

ITALY, FRANCE

for various reasons, both logical and illogical, is slowly crystallizing in the Senate. It is not probable that any definite move looking to its rejection will be made for some time—no, of course, before the President has transmitted the document. It is his desire to have the completed work of the conference considered as a whole, in so far as treaty obligations are concerned. For this reason it is not his purpose to submit the four Power treaty until the conference has completed its work. Republican Senators who have completed a comprehensive survey of the situation in the upper house are still supremely confident that the treaty will be ratified whether reservations are offered and accepted or not.

Democratic Senators, who have promised Senator Underwood not to indicate their position until he has explained the treaty, while holding off, generally reflect adverse criticism of their discussion of it. A circumstance that greatly disturbs the opposition is the attitude of the Japanese Government and its delegates to the Washington conference.

Japanese Position Explained.

The position of the Mikado's representatives in the international conference was clearly set forth in The New York Herald yesterday. Substantially, it is that the Japanese delegates do not appear to care one whit whether their homeland is embraced within the scope of the four Power treaty. They were, as The New York Herald set forth, opposed to the inclusion of their homeland country during the conference of Secretary Hughes, Mr. Balfour, M. Viviani and Ambassador Shidehara.

They advanced several reasons for their opposition. One was that the inclusion of their homeland might place them in the "favored nations" class. Another was that any suggestion of paternalism toward the people of Japan would be repugnant to the people of that country.

Still another was that if the pledges of respect agreed to by the four Powers are kept "Japan can take care of herself."

It developed to-day that Baron Shidehara and his associates agreed to the inclusion of the homeland of Japan in the treaty only after Mr. Balfour had made an appeal to them to consent to it. The basis for his request was that the British Government desired Australia and New Zealand included in the terms of the agreement but did not want to be placed in the position of seeking special privileges in this respect. It is the Japanese view that in making this argument Mr. Balfour desired to emphasize the statements of Lloyd George and himself that the closest sentimental ties between England and Japan should be perpetuated.

Compensation for Alliance.

The Japanese version of the British ambition was that the inclusion of Japan in the four Power treaty would to some extent make up for the automatic abrogation of the Anglo-Japanese treaty. The nullification of that alliance, which was the basis of the United States Government, is in fact regarded as the most important feature of the four Power treaty.

The Japanese have made it perfectly clear they did not seek any special privileges under the treaty, but, on the contrary, expressed the most complete willingness to accept to any suggestions made by the American delegates, whose position, by the way, was in harmony with the Japanese view.

The decision to include Japan within the scope of the treaty was, as said, directly due to the appeal made by Mr. Balfour on behalf of Australia and New Zealand.

The Japanese representatives are not concerned over possible opposition to the treaty in the Senate on the ground that it favors their country.

They fully appreciate the extent of prejudices due to racial and industrial conditions on the Pacific coast. One of their spokesmen expressed sympathy over the negligible influences of this character developed so far in conference proceedings.

Unfriendly critics of the Japanese policy in the conference have been compelled to admit that up to date the representatives of the Mikado's Government have manifested a sympathetic path with the purposes of the international conference than those of some of the European nations. Predictions that Japan will yet show the "cloven hoof" elicit but one reply. This is that the record of the conference will show.

WOULD FIX PRINCIPLE OF USE OF SUBMARINES

That Done, French Think It Easy to Settle Tonnage.

Special Dispatch to The New York Herald. New York, Dec. 23.—The French representative at the Washington conference, Admiral de Bon, stated this evening that once the naval committee adopted the principle of the use of submarines it will not be difficult to fix the tonnage figures for the various countries.

France today is in the course of the submarine debate that she wanted 90,000 tons of submarines. Admiral de Bon, the leading French naval expert, mentioned in his speech at the meeting while opposing the British contention that submarines should be entirely abolished.

The French appear to think they cannot move from their present position and that everything depends on how far other countries will meet their views. Fully opinion in France is agitating against what is considered an attempt to dictate unjust naval terms to France, and the French delegation, while willing to cede on the question of tonnage, intends to insist on the fundamental principles it put forward to-day.

The French feel their position to be strongly attacked by Britain and Italy and are now in a position to be met by Secretary Hughes as to say to-morrow on behalf of America. The Japanese attitude also remains doubtful for the moment. Mr. Balfour, however, on behalf of England and Senator Schanzer for Italy spoke at to-day's meeting.

