Hisses and "Boos" Punctuate League of Nations Debate in Senate

with this amendment, considering many other features to be very bad.

It seems sure to-night also, entirely aside from any action by the committee, that a reservation or amendment favoring the right of Ireland to independence would be inserted in the treaty. It was declared that while a majority of the Senate may not really favor such an amendment, it could not be defeated if brought up for a roll call on the floor.

David H. Miller, legal adviser to the league of nations commission at Versailles, was questioned by the Foreign Relations Committee about the origin of the league covenant and the meaning of some parts of it. He admitted he had never seen the draft of the American plan, which was sent to the Senate yesterday by the President, until it had been printend and was ready for submission to the commission. He said the basis for the final draft of the covenant was a composite, which he and C. J. P. Hurst, a legal attaché of the British Foreign Office, had prepared.

Senator Lodge Calls League of Nations 'Deformed Experiment on Noble Purpose'

New York Tribune Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON, Aug. 12.—Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, speaking in the Senate to-day in opposition to the league of nations, described it as "a deformed experiment upon a noble purpose," and as essentially an alliance embracing many "provisions for war." He expressed the belief that instead of safeguarding the Monroe Doctrine, the covenant would kill it.

His speech was cheered by the galleries, which booed and hissed the reply of Senator Williams, of Mississippi, who attacked the position of Senator Lodge as "partisan and narrow" and accused him of "always attempting to make a show of himself."

Senator Williams denied several of the Massachusetts Senator's assertions and rebuked him for scorning certain of President Wilson's utterances.

Debate of the covenant followed, in which Senator Hitchcock, of Nebraska, and Senator Borah, of Idaho, took part. Outbursts of hisses and cheers from the galleries provoked several remonstrances from Vice-President Marshall, who failed, however, to stop the demonstrations by threats of clearing the visitors' space.

Reviews Holy Alliance

In opening his speech, Senator Lodge reviewed the history of the Holy Alliance to demonstrate that history "never repeats itself exactly," and then continued:

"I have taken the trouble to trace in the merest outline the development of the Holly Alliance, so hostile and dangerous to human freedom, because I think it carries with it a lesson for us at the present moment, showing as it does what may come from general proportions and declarations of purposes in which all the world agrees. Turn to the preamble of the covenant of the league of nations now before us, which states the object of the league. It is formed "in order to promote international coöperation, to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations, by the firm establishment of the understandings of international laws as the actual rule of conduct among governments and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another."

Brave Words, He Says

"No one would contest the loftiness or the benevolence of these purposes. Brave words, indeed! They do not differ essentially from the preamble of the treaty of Paris, from which sprang the Holy Alliance. But the covenant of this league contains a provision which I do not find in the treaty of Paris, and which is as follows:

"'The assembly may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league or affecting the peace of the world.'

"No revolutionary movement, no internal conflict of any magnitude, can fail to affect the peace of the world. That this fair and obvious interpretation is the one given to it abroad is made perfectly apparent in the direct and vigorous statement of M. Clemenceau in his letter to Mr. Paderewski, in which he takes the ground in behalf of the Jews and other nationalities in Poland that they should be protected, and where he says that the associated powers would feel themselves bound to secure guarantees in Poland 'of certain essential rights which will afford to the inhabitants the necessary protection, whatever changes may take place in the internal constitution of the Polish Republic.' He contemplates and defends interference with the internal affairs of Poland—among other things—in behalf of a complete religious freedom, a purpose with which we all deeply sympathize.

