

PLANS PEACE FOR FUTURE.

President Wilson in His Address to Senate Points out Path of Duty and Service to Humanity for America.

Proposes That United States Join Great League to Enforce Peace to Prevent Wars in Future—This Country, Says President, Must Have Hand in Terms Decided on at End of Present War to See That Justice is Meted out to All Nations and That Governed are Not Forced to Live in Subjection.

Washington, Jan. 22.—Whether the United States shall enter a world peace league, and, as many contend, thereby abandon its traditional policy of isolation and no entangling alliances, was laid squarely before congress and the country today by President Wilson in a personal address to the senate.

For the first time in more than a hundred years a president of the United States appeared in the senate chamber to discuss the nation's foreign relations after the manner of Washington, Adams and Madison. The effect was to leave congress, all official quarters and the foreign diplomats astounded and bewildered. Immediately there arose a sharp division of opinion over the propriety as well as the substance of the president's proposal.

"Startling," "staggering," "astounding," "the noblest utterance that has fallen from human lips since the Declaration of Independence," were among the expressions of senators.

The president himself after his address said:

"I have said what everybody has been longing for, but has thought impossible. Now it appears to be possible."

The chief points of the president's address were:

That a lasting peace in Europe can not be a peace of victory for either side.

That peace must be forwarded by a definite concert of power to assure the world that no catastrophe of war shall overwhelm it again.

That in such a concert of power the United States can not withhold its participation to guarantee peace and justice through the world.

And before a peace is made the United States government should frankly formulate the conditions upon which it would feel justified in asking the American people for their formal and solemn adherence.

The president, in his address, said:

"Gentlemen of the Senate: On the 18th of December, last, I addressed an identical note to the governments of the nations at war requesting them to state, more definitely than they had been stated by either group of belligerents, the terms upon which they would deem it possible to make peace. I spoke on behalf of humanity and of the rights of all neutral nations like our own, many of whose most vital interests the war puts in constant jeopardy. The central powers united in a reply which stated merely that they were ready to meet their antagonists in conference to discuss terms of peace. The entente powers have replied much more definitely and have stated, in general terms, indeed, but with sufficient definiteness to imply details, the arrangements, guarantees and acts of reparation which they deem to be the indispensable conditions of a satisfactory settlement. We are that much nearer a definite discussion of peace which shall end the present war. We are that much nearer the discussion of the international concert which must thereafter hold the world at peace. In every discussion of the peace that must end this war it is taken for granted that that peace must be followed by some definite concert of power which will make it virtually impossible that any such a catastrophe should overwhelm us again. Every lover of mankind, every sane and thoughtful man, must take that for granted.

"I have sought this opportunity to address you because I thought I owed it to you, as the counsel associated with me in the final determination of our international obligations, to disclose to you without reserve the thought and purpose that have been taking form in my mind in regard to the duty of our government in those days to come when it will be necessary to lay afresh and upon a new plan the foundations of peace among the nations.

"It is inconceivable that the people of the United States should play no part in that great enterprise. To take part in such a service will be the opportunity for which they have sought to prepare themselves by the very principles and purposes of their polity and the approved practices of their government ever since the days when they set up a new nation in the high and honorable hope that it might in all that it was and did show mankind the way to liberty. They

can not in honor withhold the service to which they are now about to be challenged. They do not wish to withhold it. But they owe it to themselves and to the other nations of the world to state the conditions under which they feel free to render it.

"That service is nothing less than this: To add their authority and force of other nations to guarantee peace and justice throughout the world. Such a settlement can not now be postponed. It is right that before it comes this government should frankly formulate the conditions upon which it would feel justified in asking our people to approve its terms and solemn adherence to a league for peace. I am here to attempt to state those conditions.

"The present war must first be ended; but we owe it to candor and to just regard for the opinion of mankind to say that so far as our participation in guarantees of future peace is concerned, it makes a great deal of difference in what way and upon what terms it is ended. The treaties and agreements which bring it to an end must embody terms which will create a peace that is worth guaranteeing and preserving, a peace that will win the approval of mankind, not merely a peace that will serve the several interests and immediate aims of the nations engaged. We shall have a voice in determining what those terms shall be, but we shall, I feel sure, have a voice in determining whether they shall be made lasting; or not by the guarantees of a universal covenant; and our judgment upon what is fundamental and essential as a condition precedent to permanency should be spoken now, not afterwards, when it may be too late.