FAR EASTERN REPUBLIC PROTESTS JAPAN RULE

Says Nipponese Control All of Siberia's Pacific Coast.

Riga, Latvia, Dec. 23.—The Parliament of the Far Eastern Republic of China has sent out an appeal to all nations against what is described as the present Japanese aggression in Siberia, says a dispatch to the Bolshevik News Agency today.

The appeal, says the dispatch, calls attention to the claim that Japan now controls the entire Pacific coast of Siberia.

SUBMARINE ISSUE IS ARGUED 3 WAYS

Admiral de Bon Says Limit Should Not Be Below 90,000 Tons.

'USEFUL IN DEFENSE'

Balfour, Denying Claims, Says Craft Is Greatly Overestimated.

RECALLS WAR'S HORRORS

Italian Delegate Favors Following Spirit of U. S. Proposal—No Agreement Reached.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 23 (Associated Press).—A three hour triangular debate on submarines took place to-day in the naval committee of the Washington conference. Admiral de Bon of France, Arthur J. Balfour, head of the British group, and Senator Schanzer of Italy being the only participants.

The official communiqué issued by the committee showed that no action was taken, although Admiral de Bon "reasonably" limit submarine construction at all; but that if it did "90,000 tons is the absolute minimum for all the navies which may want to have a submarine force."

For the British Mr. Balfour reiterated and extended arguments already advanced by Lord Lee for total abolition of submarines. He admitted, however, that "the British Empire has no objection of getting any important support in the course of this conference," adding:

"I do earnestly trust that our debates may go beyond the limits of this room or even of a public session."

Senator Schanzer insisted that the committee should be guided by substantially technical difference of opinion, as to the defensive value of submarines. The Italian delegation felt that the British had a right to destroy submarines in a wider conference. He said, before any action toward abolition of underwater craft could be undertaken.

Balfour Answers de Bon.

"For the present," Senator Schanzer added, "one point is clear in our minds and that is that the best course would be to follow even in this case, the spirit of the American proposal and consequently to limit submarines to the measure strictly necessary for the ends of a purely defensive naval policy."

Admiral de Bon took exception to the report of Mr. Balfour's remarks which the French officer regarded as unjust to him, a desire to support the theory that submarines had a right to destroy merchant vessels after saving the crews. Neither he nor the French Government held that view, he said.

Admiral de Bon said he had not intended to "misrepresent Admiral de Bon," but had attempted to show that if the submarine was to play "the great role in future wars, which Admiral de Bon suggested in his speech it could do so only by resort to extreme methods, for it was futile to suppose submarines would make a practice of stopping merchant ships and placing prize crews on board and then into port."

Admiral de Bon opened the debate with a long address to the committee, calling attention to the opposing views as to the usefulness of submarines. He said that the report of the American advisory committee, but for "certain differences of opinion" in the naval committee, had said these two presentations were "exhausted" as having almost "exhausted" debate.

As to the usefulness of submarines against warcraft, Admiral de Bon recalled the progress of submarine warfare, ships, five cruisers and had several other ships torpedoed during the war, losing 130,000 tons in fishing craft, but from 1914 to 1918, he said, Italy and Great Britain had lost battle craft in the same way, and that in addition all three nations were compelled to erect "defensive" systems against U-boats which "certainly" had an influence toward weakening the general forces of the nations engaged."

Powerful Coast Defense.

The Admiral argued that Germany had "maintained her entire coast intact" because her submarines were made approach to the mine field produced by her submarines, while in the Adriatic "submarines also formed one of the most powerful means of action for the enemy." Bombardment of Turkey, he added, had been "hampered" by enemy submarines and "aid for their efforts with the loss of several ships."

"The submarine has proved its worth as a means of attack against warships in the protection of coasts."

It "has shown that submarines," especially the German, "are a very real and effective weapon against the merchant marine. What had struck terror to all peoples," he added, had been the German attack on the coast of Belgium, and the attack on merchant vessels of their enemies.

"In fact," he said, "it always has been one of the most effective means of seriously crippling one's adversary" to attack enemy merchant craft, and the French officer thought "it would always seem legitimate to demand that the submarine, in an extreme case, one might consider it possible to bring one's adversary to the point of yielding by the force, would it not be less cruel and less wasteful of human life than military operations which would arrive at the same result by direct application of force?" Admiral de Bon inquired, "One might protest against this interpretation, but no attempt to formulate a doctrine, which is a legitimate practice, and its effects would not be peculiar to submarines."

