

CHINESE ARE UNITED AGAINST JAPAN PLAN

Travelers From Orient Bring Report of Deep Feeling.

BOYCOTT WELL SUPPORTED

Great Opportunities Held to American Trade, as Demand for Supplies Is Great.

SEATTLE, Wash., July 23.—(Special.)—Difficult as it seems to be for China to unite upon any general national question, reports brought to Seattle today from the far east by the passengers of the Nippon Yusen Kaisha liner Fushimi Maru are that upon at least one question the huge nation stands together, and that is the matter of Japan and her intentions toward Shanghai.

Petty revolt, provincial differences and political upheavals are very well among themselves, but Shanghai and Japan are beside these questions, and all China feels that Shanghai and its people are of China and should remain so, asserted the liner's passengers, who brought to Seattle the first word of mouth reports since the signing of the peace treaty.

C. Best, a contracting and construction engineer of Hongkong, who today reached Seattle, said that from one end of China to the other the nation is united against Japanese aggression, and her apparent intentions in Shanghai have created a storm of protest from all Chinese people, irrespective of class or condition.

Boycott Is Thorough.
He said he received an exaggerated report of Japanese goods and customs is wonderfully well organized, and is being felt keenly by those against whom its strength is directed.

The thoroughness with which the boycott seems to be organized, together with the evident determination of the Chinese people to avoid the use of all things offered by Japan for sale, is having an immediate effect upon Japanese business in China, and indications are that the present dislike for Japan will not abate before China is given a fair and square deal, said Mr. Best.

When asked if China is successfully solving her governmental troubles, Mr. Best said it seems doubtful if the government could be said to be other than unstable.

"It will require time and considerable effort before the country secures the strong control necessary for the general good," said Mr. Best.

Foreign Aid Sought.
"In the meantime China must look to the United States and England for assistance and advice, and with suitable help from these nations there is no fear of the eventual outcome."

"Business opportunities in China are excellent for American manufacturers and merchants if they are willing to work sensibly with Chinese merchants, and this will be necessary to make business successful. Just now there is a large and steadily increasing demand for various kinds of machinery, and American machinery is preferred above all other makes."

"Electrical machinery is especially desired by China, as this power is becoming very popular. Electric light plants are springing up in all parts of China, and numerous villages are installing electric lighting plants. There are instances of such installations being made for as few as 50 lights. There is much water power possible of development, and this is now being looked to as a cheap and general power for generating electricity for machine operations."

SYNOD FAVORS LEAGUE

PRESBYTERIANS ASK RATIFICATION BY CONGRESS.

Action Is Taken at Closing Session in Eugene, Where Resolution Is Introduced.

EUGENE, Or., July 22.—(Special.)—Immediate ratification by the United States senate of the league of nations covenant and acceptance by congress of a mandatory over Turkey and Armenia were urged by the Presbyterian synod of Oregon at its closing session here this afternoon. The resolution to this effect was passed unanimously.

The text of the resolution follows: "That the synod of Oregon put on record for its belief that America is called by God to be his servant in the house of the nations and to that end we endorse the league of nations and urge upon the United States senate its speedy ratification."

"And that we further memorialize the congress of the United States to accept a mandatory over Turkey and Armenia." The resolution was introduced by Rev. Charles W. Hayes of Portland, moderator at last year's session, was presented by illness from attending this session and his place on the executive committee was taken by Rev. William Baird of Baker, who was moderator at the 1917 session here.

PRICE OF HOPS SOARING

Growers of Puyallup Valley Contract at Good Figure.

SEATTLE, Wash., July 22.—(Special.)—Notwithstanding the fact that the liquor business has been abolished by law, the hop growers of the Puyallup valley will make more money off their crop this year than they have since 1882, experts declared today. This year some of the farmers sold their hops on contracts from 15 to 27 cents a pound.

It was learned today that hops are being quoted from 50 to 55 cents a pound, and it is said that they will go as high as 65 cents a pound. A large share of the hops are being purchased by English firms and exporters, and it is said that a large part of the hops will eventually find their way to Germany.