"No covenant of cooperative peace that does not include the peoples of the new world can suffice to keep the future safe against war; and yet there is only one sort of peace that the people of America could join in guaranteeing. The elements of the peace must be elements that engage the confidence and satisfy the principles of the American governments elements consistent with their political faith and the practical convictions which the peoples of America have once for all embraced and undertaken to defend.

"I do not mean to say that any American government would throw any obstacles in the way of any terms of peace the governments now at war might agree upon, or seek to upset them when made, whatever they might be. I only take it for granted that mere terms of peace between the belligerents will not satisfy even the belligerents themselves. Mere agreements may not make peace secure. It will be absolutely necessary that a force be created as a guarantor of the permanency of the settlement so much greater than the force of any nation now engaged or any alliance hitherto formed or projected that nation, or probable combination of nations, could face or withstand. If the peace presently to be made is to endure, it must be a peace made secure by the organized major force of mankind.

"The terms of the immediate peace agreed upon will determine whether it is a peace for which such a guarantee can be secured. The question upon which the whole future peace and policy of the world depends is this: Is the present war a struggle for a just and secure peace or only for a new balance of power? If it be only a struggle for a new balance of power who will guarantee who can guarantee, the stable equilibrium of the new arrangement? Only a tranquil Europe can be a stable Europe. There must be, not a balance of power, but a community of power, not organized rivalries, but an organized common peace.

"Fortunately we have received very explicit assurances on this point. The statesmen of both of the groups of nations now arrayed against one another have said in terms that could not be misinterpreted, that it was a part of the purpose they had in mind to crush their antagonists. But the implications of these assurances may not be equally clear to all, may not be the same on both sides of the water. I think it will be serviceable if I attempt to set forth what we understand them to be.

"They imply first of all that it must

be a peace without victory. It is not pleasant to say this. I beg that I may be permitted to put my own interpretation upon it and that it may be understood that no other interpretation was in my thought. I am seeking only to face realities and to face them without soft concealments. Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation under duress at an intolerable sacrifice and would leave a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently, but only as upon quicksand. Only a peace between equals can last. Only a peace the very principle of which is equality and common participation in a common benefit. The right state of mind, the right feeling between nations, is as necessary for a lasting peace as is the just settlement of vexed questions of territory or of racial and national allegiance.

"The equality of nations upon which peace must be founded if it is to last must be an equality of rights; the guarantees exchanged must neither recognize nor imply a difference between big nations and small, between those that are powerful and those that are weak. Right must be based upon the common strength, not upon the individual strength, of the nations upon whose concert peace will depend. Equality of territory or of resources there of course can not be; nor any other sort of equality not gained in the ordinary peaceful and legitimate development of the peoples themselves. But no one asks or expects anything more than an equality of rights. Mankind is looking now for freedom of life, not for equipage of power.

"And there is a deeper thing involved than even equality of right among organized nations. No peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property. I take it for granted, for instance, if I may venture upon a single example, that statesmen everywhere are agreed that there should be a united, independent and autonomous Poland and that henceforth inviolable security of life, of worship and of industrial and social development should be guaranteed to all people who have lived hitherto under the power of governments devoted to a faith and purpose hostile to their own.

"I speak of this, not because of any desire to exalt an abstract political principle which has always been held very dear by those who have sought to build up liberty in America but for the same reason that I have spoken of the other conditions of peace which seem to me clearly indispensable—because I wish frankly to uncover realities. Any peace which does not recognize and accept this principle will inevitably be upset. It will not rest upon the affections or the convictions of mankind. The ferment of spirit of whole populations will fight subtly and constantly against it, and all the world will sympathize. The world can be at peace only if its life is stable, and there can be no stability where the will is in rebellion, where there is not tranquility of spirit and a sense of justice, of freedom and of right.

