

CORPORAL SHELTON OFFERS ANSWER TO CHARLES E. KING

Mr. Editor:

I was in hopes it would be unnecessary for me to again impose on your generosity, but an article from the pen of Charles E. King, appearing in the Sunday Morning Observer, of March 23d, leaves but one avenue open through which I can pass if I would perform my duty as an American citizen and remain devoted to the principles of liberty to which my life was voluntarily dedicated fourteen months ago, and that avenue consists of not answering Mr. King, for his allegation is too childish to merit serious consideration from any thinking man, but to direct my remarks, through you, to your numerous readers who are directly concerned in the process of civilization and the part any power is apt to play in it.

This is not an argument between Mr. King and myself. It is intended merely to analyze his article and show, if possible, the flimsy foundation on which it rests. It is preposterous, beyond comparison, to imagine, at the invitation of an Englishman, that the British are just bubbling over with love for Americans.

Mr. King is a stranger in our midst, and no doubt he is a wee bit homesick to have about his Majesty's navy and army (particularly the navy) and about the fair name and fame of England. Mr. King is really to be pitied, for one so far away from home, and especially where one is among people who have an opinion of their own and the courage to express it, life is apt to grow rather monotonous with every one your social and political equal.

But, Mr. Editor and fellow citizens, let us examine the record of England and see if I have not a just cause for complaint. Mr. King lays great stress on the fair name and fame of England. That is to be expected, and no one objects. England is his country, and he is to be admired for upholding it. But America is my country and my home, and if I speak of England from a personal knowledge wrought from a sincere wish to know the British people as they really are, I feel that what I say should be taken as emanating from a heart beating with sincerity, and from a soul flooded with a national life, to see mankind everywhere to be masters of themselves, and not the unwilling servants of any flag.

England's Conquests.

England's fame (as a land-grabber) is beyond question, as the following will verify. In Africa, England holds by right of conquest or by a sword not as cruel but as dominating as the one just being sheathed by Germany, the colossal area of 1,608,983 square miles, including Gold Coast, St. Helena, Seychelles, Sudan, Togoland and Cape of Good Hope. By annexation, 196,139 square miles. The dominions by annexation are Ascension, Natal, Orange Free State and the Transvaal.

In America England owns the Dominion of Canada, conquest of 1759-60. In addition, Trinidad, Tobago, Jamaica, Honduras and British Guiana was plucked from the tree of self-determination by the superior strength of Great Britain.

In Asia, England owns by right of conquest and annexation nearly 2,000,000 square miles of territory, com-

posed of Aden, Cyprus and India. Her holdings in Australasia by conquest and annexation amount to about 125,000 square miles, and in Europe England has caught Gibraltar and Malta in her fine spun web that renders it impossible for the sun to set on British soil.

England sits not at the council of nations with clean hands as her dominions throughout the world increase as the years multiply, and those dominions are brought under subjection not by common approval of the territories affected, but by the humble appearing yet mandatory will of the British crown.

Delve into the pages of our own history and it will be found that we hold not a foot of soil but what we acquired by right of discovery or by purchase. Compare the acquisitions of the two countries, England and America, and judge for yourself if my so-called uneasy state of mind is not warranted by the conspicuous policy of the former, even though I did not know the British people from personal contact in their own land.

Duty is to Speak.

Mr. King is as proud as little Johnnie with a pair of new brass-toed boots to think he has found a satisfactory reason for my clouded brain by saying: "Mr. Editor, I believe Corporal Shelton is just consumed by the exuberance of his own verbosity." May I inquire if my fellow citizens would have me remain quiet, and not pass on to them the convictions wrought from my experience and study while in England? Would I be exercising the functions of a household companion if I felt that the home was in jeopardy and not warn the members of the approaching danger?