Useful to Small Fleets.

The French Admiral said the German submarine campaign had been "aimed almost exclusively at mere effort" in the beginning, and that it was only when it failed to produce the "material results" of their campaign. He insisted that war against enemy commercial ships could have been waged legitimately, although he had no attempt to formulate a doctrine as to the process. Through the use of a submarine campaign confined to "honorable warships" would have been smaller, he added, but it was impossible

BILLION DOLLAR NAVAL HOLIDAY VANISHES IN NAVAL HOLIDAY

But American Business Men See Flood of Orders to Come When Saving Through Arms Limitation Becomes Effective.

Special Dispatch to The New York Herald. New York, Dec. 23.—Government markets estimated to be worth \$1,000,000,000 to American business men in the next ten years will be destroyed by the Hughes program of an international naval holiday now ready to be written into formal agreement by delegates attending the Conference on the Limitation of Armaments.

That estimate based on Government reports shows the extent of the sacrifice American business men are making voluntarily.

Judge E. H. Gary of the United States Steel Corporation and Charles M. Schwab, president of the Bethlehem Steel Company, are two officials of big concerns who are on record as favoring without qualification the naval holiday plan. Manufacturers and business men generally have given spirited applause to the limitation of armaments through formal letters to members of the American delegation and through the statements of officials of the Chamber of Commerce and the international naval holiday.

Business heads connected with the Chamber of Commerce of the United States eventually will bring to the American mills and factories a flood of orders that will more than make up for the loss of the naval holiday. Dollars saved by the naval holiday in all other countries are likely to flow toward the United States in return for steel and machinery.

Reduction of naval armaments in other countries will tend to lower taxes and give consumers more money to spend. The United States, however, is in a position to increase its production, or is prepared to manufacture in large quantities, those goods and commodities for which there is a large market. The international naval holiday will greatly increase purchasing power and end the buyers' strike.

It is claimed that there would have been something that encouraged defense and discouraged attack. It is nothing of the kind. The fact that you are going to allow and give your general business to the Government, rather than a large part of it in the power of every state that has a seaboard at all to make itself a formidable, aggressive enemy. Italy has five million great tons of sea, paralyzing large ships, possibly squadrons. The submarine, he said, might well become a defense against aircraft because it is so small and so maneuverable that it can escape the blows of the adversary in the air."

War in Three Places at Once.

The last war had shown, Admiral de Bon said, that "heretofore naval warfare was fought on simultaneously under water, on the surface and in the air."

"These are actual facts from which there is no possible escape," he said, "and they are the only ones that we must stop the progress of human industry. It has taken possession of the submarine domain. That is a fact which we are unable to ignore."

The French Admiral questioned Lord Lee's statement that Germany had constructed 130 submarines during the war and generally had the absolute right to do so at one time. The French estimated, he said, that Germany had from 80 to 100 completed submarines, "which are still in existence, and of the number of which twenty at least are at once because of the necessity of resting crews and refitting boats. He pointed out that the American proposal of 90,000 tons of submarines for Great Britain and the United States meant ninety submarines of a future type of 1,000 tons, and probably fifteen or twenty capable of attacking the surface."

"This seems indeed the minimum submarine strength a Power desirous of making use of this contrivance should have," he added.

"We are convinced that the idea of large sized submarines could not be dismissed. If you impose too narrow a limit on submarine tonnage you will obstruct the progress of submarine science."

"To draw a conclusion from the foregoing, I think that we cannot reasonably limit submarine tonnage, since we have before us an entirely new weapon which, if not used, will be lost. We can see the possible transformation and growth, perhaps in the near future, which in spite of this idea—which is a menace to no one—will result in a new type of submarine tonnage. I believe that 90,000 tons is the absolute minimum."

Possibilities of Peril.

In answer Mr. Balfour said he was advised the American advisory committee could have no objection to the proposal of the British group, which he said, before drawing up its report.

"The committee concluded that destruction of commerce by submarines was not the main business of submarines and that regulations could prevent inhumane employment of U-boats, he pointed out. While Admiral de Bon had condemned inhumane use of submarines, he added: "It was the action of submarines upon merchant ships which he regards as on the whole the most important of the whole of the submarine warfare can be put."

"If they are ones let loose to deal with merchant ships," Mr. Balfour said, "it is inevitable that in the stress of war their powers will not be abused in the future as they have been grossly abused in the past."

