Also, a bill (H. R. 1986) granting an increase of pension to George J. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1987) granting an increase of pension to Richard Starr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1988) granting an increase of pension to William Harper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1989) granting an increase of pension to Warren Burch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1990) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1991) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Ayers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1992) granting an increase of pension to Edwin A. Jefferies; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1993) for the relief of James A. Showen; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1994) for the relief of Bessie Meek, wife of Gordon H. Meek, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1995) to correct the military record of Stephen A. West; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1996) to correct the military record of J. H. McGrew; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1997) to correct the military record of Charles R. Pennybacker; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON: Petition of citizens of Michigan, on war and military affairs; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of 18 citizens of Petersburg, Mich., against war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of churches of Ypsilanti, Mich., favoring amendment against polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAGO: Memorial of the Society of Colonial Wars in the State of Pennsylvania, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILLON: Petitions of citizens of Minnehaha, Pukwana, and officers of the Logan Reformed Sunday School, of Dell Rapids, S. Dak., against the United States in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: Petition of Waynesville (Ohio) Sunday School, against declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Springfield (Ohio) Rotary Club, indorsing President's stand on war situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Christian Herald, New York, to distribute costs of war on basis of incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Waynesville (Ohio) Sunday School, against declaration of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Memorial of mass meeting of citizens of Englewood; Princeton Alumni Association, of Montclair; and citizens of Lawrenceville, all in the State of New Jersey, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Rhode Island, favoring declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Rhode Island, to urge standing by the President in present crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: Petition signed by Charles F. Coe and 400 other citizens of the city of Findlay, Ohio, in which they declare absolute and unconditional loyalty to the Government of the United States and pledge their support to the President in protecting American rights against unlawful violence upon land and sea, in guarding the Nation against hostile attacks, and in upholding international right; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of 1,000 residents of Miami County, Kans., expressing the belief that it is for the best interests of the United States in general to stay out of war as long as possible, as by doing so we have peace and safety in our own land; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of mass meeting at Fort Scott, Kans., asking prohibition of liquor traffic in United States during war, and that there be a call for volunteers of men, money, and property to carry on the war, to be returned after the war, and asking that no person be allowed to make any profit out of war or preparations therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MAHER: Memorial of Y. M. H. A. of Williamsburg, Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to upholding the President; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of National Guard Association meeting, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIORDAN: Petition of citizens of Staten Island, N. Y., favoring peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: Resolution of the Patrons of Husbandry, Chazy Grange, No. 981, Chazy, N. Y., through M. D. Anderson, secretary, indorsing the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Earl Laidlaw, master; A. J. McCoy, secretary; and F. J. Bolton, chairman legislative committee of Gouverneur Grange, No. 303, Gouverneur, N. Y., indorsing the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SNOOK: Memorial of public meetings held at Wauseon and Swanton, Ohio, favoring amendment abolishing polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Memorial of board of education, faculty, and students of the high school, Clinton, N. Y., pledging loyalty to the country and the President in present situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Petitions of governor of Rhode Island and 46 other prominent citizens of Rhode Island, and mayor of Providence, R. I., for the upholding of American honor and for the vindication of American rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of Society of Colonial Wars, in State of Pennsylvania, supporting the President in the present crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring passage of the rivers and harbors appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petitions of William Berndt and 31 others, of Anamoose; August Morlock and 30 others, of Lake William; Fred Schmidt and 22 others, of Voltaire; William Schaller and 28 others, of Ellendale; W. H. Rupp and 34 others, of Baldwin, all in the State of North Dakota, protesting against war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *April 5, 1917.*

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we know not how or why, but we are here, and we believe through the promptings of infinite love. Thou hast imbued us with marvelous faculties of mind and soul, and bade us go forward day by day to new achievements and larger life. Help us, we beseech Thee, to think wisely and act conscientiously, and to leave the rest to a wise Providence which has never yet failed us. And everlasting praise we will give to Thee through Him who taught us how to live and how to die for liberty, justice, truth, and righteousness. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baker, the Secretary of the Senate, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial German Government and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same.

Whereas the Imperial German Government has committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial German Government; and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein certain resolutions passed by American citizens of German ancestry in Lincoln, Nebr., pledging their loyalty and offering their services to the Government of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner stated. Is their objection?

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of Rhode Island relative to obligatory military training.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Rhode Island asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner stated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WAR WITH GERMANY.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House joint resolution 24, declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial German Government and the Government and people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same. Pending that, I first ask unanimous consent that the resolution passed last night by the Senate, which is identical with the House resolution, be substituted for the House resolution.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose the gentleman desires to ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order now to proceed to the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1, in lieu of considering the House resolution?

Mr. FLOOD. Exactly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that Senate joint resolution No. 1, passed last night by the Senate, be substituted for the House joint resolution.

Mr. FLOOD. And be considered in lieu thereof.

Mr. MANN. That it be in order to consider it.

The SPEAKER. That it be in order to consider it in lieu of the House joint resolution. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering Senate joint resolution No. 1. Pending that I desire to see if we can not make some arrangement respecting debate, as to what time it shall close, and when a vote shall be taken.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I thought the gentleman on yesterday said that debate would run along.

Mr. FLOOD. I said I thought it would run along until 4 or 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman mean the general debate?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then how long will there be for opportunity for debate under the five-minute rule?

Mr. FLOOD. I mean that, altogether. I mean that we want to vote about 5 o'clock this afternoon. I thought general debate could run along for some time less than that, and that then there would be time given under the five-minute rule.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. How would a suggestion of this kind meet with the approval of gentlemen—one hour on a side for general debate, and then the five-minute rule? Under that arrangement the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] would have an hour, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] an hour, to be consumed by members of the committee, and under the five-minute rule men who are not members of the committee would have an opportunity to express their views.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, that would not be satisfactory at all, because the number who desire to speak in favor of the resolution greatly outnumber those who are opposed to it, and I certainly would not consent to any such arrangement——

Mr. BORLAND. That would not cause any confusion.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I would not consent to any arrangement by which a few people would have the right to occupy so much more of the time on this matter than the many.

Mr. BORLAND. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole would have the right to recognize gentlemen in order.

Mr. MANN. But he would have to recognize those for and against the proposition.

Mr. BORLAND. It would give Members of the House who are not members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and who do not ask for time on either side an opportunity for recognition.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I hope some arrangement can be made by which the general membership of the House may speak.

Mr. BORLAND. That is what we are endeavoring to do.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we might proceed with general debate without fixing any time at the present, and then after a while, unless the time is divided so as to satisfy the House, the gentleman from Virginia could move to rise and close general debate and then proceed under the five-minute rule as long as the House is willing to consent to it.

Mr. FLOOD. That was my expectation, if we failed to get an agreement as to the length of debate.

Mr. MANN. I think that is the way we ought to proceed.

Mr. BORLAND. It does seem to me that we ought to have a limit upon general debate before we go into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANN. I do not see why.

Mr. BORLAND. And then the five-minute rule can run until the House is ready to vote.

Mr. MANN. Here is the situation: If we go into the Committee of the Whole on general debate and remain therein, the gentleman in favor of the resolution is entitled to an hour's time—and I do not think you can make a division—and some gentleman who is opposed to the resolution is entitled to an hour's time. After that a gentleman in favor of the resolution would be entitled to an hour's time, and then some gentleman opposed to it entitled to an hour's time.

Mr. BORLAND. That is what we do not want.

Mr. MANN. Whereas if we get into the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule early the Members of the House will have a chance to take five minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. That is exactly the proposition I am making, that general debate be limited to two hours and then directly go into the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule to give Members of the House an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MANN. You can not limit general debate to two hours, but at the end of two hours, if the gentleman chooses, unless time has been appropriated among Members to their satisfaction, he can close general debate by a motion.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is it to be understood when a gentleman is recognized in general debate that he thereby has one hour and thereafter he can occupy, say, 10 minutes and then yield of his own time to such Members as he cares to yield to from that hour?

Mr. FLOOD. That is a parliamentary inquiry which the Speaker had better answer.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make that parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman desires to do what?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. To ask if a Member is recognized in general debate he thereby secures the floor for one hour——

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is he thereby entitled to occupy, say, 10 minutes and then yield the remainder of his hour to such Members as he desires?

The SPEAKER. That is not the usual practice, although it has been done at different times.

Mr. MANN. If a gentleman gets an hour, he can yield of it as he pleases.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is stating what the practice had been and what exceptions to it were. Until a short time ago a man either had to use his time or quit, but here in the last Congress the House drifted into this thing of a man yielding his time. I believe that would be the rule to-day, although the present occupant of the chair will not be in the chair.

Mr. MANN. That has been the rule ever since I have been here.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I beg the gentleman's pardon, I know it has been tried on several occasions and a Member had either to occupy his time or quit.

Mr. MANN. A Member who has an hour always has the right to yield.

The SPEAKER. The Chair should assume that that was the time where if a man got an hour he could do as he pleased about it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I rise to speak to the subject before the House, if I may be indulged.

The SPEAKER. There is no trouble about that, but the subject is not before the House. The gentleman from Virginia was trying to negotiate a modus vivendi by which this debate could be carried on. There is no definite proposition before the House.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. No; but, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker on yesterday suggested that the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs should be consulted or recognized after the gentleman from Virginia. It has always been customary hitherto to make an arrangement in the House to govern debate when we were in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on any proposition.

The SPEAKER. That is what they are trying to do now.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Without consulting, however, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. I appealed to him when I first rose to know in regard to the time.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And I only asked one question when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] kindly took the floor [laughter], and then the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], who is not even a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to ask another question.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. That is exactly what we are trying to get at.

Mr. GARNER. Let us have it, if we can, and see if the gentleman from Wisconsin can get the floor on the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin has already got it. Can the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Wisconsin come to an agreement?

Mr. FLOOD. I am waiting to see.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on this resolution.

Mr. GARNER. That is what I am calling for.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] permit me to say that there are several Members who are opposed to the resolution who do not desire to speak an hour, but they do desire to speak more than 5 minutes, possibly 10 minutes; several have told me they wish to speak 10 minutes, some even 20 minutes. There are many upon the other side who wish a similar opportunity. It has always been customary to leave the control of the time to the ranking majority member of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Can I ask the gentleman a question? Will the gentleman yield to members of the minority who desire to speak in favor of the resolution?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I expected that inquiry would be made. This is not really a party question. This is a question of sending this Nation into war, and the gentleman from Virginia was not elected on that issue nor was I. Then why attempt to invoke the rule of party regularity upon this? Let the gentleman from Virginia control the time of all those, irrespective of party, who are in favor of the resolution, and let the ranking minority members, as is customary, control the time of those who are opposed to the resolution.

Mr. FLOOD. That is what I wanted to find out from the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Under the circumstances I ought not to control the time of any who favor the resolution.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can the gentleman from Wisconsin indicate about how many desire to talk against the resolution?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Can the gentleman from Minnesota indicate about how many want to speak in favor of it?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. As far as I know, all the Members in the House.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman is mistaken about that.

Mr. FLOOD. As I understand, the gentleman desires to yield time to the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle who are against the resolution. This is not a partisan question, and I do not think it is fair for one gentleman to have control of half of the time in this debate when those who vote with him do not represent one twenty-fifth of the membership of the House.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not propose to control half of the time. I simply ask that the few gentlemen who have requested time in opposition to the resolution shall be granted the privilege of speaking.

Mr. FLOOD. How much time will that take?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not know. Some of them want 10 or 20 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. I suggest that the motion be put, and we will try to arrange that later.

The SPEAKER. The question is on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on this resolution.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Does that mean that anybody who gets the floor has one hour?

The SPEAKER. It undoubtedly does; that is, if he wants an hour.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. But he can not yield any of that time.

The SPEAKER. Yes; he can. That has been the practice here for two or three years.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think the best way is to proceed in the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is to vote on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1, declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial German Government and the Government and the people of the United States, and making provision to prosecute the same, with Mr. FITZGERALD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial German Government and the Government and the people of the United States, and making provision to prosecute the same.

Whereas the Imperial German Government has committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial German Government; and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. If the committee will indulge the Chair for a moment, he wishes to call attention to the fact that under the rules no Member is permitted to speak without first addressing the Chair, nor is he permitted to interrupt a Member without so addressing the Chair, or to make interruptions from his seat. Members occupying the floor can not be interrupted by gentlemen submitting parliamentary inquiries. It is a breach of order for any manifestation of approval or disapproval to be given by the galleries. The Chair hopes that the committee will observe these rules so as to make the conduct of this debate at least as easy as possible for the occupant of the chair.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for one hour. [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in presenting this resolution declaring that a state of war exists between this country and its people on the one hand and the German Empire on the other, I realize the deep solemnity of the occasion. And I believe, Mr. Chairman, that every Member upon this floor realizes the seriousness of the step which we are about to take. The American Congress is composed, as far as I know and believe, without exception, of American patriots, who will vote according to their judgment in the best interests of their country, who will cast their vote to-day upon this momentous resolution for what they believe to be for the best interests of America. [Applause.] I am happy to believe, Mr. Chairman, that most of the Members of this body will vote for this resolution, will vote to comply with the request made by the President of the United States, will vote to meet the demands of the American people, will vote, with the Senate of the United States, to declare that the illegal acts of the German Government have brought about a state of war with our country. [Applause.]

I have thought this, Mr. Chairman, for the past three weeks. I have believed during that time there could be no question as to how the American Congress should vote. [Applause.] I have not seen how an American citizen or an American Congressman could cast his vote in any other way; and in saying this I do not mean to challenge anything except the judgment of those Congressmen who take a different view, because I know that there are some Members whose patriotism and whose integrity stand as high as any man in this House or in this country, who will vote against this resolution. But it has seemed to me that during the past three weeks there has been manifested to everyone who has watched the current of events a determined and deliberate intention on the part of the German Government to insult our flag, to destroy American property, and to murder American citizens, and a nation that will not fight for its honor and for such wrongs to its people is not worthy of the love of those people or the respect of the world and will not long retain either. [Applause.] With that situation, it seemed to me there was but one course for an American and a Congressman to pursue, and that was to accept the gage of battle thrown at our feet by the arrogant autocracy of Germany. [Prolonged applause.]

For two years and a half the world has been afire. For two years and a half our civilization has been shaken by a convulsion unequaled in its history heretofore. But during that time the great Chief Executive of this country, by the exercise of a marvelous patience, by the exercise of great wisdom and patriotism, has kept this country out of Europe's fearful conflict. But despite all of his efforts in the interests of peace, despite the wishes and the prayers of the American people in the interests of peace, despite our many courtesies to and our unfailing consideration of the German Government, this powerful belligerent, this most unscrupulous of all the European belligerents, has so acted as to make it necessary for us to enter the war, and when we do enter it we will teach that belligerent that it is a dangerous thing to arouse the long-suffering and patient democracy of this great Republic. [Applause.]

The improper acts of German officials in the United States who have filled our unsuspecting communities with spies and set criminal intrigues on foot against our peace, industry, and commerce, the indignities inflicted upon American officials, the inhuman treatment accorded the *Yarrowdale* prisoners by the German authorities, the interference with the communications of our embassy at Berlin, the intrigues to involve the United States in war with Mexico and Japan constitute sufficient offenses against our dignity and honor as a nation as to have justified a severance of diplomatic relations, if not a declaration of war. But we felt, and the President felt, that many of the illegal and unjustifiable acts of the Imperial Government might be settled by negotiation, and the President has attempted peaceful settlement with a patience rarely equaled in human history.

The German Government, however, has not stopped with the commission of these offenses. It is actually to-day waging war upon our people and our commerce, and that in the face of its repeated declarations and promises that it would abstain from such a course in violation of its treaty obligations with us and of humane rules of war which have obtained for centuries among civilized nations. It has treated all its promises as mere "scraps of paper." It is making war upon us in violation of right, but especially in violation of its definite promises given us at least eight times in the last two years that it would abstain from the character of submarine warfare which it is now conducting.

There is nothing left for America to-day to do but to accept the war that that Government has thrust upon us. [Applause.] When the world war broke out no principle of international law was more securely established than that war should be so conducted that injury and death should be spared to noncombatants so far as was humanly possible.

The principle was as old as civilization. In the application of this principle Grotius holds that "in the calamities of war children are exempted and spared on the score of their age and women from respect to their sex."

This was the principle which applied to the noncombatants of the belligerent nations. The reasons for applying this reasonable and humane rule to neutrals who had no part in war was very much stronger.

Such was the undoubted law of civilization at the outbreak of this war.

The clearest recognition of this principle is evidenced by the fact that for six months after the war began it was recognized by all the warring nations, and the idea that any right existed to slaughter indiscriminately noncombatants, including women and children, whether citizens of belligerent nations, in order to destroy an enemy's commerce was not asserted until the war had raged in all of its fury for a half a year.

When this proposition was advanced our Government took immediate issue with it.

Germany gave notice on the 4th day of February, 1915, of her purpose to sink merchant vessels on the high seas without safeguarding the lives of noncombatants and the crews and passengers. Our Government on February 10 sent, through our Secretary of State, the Hon. William Jennings Bryan, a note of protest to the German Government, taking positive and splendid issue with it upon its proposed ruthless submarine warfare; and I will say, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Bryan never produced a finer document than the note to Germany on that occasion. It protested against the German proposed disregard of the precepts of international law and the instincts of humanity. This splendid document seemed to be effective, for on the 16th day of February the Imperial German Government replied to it in a friendly and satisfactory manner, conceding the propriety, the legality, and the right of the position taken by our Government. [Applause.]

That Government declared on the 16th of February that—

> It is very far indeed from the intention of the German Government * * * ever to destroy neutral lives and neutral property.

That was promise No. 1, made by the German Government to this Government, to respect the lives of neutrals and neutral properties. Their reply goes on to say:

> The commanders of the German submarines have been instructed, as was already stated in the note of the 4th instant, to abstain from violence to American ships when they are recognizable as such.

A distinct promise on the part of the German Government to respect the rights of American ships when they are recognized as such. And yet within the past three weeks, Mr. Chairman, they have sent to the bottom of the ocean seven American merchant ships which they recognized as such, and which they torpedoed and sunk without warning and without notice and without the slightest opportunity for the passengers and crew to have their lives saved.

That is war. That is the war that the German Government is making upon this country to-day.

Our Government had every right to believe that this promise of February 16, 1915, could be relied upon, and our Government did rely upon that promise. Nevertheless the German Government proceeded to carry out its plans of submarine warfare as if that promise had never been made, and it torpedoed on March 27, just a little over a month after that promise was made, the British passenger ship *Falaba*, with Americans on board, on which occasion one American lost his life. On April 28, less than two months and a half after this first promise was made, the American steamer *Cushing* was attacked by airships, and on May 1 the American tank steamer *Gulflight* was attacked by submarines; and on May 7, less than three months after the promise was made, the British passenger liner *Lusitania* was sunk, when 114 American lives were lost; and later on in that month, the American steamer *Nebraskan* was attacked by submarines and sunk; in all of which ships there were 125 citizens of the United States murdered and hundreds of noncombatants, including men, women, and children of other nations, lost their lives, and a number of American citizens had their lives put in jeopardy. Later on, on June 28, the British mule boat *Armenian* was torpedoed, and 20 Americans lost their lives.

The American Government vigorously protested against these outrages, expressing its condemnation of Germany's violation of the laws of nations, the instincts of humanity, and her agreements with this country in murdering innocent American citizens and noncombatants of other nations. The German Government replied to these protests, making one excuse after another, and impressing our Government with its intention in the future to observe the rules of the sea, the laws of nations, and the principles of humanity.

On July 8, 1915, in a note to Ambassador Gerard, arguing in defense of its method of warfare, and particularly of the submarine commander in the *Lusitania* case, the German Government stated—and here is promise No. 2; listen to what the German Government said to the United States on that occasion:

> The Imperial Government therefore repeats the assurances that American ships will not be hindered in the prosecution of legitimate shipping and the lives of American citizens on neutral vessels shall not be placed in jeopardy.
>
> In order to exclude any unforeseen dangers to American passenger steamers * * * the German submarines will be instructed to permit the free and safe passage of such passenger steamers when made recognizable by special markings and notified a reasonable time in advance.

This promise was unequivocal—there was no string to it—but notwithstanding that fact seven American ships have been sunk in violation of it in the last few weeks.

This was a promise to safeguard American ships and American passengers upon neutral ships. But notwithstanding this, subsequent to the 8th of July, 1915, a number of vessels—namely, the *Orduna* and *Leo*, July 9; *Leelanaw*, July 25; *Arabic* and *Nicosum*, August 19; and the *Hesperian*, September 4—carrying American citizens were attacked and sunk by submarines and 25 American lives were lost in such ships.

Following these events, conspicuous by their wantonness and violation of every rule of humanity and maritime warfare, the German ambassador, by instructions from his Government, on December 1, 1915, gave the following assurances to the Government of the United States. This is promise No. 3. Here is what the German Government promised upon this occasion:

> Liners will not be sunk by our submarines without warning and without safety of the lives of noncombatants, provided that the liners do not try to escape or offer resistance.

That promise seems clear and very distinct.

On September 9, in a reply to the submarine attack on the *Orduna*, the German Government gave assurance No. 4, in the following language:

The first attack on the *Orduna* of a torpedo was not in accordance with the existing instructions, which provide that large passenger steamers are to be torpedoed only after previous warning and after the rescuing of passengers and crew.

The German Government, Mr. Chairman, could not more clearly have stated that liners or large passenger steamers would not be torpedoed except upon previous warning and after the passengers and crew had been put in places of safety.

On November 29 the German Government stated in connection with the case of the American vessel *William P. Frye*—and this is pledge No. 5, given by the German Government to our Government not to conduct a ruthless submarine warfare. It said:

The German naval forces will sink only such American vessels as are loaded with absolute contraband when the three conditions provided by the Declaration of London are present. In this the German Government quite shares the view of the American Government that all possible care must be taken for the security of the crews and passengers of the vessels to be sunk. Consequently the persons found on board of a vessel may not be ordered into a lifeboat except when the general conditions—that is to say, the weather, the condition of the sea, and the neighborhood of the coast—afford absolute certainty that the boats will reach the nearest port.

Mr. Chairman, there could hardly be a more positive and definite agreement made by the German Government with this Government not to sink passenger liners until they had been warned, and not only until the passengers and crew had been afforded an opportunity to escape with their lives, but the commanders of the German submarines were to take into consideration the conditions surrounding the liner—the condition of the weather, the condition of the sea, and its proximity to a port—and they should not be ordered into boats unless those conditions gave absolute certainty that they could reach land in safety.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. Certainly.

Mr. SISSON. I did not catch the date. When was the date of that agreement that the gentleman last referred to?

Mr. FLOOD. The date of that was November 29, 1915.

Following this accumulated series of assurances though, which were brought about by the strong protest of our Government against the violation of their previous promises and their illegal submarine warfare, there does not seem to have been the slightest abatement in the rigor of submarine warfare, for attacks were made in the Mediterranean upon an American steamer on December 3, upon another American steamer on December 5, a Japanese steamer on December 21 of that year, and the passenger liner *Persia* on December 30. In the sinking of the *Persia* out of a total of 500 human beings on board only 165 were saved. Among those lost was an American consul traveling to his post. On January 7, eight days after the sinking of the *Persia*, after a protest had been sent by us to the German Government, that Government again notified our Government through its ambassador in Washington that it would no longer pursue this character of submarine warfare, saying:

First, German submarines in the Mediterranean had from the beginning orders to conduct cruiser warfare against enemy merchant vessels only in accordance with the general principle of international law, and in particular the measures of reprisal as applied to the war zone around the British Isles were to be excluded.

But yet we have never heard of the punishment of the submarine commanders and crews who destroyed these vessels and murdered these people in the Mediterranean in violation of that instruction of their Government.

Second. German submarines are, therefore, permitted to destroy enemy merchant vessels in the Mediteranean—that is, passenger as well as freight ships—as far as they do not try to escape or offer resistance, only after passengers and crews have been accorded safety.

That is all that our Government demanded of them. That is all that the United States required of the German Government in the conduct of its submarine warfare. We demanded that they should not murder unoffending noncombatants—men, women, and children—upon the high seas, but that when they determined to sink a merchant vessel they could do so only after they had given warning to that vessel, and provided for the safety of the people on board. And here is the sixth distinct, positive, clear, and unequivocal promise that the German Government made to the Government of the United States to observe these rules of submarine warfare. Clearly, Mr. Chairman, the assurances of that Government that neutral and enemy merchant vessels, passenger as well as freight ships, should not be destroyed except upon the passengers and crews being accorded safety were by these promises declared to be the official position of the Imperial German Government. [Applause.]

On February 16, 1916, the German ambassador communicated to the Department of State an expression of regret for the loss of American lives on the *Lusitania* and proposed to pay a suitable indemnity. In the course of this note the seventh promise is made to this Government to conduct a decent submarine warfare. It said:

Germany has * * * limited her submarine warfare because of her long-standing friendship with the United States and because by the sinking of the *Lusitania*, which caused the death of citizens of the United States, the German retaliation affected neutrals, which was not the intention, as retaliation should be confined to enemy subjects.

But notwithstanding this assurance, on March 1, 1916, the unarmed French passenger steamer *Patria*, carrying a number of American citizens was attacked without warning. On March 9 the Norwegian bark *Silius* was torpedoed by an unseen submarine and one of the seven Americans on board was injured. On March 16 the Dutch passenger steamer *Tubantia* was sunk in the North Sea by a torpedo. On March 16 the British steamer *Berwindale* was torpedoed without warning with four Americans on board. On March 24 the British unarmed steamer *Englishman* was, after a chase, torpedoed and sunk by the submarine *U–19*, as a result of which one American on board perished. On March 24 the unarmed French cross-channel steamer *Sussex* was torpedoed without warning and several of the 24 American passengers were injured. On March 27 the unarmed British liner *Manchester Engineer* was sunk by an explosion without prior warning with Americans on board, and on March 28 the British steamer *Eagle Point* was chased, overtaken, and sunk by a torpedo after the persons on board had taken to the boats.

These lawless acts upon merchant vessels and the lives of American citizens and the repeated violation of promises made by the German Government to our Government, and also the violations of the treaty obligations brought us to the point where it seems there was nothing for our Government to do but to break off diplomatic relations with the German Government and take whatever steps a breach of diplomatic relations might lead to.

In a communication of April 8, 1916, the American Government said:

If it is still the purpose of the Imperial Government to prosecute relentless and indiscriminate warfare against vessels of commerce by the use of submarines without regard to what the Government of the United States must consider the sacred and indisputable rules of international law and the universally recognized dictates of humanity, the Government of the United States is at last forced to the conclusion that there is but one course it can pursue. Unless the Imperial Government should not immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels the Government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire altogether.

The German Government replied to this communication on May 4, 1916, giving definite assurances that new orders had been issued to the German naval forces "in accordance with the general principles of visit and search and the destruction of merchant vessels recognized by international law," and again assured our Government that under these rules no American citizens' lives would be taken and no merchant vessels would be sunk without warning and without an opportunity for the people, passengers, and crew aboard the ships to escape with their lives.

Under this assurance the country breathed easier. The breach of diplomatic relations was avoided and war seemed to have been averted. I believed, and many other people in this country believed, that President Wilson had accomplished the greatest diplomatic triumph of the century. Germany had given this promise to abandon and not resume ruthless submarine warfare, and we credited her with sincerity. She had promised that in the future this warfare would be conducted according to the principles of visit and search, that passenger vessels would not be sunk, that due warning would be given the vessels, and that submarines might seek to destroy only when resistance was offered or escape attempted.

This method of submarine warfare which Germany promised to conduct was substantially lived up to from the 4th of May, 1916, to the 1st day of February of the present year. But on January 31, 1917, the German Government served this notice upon our Government:

Germany will meet the illegal measures of her enemies by forcibly preventing in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy, and in the eastern Mediterranean, all navigation, that of neutrals included, from and to England and from and to France, etc. All ships met within that zone will be sunk.

That notice was not only opposed to every principle of international law, but to every dictate of humanity, and it was in direct contravention of these eight promises that the German Government had during the preceding two years made to our Government. It is in contravention of the treaty between this country and Prussia entered into in 1828 and to which Germany has appealed recently in some of her controversies with our country.

In view of these facts and of this Government's warning of April 18, 1916, and the pledge of the Imperial German Govern-

ment of May 4 of the same year, it could not have been expected by the German Government that this Government would permit it to fence off the high seas at its pleasure, to deny American ships and American citizens the right to go upon these seas in safety, where every nation, including Germany, conceded they had a perfect right to go, so that Government's notice of January 31 was little short of a declaration of war against this country.

On the 3d of February, 1917, our Government sent the following declaration to the Imperial German Government through its ambassador, Count von Bernstorff:

In view of this declaration, which withdraws suddenly and without prior intimation the solemn assurance given in the Imperial Government's note of May 4, 1916, this Government has no alternative consistent with the dignity and honor of the United States but to take the course which it explicitly announced in its note of April 18, 1916, it would take in the event that the Imperial Government did not declare and effect an abandonment of the methods of submarine warfare then employed and to which the Imperial Government now purpose again to resort.

The President has, therefore, directed me to announce to your excellency that all diplomatic relations between the United States and the German Empire are severed and that the American ambassador at Berlin will be immediately withdrawn, and in accordance with such announcement to deliver to your excellency your passports—

Thus breaking off diplomatic relations, recalled our ambassador in Germany, and gave the German ambassador, Count von Bernstorff, his passports. On February 3, 1917, following the breaking off of diplomatic relations one American ship was sunk, and since that date seven ships flying the American flag and bearing American registry have been torpedoed. One of these vessels was an armed merchant vessel. The loss of life on these ships has been between 25 and 30 American souls. Twenty-five or 30 American citizens traveling on American ships under the American flag, expecting its protection, as they had a right to expect, have been ruthlessly murdered by the German Government. In addition to that, many foreign vessels of both belligerents and neutrals have been sunk since February 1, 1917, and a number of American lives destroyed and many more put in jeopardy.

Mr. Chairman, this is war; it is nothing but war—war waged by the German Government upon the people and the flag of the United States.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman will recall that when the armed-neutrality resolution was under consideration it was stated by a number of opponents that the putting of guns on American merchant ships would invite an attack from Germany. As I have understood the gentleman's splendid review of the facts, these attacks by Germany have been made upon unarmed American ships.

Mr. FLOOD. With one exception.

Mr. BORLAND. Then the statement that the arming of American ships would invite attack by Germany is wholly without foundation.

Mr. FLOOD. I think so. Generally they avoid armed ships.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Prior to the proclamation of the President, authorizing the arming of American merchant ships, had Germany in any instance by her submarine warfare sunk any American merchant ship without warning, since the diplomatic relations were broken off?

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, yes; she sunk one on February 3.

Mr. STAFFORD. Which one was that? In the case of the *Law*, sunk in the Mediterranean, that was sunk with warning. Where is there an instance of a ship having been sunk since the breaking off of diplomatic relations, without warning, prior to the proclamation authorizing the arming of American merchant ships?

Mr. FLOOD. The *Algonquin* is one, and the *Housatonic* was sunk on February 3 and the *Law* on February 13. Diplomatic relations were severed on the 1st.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the *Algonquin* is a case subsequent to the authorization of the arming of American ships.

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. Of course most of them have happened more recently, since the arming of American vessels, but my recollection is that just before and while the resolution or bill providing for the arming of American vessels was pending in Congress there were one or two of those seven sunk.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the gentlemen's recollection is entirely at fault. I would like to have him confirm his recollection by calling up the State Department and citing an instance of an American vessel having been sunk without warning subsequent to the breaking off of diplomatic relations and prior to the authorization by the President of the arming of American ships.

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, yes; while the bill was pending in the Senate on the 3d of March the *Vigilancia* and the *City of Memphis*——

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman is entirely mistaken about that. The *Vigilancia* and the *City of Memphis* and the *Illinois* were sunk two weeks ago last Sunday, long after Congress had adjourned.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman is correct about that. The *Vigilancia* was sunk on March 16, and the *City of Memphis* on the 17th. The ship I had in mind as having been sunk during the debate in the Senate on the armed neutrality bill was a Norwegian ship, the *Sjostad*, on which one American life was lost.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is not accurate in his statements.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. What did the administration expect to accomplish by its armed-neutrality bill?

Mr. FLOOD. I will say to the gentleman that the armed-neutrality bill is a thing of the past.

Mr. BRITTEN. And a failure.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not think it would have been a failure if certain Senators had permitted it to become a law. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. The President said the day before yesterday in this chamber that it was impracticable at best, did he not?

Mr. FLOOD. Impracticable at this time, because the time for neutrality of any kind is past. [Applause.] We are at war now. A foreign government is making war upon this country, and we are not going to depend upon neutrality, armed neutrality or any other neutrality, but we are going to war with the country that is making war upon our Nation and murdering our people. [Applause.] These acts are acts of war. American vessels flying the American flag, carrying American men, women, and children, have been sunk by German submarines without warning, and without the slightest opportunity for saving their lives—in violation of the German treaty, in violation of eight promises made to this Government, in violation of the principles of international law, and in violaton of the instincts of humanity, and for these wrongs America is going to war and proposes to put her resources and her strength in that war in the interest of her honor, in the interest of her people, in the interest of democracy, and in the interest of humanity.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. I do.