If my defined excess of talking will open the minds of those near and dear to me (the American people) to the realization that "self preservation is the first law of nature," I'll accept, with gratitude, all the compliments Mr. King cares to toss my way. At any rate, I intend to continue advertising, regardless of the consequence of which Mr. King is generous enough to extend a timely warning, what I believe to be the safest preservative known, viz., a navy sufficient to secure our own position, and the position of those who willingly consented to be adopted by us, but such a navy can never be employed in the capacity of a magic wand to brow beat weaker nations into submission at the extreme cost of their right to self-determination.

Indifferent to Americans.

Mr. King clinches his argument that England is a friend to America by recalling that one Charles Godfrey sang a song in England entitled, "It's the English Speaking Race Against the World," and at its conclusion the audience "broke out into a pandemonium of cheering." It would be interesting to know if the gentleman has visited a theatre in England during the last two years, and if he has why he did not mention that when a picture was thrown on the screen showing a lone "Tommy" or a squad of British soldiers winding their way across "no man's land," or on any section of the front, that the audience was wild with admiration, but if an entire regiment of Yankee soldiers were seen on the

screen going over the top, that there was no response from the people who, in Mr. King's estimation, hold us in such high esteem.

"I have seen this very thing demonstrated not once, but dozens of times in the 'movies' in London and throughout England. I mention this merely to show that the hearts of men are apt to change, though I am of the opinion that the cheering to which Mr. King refers, was directed to the singer and not the song."

Referring to me Mr. King says: "It's easy to see he has no love for England or Englishmen." If Mr. King intended to be fair, he would quote me verbatim and not segregate my statements, thereby destroying their meaning, and using such parts that suit his own purpose.

What I did say was: "I have no quarrel with England; in fact, some of my very best friends are numbered among the people of the Island Empire. It is their damnable policy, relative to international affairs, particularly with America, that is going to complicate our relations with them."

British Policy Objectionable.
It is evident Mr. King is attempting to bolster up his attitude at my expense. If he can't play the game in a sportsmanlike manner and win, he will resort to the "Diamond Dick" methods of square shooting. I welcome anything his brain is cunning enough to devise.

I again declare that I hold nothing against the British people. It is their policy and nothing else that I take issue with, and that would not concern me if it did not concern the American people.

Was Misquoted.

Mr. King continues to create a false impression by quoting me in part and not in whole: "He complains (Corporal Shelton) of the fuel feeding the ideas of an Englishman is his ego," then goes on to state in the next sentence that certain people are in harmony with the humanitarian and idealistic views so beautifully expressed and lived by the American people. In fact, this is what I wrote: "The fuel feeding the ideas of an Englishman relative to the world and the methods by which the problems vital to the interests of mankind should be solved, is his ego. I did not refer to the thoughts flowing through the British mind in connection to their internal affairs as Mr. King would lead the Observer readers to believe."

If Mr. King had been a little more generous with his ink here is what would have been written about my granting that certain people are in harmony, etc. We will grant that Mr. Bonar Law, M. P., Mr. Asquith, M. P., Mr. Lloyd George, Prime Minister of England, and all of the leaders of English political thought were and are, apparently on the surface, in harmony with the humanitarian and idealistic views so beautifully expressed and lived by the American people, but one man, two men, or a dozen men cannot change the inherited thoughts and ambitions of a nation. Does that sound as though I am "lining up pretty strong for a place in the ranks of the egotistical" as Mr. King informs the Observer?

If my compatriots see fit not to thank me for my attitude as the gentlemanly, courteous and friendly countryman, were in this continent. Although the men were forced hard work from morning to night were confined in barracks during intervals between sleep and meals. Boyle said the prisoners were no victims of any particular physical cruelty.

"We had twenty-one months of hard work on Nov. 13, two days after the armistice signed. We were released on Nov. 14. It was in February that we were given a new found jewel will be protected by first indication of revolt in Germany. A strike came in which the military authorities—at least the natives—refused to interfere. Soldiers frequently told us they'd like to see their guns away, as the war was good for them. They wanted to be home, and said they were tired. This strike appeared to be a test and trial of strength developed into the revolution."

BAPAUME WANTS GODMOT

French Town, March 14th by War, Help From Some City to Aid Reconstruction.