"So far as practicable every great people now struggling towards a full development of its resources and of its powers should be assured a direct outlet to the great highways of the sea. Where this can not be done by the cession of territory, it can no doubt be done by the neutralization of direct rights of way under the general guarantee which will assure the peace itself. With the right comity of arrangement no nation need be shut away from free access to the open paths of the world's commerce.

"And the paths of the sea must alike in law and in fact be free. The freedom of the seas is the sin qua non of peace, equality and cooperation. No doubt a somewhat radical reconsideration of many of the rules of international practice hitherto sought to be established may be necessary in order to make the sea indeed free and common in practically all circumstances for the use of mankind, but the motive for such changes is convincing and compelling. There can be no trust or intimacy between the peoples of the world without them. The free, constant, unthreatened intercourse of nations is an essential part of the process of peace and of development. I need not be difficult to define or to secure the freedom of the seas if the governments of the world sincerely desire to come to an agreement concerning it.

"It is a problem closely connected with the limitation of naval armaments and the cooperation of the navies of the world in keeping the sea at once free and safe. And the question of limiting naval armaments opens the wider and perhaps more difficult question of the limitation of

armies and of all programmes of military preparation.

"Difficult and delicate as these questions are, they must be faced with the utmost candor and decided in a spirit of real accommodation, if peace is to come with healing in its wings, and come to stay. Peace can not be had without concession and sacrifice. There can be no sense of safety and equality among the nations if great preponderating armaments are henceforth to continue and here and there to be built up and maintained. The statesmen of the world must plan for peace and nations must adjust and accommodate their policy to it as they have planned for war and made ready for pitiless contest and rivalry. The question of armaments, whether on land or sea, is the most immediately and intensely practical question connected with the future fortunes of nations and of mankind.

"I have spoken upon these great matters without reserve and with the utmost explicitness because it has seemed to me to be necessary if the world's yearning desire for peace was anywhere to find free voice and utterance. Perhaps I am the only person in high authority amongst all the peoples of the world who is at liberty to speak and hold nothing back. I am speaking as an individual, and yet I am speaking also, of course, as the responsible head of a great government, and I feel confident that I have said what the people of the United States would wish me to say.

"May I not add that I hope and believe that I am in effect speaking for liberals and friends of humanity in every nation and of every programme of liberty? I would fain believe that I am speaking for the silent mass of mankind everywhere who has yet had no place or opportunity to speak their real hearts out concerning the death and ruin they see to have come already upon the persons and the homes they hold most dear.

"And in holding out the expectation that the people and government of the United States will join the other civilized nations of the world in guaranteeing the permanence of peace upon such terms as I have named I speak with the greater boldness and confidence because it is clear to every man who can think that there is in this promise no breach in either our traditions or our policy as a nation, but a fulfillment rather, of all that we have professed or striven for.

"I am proposing, as it were, that the nations should with one accord adopt the doctrine of President Monroe as the doctrine of the world: That no nation should seek to extend its policy over any other nation or people, but that every people should be left free to determine its own policy, its own way of development unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful.

"I am proposing that all nations henceforth avoid entangling alliances which would draw them into competitions of power, catch them in a net of intrigue and selfish rivalry, and disturb their own affairs with influences intruded from without. There is no entangling alliance in a concert of power. When all unite to act in the same sense and with the same purpose, all act in the common interest and are free to live their own lives under a common protection.

"I am proposing government by the consent of the governed; that freedom of the seas which in international conference after conference, representatives have urged with the eloquence of those who are the convinced disciples of liberty; and that moderation of armaments which makes of armies and navies a power for order merely, not an instrument of aggression or of selfish violence.

"These are American principles. American policies. We can stand for no others. And they are also the principles and policies of forward looking men and women everywhere of every modern nation, of every enlightened community. They are the principles of mankind and must prevail."

COTTON GINNERS' REPORT.

Crop in Sight to January 10, 11,147, 118.

Washington, Jan. 23.—Cotton ginned prior to January 16th amounted to 11,147,118 bales, the census bureau announced today. In this number 189,000 were round and 115,400 bales sea island are included.