Embodied in Treaty

"These promises of the French Prime Minister are embodied in effective clauses in the treaties with Germany and with Poland and deal with the internal affairs of nations, and their execution is intrusted to the 'principal Allied and associated powers'; that is, to the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy and Japan. This is a practical demonstration of what can be done under Article III and Article XI of the league covenant, and the authority which permits interference in behalf of religious freedom—an admirable object—is easily extended to the repression of internal disturbances, which may well prove a less admirable purpose. If Europe desires such an alliance or league, with a power of this kind, so be it. But I object in the strongest possible way to having the United States agree, directly or indirectly, to be controlled by a league which may at any time, and perfectly lawfully and in accordance with the terms of the covenant, be drawn in to deal with internal conflicts in other countries, no matter what those conflicts may be. We should never permit the United States to be involved in any internal conflict in another country, except by the will of her people expressed through the Congress, which represents them.

"With regard to wars of external aggression on a member of the league, the case is perfectly clear. There can be no genuine dispute whatever about the meaning of the first clause of Article X. In the first place, it differs from every other obligation in being individual and placed upon each nation without the intervention of the league. Each nation for itself promises to respect and preserve as against external aggression the boundaries and the political independence of every member of the league. The elaborate arguments which have been made here and the learning which has been displayed about our treaty with Granada, now Colombia, and with Panama, were not necessary for me, because there can be no doubt of our right to give a guarantee to another nation that we will protect its boundaries and independence.

It Is Individual Pledge

"The point I wish to make is that the pledge is an individual pledge. We have, for example, given guarantees to Panama and for obvious and sufficient reasons. The application of that guarantee would not be in the slightest degree affected by ten or twenty other nations giving the same pledge, if Panama, when in danger, appealed to us to fulfil our obligations; we should be bound to do so without the slightest reference to the other guarantors. In Article X the United States is bound on the appeal of any member of the league not only to respect but to preserve its independence and its boundaries, and that pledge, if we give it, must be fulfilled.

"There is to me no distinction whatever in a treaty between what some persons are pleased to call legal and moral obligations. A treaty rests and must rest upon moral obligations. No doubt a great power impossible of coercion can cast aside a moral obligation if it sees fit and escape from the performance of the duty which it promises. The pathway of dishonor is always open. I, for one, however, cannot conceive of voting for a clause of which I disapprove because I know it can be escaped in that way. Whatever the United States agrees to by that agreement she must abide.

"I return, then, to the first clause of Article X. It is, I repeat, an individual obligation. If China should rise up and attack Japan in an effort to undo the great wrong of the cession of the control of Shantung to that power we should be bound under the terms of Article X to sustain Japan against China and a guarantee of that sort is never invoked except when the question has passed beyond the stage of negotiation and has become a question for the application of force. I do not like the prospect. It shall not come into existence by any vote f mine.

Article XI Increases Danger

"Article XI carries this danger still further, for it says:

"'Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league and the league shall take any action that shall be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations.'

"'Any war or threat of war'—that means both external aggression and internal sturbance. Let me take an example. The following dispatch appeared recently in the newspapers:

"'Hedjaz vs. Bedouins—The forces of Emir Adullah recently suffered a grave defeat, the Wahabis attacking and capturing Kurma, east of Mecca. Ibn Savond is believed to be working in harmony with the Wahabis. A squadron of the royal air force was ordered recently to go to the assistance of King Hussein.'

"Hussein I take to be the Sultan of Hedjaz. He is being attacked by the Bedouins, as they are known to us, although I fancy the general knowledge about the Wahabis and Ibn Savond and Emir Adullah is slight and the names mean but little to the American people. Nevertheless, here is a case of a member of the league—for the King of the Hedjaz is such a member in good and regular standing and signed the treaty by his representatives, Mr. Rustem Haidar and Mr. Abdul Havi Aouni.

"Under Article XI, if King Hussein appealed to us for aid and protection against external aggression affecting his independence and the boundaries of his kingdom, we should be bound to give that aid and protection and to send American soldiers to Arabia. It is not relevant to say that this is unlikely to occur, that Great Britain is quite able to take care of King Hussein. The fact that we should not be called upon does not alter the right which the King of Hedjaz possesses to demand the sending of American troops to Arabia in order to preserve his independence against the assaults of the Wahabis or Bedouins. I am unwilling to give that right to King Hussein, and this illustrates the point which is to me the most objectionable in the league as it stands—the right of other powers to call out American troops and American ships to go to any part of the world, an obligation we are bound to fulfil under the terms of this treaty.

