FRANCE FACES FINANCIAL RUIN IF GERMANY DOES NOT PAY TODAY

GERMANY TODAY MUST BEGIN TO PAY REPARATION DEMAND OR FRANCE MOVES ON RUHR

Simonds Says Issue Is Wreckage of Either France or Hun.

By FRANK H. SIMONDS.

The arrival of May 1, for Europe always a date of anxiety, brings more than usual apprehension this year, for it is the day fixed in the treaty of Versailles for the completion of the first series of payments by Germany and the adoption of the further program which should provide for the liquidation of Germany's debt to her victims of the war. The recent German appeal to President Harding to act as an umpire and his prompt refusal to act in that capacity, serve to bring home to the United States the gravity of the situation.

About the whole subject of reparations there has waged, since the moment of the armistice, a battle which shows no sign of abatement, a battle between the Germans, seeking to evade all payments, and their French creditors, seeking restoration for their ruins. In addition, a hardly less sharp debate has persisted in allied quarters over the sum which may be considered reasonable and possible for Germany to pay. At this decisive moment, then, perhaps it is worth while briefly to review the questions at issue.

Contrasts Past Wars.

We have, first of all, to note the difference between the world war and the conflicts of the past. Given the immensity of the struggle, its length, and the corresponding vastness of the destruction, peace, when it did come, revealed instantly the staggering fact that there could be no adequate reparation made by the aggressor; that, to put the thing bluntly, the German while at war had wrought havoc and done injury far in excess of his capacity to restore. Whatever happened, on the economic side, all the European participants in the struggle were bound to be losers, irrespective of the battlefield decision.

By contrast, when after the relatively brief period of fighting in the Franco-Prussian war Bismarck not only annexed Alsace-Lorraine, but laid upon France a tribute of 5,000,000 of francs, more than $1,000,000,000 he obtained for Germany a sum at least twice as large as that actually expended by the victors in the war, who had no devastated areas to restore, since the war had been fought on French soil and such destruction as had been incident to the struggle had been at the expense of the conquered. This $1,000,000,000 which France had to pay, could be paid and was paid in two years, and until the debt was discharged German armies remained in occupation of the eastern departments of France.

But in 1919, as contrasted with 1871, it was patent from the beginning at the Paris Conference that it was beyond the power of Germany to undo all the injury in material things which she had done, and that for her to make such partial payments as were inevitable would take many years, at least a generation as compared with the two years within which France paid up. Two facts, then, altogether too little appreciated in the United States, explain the present problems: First, the inability of Germany to pay all she should pay, as an aggressor morally and legally bound to make good the harm done; second, the inevitable prolongation of the partial payment over a period of at least a generation.

Can Germany Pay?

Frequently in talking with Americans about the whole subject, I find impatient protest against the idea that the war should be prolonged after peace and repeated declarations are made that holding a whole people to ransom or subjecting them to economic slavery is a vicious thing in itself, and a positive menace to world peace. Yet in what other way can France, Belgium, Italy, receive even a fraction of that which justice would assign to them? If the economic servitude of the German people must last for a generation, will not the economic misery of the peoples which were the victims of the German attack last equally long?

Now, taking up the question of reparations figures, the situation is this: At the Paris conference it was agreed—and the agreement is written into the treaty of Versailles—that Germany should pay in kind or in gold up to $5,000,000,000 before May 1, 1921; that she should, in addition, issue $1,000,000,000 bonds to cover Belgian obligations and thereafter two further sets of bonds of $10,000,000,000 each. Thus the actual sum fixed amounted to $26,000,000,000. But, in addition, it was left to the allies to demand additional bond issues as they might decide.

In point of fact, while nominally deciding upon a figure of $26,000,000,000 as the sum total of reparations, subject to later additions, the treaty of Versailles actually transferred the whole question of the fixation of the sum to the reparations commission, leaving it free to decide upon a sum larger or smaller than the $26,000,000,000 and to determine all of the modalities of payment. The only thing that was fixed definitely was the sum of the first payment, that is $5,000,000,000 in gold or kind before May 1, 1921.

As the discussion proceeded after the Paris conference had adjourned the supreme council in fact took the task of fixing the sum of reparations out of the hands of the commission, and after many tentative proposals, actually served upon the Germans in London last month a bill which called for a total payment of $21,000,000,000. These figures should be clearly understood, because the whole discussion has been confused by many other details. Actually the allies said to the Germans at London, "We estimate that you can pay us only a part of what you ought to pay, but that part we fix as having a present value of $21,000,000,000."