The ginnings by States were: South Carolina, 936,706; Georgia, 1,825,629; Alabama, 543,987.

Announce Engagement.

Bishopville, Jan. 20.—Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Parrott announce the engagement of their daughter Inez, to Jesse Olin Rikard, the marriage to be solemnized in the spring.

Jacksonville, Jan. 23.—Thomas C. McCoy, a former distiller, was today sentenced to two years' imprisonment on the charge of conspiring to defraud the United States out of revenue taxes.

MORE PROHIBITION, MORE BOOZE

TILLMAN GETS STARTLING FIGURES FROM MODEL LICENSE LEAGUE PRESIDENT.

Asks Osborne About it and Commissioner of Internal Revenue Tells the Senator Figures are Correct.

Washington, Jan. 21.—Senator Tillman has been having some correspondence recently on the subject of prohibition, which has brought to light some statistics which startled him.

Assertions made by President T. M. Gilmore, of the National Model License League, that the official figures showed a larger per capita consumption of liquor in this country today than twenty years ago so strained the South Carolina senator's credulity that he wrote to Commissioner of Internal Revenue W. H. Osborn, who before taking his present office was in charge of the Keeley Institute at Greensboro, N. C. Commissioner Osborn admitted that the Gilmore statement was correct.

The letters given out by Senator Tillman are as follows: Hon. Benjamin R. Tillman, M. C., National Model License League, Louisville, Ky.

Washington, D. C.:

Dear Senator Tillman—I thank you very much for your letter of the 4th. It is a great compliment for one of your age and distinction to write me at such length, and I appreciate it.

The National Model License League never tries to avoid a fact nor a logical conclusion. There is a startling fact, however, that seems to me to overshadow this whole so-called prohibition movement.

It is this: That our per capita consumption, according to the records of the Internal Revenue Department, of whiskey and beer twenty years ago, when only two States—Kansas and Maine—were under prohibition, was 15 gallons per annum, while today, with over half of the country under prohibition, the per capita consumption of whiskey and beer is over 20 gallons per annum.

We were using in those days a billion gallons of beer, and today over two billion gallons per annum; we were using in those days eighty odd million gallons of whiskey; today we are using over one hundred and forty million gallons of whiskey per annum.

If prohibition does not prohibit the use of liquor, then we have no prohibition. If prohibition encourages the excessive use of liquor, then it is not to be encouraged. Coincident with the progress of prohibition we see a steady increase in the per capita consumption of liquor.

The so-called prohibition States permit the shipment of liquor from other States, for personal use, and there can be no question that under such laws the consumption is increased.

Georgia today, with her limitation law, is receiving a much larger per capita of whiskey than the per capita consumption of the country in general.

I do not believe in vested rights, but I do believe that where men are encouraged by a government, and by custom, and by the general patronage of the people, to engage in an enterprise, that they should be compensated for losses sustained if later on the people decide to destroy such an enterprise.

If the people of the country should decide, influenced by agitation, to prohibit the manufacture and sale of tobacco. I think the men in that business should be compensated.

You speak of our retiring from the business. We cannot retire, because we cannot dispose of our properties while this so-called prohibition movement is rampant.

I own Bonfort's Circular in New York. I have been connected with it for over thirty years. I have given my life to its development. Four years ago it was valued at \$400,000. It would be impossible for me today to find a buyer for it for \$50,000.

If the Hobson resolution is adopted by congress, Bonfort's Circular will be destroyed and I will be ruined financially. But if the Hobson resolution is adopted by congress and then ratified by the States it will not put a stop to the manufacture, nor the use, of alcoholic beverages, and it is not so intended.

Thanking you again for your letter, I beg to remain,

Very truly yours,

T. M. Gilmore.

President National Model License League.

Treasury Department.

Washington, Jan. 13, 1917.

Office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Hon. B. R. Tillman, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

My Dear Senator: I wish to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, inclosing a communication addressed to you by T. M. Gilmore, president of the National Model License League, in regard to the effects of prohibition, and it is noted that you ask to be advised if the statements made by the letter of Mr. Gilmore are facts, and you further

request that a comparative statement be furnished of the per capita consumption of intoxicating beverages now and twenty years ago. You also would like to have a statement of the per capita consumption in Georgia now as compared with that of any period when the open bar flourished.