Washington, — Bapaume, a French town which suffered from the war, wants a "godmot" according to an official dispatch received here.

General Bapaume, mayor of the town, is quoted by the dispatch as saying: "If some great city would send a godmot to Bapaume, it would be a great help. I hope that some other great city of the old continent of Europe will do so."

temple in our midst has prophesied, their disapproval must come from them, if it carries any weight, and not from a stray Englishman who has wandered a little too far from his mother's apron strings.

Mr. King says I do not like England being mistress of the seas. Strange he should be frank enough to admit one truth. He continues: Well, thanks to the British fleet being what it was, and is, etc., etc., and adds: "The great British fleet that saved England, and in fact civilization, from the monster system that was in the act of blighting and destroying every thing that the human mind and human soul has heretofore held dear, this was the British mastery of the sea which your correspondent complains of."

But did the British fleet save civilization? It is a debatable question, and some of our best authority, including the Prime Minister of England, affirms that it was American dollars, American food and American soldiers that turned the tide of a crushing defeat into victory.

England's Fleet Too Strong.

Be that as it may, the fact remains that if England had not been in a hole struggling by the side of her allies for her own security, she possessed the power, as she possesses it now, to crush any fleet on the high seas and go sailing into any port if she so desires, and there is nothing to prove that her train of thoughts will not lead to such a move in the future. She has done it before, as her territorial aggrandizement is the best witness, and who knows but what her coveted eyes are focused on other worlds to conquer, and her predatory fleet alert to spring on the weaker prey?

The service rendered by the British fleet during the recent war is worthy of the highest praise, and I do not hesitate to contribute my share. I complain only of the persistent attitude of England in claiming it is her right to be "bully" of the sea and Lord of everything that floats. It seems to be another case of "Me and Got."

Mr. Bernard Shaw in a recent utterance said: "We will endure oppression and masters from one another, but we will suffer no other state on earth to master us. If any state begins to build up an armament with that in view, or even without that as possible result, that state will have to fight us."

Mr. Shaw is high in the council of the British nation, and his influence is a power to be reckoned with. But on top of all this, Mr. King would have the Observer readers believe that we have nothing to fear from England's policy.

Distrust Mutual.

Even so, but if England cannot trust America, why should America trust England? It amounts to simply this, if a man is crooked he believes everyone else to be crooked too. England knows her hands are not clean, and if she does not hold the most impressive whip she fears that some of her stolen property might be returned to its rightful owner.

But Mr. Editor and fellow citizens, after all is said and done, my heart goes out with all tenderness to the people of the old world. They need the sympathy, the newer courage and the helping hand of the new world, and America can be depended on to continue in the path of righteousness, but in doing so we should not "kill the goose that laid the golden egg." We must work to the pattern cast in Western moulds and pursue the course that will insure our perpetual safety, though that course must not antagonize the safety of those beyond our own boundaries.

The days that tick off the months and years, and the months and years that build the decades and centuries, will find the United States ever striving to blaze a satisfactory trail that pleads mankind, weary of the old order of things, can find their way to mutual ground, where in their right to live their own lives in their own way will be their reward, and the new found jewel will be protected by a navy whose history is not darkened by deeds wrought from selfish motives.

There are volumes yet to be written on why England should be feared, but I must not tax the kindly and generous spirit of the Observer, so will conclude by agreeing with Mr. King, "that one swallow can not make a summer," but that one Woodpecker can make a hole if he keeps pecking, and that my bill is just being sharpened for more pecking against England's policy.

Sincerely,
DONALD D. SHELTON

THE SHALLOT

The shallot is a variety of small onion that is frequently planted in early spring for its small bulbs, which are used in the same manner as onions. The leaves are utilized for flavoring. Another onion-like plant is the chive, the small round, hollow leaves of which are used for flavoring. These leaves may be cut freely, as they are soon regrown by others.

"ALL NATIONS" PHRASE DISPLEASES ORE. SOLÓN

Congressman Nick Sinnott Reviews Other Treaties That Have Caused Uncle Sam Trouble.

From Washington, D. C., Post.