Suggests Installment Plan.

Of course, it was perfectly well understood that Germany could not immediately pay $21,000,000,000 either in gold or in goods, that, in fact, she could pay no large fraction of it on demand. What she would have to do was to pay on the installment plan. But paying on the installment plan she would have to take care of both the principal and the interest, that is, she would have to take care of the annual interest on the capital sum, while paying something each year to reduce that capital sum.

It was decided by the allies, then, that Germany should be compelled to pay her debt in forty-two years, an installment each year, that she should meantime pay 5 per cent on the capital. Thus her total payment over forty-two years would be $56,000,000,000 and her average yearly payment $1,333,333,333.33. This is the sum which Germany refused to pay at London, thus precipitating the crisis which now continues and must lead to grave consequences in the next few days.

But Germany not only refused in March to comply with the allied demands and undertake to meet the payments fixed, but she had also failed and has continued to fail to meet the one fixed requirement of the treaty of Versailles, namely, that she pay in gold and in kind at least $5,000,000,000 by May 1. On this payment she stands in default and this default opens the way, technically, for allies action, such as has long been threatened.

To be sure, Germany claims that such surrenders as she has made of arms, of colonies and of other things have amounted in value to the $5,000,000,000, but this assertion is denied by the reparations commission, on which all the allied nations are represented. The commission estimates at less than $3,000,000,000, the German payments on this account and even the Germans have been obliged to scale down extravagant claims for their payments.

The whole discussion at the juncture which we have now reached turns upon the single question of the German capacity to pay. The Germans at London not only declared that they could not pay $21,000,000,000, but made proposals which were accurately described as "ridiculous" by Lloyd George and by all allied statesmen. Indeed the German figures were so small as to suggest a deliberate intent to flout the allies and, as a consequence, the frank British policy of moderation, the manifest British wish to curb any extravagant French claims, was paralyzed and France for once saw the British prime minister compelled to follow the French in accepting military measures against Germany.

Divergence in Figures.

From the day of the armistice to the present moment the discussion on the subject of reparations has waged. At Paris the most conflicting figures were presented to measure German capacity, one Englishman suggested $120,000,000,000, another $10,000,000,000. Our own American experts ranged from $25,000,000,000, which is approximately the London figures, down to $12,500,000,000, which more or less coincides with the maximum German offer.

When you have considered all the mass of testimony of the experts, German and allied alike, you are bound to conclude, first, that the whole subject is a matter of speculation, and second, that some of the most serious problems involved concern, not German capacity to pay, but allied capacity to absorb payments not made in money, but necessarily in goods. Even if the whole question were submitted to arbitration, granted that a neutral tribunal could be found, and the whole world is interested in the matter, pecuniarily interested, the decision rendered would be largely a guess, for there is no possible method of proving in advance what German capacity to pay is or what allied capacity to receive payment may be.

As to the sum at present fixed, all that one can say is that many experts, including some Americans, believe that Germany can pay $56,000,000,000 in forty years, which, as I have emphasized above, represents a present or capital value of $21,000,000,000. At least their evidence is as good as that presented by the champions of the Germans and by the Germans themselves, nor is it less trustworthy than the judgment of experts, who are less completely influenced by any nationalistic sentiment or sympathy.

But unhappily, the financial is only one aspect of the reparations discussion, the political is even more troublesome. We have first to consider the frank determination of the Germans to pay nothing which they can get out of paying, a wholly understandable purpose, but one which leads to evil consequences, because the French are fiscally ruined unless the Germans pay all of the $21,000,000,000, which is the London figure, and of which, under various allied agreements, the French share will be about $11,000,000,000.

France or Germany Ruined.

You may state the case quite accurately when you say that France is ruined if Germany does not pay and pay in full. But if Germany does pay and pay in full, then for at least a generation, she will be in economic servitude, men and women unborn when Germany attacked France in August, 1914, will have to see the fruits of their labors turned over to another nation. At London, Germany said flatly and defiantly, "I won't." To which France replied, for the moment with allied approval, "You will and you must," and allied armies were set in motion and a portion of the Ruhr region occupied.