In reply, I have the honor to advise you that the statements of Mr. Gilmore as to the fact that the per capita consumption of whiskey and beer twenty years ago was 15 gallons per annum, while today the per capita consumption of whiskey and beer is over 20 gallons per annum, is approximately correct.

Twenty years ago there were tax-paid 34,423,094 barrels of fermented liquors of not more than 31 gallons to the barrel and 69,979,362 taxable gallons of distilled spirits. The probabilities are that over 140,000,000 gallons of distilled spirits will be tax-paid in this fiscal year and 63,000,000 barrels of fermented liquors.

Compared with prior fiscal years, the estimated tax payments for this fiscal year of distilled spirits show, generally speaking, a decided increase. In my opinion there are two principal causes for this increase. One is that due to a strict enforcement of the internal revenue laws the government is now receiving practically all of the tax that is due, whereas a few years ago much of the tax was evaded as shown by investigations recently completed by me. The other reason is that due to general prosperous conditions throughout the country more whiskey is being used, particularly in those States where prohibition laws are not in effect. In my opinion, there is not consumed in the States that have State-wide prohibition laws as much whiskey as was consumed when the State laws did not prohibit the sale of distilled spirits.

In regard to the consumption of alcoholic liquors in Georgia, or other States, you are advised that this information is not disclosed by reports made to this office. The internal revenue tax is paid in the case of spirits, at the distillery or bonded warehouse, and, in the case of beer, at the brewery prior to its removal, after which the same become subject to general trade conditions, including interstate shipment, and of which no further report is required to be made to this office.

There is enclosed a statement showing the annual tax-paid withdrawals for consumption of distilled spirits and fermented liquors in the United States during the fiscal years 1897 to 1906, inclusive; also the per capita consumption of each in the United States during the same period, excepting the fiscal year 1916, as to per capita consumption, which information is not available at this time. The figures for per capita consumption were taken from the Statistical Abstract of the United States for the fiscal year 1915. The report for fiscal year 1916 is not yet in print. Sincerely yours,

W. H. Osborn, Commissioner.

VALUE PROPERTY AT \$2,500.

A verdict for \$2,500 was awarded by the jury yesterday to Mrs. Dawes in the condemnation proceedings brought by the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad company against Mrs. Mary A. Dawes for possession of property opposite the A. C. L. station. This property is wanted by the railroad in order that they may extend tracks at this place.

The proceedings took up most all of Monday, the verdict of the jury being returned late in the afternoon. Those on the jury were Messrs. W. B. Burns, foreman; S. O'Quinn, A. C. Thompson, W. R. Wells, J. A. McKnight, R. K. Wilder, E. E. Aycock, C. C. Beck, A. D. Harby, S. A. Harvin, S. W. Raffield, T. H. Clarke.

The witnesses for the railroad were Messrs. Geo. D. Shore, D. R. McCullum, Bartow Walsh, R. B. Belser, J. R. Clark; for Mrs. Dawes E. K. Friar, Neill O'Donnell, W. F. Shaw and Mrs. Mary A. Dawes. The values set by these witnesses on the property wished condemned by the railroad varied greatly, some of the witnesses deeming it practically a confiscation of the entire property, as there would be no direct approach to it, in their judgment, while others did not think that it would hurt the value of the other property owned by Mrs. Dawes.

Neither side had given any notice of appeal up to this morning, so it seems that both sides must be fairly well satisfied.

London, Jan. 23.—The known casualty list from Friday night munition factory explosion includes sixty-nine killed, seventy-two seriously injured and three hundred and twenty-eight slightly hurt, it is officially announced.

Ottawa, Jan. 23.—Canada has recruited an army of 434,539 men for the war, 120,000 in excess of the force Great Britain asked the Dominion to contribute at the beginning of the conflict, Sir Robert Borden, premier, informed parliament yesterday. Of this 175,000 already have seen active service, he announced, with casualties of 70,000.