

Chamberlain Agrees To 'Test' Peace Plan; Says Hitler Must Go

Lloyd George Suggests U. S. Attend Parley; Labor And Liberal Leaders Disavow Disgrunted Factions.

LONDON, Oct. 3 (U. P.)—Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain warned Germany today that the threat of Nazi-Soviet military co-operation would not halt the Allied war on Hitlerism, but he offered to "test" any peace proposals in the light of Great Britain's determination to end the rule of force in Europe.

Coldly blocking a possible attempt by Adolf Hitler to make peace on the basis of the conquest of Poland, the Prime Minister told the House of Commons that the Nazi Fuehrer could neither "evade nor excuse" responsibility for the war and that no "mere assurances" could be accepted from Government which has repeatedly broken pledges.

David Lloyd George, the World War Premier who has repeatedly demanded strong action against Germany, surprised the House and clashed with Mr. Chamberlain when he urged cautious consideration of the proposals Adolf Hitler is expected to make in a speech later this week and said the Government should consider whether the United States should be "brought in" to any peace conference.

Suggests U. S. "Help"

The German proposals, Mr. Lloyd George predicted, will be far-reaching plans for permanent readjustments, and "the United States could help us."

Mr. Chamberlain agreed to take a cautious attitude but said that Great Britain should wait and see what the proposals are.

"No threat would even induce this country or France to abandon the purpose for which we entered this struggle," he said. "If proposals are made we shall certainly examine them and we shall test them in the light of what we have just said. . . . It is quite possible the offer might prove to be one which no self-respecting Government could consider at all."

Tempers Flare

Alfred Duff Cooper, former First Lord of the Admiralty, criticized Mr. Lloyd George's speech as subject to misinterpretation as a "suggestion of surrender," but the former Prime Minister vigorously contradicted such suggestion.

Shouts of "No! No!" greeted Laborite George Buchanan when he congratulated Mr. Lloyd George for his courage, adding bitterly that the masses in Britain oppose war. "I never saw in 1914 anything like the hostility to war I find to-day," he said.

The responsibility for the war rests on those who conceived and carried out a policy of successive aggressions. . . . That menaced the very security of all Europe," Mr. Chamberlain said in an attack on Adolf Hitler.

Emphasizing previous statements that the Allies would never again trust Herr Hitler but that they would deal with the German people on a just basis, the Prime Minister said that Britain could not accept mere "assurances" from Germany. "For the Government to offer assurances has proved in the past that their undertakings are worthless when it suits them that they (the undertakings) should be broken," he pointed out, in indicating that elimination of Herr Hitler from the German Government was a necessary prelude to peace.

Poland Called Only Incident

Regarding Herr Hitler's contention that there is no reason for war now that Poland has been conquered and partitioned, Mr. Chamberlain said that Poland was not the fundamental cause of the war.

Mr. Chamberlain, observers believed, made clear that Herr Hitler's peace offensive would fail. That Britain's intention of making peace with any Nazi Government.

He refrained carefully from unfriendly references to Russia although he warned Germany that the Berlin-Moscow agreement would not work to Germany's advantage in the long run. Mr. Chamberlain also emphasized that the threat of Russia's entry into war on Germany's side would not deflect Britain and him—with a receipt.

IN INDIANAPOLIS

Here Is the Traffic Record

DEATHS TO DATE

County City
1938 65 51
1939 70 53
—October 2—

Injured 7 Accidents 14
Dead 0 Arrests 31

MONDAY TRAFFIC COURT

Violations Cases Convic- Fines

Speeding 4 4 \$41

reckless driving 6 4 21

Failing to stop at through street 10 10 21

Disobeying traffic signal 2 2 5

Drunken driving 1 1 35

All others 36 27 56

Totals 59 48 \$186

MEETINGS TODAY

Amalgamated Association, meeting Hotel Washington 8 p. m.

Men's Apparel Club of Indiana, convention, Clapp Hotel all day.

Director of State Employment Commission, National conference, Indianapolis Athletic Club all day.

East Club, election night dinner, Clapp Hotel, 12th floor.