Gives Control of Immigration

"Let me now briefly point out the insuperable difficulty which I find in Article XV. It begins: 'If there should arise between members of the league any dispute likely to lead to a rupture' . . . 'Any dispute' covers every possible dispute. It therefore covers a dispute over tariff duties and over immigration. Suppose we have a dispute with Japan or with some European country as to immigration. Immigration cannot escape the action of the league by any claim of domestic jurisdiction; it has too many international aspects.

"Article IX says:

"'The council may, in any case under this article, refer the dispute to the assembly.'

"We have our dispute as to immigration with Japan or with one of the Balkan States, let us say. Japan or the Balkan States ask that it be referred to the assembly and the immigration question between the United States and Jugo-Slavia or Japan, as the case may be, goes to the assembly. The representatives of the council, except the delegates of the United States and of Japan or Jugo-Slavia, must all vote unanimously upon it as I understand it, but a majority of the entire assembly, where the council will have only seven votes, will decide. Can any one say beforehand what the decision of that assembly will be? The question in one case may affect immigration from every country in Europe, although the dispute exists only for one, and in the other the whole matter of Asiatic immigration is involved. Is it too fanciful to think that it might be decided against us? There should be no possibility of other nations deciding who shall come into the United States, or under what conditions they shall enter.

"Article XXI says:

"'Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine for securing the maintenance of peace.'

Not in the First Draft

"This provision did not appear in the first draft of the covenant. The British delegation took it upon themselves to eplain Article XXI at some length and this is what they said:

"'Article XXI makes it clear that the covenant is not intended to abrogate or weaken any other agreements, so long as they are consistent with its own terms, into which members of the league may have entered, or may hereafter enter, for the assurance of peace. Such agreements would include special treaties for compulsory arbitration and military conventions that are genuinely defensive.

"'The Monroe Doctrine and similar understandings are put in the same category. They have shown themselves in history to be not instruments of national ambition, but guarantees of peace. The origin of the Monroe Doctrine is well known. It was proclaimed in 1823 to prevent America from becoming a theatre for intrigues of European absolutism. At first a principle of American foreign policy, it has become an international understanding, and it is not illegitimate for the people of the United States to say that the covenant should recognize that fact.

"'In its essence it is consistent with the spirit of the covenant, and, indeed, the principles of the league, as expressed in Article X, represent the extension to the whole world of the principles of the doctrine, while, should any dispute as to the meaning of the latter ever arise between the American and European powers, the league is there to settle it.'

"The explanation of Great Britain received the assent of France.

"'It seems to me monumentally paradoxical and a trifle infantile,' says M. Lausanne, the chief spokesman for M. Clemenceau, 'to pretend the contrary.'

"When the executive council of the league of nations fixes the 'reasonable limits of the armament of Peru,' when it shall demand information concerning the naval programme of Brazil (Article VII of the covenant), when it shall tell Argentina what shall be the measure of the 'contribution to the armed forces to protect the signatures of the' social covenant' (Article XVI), when it shall demand the immediate registration of the treaty between the United States and Canada at the seat of the league, it will control, whether it wills or not, the destinies of America.

"'And when the American states shall be obliged to take a hand in every war or menace of war in Europe (Article XI), they will necessarily fall afoul of the fundamental principle 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 necessity her own doctrine by intermixing in the affairs of Europe.'

One Mistake of Lausanne

"The British statement that the Monroe Doctrine under this article, if any question arose in regard to it, would be passed upon and interpreted by the league of nations is absolutely correct. The statement of M. Lausanne is explicit and truthful, but he makes one mistake. He says in substance that if we are to meddle in Europe Europe can not be excluded from the Americas. He overlooks the fact that the Monroe Doctrine also says:

"'Our policy in regard to Europe, which was adopted at an early stage of the wars which have so long agitated that quarter of the globe, nevertheless remains the same, which is not to interfere in the internal concerns of any of the powers.'