We are then, face to face with the conditions of war disguised by a polite friction of peace. France, with her economic future and her present financial solvency at stake, demands German payment in full, up to the sum agreed upon by all the allies in a recent Paris conference and notified to the Germans at the London gathering. France possesses a powerful army and all the necessary machinery for coercion. If Germany remains defiant, then, France can occupy all of the great Ruhr industrial region, containing more than half the coal in Germany, and operate the vast manufacturing plants to her own profit, as well as employ the coal mines to feed her own industry and as a basis of political and economic barter in Europe.

Germany, on her part, refuses to meet the allied terms, but seeks at the same time to avoid the French occupation. She faces two possibilities which in her mind spell the same sort of run. To submit to allied figures means forty-two years of hard labor; to refuse to submit means an occupation of the richest industrial district, the prostration of her own industrial life, and the possible economic and political disintegration of the empire. In this dilemma she has come to the United States, after appealing to England, in the vain hope that we will intervene and save her both from the necessity to pay and the danger of French occupation.

But, up to the present moment the whole problem of German reparations has had but one of two solutions—either the ruin of France or—what seems to Germans—the almost certain ruin of Germany. Not to be paid, for France, means national collapse. To pay means, for Germany, putting her economic future in pawn. The world has been asked—is now asked again—to decide between France and Germany, to interpose on behalf of Germany means to seal the fate of France; for, as I have pointed out, unless France gets the maximum sum, now fixed as German obligation, she is financially ruined.

Hun Runs True to Form.

Of course, if Germany had ever given the slightest evidence of an intention to pay anything, except under duress, the situation might be different. But German tactics now are exactly what they were in the submarine days, the Germans were prepared to promise anything, to use any and every appeal to neutral prejudice, but they were not ready ever to abandon the use of the submarine and they are not now ready to pay, to pay anything except under pressure. The best proof of their spirit is their steady refusal to abide by those portions of the treaty of Versailles which direct German disarmament. Here, too, they have consistently evaded, deceived, defied.

As for the French, they have come to the end of their patience. Financial collapse is within sight as a consequence of the vast sums France has already expended to restore her ruins, in advance of any German payments. The French have made up their minds that the Germans will never pay, except under the immediate and constant pressure of force. They have declined to be made the dupes of German tactics any longer. Their temper is that of the United States after the final German submarine blockade of February, 1917.

What is even more serious is the fact that the French have reached a pitch of desperation which precludes the possibility of effective intervention by any country. France believes that the rest of the world is not ready to make any sacrifice for French safety or solvency. If Great Britain and the United States continue to give a measure of apparent sympathy to France, each is really anxious, in the interests of its own economic affairs to restore peace in Central Europe and to obtain this by such reductions in the sum total of reparations as may placate Germany.

From the French point of view British and even American policy seems, upon trial to aim at restoring economic peace in the world, at the expense of France, who has most to lose by the reduction of German reparations. Both we and the British signed a Treaty of Versailles promising to come to the aid of France in case of German attack in the future, but since we have failed to ratify, the treaty is dead. France has nothing left now but her own strong right arm, and it is strong at the moment. Therefore most Frenchmen agree that now is the time to act.

United States as Arbiter.

The German suggestion that the United States arbitrate and the subliminal suggestion in Mr. Hughes' reply, that America was ready under certain circumstances to mediate, left the French, if not cold, far from impressed. If the United States should mediate, should decide that Germany could only pay $15,000,000,000, instead of $21,000,000,000, would the United States, having reduced the sum, agree to help to collect the reduced total? This was the first French inquiry, to which the obvious answer was that the United States would not.

But there is a second inquiry, bound to be made before long, if the possibility of American mediation recurs: Europe owes America some $11,000,000,000 in loans, which will amount to $12,000,000,000 before any payment begins. The United States has indicated that it will not cancel these allied loans. But the chief source, the basic security for the loans is the German reparations account. Suppose we should, as mediators fix the sum of reparations which Germany could pay at $15,000,000,000, from which would be deducted what Germany has already paid, namely $3,000,000,000, as a round sum, and this $15,000,000,000 was the favorite figure of our experts at Paris, would not all Europe at once conclude that we were only interested in seeing that Germany paid our creditors just enough to enable them to discharge their obligations to us?

And if the United States insisted that Germany should be treated gently and generously, that her capacity for payment should be gravely considered, could the United States consistently display toward her recent allies of the war a more exacting spirit than she permitted them to show toward Germany, recently the common enemy? Not enough attention has been paid in this country to the circumstance of our own loans to Europe. The larger the reduction in the sum total of German reparations, provided the final figure does not fall below the sum of our loans, the better becomes our security for our loans. Thus in reality, we are not a disinterested, but the most interested party in the whole German reparations discussion, because we have a larger sum at stake than anyone else.