CORNELIUS BOY BURIED

Funeral of Edwin R. Kyle Held at Cedar Mills Church.

Edwin R. Kyle, who died Sunday from an attack of heart failure while bathing in the Tualatin river near Cornelius, was buried yesterday afternoon, funeral services being held in

the Cedar Mills Union church. The young man, who was 29 years of age, was out with a party of picnickers swimming in the stream. In sight of 200 people he dived and a few minutes later it was supposed that a man seen climbing up the opposite bank was Kyle. The error was discovered when the group prepared to go home.

Twelve-year-old Edwin Geiger made a search for the body and brought it to the surface. Dr. Smith and two Hillsboro nurses worked over it, but failed to bring the young man back to life.

He was the son of M. Kyle and a brother of Raymond Kyle, now serving with the navy in Siberia, and Miss Alta Kyle and Mrs. Clifford A. Squire. He was born at Cedar Mills April 18, 1890, and had lived there all his life.

LEAGUE HELD BIG STRIDE

IMPROVE ON ANCESTORS' WORK, PLEADS SENATOR.

Opposition Declared to Come From "Reactionaries" Like Those Who Fought Federal Constitution.

WASHINGTON, July 23.—The league of nations was supported in the senate today by Senator McKellar, democrat, Tennessee, as one of the greatest forward steps in the nation's history. Most of the opposition, he asserted, came from "reactionaries" of the same school as those who opposed the federal constitution and those who later handicapped the growth and development of the country.

"There have always been reactionaries in our country," said the Tennessee senator, "and there have always been progressives. There have always been forward-looking men and backward-looking men. There have always been men who looked to precedents and to the past and men who looked to the future."

"We ought to improve upon those who have gone before us. We have had better advantages than they had. They blazed the path."

Reactionary republicans and reactionaries of other parties are opposing this league, don't let your hatred of any one man warp and set aside your judgment. Whatever may be said of Mr. Wilson, he has surely done great things for America. Under his administration, we have become a world power, faster than in any other like period in our history. All of his work has been done for America. Let not America, which has given this great peace covenant to the world, be the only one to repudiate it."

'CHEER UP, GIRLS,' IS WORD

California Farmer Asks Albany Mayor to Advise for Wife.

ALBANY, Or., July 23.—(Special.)—Albany Mayor, "Cheer up, girls," Mayor Curly is in receipt of a letter from a California farmer who is most "awful lonesome without somebody to write to." The only qualifications are youth, religion and a desire to get married. The farmer did not tell much about himself.

Vallejo, Cal., July 20.

"Dear Sir:

"I thought that I would write you a few lines in regards to you putting an ad in your home-town paper for me. If you will be so kind to do that."

"A gentleman wishes to get acquainted with a nice girl of about 20 years of age and it has to be a protestant with the intentions of getting married, as I am very lonesome without anybody to write to."

"It will be very much appreciated by me if you will do that and you can put my address in also if you wish, but only for about three days in the month. Oblige."

"Mr. Geo. W. Blume, 932 Tenn St. Vallejo, Calif."

"P. S.—Please don't put this in any California paper."

BRYAN SAYS HE'S SATISFIED

Prohibition, Suffrage and Referendum Long Championed, He Recalls.

SALEM, Or., July 23.—(Special.)—William Jennings Bryan, speaking at an informal banquet attended by many prominent Marion county democrats here tonight, said it was his highest aim in life to see the three greatest issues of the age put into national operation. He referred to prohibition, woman suffrage and the initiative and referendum.

"My trials and tribulations have been many," said Mr. Bryan, "but I have the satisfaction of knowing that many of the issues I advocated in days past have been adopted and are being satisfactorily applied in conducting the government."

Tonight Mr. Bryan delivered his lecture on reconstruction before a large crowd at the Chautauque.