"The Monroe Doctrine was the corollary of Washington's neutrality policy and of his injunction against permanent alliances. It reiterates and reaffirms the principle. We do not seek to meddle in the affairs of Europe but to keep Europe out of the Americas. It is as important to keep the United States out of European affairs as to keep Europe out of the American continents. Let us maintain the Monroe Doctrine, then, in its entirety, and not only preserve our own safety but in this way best promote the real peace of the world.

A Regional Understanding

"Let me now deal with the article itself. We have here some protective coloration again. The Monroe Doctrine is described as a 'regional understanding,' whatever that may mean. But the Monroe Doctrine is no more a regional understanding than it is an 'international engagement.' The Monroe Doctrine was a policy declared by President Monroe. Its immediate purpose was to shut out Europe from interfering with the South American republics, which the Holy Alliance designed to do. No nation has ever formally recognized it. It has been the subject of reservation at international conventions by American delegates. It has never been a 'regional understanding,' or an understanding of any kind with anybody.

"The instant that the United States, which declared, interpreted and sustained the doctrine, ceases to be the sole judge of what it means, that instant the Monroe Doctrine ceases and disappears from history and from the face of the earth. In the interests of the peace of the world it is now proposed to wipe away this American policy, which has been a bulwark and a barrier for peace. Why, in the name of peace, should we extinguish it? Why in the name of peace should we be called upon to leave the interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine to other nations?

The Right of Withdrawal

"Another point in this covenant where change must be made in order to protect the safety of the United States in the future is in Article 1, where withdrawal is provided for. This provision was an attempt to meet the very general objection to the first draft of the league, that there was no means of getting out of it without denouncing the treaty; that is, there was no arrangement for the withdrawal of any nation. As it now stands it reads that—

"'Any member of the league may, after two years' notice of its intention to do so, 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 its withdrawal.'

"The right of withdrawal is given by this clause, although the time for notice, two years, is altogether too long. Six months or a year would be found, I think, in most treaties to be the normal period fixed for notice of withdrawal. But whatever virtue there may be in the right thus conferred is completely nullified by the proviso. The right of withdrawal cannot be exercised until all the international obligations and all the obligations of the withdrawing nations have been fulfilled. Remember that this gives the league not only power to review all our obligations under the covenant, but all our treaties with all nations, for every one of those is an 'international obligation.'

"Are we deliberately to put ourselves in fetters and be examined by the league of nations as to whether we have kept faith with Cuba or Panama before we can be permitted to leave the league? This seems to me humiliating, to say the least. The right of withdrawal, if it is to be of any value whatever, must be absolute.

Little Chance of Amendment

"I have dwelt only upon those points which seem to me most dangerous. There are, of course, many others, but these points, in the interest not only of the safety of the United States, but of the maintenance of the treaty and the peace of the world, should be dealt with here before it is too late. Once in the league the chance of amendment is so slight that it is not worth considering. Any analysis of the provisions of this league covenant, however, brings out in startling relief one great fact. Whatever may be said, it is not a league of peace; it is an alliance, dominated at the present moment by five great powers, really by three, and it has all the marks of an alliance. The development of international law is neglected. The court which is to decide disputes brought before it fills but a small place.

"The conditions for which this league really provides with the utmost care are political conditions, not judicial questions, to be reached by the executive council and the assembly, purely political bodies without any trace of a judicial character about them. Such being its machinery, the control being in the hands of political appointees whose votes will be controlled by interest and expediency, it exhibits that most marked characteristic of an alliance—that its decisions are to be carried out by force. Those articles upon which the whole structure rests are articles which provide for the use of force; that is, for war. This league to enforce peace does a great deal for enforcement and very little for peace. It makes more essential provisions looking to war than to peace, for the settlement of disputes.