Will Only Pay Under Pressure.

The difficulty with any possible compromise lies in the self-evident fact that any sum which is within the limits of even remote probability, say even the fifteen billions of the conservative American experts, is so great that Germany will not undertake to pay it, save under pressure, and is bound to seek at every future opportunity to avoid paying it. Even if the sum were fixed at $15,000,000,000, it would be a matter of a quarter of a century before it could possibly be paid in full, and throughout that whole period you would have the same German evasion attempted and the same need of coercive methods on the part of the French.

Under the Treaty of Versailles allied troops were to occupy German territory for fifteen years, progressively evacuating districts, provided Germany observed the treaty provisions. But Germany has already violated the treaty provisions, and the French have indicated their determination, as a consequence, to extend the period of occupation over the time during which the payments must be made. In a word, we are going to have German territory occupied by French troops for the length of time payment of the account takes, and this will certainly be a quarter of a century.

But, if Germany continues to seek evasion, you are going to have an ever-increasing extension of the area of occupation, which is now to be expanded to include the Ruhr. Thus you are certain to have a condition of all but technical war, lasting for at least a quarter of a century, and probably for a full generation. Under the treaty of Versailles, France is within her rights in insisting on this occupation, but, under her own concepton of national interest, Germany refuses to comply with the treaty terms, which must be complied with if there is to be any evacuation.

Even if the sum of reparations should be now reduced, France would still retain her armies of occupation, her sole method of insuring payment, and any attempt of Germany to evade—and such attempts are inevitable—any disagreements over details, would lead to new crises exactly like those which have disturbed Europe and the world for the past two years and led to two excursions beyond the Rhine, while a third, even more extensive is now preparing.

Mediation Not a Solution.

Talk of mediation leads to no solution, because there is no corresponding agreement to enforce the terms which emerge from such a mediation. Neither Great Britain nor the United States is interested in assising France in enforcing any terms by supplying troops to assist the French in the occupied area. Both the United States and Great Britain are vitally interesed in closing up the German dispute and in restoring the German market for their own trade. But both the United States and Great Briain hold France to pay very large war loans and they cannot successfully undertake to persuade France to reduce her bill against Germany while insisting that she pay them every centime, which she has borrowed from them.

In the last analysis, France is not going to make concessions which will materially reduce her own reparations claims, while the sole or the major benefit will fall upon her own treasury. But if France sets out to collect her bill by employing her armies, as she can, the process will work very great hardship both to the United States and to Great Britain. If the whole question were sent to another international conference no useful result would be attained, unless the United States and Great Britain were prepared to forego some of their claims against France, to balance French reductions of claims against Germany. Nor would anything be accomplished that way, in restoring order permanently and avoiding new crises, unless the British and the American governments agreed to assist France in making Germany pay the reduced sum.

Meantime France, feeling herself alone, and knowing that she has now the power to seize the most valuable German industrial districts and pay herself out of them, can no longer be held back by British and American opinion. This is a fact which derives additional strength from the German policy, which aims at isolating France and using British and American selfish interest to advance German ends.

It may be that some way of delaying French action may still be found, although as I write there seems small chance of it. But delay can count for but little so long as the basic conditions remain unchanged. The fact is that in waging war Germany did France injuries which can only be paid for in part through long years, that Germany can only be made to pay at all by the exercise of force by France and that the exercise of force means the prolongation of war and the postponement of economic stability all over Europe, indefinitely. But any failure to exercise force means for France economic and fiscal ruin now and political destruction a few years hence, when Germany by virtue of escaping reparations payments, recovers strength far more rapidly than the neighbor she has ruthlessly crippled.

Claims Women Learn to Swim Fastern Than Men

"Washington is backward when it comes to swimming, but the fault does not lie with the women."

This is the remark made yesterday by F. J. Brunner, District swimming instructor, who announced the opening of the large pool at the Municipal bathing pool, Saturday at 10 o'clock.

Prof. Brunner makes an appeal to men to take advantage of the swimming classes, to prevent drownings this summer. "It's surprising, the number of Washington men who are unable to swim a stroke," said Prof. Brunner, yesterday. "Men who failed to learn to take care of themselves in the water when they were boys, haven't the nerve to enter the classes. Since the swimming classes have been opened there has always been a scarcity of men pupils.