"I do not in the least unduly minimize the utility of submarines for genuine war purposes, but I cannot help thinking that Admiral de Bon has exaggerated it. I am sure that the committee in error in supposing the immunity from attack enjoyed by the German coast was in the least degree due to their submarines," he said with authority. "Neither do I believe that you will find that submarines on the whole are any more useful to a Power than military operations which would arrive at the same result by direct application of force?" Admiral de Bon inquired. "One might protest against this interpretation, but no attempt to formulate a doctrine, which is a legitimate practice, and its effects would not be peculiar to submarines."

Security Not Impaired.

"No other country in Europe has that population," he said. "No other country can provide that defense against submarines. It is not that. We had to reduce our navy to a minimum. If I say, do not let anybody suppose, though I believe all our colleagues are bound up in this controversy, that we are the people who will suffer most if you do not have submarines, it is because, that submarines are to receive the sanction of this conference."

"I know it will increase our cost and will increase it enormously, because we should have to organize all the auxiliary craft against it. But that it will impair our security I do not believe. I do not know whether all my friends would believe it or not, but I have the confidence of their opinion."

Before restating the Italian position that Italy could not agree to submarine abolition at this time Senator Schanzer expressed to Mr. Balfour "Italy's sincere gratitude" for what England had done for Italy during the war. He also thanked Mr. Balfour for the important role Italy had played in the war conditions of Italy "as being surrounded by five maritime neighbors and thus exposed to offensive action by any of the seven."

"His observations," Senator Schanzer continued, "are such a stoic justification that I could ever have done myself proud to represent her. I believe that she has assumed in the present debate."

Entente Strengthens Japan, Says Premier

Replaces Alliance and Guarantees Her Position.

PARIS, Dec. 23 (Associated Press).—Premier Briand's speech at the Tokyo conference of the newspaper *Excelsior*, as declaring: "The Quadruple Entente, which for Japan represents an inviolable guarantee, is much wider in bearing, and removes all chances of war."

"I venture say," he continued, "that the Washington conference has opened a new epoch in the Pacific and the world. I not only believe that the entente will result in making the Japanese people happier, because it will lighten their burdens, but further, that by reason of the guaranty we obtain the position of Japan is strengthened in the Far East."

In regard to China, the Premier was quoted as saying: "China is an advanced stage of decomposition. It will be an unpleasant situation for Japan, and a misfortune for China, if, as a result of her anarchy, she does not cooperate with the friendly Powers endeavoring to bring about her unification."

AMUSES JAPANESE

Some Serious Patriots Seem to Regard Protection as Affront.

IS BENEATH DIGNITY

Declare Japan Is Able to Take Care of Her Own Mainland.

CONCERN OVER SHANTUNG

Mikado's Subjects Inclined to Appraise That as Outstanding Problem.

By K. K. KAWAKAMI. Special Correspondent of the *Jiji-Shinpo*, Tokio.

Special Dispatch to The New York Herald. Washington, D. C., Dec. 23.

A mingled feeling of indignation, amusement and curiosity prevails among the Japanese here whether Japan proper comes within the scope of Articles I and II of the four Power treaty, a question which has blossomed forth into animated discussion in other quarters. Ask Baron Kato, Ambassador Shidehara or Mr. Hanikawa about it and you get a smile and a few jesting remarks. All of which show that they are not thinking about it seriously.

The more serious minded patriots from the Mikado's empire are inclined to take it as an affront to Japan's dignity that the treaty should be interpreted as obligating the other contracting parties to extend even a moral assistance to the safeguarding of the integrity of Japan proper. Quite properly they think that Japan can take care of herself as far as the protection of her main islands is concerned, and that no outsider need worry about it.

For the Japanese the one outstanding question to-day is the Shantung Railway question, which has brought the Sino-Japanese conversations to an impasse. The Japanese delegation is convinced that it has made every possible concession to China, giving up even the right to the railway, and yet the Chinese government has refused to accept the terms of settlement set on September 7 were the irreducible minimum.

Delegates Receive Protests.