"These provisions for war present what to my mind is the gravest objection to this league in its present form. We are told that of course nothing will be done in the way of warlike acts without the assent of Congress. If that is true let us say so in the covenant.

Under Our Own Command

"I think we can move to victory much better under our own command than under the command of others. Let us unite with the world to promote the peaceable settlement of all international disputes. Let us try to develop international law. Let us associate ourselves with the other nations for these purposes. But let us retain in our own hands and in our own control the lives of the youth of the land. Let no American be sent into battle except by the constituted authorities of his own country and by the will of the people of the United States.

"Those of us, Mr. President, who are either wholly opposed to the league or who are trying to preserve the independence and the safety of the United States by changing the terms of the league and who are endeavoring to make the league, if we are to be a member of it, less certain to promote war instead of peace, have been reproached with selfishness in our outlook and with a desire to keep our country in a state of isolation. So far as the question of isolation goes it is impossible to isolate the United States.

"Nobody expects to isolate the United States or to make it a hermit nation, which is a sheer absurdity. But there is a wide difference between taking a suitable part and bearing a due responsibility in world affairs and plunging the United States into every controvery and conflict on the face of the globe. The fact that we have been separated by our geographical situation and by our consistent policy from the broils of Europe has made us more than any one thing capable of performing the great work which we performed in the war against Germany, and our disinterestedness is of far more value to the world than our eternal meddling in every possible dispute could ever be.

Endless Disputes and Entanglements

"Not only must we look carefully to see where we are being led into endless disputes and entanglements, but we must not forget that we have in this country millions of people of foreign birth and parentage. We shall fill this land with political disputes about the troubles and quarrels of other countries. We shall have a large portion of our people voting not on American questions and not on what concerns the United States, but dividing on issues which concern foreign countries alone. That is an unwholesome and perilous condition to force upon this country. We must avoid it. We ought to reduce to the lowest possible point the foreign questions in which we involve ourselves.

"Never forget that this league is primarily—I might say overwhelmingly—a political organization, and I object strongly to having the politics of the United States turn upon disputes where deep feeling is aroused, but in which we have no direct interest. It will all tend to delay the Americanization of our great population and it is more important not only to the United States but to the peace of the world to make all these people good Americans than it is to determine that some piece of territory should belong to one European country rather than to another. For this reason I wish to limit strictly our interference in the affairs of Europe and of Africa.

"It has been reiterated here on this floor and reiterated to the point of weariness that in every treaty there is some sacrifice of sovereignty. That is not a universal truth by any means, but it is true of some treaties and it is a platitude which does not require reiteration. The question and the only question before us here is how much of our sovereignty we are justified in sacrificing.

"I am as anxious as any human being can be to have the United States render every possible service to the civilization and the peace of mankind, but I am certain we can do it best by not putting ourselves in leading strings or subjecting our policies and our sovereignty to other nations. The independence of the United States is not only more precious to ourselves but to the world than any single possession. The United States is the world's best hope, but if you fetter her in the interests and quarrels of other nations, if you tangle her in the intrigues of Europe, you will destroy her power for good and endanger her very existence.

The Heart of the World

"We are told that we shall 'break the heart of the world' if we do not take this league just as it stands. I fear that the hearts of the vast majority of mankind would beat on strongly and steadily and without any quickening if the league were to perish altogether. If it should be effectively and beneficently changed, the people who would lie awake in sorrow for a single night could be easily gathered in one not very large room, but those who would draw a long breath of relief would reach to millions.

"Ideals have been thrust upon us as an argument for the league until the healthy mind which rejects cant revolts from them. Are ideals confined to this deformed experiment upon a noble purpose tainted, as it is with bargains, and tied to a peace treaty which might have been disposed of long ago to the great benefit of the world if it had not been compelled to carry this rider on its back? 'Post equitem sedet atra cura,' Horace tells us, but no blacker care ever sat behind any rider than we shall find in this covenant of doubtful and disputed interpretation as it now perches upon the treaty of peace.