Seated across the table from Mr. Bryan at the banquet was Miss Ida Tarbell, noted writer, now on the Chautauque platform. August Hockenstein, prominent Salem democrat, presided at the banquet.

BIRD CENTER FLOURISHES

Oregon City Responsible for Tale of Feathered Community House.

OREGON CITY, Or., July 23.—(Special.)—Bird eccentricity is sensibly being a curiosity at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Jones of this city.

Two years ago a pair of robins took up their abode at the Jones home in a rose bush at the rear of the house, where a brood of birds was hatched. The following year the same birds appeared at this home and occupied the same nest and hatched a second brood. This year a new brood was hatched and made two years ago, and a few weeks ago another pair of robins made their appearance and have been nesting on top of that made by the wren, and there are now three bird nests piled high, the last one containing a family of young robins.

ENLARGEMENT PLAN LOST

Republican Conference Opposed to Proposal.

WASHINGTON, July 23.—Enlargement of the republican legislative steering committee was voted down tonight at a party conference.

Proposals to increase the committee from five to seven and from 10 to 12 members each was disapproved by margins of ten votes or more.

BRYAN AT ST. JOHNS.

Edison-White presents William Jennings Bryan at St. Johns Chautauque Thursday afternoon, 8 o'clock. Lecturing on "Foreign and Domestic Problems." Ida M. Tarbell at 8 o'clock. Lecturing on peace conference. Central high school grounds.—Adv.

TAFT OFFERS SCHEME TO END TREATY ROW

Letters to Will Hays Carry Outline of Compromise.

SENATE VOTE IS FIGURED

Root and Lodge Mentioned as Being Perhaps Best Left Out of Plan to Unite Factions.

(Continued From First Page.)

fulfilled all her obligations under the covenant.

Second—That self-governed colonies and dominions should not be represented on the league council at the same time with the mother government, or be included in any of those clauses where the parties to the dispute are to be free to determine questions of war in its own way, the decision of the United States resting under article 16.

Third—That the functioning of the council under article 10 shall be advisory only, and that each member shall be left free to determine questions of war in its own way, the decision of the United States resting with congress.

League Power Limited.
Fourth—That differences between the nations regarding immigration, tariff and other domestic questions shall not be left to the league for settlement.

Fifth—That the Monroe doctrine is to be reserved for administration by the United States.

Sixth—That the United States reserves the right to withdraw unconditionally at the end of ten years, or at least to terminate then her obligations under article 16.

These interpretations, Mr. Taft wrote, could be made without weakening the covenant. The argument of administration senators against inclusion of any such provisions in the ratification has been, however, that any qualification at all would weaken the league.

Mr. Taft wrote that these interpretations would not weaken the league covenant, but would, he believed, assure ratification. He suggested that he would not appear publicly at this time. The letters follow:

Ratification Held Advisable.

"My Dear Mr. Hays—In what I said yesterday I did not go over the various interpretations and reservations because I thought that the public correspondence between us was sufficiently explained. I think it wise, now that I have formulated them, after a good deal of thought, to give you my reasons in detail for suggesting them."

"Speaking generally, I wish to emphasize my conviction that the United States senate might well ratify the present treaty, without any reservations or interpretations. I am confident that the actual operation of a treaty after ratification would bring about exactly the same result as that which would be attained by the acceptance of these interpretations. It seems to me to be the part of statesmen to recognize the exigencies of personal, partisan and political, of a nation in seeking to achieve real progress and reform."

"The situation which confronts us now in reference to the ratification of the treaty is one created by very serious mistakes of policy committed by Mr. Wilson."

Wilson Attitude Deplored.
"The partisan character of his administration during the treaty-making process, his refusal to permit a democratic congress in November, 1918, created a condition of political and partisan antagonism between him and republican leaders which was shared by a majority of the American people. This was shown in the results of the election. Notwithstanding this, Mr. Wilson persisted in continuing the same partisan exclusion of republicans in dealing with the highly important matters of settling the results of the war."