Mr. FESS. Has the chairman of the committee any definite information as to how many of our armed vessels passed through the war zone, so as to know whether Germany has any intention of changing her policy because of our policy of armed neutrality?

Mr. FLOOD. I have not got that information, but I do not think that they have changed their policy in the slightest.

Mr. FESS. I do not, either.

Mr. FLOOD. They have notified us time and again they intended to sink merchant vessels. They have said nothing about the arming of them. They have notified us they intended to sink them in a war zone that took in nearly all of the high seas, and they have been sinking them and murdering our citizens on them. In such circumstances, what are we to do? What is the American Congress to do? What is the American Government to do? There is but one thing to do, and that is to go to the defense of our people and the honor of our flag. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield again for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. FESS. If we yield to a certain limit of 400 miles, what assurance have we that we would not be asked to yield a thousand miles or the entire seas?

Mr. FLOOD. None in the world. There is but one issue before the American people to-day; there is but one issue before the American Congress. We must defend our country, defend the rights of our citizens, and defend our flag, or cravenly and cowardly submit to the dictates and domination of the German Kaiser. [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes; I do.

Mr. GORDON. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] as to any evidence in the gentleman's possession as to any intention of the German Government to sink any armed vessels, I desire to ask the gentleman if the last note of the German Government to this Govern-

ment—January 31—did not expressly notify this Government of its intention to sink all neutral vessels of all kinds, whether they were armed or unarmed?

Mr. FLOOD. It did. I stated that in answer to the question of the gentleman from Ohio. I read the note. They have never qualified it. They have never indicated their intention to modify their system of submarine warfare.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Do not the British mines in the North Sea, in violation of international law, sink all neutral vessels, whether armed or unarmed?

Mr. FLOOD. No; they have not destroyed any American lives.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. They sunk three of our ships.

Mr. FLOOD. Not a single one.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Why, they sunk three of our ships—the *Evelyn*, the *Carib*, and another, whose name I have forgotten.

Mr. FLOOD. The *Carib* and the *Evelyn* were sunk by German mines made by the German Government. England in this war, although she has violated our commercial rights and our rights on the seas, has never destroyed an American life. Germany has murdered over 250 of our people. We are going to war with Germany for murdering American citizens who were sailing the high seas under the American flag, and who have the right to expect the American Nation to protect them [applause], for murdering American citizens in violation of the laws of God and man, in violation of Germany's treaties and its promises.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Was not the *Evelyn* sunk in the North Sea close to the German coast, in the German mine area?

Mr. FLOOD. It was. The German Government admits there were German mines there and excuses itself by saying that the *Evelyn* should have had a German pilot on board.

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. I will.

Mr. BRITTEN. Is it not a fact the report of the American consul indicated that the *Evelyn* was sunk by a British mine, and is it not also a fact the *Evelyn* had a cargo of cotton for Germany, and does the gentleman think that Germany would sink her own cargo?

Mr. FLOOD. It is a fact that the evidence in the State Department proves a German mine sunk the *Evelyn*, and the German Government does not deny it. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. FLOOD. I have yielded to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Speaking of the differences of the war-zone orders between Germany and England in closing the sea, is it not a fact that England's order was not forbidding entrance, but rather a caution to vessels going into the North Sea, and also that pilots would be furnished to pilot such vessels through the safety zone?

Mr. FLOOD. That is true.

Mr. FESS. But there was no order to stay out, no order to sink, but simply the suggestion that it was dangerous to go in, but not from submarines——

Mr. FLOOD. And directing them where to go and an offer to pilot them away from the danger zone.

Mr. FESS. Stating that there were mines. Those two then are not alike?

Mr. FLOOD. Not at all. There is no similarity in the two cases. The question, Mr. Chairman, is whether we shall accept the gage of battle which has been thrown down to us by the German Government. We would be cravens if we did not. There is no choice as to our course. We are compelled by the acts of the German Government to enter into this colossal war. [Applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. FLOOD. I have only a few minutes and I can not yield now. Mr. Chairman, the time for argument has passed, the time for heroic action is here, and I believe the American people will rally to the support of their Government in this trying and patriotic hour and meet war's sacrifices and war's perils as a brave people should. We will take our stand by the side of the allied nations who have been fighting humanity's battle for two and one-half years, determined that our power, our resources, our men, if needs be, shall be so employed that complete victory shall crown their efforts and our efforts and that Prussian militarism shall be crushed forever from the face of the earth, and that the world shall be delivered from the threat and danger of the Hohenzollern dynasty. [Applause.]

This war is not of our choosing. We have submitted to outrages which could be borne only because of our conscious rectitude and of our steadfast hope that we might bring peace to stricken humanity. That hope was destroyed by the obstinate outlawry of the German Government. Our cause is just, we are about to engage in a war as sacred and as noble as the war of 1776. We will be fighting for our freedom, our ideals, our liberty, and our institutions as truly as the patriots of Valley Forge and Yorktown fought for theirs. For wrongs committed by the German Government to democracy, to humanity, and to civilization we have ample cause for declaring war; for wrongs done to American citizens and the American flag we have no course but to go to war. [Applause.]

Let us, Mr. Chairman, pass this resolution. Let us sustain the President by the enactment of this resolution and by the enactment of other measures which may be necessary to bring this war to a successful conclusion. Let us take our stand with the Senate, go into this war with all our resources, and then welcome the dawn of a grander and a freer day for all the peoples of the earth. [Applause.]

The American Nation is the fairest flower of civilization. Princes may be jealous of her progress and tyrants may read in her rise their own downfall; but the great heart of the people of every land and clime is hers, she is their beacon light, guiding them to-day to the glories of this grander day. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Sixteen gentlemen have requested me for time. I had supposed until this arrangement was made the morning before the debate opened that, as has been customary always hitherto——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hopes the gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am going to make a parliamentary inquiry now in a moment. I had supposed that the Chairman would control on that side for those favoring the resolution and the ranking member on this side for those who oppose it, and if there were others in the minority membership in favor of the bill that somebody on this side of the Chamber would be appointed to give them time. That would be perfectly fair and the customary practice. But as I have only one hour, and as these gentlemen, evidently thinking that the old method would be followed, have asked for time and I have noticed them going to the Chair for recognition, it seems inevitable that somebody is to be shut out. It is not at all in accordance with the understanding which everybody had here yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin that he can not under the guise of a parliamentary inquiry debate the question. He must proceed or the Chair will recognize for debate any of the other gentlemen.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Can I yield these gentlemen time and then get an hour later?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is entitled as a member of the committee to recognition at this time before any other Member of the House. If the gentleman desires recognition the Chair will recognize him for one hour. Whether he gets recognition later on will depend upon whether other Members who desire to be recognized have been recognized. Does the gentleman wish to be recognized now?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not see that I can do anything else. I have agreed to give those gentlemen that time——

Mr. BRITTEN. A parliamentary inquiry. Is it the intention of the Chair to recognize gentlemen whose names he has on his desk?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair declines to commit himself. He is embarrassed enough as it is without making any public statement about it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I regret to be compelled to say to the gentlemen who spoke to me for time that I find myself unable to yield to their requests without relinquishing all of my own time. I suggest that they go directly to the Chairman.

I regret also that it will be impossible for me to submit the remarks which I had intended, because as the result of a slight accident since the session opened to-day I have been deprived of the only means by which I could see to read my own notes. Were the occasion not one of such extraordinary importance, I should not speak at all.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, in view of the statement just made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] as to the loss of lives of American citizens through submarine warfare, I desire to call attention to a letter dated March 27, 1917, from the Secretary of State:

Hon. C. W. RAMSEYER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. RAMSEYER: I have received your letter of March 15, 1917, in which you request to be informed as to the number of American citizens who lost their lives as the result of the attack and sinking of the *Lusitania*, the *Sussex*, the *Carib*, and the *Evelyn*.

In reply you are informed that no American citizens lost their lives on the *Sussex* and *Evelyn*, but that 137 perished with the *Lusitania* and 1 with the *Carib*.

I am, my dear Mr. RAMSEYER,
Very sincerely, yours, ROBERT LANSING.

It thus appears that one life was lost on the *Carib* and none on the *Sussex*.

In view of the information in this letter of the Secretary of State it is to be regretted that the President, on February 3—two months ago—in his address to the Congress said:

Let me remind the Congress that on the 18th of April last, in view of the sinking on the 24th of March of the cross-channel passenger steamer *Sussex* by a German submarine, without summons or warning, and the consequent loss of the lives of several citizens of the United States, who were passengers aboard her—

I make no attack upon the President of the United States; not at all. I simply present the facts. But I have received many letters from constituents calling attention to the President's language and to what some of the writers called the "infamous murder of American citizens" by the sinking of the *Sussex*. And yet no American citizen lost his life. Is it not time for accuracy of information?

Mr. Chairman, a year ago, during the debate on the McLemore resolution, I said:

If war should come to us, we will be united in support of the Government.

I to-day renew that pledge, though I still am strongly opposed to having this Nation enter the war and shall vote against the pending resolution. I shall vote against it not because I am opposed to preparedness, though the contrary has been repeatedly and falsely charged. I voted for all of the preparedness bills. As the House knows, my vote was cast for the appropriations for the Navy, for the Army, for aeroplanes, for submarines, for fortifications. I shall vote against the resolution for a different reason.

Much is said about the rights of American citizens. Had those fathers and mothers, sons and daughters quietly assembled in that building in Baltimore not to incite to the destruction of life or property but only to consult together in the hope that they might be able to say or do something that would help to keep their country at peace—had they no rights?

David Starr Jordan, one of the most distinguished educators of the country, the president of Leland Stanford University, in the country, and other speakers of prominence, men and women, were to address the meeting. And yet their meeting was broken up by a mob which forced open the doors and drove them into the street.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] is solicitous about American rights. Do not merely insist that an American citizen has the right to ride on a belligerent ship into the zone of war and that if the ship and he go to the bottom of the sea we must send our young men 4,000 miles away to avenge his death, for the President and the Secretary of State, in the letter of the 16th of January, 1916, said that the right of an American citizen to travel on a belligerent ship into the zone of war is a "doubtful legal right." "Doubtful" was their word. It is a doubtful legal right. Are we to go to war to enforce it? What are the rights that you want protected? Do they include the right of free speech in Philadelphia? Take the papers of Monday. Read that a theater in that city had been rented on Tuesday for a meeting on Saturday to promote the cause of peace, to be addressed by prominent speakers; that after notices had been published the chief of police issued an order prohibiting the meeting, and that Prof. Leeds stood outside the door while policemen kept a thousand men and women, law-abiding citizens, from holding a meeting, the object of which was to help, if they could, to keep their country at peace. American rights! There is nothing more essential to the perpetuity of republican institutions in this country than the right of the people peaceably to petition for a redress of grievances—the right of free speech.

Fathers and mothers in Baltimore met quietly to consult together, having in their hearts the fear of what might come to their beloved—driven out by a mob. I hope that their assailants were not descendants of the mob that stoned and killed in the streets of that city the soldiers from Massachusetts on their way to Washington, where, as we now know, Abraham Lincoln waited for them through hours of awful anxiety lest the Union go to destruction. Talk to me about human rights when you not only slander law-abiding citizens who do no more than ask that their country be not plunged into war, but also deny them the constitutional right of free speech.

I said a year ago, during the debate of which I have spoken, that I was opposed to war unless it be a war of defense, and that then it should be in defense of something worth the sacrifice. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] declared that our rights upon the sea had been ruthlessly attacked, and another gentleman recently said in debate that a nation that will not protect its rights upon the sea will soon cease to protect its rights upon the land. Now, there could not well be a greater non sequitur than that, if we mean to apply the proposition to present conditions. There is no reason in it, since a brave man might well defend his own home, his wife and children from marauders and yet not be willing to go 100 miles away to engage in a brawl.

Every pacificist in the United States, with very few exceptions—and I am not a pacifist in the peace-at-any-price sense in which that word is being used—every true American would fight to the death rather than permit the foot of an invader to remain upon our soil. And because I wish, so long as is consistent with its highest interests, to keep the Nation out of the European war it does not follow that I am therefore not an American or that I would not defend my own country against invasion.

Gentlemen speak as if the recent order of the German Government was issued without any assigned reason and in open violation of an express promise. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] said this, in effect, and in the same connection read a passage from an official dispatch of the German Government, as follows:

The German submarine forces have had in fact—

This is the statement of the German Government—

The German submarine forces have had in fact orders to conduct submarine warfare in accordance with the general principles of visit and search and destruction of merchant vessels as recognized by international law, the sole exception being the conduct of warfare against the enemy trade carried on enemy freight ships that are encountered in the war zone surrounding Great Britain; with regard to these no assurances have ever been given to the Government of the United States; no such assurance was contained in the declaration of February 8, 1916. The German Government can not admit any doubt that these orders have been given and are executed in good faith.

Mr. FESS. What is the date of that?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is dated May 4, 1916.

Errors—

Says the dispatch—

have actually occurred.

What follows was not read by the gentleman from Virginia.

They can in no kind of warfare be avoided altogether, and allowances must be made on the conduct of naval warfare against an enemy resorting to all kinds of ruses, whether permissible or illicit.

* * * * * * *

In self-defense against the illegal conduct of British warfare, while fighting a bitter struggle for her national existence, Germany had to resort to the hard but effective weapon of submarine warfare. As matters stand, the German Government can not but reiterate its regret that the sentiments of humanity which the Government of the United States extends with such fervor to the unhappy victims of submarine warfare are not extended with the same warmth of feeling to the many millions of women and children who, according to the avowed intentions of the British Government, shall be starved, and who by their sufferings shall force the victorious armies of the central powers into ignominious capitulation. The German Government, in agreement with the German people, fails to understand this discrimination, all the more as it has repeatedly and explicitly declared itself ready to use the submarine weapon in strict conformity with the rules of international law as recognized before the outbreak of the war if Great Britain were likewise ready to adapt her conduct of warfare to these rules. The several attempts made by the Government of the United States to prevail upon the British Government to act accordingly have failed because of the flat refusal on the part of the British Government.

I read this to lay the facts, as stated by Germany, before you. I take neither side of the controversy, but I believe that it is our duty to study the whole case.

Then Germany says that notwithstanding the continued refusal of Great Britain she ordered her submarines not to sink ships without warning, but to exercise the right of visit and search, in the hope, as she says, that England would consent to obey the rules of international law.

The dispatch continues, as follows:

But neutrals can not expect that Germany, forced to fight for her existence, shall, for the sake of neutral interest, restrict the use of an effective weapon if her enemy is permitted to continue to apply at will methods of warfare violating the rules of international law. Such a demand would be incompatible with the character of neutrality, and the German Government is convinced that the Government of the United States does not think of making such a demand, knowing that the Government of the United States has repeatedly declared that it is determined to restore the principle of the freedom of the seas, from whatever quarter it is violated.

Accordingly the German Government is confident that, in consequence of the new orders issued to its naval forces, the Government of the United States will now also consider all impediments removed

which may have been in the way of a mutual cooperation toward the restoration of the freedom of the seas during the war, as suggested in the note of July 23, 1915, and it does not doubt that the Government of the United States will now demand and insist that the British Government shall forthwith observe the rules of international law universally recognized before the war as they are laid down in the notes presented by the Government of the United States to the British Government on December 28, 1914, and November 5, 1915.

Now, gentlemen of the House, I call your attention to the closing statement of the German dispatch. The President accused Germany of violating shamefully an express promise. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD], who just took his seat, said the same thing. But Germany insists that she made no absolute promise, but only a conditional promise.

Mr. FLOOD. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. One moment. I can not yield now. Here is the promise of the German Government as set forth in the dispatch:

Should the steps taken by the Government of the United States not attain the object it desires, to have the laws of humanity followed by all belligerent nations, the German Government would then be facing a new situation, in which it must reserve itself complete liberty of decision.

Mr. FLOOD. May I interrupt the gentleman right there?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not yield right here.

Mr. FLOOD. What I want——

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I know what the gentleman wants.

Mr. FLOOD. There is a complete answer to the gentleman.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield, and one gentleman must not interrupt another without his permission.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman wishes to inject into my remarks, as if I were inclined to omit it, what Secretary Lansing said in his reply. I had no thought of omitting what the Secretary said. I will read the chief paragraph of his reply:

In order to avoid any possible misunderstanding the Government of the United States notifies the Imperial Government that it can not for a moment entertain, much less discuss, a suggestion that respect by German naval authorities for the rights of citizens of the United States upon the high seas should in any way or in the slightest degree be made contingent upon the conduct of any other Government affecting the rights of neutrals and noncombatants. Responsibility in such matters is single, not joint; absolute, not relative.

But let us see what Thomas Jefferson thought about that view of international law, in a letter dated Philadelphia, September 7, 1793, to Thomas Pinckney, United States Minister to England, regarding England's stoppage of our food shipments to France. I will ask to put the whole letter into the RECORD, but will now read only the paragraphs that are germane at this point:

Mr. Jefferson said:

Reason and usage have established that when two nations go to war, those who choose to live in peace retain their natural right to pursue their agriculture, manufactures, and other ordinary vocations, to carry the produce of their industry for exchange to all nations, belligerent or neutral, as usual, to go and come freely without injury or molestation, and in short that the war among others shall be for them as if it did not exist. One restriction on their natural rights has been submitted to by nations at peace; that is to say, that of not furnishing to either party implements merely of war for the annoyance of the other, or anything whatever to a place blockaded by its enemy.

It suffices for the present occasion to say that corn, flour, and meal are not of the class of contraband, and, consequently, remain articles of free commerce.

Before continuing I will again read the last paragraph:

It suffices for the present occasion to say that corn, flour, and meal are not of the class of contraband, and, consequently, remain articles of free commerce. A culture which like that of the soil gives employment to such a proportion of mankind could never be suspended by the whole earth or interrupted for them, whenever any two nations should think proper to go to war.

* * * * * * * *

It is not enough for a nation to say we and our friends will buy your produce. We have a right to answer that it suits us better to sell to their enemies as well as their friends.

It is an open violation of international law as always understood prior to the opening of this war to stop flour under a neutral flag going from one neutral country to another neutral country.

Says Jefferson:

We have a right to judge for ourselves what markets best suit us and they have none to forbid to us the enjoyment of the necessaries and comforts which we may obtain from any other independent country.

* * * * * * * *

This act, too, tends to directly draw us from that state of peace in which we are wishing to remain.

It is an essential character of neutrality to furnish no aid (not stipulated by treaty) to one party which we are not equally ready to furnish to the other. If we permit corn to be sent to Great Britain and her friends, we are equally bound to permit it to France. To restrain it would be a partiality which might lead to a war with France, and between restraining it ourselves and permitting her enemies to restrain it unrightfully is no difference.

Observe that last statement of Mr. Jefferson. I will read it again:

Between restraining it ourselves and permitting our enemies to restrain it unrightfully is no difference. She—

France—

would consider this as a mere pretext, of which she would not be the dupe. And on what honorable grounds could we otherwise explain it?

* * * * * * * *

Were we to withhold from her—

France—

supplies of provisions, we should in like manner be bound to withhold them from her enemies also, and thus shut to ourselves all the ports of Europe where corn is in demand or make ourselves parties in the war. This is a dilemma which Great Britain has no right to force upon us and for which no pretext can be found in any part of our conduct. She may, indeed, feel the desire of starving an enemy nation, but she can have no right of doing it at our loss nor of making us the instrument of it.

In accordance with the leave granted, I place all of the relevant portions of the letter of President Jefferson to Thomas Pinckney in the RECORD, as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, *September 7, 1793.*

SIR: We have received, through a channel which can not be considered as authentic, the copy of a paper, styled "Additional Instructions to the Commanders of His Majesty's Ships of War and Privateers," etc., dated at St. James, June 8, 1793. If this paper be authentic, I have little doubt but that you will have taken measures to forward it to me. But as your communication of it may miscarry, and time in the meanwhile will be lost, it has been thought better that it should be supposed authentic and that on that supposition I should notice to you its very exceptional nature and the necessity of obtaining explanations on the subject from the British Government, desiring at the same time that you will consider this letter as provisionally written only, and as if never written in the event that the paper which is the occasion of it be not genuine.

The first article of it [the British order] permits all vessels laden wholly or in part with corn, flour, or meal bound to any port in France to be stopped and sent into any British port, to be purchased by that Government, or to be released only on the condition of security given by the master that he will proceed to dispose of his cargo in the ports of some country in amity with His Majesty.

This article is so manifestly contrary to the law of nations that nothing more would seem necessary than to observe that it is so. Reason and usage have established that when two nations go to war, those who choose to live in peace retain their natural right to pursue their agriculture, manufactures, and other ordinary vocations, to carry the produce of their industry for exchange to all nations, belligerent or neutral, as usual, to go and come freely without injury or molestation, and in short, that the war among others shall be for them as if it did not exist. One restriction on their natural rights has been submitted to by nations at peace; that is to say, that of not furnishing to either party implements merely of war for the annoyance of the other, nor anything whatever to a place blockaded by its enemy.

What these implements of war are has been so often agreed and is so well understood as to leave little question about them at this day. There does not exist, perhaps, a nation in our common hemisphere, which has not made a particular enumeration of them in some or all of their treaties, under the name of contraband. It suffices for the present occasion to say that corn, flour, and meal are not of the class of contraband, and, consequently, remain articles of free commerce. A culture which, like that of the soil, gives employment to such a proportion of mankind, could never be suspended by the whole earth or interrupted for them, whenever any two nations should think proper to go to war.

The state of war then existing between Great Britain and France furnishes no legitimate right either to interrupt the agriculture of the United States or the peaceable exchange of its produce with all nations, and consequently the assumption of it will be as lawful hereafter as now, in peace as in war. No ground, acknowledged by the common reason of mankind, authorizes this act now, and unacknowledged ground may be taken at any time and at all times.

We see then a practice begun to which no time, no circumstances prescribe any limits, and which strikes at the root of our agriculture—that branch of industry which gives food, clothing, and comfort to the great mass of the inhabitants of these States. If any nation whatever has a right to shut up to our produce all the ports of the earth except her own and those of her friends, she may shut up these also, and so confine us within within our own limits. No nation can subscribe to such pretensions; no nation can agree, at the mere will or interest of another, to have its peaceable industry suspended and its citizens reduced to idleness and want. The loss of our produce destined for foreign markets, or that loss which would result from an arbitrary restraint of our markets, is a tax too serious for us to acquiesce in. It is not enough for a nation to say we and our friends will buy your produce. We have a right to answer that it suits us better to sell to their enemies as well as their friends. Our ships do not go to France to return empty. They go to exchange the surplus of one produce which we can spare for surpluses of other kinds which they can spare and we want, which they furnish on better terms and more to our mind than Great Britain or her friends.

We have a right to judge for ourselves what market best suits us, and they have none to forbid to us the enjoyment of the necessaries and comforts which we may obtain from any other independent country.

This act, too, tends directly to draw us from that state of peace in which we are wishing to remain. It is an essential character of neutrality to furnish no aids—not stipulated by treaty—to one party which we are not equally ready to furnish to the other. If we permit corn to be sent to Great Britain and her friends, we are equally bound to permit it to France. To restrain it would be a partiality which might lead to a war with France, and between restraining it ourselves and permitting her enemies to restrain it unrightfully is no difference. She would consider this as a mere pretext, of which she would not be the dupe; and on what honorable ground could we otherwise explain it? Thus we should see ourselves plunged by this unauthorized act of Great Britain into a war with which we meddle not, and which we wish to avoid if justice to all parties and from all parties will enable us to avoid it. In the case where we found ourselves obliged by treaty to withhold from the enemies of France the right of arming in our ports we thought ourselves in justice bound to withhold the same right from France also, and we did it.

Were we to withhold from her [France] supplies of provisions, we should in like manner be bound to withhold them from her enemies

also, and thus shut to ourselves all the ports of Europe where corn is in demand or make ourselves parties in the war. This is a dilemma which Great Britain has no right to force upon us, and for which no pretext can be found in any part of our conduct. She may, indeed, feel the desire of starving an enemy nation, but she can have no right of doing it at our loss nor of making us the instruments of it.

Mr. Chairman, I now invite attention to what a distinguished authority has said about the way our neutral rights have been disregarded in this war. In the New Republic Prof. Albert Bushnell Hart, of Cambridge, Massachusetts, a very strong pro-ally sympathizer, is quoted as saying that—

The humiliating truth is that Great Britain has applied to the commerce of the United States such limitations and restrcitions as were never practiced in the worst times of Napoleon's wars—ordained a system of passes and permits which if tried against the United States in time of peace would cause a war with Great Britain.

Why have we condoned all this? Why have we not resisted vigorously as we did a hundred years ago her lesser violation of our rights on the high seas? Only because we know that the people of England are in the midst of the greatest of wars fighting desperately. Because we know that all of the belligerents have thrown to the winds the rules of international law.

Says Prof. William I. Hull, professor of history and internation relations at Swarthmore College:

Germany is engaged in a gigantic effort to defeat England by starvation. It has invented means and methods of warfare which never came within the ken of international law before. In this effort it has caused the death of neutral American citizens sailing on belligerent ships and has threatened to destroy the lives of other American citizens who sail on either neutral or belligerent ships.

Great Britain is engaged in a gigantic effort to defeat Germany by starvation and has blockaded on a scale and in a manner never adopted before in human warfare large sections of the high seas, as well as the force of the enemy; it has abolished the old distinction between absolute and conditional contraband, thereby destroying our neutral trade with the noncombatant populations of belligerent lands; it has greatly restricted our neutral trade with other neutral lands; it has interfered with the dispatch of our neutral mail to neutral and belligerent lands alike; it has "blacklisted" American firms for daring to trade directly or indirectly with Great Britain's enemies, with whom we are at peace; and in other ways it has exercised its supremacy over the high seas for the purpose of defeating its enemy, regardless of neutral rights.

I desire now to speak for a moment about the declaration of London. In 1909 the British Government called together representatives from all the great nations of the world to codify what was then international law. They met at London. They signed a document, all of the representatives of all of the great powers. It is true that some of the great powers never ratified it; but all of the representatives of the great powers formally agreed that it embodied, when completed and signed, the then existing international law. In 1908 Sir Edward Grey instructed the British delegates to the London conference to attempt to arrive "by common agreement at a uniform definition of the main principles of existing law." In the report of these delegates to Sir Edward Grey upon the declaration of London, March 1, 1909, the British delegates stated:

As a body those rules do amount practically to a statement of what is the essence of the law of nations.

In a book by Earl Loreburn, entitled "Capture at Sea," published in 1913, just before the war, on page 86 appears the following:

The British delegates, explaining the results of the conference, congratulated themselves with justice upon having secured full recognition of the principles advocated by the British Government.

What some of those principles were is set forth by Prof. Clapp, of the University of New York, in his book The Economic Aspects of the War. Concerning contraband, he says:

In the declaration of London the articles classed as absolute contraband of war—that is, articles which Great Britain might properly shut out of Germany altogether—were restricted to the actual tools and equipment of fighting nations. Conditional contraband was a more comprehensive list, including such merchandise as food, clothing, coal, harness and saddlery, horses, shoes, and barbed wire. Finally the declaration specified a list of free goods, articles which might not be molested because only distantly related to warfare, necessary to the civilian population, and contributing a very important portion of the commerce of peaceful neutrals.

Prof. Clapp quotes from the declaration of London as follows:

Conditional contraband is not liable to capture except when on board a vessel bound for territory belonging to or occupied by the enemy * * * and when it is not to be discharged in an intervening neutral port.

"If food," says Prof. Clapp, "is to be discharged in a neutral port, its destination is not subject to suspicion." But England modified the rules of international law to suit her own interests after the war began, and the professor says, on page 22:

The things which by the declaration of London Great Britain was obligated not to do gradually came to constitute a fairly good record of what she actually did.

This is to some extent true of all the other belligerents.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I have only a few minutes more.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I was very anxious for some information.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I was not proposing to ask a question in the spirit of controversy, but if it is not agreeable to the gentleman, of course I shall not ask it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What is the question?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The question is to what extent England has compensated for the property she has taken in violation of the rules?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. I admire his ability, but I fear that the dollars-and-cents view has gotten hold of him. The gentleman suggests that England will compensate for her taking of American goods. But Thomas Jefferson said that under the rules of international law we have the right to sell our foodstuffs to whomsoever we please, and that to consent to sell them only to her, in instances when they could not be touched by a belligerent, except in violation of international law, would have been a violation by the United States of the rights of France.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee rose.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. One moment. The gentleman forgets the claim of Germany that while England proposed to compensate our people for foodstuffs intercepted in violation of the recognized rules of international law as laid down in the declaration of London, she by that act starved the German people. And Germany asks whether we are content to have our rights violated, if we are paid money, knowing that such violation of law and of our rights on the high seas is starving the people of another nation, its women and children? [Applause.] That is the question. Repeatedly it has been said here that one is a question of property and the other a question of human life. But with all respect for those who differ with me, I deny that this is a fair statement of the issue. I respect the President. I have not a harsh word to say about him. But in my judgment it is not a question of property and of human life; it is a question of the American people being entirely neutral, or adopting armed neutrality, or going into this war admittedly to help to destroy the Imperial German Government.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee rose.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. That is the question before us. There is no evading it. On the 3d of February last the President said to the Congress:

We do not desire hostile conflict with the Imperial Government. We are the sincere friends of the German people and earnestly desire to remain at peace with the Government which speaks for them.

And yet now we are asked to mobilize an army and navy and send 500,000 young Americans to the trenches of Europe to be maimed, mutilated, blinded, killed, to fight and destroy a Government that on the 3d of February the President said spoke for the German people and represented them, a Government with which we wished to remain at peace.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee and Mr. BORLAND rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I can not yield right now. I have only a few minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The President says that the German people had nothing to do with bringing on this war. Did not he know that before the 3d of February? He knew all of the time that they had nothing to do with it. How much did the English people have to do with bringing on this war? Nothing at all. How much did the people of any European nation have to do with bringing on the war? Nothing at all. It is said that six members of the British cabinet resigned, certainly three—Frank Harris, a former London editor, said that six resigned—because secret diplomacy had plunged England into war.

Since the revolution in Russia we have repeatedly read in many papers that it was the most tyrannical, backward, reactionary, oppressive, medieval despotism in the world, and yet England and Italy and France and Japan were allied with it to destroy Germany; and if during the first two years and more of this war at any time they had been successful that medieval despotism would have had Constantinople and been established for another century. What has overthrown the Czar? The tremendous struggle of the central powers. Now, I ask you this question: If we were in the situation of the German people and just across an imaginary boundary, or one say like the Rio Grande River, was a country of 130,000,000 or more people, ruled by the most absolute, tyrannical, corrupt despotism of modern times, with an army of 1,300,000, what would we have done to secure our own safety and how long before this would we have had universal military service, a large staff of trained

officers, and a great standing army? Lloyd George suggested an answer in a speech which he made in Queen's Hall, London, July 28, 1908:

I want to put two considerations to you from the German point of view. Every misunderstanding and quarrel is largely a matter of lack of imagination. Men have not got the imagination to project themselves into the position of the other party.

Now, just consider for a moment. You say, "Why should Germany be frightened of us? Why should she build because of us?" Let me put two considerations to you. We started; it is not they who have started. We had an overwhelming preponderance at sea, which would have secured us against any conceivable enemy. We were not satisfied. We said, "Let there be dreadnaughts." What for? We did not require them. Nobody was building them; and if anybody had built them we could easily have outbuilt them.

We have more shipbuilding resources than any country in the world, and more than every country in the world put together, so really there was no need for it. Well, let me put another consideration before you which I don't think is sufficiently pointed out. We always say we must have what we call a "two-power standard." What does that mean? You must have a navy large enough to oppose a combination of any two naval powers. So if we had Russia and France, Germany and France, Germany and Italy, we should always have a fleet large enough to defend our shores against any combination of the two greatest naval powers in Europe. This has been our standard.

Look at the position of Germany. Her army is to her what our navy is to us—her sole defense against invasion. She has not got a two-power standard. She may have a stronger army than France, than Russia, than Italy, than Austria, but she is between two great powers who in combination could pour in a vastly greater number of troops than she has.

Don't forget that when you wonder why Germany is frightened at alliances and understandings and some sort of mysterious workings which appear in the press and hints in the Times and the Daily Mail.

I remember motoring on a Sunday morning in Germany, and I picked up a German newspaper, and the only words I could read were Observer and Daily Mail; so I asked a friend what it meant, and he said it was an extract full of menaces to Germany, and the German paper had copied it. All that means something to Germany.

Here is Germany, in the middle of Europe, with France and Russia on either side, and with a combination of their armies greater than hers. Suppose we had here a possible combination which would lay us open to invasion—suppose Germany and France, or Germany and Russia, or Germany and Austria had fleets which in combination would be stronger than ours.

Would not we be frightened; would not we build; would not we arm? Of course we should. I want our friends, who think that because Germany is a little frightened she really means mischief to us, to remember that she is frightened for a reason which would frighten us under the same circumstances.

Gentlemen, if we pretend to statesmanship we must try to see all sides of great questions. The destruction of England would be a world calamity. And the world ought never to permit it. So, too, the dismemberment of Germany would be a world calamity, and the world ought never to permit that. I pray that the neutral nations may in combination find some way speedily to bring this horror to an end.