"No doubt many excellent and patriotic people see a coming fulfilment of noble ideas in the words 'league for peace.' We all respect and share these aspirations and desires, but some of us see no hope, but rather defeat, for them in this murky covenant. For we, too, have our ideals, even if we differ from those who have tried t establish a monopoly of idealism. Our first ideal is our country, and we see her in the future, as in the past, giving service to all her people and to the world.

"Our ideal of the future is that she should continue to render that service of her own free will. She has great problems of her own to solve, very grim and perilous problems, and a right solution, if we can attain to it, would largely benefit mankind. We would have our country strong to resist a peril from the West, as she has flung back the German menace from the East. We would not have our politics distracted and embittered by the dissensions of other lands. We would not have our country's vigor exhausted, or her moral force abated, by everlasting meddling and muddling in every quarrel, great and small, which afflicts the world. Our ideal is to make her ever stronger and better and finer, because in that way alone, as we believe, can she be of the greatest service to the world's peace and to the welfare of mankind."

Hisses From Galleries

When Senator Williams, beginning his reply to Senator Lodge, declared the Massachusetts Senator "always had made a show of himself," he was interrupted by loud hisses from the gallery. Senator Lodge had been applauded for a full minute when he ended his address.

Senator Williams bitterly attacked the position of the Foreign Relations chairman as "partisan and narrow."

"I hesitate very much," he said, "to undertake to reply to the greatest possible prepared presentation of the selfishness of American policy in an extemporaneous answer. It is not a new presentation of the personality of the Senator from Massachusetts. He has always attempted to make a show of himself."

It was at this point that hisses and "boos" came from the gallery and drowned out the Mississippi Senator's voice.

Vice-President Marshall, after restoring order, warned that if the Senate rules again were violated he would order the galleries cleared.

As Fair and Impartial

Senator Williams continued that Senator Lodge "has always attempted to make a show of himself as being non-partisan and fair and impartial."

"But the Senator refers," continued Mr. Williams, "to the fact that we must render service of our own free will to the world. How can any nation render service of its own free will? I cannot render service to Mississippi of my own free will. I must consult the other people who are my neighbors. Mississippi cannot render service of its own free will.

"All the crossing of t's and all the dotting of i's that the Senator from Massachusetts has recourse to does not make me forget that he has neglected the weightier matters of the law. Leave out his crossing of t's and his dotting of i's and his finally, carefully, three months' prepared peroration intended to appeal to the Senate and the galleries, has he shown the slightest heart sympathy with the desire of the world to have peace? Has he shown any sympathy with the desire of the mother that her son shall not die uselessly upon the battlefield?

Easy to Cast Obloquy

"It is easy for the Senator to score and cast obloquy upon the sentence of the President when the President said, 'If you defeat the league of nations you will break the heart of the world.' With an absolute cold New England cynicism that invites the scorn of every honest, human, loving man, he merely made fun of the phrase. It is a slight thing to break the heart of the world provided Republican policies in the Senate of the United States are at stake.

"The Senator goes back in history and he tells us of all the brave dreams that brave men have ever dreamt, and then he makes fun of it all. The Holy Alliance came from autocrats seeking the perpetuation of autocratic powers. It failed. Does it follow necessarily, therefore, that an agreement between the peoples of the earth seeking popular power shall fail?

"The Senator can stand there and read his carefully prepared sentences with the view of controlling politics in America, but he cannot blot out the fact that while I am a citizen of America I am also a citizen of the world."

Ears of Groundlings

Referring to Senator Lodge's assertion that the covenant would oblige the United States to send troops to aid Hedjaz in defending her integrity, Senator Williams declared the Massachusetts Senator knew when he said it that there was nothing of that sort provided.