"He selected a commission in which the republicans had no representation and in which there were no prominent Americans of any real experience and leadership of public opinion. With such a commission his unusual course in going abroad himself as president, greatly emphasized the personal element in the framing of the treaty. His prejudice against republicans intensified the general tendency to oppose anything that he might bring home, because of his apparent wish to monopolize the credit for it."

"I feel that some of the defects of the league of nations are due to him. I am confident that he prevented the adoption of the plan of the league to enforce peace in respect to an international court and the settlement of justiciable questions."

Prejudices Are Shown.

"This was, as I am advised, in the English plan, but was studiously omitted from the very satisfactory American plan. His prejudice against republicans is well known. Article 10, I think, is due to him primarily because it is merely the embodiment of the last 14 points. While it came from his suggestion, however, it suited the demands of the French, so far as it went, and I believe it to be the best of the league intended to unite the forces of the world in police duty to suppress wars of conquest."

"The power of amendment contained within the terms of the league, offers full opportunity to remedy the defects of the league with reference to the international court and in other respects. The great point which supporters of the league of nations now should seek is the establishment of a basis upon which, through amendment, the league can be perfected."

"It is absolutely necessary to retain article 10 in order to stabilize the world. The fluid condition of the region of the war threatens the stability of the world, and the league is the only force of the world to restore a normal condition of self-maintenance."

Article 10 Held Vital.

"In my judgment, therefore, it would

be most unfortunate if the cautious influence of article 10 may not be retained in the crucial decade through which the world is to pass."

"The attitude of hostility toward the president has aroused criticism and opposition which might have been avoided had he taken with him such a man as Mr. Root and two representatives of the foreign relations committee in the senate. The criticism thus aroused have attracted the conscience of a number of republican senators and have endangered the ratification of the league by two-thirds of the senate."

"Mr. Wilson's influence with his democratic supporters in the senate will secure perhaps 45 votes. Nineteen republican votes are needed, and the question is how they can be secured. I don't think they can be secured except by relieving their consciences through reassuring interpretations of the league of such a character that they are likely to be accepted without further negotiation and conference and delay by the other nations who dictated the peace."

Working Plan Outlined.
"After consideration of the arguments made on the subject, I have formulated these interpretations and reservations, and the hope that they will suggest a basis of agreement between the democrats and sufficient republicans to ratify the treaty and secure us the inestimable benefit of a league of nations, which will be the foundation for growth and development into a new era in our international relations."

"The attempt of such men as Senator Borah, Senator Johnson, Senator Sherman and others to defeat the treaty, and the deliberate exaggeration of the Shantung feature of the treaty, do not, I think, indicate the attitude of the majority of the republican party in the senate, and I do not think that any attention should be paid to the suggestion that the treaty be amended in its provisions with reference to the arrangement of the map of the region of the war."

"To repeat, I am strongly in favor of ratifying the treaty as it stands. Were I in the senate, I would not hesitate to vote for it, but the situation requires concession to secure ratification, and I suggest what I have already sent to you, a copy of which I enclose, as something that will secure a useful league of nations, which may be improved and which at the same time may satisfy the genuine objections of the republican friends of the league in the senate."

Withdrawal Is Simplified.
"Coming now to specific interpretations, it seems to me that the first achieves all that the draftsmen of the withdrawal clause intended and as such it is a necessary relief from a possible construction by which the actual withdrawal on two years' notice would be excluded by the language of the clause of the other members of the league."

"The second interpretation has to do with the reservation in the league, as members, of self-governing dominions or colonies of a home government also a member. Certainly in the body like that of the council it would be unfair to have a home government represented and also one of its dominions or colonies, and I cannot think it was the intention of the framers of the covenant that this might happen."

"Yet, I am bound to say that such a reservation is excluded by the present language of the covenant in article 10 and article 4; nor does the language of article 15 necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one of its dominions or colonies are a party, nor does it necessarily exclude a dominion or colony from such tribunal where the home government may be a party; yet, I have from the tribunal, to recommend a settlement of a dispute, a home government where one