I digress here to mention a strange fact and withal one in this connection of much importance. A constituent of mine sent to me to get for him a set of the documents compiled by the State Department embodying the correspondence between this country and the belligerents respecting the rights of neutrals. I procured a set and sent them to him. But the compilation does not contain the British order of November 2, 1914, establishing a mine zone in the North Sea and warning all vessels that if they traverse the North Sea or cross a line running from the Faroe Islands to Iceland they will do so at their peril.

A gentleman connected with a leading eastern university writes that this is the most astounding omission in an important official publication that he has ever known. In explanation of this omission, Secretary Lansing wrote a letter, of which you have all seen copies. I now ask permission to insert it in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It is a letter written to Hon. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM, of the House of Representatives, our colleague here. An inquiry was made as to why this British order, which is among the most important of these documents, if not itself the most important, was omitted from the official compilation by the Department of State.

The letter of Secretary Lansing is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 9, 1917.

The Hon. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. TINKHAM: I am in receipt of your letter of February 28, 1917, inclosing a communication from Mr. Emil Ahlborn, 258 Marlboro Street, Boston, Mass., requesting that he be informed why this Government omitted from its official publication of the documents relating to belligerents and the rights of neutrals and commerce the British Admiralty order of November 2, 1914, declaring the North Sea a military area.

In reply I would suggest that Mr. Ahlborn be informed that as it was impossible to publish all the material in the department relating to the war, and as the order of November 2, 1914, had already been made public by the department, it was deemed unnecessary at this time to reprint the order in the official white book.

I am, my dear Mr. TINKHAM,
Very sincerely, yours, ROBERT LANSING.

My time has expired. I assume that the war is to come.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. When it comes we will be united in support of the Government. I shall do all that I can to help achieve a victory for our country, but I shall not vote to send the Nation to war in accordance with this resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] is recognized for 20 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question for information. Are we under the hour rule?

The CHAIRMAN. We are. The gentleman is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. A member of the committee is entitled to an hour.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I will say to the gentleman that I hope to finish within 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] would have been most appropriate if delivered in the Reichstag. No doubt tremendous applause would there have greeted his remarks. Much more so than in this House.

He talks about England's outrages and violations of our rights. He speaks of the sinking of the *Evelyn* and the *Carib* in the waters of the North Sea, and charges it to English mines. This statement has been relied upon many times to bolster up the contention of those not in sympathy with the policy of this Government. Touching those two vessels, the State Department says that they have no evidence that they were sunk by English mines. On the contrary, Count von Bernstorff, the then ambassador from Germany, wrote a letter to the State Department immediately after they were sunk and said—I read from a copy of his letter to the Secretary of State, dated March 1, 1915:

Pursuant to instructions—

He says—

I have the honor to inform your excellency that the American vessels *Evelyn* and *Carib* were lost in the North Sea because, contrary to the directions given in the Wachrichten für Seefahrer (Notice to Mariners), No. 2770–14, etc., they ran along the East Friesian Islands by direction, as stated by the captain of the *Evelyn*, of a British warship.

That letter carries the assumption in the words of Bernstorff himself that a German mine sunk the *Carib* and the *Evelyn*.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] spoke much about the action of England in decreeing that vessels should not go into the North Sea, and excusing Germany's action by England's action in that respect. Ah, sirs, he did not tell you, and those of his way of thinking did not tell you, that when England executed that order she said to the United States, "We have mined certain places in the North Sea, but if any of your vessels wish to go through we will furnish you a diagram, so to speak; we will furnish you pilot boats, so that you may not run against the mines." Did Germany do that? No. Germany said, "Here is a zone 1,500 miles long and 1,100 miles wide your vessels can not enter except once a week, and then only at a certain port and along a certain path, and your vessel shall be painted a certain color—like a barber's sign, so to speak." And then they said, so far as the Mediterranean is concerned, "You can not enter it except in a strip of 20 miles wide." Can you not see the difference between the actions of Germany and the actions of England? A man who can not is unable to see the difference between, as some one has said, a torpedo and the prize court.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] did not answer the question propounded to him by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. The gentleman from Wisconsin must know that England's prize courts have awarded hundreds of thousands of dollars for affecting the property rights of the citizens of this country. Their courts are open, and they have said, "We will try the cases coming before us, and award damages not upon the orders in council but upon international law." And on that principle hundreds of our citizens have collected the full market value of their cargoes taken. And yet men say that we ought to go to war against England for violating property rights and excuse Germany for destroying the lives of American citizens. By that argument you say to me I shall not be permitted to choose my assailant. If one comes into my home and steals my pocketknife, he can be prosecuted for petit larceny. The penalty will be light. But if he comes into my

home and kills some one who is dear to me, the punishment will be death. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, whatever hope for peace we may have entertained, whatever desire to escape the European cataclysm we may have cherished, have now been dissipated and we are face to face with another great crisis.

For nearly three years we have tried every avenue of diplomacy commensurate with a nation's honor to avoid war. So intense has been our desire for peace that at home our Government has been criticized and abroad our patience and forbearance have been marveled at.

From the sinking of the *Lusitania* to the presentation by the Kaiser of the iron cross to the submarine commander for heroic services; from Germany's note claiming justification to her declaration of respect for our rights in the future; from her note repudiating that declaration to the sinking of the *Laconia;* from the hatching of the plot to form an alliance with Japan and Mexico for the purpose of overthrowing our Government to the unjustified holding of Americans in Germany, we have curbed our indignation and restrained our patriotic impulses in the hope of satisfactory adjustment.

Germany's policy is now firmly established. All hope of peace with honor has vanished, and the time has come when further forbearance would be humiliation.

In 1798, when we were a weak and defenseless people, our fathers had the courage and patriotism to defy the great Napoleon, the then master military mind of the world. In 1812, when we were yet but a stripling of a Nation, with only 20 vessels of war, our fathers had the courage and patriotism to defy Great Britain, the proud and haughty mistress of the seas, with her thousand war vessels, for imprisoning American seamen and interfering with American commerce.

We did not go to war in 1812 because our ships had been sunk and our citizens murdered upon the high seas, for England in all her mad conquests for commerce and trade did not claim the right to sink our vessels or murder our citizens. We went to war then because of less serious violations of our rights—interference with our commerce and imprisoning American seamen.

If it were right for this Nation, under the splendid leadership of those patriots and statesmen from whose massive intellects the principles of this Government were evolved and through whose splendid services our independence was won, to force France to respect our rights in 1798 and to make war on England in 1812 in defense of the rights and liberty of our citizens, why is it not our duty in 1917, when we have grown rich and powerful as a Nation, to defend those rights and protect to the limit the property and lives of our citizens? [Applause.]

If the mere interference or detention of our ships at that time was a sufficient cause for war, why is not the destruction of our ships to-day a greater and more just cause for war? If imprisoning American seamen at that time was a just cause for war, why is it not a greater and more just cause for war in this day when American seamen and American citizens are ruthlessly murdered at sea? [Applause.]

What mystic influence has the Imperial German Government over us that would cause us now to abandon the principles of our fathers? What is there about the Imperial German Government that should cause us to permit her to destroy our commerce, sink our vessels, and assassinate our citizens? What has that Government done for us that would justify us in conceding to her such rights? Is it because of her invasion of Belgium and her treatment of the inhabitants of that unfortunate country? Is it because of her total disregard of the undisputed rights of neutrals in waging a ruthless unrestricted submarine warfare on the lives and property of our citizens? Is it because of the dissension among our people and the distrust of our Government that her propagadists and sympathizers have caused in this country? Or is it because she would form an alliance with Japan and Mexico to wage war upon us?

We are a great Nation. We glory in its history and priceless heritage, and I refuse to believe that we have degenerated in our national ideas, that we have forgotten the teachings of our fathers, and are not now willing to fight for those principles they so courageously defended and upheld in the early history of the country. [Applause.]

We love peace. Our greatness and resources have been builded upon the peaceful toil of our people. We prefer to hear the noise of the humming factory to the roar of thundering cannon, the music of the anvil to the rattle of musketry, the songs of mothers to the sobs of widows, the laughter of happy children to the wail of hungry orphans. Yet, sirs, the inspiring words of Lawrence, "Don't give up the ship," and the heroic deeds of Perry, Somers, Decatur, and Porter are too indelibly written on the hearts of the American people for us at this time to surrender our national honor and our rights on the high seas. [Applause.]

Self-preservation is founded on a nation's character, and self-preservation is the first law of nature. One principle that makes a nation great is the protection of its citizens in their lives and property. With that protection guaranteed, they know that they are backed by their Government, that its strong arm is their arm, and they will rejoice in its increased strength and prosperity.

Protection and patriotism are reciprocal, and are the roads that all enduring nations have trod. In a great crisis like this courage and patriotism will not regard the horror of war, but will look only to the cause of war. When a brave and patriotic people are aroused they despise the dangers of war and look only to the issues involved. [Applause.]

The horror of war did not deter those sturdy patriots under Washington when they crossed the frozen Delaware and wintered in the shivering cold of Valley Forge. It did not deter the gallant John Paul Jones when asked, "Have you struck your flag?" and he responded from the deck of the *Bon Homme Richard*, "No; I have just begun to fight." It did not deter that rugged warrior, "the hero of New Orleans," and his faithful soldiers upon the battle field of Chalmette. It did not deter Taylor and Scott and Davis from leading their commands to victory and renown at Monterey and Buena Vista. It did not deter the followers of Grant and Lee from performing those splendid deeds of heroism that won the admiration of the world and have been an inspiration to the youth of America. It did not deter this Nation from breaking the tyrant's grip on Cuba and liberating a weak and oppressed people. [Applause.]

Throughout our history, armed with a just cause, we have not paused to contemplate the horrors of war. And so to-day we shall enter this war fighting for a cause as just as any that moved our fathers in the past. We are going to war in defense of our fundamental rights and for the preservation of the rights of humanity. Sirs, the charge that we are going to wage war for profit and pelf or in the interest of the munitions makers is as despicable as it is un-American, and is unworthy of any American who loves his country better than he does the land of an insidious foe. [Applause.] It is the inexorable logic of events that has driven us into this war, and we enter it asking nothing for ourselves save the glory that comes of fighting for the rights and liberties of mankind.

If there be in this body or elsewhere citizens who object to the course we are embarking upon, I would suggest to them that the greatest embarrassment the Government has experienced thus far in its unsuccessful negotiations with the Imperial German Government has been due to an apparent division of sentiment in this country; and at this time further objection on their part can only add to the gravity of the situation and give encouragement to the enemy. I would suggest to them that they now employ their talents and eloquence not in attempting to cause dissension among the American people but in addressing Kaiser Wilhelm, Bethmann Hollweg, the Reichstag, and the author of that remarkable sample of diplomatic "kultur," the Zimmermann note. Tell them how we love the history and principles of our democratic government; tell them how during the whole war the steady hand and unerring judgment and patriotic heart of the President have been employed in ceaseless effort to avoid war and maintain a neutral position; tell them how our ships have been sunk, our citizens ruthlessly murdered, and the most diabolical plots hatched at our very doors; tell them how they have sent their spies among the negroes of the South to arouse them against the white people, how they have dynamited our factories, and how they have even attempted to blow up this Capitol Building; tell them how we have protested, pleaded, and supplicated to a degree that has been almost humiliating, and how they have made promises only to be broken, and to injury have added insult; tell them that if their professions are to be considered as more than a mere "scrap of paper" they must atone for their past acts and renew and live up to their solemn pledges. If they do this, we will call off the dogs of war; but, if they do not, we will wage war to the limit of our resources, and the end will not come until German militarism, the greatest menace to the peace and happiness of mankind, is no longer a blot on civilization. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Illinois opposed to this resolution?

Mr. BRITTEN. I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] who has just preceded me, when he referred——

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question? The gentleman is not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Who yields the 20 minutes to the gentleman?

The CHAIRMAN. No member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs asked to be recognized in opposition to the resolution, and under the rules of the House the recognition alternates between those favoring and those opposing the resolution.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is recognized for an hour, then?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman asked to be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BRITTEN. I shall be very glad, Mr. Chairman, to yield to my friend from Illinois some time——

Mr. CANNON. No, no; I have no complaint about time or anything else. I just wanted to keep track of the yielding; that was all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to keep track of the time, so that it will be divided as equally as possible.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I was much impressed with the statement of my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] a few minutes ago, and particularly so when he referred to the patriotism of our scattered forces at Valley Forge. He forgot to remind the House that those forces were brought together by a German general, Von Steuben, who was largely responsible for their organization and success. He might also have referred to the German regiment at Brandywine and at Princeton, and to the 53 men and 14 officers who comprised Washington's bodyguard, every one of them a German, selected because they were Germans.

Mr. Chairman, in justice to my antagonism to this resolution I think I should preface my remarks, at least to the new Members of the House, by saying that I have been a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs for four years. I have consistently followed the suggestions of the Navy General Board of experts, with a view to putting the country in a state of preparedness, which it is not to-day; and most of the gentlemen on that side of the House have continually refused to support this board which until very recently was headed by Admiral Dewey.

I am not a pacifist in any sense, but am firm in the belief that this resolution is being jammed through Congress against the wishes of a great majority of people all over the country.

I do not believe that the great masses of our people are in favor of a declaration of war, and I am certain that they are opposed to the use of our militia in the bloody trench warfare which has already annihilated the flower of the youth of the most civilized countries on earth.

The wrongs of Germany, England, and all of the other belligerents which have been heaped upon us will not justify the loss of untold thousands of lives, the crippling and maiming of our American boys, nor the suffering and anguish which is bound to follow our flag to Europe.

It is not yet too late to diplomatically consider the differences between Germany and ourselves, and I am sure that a sincere effort in this direction would prove more valuable and creditable to the country than a declaration of war.

Let Congress immediately pass a bill for universal military service, which will give the country not less than a million real sodiers in 12 months from now, and let us leave nothing undone to bring our Navy up to the equal at least of the second great naval power just as quickly as possible, and we will then be in position to command the respect not only of Germany but of every country on earth.

Let us arm our whole Nation for its own defense and keep clear of any entangling alliances with European and Asiatic Governments.

By maintaining an attitude of armed neutrality we can rest secure until additional revolutions in Europe have done their work, and we can then assist in establishing a condition of universal peace.

I was in Chicago last Saturday when various demonstrations, parades, and band wagons were scattered about the city in an effort to work up some enthusiasm for a couple of war meetings that night, and any number of parades passed that busy corner of Madison and Dearborn Streets, where my office is located, directly across the street from the great Chicago Tribune office.

At one time would come the Boy Scouts, at another time a group of fine youngsters from the Great Lakes Training Station, at another time a company of high-school cadets with their Red Cross nurses, at another time the First Illinois Cavalry headed by our good friend, Col. Foreman, and a fine body of men they were. I called my partner, Reynolds, to our office window on the tenth floor of the Hartford Building and said to him, "Peter, look down and tell me what impresses you the most." He said, "They look fine." I said, "Ah, that is not what I mean. Do you notice how quiet everybody is?" Mr. Speaker, the following morning our great metropolitan papers came out and said that the crowds of people lining the sidewalks on the route of the march "stood in silent awe"—that was one particular headline I have in mind. Yes, they stood in silence, gentlemen, because their heartstrings and their sympathies were not with the movement that is slowly but surely dragging us into this terrible European mire. [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.] That is the reason they stood in silence. Ask your friends here around you on the floor of the House, "Are you going to vote for this bill?" "Yes; I hate like the devil to vote for it, but I am going to." Why do they hate to vote for it? The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] said, "Let there be no division." I will tell you why, gentlemen——

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I will in a moment.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. When the gentleman makes such an assertion as that, why does he not give the names of the gentlemen around him who make that statement?

Mr. BRITTEN. I could name probably 75 per cent of the Members to him, on his own side of the House as well as on this side.

Mr. HEFLIN. I challenge that statement.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman from Alabama is always challenging something.

Mr. HEFLIN. I challenge that statement. That statement is not correct.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen must not interrupt Members without their consent.

Mr. BRITTEN. The truth of the matter is that 90 per cent of your people and mine do not want this declaration of war, and are distinctly opposed to our going into that bloody mire on the other side. There is something in the air, gentlemen, and I do not know what it is, whether it be the hand of destiny, or some superhuman movement, something stronger than you and I can realize or resist, that seems to be picking us up bodily and literally forcing us to vote for this declaration of war when away down deep in our hearts we are just as opposed to it as are our people back home.

Mr. GLASS. How do you know our people do not want it? [Applause on the floor and in the galleries.]

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, am I to be interrupted without permission?

The CHAIRMAN. There must be no demonstration from the galleries. It is a breach of order. Gentlemen must not interrupt the speaker without his consent and without first addressing the Chair. The Chair insists upon the enforcement of this rule.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia, who just interrupted me, has probably not been in his district within the last 10 days. I have been in mine and I have traveled from the great Central West, and I tell you sincerely that 90 per cent of the people of this country are opposed to a declaration of war against Germany at this time. We are being drawn into that awful catastrophe contrary to our desires.

Mr. GLASS. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; I can not yield. I have not the time. Ask your neighbor at your elbow if he is in favor of this declaration of war and he will tell you "no," but he will vote for it just the same. Go out into the cloakroom on the Democratic or Republican side, they will tell you the same thing. I do not say, as some Members of the Senate last night said, that this resolution is being promoted by capitalists or by newspapers or munition makers. I do not know what is promoting it; but the truth of the matter is that your people and mine do not want it. One of the great New York papers came out with an editorial headline the other day, which was, "Wake up, Central West." What does it mean? It means that they in the East have felt the pulse of the great Central West and are assured that there is no sentiment for this declaration of war.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; I can not yield. I desire to be courteous to the gentleman, but I have not the time to yield. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to offer an amendment to this bill at the proper time, and I will ask the Clerk to read it now.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BRITTEN: On page 2, after line 16, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"*Provided however*, That no part of the military forces of the United States shall be ordered to do land duty in any part of Europe, Asia, or Africa until so directed by act of Congress, excepting those troops who specifically volunteer for such service."

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, it is short and self-explanatory. You and I do not want our boys to go up against that liquid fire, noxious gases, and a trench warfare that has made wild animals out of human beings, just because our administration has convinced itself that the future safety of our country will be more secure in the defeat of Germany than in the defeat of England.

But let us not deceive ourselves that we are going into this war in the interest of humanity. The man who deceives himself is a fool. We are being dragged into this because our administration is firm in the belief, and has been for a long time, that the future safety of our country will be more secure in the defeat of Germany than in the defeat of England, and every one of you who votes for this resolution without amendment will feel its effects a year from now when the sisters, widows, and mothers of your district come to you and say, "Mr. Congressman, my boy is my only support; he is just 22, or he is just 21; are you going to send him to the trenches in France or in Salonika?" That is what your vote to-day will mean. You will be putting your young man with probably one year's training up against a lot of seasoned warriors who will cripple him and send him home to live the balance of his life as a public charge or dependent upon his relatives.

The President came before Congress on Monday, and one of his statements were that, "We will not choose the path of submission."

Unless the administration changes its mind it will be the first time it has refrained from doing so on any great question. We have submitted to the dictates of every first-class power on earth during the past four years. Do some of you new Members of Congress realize that you or I could not ship this reading stand to Norway, a neutral country, until we had received a permit from the British Embassy in this city to do so? You would have to tell them how it was packed, where it was going, its cost, its weight, and a lot of other things before the British foreign office in London would allow you to ship it from your own American port to anyone in any neutral country of Europe. Do you realize that you could not send a pen or pencil to Switzerland, another neutral country, without first getting the consent of Great Britain in London—and then they talk about refusing to submit. Do you realize——

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; I can not yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. The gentleman does not think, really——

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman from Illinois does think, and it may be that the gentleman from Mississippi has not thought. Mr. Chairman, do the new Members of Congress know that England has seized three American ships plying between North and South America and has refused to return them to the American flag, where they belong? Have we submitted? Certainly we have. They are in the English service to-day. I recall the statement of my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] while laying great stress on the inhumanity of Germany in this terrible conflict, killing women and children. Does the gentleman realize that some time ago a request was made by the American Red Cross to be permitted to take a specially sterilized milk to the babies in Hungary, Poland, Austria, and Germany?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I can not yield; I have not the time.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Does the gentleman realize——

Mr. BRITTEN. I must refuse to yield. I thoroughly understand the gentleman's extreme excitement.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, the request came from the American Red Cross to be permitted to send specially sterilized milk to the babies in these foreign countries who could not obtain proper nourishment from their mothers' breasts, and England declined to issue a permit for it. We are told to-day that thousands of those babies have died, while others are showing signs of tuberculosis because of lack of proper nourishment and butter fat. Is there anything more inhumane than that? Could anything be more terrible than to say to babies at their mothers' breasts, without proper nourishment, "You can not have milk?" And yet we submitted.

The President said, "We would not choose the path of submission." Is it not a peculiar fact that our submission has ceased only in one direction? England has violated international law and our treaty rights a thousand times during the last three years, and we have submitted as though we were her dependent colonies. They have opened our mail and we have submitted. They established a black list against our citizens—your manufacturers and mine—telling them that they could not ship their own goods out of an American port. In many instances they deliberately blacklist in order that they may steal American business, and in other instances permits have been withheld by the British foreign office at London until the business might be stolen by British concerns. Did we submit? Certainly we did.

Mr. Chairman, Japan has violated her sacred treaties with us as though they were "scraps of paper," just as Germany did with the other powers. Did we submit? Certainly we did. After the House had passed the last immigration bill and its phraseology did not suit the Japanese foreign office, did we change it when the Japanese Embassy had sent word to that effect to our Secretary of State? I should say we did! When the Japanese foreign office told us that certain State laws objectionable to them were being enacted, did we tell them that was our business? No; we apologized and promised to be good.

Mr. Chairman, have we submitted to Mexico? Our men, women, and children have been murdered and butchered with the sanction of the de facto government of Mexico and our soldiers deliberately shot down by Mexican troops, shot down willfully. Did we submit? Certainly we did, by writing a letter to Gen. Carranza and asking him if his men really meant to kill ours. That is exactly what we did in the Carrizal affair, after our soldiers were shot down by American machine guns in the hands of the Carranza troops.

The present administration has so successfully convinced our people that it stands for peace that I was sure it would show some sincere disposition to avoid actual military conflict with Germany, but in this declaration my last hopes are shattered.

The President said in his message on Monday that we had seen the last of neutrality. When did our neutrality begin? Will anyone in the House seriously say that we have been neutral? It may be all right to go home and "bunk" your constituents about it, but it is not the truth. When we send out an American ship flying an American flag, armed with American guns to be manipulated by American gun pointers and say to the captain of that ship, "Take this foodstuff, this peaceful commerce, noncontraband, into England, and sink the ship of any belligerent who attempts to stop you," we are favoring, are we not?

If we desired to be strictly neutral why not adopt the same policy toward Austria and Germany? Your farmers want to sell their cereals or their grains, do they not?

Mr. Chairman, what do you suppose England would do with one of our ships if we insisted upon taking foodstuffs and other peaceful commerce into Germany? She would sink the ship, would she not? But, my dear friends, we are not even permitted to negotiate peaceful commerce with neutral countries without British consent, and still "we claim to have been neutral." It is because of these facts that I had hoped we might keep out of that terrible slaughter even though we did have to "submit" to violations of international law and our rights a little longer. We ourselves are largely responsible for being drawn into this war. Our lack of firmness and failure to deal with England, Italy, France, and Japan just as we would deal with Austria and Germany has brought about the condition of to-day. We have failed to deal with a firm hand with all of the belligerents alike, and I maintain that even a man like Roosevelt, with all his military valor and desire, would have kept us out of this declaration of war, because he would have treated alike all of the belligerents and made them respect that flag [pointing], which they have not done up to the present time. [Applause.]

The President refers to "a partnership of democratic nations—a league of honor." Russia has just been born to this league after many decades of the most severe and inhuman autocracy in all the world. Italy and Japan are taken into this list of democratic nations with open arms. How wonderful! And just at a time when Japan was hoping that she might take our Philippine Islands, Guam, and the Hawaiian Islands. I was over there a couple of years ago and know whereof I speak. Their plans also include the taking of the island of Java, which will come under Japanese rule at the very first opportunity.

I voted for the armed neutrality bill recently recommended by the President, because I felt that this step would keep us out of something more terrible. Is it not remarkable that just 28 days after the President has referred to that "little group of willful men" in the Senate he comes to us and says that armed neutrality has been a failure? That "little group of willful men" have been cartooned and criticized all over the United States for carrying on a filibuster against a bill which in 28 days is declared a failure, impracticable, by its maker, the President.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. I should like very much to yield to my good friend from Georgia, but my time is limited.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I can not agree with my colleague from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. I believe that the issue here to-day is the defense of the rights of American citizens upon the high seas and the defense of the American flag. [Applause.] I have great sympathy for the German people. A great many born in that country live in the city from which I come. They love the land of their nativity, and it is natural and human that they should; but I want to say to you that when the time comes the German born will stand as loyally by that flag [pointing to the American flag] as the native born. [Applause.] The issue is that of American rights upon the high seas, and every true and loyal American citizen believes in the maintenance of those rights. We have no right to exist as a nation unless we maintain and defend our citizens.

The resolution which is before us declares, in the first place, that a state of war exists between Germany and the United States by reason of her repeated acts of war against us; secondly, it authorizes and directs the President to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of this Government to carry on war against the Imperial German Government; and, thirdly, it pledges all the resources of the country to a successful termination of the conflict.

Returning briefly to the first proposition, that a state of war exists. There can be no doubt as to this. Read the long and sad list of violations of the rules of international warfare, whereby more than 200 American citizens—men, women, and children—all noncombatants, have lost their lives. All these have happened against our repeated protests. Germany has promised again and again to conduct her submarine warfare in accordance with international practice, but these promises were made only to be broken; and only recently she boldly announced that she would pursue that warfare without regard to the safety of human life on a large zone of the high seas against neutrals as well as belligerents; and as a result American ships have been sunk, with a loss of American lives.

The question is, How much longer are we to endure this slaughter? We have borne and foreborne with Germany to the very limit of our patience. The President has been bitterly criticized for his great forbearance. The American people have shown every desire to remain at peace with her. She has nothing that we want, only the recognition of our just rights. Recently she has been shooting her torpedoes into our ships, whether they were coming or going, in ballast or with cargo, in the proscribed zone or without, violating the laws of neutrality; and these acts of hers have been so flagrant as to indicate a definite purpose on her part to force the United States into this war. If, as the imperial chancellor said in the Reichstag the other day, Germany does not desire war with the United States, then why in the name of reason has she continued her acts of hostility against us? We have sought no war against her. The American people desire to be at peace with all nations.

The time has come when we can no longer submit to her inhumanities. The time has come when we must defend by force of arms the rights of our citizens on the sea. The time has come when this Nation must rise and vindicate her right to exist as a government in the performance of her first duty of protecting her citizens. [Applause.]

This resolution directs the President to employ our land and naval forces and all the resources of Government, and pledges them to a successful termination of the war. This relates to preparedness. We have a splendid Navy, not as large as we now wish, but it was fortunate indeed that we had the wisdom and foresight to build it.

We must increase our Army, which is only half what it ought to be in time of peace.

The duty of the hour is to get ready. This is a lesson the United States has never learned.

All our past wars are a striking proof of this. Not one of them but could have been won with one-tenth of the cost and one-hundredth part of the sacrifice if we had been in the beginning in any measure prepared. The only exception, and that a partial exception, was the Spanish-American War. Preparation for war, or against war, whichever it may be called, ought to be made in time of peace. The development of science has contributed so much to the complexities of war that no nation can make ready after the beginning of war without delays, which must add enormously to the loss in life and property.

The last Congress appropriated hundreds of millions of dollars for the Army and the Navy, and yet during the last year we increased the enlisted forces of the Army by only a few thousand men and the enlisted force of the Navy is 25,000 men short of the number needed to man our present ships. The vital need now is men, trained men. All the expenditure of lung power during the last year has brought little in actual results. On paper we have a large Army and a large Navy, but a year or two will be required to organize a real Army and twice as long to build and equip the ships authorized a year ago.

The surest and the most democratic way to preparedness is by compulsory military training and service, and if every young man of sound health is required to learn the lessons which the Army can teach—how to handle one's self and how to work with others in a common cause, lessons of self-control, reliance, health, discipline, organization, administration, military tactics—the greatest step will have been taken. Then the world will pay us the respect which it sometimes withholds from idealism but always accords to strength. Compulsory military training is a melting pot which will not merely mold us a weapon of national defense but will break down distinctions of race and class and mold us into a new Nation and bring forth the new American. [Applause.]

Another and scarcely less important phase of preparedness is industrial preparedness. We must organize our whole industrial life to serve the Nation against this hour of its need.

Democracy is on trial, and the principles of free government—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Can democracy meet the test? I believe she can, but only as she arouses herself from her lethargy.

This is a solemn and momentous occasion—when this great Nation, with the greatest reluctance and the deepest regret is about to enter this horrible and unnecessary war, which has now engaged nearly half the world.

Let it therefore be understood at the beginning that we are forced into it by repeated acts of inhumanity and the violation of our most sacred rights; that we enter it in defense of principles heretofore recognized by all civilized nations and the just rights of all mankind; that we enter it to uphold the principles of international law and order; that we enter it for our own peace and security.

We enter this war in no spirit of selfishness or ambition whatever, but with a true and devoted interest in the cause of freedom everywhere. As once our Nation drew its sword in defense of rights of man on the island of Cuba and won its independence and asked nothing in return, so now she raises her arm in defense of the freedom of the seas and human liberty which under the providence of Almighty God is enlightening the world. [Applause.]

[House of Representatives, Report No. 1, 65th Cong., 1st sess.]

WAR WITH THE IMPERIAL GERMAN GOVERNMENT.

Mr. FLOOD, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 24) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial German Government and the Government and people of the United States, and making provision to prosecute the same, having had the same under consideration, reports it back with amendment, and recommends that the resolution, as amended, do pass.

Page 1, strike out all after the title and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Whereas the Imperial German Government has committed repeated acts of war against the Government and people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of this Government to carry on war against the Imperial German Government; and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States."

It is with the deepest sense of responsibility of the momentous results which will follow the passage of this resolution that your committee reports it to the House, with the recommendation that it be passed.

The conduct of the Imperial German Government toward this Government, its citizens, and its interests has been so discourteous, unjust, cruel, barbarous, and so lacking in honesty and fair dealing that it has constituted a violation of the course of conduct which should obtain between friendly nations.

In addition to this, the German Government is actually making war upon the people and the commerce of this country, and leaves no course open to this Government but to accept its gage of battle, declare that a state of war exists, and wage that war vigorously.

On the 31st day of January, 1917, notice was given by the Imperial German Government to this Government that after the following day—

"Germany will meet the illegal measures of her enemies by forcibly preventing, in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy, and in the eastern Mediterranean, all navigation, that of neutrals included, from and to England and from and to France, etc. All ships met within that zone will be sunk."

Since that day seven American ships flying the American flag have been sunk and between 25 and 30 American lives have been lost as a result of the prosecution of the submarine warfare in accordance with the above declaration. This is war. War waged by the Imperial German Government upon this country and its people.

A brief review of some of the hostile and illegal acts of the German Government toward this Government and its officers and its people is herewith given.

GERMANY'S CONDUCT OF SUBMARINE WARFARE.

In the memorial of the Imperial German Government accompanying its proclamation of February 4, 1915, in regard to submarine warfare, that Government declared—

"* * * the German Navy has received instructions to abstain from all violence against neutral vessels recognizable as such."

In the note of the German Government dated February 16, 1915, in reply to the American note of February 10, it was declared that—

"It is very far indeed from the intention of the German Government * * * ever to destroy neutral lives and neutral property. * * * The commanders of German submarines have been instructed, as was already stated in the note of the 4th instant, to abstain from violence to American merchant ships when they are recognizable as such."

Nevertheless, the German Government proceeded to carry out its plans of submarine warfare and torpedoed the British passenger steamer *Falaba* on March 27, 1915, when one American life was lost, attacked the American steamer *Cushing* April 28 by airship, and made submarine attacks upon the American tank steamer *Gulflight* May 1, the British passenger steamer *Lusitania* May 7, when 114 American lives were lost, and the American steamer *Nebraskan* on May 25, in all of which over 125 citizens of the United States lost their lives, not to mention hundreds of noncombatants who were lost and hundreds of Americans and noncombatants whose lives were put in jeopardy.

The British mule boat *Armenian* was torpedoed on June 28, as a result of which 20 Americans are reported missing.

On July 8, 1915, in a note to Ambassador Gerard, arguing in defense of its method of warfare and particularly of its submarine commander in the *Lusitania* case, it is stated:

"The Imperial Government therefore repeats the assurances that American ships will not be hindered in the prosecution of legitimate shipping and the lives of American citizens on neutral vessels shall not be placed in jeopardy.

"In order to exclude any unforeseen dangers to American passenger steamers, * * * the German submarines will be instructed to permit the free and safe passage of such passenger steamers when made recognizable by special markings and notified a reasonable time in advance."