Indiana Institute of Photography, luncheon, Clapp Hotel.

Indiana Defense Men's Club, luncheon, Hotel Warren, noon.

Gym Club, luncheon, Spink-Arms Hotel, noon.

Mercato Club, luncheon, Hotel Lincoln, noon.

Universal Club, luncheon, Columbia Club, noon.

Alumni of Columbus, luncheon, Board of Trade, noon.

Indiana Club, luncheon, Canary Cottage, noon.

YMCA Club, luncheon, Y. M. C. A. noon.

Fine Paper Credit Group, luncheon, Men's Club, the William H. Block Company, noon.

MEETINGS TOMORROW

National Association of Mill Control Board, convention, Clapp Hotel, noon.

Proprietors of State Employment Com- mission, luncheon, Canary Cottage, noon.

Directors of State Employment Com- mission, national conference, Indianapolis Athletic Club, all day.

Locals Club, luncheon, Columbia Club, noon.

Lions Club, luncheon, Hotel Washington, noon.

U. S. TO PATROL SECURITY ZONE FAR OFF COAST

Bears Major Burden After Americas Vote Extension Of Neutral Waters.

(Continued from Page One)

by which name it will henceforth be known as an instrument of the neutral rights of any American country will become the concern of all and will be considered collectively by consultation.

Upon the United States Navy will fall a major part of the burden of patrolling the new security zone, although it is left to the individual nations to make their own arrangements where they can or where they desire to do their own patrolling or to act through co-operation with neighbors.

The United States' preparations to assume the patrol task are indicated by the new naval order making secret all orders concerning movement of American naval ships.

Security Band Created

The Panama declaration creating the security band about the Americas and also the general neutrality regulations, designed to prevent belligerent expeditions from American harbors, enlistments in belligerent armies, etc., were adopted unanimously by the foreign ministers in the final session of the conference last night. The conference concludes with a public plenary session today. U. S. Undersecretary of State Sumner Welles and other members of the American delegation will sail for home tonight.

Mr. Welles' proposal to prohibit submarines from entering American harbors was modified to permit each nation to raise such a ban, or not, as it chooses. This is the only important particular in which the original American program was altered.

Altogether the conference results may be considered a diplomatic triumph for the head of the American delegation, who is referred to here by the crowd which gathers outside the conference and watches the ingress and egress of the tall, serious Undersecretary, as Summer-welles—all one word, one breath.

A pointed example of what the neutrality band may involve was illustrated in a German raider sinking the American ship Clement, 70 miles off the Brazil coast, within the forbidden zone—word of which, incidentally, was taken into the final secret deliberations.

Chile Yields

The Panama declaration was finally approved when Chile yielded in her opposition. She originally favored a 50-mile zone. However, the U. S.-Chilean rapprochement was sealed when Mr. Welles and Chilean Foreign Minister Arturo Barrios announced together negotiations for a reciprocal tariff agreement between the two countries.

The final secret plenary session proceeded under the soft glow of candles twinkling in the National University conference room, due to troubles with the fuses, symbolizing the twilight period in international law in which the Panama declaration represents.

While it is designed as an attempt to outlaw the European war from American shores, some see the possibility of inciting disputes emanating from the watery Maginot Line that might involve the United States in serious disputes with belligerent powers. It is designed also to protect inter-American trade, which the conference is seeking to promote by numerous other measures.

A valuable advantage is seen for the English and French in protection for their vessels against submarines in the large Atlantic and Pacific area about the Americas, while they also are given nominal protection for their possessions in the West Indies and the Caribbean which lie within the security zone boundaries. The safety zone constitutes also a bulwark about the U. S. Caribbean zone of influence as well as the Panama Canal gateway.

U. S. Officials Say Pact Need Not Be Ratified

WASHINGTON, Oct. 3 (U. P.)—The Panama agreement for maintaining neutrality of the Western Hemisphere can be put into effect at once, without ratification by legislative bodies, officials said today.

W. E. B. SCRIBNER, 411 E. 34th St., New York, said the pact, signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Arturo Barrios, is a "statement of principles."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."

He said the pact is "a statement of principles, not a formal agreement."