"But with the women it is different. Their classes are always filled to capacity and we usually have a 'waiting list.' The women show more nerve in the elementary work of the classes than the men and learn to swim in just about half the time it takes their 'brothers' to grasp the art.

Plan New Road to Bowie.

BOWIE, Md., April 30.—To secure a more direct route from Bowie to Washington, citizens of this community will appear before the county commissioners at Upper Marlboro and ask that a country road, about a mile in length, from Springfield to Glendale, on the west side of the Pennsylvania Railroad, be opened.

SUPREME COURT'S RENT LAW DECISION SEEN AS MENACE TO CONSTITUTION, SAYS WRITER

Justice McKenna Discloses Deep Feeling in Dissenting Opinion.

By MARK SULLIVAN.

A rising tide of discussion about a decision handed down by the Supreme Court last week has brought that decision to a point where it engages the attention of constitutional lawyers and public men more fully than any subject of mere legislation. Your correspondent is assured that the discussion will quickly spread throughout the country.

Both those who like the decision and those who dislike it intensely agree that its importance is extreme. Apparently it was only because of accidental circumstances that the decision failed to make at the moment it was handed down the sensation which many serious lawyers say it will make as soon as the lawyers, judges, editors and other commentators of the country are aware of its direct present effects on the Constitution and its implications as to the future.

Expresses Dissent.

The assertion that the effect of the decision on the Constitution of the United States is sensational does not rest merely on the constitutional lawyers here in Washington who are now saying it. Grounds to justify their description of it as sensational are to be found in the words of one of the court itself. Justice McKenna, who was strongly opposed to the decision made by the majority of the court and who handed down the dissenting opinion, in that dissenting opinion repeatedly uttered words of alarm at the effect of the decision on the sanctity of the Constitution and its implications for the future.

That Justice McKenna was deeply moved is readily to be seen from an examination of his words. Several local students of the Constitution who are now discussing the decision say that it ranks in fundamental importance with any decision ever handed down by the Supreme Court, and that its effects on the heart of the Constitution, as written in the beginning, are as far-reaching as any of the court's most history-making decisions.

Stated as simply as possible and with a due warning to the reader of the limitations involved in giving mere extracts from a decision and paraphrasing its sprit, the case was this:

Congress during the war passed a law applying to the District of Columbia known as the rent law. Stated roughly, it provided that a landlord cannot get his property back from a tenant at the end of his lease if the tenant is willing to go on paying the same rent. A similar law was passed by New York State applicable to New York City.

The laws were obviously contrary to the normal sanctity of contracts However, they were passed, and many tenants, both in New York and in Washington, took advantage of them. A multitude of suits arose. In the lower courts the laws were quickly declared unconstitutional. But in due course two of the suits, one from New York and one from Washington, were united and carried up to the Supreme Court. It is the decision in these two cases which is now described as so sensational.

This present decision by the Supreme Court upholds the law and decides that the landlord cannot eject his tenant at the termination of the lease. The court was divided on lines of five to four. The justices who decided in favor of the law are Holmes, Day, Pitney, Brandeis and Clark, the decision being written by Holmes.

Judge's Opinion.

These include the justices who are commonly regarded as more sympathetic to liberal movements and to an elastic construction of the Constitution. The dissenting justices were the Chief Justice, Mr. White, together with McKenna, Van Devanter and McReynolds. Justice McKenna wrote the dissent.

With due regard to the danger of parapharsing an opinion, it may be said that in essence Justice Holmes declared that Congress or a legislature has a right to be the judge as to whether public conditions constitute an emergency, and that Congress or a legislature, having asserted that there is an emergency and having passed a statute designed to remedy the emergency, then the Supreme Court has no right to overrule the legislative decree.

The objections to the law were obviously that it is in conflict with those articles of the Constitution which forbid the taking of private property without due process of law and which forbid legislators to pass any laws impairing the validity of contracts. On these points one lawyer in high position has said that the present decision cuts a larger slice out of the Constitution than any other single decision ever made.