Subsequently the following vessels carrying American citizens were attacked by submarines:

British liner *Orduna* July 9.
Russian steamer *Leo* July 9.
American steamer *Leelanaw* July 25.
British passenger liner *Arabic* August 19.
British mule ship *Nicosian* August 19.
British steamer *Hesperian* September 4.

In these attacks 23 Americans lost their lives, not to mention the large number whose lives were placed in jeopardy.

Following these events, conspicuous by their wantonness and violation of every rule of humanity and maritime warfare, the German ambassador, by instructions from his Government, on September 1 gave the following assurances to the Government of the United States:

"Liners will not be sunk by our submarines without warning and without safety of the lives of noncombatants, provided that the liners do not try to escape or offer resistance."

On September 9, in a reply as to the submarine attack on the *Orduna*, the German Government renewed these assurances in the following language:

"The first attack on the *Orduna* by a torpedo was not in accordance with the existing instructions, which provide that large passenger steamers are to be torpedoed only after previous warning and after the rescuing of passengers and crew. The failure to observe the instructions was based on an error which is at any rate comprehensible and the repetition of which appears to be out of the question, in view of the more explicit instructions issued in the meantime. Moreover, the commanders of the submarines have been reminded that it is their duty to exercise greater care and to observe carefully the orders issued."

The German Government could not more clearly have stated that liners or large passenger steamers would not be torpedoed except upon previous warning, and after the passengers and crew had been put in places of safety.

On November 29, the German Government states, in connection with the case of the American vessel *William P. Frye:*

* * * "the German naval forces will sink only such American vessels as are loaded with absolute contraband, when the preconditions provided by the declaration of London are present. In this the German Government quite shares the view of the American Government that all possible care must be taken for the security of the crew and passengers of a vessel to be sunk. Consequently the persons found on board of a vessel may not be ordered into her lifeboats except when the general conditions—that is to say, the weather, the condition of the sea, and the neighborhood of the coasts—afford absolute certainty that the boats will reach the nearest port."

Following this accumulative series of assurances, however, there seems to have been no abatement in the rigor of submarine warfare, for attacks were made in the Mediterranean upon the American steamer *Communipaw* on December 3, the American steamer *Petrolite* December 5, the Japanese liner *Yasaka Maru* December 21, and the passenger liner *Persia* December 30. In the sinking of the *Persia* out of a total of some 500 passengers and crew only 165 were saved. Among those lost was an American consul traveling to his post.

On January 7, eight days after the sinking of the *Persia*, the German Government notified the Government of the United States through its ambassador in Washington as follows:

"1. German submarines in the Mediterranean had, from the beginning, orders to conduct cruiser warfare against enemy merchant vessels only in accordance with the general principles of international law, and in particular measures of reprisal, as applied in the war zone around the British Isles, were to be excluded.

"2. German submarines are therefore permitted to destroy enemy merchant vessels in the Mediterranean—i. e., passenger as well as freight ships as far as they do not try to escape or offer resistance—only after passengers and crews have been accorded safety."

Clearly the assurances of the German Government that neutral and enemy merchant vessels, passenger as well as freight ships, should not be destroyed except upon the passengers and crew being accorded safety stood as the official position of the Imperial German Government.

On February 16, 1916, the German ambassador communicated to the Department of State an expression of regret for the loss of American lives on the *Lusitania*, and proposed to pay a suitable indemnity. In the course of this note he said:

"Germany has * * * limited her submarine warfare because of her long-standing friendship with the United States and because by the sinking of the *Lusitania*, which caused the death of citizens of the United States, the German retaliation affected neutrals, which was not the intention, as retaliation should be confined to enemy subjects."

On March 1, 1916, the unarmed French passenger steamer *Patria*, carrying a number of American citizens, was attacked without warning. On March 9 the Norwegian bark *Silius*, riding at anchor in Havre Rhodes, was torpedoed by an unseen submarine, and one of the seven Americans on board was injured. On March 16 the Dutch passenger steamer *Tubantia* was sunk in the North Sea by a torpedo. On March 16 the British steamer *Berwindale* was torpedoed without warning off Bantry Island with four Americans on board. On March 24 the British unarmed steamer *Englishman* was, after a chase, torpedoed and sunk by the submarine *U–19*, as a result of which one American on board perished. On March 24 the unarmed French cross-channel steamer *Sussex* was torpedoed without warning, several of the 24 American passengers being injured. On March 27 the unarmed British liner *Manchester Engineer* was sunk by an explosion without prior warning, with Americans on board, and on March 28 the British steamer *Eagle Point*, carrying a Hotchkiss gun, which she did not use, was chased, overtaken, and sunk by a torpedo after the persons on board had taken to the boats.

The American note of February 10, 1915, stated that should German vessels of war "destroy on the high seas an American vessel or the lives of American citizens it would be difficult for the Government of the United States to view the act in any other light than an indefensible violation of neutral rights which it would be very hard, indeed, to reconcile with the friendly relations so happily subsisting between the two Governments," and that if such a deplorable situation should arise, "the Government of the United States would be constrained to hold the Imperial Government to a strict accountability for such acts of their naval authorities."

In the American note of May 13, 1915, the Government stated:

"The Imperial Government will not expect the Government of the United States to omit any word or act necessary to the performance of its sacred duty of maintaining the rights of the United States and its citizens and in safeguarding their free exercise and enjoyment."

In the note of July 21, 1915, the United States Government said that—

"Repetition by the commanders of German naval vessels and acts in contravention of those rights must be regarded by the Government of the United States, when they affect American citizens, as deliberately unfriendly."

In a communication of April 18, 1916, the American Government said:

"If it is still the purpose of the Imperial Government to prosecute relentless and indiscriminate warfare against vessels of commerce by the use of submarines without regard to what the Government of the United States must consider the sacred and indisputable rules of international law and the universally recognized dictates of humanity, the Government of the United States is at last forced to the conclusion that there is but one course it can pursue. Unless the Imperial Government should not immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels the Government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire altogether."

The German Government replied to this communication on May 4, 1916, giving definite assurances that new orders had been issued to the German naval forces "in accordance with the general principles of visit and search and the destruction of merchant vessels recognized by international law." And this agreement was substantially complied with for many months, but finally, on January 31, 1917, notice was given that after the following day—

"Germany will meet the illegal measures of her enemies by forcibly preventing in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy, and in the eastern Mediterranean all navigation, that of neutrals included, from and to England and from and to France, etc. All ships met within that zone will be sunk."

In view of this Government's warning of April 18, 1916, and the Imperial German Government's pledge of May 4 of the same year, the Government of the United States, on February 3, 1917, stated to the Imperial German Government that—

"In view of this declaration, which withdraws suddenly and without prior intimation the solemn assurance given in the Imperial Government's note of May 4, 1916, this Government has no alternative consistent with the dignity and honor of the United States but to take the course which it explicitly announced in its note of April 18, 1916, it would take in the event that the Imperial Government did not declare and effect an abandonment of the methods of submarine warfare then employed and to which the Imperial Government now purpose again to resort.

"The President has, therefore, directed me to announce to your excellency that all diplomatic relations between the United States and the German Empire are severed, and that the American ambassador at Berlin will be immediately withdrawn, and, in accordance with such announcement, to deliver to your excellency your passports."

On February 3 one American ship was sunk, and since that date six American ships flying the American flag have been torpedoed, with a loss of about 13 American citizens. In addition, 50 or more foreign vessels of both belligerent and neutral nationality with Americans on board have been torpedoed, in most cases without warning, with a consequent loss of several American citizens.

IMPROPER ACTIVITIES OF GERMAN OFFICIALS IN THE UNITED STATES.

Since the beginning of the war German officials in the United States have engaged in many improper activities in violation of the laws of the United States and of their obligations as officials in a neutral country. Count von Bernstorff, the German ambassador, Capt. von Papen, military attaché of the embassy, Capt. Boy-Ed, naval attaché, as well as various consular officers and other officials, were involved in these activities, which were very widespread.

The following instances are chosen at random from the cases which have come to the knowledge of the Government:

I. By direct instructions received from the foreign office in Berlin the German Embassy in this country furnished funds and issued orders to the Indian Independence committee of the Indian Nationalist Party in the United States. These instructions were usually conveyed to the committee by the military information bureau in New York (Von Igel) or by the German consulates in New York and San Francisco.

Dr. Chakrabarty, recently arrested in New York City, received, all in all, according to his own admission, some $60,000 from Von Igel. He claims that the greater portion of this money was used for defraying the expenses of the Indian revolutionary propaganda in this country and, as he says, for educational purposes. While this is in itself

true, it is not all that was done by the revolutionists. They have sent representatives to the Far East to stir up trouble in India, and they have attempted to ship arms and ammunition to India. These expeditions have failed. The German Embassy also employed Ernest T. Euphrat to carry instructions and information between Berlin and Washington under an American passport.

II. Officers of interned German warships have violated their word of honor and escaped. In one instance the German consul at Richmond furnished the money to purchase a boat to enable six warrant officers of the steamer *Kronprinz Wilhelm* to escape after breaking their parole.

III. Under the supervision of Capt. von Papen and Wolf von Igel, Hans von Wedell and, subsequently, Carl Ruroede maintained a regular office for the procurement of fraudulent passports for German reservists. These operations were directed and financed in part by Capt. von Papen and Wolf von Igel. Indictments were returned, Carl Ruroede sentenced to the penitentiary, and a number of German officers fined. Von Wedell escaped and has apparently been drowned at sea. Von Wedell's operations were also known to high officials in Germany. When Von Wedell became suspicious that forgeries committed by him on a passport application had become known, he conferred with Capt. von Papen and obtained money from him wherewith to make his escape.

IV. James J. F. Archibald, under cover of an American passport and in the pay of the German Government through Ambassador Bernstorff, carried dispatches for Ambassador Dumba and otherwise engaged in unneutral activities.

V. Albert Sanders, Charles Wunnonberg, and others, German agents in this country, were engaged, among other activities, in sending spies to England, equipped with American passports, for the purpose of securing military information. Several such men have been sent. Sanders and Wunnonberg have plead guilty to indictments brought against them in New York City, as has George Voux Bacon, one of the men sent abroad by them.

VI. American passports have been counterfeited and counterfeits found on German agents. Baron von Cupenberg, a German agent, when arrested abroad, bore a counterfeit of an American passport issued to Gustav C. Roeder; Irving Guy Ries received an American passport, went to Germany, where the police retained his passports for 24 hours. Later a German spy named Carl Paul Julius Hensel was arrested in London with a counterfeit of the Ries passport in his possession.

VII. Prominent officials of the Hamburg-American Line, who, under the direction of Capt. Boy-Ed, endeavored to provide German warships at sea with coal and other supplies in violation of the statutes of the United States, have been tried and convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary. Some 12 or more vessels were involved in this plan.

VIII. Under the direction of Capt. Boy-Ed and the German consulate at San Francisco, and in violation of our law, the steamships *Sacramento* and *Mazatlan* carried supplies from San Francisco to German war vessels. The *Olsen and Mahoney*, which was engaged in a similar enterprise, was detained. The money for these ventures was furnished by Capt. Boy-Ed. Indictments have been returned in connection with these matters against a large number of persons.

IX. Werner Horn, a lieutenant in the German reserve, was furnished funds by Capt. Franz von Papen and sent, with dynamite, under orders to blow up the International Bridge at Vanceboro, Me. He was partially successful. He is now under indictment for the unlawful transportation of dynamite on passenger trains and is in jail awaiting trial following the dismissal of his appeal by the Supreme Court.

X. Capt. von Papen furnished funds to Albert Kaltschmidt, of Detroit, who is involved in a plot to blow up a factory at Walkerville, Canada, and the armory at Windsor, Canada.

XI. Robert Fay, Walter Scholtz, and Paul Daeche have been convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary and three others are under indictment for conspiracy to prepare bombs and attach them to allied ships leaving New York Harbor. Fay, who was the principal in this scheme, was a German soldier. He testified that he received finances from a German secret agent in Brussels, and told Von Papen of his plans, who advised him that his device was not practicable, but that he should go ahead with it, and if he could make it work he would consider it.

XII. Under the direction of Capt. von Papen and Wolf von Igel, Dr. Walter T. Scheele, Capt. von Kleist, Capt. Wolpert, of the Atlas Steamship Co., and Capt. Rode, of the Hamburg-American Line, manufactured incendiary bombs and placed them on board allied vessels. The shells in which the chemicals were placed were made on board the steamship *Frederick der Grosse*. Scheele was furnished $1,000 by Von Igel wherewith to become a fugitive from justice.

XIII. Capt. Franz Rintelen, a reserve officer in the German Navy, came to this country secretly for the purpose of preventing the exportation of munitions of war to the allies and of getting to Germany needed supplies. He organized and financed Labor's National Peace Council in an effort to bring about an embargo on the shipment of munitions of war, tried to bring about strikes, etc.

XIV. Consul General Bopp, at San Francisco, Vice Consul General von Schaick, Baron George Wilhelm von Brincken (an employee of the consulate), Charles C. Crowley, and Mrs. Margaret W. Cornell (secret agents of the German consulate at San Francisco) have been convicted of conspiracy to send agents into Canada to blow up railroad tunnels and bridges, and to wreck vessels sailing from Pacific coast ports with war material for Russia and Japan.

XV. Paul Koenig, head of the secret-service work of the Hamburg-American Line, by direction of his superior officers, largely augmented his organization and under the direction of Von Papen, Boy-Ed, and Albert carried on secret work for the German Government. He secured and sent spies to Canada to gather information concerning the Welland Canal, the movements of Canadian troops to England, bribed an employee of a bank for information concerning shipments to the allies, sent spies to Europe on American passports to secure military information, and was involved with Capt. von Papen in plans to place bombs on ships of the allies leaving New York Harbor, etc. Von Papen, Boy-Ed, and Albert had frequent conferences with Koenig in his office, at theirs, and at outside places. Koenig and certain of his associates are under indictment.

XVI. Capt. von Papen, Capt. Hans Tauscher, Wolf von Igel, and a number of German reservists organized an expedition to go into Canada, destroy the Welland Canal, and endeavor to terrorize Canadians in order to delay the sending of troops from Canada to Europe. Indictments have been returned against these persons. Wolf von Igel furnished Fritzen, one of the conspirators in this case, money on which to flee from New York City. Fritzen is now in jail in New York City.

XVII. With money furnished by official German representatives in this country, a cargo of arms and ammunition was purchased and shipped on board the schooner *Annie Larsen*. Through the activities of German official representatives in this country and other Germans a number of Indians were procured to form an expedition to go on the steamship *Maverick*, meet the *Annie Larsen*, take over her cargo, and endeavor to bring about a revolution in India. This plan involved the sending of a German officer to drill Indian recruits and the entire plan was managed and directed by Capt. von Papen, Capt. Hanz Tauscher, and other official German representatives in this country.

XVIII. Gustav Stahl, a German reservist, made an affidavit which he admitted was false, regarding the armament of the *Lusitania*, which affidavit was forwarded to the State Department by Ambassador Bernstorff. He plead guilty to an indictment charging perjury, and was sentenced to the penitentiary. Koenig, herein mentioned, was active in securing this affidavit.

XIX. The German Embassy organized, directed, and financed the Hans Libeau Employment Agency, through which extended efforts were made to induce employees of manufacturers engaged in supplying various kinds of material to the allies to give up their positions in an effort to interfere with the output of such manufacturers. Von Papen indorsed this organization as a military measure, and it was hoped through its propaganda to cripple munition factories.

XX. The German Government has assisted financially a number of newspapers in this country in return for pro-German propaganda.

XXI. Many facts have been secured indicating that Germans have aided and encouraged financially and otherwise the activities of one or the other factions in Mexico, the purpose being to keep the United States occupied along its borders and to prevent the exportation of munitions of war to the allies; see, in this connection, the activities of Rintelen, Stallforth, Kopf, the German consul at Chihuahua, Krum-Hellen, Felix Somerfeld (Villa's representative at New York), Carl Heynen, Gustav Steinberg, and many others.

ATTACKS ON SHIPS OF THE COMMISSION FOR RELIEF IN BELGIUM IN VIOLATION OF GERMAN UNDERTAKINGS.

When the Commission for Relief in Belgium began its work in October, 1914, it received from the German authorities, through the various Governments concerned, definite written assurances that ships engaged in carrying cargoes for the relief of the civil population of Belgium and northern France should be immune from attack. In order that there may be no room for attacks upon these ships through misunderstanding, each ship is given a safe-conduct by the German diplomatic representative in the country from which it sails, and, in addition, bears conspicuously upon its sides markings which have been agreed upon with the German authorities; furthermore, similar markings are painted upon the decks of the ships in order that they may be readily recognizable by aeroplanes.

Upon the rupture of relations with Germany the commission was definitely assured by the German Government that its ships would be immune from attack by following certain prescribed courses and conforming to the arrangements previously made.

Despite these solemn assurances there have been several unwarranted attacks upon ships under charter to the commission.

On March 7 or 8 the Norwegian ship *Storstad*, carrying 10,000 tons of corn from Buenos Aires to Rotterdam for the commission was sunk in broad daylight by a German submarine despite the conspicuous markings of the commission which the submarine could not help observing. The *Storstad* was repeatedly shelled without warning and finally torpedoed.

On March 19 the steamships *Tunisie* and *Haelen*, under charter to the commission, proceeded to the United States under safe-conduct and guaranties from the German minister at The Hague and bearing conspicuous marking of the commission, were attacked without warning by a German submarine outside the danger zone (56° 15′ north, 5° 32′ east). The ships were not sunk, but on the *Haelen* seven men were killed, including the first and third officers; a port boat was sunk; a hole was made in the port bunker above the water line; and the ships sustained sundry damages to decks and engines.

INDIGNITIES TO AMERICAN OFFICIALS.

Various consular officers have suffered indignities and humiliation at the hands of German frontier authorities. The following are illustrations:

Mr. Pike, consul at St. Gaul, Switzerland, on proceeding to his post with a passport duly indorsed by German officials in New York and Copenhagen, was on November 26, 1916, subjected to great indignities at Warnemunde on the German frontier. Mr. Pike refused to submit to search of his person, the removal of his clothing, or the seizure of his official reports and papers of a private and confidential nature. He was therefore obliged to return to Copenhagen.

Mr. Murphy, the consul general at Sofia, and his wife, provided with passports from the German legations at The Hague and Copenhagen, were on two occasions stripped and searched and subjected to great humiliation at the same frontier station. No consideration was given them because of their official position.

Such has been the behavior on the part of German officials notwithstanding that consular officials hold positions of dignity and responsibility under their Government and that during the present war Germany has been placed under deep obligation to American consular officers by their efforts in the protection of German interests.

INHUMAN TREATMENT ACCORDED "YARROWDALE" PRISONERS BY GERMAN AUTHORITIES.

On January 19 Mr. Gerard telegraphed that the evening papers contained a report that the English steamer *Yarrowdale* had been brought to Swinemunde as prize with 469 prisoners on board taken from ships captured by German auxiliary cruisers; that among these prisoners were 103 neutrals; and that such of these as had been taken on board enemy ships and had accepted pay on such ships would be held as prisoners of war.

After repeated inquiries Mr. Gerard learned that there were among the *Yarrowdale* prisoners 72 men claiming American citizenship.

On February 4 Mr. Gerard was informed by Count Montgelas of the foreign office that the Americans taken on the *Yarrowdale* would be released immediately on the ground that they could not have known at the time of sailing that it was Germany's intention to treat armed merchantmen as ships of war.

Despite this assurance the prisoners were not released, but some time prior to February 17 the German minister for foreign affairs told the Spanish ambassador that the American prisoners from the *Yarrowdale* would be liberated "in a very short time."

Upon receipt of this information a formal demand was made through the Spanish ambassador at Berlin for the immediate release of these men. The message sent the Spanish ambassador was as follows:

"If *Yarrowdale* prisoners have not been released, please make formal demand in the name of the United States for their immediate release. If they are not promptly released and allowed to cross the frontier without further delay, please state to the foreign minister that this policy of the Imperial Government, if continued, apparently without the slightest justification, will oblige the Government of the United States to consider what measures it may be necessary to take in order to obtain satisfaction for the continued detention of these innocent American citizens."

On February 25 the American ambassador at Madrid was informed by the Spanish foreign office that the *Yarrowdale* prisoners had been released on the 16th instant.

The foregoing statement appears to have been based on erroneous information, for no further report on the subject has been received.

The men finally reached Zurich, Switzerland, on the afternoon of March 11.

Official reports now in the possession of the Department of State indicate that these American sailors were from the moment of their arrival in Germany, on January 3, subjected to the most cruel and heartless treatment. Although the weather was very cold they were given no suitable clothes, and many of them stood about for hours barefoot in the snow. The food supplied them was utterly inadequate. After one cup of coffee in the morning almost the only article of food given them was boiled frosted cabbage, with mush once a week and beans once a week. One member of the crew states that he was severely kicked in the abdomen by a German officer without provocation. He appears still to be suffering severely from this assault. Another sailor is still suffering from a wound caused by shrapnel fired by the Germans at an open boat in which he and his companions had taken refuge after the sinking of the *Georgic*.

All of the men stated that their treatment had been so inhuman that should a submarine be sighted in the course of their voyage home they would prefer to be drowned rather than have any further experience in German prison camps.

It is significant that the inhuman treatment accorded these American sailors occurred a month before the break in relations and while Germany was on every occasion professing the most cordial friendship for the United States.

INTERFERENCE WITH THE COMMUNICATIONS OF THE EMBASSY AT BERLIN.

After the suspension of diplomatic relations the German authorities cut off the telephone at the embassy at Berlin and suppressed Mr. Gerard's communication by telegraph and post. Mr. Gerard was not even permitted to send to American consular officers in Germany the instructions he had received for them from the Department of State. Neither was he allowed to receive his mail. Just before he left Berlin the telephonic communication at the embassy was restored and some telegrams and letters were delivered. No apologies were offered, however.

GERMAN INTRIGUES TO INVOLVE THE UNITED STATES IN WAR WITH MEXICO AND JAPAN.

The Government of the United States is in possession of instructions addressed by the German minister for foreign affairs to the German minister to Mexico concerning a proposed alliance of Germany, Japan, and Mexico to make war on the United States. The text of this document is as follows:

BERLIN, *January 19, 1917.*

On the 1st of February we intend to begin submarine warfare unrestricted. In spite of this it is our intention to endeavor to keep neutral the United States of America.

If this attempt is not successful, we propose an alliance on the following basis with Mexico: That we shall make war together and together make peace. We shall give general financial support, and it is understood that Mexico is to reconquer the lost territory in New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona. The details are left to you for settlement.

You are instructed to inform the President of Mexico of the above in the greatest confidence as soon as it is certain there will be an outbreak of war with the United States, and suggest that the President of Mexico on his own initiative should communicate with Japan suggesting adherence at once to this plan; at the same time offer to mediate between Germany and Japan.

Please call to the attention of the President of Mexico that the employment of ruthless submarine warfare now promises to compel England to make peace in a few months.

(Signed) ZIMMERMANN.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I desire to say in justice to the Chairman that he has recognized me in advance of other gentlemen whom he had promised to recognize to enable me to make a brief statement which I desire to make before leaving the city, which I must do within the next few minutes. I am for the resolution and have expected to vote for it, but I have received a telegram calling me to the bedside of my wife, who is dangerously ill. I had hoped that the resolution might come to a vote earlier this evening, in time for me to vote for it and leave the city at 11 o'clock. I see, however, that that is impossible, and since realizing that impossibility I have conferred with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD], who is in charge of the resolution; also with Mr. Speaker CLARK; and they are both of the opinion that the resolution will pass by an overwhelming majority, and both advise that I leave upon the earliest train and go to the bedside of my wife. I am advised that it will be necessary for her to undergo a severe operation, to which she is unwilling to submit without my being present. I have wired my son to make arrangements for the operation to-morrow afternoon, and I must leave on the next train, which leaves at 11 o'clock, to reach her bedside by that time. But I want the House, my district, and the country to understand my absence and why I absent myself from the city at this time, and also to understand that I indorse the course the President has taken and expect to support him in the prosecution of the war into which we have been forced.

In saying that I am for the resolution I do not underestimate the responsibilities that it places upon us. Neither do I underestimate the cost that the adoption of it may mean to this country. On the other hand, I do not underestimate what its defeat would mean to this country. In fact, its defeat might ultimately lead to the overthrow of the Government. Therefore in the face of the situation with which we are now confronted there is no use in reciting the horrors of war or shuddering at its cost. We must meet the unsought and unpleasant responsibility with all of its horrors. Those of you who lived through the days of the sixties are familiar with them from personal observation, and those who came after the war are familiar with them through history. It is therefore unnecessary to refer to the sorrow and the horror and the expense that this day's work may bring upon the people of the United States; but, my friends, this Government was established through effort, sacrifice, and expenditure of that kind. Our fathers sacrificed their treasures and died to give us the freedom that we enjoy, and I feel that we are willing, if need be, to die to maintain the liberties that they purchased for us with their blood. I realize what this war may mean to us, both collectively and individually. I realize what it may mean to me. I have three sons old enough for service on the battle field, and the thought of their being sent forth tries not only my nerve and my courage but my soul as well; but yet I can not let my personal feelings come between me and my duty to my country, whose rights have been invaded and whose liberties are involved and may be destroyed if we do not act and act now. Therefore I am for the resolution, and if I were present at the time it is voted on would vote for it, and I will return at the earliest date possible to assist in the enactment of such legislation as may be necessary to the prosecution of the war into which we are about to enter. [Applause.]

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the hour would never come when I would be called upon to vote upon a declaration of war against any nation. Since it became apparent that the question would come before me for my decision, I have earnestly endeavored to decide in my own mind what my duty was in the premises. There never has been a time since the sinking of the *Lusitania* when we would not have been justified in going to war with Germany. The President in his message delivered to us on Monday night brought against the German Government the most sweeping indictment that has ever been brought against a government since the dawn of civilization. Every count in the indictment is true and furnishes abundant justification for war.

But I am here as the Representative of my district, and upon such a vital matter as this I feel that I must reflect as nearly as I can the wishes of a majority of its people. Not the sentiments of the press, but the sentiments of the men, women, and children who must suffer and bear the burden of the conflict. The people of my district are loyal citizens and in the hour of trial they will fulfill every obligation. The sentiment of my district, as I understand it, is against participation in this European war. This sentiment is not unanimous, but a goodly majority, as I believe. I hope I do not misunderstand or misrepresent their sentiments. And this, further, I do know, that at this time they are overwhelmingly opposed to sending the men of this Nation to Europe to fight; that if they thought that our men were to be conscripted into the Army for foreign service there would be but a few who would sanction or approve this war upon which we are about to enter.

We live in a democracy, where the voice of the people should be heard and should rule. This is not an autocracy, such as the President so eloquently denounces and which we all abhor. The Constitution says that Congress shall declare war. I feel that to ignore the wishes of the people of my district upon such a vital question and to fail to voice their sentiments, as I understand them, would subject me to criticism as just as that which we visit upon the kings, kaisers, and emperors who decreed war without consulting the wishes of their people.

Ever since the President addressed us on Monday night, I have known that Congress would pass a war resolution. I have been much troubled over my vote, because while I am opposed to war, yet I would not want a negative vote upon my part to give any foreign enemy the comfort of a seeming division in our Nation. It would be easy for me to follow the popular sentiment in Congress and support this resolution. I know that such a course would relieve me of the criticism and even abuse that will follow a negative vote. Believing that the majority of the people of my district are against going to war, knowing that they are opposed to sending their sons and fathers and brothers to European battle fields, and positive that they would not sanction, if they could express their views, the conscription

of an army for foreign service under present conditions, I would be false to them and to my conscience, did I not vote against a war resolution.

The resolution will pass, I am sure. When it does, I know there will no longer be any division of sentiment among the people of my district and they will heroically and patriotically make every sacrifice. They will do and dare, suffer and die if need be for the Nation and the flag. They will do all these things at least as nobly and readily as the loudest who now shout for war.

Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything further, but the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] and the amendment he proposed suggest to me that I had better state that I will oppose such an amendment. My opposition to this war ceases with the passage of this resolution. Congress can not manage a war, and as a Representative here, however repugnant measures may be to me and to the people of my district, I shall vote to support every recommendation made by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy to bring the war to a successful conclusion. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, the great crisis, the crucial hour of the United States is at hand. All sane and patriotic men have sincerely wished and prayed that we might remain at peace with the nations now engaged in this the most dreadful conflict of all times. We have done more than wish and more than pray; we have suffered long and patiently. We have endured all too much.

Nearly three years ago blind blood lust struck the blow which set the world aflame. On the day of the first blow by Germany there was not a trace of feeling against her in the United States. The most prevalent sentiment was one of deep admiration for the marvelous perfection of her military establishment. The first war news lauded the efficiency of German mobilization and recounted the wonderful precision of her marching thousands.

At the beginning of this conflict the United States of America was absolutely neutral. We acknowledged to Germany the world's debt in science and the arts. We recognized her achievements and her splendid history. Her customs, many of them, had become our customs and her people had become our people. By every bond of peace, friendship, and common blood we were bound to her as much, if not more, than any other European nation.

Hardly had the shock of the various declarations of war died away before the United States stood aghast at German violation of Belgium. That the German Government could think of its solemn treaty as a "scrap of paper" came as a sharp awakening to the American public. Apologists for Germany may say what they may, military necessity may be cited as excuse, but the fact yet remains that in the violation of Belgium, the burning of her cities, the devastation of her fields, the slaughter of her women—in these things Germany laid the foundation for the present hostility of this Republic.

Germany was still exerting herself to explain away her first colossal blunder when, with monumental stupidity, she deliberately murdered 114 of our citizens on the *Lusitania*. The horror of this multimurder rocked this Nation to its foundation. The sinister warning which preceded the act showed deadly premeditation. It seemed for a time that a break with Germany must come. All the strength and courage of our President was required to avert the impending storm. He upheld our traditions and sought with diplomacy to bring the German Government to see the light of reason.

We watched and waited, hoping reason might prevail, and while we were patiently waiting on the German Government we were at length awakened to the knowledge that Germany was systematically and craftily plotting to destroy our factories, to burn our munition plants, our wharves and ships, to dynamite ships at sea after leaving our ports, to build up a "peace at any price" party in this Republic. We read day by day the long list of her crimes uncovered by our Secret Service. While we sent home the ambassador of Germany's ally, as well as Von Papen, Boy-Ed, and Dernberg, yet we held to relations with Germany and finally received her solemn assurances that she would observe international law on the high seas.

She promised she would sink no merchantmen without warning and would not jeopardize the lives of our citizen passengers on ships stopped by her submarines. How did she keep that promise? She kept it by breaking it in the making; she broke it while her ambassador was in the act of delivering that promise to this Government. She broke it steadily and at deadly intervals thereafter at a cost of some 112 American lives. Her bloody total of Americans who have met their death at the hands of Prussian pirates is now 226. Men, women, and children, every one a noncombatant, many engaged in errands of mercy, all on lawful errands, slaughtered by the skulking coyote of the seas, in no better cause than in maintaining a paper blockade of England and France and in terrorizing neutrals into nonresistance.

Germany at length, emboldened by her many crimes, has grown superior to dissimulation. German belief in German power has fattened on the blood of innocents. She no longer seeks to hide behind her broken promise, but tells us she will sink on sight any ship within a certain zone, save one poor ship per week, and then only under conditions which, to accept, was to surrender each and all our dearly bought liberties.

At the same moment we caught her red-handed in the basest act of international treachery ever committed by a civilized nation. She offers as barter a part of our sovereign territory in exchange for an attack on us by two friendly nations—Mexico and Japan.

Now Germany has dropped her diplomatic mask and stands revealed in all her naked savagery. She will now kill on sight; she has run amuck on the seas; she has now treacherously sought an alliance against our peace. Throughout all this we have remained neutral, and, as a reward for our neutrality, what have we received at the hands of William the Second?

He has set the torch of the incendiary to our factories, our workshops, our ships, and our wharves.

He has laid the bomb of the assassin in our munition plants and in the holds of our ships.

He has sought to corrupt our manhood with a selfish dream of peace when there is no peace.

He has willfully butchered our citizens on the high seas.

He has destroyed our commerce.

He seeks to terrorize us with his devilish policy of frightfulness.

He has violated every canon of international decency and set at naught every solemn treaty and every precept of international law.

He has plunged the world into the maddest orgy of blood, rapine, and murder which history records.

He has intrigued against our peace at home and abroad.

He seeks to destroy our civilization. Patience is no longer a virtue, further endurance is cowardice, submission to Prussian demands is slavery.

Mr. Chairman, we have been slow to anger; but this Republic, sir, has never been prone to rush into war. In our history we have engaged in four foreign wars, including our war for independence. Preceding each war the people of this Republic have suffered and endured foreign aggression, just as we have suffered and endured since August, 1914.

Ten years of wrong, oppression, and the blood of the Boston massacre preceded armed resistance to England and led to the Revolution.

The enslavement of our seamen and the almost total destruction of our commerce were long endured before the War of 1812.

Years of border raids, destruction of property, and the blood-stained Alamo finally drove our people to the Mexican War of 1848.

We watched for years Spanish tyranny in Cuba starve and kill a brave people before the destruction of the *Maine* brought on the Spanish War of 1898.