The Japanese delegates are receiving cablegrams reporting newspaper editorials vigorously protesting against making any further concession to China. The most criminal act, they say, is to give the railway to the Chinese. The good offices of Secretary Hughes and Mr. Balfour and insist upon the terms presented to China in September. Others insist that the Chinese government should be accepted by the Chinese delegation without modification. All agree that Japan has given up in the Shantung question what she has never shared in the Shantung Railway and the mines appurtenant thereto, and that this last vestige of Japanese interest should be maintained by the Chinese government. Japanese delegates, against the popular will at home, have offered to waive even a half share in the line and transfer absolute ownership to the Chinese government, and a transfer of supervision accorded to foreign capitalists financing Chinese railways. Moreover, their terms of loan are far more liberal than those of other railway loans in China.

Japanese Proposal.

The Japanese proposal provides for a twenty year loan, with an option for a China to redeem it at the end of ten years. Compare this with other railway loans. The British loan for Canton-Kowloon Railway is for thirty years; the Anglo-Szechuan loan, forty-five years; the Pukow line, thirty years; the British loan for Shanghai-Ningpo line, thirty years; British, American, German, French loan for Hankow-Canton line, forty years; Belgian loan for the Lungtzing-Uhal Railway, forty years; British loan for Pukow-Sinyang road, forty years; British loan for Shanghai-Nanchang line, forty-five years.

Again, the Japanese proposal provides for the appointment by the Chinese Government of three railway experts, a chief engineer, an accountant and a traffic manager, to be recommended by the Japanese capitalists. Compare this proposal with the terms required by financiers of other countries interested in Chinese railways.

In all the agreements the proceeds of the loans, as well as the receipts of the railways, are deposited not with any bank but with the corporations or banks which finance the roads. These corporations and banks also enjoy the privilege of supplying the railways with materials required for their operation. The financial control obtained by foreign capitalists over the Chinese railways seems to be justified by the present unfortunate conditions in China.

For Railroad Defense.

The two most important Italian railroads are right along the coast and a bombardment of them from the sea might interrupt our land communications. Italy has no other means of reaching the Apennines and out of reach of a possible naval bombardment. The others are all open to naval bombardment from the sea, and our naval experts think that submarines are best for dealing with such a situation.

The submarine is useful for laying mines and for watching the movements of an enemy fleet without being detected, and these advantages are obviously so great that we cannot forego them.

Italy has 20,000 tons of submarines, but that is not a large force; rather a minimum. There is a minimum of necessities of defense, just as there may be a minimum of necessities of living, which is not susceptible of bargaining and which cannot be reduced. The allotment of capital ship tonnage to Italy—175,000 tons—carries a proportionate submarine tonnage, which is 35,000. We could agree roughly with 175,000 tons of capital ship tonnage, and a proportionate submarine tonnage. If France had accepted Mr. Hughes's tonnage ratios no difficulty would have come from Italy.

Submarine rules ought to be established and become a part of international law. If all the world should agree to them, including the nations not represented here, we believe they would be observed. The Italian fleet would observe them. We want submarines for defense and not for offense.

KILLED BY ELEVATED TRAIN.

Christian Schmitz, 61, a baker, whose address could not be learned, was killed yesterday when he fell or leaped from the First avenue and First street elevated platform of the Second avenue elevated line and was run over by a train.

Conference Doings

PROPOSALS that the Powers taking part in the present conference, with others not represented, be called to a new gathering for the purpose of arranging auxiliary treaties, were reported practically ready for promulgation.

Submarine problems and the four Power treaty were warmly debated by the delegates, the day's discussion being devoted mainly to France's attitude and Britain's objection to underwater warfare.

President Harding issued a statement in which he called attention to unimportant differences in interpreting the four Power treaty, and stating that no foreign alliances were contemplated under its terms.

NEW CONFERENCE MEETS APPROVAL

Continued from First Page.

ships, because their cost will prevent serious competition from other countries. The submarine presents another problem, and it will be necessary to secure general adherence to the agreements as to limitation of submarines and to the rules adopted for their operation.

No date has been suggested for the new and larger conference visualized by this new suggestion, but there have been intimations from some of the delegations, not American, that it might be called as early as next April, and also that it might take up the question of land armaments.

Effect of New Inventions.

Still another reason which compels a further conference of the nations is recognition of what science and invention may do within a comparatively short time in revolutionizing naval warfare. The present day ships obsolete, and further agreements may be necessary to limit the new inventions that may be made in the future.

This glance into the possibilities of the future suggests the necessity of continuing conference work on a permanent basis.

Harding's gospel of understanding.

The enactment of rules of international law, and the setting up of a world court of such high standing that its decisions will carry weight and possess worldwide influence.