However, the most important criticism of the decision that is possible is obviously that which comes from a member of the Supreme Court itself. Justice McKenna's words may reasonably be called sensational. With renewed warning to the reader of the limitations involved in quoting parts of a decision, it is fair to say that Justice McKenna regarded the Constitution as being most seriously endangered. His opening paragraph contained the signs of his deep conviction—and the intensity of his dissent—signs which are recognizable even under the obscuring technicality of the legal words. It read:

"The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Van Deventer, Mr. Justice McReynolds and I dissent from the opinion and judgment of the court. The grounds of dissent are the explicit provisions of the Constitution of the United States; the specifications of the grounds are the irresistible deductions from those provisions and, we think, would require no expression but for the opposition of those whose judgments challenge attention."

Justice McKenna then quotes the articles of the Constitution which are menaced by the statute in question and says of the latter: "This is contrary to every conception of leases that the world has ever entertained."

Justice McKenna Deeply Moved.

From this point Justice McKenna passes to a moving and exalted expression of reverence for the sanctity of the Constitution. The language has the eloquence of high feeling:

"This careful adjustment of power and rights makes the Constitution what it was intended to be and is, a real charter of liberty, receiving and deserving the praise that has been given it as 'the most wonderful work ever struck off at any given time by the brain and purpose of man.' And we add, that more than a century of trial 'has certainly proven the sagacity of the constructors and the stubborn strength of the fabric.'

"The 'strength of the fabric' cannot be assigned to any one provision, it is the contribution of all, and therefore it is not the expression of too much anxiety to declare that a violation of any of its prohibitions is an evil—an evil in the circumstance of violation, of greater evil because of its example and malign instruction. 'And against the first step to it this court has warned, expressing a maxim of experience—'WITHSTAND BEGINNINGS.' Who can know to what end they will conduct?"

Then, in describing the act of Congress, Justice McKenna says: "If such exercise of government be legal, what exercise of government is illegal?"

Passing from the present effects of the decision to the future possibilities of it, Justice McKenna goes close to hinting an apprehension of Russian Socialism. He said:

"If the public interest can extend a lease it can compel a lease; the difference is only in degree and boldness. In one as much as in the other there is a violation of the positive and absolute right of the owner of the property. And it would seem, necessarily, if either can be done, unoccupied houses or unoccupied space in occupied houses can be appropriated. The efficacy of either to afford homes for the homeless cannot be disputed. In response to an inquiry from the bench counsel replied that the experiment had been tried or was being tried in a European country. It is to be remembered that the legality of power must be estimated not by what it will do but by what it can do."

Menace to Constitution.

Returning again to the menace to the Constitution, Justice McKenna is fully as eloquent as before:

"Has it (the Constitution) suddenly become weak—become not a restraint upon evil government, but an impediment to good government? Has it become an anachronism, and is it to become 'an archaeological relic,' no longer to be an efficient factor in affairs, but something only to engage and entertain the studies of antiquarians? Is not this to be dreaded? Indeed, will it not be the inevitable consequence of the decision just rendered?"

There is much more that is like this alarm for the future in Justice McKenna's dissent. For the details of the future possibilities, the things which, constitutional lawyers say, can now be done under the Constitution, as modified by the present decision, there is not space in the present article. But it may be confidently expected that much—very much—will be said, and in many quarters. Whether the decision is good or bad will be decided generally by each individual in accord with the bent of his temperament toward extreme liberalism or toward cautious regard for constitutional safeguards. If it is bad law, then it belongs in the field of which it is said "hard cases make bad laws."

There has been much resentment against the recent practice of landlords of city apartment houses of raising rents and putting limitations on the number of children. But there is a difference between curing these practices with statutory restraints on future contracts and invalidating present contracts. Also it is obvious that what is now done as to city landlords may later be done as to the rural ownership of farms.

(Copyright, 1921.)

HOLYOKE ALUMNAE SEEK FUNDS HERE

Drive for College Benefit to Start With Dinner On May 3.

One of a series of 100 simultaneous dinners to launch a campaign to raise a $2,000,000 endowment fund for Mount Holyoke College will be held in Washington at the New Willard May 3. More than 100 alumnae and many guests will attend.

Among the speakers will be William Knowles Cooper, Dr. Ada Laura Snell, professor of English at Mount Holyoke, and Dr. Emma Tucker, of Baltimore, who has set out on a walking trip around the world.

Each alumna has been assigned a quota of $305. They have launched into a variety of curious occupations to raise their quotas, including the opening of millinery shops, shoe shining parlors and manicuring establishments.

Co-operating are Vice President Coolidge and Speaker Gillett. The Vice President says:

"It has been said of Mount Holyoke College that Mary Lyon was its mother and Divine Providence was its father. It has inherited a spirit that does not die, but increases from age to age. It is the spirit of reverence, of truth, of service. Mary Lyon gave all that the mothers of men might have more abundant life."