In every instance we have been goaded to desperation before we have drawn the sword. We have ever been patient; now let Germany learn the import of the words "Beware of the anger of a patient man." The day is here! The hour has struck! It is our destiny here and now to once more draw the sword. Now as ever heretofore in defense of liberty, humanity, and peace.

We, Members of this Congress, in response to the wish of our great and patient President, stand now ready to launch into battle the mightiest Nation in the world, not the mightiest in standing armies nor in navies, nor in thirst for conquest, but in those elements which are the great foundation for victory we are the mightiest of them all. We bring to the cause of humanity more material wealth than any nation ever before in history. We bring unbounded natural resources in the very sinews of war. We bring a united Nation, strong, determined, patriotic, prepared to endure to the end. We bring 100,000,000 freemen and a flag that has never bowed in defeat.

By the iron in our mountains,
By the power in our rivers,
By the harvest of our prairies,
By the skill of our inventions,
By the courage of our fathers,
By the aid of God above us,
We shall win and we shall conquer.

Mr. Chairman, we join with the free people of the earth to resist, to overcome, and to destroy for all time that ancient and

despotic yoke, "the divine right of kings." Already have the peoples of Russia overcome the absolute power of their erstwhile Czar. Frenchmen and Englishmen are to-day living under Governments as free as ours, while Italy's broad constitutional Government springs from the will of her people. Against us will be tyranny and despotism. Two emperors, a czar, and a sultan; they are the epitome of public slavery for private glory.

No free people have ever made aggressive war on sister nations. World peace can only come when the great nations of the world are free. When Hohenzollern and Hapsburg, when czar and sultan are driven from their thrones, either from force from within or without, then there will be peace and lasting peace.

Let not this be a war upon a people, for with the German people we have no feud. Let us make clear to our people and the world that we do not seek the destruction of nor would we add to the burden of those who will be forced to fight against us. We strike to liberate, not to enslave; to free and not to burden the peoples of central Europe. We strike at the Prussian military oligarchy, at Hohenzollern and Hapsburg mad dreams of world dominion. We strike for our ancient liberties on the seas. We strike for peace.

The day will come, Mr. Chairman, when the peoples of central Europe will rise in their might and brush aside their emperors. On that day "divine right" will not aid them. They, Hohenzollern and Hapsburg, with their blood-stained plan of conquest, shall go down for ever, and out of the wreck they have wrought shall arise a great republic, dedicated to freedom and to peace.

Until then, with sorrow that we must strike a people now enslaved, for the sake of our national honor, for the sake of our very national existence, in the name of liberty and justice, in the cause of peace, let us fight the good fight; fight until the back of Prussian militarism is broken and the serpent head of war is crushed beneath the victorious heel of international liberty.

Let us now here resolve to do our full part in this battle for humanity. Let us dedicate ourselves, our country, and our manhood to the cause of freedom. Let us invest our President with every power, in arms, in munitions, in ships, and men. Let our flag wave, but never waver, until red Mars sets and the sun of international liberty rises on a free and peaceful world. [Applause.]

I recognize my stand to be strong, and for that reason I cite the following as reasons for such decision:

On the 31st day of January, 1917, notice was given by the Imperial German Government to this Government that after the following day—

"Germany will meet the illegal measures of her enemies by forcibly preventing, in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy, and in the eastern Mediterranean, all navigation, that of neutrals included, from and to England and from and to France, etc. All ships met within that zone will be sunk."

Since that day seven American ships flying the American flag have been sunk and between 25 and 30 American lives have been lost as a result of the prosecution of the submarine warfare in accordance with the above declaration. This is war. War waged by the Imperial German Government upon this country and its people.

A brief review of some of the hostile and illegal acts of the German Government toward this Government and its officers and its people is herewith given.

GERMANY'S CONDUCT OF SUBMARINE WARFARE.

In the memorial of the Imperial German Government accompanying its proclamation of February 4, 1915, in regard to submarine warfare, that Government declared—

"* * * The German Navy has received instructions to abstain from all violence against neutral vessels recognizable as such."

In the note of the German Government dated February 16, 1915, in reply to the American note of February 10, it was declared that—

"It is very far indeed from the intention of the German Government * * * ever to destroy neutral lives and neutral property. * * * The commanders of German submarines have been instructed, as was already stated in the note of the 4th instant, to abstain from violence to American merchant ships when they are recognizable as such."

Nevertheless the German Government proceeded to carry out its plans of submarine warfare and torpedoed the British passenger steamer *Falaba* on March 27, 1915, when 1 American life was lost, attacked the American steamer *Cushing* April 28 by airship, and made submarine attacks upon the American tank steamer *Gulflight* May 1, the British passenger liner *Lusitania* May 7, when 114 American lives were lost, and the American steamer *Nebraskan* on May 25, in all of which over 125 citizens of the United States lost their lives, not to mention hundreds of noncombatants who were lost and hundreds of Americans and noncombatants whose lives were put in jeopardy.

The British mule boat *Armenian* was torpedoed on June 28, as a result of which 20 Americans are reported missing.

On July 8, 1915, in a note to Ambassador Gerard, arguing in defense of its method of warfare and particularly of its submarine commander in the *Lusitania* case, it is stated:

"The Imperial Government therefore repeats the assurances that American ships will not be hindered in the prosecution of legitimate shipping and the lives of American citizens on neutral vessels shall not be placed in jeopardy.

"In order to exclude any unforeseen dangers to American passenger steamers, * * * the German submarines will be instructed to permit the free and safe passage of such passenger steamers when made recognizable by special markings and notified a reasonable time in advance."

Subsequently, the following vessels carrying American citizens were attacked by submarines:

British liner *Orduna* July 9.
Russian steamer *Leo* July 9.
American steamer *Leelanaw* July 25.
British passenger liner *Arabic* August 19.
British mule ship *Nicosian* August 19.
British steamer *Hesperian* September 4.

In these attacks 23 Americans lost their lives, not to mention the large number whose lives were placed in jeopardy.

Following these events, conspicuous by their wantonness and violation of every rule of humanity and maritime warfare, the German ambassador, by instructions from his Government, on September 1 gave the following assurances to the Government of the United States:

"Liners will not be sunk by our submarines without warning and without safety of the lives of noncombatants, provided that the liners do not try to escape or offer resistance."

On September 9, in a reply as to the submarine attack on the *Orduna*, the German Government renewed these assurances in the following language:

"The first attack on the *Orduna* by a torpedo was not in accordance with the existing instructions, which provide that large passenger steamers are to be torpedoed only after previous warning and after the rescuing of passengers and crew. The failure to observe the instructions was based on an error which is at any rate comprehensible and the repetition of which appears to be out of the question, in view of the more explicit instructions issued in the meantime. Moreover, the commanders of the submarines have been reminded that it is their duty to exercise greater care and to observe carefully the orders issued."

The German Government could not more clearly have stated that liners or large passenger steamers would not be torpedoed except upon previous warning, and after the passengers and crew had been put in places of safety.

On November 20, the German Government states, in connection with the case of the American vessel *William P. Frye:*

"* * * The German naval forces will sink only such American vessels as are loaded with absolute contraband, when the preconditions provided by the declaration of London are present. In this the German Government quite shares the view of the American Government that all possible care must be taken for the security of the crew and passengers of a vessel to be sunk. Consequently the persons found on board of a vessel may not be ordered into her lifeboats except when the general conditions—that is to say, the weather, the condition of the sea, and the neighborhood of the coasts—afford absolute certainty that the boats will reach the nearest port."

Following this accumulative series of assurances, however, there seems to have been no abatement in the rigor of submarine warfare, for attacks were made in the Mediterranean upon the American steamer *Communipaw* on December 3, the American steamer *Petrolite* December 5, the Japanese liner *Yasaka Maru* December 21, and the passenger liner *Persia* December 30. In the sinking of the *Persia* out of a total of some 500 passengers and crew only 165 were saved. Among those lost was an American consul traveling to his post.

On January 7, eight days after the sinking of the *Persia*, the German Government notified the Government of the United States, through its ambassador in Washington, as follows:

"1. German submarines in the Mediterranean had, from the beginning, orders to conduct cruiser warfare against enemy merchant vessels only in accordance with the general principles of international law, and in particular measures of reprisal, as applied in the war zone around the British Isles, were to be excluded.

"2. German submarines are therefore permitted to destroy enemy merchant vessels in the Mediterranean—i. e., passenger as well as freight ships as far as they do not try to escape or offer resistance—only after passengers and crews have been accorded safety."

Clearly the assurances of the German Government that neutral and enemy merchant vessels, passenger as well as freight ships, should not be destroyed except upon the passengers and crew being accorded safety stood as the official position of the Imperial German Government.

On February 16, 1916, the German ambassador communicated to the Department of State an expression of regret for the loss of American lives on the *Lusitania* and proposed to pay a suitable indemnity. In the course of this note he said:

"Germany has * * * limited her submarine warfare because of her long-standing friendship with the United States and because by the sinking of the *Lusitania*, which caused the death of citizens of the United States, the German retaliation affected neutrals which was not the intention, as retaliation should be confined to enemy subjects."

On March 1, 1916, the unarmed French passenger steamer *Patria*, carrying a number of American citizens, was attacked without warning. On March 9 the Norwegian bark *Silius*, riding at anchor in Havre Roads, was torpedoed by an unseen submarine and one of the seven Americans on board was injured. On March 16 the Dutch passenger steamer *Tubantia* was sunk in the North Sea by a torpedo. On March 16 the British steamer *Berwindale* was torpedoed without warning off Bantry Island with four Americans on board. On March 24 the British unarmed steamer *Englishman* was, after a chase, torpedoed and sunk by the submarine *U-19*, as a result of which one American on board perished. On March 24 the unarmed French cross-channel steamer *Sussex* was torpedoed without warning, several of the 24 American passengers being injured. On March 27 the unarmed British liner *Manchester Engineer* was sunk by an explosion without prior warning, with Americans on board, and on March 28 the British steamer *Eagle Point*, carrying a Hotchkiss gun, which she did not use, was chased, overtaken, and sunk by a torpedo after the persons on board had taken to the boats.

The American note of February 10, 1915, stated that should German vessels of war—

"destroy on the high seas an American vessel or the lives of American citizens it would be difficult for the Government of the United States to view the act in any other light than an indefensible violation of neutral rights which it would be very hard indeed to reconcile with the friendly relations so happily subsisting between the two Governments"—and that if such a deplorable situation should arise—

"the Government of the United States would be constrained to hold the Imperial Government to a strict accountability for such acts of their naval authorities."

In the American note of May 13, 1915, the Government stated:

"The Imperial Government will not expect the Government of the United States to omit any word or act necessary to the performance of

its sacred duty of maintaining the rights of the United States and its citizens and in safeguarding their free exercise and enjoyment."

In the note of July 21, 1915, the United States Government said that—

"Repetition by the commanders of German naval vessels and acts in contravention of those rights must be regarded by the Government of the United States, when they affect American citizens, as deliberately unfriendly."

In a communication of April 18, 1916, the American Government said:

"If it is still the purpose of the Imperial Government to prosecute relentless and indiscriminate warfare against vessels of commerce by the use of submarines without regard to what the Government of the United States must consider the sacred and indisputable rules of international law and the universally recognized dictates of humanity, the Government of the United States is at last forced to the conclusion that there is but one course it can pursue. Unless the Imperial Government should not immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of submarine warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels the Government of the United States can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire altogether."

The German Government replied to this communication on May 4, 1916, giving definite assurances that new orders had been issued to the German naval forces "in accordance with the general principles of visit and search and the destruction of merchant vessels recognized by international law." And this agreement was substantially complied with for many months, but finally, on January 31, 1917, notice was given that after the following day—

"Germany will meet the illegal measures of her enemies by forcibly preventing in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy, and in the eastern Mediterranean all navigation, that of neutrals included, from and to England and from and to France, etc. All ships met within that zone will be sunk."

In view of this Government's warning of April 18, 1916, and the Imperial German Government's pledge of May 4 of the same year, the Government of the United States, on February 3, 1917, stated to the Imperial German Government that—

"In view of this declaration, which withdraws suddenly and without prior intimation the solemn assurance given in the Imperial Government's note of May 4, 1916, this Government has no alternative consistent with the dignity and honor of the United States but to take the course which it explicitly announced in its note of April 18, 1916, it would take in the event that the Imperial Government did not declare and effect an abandonment of the methods of submarine warfare then employed and to which the Imperial Government now purpose again to resort.

"The President has, therefore, directed me to announce to your excellency that all diplomatic relations between the United States and the German Empire are severed, and that the American ambassador at Berlin will be immediately withdrawn, and, in accordance with such announcement, to deliver to your excellency your passports."

On February 3 one American ship was sunk, and since that date six American ships flying the American flag have been torpedoed, with a loss of about 13 American citizens. In addition, 50 or more foreign vessels of both belligerent and neutral nationality with Americans on board have been torpedoed, in most cases without warning, with a consequent loss of several American citizens.

IMPROPER ACTIVITIES OF GERMAN OFFICIALS IN THE UNITED STATES.

Since the beginning of the war German officials in the United States have engaged in many improper activities in violation of the laws of the United States and of their obligations as officials in a neutral country. Count von Bernstorff, the German ambassador, Capt. von Papen, military attaché of the embassy, Capt. Boy-Ed, naval attaché, as well as various consular officers and other officials, were involved in these activities, which were very widespread.

The following instances are chosen at random from the cases which have come to the knowledge of the Government:

1. By direct instructions received from the foreign office in Berlin the German Embassy in this country furnished funds and issued orders to the Indian independence committee of the Indian Nationalist Party in the United States. These instructions were usually conveyed to the committee by the military information bureau in New York (Von Igel) or by the German consulates in New York and San Francisco.

Dr. Chakrabarty, recently arrested in New York City, received, all in all, according to his own admission, some $60,000 from Von Igel. He claims that the greater portion of this money was used for defraying the expenses of the Indian revolutionary propaganda in this country, and, as he says, for educational purposes. While this is in itself true, it is not all that was done by the revolutionists. They have sent representatives to the Far East to stir up trouble in India and they have attempted to ship arms and ammunition to India. These expeditions have failed. The German Embassy also employed Ernest T. Euphrat to carry instructions and information between Berlin and Washington under an American passport.

II. Officers of interned German warships have violated their word of honor and escaped. In one instance the German consul at Richmond furnished the money to purchase a boat to enable six warrant officers of the steamer *Kronprinz Wilhelm* to escape after breaking their parole.

III. Under the supervision of Capt. von Papen and Wolf von Igel, Hans von Wedell and, subsequently, Carl Ruroede maintained a regular office for the procurement of fraudulent passports for German reservists. These operations were directed and financed in part by Capt. von Papen and Wolf von Igel. Indictments were returned, Carl Ruroede sentenced to the penitentiary, and a number of German officers fined. Von Wedell escaped and has apparently been drowned at sea. Von Wedell's operations were also known to high officials in Germany. When Von Wedell became suspicious that forgeries committed by him on a passport application had become known, he conferred with Capt. von Papen and obtained money from him wherewith to make his escape.

IV. James J. F. Archibald, under cover of an American passport and in the pay of the German Government through Ambassador Bernstorff, carried dispatches for Ambassador Dumba and otherwise engaged in unneutral activities.

V. Albert Sanders, Charles Wunnonberg, and others, German agents in this country, were engaged, among other activities, in sending spies to England equipped with American passports, for the purpose of securing military information. Several such men have been sent. Sanders and Wunnonberg have plead guilty to indictments brought against them in New York City as has George Voux Bacon, one of the men sent abroad by them.

VI. American passports have been counterfeited and counterfeits found on German agents. Baron von Cupenberg, a German agent, when arrested abroad, bore a counterfeit of an American passport issued to Gustav C. Roeder; Irving Guy Ries received an American passport, went to Germany, where the police retained his passports for 24 hours. Later a German spy named Carl Paul Julius Hensel was arrested in London with a counterfeit of the Ries passport in his possession.

VII. Prominent officials of the Hamburg-American Line, who under the direction of Capt. Boy-Ed, endeavored to provide German warships at sea with coal and other supplies in violation of the statutes of the United States, have been tried and convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary. Some 12 or more vessels were involved in this plan.

VIII. Under the direction of Capt. Boy-Ed and the German consulate at San Francisco, and in violation of our law, the steamships *Sacramento* and *Mazatlan* carried supplies from San Francisco to German war vessels. The *Olsen and Mahoney*, which was engaged in a similar enterprise, was detained. The money for these ventures was furnished by Capt. Boy-Ed. Indictments have been returned in connection with these matters against a large number of persons.

IX. Werner Horn, a lieutenant in the German Reserve, was furnished funds by Capt. Franz von Papen and sent, with dynamite, under orders to blow up the International Bridge at Vanceboro, Me. He was partially successful. He is now under indictment for the unlawful transportation of dynamite on passenger trains and is in jail awaiting trial following the dismissal of his appeal by the Supreme Court.

X. Capt. von Papen furnished funds to Albert Kaltschmidt, of Detroit, who is involved in a plot to blow up a factory at Walkerville, Canada, and the armory at Windsor, Canada.

XI. Robert Fay, Walter Scholtz, and Paul Daeche have been convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary and three others are under indictment for conspiracy to prepare bombs and attach them to allied ships leaving New York Harbor. Fay, who was the principal in this scheme, was a German soldier. He testified that he received finances from a German secret agent in Brussels, and told Von Papen of his plans, who advised him that his device was not practicable, but that he should go ahead with it, and if he could make it work he would consider it.

XII. Under the direction of Capt. von Papen and Wolf von Igel, Dr. Walter T. Scheele, Capt. von Kleist, Capt. Wolpert, of the Atlas Steamship Co., and Capt. Rode, of the Hamburg-American Line, manufactured incendiary bombs and placed them on board allied vessels. The shells in which the chemicals were placed were made on board the steamship *Frederick der Grosse*. Scheele was furnished $1,000 by Von Igel wherewith to become a fugitive from justice.

XIII. Capt. Franz Rintelen, a reserve officer in the German Navy, came to this country secretly for the purpose of preventing the exportation of munitions of war to the allies and of getting to Germany needed supplies. He organized and financed Labor's National Peace Council in an effort to bring about an embargo on the shipment of munitions of war, tried to bring about strikes, etc.

XIV. Consul General Bopp, at San Francisco, Vice Consul General von Schaick, Baron George Wilhelm von Brincken (an employee of the consulate), Charles C. Crowley, and Mrs. Margaret W. Cornell (secret agents of the German consulate at San Francisco) have been convicted of conspiracy to send agents into Canada to blow up railroad tunnels and bridges and to wreck vessels sailing from Pacific coast ports with war material for Russia and Japan.

XV. Paul Koenig, head of the secret-service work of the Hamburg-American Line, by direction of his superior officers, largely augmented his organization and under the direction of Von Paper, Boy-Ed, and Albert carried on secret work for the German Government. He secured and sent spies to Canada to gather information concerning the Welland Canal, the movements of Canadian troops to England, bribed an employee of a bank for information concerning shipments to the allies, sent spies to Europe on American passports to secure military information, and was involved with Capt. von Papen in plans to place bombs on ships of the allies leaving New York Harbor, etc. Von Papen, Boy-Ed, and Albert had frequent conferences with Koenig in his office, at theirs, and at outside places. Koenig and certain of his associates are under indictment.

XVI. Capt. von Papen, Capt. Hans Tauscher, Wolf von Igel, and a number of German reservists organized an expedition to go into Canada, destroy the Welland Canal, and endeavor to terrorize Canadians in order to delay the sending of troops from Canada to Europe. Indictments have been returned against these persons. Wolf von Igel furnished Fritzen, one of the conspirators in this case, money on which to flee from New York City. Fritzen is now in jail in New York City.

XVII. With money furnished by official German representatives in this country, a cargo of arms and ammunition was purchased and shipped on board the schooner *Annie Larsen*. Through the activities of German official representatives in this country and other Germans a number of Indians were procured to form an expedition to go on the steamship *Maverick*, meet the *Annie Larsen*, take over her cargo, and endeavor to bring about a revolution in India. This plan involved the sending of a German officer to drill Indian recruits, and the entire plan was managed and directed by Capt. von Papen, Capt. Hans Tauscher, and other official German representatives in this country.

XVIII. Gustav Stahl, a German reservist, made an affidavit which he admitted was false regarding the armament of the *Lusitania*, which affidavit was forwarded to the State Department by Ambassador Bernstorff. He pleaded guilty to an indictment charging perjury, and was sentenced to the penitentiary. Koenig, herein mentioned, was active in securing this affidavit.

XIX. The German Embassy organized, directed, and financed the Hans Libeau Employment Agency, through which extended efforts were made to induce employees of manufacturers engaged in supplying various kinds of material to the allies to give up their positions in an effort to interfere with the output of such manufacturers. Von Papen indorsed this organization as a military measure, and it was hoped through its propaganda to cripple munition factories.

XX. The German Government has assisted financially a number of newspapers in this country in return for pro-German propaganda.

XXI. Many facts have been secured indicating that Germans have aided and encouraged, financially and otherwise, the activities of one or the other factions in Mexico, the purpose being to keep the United States occupied along its borders and to prevent the exportation of munitions of war to the allies; see in this connection the activities of Rintelen, Stallforth, Kopf, the German consul at Chihuahua, Krum-Hellen, Felix Somerfeld (Villa's representative at New York), Carl Heynen, Gustav Steinberg, and many others.

ATTACKS ON SHIPS OF THE COMMISSION FOR RELIEF IN BELGIUM IN VIOLATION OF GERMAN UNDERTAKINGS.

When the Commission for Relief in Belgium began its work in October, 1914, it received from the German authorities, through the various Governments concerned, definite written assurances that ships

engaged in carrying cargoes for the relief of the civil population of Belgium and northern France should be immune from attack. In order that there may be no room for attacks upon these ships through misunderstanding, each ship is given a safe-conduct by the German diplomatic representative in the country from which it sails, and, in addition, bears conspicuously upon its sides markings which have been agreed upon with the German authorities; furthermore, similar markings are painted upon the decks of the ships in order that they may be readily recognizable by aeroplanes.

Upon the rupture of relations with Germany the commission was definitely assured by the German Government that its ships would be immune from attack by following certain prescribed courses and conforming to the arrangements previously made.

Despite these solemn assurances, there have been several unwarranted attacks upon ships under charter to the commission.

On March 7 or 8 the Norwegian ship *Storstad*, carrying 10,000 tons of corn from Buenos Aires to Rotterdam for the commission was sunk in broad daylight by a German submarine, despite the conspicuous markings of the commission, which the submarine could not help observing. The *Storstad* was repeatedly shelled without warning and finally torpedoed.

On March 19 the steamships *Tunisic* and *Haelen*, under charter to the commission, proceeded to the United States under safe-conducts and guaranties from the German minister at The Hague and bearing conspicuous markings of the commission, were attacked without warning by a German submarine outside the danger zone (56° 15′ north, 5° 32′ east). The ships were not sunk, but on the *Haelen* seven men were killed, including the first and third officers; a port boat was sunk; a hole was made in the port bunker above the water line; and the ships sustained sundry damages to decks and engines.

INDIGNITIES TO AMERICAN OFFICIALS.

Various consular officers have suffered indignities and humiliation at the hands of German frontier authorities. The following are illustrations:

Mr. Pike, consul at St. Gall, Switzerland, on proceeding to his post with a passport duly indorsed by German officials in New York and Copenhagen, was on November 26, 1916, subjected to great indignities at Warnemunde on the German frontier. Mr. Pike refused to submit to search of his person, the removal of his clothing, or the seizure of his official reports and papers of a private and confidential nature. He was therefore obliged to return to Copenhagen.

Mr. Murphy, the consul general at Sofia, and his wife, provided with passports from the German legations at The Hague and Copenhagen, were on two occasions stripped and searched and subjected to great humiliation at the same frontier station. No consideration was given them because of their official position.

Such has been the behavior on the part of German officials notwithstanding that consular officials hold positions of dignity and responsibility under their Government and that during the present war Germany has been placed under deep obligation to American consular officers by their efforts in the protection of German interests.

INHUMAN TREATMENT ACCORDED YARROWDALE PRISONERS BY GERMAN AUTHORITIES.

On January 19 Mr. Gerard telegraphed that the evening papers contained a report that the English steamer *Yarrowdale* had been brought to Swinemunde as prize with 469 prisoners on board taken from ships captured by German auxiliary cruisers; that among these prisoners were 103 neutrals; and that such of these as had been taken on board enemy ships and had accepted pay on such ships would be held as prisoners of war.

After repeated inquiries Mr. Gerard learned that there were among the *Yarrowdale* prisoners 72 men claiming American citizenship.

On February 4, Mr. Gerard was informed by Count Montgelas, of the foreign office that the Americans taken on the *Yarrowdale* would be released immediately on the ground that they could not have known at the time of sailing that it was Germany's intention to treat armed merchantment as ships of war.

Despite this assurance the prisoners were not released, but some time prior to February 17, the German minister for foreign affairs told the Spanish ambassador that the American prisoners from the *Yarrowdale* would be liberated "in a very short time."

Upon receipt of this information a formal demand was made through the Spanish ambassador at Berlin for the immediate release of these men. The message sent the Spanish ambassador was as follows:

"If *Yarrowdale* prisoners have not been released, please make formal demand in the name of the United States for their immediate release. If they are not promptly released and allowed to cross the frontier without further delay, please state to the foreign minister that this policy of the Imperial Government, if continued, apparently without the slightest justification, will oblige the Government of the United States to consider what measures it may be necessary to take in order to obtain satisfaction for the continued detention of these innocent American citizens."

On February 25 the American ambassador at Madrid was informed by the Spanish foreign office that the *Yarrowdale* prisoners had been released on the 16th instant.

The foregoing statement appears to have been based on erroneous information, for no further report on the subject has been received.

The men finally reached Zurich, Switzerland, on the afternoon of March 11.

Official reports now in the possession of the Department of State indicate that these American sailors were from the moment of their arrival in Germany, on January 3, subjected to the most cruel and heartless treatment. Although the weather was very cold they were given no suitable clothes, and many of them stood about for hours barefoot in the snow. The food supplied them was utterly inadequate. After one cup of coffee in the morning almost the only article of food given them was boiled frosted cabbage, with mush once a week and beans once a week. One member of the crew states that he was severely kicked in the abdomen by a German officer without provocation. He appears still to be suffering severely from this assault. Another sailor is still suffering from a wound caused by shrapnel fired by the Germans at an open boat in which he and his companions had taken refuge after the sinking of the *Georgic*.

All of the men stated that their treatment had been so inhuman that should a submarine be sighted in the course of their voyage home they would prefer to be drowned rather than have any further experience in German prison camps.

It is significant that the inhuman treatment accorded these American sailors occurred a month before the break in relations and while Germany was on every occasion professing the most cordial friendship for the United States.

INTERFERENCE WITH THE COMMUNICATIONS OF THE EMBASSY AT BERLIN.

After the suspension of diplomatic relations, the German authorities cut off the telephone at the embassy at Berlin and suppressed Mr. Gerard's communication by telegraph and post. Mr. Gerard was not even permitted to send to American consular officers in Germany the instructions he had received for them from the Department of State. Neither was he allowed to receive his mail. Just before he left Berlin the telephonic communication at the embassy was restored and some telegrams and letters were delivered. No apologies were offered, however.

GERMAN INTRIGUES TO INVOLVE THE UNITED STATES IN WAR WITH MEXICO AND JAPAN.

The Government of the United States is in possession of instructions addressed by the German minister for foreign affairs to the German minister to Mexico concerning a proposed alliance of Germany, Japan, and Mexico to make war on the United States. The text of this document is as follows:

BERLIN, *January 19, 1917.*

On the 1st of February we intend to begin submarine warfare unrestricted. In spite of this it is our intention to endeavor to keep neutral the United States of America.

If this attempt is not successful we propose an alliance on the following basis with Mexico: That we shall make war together and together make peace. We shall give general financial support, and it is understood that Mexico is to reconquer the lost territory in New Mexico, Texas, and Arizona. The details are left to you for settlement.

You are instructed to inform the President of Mexico of the above in the greatest confidence as soon as it is certain there will be an outbreak of war with the United States, and suggest that the President of Mexico on his own initiative should communicate with Japan suggesting adherence at once to this plan; at the same time offer to mediate between Germany and Japan.

Please call to the attention of the President of Mexico that the employment of ruthless submarine warfare now promises to compel England to make peace in a few months.

(Signed) ZIMMERMANN.

Mr. Chairman, I want to answer, in addition to my set remarks, the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] in reference to the troublous times we had in Baltimore on Sunday last. I beg to assure the gentleman that the men who marched into the Academy of Music where that pacifist meeting was being held did not do so for the purpose of breaking up the meeting, but they went there that they also might be heard in the interests of American honor, of American liberty, and American freedom. [Applause.] They did not go there for any boisterous purpose. Those men were contending that they believed in free speech and that the other side of the question ought to be heard. I want to say in addition that it was not the descendants, as the gentleman said, of men who led the attack in the Civil War, but the man who led that procession for American honor and American liberty was a descendant of one of our best German families, who traces his ancestry back to the Fatherland. That brave and able descendant of German descent and the men with him believed that this is not the time for pacifist meetings, but that the time for the American Government to act in self-defense and in the interest of the freedom of the people not only of the United States but of the world at large had struck. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the same request to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the declaration of war, and will so vote. I desire to answer one very brilliant young man who appealed to us to change our votes lest we might embarrass our Government. The greatest embarrassment that comes to my Government would be that a man elected to Congress, having stood at this bar and taken the oath to discharge his duty under the Constitution, should be silent when his conscience bids him speak [applause] and submit to a denial of free speech in this country. If war is declared, we will all be united for that war; but I am against this war because under international law the Imperial Government of Germany has given us no cause for war, and I predict that in the ultimate decisions of the maritime courts of the world it will be decided that she has followed the rule laid down in the past that has been the governing and accepted rule of the world. I could cite you precedent after precedent, beginning with our own country. When Abraham Lincoln declared a blockade—aye, a paper blockade, I know; I think I know the rule and the law—when he laid a blockade that shut the southern Confederacy from receiving anything in the way of arms or ammunition or anything to eat or comfort themselves, the world accepted it as the right of one of the belligerents to keep all neutrals out.

Great Britain recognized that right. While she had her blockade runners, as we have to-day, Mr. Lincoln captured over 1,500 of them and sank upward of 450 of them, and Great Britain never brought a complaint against the United States, because we had the right to declare the blockade and use all the power that God Almighty gave us to maintain that blockade. Germany to-day treats us the same as Lincoln treated the world. He treated them all alike; and here we are declaring war, a great strong, healthy Nation, against a nation that is at war, broken, bleeding, and in trouble, because she will not vary her blockade rules to please us. If she allowed Norway or Sweden or any other country in the world to carry contraband of war through this zone and denied it to us, that would be a cause for war, but when she says every boat of every nation shall be treated alike, that is not a casus belli; it is not a declaration of war.

And I am opposed to declaring war, because she stands on her international rights. I have no apologies to make for Germany or Great Britain. They have both wronged us, they have injured us bitterly and seriously, and none more than Germany, but some of them equally with Germany. But, as a matter of fact, that was our precedent.

May I bring you down to another precedent since the beginning of this war? There is a dispute to-day by reason of nonpublication in our White Book as to what caused the sinking of the *Carib* and the *Evelyn*. But they were sunk with mines. Great Britain notified the world in November, 1914, that she would spread mines that closed the whole North Sea. And, when those two boats went down—I remember the indignation of those gentlemen who were angry with Great Britain and who would have been glad to fight her at any time with or without cause, and who wanted to hold a meeting in Chicago. I said, "No. The President is right. That is not a cause for war. Have they not violated the treaty?" Yes. But every student of international law knows that treaties fly out of the window when military necessity knocks at the door. England did violate the treaty when she laid her miles and miles of mines in the North Sea; and whether they sunk these boats by them or not, you did not call it a cause for war, gentlemen. They were clearly within their rights. They established a closed zone. I speak of a closed zone as a blockade. The submarine is a new war weapon. No court of admiralty has fixed its legal status. International law on that subject is still in the making, and arbitration and not war should settle it.

Is it possible that a precedent so lately indorsed by you and your administration is so soon forgotten? Show me one place where the Imperial Government of Germany has not accorded to American ships the same right she gives to every other neutral, and I will agree with you to vote for war.

We are told constantly and reminded by letters and telegrams to stand by the President. I remember when I read the ruling of the department in these cases that it was not a cause for war. I was with the President then in that decision, or the Secretary of State—whoever made it. And I want to stand by the President. But he is not sworn to declare war. He is not empowered to declare war. The responsibility rests here. You may believe it or not, gentlemen, but I would give my life cheerfully in defense and for the protection of our President's life while he is President of the United States, but I can not forswear myself in the discharge of my duty under the Constitution, representing people as a Member of Congress, and wash my hands and say, "Leave it to the President."