The submarine is a new invention to continue indefinitely her plans for the abandonment of the submarine until a world opinion demands that this be taken as a step toward a good faith, blockade your coast without having a single surface ship of war at their disposal.

"Now I will take the case of France. France is nearly self-supporting in point of food, and France has a great land frontier which gives her access, directly and indirectly, to the sea. She has a position of great security from the side of the sea. M. Briand assured us in very excellent terms that she is in a position to defend herself on the side of the land, and he certainly indicated to an attentive world that France not only required a large army now, but as events develop, she will require a large assistance from overseas, across the Atlantic or across the Channel.

"This encouragement of submarines, which is the only way that it would be possible to stop the progress of human industry. It has taken possession of the submarine domain. That is a fact which we are unable to ignore."

The French Admiral questioned Lord Lee's statement that Germany had constructed 130 submarines during the war and generally had the absolute right to do so at one time. The French estimated, he said, that Germany had from 80 to 100 completed submarines, "which are still in existence, and of the number of which twenty at least are at once because of the necessity of resting crews and refitting boats. He pointed out that the American proposal of 90,000 tons of submarines for Great Britain and the United States meant ninety submarines of a future type of 1,000 tons, and probably fifteen or twenty capable of attacking the surface."

"This seems indeed the minimum submarine strength a Power desirous of making use of this contrivance should have," he added.

"We are convinced that the idea of large sized submarines could not be dismissed. If you impose too narrow a limit on submarine tonnage you will obstruct the progress of submarine science."

"To draw a conclusion from the foregoing, I think that we cannot reasonably limit submarine tonnage, since we have before us an entirely new weapon which, if not used, will be lost. We can see the possible transformation and growth, perhaps in the near future, which in spite of this idea—which is a menace to no one—will result in a new type of submarine tonnage. I believe that 90,000 tons is the absolute minimum."

WORLD WILL TO PEACE

British Editor Comments on Demand for High Allotment of Warships.

By WICKHAM STEED. Editor of *London Times*. Washington, Dec. 23.—It may be the approach of the Christmas season, with its recurrent message of peace and good will; it may be the incompetence of a lay mind fully to appreciate technical naval arguments, or it may be an echo of the late Admiral "Jacky" Fisher's voice crying at our last meeting: "Scrap the lot! Remember, the future lies with the subsurface cruiser and internal combustion engines." But for some reason or other the discussion for and against the retention of submarines in the grand naval committee yesterday seems to lack finality.

The British case was admirably presented by Lord Lee. In logical structure and force of argument it was certainly worthy of the present and future. It included the report of the American advisory committee, pertinent though some of the American contentions are. But the balance of expert naval opinion, it is true, still inclines strongly toward capital ships as an index of the fighting strength of navies. The views of a minority of naval seers cannot altogether be ignored, nor can a doubt be silenced whether the well meant British remedy for present and future evils seems to lie in the direction of the continued association of civilized nations with one another to concert measures for the maintenance of a safe and peaceful regulation of the manner in which wars may be waged.

The submarine is a new invention to continue indefinitely her plans for the abandonment of the submarine until a world opinion demands that this be taken as a step toward a good faith, blockade your coast without having a single surface ship of war at their disposal.

"Now I will take the case of France. France is nearly self-supporting in point of food, and France has a great land frontier which gives her access, directly and indirectly, to the sea. She has a position of great security from the side of the sea. M. Briand assured us in very excellent terms that she is in a position to defend herself on the side of the land, and he certainly indicated to an attentive world that France not only required a large army now, but as events develop, she will require a large assistance from overseas, across the Atlantic or across the Channel.

"This encouragement of submarines, which is the only way that it would be possible to stop the progress of human industry. It has taken possession of the submarine domain. That is a fact which we are unable to ignore."

The French Admiral questioned Lord Lee's statement that Germany had constructed 130 submarines during the war and generally had the absolute right to do so at one time. The French estimated, he said, that Germany had from 80 to 100 completed submarines, "which are still in existence, and of the number of which twenty at least are at once because of the necessity of resting crews and refitting boats. He pointed out that the American proposal of 90,000 tons of submarines for Great Britain and the United States meant ninety submarines of a future type of 1,000 tons, and probably fifteen or twenty capable of attacking the surface."

"This seems indeed the minimum submarine strength a Power desirous of making use of this contrivance should have," he added.