"But it pleased the galleries," continued Senator Williams, "it tickled the ears of the groundlings. It was idle, the Senator said, to say that the United States might be forced to accept Japanese immigrants under the league.

"Who would force us to do that?" he asked. "The decision would have to be unanimous, and would Great Britain join in forcing us to do this? If she

Continued on next page

What Lodge Says of League

WASHINGTON, Aug. 12.—Striking phrases from Senator Lodge's attack on the league of nations covenant in the Senate to-day were:

"It is as important to keep the United States out of European affairs as to keep Europe out of the American continents."

"The Monroe Doctrine is no more a regional understanding than it's an international engagement. . . . The instant the United States ceases to be the sole judge of what it means, that instant the Monroe Doctrine ceases and disappears from history."

"It is not a league of peace; it is an alliance."

"Those articles upon which the whole structure rests are articles which provide for the use of force—that is, for war. This league to enforce peace does a great deal for enforcement and very little for peace."

"This league is primarily a political organization."

F.R. TRIPLER & Co

STRIPED NECKWEAR

Narrow Four-in-hands

$1.00 and $1.50

A varied assortment of harmonious color combinations, including many sufficiently subdued to be appropriate for business wear.

Distinctive Low Collar Styles in Popular Demand.

Bond Street Regent Street York Street

42ND STREET AT MADISON AVENUE

Additional Telephone Operators are needed by the

New York Telephone Company

Why not take up Telephone Operating as a Profession or advise your friends to take it up?

We have employed over 1,000 new operators in the past five weeks and we can use 1,000 more for the fall and winter business. They earn over $900.00 the first year—8 hour day and 6 day week. Tuition is free. A salary is paid while learning. Positions are permanent to all who qualify. There are many opportunities for advancement.

If INTERESTED—Call "SPRING OFFICIAL"

Or APPLY IN PERSON at

58 West Houston Street, Manhattan - 9.00 A. M. to 5.00 P. M.
453 East Tremont Avenue, Bronx - 12.00 M. to 9.00 P. M.
81 Willoughby Street, Brooklyn - - 9.00 A. M. to 5.00 P. M.
1336 Broadway, Brooklyn - - 12.00 M. to 9.00 P. M.

Gidding

PARIS 5TH AVE. AT 46TH ST. NEW YORK

"THE PARIS SHOP OF AMERICA"

WILL CLOSE OUT THIS DAY

A GROUP OF SMART TAILOR MADE SUITS IN BROKEN SIZES

Tricotines—Twills—Serges—Velour Checks and Taffeta Silk

Formerly $75 to $150 at $45 and $65

BEAUTIFUL SUMMER BLOUSES

Odd Groups—Broken Sizes at $5

SPORTS COATS and CAPES

Odd Pieces—of Duvetyn—Velour—Tricolette and Satin in Light and Dark Shades

Formerly $65 to $85 at $25

ALSO

A SMALL GROUP OF CAPES

Tricotine or Serge.

Formerly to $95 at $35

Gidding

PARIS 5TH AVE. AT 46TH ST. NEW YORK

"THE PARIS SHOP OF AMERICA"

WILL CLOSE OUT THIS DAY HATS of TULLE and NET

Bow and Flower trimmed.

Formerly to $40 at $15

SILK—CHIFFON—FOULARD AND CLOTH DRESSES

Formerly $85 to $145 at $35 and $55

ALSO

DINNER GOWNS—EVENING GOWNS AND DANCE FROCKS

of Taffeta, Tulle, Satin and Emb. Net.

Formerly $95 to $150 at $35 and $55

AND

A SMALL GROUP OF SUMMER WRAPS

in Taffeta and Satin.

Formerly $95 to $135 at $35 and $55

ALSO

COTTON DRESSES

consisting of gingham—voile—crepe—organdie and net.

Formerly $45—$85 $25 and $35