You know the gentlemen here. It is not necessary to call names. Let us see what the President wants. You wash your hands and put the responsibility upon one man who under the Constitution does not have that responsibility. If he was as wise as Solomon, as pure as Christ, and with the patriotism of Lincoln, yet the men who laid the foundations of this Government declared in the Constitution that war or peace for this Government could never rest in the hands, mind, or conscience of one man. When Christ was brought before Pontius Pilate, the latter, to relieve himself of responsibility, got a basin and washed his hands in the presence of the multitude and then turned the Master over to the mob. He was the first great hand washer in history, but not the last, by any means. [Laughter.] And if there is any place in the world where wash basins and towels are in demand it is in the city of Washington at this very hour. Mind you, gentlemen, that I do not question your patriotism when you want war. I love to hear the name of John Paul Jones and the music of the Star-Spangled Banner just as much as you do. I do not question your patriotism, and I do not permit you to question my patriotism when I say that I am not willing to give a million American boys to avenge the lives of those people who sought to run the blockade laid down either by the English or the German Government. [Applause.]

The only casus belli explained by the President is the blockade question. It is true in a report that we have this morning there is a long list of outrages committed entirely by officers and employees of the German Government. There is not a word about the suffering we have had from the English Government. I do not believe in going to war with Great Britain because of it. It is a fight between kings. Let them finish it, and let us keep the Republic's skirts clean, this spirit of democracy, so that they can look to us in helping to maintain peace.

And I am against this resolution further, Mr. Chairman, because, looking each other in the face and telling God's truth, we are not prepared for it. There are people in my town to-day who do not get enough to eat, and yet the President says we must continue shipping our foodstuffs to a foreign people and feed them while they fight. Oh, but you say, there has been a combination and a conspiracy to raise the prices to our people who are going hungry. Then, for God's sake, let us remember the oath that we took here this week to defend our Government against the domestic enemies of our country and remember the men who have conspired to raise the price of food products are greater enemies to-day than the Imperial Government of Germany that has laid down a hard and fast rule of blockades or closed ports. I say to you, and you know as well as I do the situation, that the people who work are not fed in this country as they have been used to being fed. Prices have gone beyond their reach. And you may make a declaration of war to-day, and it does seem as though, having watched the people in Poland and Germany and England starving to death, we were crazy to get into the difficulties of starvation simply to avenge some imaginary wrong or fight for lives that are gone and that our fighting will not bring back. [Applause.] I am as sorry for them as anyone else, those who have lost their lives; but you can not bring them back by giving your sons and mine to go into the fight, there in the trenches, and if you are in good faith let us vote an amendment to this declaration.

I am against this war because I know that people in my State are not for it. I am not quoting newspapers. I asked the people to write me; I wanted to know their wish, and out of a thousand letters or telegrams, not exceeding five or ten have come asking for a declaration of war, and those as a rule can be traced to gentlemen interested in war as a business.

Some one was called a traitor because he called this "a dollar war." It is a dollar war. If the Imperial German Government could have offered enough money when she talked about peace, it would have been settled. It is a war between kings for money and for territory. It does not involve a single human life that interests a great republican democracy like the United States.

Then I am against this war not only because we are not prepared for it and because of the hardships to be entailed by it, but I beg you to remember this, even if you forget everything else that I say to-day: The danger of entering into war where the entente is upon one side and the central powers are upon the other lies in the fact that it means an entrance on our part into European war and European politics, the dangers of which were foreshadowed by Washington and are familiar to every student of the history of the United States.

If this resolution passes to-day we are then in war, and we must do one of two things—either make a treaty with the entente or not make a treaty with them. If we do not make a treaty with them they may go on and finish with the central allies and settle at any time and leave your Uncle Sam on the high sea, or between wind and water, or between this earth and the sky, without consulting us. If you do make a treaty with them—for it is a treaty you stand for, most of you who stand for war—if you do make a treaty with them, then when the time comes when Washington's prophecies are fulfilled, when we might seek to make a peace that would be consistent with our honor and interests, you can not close your terms of peace until some little fellow with a crown on his head, in Serbia or Montenegro or Italy or some other place, gets his share, and you leave the interests of this great Republic tied into a treaty of peace with the entente in a way that absolutely forbids you from coming to separate terms; and if Germany were to come to-morrow or the day after that treaty was made and should concede everything on submarine war that we ask, should concede and promise to pay every bit of indemnity that we might ask, and should consent to apologize and salute our flag, when you are tied then as a matter of honor that the American people will not let us break, as kings and queens can break their treaties, we will be tied to a treaty that we can not break without dishonor to a hundred million people, and your peace and your war and the destiny of your Republic hangs in the balance and in the caprice of a few crowned heads in the Old World.

That is another reason why I am against a declaration of war against one of the nations at war. It means an alliance, either written or verbal, without which we are in danger, and with it we are in more danger than if we went in without it.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FITZGERALD). The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. MASON. I am against this war, Mr. Chairman, because we have had no just provocation under international law for going into the war. Both parties have insulted us. But the great broad reason is that as a student of civilization I am against this war at this time because we are a Christian Nation. Some one asked me if I believed the Christian religion was a success. I said, "I would like to see it tried." They have forgotten to try it over there. Let us not forget to try that thing here that laid the foundation for your Government and mine.

Our safety lies in the traditions, in following the teachings of the Master; and I say to you, gentlemen, before you vote to go to war, before you say, "We love the German people, but we want to kill them because we do not like the Kaiser," pity them, then, if you do not like the Kaiser. We do not hate the German people and they do not hate us; and if we go killing each other it is because the politicians and the kings forced friendly people into the trenches to take each other's life. Let us go back to the foundation of our Government, a Christian Government. Let us not forget this hour of Gethsemane. Let us not declare war in the hour they crucified the Prince of Peace. Take your mother's old Bible and read the story of the coming—the heralded message of peace, "Peace on earth, and good will to men." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman and gentleman of the House, while my own judgment has been that a course other than an immediate declaration of war against Germany might be the wisest procedure for us, nevertheless my duty in this hour is clear. I shall vote for this resolution—vote for it earnestly and with the utmost determination in my heart.

This is no time for us to quibble about procedure. This is no time for one to say that this should be done or for another to say that that should be done. This is the time for united counsel and united effort. The President of the United States, in his judgment, has seen clearly the course he recommends. I indorse his position and support him with my whole heart. [Applause.]

Gentlemen who have spoken thus far to-day in opposition to this resolution seem to be worried because nations other than Germany have inflicted wrongs upon the sovereignty of the United States. It may be true—and you and I know that it is true—that many acts of the British Government have been contrary to our rights. But this is and has been a time when trifles can be ignored. Whether they are trifles or not, the fact that we may have been slapped upon the cheek by one adversary is no reason why we should now lie down and surrender while we are mercilessly trampled upon by nailed feet.

Gentlemen may further query whether or not the entrance into a war with the Imperial German Government means that we shall become entangled with European affairs. I say not so at all. As for myself, I propose to vote for this resolution that shall pledge this country to war not because of anything the entente powers are fighting for but to vindicate the right of America and to show to the world that American life and property and sovereignty must be respected upon every sea and in every land. [Applause.] Fear not the consequences when you know you are in the right, but like high-minded and brave men dare to go where duty calls. In this hour America calls to me for American manhood to defend the heritage our fathers bequeathed unto us. We have received injuries on every hand. You and I have many times blushed for shame, as we read the morning papers, to find here and there how Americans have been abused and outraged.

It may be, my friends, that virtue has been patience and patience a virtue, but the time has now come, to my mind, when patience ceases to be a virtue. Either we must now give up our independent existence as a Nation or we must defend the Nation when thus outrageously attacked. People associate themselves into a government for but one purpose. As individuals they are pitted against the world with its rapacity and its power to destroy. They band themselves together into a commonwealth or a nation for the one purpose of securing protection to themselves and their property and immunity from destruction. A nation that fails to give this protection to its citizens fails in the important reason for its very existence, and long continuing so to fail must pass away from the earth. I firmly believe the time is here for America once more to assert the claim that she has heretofore made and supported that the seas of the world are free; that Americans in all their lawful pursuits on the high seas shall not be ruthlessly destroyed. We went to war in 1812 for one-half the cause that confronts us now. Either the reason we fought for in 1812 was wrong or it is wrong now to fail to support the claims of America for freedom of the seas. One of the great powers of the world has decreed that a portion of the high seas no longer belongs to humanity and the world. They say, "This area of the high seas belongs to us." Oh, my friends, let your thoughts run back a few centuries and behold a parallel. The great King of Spain held the same view and promulgated the same doctrine. He partitioned out the seas of the world and said that in this and that area the Spanish flag alone might fly above a ship. The valiant men of the time took issue and destroyed the power and the pretension. The blood of a Gilbert, the blood of a Drake flows in our veins to-day, and I say, let us hurl back to this presumption of the Imperial Government of Germany the reply that the seas of the world are and shall be free, and shall be free against any armed threat or against any armed power in the world. And when any government sees fit to destroy American life and property it is not alone acting against the individual but it must reckon with Uncle Sam.

My friends, we need not recite all the causes that bring us to this fateful hour. We can look back upon two or three years that fill us with sadness when we reflect. Pledges that have been made to respect American life and American property and American sovereignty have been ruthlessly disregarded and forsaken under such conditions and in such a way that we can only conclude the Imperial Government of Germany is regardless of the rights of America and careless of how she wages war on lives in times of peace. I do not believe the peace of the world, I do not believe civilization can exist in the world while such an idea or a theory prevails.

There will be mighty consequences following upon this declaration of war, but let us not falter because of them. Rather let us gird ourselves with greater determination that America may stand supreme in the world as the champion of the freedom of the seas and the rights of peaceful citizens to follow their peaceful pursuits.

We have had many and many a circumstance calculated to goad us into fury. Many of them have been misguided and have produced but feeble results. They only indicate that the purpose back of them has been one to ignore the rights of America as a Nation and the rights of Americans to be free. They only indicate it is the settled purpose of the German Government to have their imperial sway, to the destruction of other nations, commanding them to get off the earth. I am in favor of this resolution because it will vindicate those rights and hurl back the power that seeks to destroy us as a people. In the few minutes that remain to me I want to direct your attention to some things of great magnitude that may not have come to your attention. Our eyes have been directed largely to happenings upon the high seas; but, my friends, the aggressions of the Imperial German Government on the high seas are not as serious, are not as hostile, as some of the things that Government has recently done upon the American Continent. A knowledge of them clearly discloses that the Imperial Government of Germany for two months or more has been actively hostile against the sovereignty and the peace of the United States. I want to direct your attention southward, to that land that has given us so much trouble in the last three or four years. I want to direct your attention to Mexico and to give to you a brief outline of some of the things that have recently been done, which I have learned on an authority that can not be mistaken. We were all shocked—to say surprised is too mild—we were shocked beyond measure when we read in the public press of the so-called Zimmermann note, whereby it was designed to stir up Mexico and Japan against the United States. My friends, do you know that all of that note has never been published? Do you know that one paragraph has remained locked secret in the archives of our Government, for a purpose they then had which was plain and right, but which now need no longer control. I have been able to secure the substance of that unpublished part of the Zimmermann note, and I read it to you in your hearing. After that part which has been published, this is added:

Agreeably to the Mexican Government, submarine bases will be established at Mexican ports, from which will be supplied arms, ammunition, and supplies. All reservists in the United States are ordered into Mexico. Arrange to attack all along the border.

Under that what has been done?

The German reservists in the United States have been pouring into Mexico—not simply soldiers to carry a gun, but men trained and skilled in the manufacture of munitions. They are to-day establishing and operating a plant for the manufacture of munitions in the City of Mexico. Not that alone, but in the last few days three schooners have unloaded on the Pacific coast of Mexico arms and munitions. Not that alone, but I am credibly and reliably informed that Gen. Villa himself is now surrounded by a large number of German officers, who have practically taken charge of the organization and the drilling of his army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I can not now. I am further reliably informed that the other side is no better, and that the Carranza government is to-day largely in the control of Germans and the German military officers, with a flood of money, which during the last few weeks has gone from German sources into Mexico to finance these operations against the United States.

Oh, my friends, do not pause to consider whether or not the circumstances of the hour justify the passage of this resolution. They either justify it, or we should pause till our country is destroyed. Either we must pass it in the face of the active hostility against us, or we must lie down and haul down our flag forever. I say, America and Americans, awake! The existence of this country, the purpose for which it stands among the nations of the world, are at stake! All America and Americans, I call to the noble sacrifice, to the great trial of strength, and while we are not the first to strike the blow, let us strike the hardest and the last. Let us, my good friends, not fear so much about sitting around the council table when peace shall come to decide what kings or principalities shall continue to rule elsewhere, but determine here and now, once and for all, that America shall rule in America and stand determined throughout the world where her rights and her citizens are assailed. [Applause.]

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am sorry that I could not get myself to prepare a speech. I have spoken so often on the subject that my mind has stopped creating. I can not argue with a man who favors war. War is incomprehensible to me. Nor do I hope that it will be possible at this moment to convert anybody. I feel, however, that I owe an obligation to myself to again state my position.

The greatest service to democracy that could be rendered by this Congress would be to refuse to indorse the request for war. This is the only parliament in the world to which the question of war or peace has been submitted. No other parliament has had an opportunity to vote on the question of war or peace. The German Reichstag, the British Parliament, the French Chamber of Deputies, the Russian Duma were all confronted with an accomplished fact. War had either taken place when they were called upon to vote for the military budget or the representatives of the people were told so.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. No; I can not. I am sorry, but I have not enough time. This is the only parliament, the only congress, where the representatives of the people are called upon to act. They are invited to search their minds and their consciences. Will they throw away that opportunity? If this representative body indorses the idea of war, then all hope for international peace may as well be abandoned.

Only six weeks ago the Members of this Congress had an opportunity to express themselves on the subject of war during the discussion of the armed-neutrality bill. Almost every man who favored armed neutrality argued that it excluded the idea of war; that war was inconceivable, impossible, unimaginable.

Now, the very same men who only six or eight weeks ago declared that war was inconceivable are ready to vote for war because the President asks for it. In six weeks you are invited to reverse a policy as old as this Republic; you are invited not only to defend the territory of the United States and the territorial waters of the United States as is your sworn obligation to do, but you are invited to fight for rights admitted to be disputable within the war zone thousands of miles away. You are invited within six weeks to change a policy as old as the Republic, to enter into all sorts of alliances, into all sorts of partnerships with kings, rulers by divine right, with monarchs of all sorts. Congress is vested by the Constitution with the power to declare war. Is it a mere clerical duty that we are to perform? It may be true that in the past Congresses have acted this way. Shall we now, when we are called upon to fight for democracy abroad, surrender all democracy here?

The President says we have no war with the German people. Of course we have not. The very same words were uttered by the British premier in the parliament of England; and the British premier meant it, and he was sincere about it; and the President meant what he said, and he was sincere about it. But, while you have no war to-day with the German people, and while the nations of Europe had no war in their hearts in July, 1914, and while the war was originally a war of capitalists, plutocrats, expansionists, and kings, it became a war of the people, a war of the nations themselves. With every fresh grave, with the crippled, the mutilated, and the sightless returning home, hatreds grew, bitterness grew, until men became beasts. They ceased being Germans, they ceased being Frenchmen, they ceased to be Britishers. Through hatred they reverted to the brutal instincts of the savage, and the worst animal of all animals is the human being who hates.

Of course we have no hatred of the German people, but with the first victim of the war hatred will grow and we will be at war, not with the Kaiser but with the German people. We will be at war with the people who have built up a glorious civilization, with a people among whom there are millions of social democrats, the most advanced democracy of the world, whose hearts beat in unison with ours, whose souls crave for communion with the democratic elements throughout the world.

The President referred to the Russian revolution. Nothing of greater importance has occurred during the last hundred years. A people inhabiting one-sixth of the habitable land of the world and constituting one-twelfth of the human family have overthrown autocracy and new democratic forces have been released. The effect of the revolution is already being felt throughout the Continent of Europe. For the first time since the inception of the war the German social democracy, which had up to two weeks ago been supporting the Government, unanimously voted against the military budget. Since the Russian revolution the social democracy of Austria has unanimously demanded peace. In every other country of Europe is now being heard a more insistent demand for a larger share in the participation of the people in the determining of international relations. The Russian revolution has been brought about not from the outside, not by a foreign military force, not by an army of invasion, but by a revolutionary struggle carried on for the last 60 years, by sacrifice and martyrdom in the cause of liberty by a noble people.

The question was asked here, How do we know that the people are opposed to war? Of course, we know that the people are opposed to war, and I hate to say I am afraid the President himself doubts whether the people favor war. I should hate to say so, but it is the only implication which his recommendation for compulsory military service carries. In the Spanish-American War the martyred President McKinley had no difficulty in getting volunteers. There was an ideal presented to the American young man, the delivery of an oppressed people, and 225,000 young men responded in less than six weeks to the call of the President. There was no talk of conscription then. A spiritual thing was conjured up which demanded of men to sacrifice their lives. But now nobody dares speak of volunteers. In order that we should be able to get volunteers there must be a desire in the hearts of the people to fight, to fight for the things for which the President asks us now to fight. Not on February 26, not on January 22, but now on April 2 he determined the destiny of this Republic. On April 2 he told the great mass of the American people what they should fight for—for a new idea—not to improve this Republic, not that the American people may rise to greater heights, but to change the forms of government in Turkey, in Austria, and Germany. No wonder he is compelled to recommend compulsory military service. Australia has been generous to her mother country. So has the Dominion of Canada, but neither the Dominion of Canada or Australia has tolerated the idea of compulsory service. On the contrary, when that issue was presented to the people of Australia they voted down compulsory service after two years of war.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LONDON. No, please do not interrupt me now.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is a question on volunteer and compulsory service.

Mr. LONDON. I have so much material I desire to incorporate in my remarks I can not yield, and I have just a few more moments.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will yield the gentleman time myself.

Mr. LONDON. Pardon me. We may as well frankly admit that the great mass of the American people do sympathize with the allies. It is but natural. Every American loves France. France has exercised a noble influence upon the course of America. In the Declaration of Independence you will find the very language of the French encyclopedists and of the liberal philosophers of that day. In turn the American Declaration of Independence and the successful American Revolution have reacted upon France. It is the only great sister Republic.

This is an Anglo-Saxon country, with the great heritage of English literature, of English political institutions, and the English system of jurisprudence. Besides these spiritual causes, there are strong economic reasons why the friendship of the great naval power should be more valuable than the friendship of the central powers on the Continent of Europe. But if we are to render aid to the allies, why necessarily in the form of war? Why has no one thought of suggesting noncombatant aid? Why should we use the last and most desperate method, the unspeakable method of war, before we have tried other expedients? Why has not the President of the United States, in view of the great wave of democratic thought upon the Continent of Europe, again made his offer of peace? Why has not the President now again asked that the nations of the world make an effort to get together? Why should not we suggest a truce; why should we not suggest a three or four months stoppage of this slaughter, so that the representatives of the free people of the free democracies of which he speaks, should have an opportunity to get together and take up the question of peace and war? But I fear that the average Member of Congress will against his own convictions and against his own judgment vote as the President asks him to vote. This talk that every vote against the resolution will be helpful to Germany and the German Emperor is cheap, vulgar nonsense. That is all right on the platform before an irresponsible mob, near the door of a saloon.

The elected Representatives of the people should speak their minds freely. Our newspapers have not always reported the facts, but in the French Chamber of Deputies, in the English Parliament, in the German Reichstag, in the Austrian Reichsrath, and in the Russian Duma there have been minorities all the time during the war. Here an attempt is being made to suppress every free expression of opinion before a declaration of war.

Mr. AUSTIN. Where is the attempt made to suppress the expression of opinion?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Not to the gentleman from Tennessee, unless he will interrupt no more. It is an extremely ungrateful task for me to take the stand that I am taking now, but I would have no respect for myself unless I voted against the resolution. The issue is not between Germany and America. The issue is between two Americas—between those who believe that it is the mission of America to influence the world for the better by being a free democracy, by growing into a genuine democracy, by marching unhindered on the road toward nobler and more beautiful ideals, and the group of men who believe that the United States must follow in the footsteps of the European countries and adopt the jargon of European diplomacy about national honor and national dignity. There is no national honor in superior physical force, there is no national honor in whipping a weaker fellow, there is no national honor in a combination with other miltary and naval forces to crush a weaker military or naval force. This country has suffered from the inroads of the Imperial German Government upon the rights of the American people.

I do not agree with those who argue that the German submarine warfare is in consonance with international law. If there were such international law, if there were international law which would permit the destruction of innocents and noncombatants, it would not be an international law to which I would subscribe. There is no doubt that the German Government has inflicted incalculable and irreparable injury, but the question is, Is revenge to be our policy, is a blow for a blow our policy, is the use of physical force the only expedient to which we are to resort, or shall we give to the world this splendid example of the humility of a great and free people, and say that we have been injured, that we are suffering to-day, but that the loss is largely commercial, and that in the interests of humanity we shall refuse to add to the work of destruction?

Let us distinguish between the two Germanies. There is the Germany of the Kaiser, there is the Germany of the landed aristocracy, there is the Germany of the Prussian military system, and there is the Germany of Freilingrath, of Heine, of Bebel, and Liebknecht, the Germany of millions of social democrats contending for the very same ideals for which the American people stand. Unfortunately we can not hurt the Kaiser without striking at the German people, without killing men whose ideals are ours, whose aspirations are the aspirations of the American people. Gentlemen, perhaps it is not too late, perhaps my voice is not as a voice in the wilderness. Perhaps you will still assert yourselves and show to the world an example in democracy for every other nation to follow.

The President, one arm of the Government, has made a request upon the elected Representatives of a free people to indorse the idea of war, and every elected Representative of the people should say, "No; I shall not kill; I shall not vote to kill; I am ready to suffer injury rather than kill; I shall not permit anyone to vote that my arm should be stretched to kill a fellow human being." Mr. Chairman, war is wrong, inexcusable, indefensible. Let us be strong men; let us throw away our political ambitions; let us throw away our chances of reelection. The people will ultimately do right; they will ultimately stand by every man who will show courage in this moment of crisis, a crisis not only for the American people but for the whole world. Let us be free, strong men, and do as men should do in momentous times like these. [Applause.]

I extend my remarks by incorporating the resolution which I introduced on the opening day of this session, and which calls for a renewed effort for peace. Is it not better to help end the war than to enter it?

Whereas the revolution in Russia has liberated new democratic forces which promise to extend beyond the boundaries of rejuvenated Russia and over the entire continent of Europe; and

Whereas the ideals of true democracy and international peace are inseparable; and

Whereas in consonance with the new wave of democracy and the universally growing demand for international peace the German Social Democracy in the German Reichstag has for the first time since the beginning of the war unanimously voted against the military budget and the Austrian Social Democracy in the Austrian Reichsrath has unanimously voted for peace, and in all other countries of Europe there has been a demand for a larger measure of the people's participation in the determining of international relations; and

Whereas these changes, that have occurred since the severance of diplomatic relations between the United States and Germany, justify the hope that the declaration of the sentiments and principles of the American people on the subject of international peace as promulgated by the President of the United States before the Senate of the United States on the 22d day of January, 1917, would now receive more favorable hearing and would strike a responsive chord with all democratic elements throughout the world: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to renew his suggestion to the belligerents for a termination of the war, to the end that, as declared by the President, "there should be an organized common peace," and "that no nation should seek to extend its policy over any 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," and to the end that the United States may be saved for the work of peace.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, this discussion has indeed assumed a very wide latitude.

I am free to confess that when war is about to be declared that considerable ramification of thought may be given to its legitimate discussion. I hold in this debate, Mr. Chairman, no brief for England or for her violations of international law. I hold no brief for the entente group or for its incursions upon our commerce and the rifling of our mails. I hold no brief for any nation now engaged in war. But in my feeble way I will endeavor to uphold the honor and the dignity of American commerce and American citizens everywhere. [Applause.]

Much has been said in this debate about the violations of international law made by England and the entente group. Doubtless much that has been said is true. But those who have hurled epithets and anathemas at the entente group have not, so far as I understand, said one word in condemnation of the Prussian autocracy that has sought to override the civilized nations of the earth. My good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], whom I love much, and who has seen a quarter century of distinguished service in this House, for 60 minutes this afternoon occupied the floor of this Chamber, and during all of his address, so far as I heard, sought to justify the attitude of the German Imperial Government and upon all occasions laid criticism at the doorway of England and her allies. But never for one moment did I hear him raise his voice in defense of American liberty, in defense of national honor or the rights of American citizens.

During the course of his address he read this as a part of a reply issued by Herr Bethmann-Hollweg as to the cordon of ships that had been placed around the German group of nations to starve her into submission. I quote the language of the gentleman literally as I got it from the reporter:

The German Government would then be facing a new situation, in which it must reserve to itself complete liberty of decision.

Mr. Chairman, is that in consonance, is that in keeping, with the established principles of international law to disregard the rights of neutrals and to arbitrarily proscribe a zone through which neutral vessels on their peaceful missions on the high seas shall be forbidden to go when unarmed and their manifests consisting of noncontraband goods? Let us repeat the concluding part of that sentence. The Imperial German Government "will reserve to itself"—not beholden to the established principles of international law, but will reserve to itself—partial? No—com-

plete "liberty of decision," however arbitrary and wanton and ruthless may be the consequences resulting from that decision.

And yet my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] quotes it and rolls it under his tongue as a sweet morsel in justification of the unlawful terrorizing of the seas by German submarine warfare.

Again, he says, "Has not the Romanoff dynasty been overthrown? Has not the Romanoff dynasty been trampled under foot?" I will tell you how that occurred, though he did not give you the answer. Those great people, struggling for liberty for hundreds of years, have had but glimpses of freedom and of civilization, but the time being opportune and ripe, when they found that the court of Russia and the armies of Russia and all the officialdom of Russia had become tinctured and impregnated with Prussianized autocracy and Prussianized money and corruption, the Russian people, the mob as they were called at first, rose overnight, so to speak, and, working in harmony with the constabulary and with the army, overthrew the Romanoff dynasty; and, thank God, in the fullness of time they will plant, as I believe they will plant, a great democracy upon the dismantled throne of that dynasty that for hundreds of years has denied to the Russian people all national aspiration. [Applause.]

So I say, Mr. Chairman, let us get down to the crux of the issue in this case. It makes no difference what the entente powers may do to the central group, so far as we are concerned. For that is their fight, if they will but let us alone. We are primarily concerned in that which affects us directly. We are, of course, concerned as to the destiny of the world. The genius of man, so to speak, has drawn us into the currents of activity. Electricity, wireless telegraphy, the submarine, the airship, commerce, commercial ties and treaties, and outstanding obligations have brought the world together as no other agencies in the past ages of the world have been able to do, and therefore we are drawn into the current of the world's affairs, whether we will it or not. All the nations of the world are interdependent; no one is independent of the rest.

But there may be said to exist this distinction between the attitude of England and the attitude of Germany. So far as I recall—and I make no defense in behalf of the English Government—so far as I recall, thus far the English people have not sunk one single, solitary neutral ship and have not taken one single neutral life. They have seized our mails and some of our goods, wares, and merchandise, but they have made partial restitution for these and finally they will make restitution for all. But there is this distinction between ruthless submarine warfare in destroying life and the capture of property: You can restore the value of property taken, but you can not restore the life of people who go to the bottom of the deep. And it is because of this ruthless, wanton, uncivilized warfare made upon us as a great people, who have been long-suffering and charitable and patient, that we have been forced to call the hand of the power that would seek to terrorize and override the world.

But what else, Mr. Chairman? It has been debated upon the floor of this Chamber to-day, and the statement has been oftentimes made, that Germany has never yet acceded to the requirements and the requests of this country when exceptions were made to her arbitrary rulings and her findings, as though Germany had constituted herself as dictator of the world and could say that so far a neutral might go and no farther. Since when—and I appeal to the candor of the Members—has any government, Germany or otherwise, been clothed with arbitrary power to draw a line through which the commerce of neutrals shall not go? Since when has there been conferred upon any great over-sea lord, who has blood in his brain and murder in his heart, the right to define and to proscribe the limitations and to sink to the bottom of the depths neutral ships bound not for an enemy country but bound for neutral nations and neutral ports, carrying not guns, but going unarmed, carrying not contraband but noncontraband products? Since when, I say, has any nation been clothed and invested with that imperious, with that defiant, with that arbitrary power?

Mr. Chairman, war indeed is an awful thing, and Gen. Sherman's description of it was a mild description. War is all that he said of it and then some. But, Mr. Chairman, there are some things worse than war. I hate it; with all the power of my soul I hate it. But abject, craven cowardice, the failure of a great nation to avenge the wrongs of its people when hundreds of lives have been wantonly taken and millions of property ruthlessly destroyed, such cowardice, I say, is worse than a just and holy war. But have we not been patient? Have we not importuned, have we not begged, have we not sought to restrain and to counsel? Have we not been charitable and forgiving?

For two long years, Mr. Chairman, the dragon's teeth of discord and of strife have been sown by the nation that we now soon will challenge; and, atrocious and as unholy as has been the submarine war conducted, unjustifiable as that has been, that within itself, Mr. Chairman, constitutes but a small paragraph in the great indictment laid at the doorway of the Imperial German Government. I send to the Clerk's desk and ask that the Clerk read the paragraph therein indicated, it being taken from the address of President Wilson delivered upon that stand less than three days ago. It constitutes, in my opinion, an unparalleled indictment, based and predicated, as are the data contained in that paragraph, not upon hearsay testimony, but upon the official records in the archives of the State Department. I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

One of the things that has served to convince us that the Prussian autocracy was not and could never be our friend is that from the very outset of the present war it has filled our unsuspecting communities and even our offices of government with spies [applause] and set criminal intrigues everywhere afoot against our national unity of counsel, our peace within and without, our industries and our commerce. Indeed, it is now evident that its spies were here even before the war began; and it is unhappily not a matter of conjecture but a fact proved in our courts of justice that the intrigues which have more than once come perilously near to disturbing the peace and dislocating the industries of the country have been carried on at the instigation, with the support, and even under the personal direction of official agents of the Imperial Government accredited to the Government of the United States. [Applause.] Even in checking these things and trying to extricate them we have sought to put the most generous interpretation possible upon them because we knew that their source lay, not in any hostile feeling or purpose of the German people toward us (who were, no doubt, as ignorant of them as we ourselves were), but only in the selfish designs of a Government that did what it pleased and told its people nothing. But they have played their part in serving to convince us at last that that Government entertains no real friendship for us and means to act against our peace and security at its convenience. That it means to stir up enemies against us at our very doors the intercepted note to the German minister at Mexico City is eloquent evidence.

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that this indictment, made officially by the President of the United States and predicated upon official testimony and official documents, has not its parallel in modern or ancient history, nor even in the dark ages, not even at a time when piracy prevailed upon the high seas. Why, in the days of piracy the pirate was content with the cargo. Upon almost all occasions he would let the ships go by, in order that he might rob them again later on. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the pirate very seldom, if ever, took human life. He was content with his booty, with his plunder, with that which he pillaged.

But in defiance of the established and hoary principles of international law, that great country, whose people are most generous, big people, indeed, but who unfortunately are harnessed to the juggernaut and chariot wheels of an autocratic form of government, seeks to challenge the right of neutrals to pursue their peaceful mission while carrying their legitimate commerce upon the seas. This has been an unquestioned privilege vouchsafed to all nations for hundreds of years by international law. But these rights are denied to us and wholesale destruction has been made of our property and the lives of our people. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I make no pretense of having more patriotic fervor than the average American citizen should possess, but I do believe, if I may speak rather modestly, that I am an 18-karat all-around American, without dross or alloy, 365 days in the year [applause]; and when our rights as a Nation have been challenged; when our people have been murdered and slain; when our men and women and children, who have the right to travel the sea, have been wantonly and ruthlessly killed and their bodies sunk to the bottom of the deep; when for two years these atrocities and these outrages have been going on and still continue over our protest, I contend that, as dreadful and as horrible as war is, we are obliged, in obedience to the dictates of national good faith and American honor, not to fail to unsheath the sword for the protection of American citizens and the vindication of American honor. And when the conflict is over and victory shall perch on our banner, that sword, Mr. Chairman, still stainless, will be again thrust into its scabbard and the rights of American citizens will be maintained and recognized throughout the world. [Applause.]

We have recorded for us in a mighty good Book a character known as Thomas, one of the disciples of the Lord. When the Savior had come back to earth and was here for a few days all the other disciples met Him, but Thomas came in rather late, and when he was apprised of the fact that the Savior had risen and was present he said, "Except I be permitted to place my finger in the nail print—yea, unless I be permitted to press my hand into his riven and bleeding side—I will not believe it."

And from that day to this, Mr. Chairman, there has come down through all the ages a Thomas sect, who, having eyes, see not, and, having ears, hear not, and neither will they apprehend nor understand. These gentlemen pretend not to believe those German atrocities until they first thrust their un-American, Germanized hand into the bleeding and riven side of the American Republic. And in this discussion to-day I am sorry to say that certain gentlemen who are clothed with power upon this floor—American citizens who only last Monday held up their hands and, facing that flag yonder and the portrait of the Father of his Country and that other portrait over there, the great Lafayette, who came hither from abroad and gave his chivalry and services to our cause; some of these gentlemen who took the oath of office, I say, in the presence of all these stimulating suggestions and inspiring influences—have championed not American rights, but they have espoused the cause and defended the vandalism of Prussian autocracy. [Applause.] However, from this time on, when war is declared, there must be, Mr. Chairman, no divided America, because a house divided against itself can not stand. Every man must be either for his country or against his country. [Applause.]