"We are convinced that the idea of large sized submarines could not be dismissed. If you impose too narrow a limit on submarine tonnage you will obstruct the progress of submarine science."

"To draw a conclusion from the foregoing, I think that we cannot reasonably limit submarine tonnage, since we have before us an entirely new weapon which, if not used, will be lost. We can see the possible transformation and growth, perhaps in the near future, which in spite of this idea—which is a menace to no one—will result in a new type of submarine tonnage. I believe that 90,000 tons is the absolute minimum."

CAIRO UNDER STRONG GUARD AFTER RIOTS

Nationalist Leader's Removal Due to Refusal to Obey Military Order.

CAIRO, Egypt, Dec. 23 (Associated Press).—Cairo bristled with police and troops to-night and airplanes circled over the delta of the Nile following disturbances in connection with the forcible removal of Said Zagloul Pasha, a Nationalist leader, by the authorities to Suez early to-day. His removal came as a result of his refusal to obey an order issued by the military authorities that he and his chief followers cease all political activity and leave Cairo.

Although much wanton destruction occurred during the disturbances, the authorities declare that the incident is relatively unimportant and that the situation need not be regarded with particular anxiety. The disturbances appear to have been confined to Cairo, and reports to-night were that everything was quiet in the neighboring provinces.

Six of Zagloul's supporters were arrested on the charge of refusing to obey the same order to return to their home villages. Two demonstrators were killed during the disturbances by rifle shot.

MALTA, Dec. 23 (Associated Press).—Two British warships have received orders to proceed to Egypt immediately. Other units of the British Mediterranean fleet are under orders to leave at the shortest notice.

SILENCE TO CONFRONT PRINCE IN CALCUTTA

Non-Violent 'Hartal' of 24 Hours Declared.

CALCUTTA, India, Dec. 23 (Associated Press).—A "hartal" of a completely non-violent character was declared today for December 24, the occasion of the visit of the Prince of Wales to the city.

Instructions urge the public to refrain from anything which might lead to disturbance; no one should abuse, intimidate or retaliate, however great the provocation, and no one should go to the races or participate in any festivities.

PATNA, British India, Dec. 23.—The Prince of Wales started for Calcutta this evening after a day of brilliant ceremonies and great popular demonstrations. The "hartal" was abandoned to-day, the promoters declaring its purpose was attained yesterday, but the natives were enjoined to remain indoors. This was generally ignored, and although the bazaars remain closed thousands of persons flocked to witness the ceremonies and cheered the Prince.

ALLIES SEIZE 9,000 RIFLES OF AMERICAN 7,000,000 Mark Shipment to Munich Confiscated.

BERLIN, Dec. 23.—Nine thousand hunting rifles valued at 2,000,000 marks, said to have been purchased by an American, were confiscated at Munich by the Entente Disarmament Commission on the arrival of the rifles from Holland to-day. The rifles were shipped from Holland, although the sale was not consummated.

It is stated that the American, whose name has not been given, intended to demand the property through the American consular authorities.

The Christmas Spirit—Good-Will

From Greenland's icy mountains to India's coral strand. In mansion; in lonely cabin; and far out at sea, the birthday of Him who brought Good-Will to man is being celebrated. As hearts warm and the whole world is a chorus of "Merry Christmas," the spirit of Good-Will unites in one big Spirit that encircles the globe. The Good-Will of its patrons is the most valuable asset the Knickerbocker Ice Company has. And Knickerbocker assures them that sincere appreciation accompanies this Merry Christmas to All!

Knickerbocker ICE Company

Gift Suggestions

XMAS BOOKS

Poetry	Music
History	Essays
Biography	Old Books
Travel	Travel
Drama	Sets in Binding

XMAS CARDS

Book Ends	Gold Pencils
Desk Sets	Silver Pencils
Portfolios	Fountain Pens
Leather Goods	Stationery
Leather Goods	Novelty

JUVENILES

Myths	Animal Books
Legends	Games
Fairy Tales	Toys
Picture Books	Books
Nursery Rhymes	Books in Series

Brentano's World

Booksellers to the World

FIFTH AVENUE

Open 'Till 6 P. M.

SIAM ROYALLY GREETED JOFFRE

SIAM, Dec. 23.—Marshall Joffre, who is making an extended tour of the Far East, arrived here to-day. He was warmly welcomed and is being entertained as a royal guest.