Hay-
Pauncefote Treaty is fairly to be construed as forbidding
the United States to grant freedom of tolls to its coast-wise shipping. But on the other hand, I do not believe that such exemption for our ships is economically sound policy.
The only reason to break house or cattle is for abuse of authority. I do not believe that there is a case of political injustice on either side that cannot be settled by communication. — happening.