All Passengers Taken from Wreck

NEW BEDFORD, Mass., April 30.—Transfer of passengers from the Portuguese steamer Mormugao, stranded on Block Island, was completed today. Wrecking tugs were standing by to attempt to pull the ship off the reef.

MEMORIAL DAY RACE WILL SET NEW RECORD PACE

Stars from Four Nations Will Compete in Event.

DE PALMA ENTERED

Dario Resta Again Will Challenge Italian Speed Demon.

INDIANAPOLIS, Ind., April 30.—With the assurance that at least twenty-five American and foreign cars and drivers will roll to the tape for the tenth International 500-mile race on the Indianapolis Motor Speedway Monday, May 30, for the largest racing purse ever offered in the world, approximately $85,000, things are humming in the Hoosier capital in preparation for the great annual event.

The citizens of Indianapolis are making up an added purse of $20,000 to be divided into $100 prizes for winners of each lap of the race, making every heat a duel. This is proving a great attraction for the drivers, as it did last year, when the initial added purse was made up by local citizens and organizations.

Ten drivers have already cleared the way for entrance and many others have made initial overtures. According to the speedway management, the greatest drivers of the world will be in the competition.

Four nations already have an interest in the big racing classic for, along with the Americans cars and drivers entered there are English, French and Italian cars and drivers preparing for race day.

Eddie Hearne, in a Re Vere, was the first driver to complete entry papers. Others who have completed arrangements are Ralph De Palma, Italian, in a French Ballot; Jimmy Murphy in a Duesenberg; Tommy Milton in a Durant. Special; Dario Resta, Italian, in a Duesenberg; Rene Thomas, French, in an English Sunbeam; Ira Vail in a Leach Special; Andre Boillot, French, in a French Talbot-Darracq; Eddie Pullen in Duesenberg.

Start Free Mail Delivery.

HYATTSVILLE, Md., April 30—Free delivery of mail is to be inaugurated in Hyattsville, May 16. Postmaster Mary W. Tise will name two carriers, one to serve full time, at $1,000, and the other half time, at $500.

Use Cuticura Talcum To Powder and Perfume

An ideal face, skin, baby and dusting powder. Convenient and economical, it takes the place of other perfumes. A few grains sufficient.

Sample Each Free by Mail. Address: "Cuticura Laboratories, Dept. 19B, Malden, Mass." Sold everywhere. Soap 25c. Ointment 25 and 50c. Talcum 25c. Cuticura Soap shaves without mug.