The time will soon be here when every citizen must stand and uphold the rights and honor of an Americanized democracy or condone the piracy and vandalism of a Prussianized autocracy. And how does the Zimmermann note, an official document intercepted, written to the German minister in the City of Mexico, appeal to men of patriotic blood and American fervor?

How would it appear, Mr. Chairman, when the war is over, should we be trampled in the dust by a divided Americanism, if this country, born in the shock of battle and dedicated to the freedom of Americans and to the rights of humankind the world over—how would it appear to those Americans and to their followers and to their champions if this Republic should be Japanesed and Mexicanized and Prussianized, if you please? Yet this is the proposition officially made by Germany. I repeat, this is no time for division. Every man should stand with his face to the enemy, and give, if need be, of his blood as well as of his treasure. We have been at war for the past two years, but it has been a one-sided, a unilateral war, a war conducted by Germany against American rights and American citizens. I believe that when the sword is drawn it will be drawn in honor and sheathed in American glory. We seek no conquest, said the President the other day. We seek no territorial aggrandizement. We seek no indemnities. We will give of our blood and of our treasure that which becometh a great, free people to give, that their rights shall be maintained not only upon land but upon the seas, and that democracy finally shall inherit the earth. And with this spirit, Mr. Chairman, and animated by this fervor and this patriotic impulse, we will go forward, doing our duty as America has always done, though the very heavens fall. [Applause.] Of course I do not know the extent of the opposition to this resolution. So far as I am concerned, permit me to say that I myself have been depressed for many weeks, and have carried, indeed, a most heavy heart. This is the most solemn hour the Republic has witnessed in half a century. This will be the most solemn vote ever cast by me. The war is forced upon us, and to strike back is our only alternative; otherwise we would earn and deserve the contempt of all mankind. Every patriotic American will stand for his country and give of his mite, even to the sacrifice of his property and his life itself, if need be. And this is the appeal that the American people will make to America—that that flag, the insignia of national honor and American rights, may not trail in the dust, but may be upheld triumphant and victorious, to champion the rights of democracy and of mankind everywhere. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the many assumptions of loyalty and patriotism on the part of some of those who favor the resolution, and insinuations by them of cowardice and disloyalty on the part of those who oppose it, offshoots, doubtless, of a passionate moment, let me at once remind the House that it takes neither moral nor physical courage to declare a war for others to fight. [Applause.] It is evidence of neither loyalty nor patriotism for one to urge others to get into a war when he knows that he himself is going to keep out.

The depth of my sorrow, the intensity of my distress in contemplating the measureless step proposed, God only knows. The right and necessity of this momentous resolution are addressed to the individual judgment of the Members of the House. Too grave is the responsibility for anyone to permit another to stand sponsor for his conscience.

Profoundly impressed with the gravity of the situation, appreciating to the fullest the penalties which a war-mad moment will impose, my conscience and judgment, after mature thought and fervent prayer for rightful guidance, have marked out clearly the path of my duty, and I have made up my mind to walk it, if I go barefooted and alone. [Applause.] I have come to the undoubting conclusion that I should vote against this resolution. [Applause.] If I had a single doubt, I would with profoundest pleasure resolve it in favor of the view of the administration and of a large majority of my colleagues, who have so recently honored me with their confidence. I know that I shall never criticize any Member for advocating this resolution. I concede—I feel—that he casts his vote in accordance with sincere conviction. I know, too, that for my vote I shall be not only criticized, but denounced from one end of the country to the other. The whole yelping pack of defamers and revilers in the Nation will at once be set upon my heels.

My friends, I can not leave my children lands and riches—I can not leave them fame—but I can leave them the name of an ancestor, who, mattering not the consequences to himself, never dared to hesitate to do his duty as God gave him to see it. [Applause.]

Half the civilized world is now a slaughterhouse for human beings. This Nation is the last hope of peace on earth, good will toward men. I am unwilling for my country by statutory command to pull up the last anchor of peace in the world and extinguish during the long night of a world-wide war the only remaining star of hope for Christendom. I am unwilling by my vote to-day for this Nation to throw away the only remaining compass to which the world can look for guidance in the paths of right and truth, of justice and humanity, and to leave only force and blood to chart hereafter the path of mankind to tread.

By passage of this resolution we enter the war, and the universe becomes one vast drama of horrors and blood—one boundless stage upon which will play all the evil spirits of earth and hell. All the demons of inhumanity will be let loose for a rampage throughout the world. Whatever be the future, whatever be the rewards or penalties of this Nation's step, I shall always believe that we could and ought to have kept out of this war.

Great Britain every day, every hour, for two years has violated American rights on the seas. We have persistently protested. She has denied us not only entrance into the ports of the central powers but has closed to us by force the ports of neutrals. She has unlawfully seized our ships and our cargoes. She has rifled our mails. She has declared a war zone sufficiently large to cover all the ports of her enemy. She made the entire North Sea a military area—strewed it with hidden mines and told the neutral nations of the world to stay out or be blown up. We protested. No American ship was sunk, no American life was destroyed, because we submitted and did not go in. We kept out of war. We sacrificed no honor. We surrendered permanently no essential rights. We knew that these acts of Great Britain, though in plain violation of international law and of our rights on the seas, were not aimed at us. They were directed at her enemy. They were inspired by military necessity. Rather than plunge this country into war, we were willing to forego for the time our rights. I approved that course then; I approve it now.

Germany declares a war zone sufficiently large to cover the ports of her enemy. She infests it with submarines and warns the neutral world to stay out, though in plain violation of our rights and of international law. We know that these acts are aimed not directly at us but intended to injure and cripple her enemy, with which she is in a death struggle.

We refuse to yield; we refuse to forego our rights for the time. We insist upon going in.

In my judgment, we could keep out of the war with Germany as we kept out of the war with Great Britain, by keeping our ships and our citizens out of the war zone of Germany as we did out of the war zone of Great Britain. And we would sacrifice no more honor, surrender no more rights in the one case than in the other. Or we could resort to armed neutrality, which the President recently urged and for which I voted on March 1.

But we are told that Germany has destroyed American lives while Great Britain destroyed only property. Great Britain destroyed no American lives, because this Nation kept her ships and her citizens out of her war zone which she sowed with hidden mines.

But are we quite sure that the real reason for war with Germany is the destruction of lives as distinguished from property, that to avenge the killing of innocent Americans and to protect American lives war becomes a duty?

Mexican bandits raided American towns, shot to death sleeping men, women, and children in their own homes. We did not go to war to avenge these deaths. We sent an armed expedition into Mexico to hunt down and punish the bandits. Away out from the American border the soldiers of Carranza, of the Mexican Government, which we had recognized, met our soldiers, shot the American flag from the hands of an American soldier, shot down to the death our soldiers, and Carranza, instead of disavowing the dastardly act, defiantly approved and ratified it. Yet we did not go to war to avenge the destruction of American lives and the insult and assault on the American flag. We were willing to forego our rights rather than plunge this country into war while half the world was in conflagration. I approved that course then; I approve it now.

Why can we not, why should we not, forego for the time being the violation of our rights by Germany, and do as we did with Great Britain, do as we did with Mexico, and thus save the universe from being wrapped in the flames of war.

I have hoped and prayed that God would forbid our country going into war with another for doing that which perhaps under the same circumstances we ourselves would do.

Are we quite sure that in a war with Germany or Japan, if our fleet was bottled up, helpless, and our ships of commerce had been swept from the seas, all our ports closed by the enemy's fleet, imports of fuel and food and clothing for our people and ammunition for our soldiers were denied, with our very life trembling in the balance, we would not, in the last struggle for existence, strike our enemy with the only weapon of the sea remaining, though in violation of international law? Would one contend that under the circumstances our submarine commanders should permit the landing at the ports of the enemy arms and ammunition with which to shoot down our brave American boys when they had it in their power to prevent it? Would we demand of our submarine commanders that they give the benefit of the doubt to questions of international law rather than to the safety of our country and the lives of our soldiers?

War upon the part of a nation is sometimes necessary and imperative. But here no invasion is threatened. Not a foot of our territory is demanded or coveted. No essential honor is required to be sacrificed. No fundamental right is asked to be permanently yielded or suspended. No national policy is contested. No part of our sovereignty is questioned. Here the overt act, ruthless and brutal though it be, is not aimed directly at us. The purpose of the proposed enemy is not our injury, either in property or life. The whole aim and purpose and effort are directed at a powerful enemy with which she is in a life and death struggle.

The causes for which we are now asked to declare war could have been given with equal—yea, greater—force 30 days or 10 days after the first step taken by the German Army in its march toward Paris. They existed then.

The House and the country should thoroughly understand that we are asked to declare war not to protect alone American lives and American rights on the high seas. We are to make the cause of Great Britain, France, and Russia, right or wrong, our cause. We are to make their quarrel, right or wrong, our quarrel. We are to help fight out, with all the resources in men, money, and credit of the Government and its people a difference between the belligerents of Europe to which we were and are utter strangers. Nothing in that cause, nothing in that quarrel, has or does involve a moral or equitable or material interest in or obligation of our Government or our people.

To this program every impulse of patriotism, every sense of right, every feeling of humanity, every sentiment of loyalty, every obligation of duty within me combine in forbidding my consent until the Government and its people, through its rightful and constitutional voice—the Congress of the United States—have clearly spoken, in the passage of such a resolution as is now before the House. Then and then only will it become the patriotic duty of each Member of the House and Senate to merge his individual judgment and conviction into those so declared of his country, as it will become the duty of every American, in and out of Congress, to make the judgment and conviction of his country thus written into statute his judgment and conviction. [Applause.] The voice of law will command, and a patriotic duty will demand, loyal and earnest and active submission and obedience. Until then each should have and does have the inherent right, and it is his bounden duty to himself and to truth, to vote his conviction.

I can conceive of a brave, loyal, devoted son of a father who contemplates a personal difficulty with another begging and persuading him to refrain, even condemning, and protesting in vain against his proposed step, but when the final word is spoken and blows are about to be given, taking off his coat and struggling with all of his soul and might in defense of that father.

When this Nation, as it doubtless will to-day, speaks the final word through the Congress, I trust I will be found in relation with my Government and my country emulating the example of that son. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I am unreservedly in favor of the pending resolution. I had the honor of voting to report it out of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I shall have the honor of voting to pass it through the House. And yet I realize, as every man must, the gravity and importance of the step which the Congress of the United States is taking to-day. War is at all times a frightful thing, and science and invention have combined in these recent months and years to make it doubly frightful. The toll of men, the flower of our Nation, may well be great as a result of this step; the drain upon our resources and the burden of taxation upon us will certainly be severe beyond precedent. This is a solemn hour; it is no time for heroics or hysterics, and yet, as I view the situation, no patriot can hesitate to cast his vote—and it makes no difference whether his vote be cast as a Member of this body or as a member of our body politic—in favor of a vigorous prosecution of the war against Germany.

Frankly, I do not believe that the question whether Germany has given us a cause for war is arguable. For nearly two and a half years she has in the most deliberate and often in the most contemptuous way disregarded the fundamental and sacred rights of American citizens and the American Nation both at home and abroad. Almost daily for long periods of time has Germany committed at least one act against the peace and safety of the United States which was an abundant cause for war. I can not conceive how any thinking and even moderately informed man, whether in the United States or in Germany, can fail to agree that there is ample justification—that for more than two years there has at all times been ample justification—for the United States to take the step which she is taking to-day. The only possible argument, even on the part of those who are pacifists or pro-Germans, must be as to whether the present declaration that a state of war exists is hastily taken or premature. Perhaps a very brief outline of some of the high lights of the past two years will be illuminating in this connection.

On February 4, 1915, two months and two years ago, the chief of the admiral staff of the German Navy issued a proclamation, reading in part as follows:

> The waters surrounding Great Britain and Ireland, including the whole English Channel are hereby declared to be war zone. On and after the 18th of February, 1915, every enemy merchant ship found in the said war zone will be destroyed without its being always possible to avert the dangers threatening the crews and passengers on that account.

In a memorial accompanying this proclamation it was said:

> Neutral powers are accordingly forewarned not to continue to entrust their crews, passengers, or merchandise to such vessels. * * * It will not always be possible to prevent a neutral vessel from becoming the victim of an attack intended to be directed against a vessel of the enemy.

This entire program of Germany, of course, involved a direct violation of the principles of international law in a manner vitally dangerous to the welfare of the United States. Accordingly, on February 10, 1915, Secretary of State Bryan—not usually regarded as a jingo—transmitted to Germany a note, reading in part as follows:

> If the commanders of German vessels of war * * * should destroy on the high seas an American vessel or the lives of American citizens, it would be difficult for the Government of the United States to view the act in any other light than as an indefensible violation of neutral rights which it would be very hard indeed to reconcile with the friendly relations now so happily subsisting between the two Governments. If such a deplorable situation should arise, the Imperial German Government can readily appreciate that the Government of the United States would be constrained to hold the Imperial German Government to a strict accountability for such acts of their naval authorities and to take any steps it might be necessary to take to safeguard American lives and property and to secure to American citizens the full enjoyment of their acknowledged rights on the high seas.

Germany's answer to this note was to sink the steamship *Falaba* on March 28, with the resultant drowning of an American citizen; to attack the American vessel *Cushing* on April 28; to torpedo the American vessel *Gulflight* on May 1, with the resultant death of two or more Americans; and, as a crowning horror, to torpedo and sink the steamship *Lusitania* on May 7, with the resultant loss of life of 114 American citizens. Remember the "strict accountability" phrase in the note of February 10; remember the acts by Germany which I have just related; and then remember that all these occurred two years ago. Is there any flavor of precipitation in our course to-day?

After the *Lusitania* sinking, Mr. Bryan, as Secretary of State, on May 13, 1915, addressed another communication to Germany, in which he again stated that the United States—

can not admit the adoption of such measures or such a warning of danger to operate as in any degree an abbreviation of the rights of American shipmasters or of American citizens bound on lawful errands as passengers on merchant ships of belligerent nationality; and that it must hold the Imperial German Government to a strict accountability for any infringement of those rights, intentional or incidental. * * * The lives of noncombatants, whether they be of neutral citizenship or citizens of one of the nations at war, can not lawfully or rightfully be put in jeopardy by the capture or destruction of an unarmed merchantman. * * * The Imperial German Government will not expect the Government of the United States to omit any word or any act necessary to the performance of its sacred duty of maintaining the rights of the United States and its citizens and of safeguarding their free exercise and enjoyment.

Here again, over the signature of the pacific Mr. Bryan, we have the "strict accountability" phrase. We also have the positive and emphatic statement that the United States will not "omit any word or any act" necessary to protect the rights of the Nation or its citizens. This, again, was about two years ago. If we are to take words in their usual and literal significance, can we to-day feel that the German Government has not been fully advised of the course and purpose of the United States?

Thereafter the submarine war was prosecuted by Germany with fluctuating success for about a year. Time and time again during that period acts were committed which clearly infringed and invaded our American rights. Yet the American Nation gritted its teeth and, in spite of the strong words of the two notes which I have quoted, did nothing very definite. To many of us it seemed as if the Nation was becoming benumbed to indignity and outrage. It seemed as if prosperity had overbalanced and removed from view every consideration not of the purely material sort. Notes were exchanged now and then, but very little of a substantive nature seemed to result from the procedure.

The next high light occurred on April 19, 1916, when, for the first time, the President addressed Congress upon the subject of submarine warfare. In the course of his address, he said:

I have deemed it my duty, therefore, to say to the Imperial German Government that if it is still its purpose to prosecute relentless and indiscriminate warfare against vessels of commerce by the use of submarines, notwithstanding the now demonstrated impossibility of conducting that warfare in accordance with what the Government of the United States must consider the sacred and indisputable rules of international law and the universally recognized dictates of humanity, the Government of the United States is at last forced to the conclusion that there is but one course it can pursue; and that unless the Imperial German Government should now immediately declare and effect an abandonment of its present methods of warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels this Government can have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the Government of the German Empire altogether.

Again there was a period of nearly a year of delays. Our citizens were drowned and our rights invaded, usually by retail and not by wholesale. At all events, no definite steps were taken during the period by the United States Government.

On January 31 of the present year Germany announced that on the following day a great war zone, surrounding Great Britain, France, and Italy, and applying also in the eastern Mediterranean, would be established, and stating that she would forcibly prevent all navigation in that zone, including that of neutrals. "All ships met within the zone will be sunk." President Wilson on February 3 again came before Congress and announced that he had severed diplomatic relations between the United States and the German Empire and had caused to be handed to the German ambassador his passports.

Germany persisted in this course, and in the next two or three weeks sank at least two American ships—the *Housatonic* and the *Lyman M. Law*. Many other ships she also sank with Americans on board, whose lives were lost as a result. Accordingly, on February 26, President Wilson came before Congress and said:

Since it is unhappily proved impossible to safeguard our neutral rights by diplomatic means against the unwarranted infringement they are suffering at the hands of Germany, there may be no recourse but to armed neutrality, which we shall know how to maintain and for which there is abundant American precedent. * * * I request that you will authorize me to supply our merchant ships with defensive arms, should that become necessary, and with the means of using them, and to employ any other instrumentalities or methods that may be necessary and adequate to protect our ships and our people in their legitimate and peaceful pursuits on the seas.

Germany, nevertheless, made no modification of her program of frightfulness, and for the last six weeks has been proceeding with a ruthlessness not previously approached. I shall include as a part of my remarks a table showing some of the violations by Germany of our rights and international law during the past two years, and more especially during the past weeks.

American ships damaged or destroyed by German submarines.

Name of vessel.	Date.	Particulars.
Gulflight	May 2, 1915	Torpedoed.
Nebraskan	May 25, 1915	Do.
Leelanaw	July 25, 1915	Torpedoed and shelled.
Seaconnet	June 16, 1916	Damaged by mine or torpedo.
Oswego	Aug. 14, 1916	Fired on 10 times by submarine.
Lanao (Philippine)	Oct. 28, 1916	Sunk by submarine.
Columbian	Nov. 7, 1916	Do.
Colena	Nov. 26, 1916	Fired on.
St. Helen's	Dec. 10, 1916	Attacked by submarine.
Rebecca Palmer	Dec. 14, 1916	Fired on; slight damage.
Sacramento	Jan. 9, 1917	Fired on.
Housatonic	Feb. 3, 1917	Sunk.
Lyman M. Law	Feb. 13, 1917	Burned by submarine.
Vigilancia	Mar. 16, 1917	Torpedoed.
City of Memphis	Mar. 17, 1917	Sunk by gunfire.
Illinois	....do.....	Torpedoed.
Aztec	Apr. 1, 1917	Do.

SHIPS SUNK WITH LOSS OF AMERICAN LIVES.

British ship *Falaba*, torpedoed March 28, 1915 (warned); 1 American lost.

British ship *Lusitania*, torpedoed May 7, 1915 (no warning); 114 Americans lost.

American ship *Gulflight*, torpedoed May 1, 1915 (no warning); 2 Americans lost.

British ship *Armenian*, torpedoed June 28, 1915 (ordered to stop; tried to escape); 23 Americans lost.

British ship *Iberian*, sunk July 31, 1915 (tried to escape; stopped by shell fire); 3 Americans lost.

British ship *Anglo-Californian*, sunk July 4, 1915; 2 Americans lost.

British ship *Hesperian*, torpedoed September 4, 1915 (no warning); 1 American lost.

British ship *Arabic*, torpedoed August 19, 1915 (no warning); 3 Americans lost.

British ship *Persia*, believed to have been torpedoed; sunk December 30, 1915 (no warning); 2 Americans lost

Italian ship *Ancona*, torpedoed November 9, 1915 (no warning); 7 Americans lost.

British ship *Englishman*, torpedoed March 27, 1916; 6 Americans lost (1 more whose nationality is doubtful).

British ship *Sabota*, sunk by gunfire October 20, 1916; 1 American lost.

British ship *Marina*, sunk by gunfire October 28, 1916 (warned); 8 Americans lost.

British ship *Russian*, torpedoed December 14, 1916 (no warning); 17 Americans lost.

British ship *Eavcston*, sunk by shell fire February 5, 1917; 1 American lost (1 other whose nationality is doubtful).

British ship *Vedamore*, torpedoed February 7, 1917 (no warning); 10 Americans lost.

British ship *Turino*, torpedoed February 7, 1917 (no warning); 1 American(?) lost.

French ship *Athos*, torpedoed February 22, 1917 (no warning); 1 American lost.

British ship *Laconia*, torpedoed February 26, 1917 (no warning); 8 Americans lost.

Norwegian ship *Sjostad*, believed torpedoed March 2, 1917 (no warning); 1 American lost.

American ship *Vigilancia*, torpedoed March 16, 1917 (no warning); 5 Americans lost.

American ship *Healdton*, torpedoed March 21, 1917 (no warning); 7 Americans lost.

British ship *Crispin*, torpedoed March 29, 1917 (no warning); 68 Americans on board, 1 killed, 18 missing.

Total, 226 American lives lost.

On the *Lusitania* there were also 24 children born of foreign parents on American soil.

It is sufficient in this connection to say that during the submarine warfare of Germany 226 American lives have been taken without justification and in direct subversion of the most elementary principles of law and of morality. And I am leaving to other speakers the recital of German outrages upon the American Continent—outrages upon the persons and property of United States citizens.

Mr. Chairman, whatever the verdict of history may be, I am satisfied that it will acquit this Government and the American people of the charge that they acted with rashness or precipitation. As I review in my own mind the dastardly career of Germany in its relation with the United States, I confess myself amazed at the moderation and forbearance of the United States. I doubt if there has ever been in the history of the world a case where so much patience has been exhibited by one nation toward another. As we consider the language of our own communications to Germany—"strict accountability," "omit no word nor act," and so forth—what must be our conclusion? Surely if men are ever again to believe that we mean what we say we must make good those ringing and patriotic declarations.

There is no question that Germany itself has been astounded that it has not long ago been at war with the United States. Its responsible officers have been unable to understand how the German program could result in any other course. They could not see how any self-respecting nation could refrain from

accepting the gauntlet which time and time again they have cast at the feet of the United States. Take, for example, the famous Zimmermann letter of instructions to the German minister in Mexico, dated January 19 of the present year. The letter reads, in part:

> On the 1st of February we intend to begin submarine warfare unrestricted. * * * You are instructed to inform the President of Mexico of the above in the greatest confidence as soon as it is certain that there will be an outbreak of war with the United States.

"As soon as it is certain that there will be an outbreak of war with the United States." There was no suggestion of doubt in the mind of the Imperial German minister, who was very well informed as to the sentiment of this country, whether or not war would result from ruthless submarine warfare. It was perfectly clear to him on the 19th of January, two weeks before the announcement of February 1 was made, that that announcement must inevitably bring about war between the United States and Germany. He knew, of course, that there was a man in the White House who had been reelected upon a peace program, a man who stood for peace. He knew that the people of the United States desired peace, and, indeed, yearned for peace, and yet he thought it too clear for argument that war would follow the declaration of February 1.

The United States to-day is doing the inevitable thing. It is taking up arms against the pirate and the desperado of nations, which, as President Wilson said the other evening, is running amuck. It is because we are lovers of peace that we are forced to take this step. Only thus can an enduring peace be achieved. Mr. Chairman, in entering upon this conflict we are fighting the battle of democracy against autocracy, of liberty against despotism, of freedom against enslavement, of civilization against barbarism.

How shall we wage the war? The answer to this question can not be given fully or in detail. It is, of course, in a large measure an executive and not a legislative matter. But I think there are several general principles which loom large and which may perhaps be regarded as absolutely fundamental.

In the first place, I believe that we must hit hard. [Applause.] Half measures are frequently worse than no measures at all. The kindest thing we can do to our own people and to the world is so to engage in the conflict that it may be brought at the earliest possible moment to the end of its dreadful course.

In the second place, I believe that we must promptly embark upon a program of universal military training. I say this because I believe strongly that the future welfare of the Nation—indeed, its very existence—may well depend upon our adoption of universal military training as a part of our national program of defense. Now is the time to act.

In the third place, I believe that we should enter the war with the allies. This country of ours has throughout its history proceeded upon the principle that in union there is strength. It has poured out its precious blood in support of this principle. Merely fighting against Germany may be an ineffective thing. Fighting on the side of those who are fighting Germany will mean that we shall be a powerful and mighty factor in prosecuting the war to an early and definite conclusion. Of course we do not contemplate any permanent alliance with any country. To many of us such a thought would, indeed, be abhorrent; but there can, I think, be no well-founded objection to an alliance for the duration of the war. Only thus shall we have a voice in the peace conference; only thus shall we be able to insure for ourselves the permanent and satisfactory guaranties of an enduring peace, which transcends every other consideration. Just how we shall wage the war is a matter of detail.

If we are fighting squarely upon the side of the allies, we should, for our own maximum efficiency, consider their wishes in the nature of the warfare. Doubtless we can do much by granting a liberal credit to the allies. I am told that France is paying an ultimate interest rate equivalent to 25 per cent upon the bonds which she has recently disposed of in this country. If the United States lends its credit and guarantees those bonds the interest rate will instantly sink to three or three and a half per cent. No greater financial contribution to the permanent welfare of the Republic of France can well be imagined than the taking of this step. What of an expeditionary force? Frankly, I do not know. I doubt if we could send to France within a year and perhaps not within 18 months an army which would be sufficiently trained and equipped and numerous to be a real factor and a fighting force; but much can be done with our Navy; much can be done, I believe, also, by aiding the allies in their aerial warfare. These, however, are considerations which will grow out of the events of to-day but which have no necessary place in the discussion of to-day. Warfare is a serious business at best, but fighting softly is not the way to reduce its horrors. If we throw ourselves and our resources into this war I believe it well within the possibilities that we can so overbalance the scales on the side of the allies that the conflict may be brought to a conclusion during the forthcoming season. [Applause.]

April has been a momentous month in the history of our Nation. In April, 1775, the embattled farmers of Lexington and Concord struck the first blow for liberty; in April, 1812, the Congress of the United States began to voice those protests against the invasion by England of our American rights at sea, which resulted in the war sometimes called the second war of independence. In April, 1861, the first blood was shed by men of Lowell in defense of the Union; in April, 1898, Congress passed the resolution declaring that the people of Cuba should be free, thereby reaching the climax in the relations between Spain and the United States, prior to the actual declaration of war. In April, 1916, the President made the first declaration to Germany to the effect that the patience of the American Government had been exhausted. Whenever on these occasions the United States has taken up arms it has been for a righteous cause. I believe, with all my heart, that our course to-day is righteous—that it is the only course open to an honorable and self-respecting nation. I believe that it is a war not of aggression or for conquest or power, or even for expansion of trade, but a war of self-defense; a war for humanity; a war for Christianity itself. God grant that the issue be decided in accordance with the dictates of right and of humanity, and that our entrance into war to-day may aid in the wiping of wars for all time from the face of the earth. [Applause.]

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless the gentleman gets recognition from the committee he can not do that.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I can not keep faith with my people by voting for this war resolution in its present form. I will vote for it if the provision to authorize an army to be sent across the Atlantic to participate in this European conflict is stricken out. I will vote for a resolution to use the naval forces of the United States to protect American interests and safeguard our national honor on all the seas and oceans of the world. I agree with the distinguished and experienced gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] that sending untrained and unseasoned soldiers into the terrible trench battles of the allies is wholesale murder.

We have said to Germany that we have an unrestricted right to send ships to English ports. The seas are free. We have said to England that we had an unrestricted right to send ships to German ports. The seas are free. We said to England that her blockade was "illegal, indefensible, and ineffective." Therefore we were not bound by it.

We attempted to send ships to German ports. They were halted by British cruisers, and because they were not armed and did not resist, they were not sunk but towed into Kirkwall and declared British prizes. All ships that attempted to go to Hamburg or Bremen were captured and millions of dollars worth of noncontraband goods were confiscated. A matter of $17,000,000 worth of meats was made the subject of peaceful settlement with the Chicago packers, so as to silence this influential element. But the ships of the American Trans-Atlantic Co., sailing in trade between our ports and South American ports, were seized and have recently been declared lawful prizes. All our differences with Great Britain were made a subject of peaceful arbitration. In upward of two years we have not sent an American ships to German ports. If we did so, and the vessel offered resistance, it would be sunk by the British Navy just as we have always held to be the right of a belligerent nation, and as we did in the war of 1812 and 1861–65, when every blockade runner was fired upon without notice and sunk in the Atlantic Ocean with all on board, no matter if citizens of neutral nations were on ships.

Let us not fail to remember that the freedom of the seas and oceans of the world is always subject to the law of blockade.

Prof. Lawrence, lecturer on international law in the Chicago University, is recognized as the highest authority in the United States. Here is his definition of international law:

> International law may be defined as the rules which determine the conduct of the general body of civilized States in their mutual dealings. Strictly speaking there is no such thing as international law. A rule of national conduct may in time become a part of international law, but it is not law until it has met with general acceptance and been incorporated into the usages of States.

Hence, there is no international law on submarine warfare, because submarines are used in this war the first time.

The freedom of the seas is what we are now contending for, but we must remember that the law of blockade is older and better defined than any now recognized system of international law; and the freedom of the seas is always subject to the law

of blockade of belligerent nations. The law of blockade, according to Prof. Lawrence and all other recognized authorities is about 300 years old, and has not been materially changed since 1630. It owes its origin to the Dutch of 1630, when the Dutch fleet blockaded the port of Flanders.

In 1800 the Government of Great Britain claimed—and here I quote from the best-recognized authority on international law—the right to capture at any point in mid-ocean any vessel of the high seas which had for its destination a blockaded port. This position has been recognized as the law of blockade for over 100 years, and is the law to-day. Let me quote a vital instance from the law of blockade by Prof. Lawrence:

During the half century of its existence the greatest blockade ever carried on by cruising vessels was on the coast of the Southern Confederacy during the great Civil War. This was acquiesced in by neutrals without a protest. This isolation of the Confederacy contributed powerfully to the triumph of the Union cause.

While we are discussing the ruthless submarine warfare it is conceded that a mine is the most cowardly and destructive of all war's barbarities, much more so than the submarine, and yet England mined the North Sea, one of the great oceans of the world, and also mined the harbors of several neutral countries and notified the world to keep out of that zone, and we kept out. Including Austria-Hungary and the coasts blockaded by Great Britain, we lost the markets for our products for over 175,000,000 people, and yet we submitted without breaking off diplomatic relations.

Germany has established a war zone not nearly so extensive as that of Great Britain, because it is only 20 miles from shore, and notified not only the United States but all the countries of the world that vessels entering that zone, consigned to ports of England, do so at their peril. This was not aimed at the United States alone or any other country, but strictly a measure of protection and notice to all the countries of the world, and yet these war-crazed enthusiasts, who talk about national honor, would make us believe that this submarine warfare is aimed at the United States.

Germany agreed to give up her submarine campaign provided England allowed ships to reach German ports from neutral countries, including the United States. This England refused to do. Germany thereupon intensified her U-boat campaign under the law of retaliation, because the neutral nations declined to protect the law of neutral shipping, and our Government refused to take part in a coalition of neutral powers to protect themselves against British aggression upon their rights. This is history, however. We then informed Germany that she must confine her submarine campaign to limits which we held to be dictated by laws of humanity and international usage, and Germany agreed on condition that we should compel Great Britain to return to the recognized principles for the safety of neutral shipping. This reasonable request Great Britain refused to grant.

Waiting in vain nearly a year for us to effect means to let neutral ships travel the seas unrestricted by British orders, Germany announced a certain date after which all ships would be sunk without notice if they attempted to invade the German war zone, but agreed voluntarily to provide for the safety of American ships through a defined passage in their journey to British ports. As a result of this, the President broke off diplomatic relations with Germany. And the President called upon all the neutral countries of the world to also sever diplomatic relations with Germany. But not one neutral nation responded.

We are now urged to war because Germany has established a war zone 20 miles from shore around the shore line of England. During the Crimean War England blockaded the port of Riga in Russia by war vessels 120 miles from the town. This exceeds the German blockade by 100 miles.

THE TRADE IN CONTRABAND OF WAR.

On page 697 of Prof. Lawrence's great book on international law is a valuable chapter on contraband of war. I quote a paragraph:

Every belligerent may capture goods of direct or immediate use in war if he is able to intercept them on their passage to the enemy.

This principle has been recognized as international law for over 100 years. And yet we are told now that we have the right to ship munitions of war—cannon, muskets, powder, and all the instruments for wholesale murder—to Great Britain and put American citizens on board and sail into the war zone established by Germany.

Gov. Glynn, in sounding the keynote at the St. Louis convention that nominated President Wilson the second time, said of this policy of keeping us out of war:

It has freed us from the paralyzing touch of Europe's balance of power, leaving to Europe the things that are Europe's and preserving for America the independence, the peace, and the happiness that now are here.

Let me refer to a bit of vital history of over a half century ago of which I was a humble participant on the field of war—a period when the life of this Republic was in serious peril: President Lincoln called England to account for the seizure of the United States ship *Chesapeake* on the high seas, bound from New York to Portland, for the burning of the United States ship *Roanoke* off Bermuda, for the seizure on Lake Erie of the ship *Philo Parsons*, and the scuttling of the *Island Queen*, the shooting of its engineer and the wounding of its passengers; and he protested to England against the invasion of the territory of the United States by a band of southern sympathizers from Canada, who rode across the border into Vermont, burned a portion of St. Albans, looted its homes, robbed its bank of $211,000, killed one of its citizens, and wounded several more.