Charging that the Santa league of nations covenant contains in one section the same ambiguous language which cost American citizens freedom of the Panama canal and precipitated an unsuccessful effort to have America's interpretation of the language prevail, Representative Sinnott, of Oregon, yesterday directed the spotlight of publicity on Article XXI of the league constitution and section 1, Article III, of the Panama Canal treaty.

After showing the striking similarity in the two articles, Mr. Sinnott points out that America's effort to protect the rights of its citizens respecting the canal was defeated because the British interpreted the phrase "all nations" as meaning other nations with the United States included, thereby forcing American coastwise trade to obtain no benefits over the British in the matter of tolls, etc.

Brings Up New Question.

He now asks if the phrase "all nations" of the league, referred to in Article XXI, means other states with the United States included, which would prevent American commerce from obtaining any advantage at any time not accorded to the British.

Mr. Sinnott admits that the Americans will contend that the language of this article does not bind American commerce to sacrifice its opportunities in the future, and does not mean a solemn pledge never to give to American trade an opportunity not given to the British. But he contends that with the Panama Canal precedent already established, the British interpretation would almost certainly prevail. Any argument as to interpretation would naturally be given over to the league "board of directors" to decide, and with the precedent already established, little doubt is entertained as to what the ruling imposed on the American people would be.

"Ambiguous, if not artfully conceived language deprived American citizens of the free use of the Panama Canal," Mr. Sinnott warns. "We

should not be caught again." "Subtle and Skillful." "Did the same subtle and skillful diplomacy contrive both Article XXI of the covenant of the league of nations and section 1, Article III, of the Panama Canal treaty with England?" he asks.

"Is Article XXI of the covenant of the league designed to give to citizens of other nations the same privileges enjoyed by our citizens in our own commerce?" asks Sinnott, and contends that "the import of the phraseology in Article XXI of the covenant, and section 1, Article III, of the Panama Canal treaty are so perilously close, so susceptible of the same or analogous interpretation as to justify a demand for clarification or amendment of said Article XXI."

"If this amendment or clarification is not made," he asserts, "we may be compelled under Article XXI of the covenant to open our markets to the commerce of the world on the same terms accorded our own citizens, just as we were forced to open the Panama Canal to the vessels of citizens of all other countries on the same terms and conditions as enjoyed by those of citizens of the United States," and he argues, "that the language of Article XXI of the covenant of the league is as crafty and insidious or at any rate as ambiguous as said section of the Panama Canal treaty and that it is as susceptible of a similar or analogous interpretation and construction."

Canal Treaty Quoted.

He quotes section 1, Article III, of the Panama Canal treaty as follows: "The canal shall be free and open to vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable."

"The United States contended," he says, "that the phrase 'all nations' in the above section means all other nations; also that the equitable condi-

tions and charges, referred to in the last paragraph of the above section, meant equitable charges and conditions as among other nations not including the United States, which constructed the canal at its own expense."

"The British contention and interpretation was that the phrase 'all na-

(Continued from Page 3)



Hotpoint
Vacuum Cleaner
—operates from any lamp socket.
—makes cleaning a pleasant pastime
Nash Electric Co.

Sawyer-Holmes Mercantile Co.

FUEL-HAY - GRAIN - LIME - CEMENT
PLASTER - BUILDING MATERIAL
STORAGE

Phone Main 17

GARDEN SEEDS
FIELD SEEDS
GRAIN SEEDS

Don't let the bugaboo of "High Prices" keep you from having that odd job done now. Let us prove to you that it can still be done at a reasonable price.

W. A. BENHAM

Licensed Electrician.
Phone Main 767 West Jacobson Bldg.
Next to La Grande Printing Co.

Service Is Our Motto; And We Give It

Did you ever attend a banquet where the eats were of the best, the toasts fine, but the service so poor that everything from soup to turkey was cold? Poor service spoiled it all, didn't it?

We endeavor to give real service, together with up-to-date insurance forms and policies.

Security Insurance Agency
Chas. H. Reynolds, Manager
Insurance With Service.