Keep our Ships on the Seven Seas under the Stars and Stripes

TO ALL PARTS OF THE WORLD

New Combination Passenger Ships

Fast, Luxurious Steamers

LATEST PASSENGER SAILINGS

New York to Seattle.
1—Keystone State, May 1st (estimated sailing date).
Baltimore via San Francisco to Honolulu.
2—Buckeye State, May 7th.
San Francisco to Orient via Honolulu (Yokohama, Kobe, Shanghai, Manila, Hongkong).
5—Golden State, May 28th.
5—Empire State, July 23d.
San Francisco to East India via Honolulu (Manila, Saigon, Singapore, Colombo, Calcutta).
5—Creole State, May 12th.
5—Wolverine State, June 11th.
5—Granite State, July 14th.
New York to East Coast, South America via Rio de Janeiro, Santos, Montevideo, Buenos Aires.
3—Martha Washington, May 4.
New York to Boulogne, London.
6—Old North State, May 3rd.
6—Panhandle State, May 24th.
Rio de Janeiro, Montevideo and Buenos Aires from New York.
3—Huron, May 25th.
Europe to New York via London and Boulogne.
6—Panhandle State, May 5th.
New York to Europe via Bremen and Danzig.
6—Antigone, May 7th.
Return New York via Danzig, May 28th.
New York to Europe via Boulogne and London.
6—Old North State, May 3rd.
Return New York via London and Boulogne, May 19th
New York to Europe via Bremen and Danzig.
6—Susquehanna, May 21st.
Return New York via Danzig June 9th; via Bremen, June 14th.
Europe to New York via London and Boulogne.
6—Panhandle State, June 9th.
New York to Europe via Boulogne and London.
6—Old North State, June 7th.
Return New York via London and Boulogne, June 23rd.
New York to Europe via Bremen and Danzig.
6—Antigone, June 25th.
Return New York via Danzig, July 16th.
New York to Europe via Boulogne and London.
6—Panhandle State, June 28th.
Return New York via London and Boulogne, July 14th.
New York to Europe via Bremen and Danzig.
6—Susquehanna, July 5th.
Return New York via Danzig, July 24th; via Bremen, July 29th.
New York to Europe via Boulogne and London.
6—Old North State, July 12th.
Return New York via London and Boulogne, July 28th
New York to Europe via Boulogne and London.
6—Panhandle State, August 2nd.
Return New York via London and Boulogne, August 18th.
New York to Europe via Boulogne and London.
6—Old North State, August 16th.
Return New York via London and Boulogne, September 1st.
New York to Europe via Bremen and Danzig.
6—Susquehanna, August 18th.
Return New York via Danzig, September 6th; via Bremen, September 10th.
New York to Europe via Boulogne and London.
6—Panhandle State, September 6th.
Return New York via London and Boulogne, September 22nd.
New York to Europe via Boulogne and London.
6—Old North State, September 20th.
Return New York via London and Boulogne, October 6th.
New York to Italy via Naples and Genoa.
6—Princess Matoika.
Return New York from Genoa, May 12th; from Naples, May 14th.
New York to Italy via Naples and Genoa.
6—Pocahontas, May 19th.
Return New York from Genoa, June 9th; from Naples, June 11th.
New York to Italy via Naples and Genoa.
6—Princess Matoika, June 2nd.
Return New York from Genoa, June 22nd; from Naples, June 25th.
New York to Italy via Naples and Genoa.
6—Pocahontas, June 30th.
Return New York via Genoa, July 21st; via Naples, July 23rd.
New York to Italy via Naples and Genoa.
6—Princess Matoika, July 14th.
Return New York via Genoa, August 4th; via Naples, August 6th.
New York to Italy via Naples and Genoa.
6—Pocahontas, August 11th.
Return New York via Genoa, September 1st; via Naples, September 3rd.
New York to Italy via Naples and Genoa.
6—Princess Matoika, August 25th.
Return New York via Genoa, September 15th; via Naples, September 17th.
New York to Italy via Naples and Genoa.
6—Pocahontas, September 22nd.
Return New York via Genoa, October 13th; via Naples, October 15th.

Key number before ship's name indicates name and address of steamship company in the following list:

Operators of Passenger Services

1 Admiral Line, 17 State St., New York City
Matson Navigation Co. 190 Market St., San Fran. 26 South Gay St., Baltimore, Md.
3 Munson Steam Ship Line, 82 Beaver St., New York City
4 New York and Porto Rico S. S. Co. 11 Broadway, New York City.
5 Pacific Mail S. S. Co., 7 Hanover Square, New York City. 621 Market St., San Francisco, Calif.
6 U. S. Mail S. S. Co., 45 Broadway, New York City.
7 Ward Line, (New York and Cuba Mail S. S. Co.) Foot of Wall St., New York City.

FOR SAILINGS OF FREIGHT SHIPS TO ALL PARTS OF THE WORLD WRITE DIVISION OF OPERATIONS, TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT, U. S. SHIPPING BOARD EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

CURED HIS RHEUMATISM!

"I am eighty-three years old and I doctored for rheumatism ever since I came out of the army, over 50 years ago. Like many others, I spent money freely for so-called 'cures' and I have read about 'Uric Acid' until I could almost taste it. I could not sleep nights or walk without pain; my hands were so sore and stiff I could not hold a pen. But now I am again in active business and can walk with ease or write all day with comfort. Friends are surprised at the change." You might just as well attempt to put out a fire with oil as try to get rid of your rheumatism, neuritis and like complaints by taking treatment supposed to drive Uric Acid out of your blood and body. It took Mr. Ashelman fifty years to find out the truth. He learned how to get rid of the true cause of his rheumatism, other disorders, and recover his strength from "The Inner Mysteries," now being distributed free by an authority who devoted over twenty years to the scientific study of this trouble. If any reader of The Herald wishes "The Inner Mysteries of Rheumatism" overlooked by doctors and scientists for centuries past, simply send a post card or letter to H. P. Clearwater, No. 100-Z Street, Hallowell, Maine. Send now, lest you forget! If not a sufferer, cut out this notice and hand this good news and opportunity to some afflicted friend. All who send will receive it by return mail without any charge whatever.