In stinging language Lincoln told England that she violated neutrality for permitting "the use of British ports and British borders as a base for felonious depredations against the citizens of the United States," and he wrote into history his diplomatic battle against England for letting loose the *Alabama* to prey upon our commerce, to destroy $100,000,000 worth of property, to capture 84 of our vessels and drive our flag from the seas. No nation ever inflicted upon another nation a more damnable or more maddening wrong than England inflicted upon the United States in the *Alabama* outrage.

The great Civil War ended with the United States holding the strongest and most valiant veteran Army in the world. But we did not go to war. Gen. Grant, then recognized as the foremost soldier in the world, was President; but he was not hysterical. He and his great Army and the whole American people had been saddened and sobered by war. And Gen. Grant in the White House was supported by able, sane, and experienced statesmen, and all our aggravating trouble with England was settled by arbitration. And who will say now that this was not best? At the distance of 3,500 miles the undesirable and dangerous German Kaiser looks the same to me as the great grandson of George III; in fact, all kings look alike to me. I am not willing to vote to send the gallant young manhood of America across the Atlantic Ocean to fight for either.

I remember well when Theodore Roosevelt was President of the United States the German Kaiser tendered an heroic statue of Frederick the Great to the United States, which tender was accepted with gracious thanks by Theodore Roosevelt, President, and the same statue, after due formality, was set up in the White House Park in the most conspicuous spot in the city of Washington—in front of the White House. It was dedicated with heroic ceremony. Frederick the Great was a friend and defender of George Washington, and the German nation ever since the organization of the Republic has been a constant and abiding friend of the United States; that during all our wars with Great Britain Germany has stood steadfast as our friend; that in the great Civil War, when Confederate ships were being built in English shipyards and driving our commerce from the seas and oceans of the world, Germany was our fast friend.

Germany furnished 300,000 soldiers to the Union Army, and such distinguished generals as Gen. Carl Schurz, Gen. Franz Sigel, and Gen. Osterhaus, and thousands of others who offered up their lives for the Union while England was trying to destroy the Republic. I am quoting from recent history.

I have a list here of 48 generals, all Germans, who fought on the Union side in that great war, which I will print in the RECORD. Their names are not as familiar as some others, because they did not think their services entitled them to be kept on the public pay roll the remainder of their lives. But I can say this as a matter of simple justice: That they include some of the most distinguished generals of the great Civil War. Had it not been for the Germans both Missouri and Maryland would have been lost to the Union. Gen. Robert E. Lee said, and Mrs. Jefferson Davis repeated the sentiment, "Take the Dutch out of the Union Army and we could lick the Yankees easily." Here is the list:

Gen. Carl Schurz, Gen. Franz Sigel, Gen. Adolph von Steinwehr, Gen. Alex. von Schimmelpfennig, Gen. Louis Blenker, Gen. Peter Osterhaus, Gen. George von Schack, Gen. Konrad Krez, Gen. Alban Schoepf, Gen. Julius Stahel, Gen. Samuel Peter Heintzelmann, Gen. J. H. Heintzelmann, Gen. Louis Wagner, Gen. August Kautz, Gen. Hugo Wangelin, Gen. G. Pennypacker, Gen. Friedrich Hecker, Gen. Max Weber, Gen. August Willich, Gen. Friedrich Salomon, Gen. Karl Salomon, Gen. Edward S. Salomon, Gen. Isaak Wister, Gen. Heinrich von Bohlen, Gen. Adolph Hassendeubel, Gen. Louis Zahm, Gen. Gottfried Weitzel, Gen. Theodor Schwan, Gen. Adolph Buschbeck, Gen. Wilhelm Heine, Gen. Gustav Kaemmerling, Gen. Louis von Blessing, Gen. August Mohr, Gen. Julius Raith, Gen. F. C. Winkler, Gen. Johann A. Koltes, Gen. Herman Lieb, Gen. Alexander von Schrader, Gen. William C. Kueffner, Gen. George W. Mindel, Gen. Felix Salm-Salm, Gen. G. R. Paul, Gen. Karl Leopold Mathies, Gen. Edward S. Meyer, Gen. George A. Custer, Gen. Adolph Engelmann, Gen. Joseph Gerhardt, Gen. Hermann Haupt—

Forty-eight names, and there are others.

And now we are going to war as an ally of the one nation in Europe that has always been our enemy and against the nation that has always been our friend. This is the record we are making to-day. Posterity will judge our actions by this record.

I remember all this in that terrible conflict for four years, and it is burnt into my memory; and while my father was an Englishman, full bred, and my mother was a Scotch woman, full bred, I have been for strict neutrality in this great European conflict. I can not forget, because it is only a few months old, that the President of the United States was elected President because he kept us out of the European conflict. I can not forget, either, that in the speech made by the chairman of the Democratic national convention of 1916, his most forceful point in the declaration which called for the most enthusiastic applause was that we were not mixing and would not mix in this great European conflict, in this terrible holocaust of murder then in progress in Europe. I can not forget these things, because they are vital now.

Who are backing this powerful movement for war? Let me state. The report of the Du Pont Co., one of the manufacturers of explosives, shows gross receipts for 1916 of $318,845,685, and net earnings of $82,107,693. The company paid 100 per cent dividends on common stock and is constructing new plants to cost $60,000,000—getting ready for more war. The Bethlehem Steel Co. recently announced that it had placed $37,500,000 of foreign short-term notes as security for increased capital stock. New York and London financial interests are becoming identical. They are getting ready for more war, more human killings, for more bloody dollars.

Flour and potatoes are cheaper in London and Berlin, handicapped as they are by embargoes, than in the cities of the United States. This country has been drained of wheat, corn, and other food products for export to England and the allies, and we have had bread riots in New York and Philadelphia and Chicago, but we have not heeded the piteous cry of the hungry at home, while passing military appropriations liable to aggregate over three thousand five hundred millions to embroil this peaceful country in the most useless, destructive, and brutal war in all history, 3,000 miles away.

I have just been reading the Farewell Address of George Washington warning his countrymen to keep out of the struggles and conflicts of European empires. And while it is true that George Washington's sage advice and wise counsel is lightly regarded now by those who believe that war and not peace is the normal condition of our so-called Christian manhood, I still believe that George Washington was the greatest statesman and prophet of humane destiny since civilization was evolved in the womb of the dead centuries of barbarism.

CONSCRIPTION.

I have recently been reading a very valuable pamphlet by Prof. George Nasmyth, a noted writer on sociology, author of a book on social progress, and another valuable book, A Study of Force, as a factor in human relations. This pamphlet deals with the question of universal military training, or conscription, whichever you may call it. The argument for universal military service is that it treats the rich and the poor alike. This argument is not sound. Let me quote from Prof. Nasmyth, a paragraph that goes to the root of the whole question:

> Does universal military service involve equal sacrifice on the part of rich and poor alike? If both are killed, of course, both have made the last great sacrifice. But for the families of the two men the difference is very great. For the family of the poor man the loss of the bread winner means that the widow must go out to work; that the children must be deprived of an opportunity for education. For the rich man, on the contrary, no such sacrifice on the part of his family is involved. His wife is not compelled to go out and work; his children are not deprived of the opportunity of receiving a liberal education. A conscription of lives alone, such as is advocated by the believers in universal military service, is fundamentally unjust if the family, instead of the individual, is considered as the foundation of the Nation's life. But if conscription ever does become inevitable let us not add blasphemy to our other crimes by adopting militarism in the name of democracy. No; let us do it with the clear knowledge that we are dealing a death blow to the greatest experiment in democracy the human race has ever tried.

Besides, the rich man can purchase a substitute, but the poor man can not. He must go into the ranks of the killing and the killed.

Those Members of Congress who vote for this war resolution to-day are taking an awful responsibility. If this resolution was to provide for the national defense against any threatened foreign aggression I would vote for it, but we all know it is not. The President, in the presence of both Houses of Congress and the Cabinet and the Supreme Court and the bespangled Diplomatic Corps, in a spectacular and elaborately staged event, read a message to Congress and the country, declaring his purpose to enter the European conflict in the interest of a world-wide democracy. Hence every Member on this floor knows that Germany has at this very moment declared officially that she desires peace and not war with the United States; that her war blockade of England and the allies' coasts is for self-protection. Her official warning was sent to the United States and all the neutral countries of the world to keep out of this established war zone. In violation of all the most sacred traditions of the past century and in violation of the most vital and sacred admonitions of George Washington, warning this Nation to avoid the conflicts of European empires; in violation of the Monroe doctrine, we are now about to plunge this great peaceful Nation into a kings' war in Europe. This, too, in violation of our most vital and sacred promises made to the American people less than six months ago to keep this Nation out of this criminal European conflict. We are going into a world-wide war, a war of kings and emperors and czars and sultans against kings and emperors and kaisers, in which the best manhood of Europe has already been ruthlessly slaughtered. In order to add to the horrid holocaust the stalwart young manhood of America are to be forced into the conflict, and we are going to rush them into this slaughter-house against the best and highest ideals of this Republic—peace, progress, and prosperity, and a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Some kindly soul from way out West, a student of the sweeter humanities, sends me the following:

> Why attempt to overthrow "Prussian militarism" abroad and intrench it within our very doors? It is already in our midst, increasing by leaps and bounds under only the shadow of the war. Why give it the immeasurable opportunity of the war itself—the greatest of wars—which it so eagerly craves? Shall they alone be sent to the war who are willing to be killed and to kill? Shall they be given an opportunity to say whether they are willing or not? Since ours is supposed to be a government of, by, and for the people, shall the people themselves be given a chance to say whether or not their Government shall take a step of such fundamental weal or woe as is that of going into the war? Or shall it be left to 500 men out of 100,000,000? Above all, shall the mothers of men be given a chance to vote on the momentous question? The cry is being raised, "Let us stand behind the President!" Alas, that it should be most vociferously raised by those who have peace upon their lips, but war within their hearts. When the President made his great and prophetic speech to the Senate on the 22d of January, his constructive program for a durable peace for all the world was received in derision by most of those who now so violently demand that we shall "stand behind him." Their manifest purpose is to push him and the country into war. Their demand for "patriotic" support of the President is hypocrisy and a sham. The very men who sang the doxology and marched in procession through the streets in honor of his supposed defeat at the recent election, and who have consistently denounced and despised his every policy and effort during the past four years, are now loudest in their summons to "stand behind him."
>
> These men are not true patriots in this time of grave crisis which confronts our Nation and the world. This is a time that tries men's souls. The pure gold of patriotism will be found in those Americans who are loyal, even and especially in this period of military fury and jingoistic hysteria, to the best and noblest ideals of America. What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? What shall it profit us if we should gain a victory over Germany and lose the fairest fruits of our democracy?

I can not vote to send the brave and stalwart sons of my beloved country into the horrid slaughter pens of Europe, to enter the most useless, brutal, and criminal war in all history.

Let me quote here as timely a couplet from our own beloved poet, Howard S. Taylor:

> We have forgot! A Roman lust
> Profanes our ancient holy things;
> We trample justice in the dust;
> We have the rabies of the kings,
> The scarlet rage of gun and sword.
> Have mercy on Thy people, Lord!

MY SACRED CAMPAIGN PLEDGES.

I am pledged to my constituents to use every honorable means to keep this country out of war. That was the main issue in my campaign, which culminated in November, 1916. The Republicans put up their most popular man with the largest campaign fund ever known. They started it with a great parade in which 29 brass bands were hired, and all the newspapers in my district were committed for preparedness. They claimed it was the universal sentiment and a patriotic sentiment. In every campaign speech I made I said, with all the emphasis I could command, that I regarded war as the greatest crime of the human race. I have been fourteen times elected to civil office, and have never accepted a dollar from an individual or a corporation as a campaign fund. I was elected last November from a Republican district with a majority approximating 13,000, the largest majority of any Democrat running in a Republican district on that issue. I would be violating my convictions and lacking in fidelity to the patriotic and stalwart men who sent me to Congress if I did not do my utmost to keep faith with my people.

As I love my country, I would use every honorable means to keep the young manhood of America out of this horrid holocaust of European slaughter. My experience in the Civil War has saddened all my life. I had my soul rent with indescribable agony, as I stood in the presence of comrades who were maimed, mangled, and dying on 42 battle fields of this Republic. As I

love my country, I feel it my sacred duty to keep the stalwart young men of to-day out of a barbarous war 3,500 miles away, in which we have no vital interest. And I am earnestly inquiring what the harvest will be outside of a wholesale slaughter of the patriotic manhood of the Nation. As I love my country, if war is inevitable, then I will be found standing by the country as I did from '61 to '65, and I will go to the front if accepted as a soldier whenever or wherever duty calls.

APPENDIX.

Among the hundreds of letters and telegrams I have received during the past five days I print only a few. Here is a letter from that student of the humanities, Miss Elizabeth G. Bach, of Wellesley College, explaining why so many Congressmen vote for war against the convictions and interests of their constituents:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 5, 1917.*

The situation here in Washington for the last four days has been extraordinarily interesting. Members of the peace delegation have been talking with their representatives in Congress and their reports which I have been helping to tabulate are illuminating. The fact that stands out is that so many Congressmen are ready to vote against their own judgment, against their conscience, and against what they have reason to believe to be the will of their constituents.

I take up the first pile on my desk—that of a New York Congressman. He is reported to have said substantially as follows: "The people of my district are seven to one against war. But I shall vote for it. They will soon forget about it, but the men who voted in the Senate against war will go down in history in obloquy."

A Minnesota delegate reported that several Congressmen told him that they knew the constituents were opposed to war; that they themselves knew no reason why the country should enter the war, but "somehow they felt that patriotism demanded that they should vote for war."

A North Carolina Congressman is reported as saying "he would really rather be dead than vote for war," but that he proposes to do it.

Another New York Congressman said that he believed that the majority of the citizens in his district are against war, but that they could "go to hell." "Or words to that effect."

I next take up the report on two Ohio Congressmen. One is against war but calls opposition hopeless. The other is against war but will not commit himself as to how he will vote.

An Iowa Congressman is "heart-broken that it is going to happen," but it appears that he is going to vote for war.

An Arkansas man will vote for war but does not like it.

A South Carolina man "would vote for war if Wilson wanted it, even if he knew it meant the ruin of his country."

A Virginia man is "opposed to war but may have to vote for it."

Two Mississippi men take the same position.

A Michigan man is "not for war, and never has been, but the President has put us in such a position that if we do not declare war we shall be the laughing-stock of the whole world. To avoid appearing to be divided among ourselves, to save the good name of the country, it is necessary to vote for war."

Many Congressmen speak with unrestrained bitterness of the President whom they blame for the dilemma in which they thus find themselves.

Others interpret the situation in terms of the political game and say that the Republicans are jockeying the Democrats into assuming the burden of a war policy in the extreme form which the President's speech has, as they feel, now given it. They believe the war will prove most unpopular and a formidable political boomerang.

Many Congressmen are hearing what the people are thinking at their quiet firesides. Outside of uptown New York, we have not heard of any district sending in a majority of telegrams and letters favoring war, and we hear of many where the contrary is true. Unfortunately we have no complete data on this point as yet.

So far as we can learn, the various unofficial referenda show a strong preponderance for peace, with the sole exception of one in the residential town of Newton, Mass., where 55 per cent favored war. Of 12,000 replies to the same inquiry from Massachusetts at large, 65 per cent, on the other hand, are against war.

In New Ulm, Minn., out of 485 replies, 19 favored war.

The Associated Press reports the voters of Monroe, Wis., as ten to one against a declaration of war, 1,049 votes having been cast. The Sheboygan, Wis., ballot on war was 4,177 against war and 17 votes for.

The secretary of Senator LA FOLLETTE, who "represents no one but himself," estimates that the Senator has received some 15 prowar letters or cards out of about 2,000, the rest approving his course.

Many Congressmen are in the most acute distress of mind. They are white, with drawn faces. Some shed tears. They are on the rack, drawn one way by one set of considerations and in the contrary direction by another.

It is impossible to know how many would vote against war if they voted on their convictions or if they intended to represent the will of the majority in their home districts.

One Congressman claimed that a secret vote would result in a majority of two-thirds for peace. Representative BRITTEN, of Illinois, has claimed on the floor of the House that 75 per cent of the Representatives want to vote against war.

The early days of April, 1917, may appear in history as more fateful than the early days of August, 1914. A war urged by the President on a reluctant Congress upon the grounds of the most disinterested idealism will apparently be "wished upon" the country against its will by the votes of men who fear the press more than they fear their constituents, who fear the party whip more than they fear their consciences.

So nearly 1900 years after the death on the cross this is to be the celebration of Good Friday.

ELIZABETH G. BACH.

THAT MILITARY PROPAGANDA.

About the military propaganda which was started soon after the breaking out of the European war, Mr. J. L. Hughes, of Columbus, writes as follows:

We heard a minister state wtih vehemence "that we should all be willing to take up our cross and follow Jesus," that the great question to-day is "Christ or Prussianism." His idea was that we should shoot Christianity into the Germans with machine guns and cannon. Just how much Christianity he could cram into a 10 or 12 inch cannon he did not say. But I imagine that a cannon full of this so-called Christianity directed by an accurate gunner into the anatomy of some European heathen would yield forth fruit to a hundredfold. The shells and ammunition we have made and shipped to Europe in the last two years has filled thousands of graves, destroyed many homes, made thousands of widows and orphans, and kept the fires of the hell in Europe burning at a hellish heat. It is true we received big pay for this fuel of hell, but every dollar we received is dripping with the blood of our brother. You ask me where England and France would be had they not protected their homes and families. England with her navy was and is mistress of the seas. Germany was trying to outdo England, and succeeded in doing so, on land. France and the rest of the nations were trying to keep up with them. Were it not for this competitive preparation there would have been no need for any nation to defend its homes. I ask you to think seriously, has Europe protected her homes? Don't you know that nearly every family and home in Europe is stricken almost to the death and that Europe has been mortally wounded by that which (armies and navies) the jingoist told them would protect them? Armies and navies are, as used to-day, for the purpose of killing, and it takes homes, families, and blood to satisfy them.

The next time you see a thoughtless, so-called patriot get up and with swinging arms and blatant voice shout about patriotism point him to poor blood-stained, dying Europe, where the greatest armies and navies the world ever dreamed of are assembled with unlimited ammunition and show him the protection afforded by preparedness.

Truly, yours,

J. L. HUGHES.

The Rev. Patrick O'Brien, a prominent pastor of Toledo, Ohio, and a Civil War veteran, has been very active in the military propaganda, and has been marching in the preparedness parades, but he balks at the proposition to send the brave and stalwart sons of America into this European war, and sends the following telegram:

Make no alliance with England or her allies. Vote no money, munitions, or provisions. Send no troops to Europe to be slaughtered. Let America stand alone.

I also received the following telegram from Rev. J. Henry Hornung, of the Kenilworth Avenue Church, Toledo, Ohio:

War is wrong. Wrong can not bring right. Vote against the wrong. Vote for the right.

Here is a copy of a telegram received from C. J. N. Garfunkle, of Cincinnati, Ohio:

Cherishing the memories of your noble consort and as an American citizen from Cincinnati, formerly from Toledo, I ask, in the name of God and humanity as the hours pass and the world's tragedy intensifies, what gain will result if the United States enters into the world's cataclysm? Have not all belligerents violated international law? Hasn't England first instituted ruthless warfare? Has she not conspired against a nation of a handful of people in comparison defending themselves against starvation and conquest, as she publicly proclaimed the ruthlessness by Germany had been instigated and provoked? Secondarily, Germany was willing never to commence ruthless submarine warfare if Britain's violation of international law would have been stopped. I pray that Congress will listen to the fervent prayers of millions of its citizens not to drag our country into this world war, thereby avoid scuttling of ship of state on its rocks. Let us raise forever our Stars and Stripes upon the highest pinnacle to the breezes of the world, and justice and charity to all, privilege to none, will be proclaimed. Kindly read this to Congress. Believe me, sir.

Also an extract from a letter signed by Mr. J. P. Kready, of Butte, Mont.:

Will you allow me to thank you for the fight you are making against war? We who live in Montana are without representation (the Amalgamated Co. controls them all), so we are bound to turn to others for defense of American ideals and principles.

Here is a letter received from Mr. W. S. Moulton, Lima, Ohio, under date of March 27, 1917:

Permit me to say, as a citizen who inherits that citizenship from colonial forefathers, that in my humble opinion the best interests of the Nation and people lie in the path of peace while the present struggle is going on across the Atlantic.

W. S. MOULTON.

Also a telegram from Mr. Fred D. Warren, Chicago, Ill.:

Urge adoption amendment to pending war measure, "All Congressmen who vote 'yes' shall by such vote be drafted into Army as private soldiers and sent to Europe with first troops. If physically unfit, then next of kin." Let them give the country an example of real patriotism.

FRED D. WARREN,
Trenier Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

LETTER FROM REV. JENKIN LLOYD JONES, OF CHICAGO.

Hon. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
Representative from Ohio:

Be not deceived by the flattering hope that the declaration of war will not involve much disaster and that such a war will come to a speedy end. The terrible demonstration in Europe, as well as our own experience, proves that "short wars" are impossible in our present stage of human development and military engineering. Beware how you start a fire that will promptly burst into a conflagration beyond your control. The 500 American lives, more or less, already lost can not be brought back by offering many thousands more of innocent lives on the Moloch altar of war.

On behalf of the many silent and suffering protestants, I plead with you to save our country from the disgraces of this unholy war. Save our country to the leadership for peace, which is its providential opportunity.

Yours, very respectfully, an humble citizen,

JENKIN LLOYD JONES.

BRIEF PROTEST FROM AKRON.

AKRON, OHIO, *March 28, 1917.*

Hon. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I earnestly suggest that you vote against a declaration of war with Germany at this time. Let not future history record the fact that we went to war to maintain our right to sell munitions to belligerents. A great majority of the people are of the same opinion, the newspapers to the contrary notwithstanding.

Yours, very truly, A. C. HOLLOWAY.

VOICE OF A VETERAN.

STRATTON, NEBR., *March 10, 1917.*

Hon. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
Representative from Ohio.

MY DEAR GENERAL: I wish to thank you men for the stand you have taken, and may God still guide you.

For the Master.

T. E. WELLMAN,
Seventy-ninth Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

THE VOICE OF ORGANIZED LABOR.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 12, 1917.*

Congressman SHERWOOD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Complying with a motion unanimously passed by the Trades and Labor Assembly (the central labor organization of the city, representing close to 100 labor unions, with a membership of 18,000), I was instructed to commend you for your noble stand for peace and against war, in the interest of the great common people, for whom war's only rewards are hardships, pains, sorrows, and deaths.

Words fail to express our sincere appreciation for your efforts, regardless of the fact the "prostitute press," the munition manufacturers, and the patriots for profits may win in the end and bathe this Nation in a deluge of blood.

L. SIXTON,
Secretary of the Minneapolis Trades and Labor Assembly.

JOHN SAMSEY, PUBLISHER, WRITES.

CLEVELAND, *April 1, 1917.*

Gen. I. R. SHERWOOD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL: First of all, I am fully convinced that no great number of the people of Cleveland want war. Those who express themselves believe the whole proposition is to aid England and to make secure the money advances made by people of this country. This opinion is based on what I meet in my daily walks and what I hear on the street cars. The opinions of foreign-born people are not considered in coming to this conclusion. I went out to feel the "public pulse" among native born, and I firmly believe there is no real sentiment for war in this city. We have guards on bridges over railroads, and those I saw to-day were without rifles. You are one of those who can aid to prevent war, and I feel that if Congress would listen to "the noise" of the common people they would let Europe fight its own battles.

Yours, very truly, JOHN SAMSEY.

LETTER FROM A PACIFIST.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *April 1, 1917.*

Congressman SHERWOOD,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Just a few words to say that a score of us mining, cattlemen, and merchants of this section are bitterly opposed to any declaration of war at this time against Germany, the newspapers to the contrary notwithstanding. Talking with many people all the way from New York to this place, I find a very large number of our best people opposed to a declaration of war. The proposition if it could be submitted to a vote would be defeated all the way from 8 to 12 to 1.

With kindest regards, I am, yours, respectfully,

B. A. SEITZ.

A PATRIOTIC LETTER FOR PEACE.

LIMA, OHIO, *March 29, 1917.*

Honorable SENATOR: As a descendant and historian of an American family whose sons were in the Revolution, in the War of 1812, on almost every battle field of the Civil War, as well as in various units of our Army to-day, I beg to say that the overwhelming sentiment is against a declaration of war against Germany at this time and under present circumstances. Rally 'round the flag; but let it not be carried to foreign shores contrary to the cause of liberty and freedom for which it was gloriously raised.

Very patriotically, yours, F. A. BURKHARDT.

A TOLEDO LAWYER WRITES.

TOLEDO, OHIO, *March 28, 1917.*

Gen. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Are we going to sell our young men into the European trenches to King George the Fifth, as the Hessians were sold to his great-grandfather, King George the Third? Is it possible that a small coterie of men have gotten absolute control of our Government, by which they can dominate and dictate its policy through control of the press, by which we are drawn into the conflict which we had very little interest in? Is this the new freedom that was so widely heralded several years ago? Is this the fulfillment of the covenant made with the people last fall that "As long as I am President, there will be no war." With a subsidized, venal, yellow press, absolutely controlled, the news manufactured to order at the Capital, sent out broadcast one day, heralded as public opinion the next day, proclaiming the enthusiasm of a comparatively small coterie in each community, and when you examine the names of the signers of many of these self-constituted committees or organizations, you will find a majority consisting of men perfectly safe from conscription on account of their age or their habits.

Yours, truly,

J. H. CAUFFIEL.

A WISCONSIN SOCIOLOGIST WRITES.

RIVER FALLS, WIS., *March 29, 1917.*

MY DEAR MR. SHERWOOD: I beg you to take your old stand against war and against compulsory military training. Now is the time for the most controlled action and not an alliance with the jingoists.

Cordially,

ELMER WILLIS SERL.

A PROMINENT BOSTONIAN WRITES.

BOSTON, *March 31, 1917.*

Gen. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am taking the liberty of writing to you in this grave crisis to beg you earnestly to do everything in your power, by your influence, voice, and vote, to save this country from the horrors of war.

It seems to me wholly unnecessary. An unnecessary war is a crime. Four weeks ago, with the present situation in full view, armed neutrality was good enough for the President, Congress, and the country. Why, then, is it not the proper course to-day? America is a peaceable country. She wants no war for revenge, for a duelist's idea of honor, to defend her great ideals of freedom, democracy, and peace. She does not want to get mixed up in European quarrels.

And yet a wave of hysteria threatens to sweep us off our feet into the raging whirlpool of war.

Surely armed neutrality deserve at least a fair trial. Large enthusiastic mass meetings are being held in Boston to protest against war.

I appeal to you in the name of all these Boston peace people, in the name of our country and its ideals, in the name of humanity and of God to do everything in your power to promote the adoption of the policy of armed neutrality and to avert the incalculable horrors of war.

Very sincerely, yours,

DAVID G. HASKINS, Jr.

LETTER FROM COMMISSION MERCHANTS.

CHICAGO, *April 2, 1917.*

Hon. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This administration was elected upon a peace platform. Therefore we must now be true to the people and not precipitate war before ascertaining by referendum whether or not the people want war, otherwise no belligerent act of any European nation could be compared in the injury done our country with this dishonor and betrayal of our Republic. We must not betray the people's trust, for if we do this Nation's blood will be upon our hands.

Have we not criticized European monarchies for forcing their subjects into war against their will? How, then, unless the will of the people is ascertained by referendum vote, do we differ from these monarchies?

Yours, truly, EARL BROS.

AN IMPORTANT REQUEST.

Hon. I. R. SHERWOOD,
Representative of Ohio, Toledo, Ohio.

DEAR SIR: I respectfully request you to consider the following before voting for war:

First. If you decide for war with Germany you put the United States in the position of going to war with a country who does not desire war with us. (See official statement of Imperial German chancellor.) This would be a lamentable action for us to take after our properly exalted and humanitarian attitude of the last few years.

It would be bad enough to go to war with a nation that hated us and wanted war with us. But not an injury that has come to us has been intended against us. Every injury that we have suffered has been incidental to an injury that was intended against some one else.

Second. Furthermore, our Supreme Court has decided that this is a Christian Nation. If so, the Nation ought to act like a Christian.

There is trouble and woe and horror enough in this world now without our deliberately spreading it to our own beloved Nation, and there are ideals for us to live up to. We may never again have so favorable an opportunity to emphasize these ideals to the world as we have at this very serious day.

Yours, very respectfully, JAMES EDWARD VAN DYKE,
Of New Jersey.

LETTER FROM SECRETARY OF THE FIRST MICHIGAN CAVALRY ASSOCIATION (CUSTER'S MICHIGAN CAVALRY BRIGADE).

DETROIT, MICH., *March 31, 1917.*

To Gen. I. R. SHERWOOD,
Washington, D. C.:

May God bless you and spare you a long and happy life. You, a genuine American patriot, a grand soldier of the battle field, and a lover of peace, you know what war is. You know what peace is. I wish to God every Member of Congress was half as loyal to country and flag as you are, Gen. SHERWOOD. I voted for ex-President Taft. I voted for our President Wilson because he kept us out of war. God bless you again, Gen. SHERWOOD, for the stand you have taken trying to keep our grand and beloved country out of this European war.

Yours, in F., C. and L.,

CORNELIUS O'DWYER,
639 Lenox Avenue.

One who served our country honorably on 32 battle fields, never answered a sick call, never missed a roll call.

STAND FAST FOR PEACE.

NEW YORK, *April 2, 1917.*

Hon. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of the patriotic Christian Americans in all sections, who are loyal to the Government, the Christian Herald appeals to you in this crisis to stand fast for this high ideal.

THE CHRISTIAN HERALD.

TOLEDO, OHIO, *April 5, 1917.*

Gen. I. R. SHERWOOD, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

I have plans formed for raising a regiment of volunteers in and about Toledo, and call on you as an old One hundred and eleventh man to give me all the assistance you can. Will you see Secretary Baker and find out if he will sanction such a move and recognize it. You

know I have had some organization experience and am a Spanish-War veteran. Help and we'll fight as hard as you did at Franklin and Nashville.

WES. THURSTIN.

A PEACE-LOVING WOMAN'S LETTER.

NEW YORK, *April 4, 1917.*

Hon. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD.

MY DEAR SIR: Being convinced of your desire to know the true sentiments of the great mass of American people in this hour of world crisis, I am writing to let you know that I have found everywhere among what is termed the "common people" a universal aversion to war. To be sure, this aversion is apathetic; not, however, the apathy of indifference, but rather that of despair; the tragic resignation of those who believe they have, and can have, no voice that will be heard.

I, therefore, in the name of those countless masses, make you this plea to do your "bit" to keep the country out of war. I feel confident that you will receive the grateful acknowledgment of your constituents in some form or other before next election day if you can accomplish this great and truly patriotic deed.

Very respectfully, yours,

Mrs. J. SERGEANT CRAM.

During the course of Mr. SHERWOOD's remarks,

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to make a statement for the benefit of the committee. There seems to be some misunderstanding as to the procedure that has been adopted. Under the rules of the House members of the Committee on Military Affairs have absolute right to recognition in preference to any other Members of the House. Thus far no Members have been recognized to speak in support of the resolution excepting those who have been members of that committee. The Chair has declined to recognize Members for an hour, because to do so would be to preclude a number of gentlemen who desire to speak. The Chair has a list of seventy-odd Members who desire to make some remarks upon this resolution, and unless the Chair somewhat arbitrarily limits the time of the various Members himself a great number will be disappointed. The Chair does not seek the popularity that will follow this course, but in order to be just and fair to the members of the committee he has determined to recognize Members for definite periods and to recognize no requests for further extensions of time. [Applause.] To violate that determination in one instance will make it impractical for a large number of Members who for important reasons affecting themselves, if not affecting the interest of the country, desire to have some time to speak.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHERWOOD] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, it would be an unprofitable task to attempt to analyze all of the inconsistencies of the speeches which have been made in opposition to this resolution. Some of them have been mere tirades against the present administration, and incidentally, but nevertheless directly, against the American Government. Some of them have presented with great force and eloquence the position of Germany in this controversy. Some of them have emphasized the outrages or alleged outrages to which it is claimed we have submitted from England and other belligerent powers. Of those that I have heard only two will bear the test of logic, and those two are the speeches of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. Both of those speeches were eminently logical. Both of them resulted in but one thing, and that is, that no matter what the aggression might be, unless it came directly home to the fireside of the man himself, no question of national honor or national integrity was involved. To that doctrine I can not subscribe. I believe that the independence of the Nation consists in protecting the great fundamental, beneficial freedom of commerce, the intercourse of the Nation with the world, which is a blessing to mankind.

I believe that the integrity of the Nation demands that every citizen engaged in a lawful pursuit for the benefit of mankind and civilization shall have a free right to go abroad in the world. This right should not be abridged by belligerent nations under pretext of military necessity. War is the abnormal condition which must be kept within the rules of international law. The rights of neutrals are higher and more sacred than the rights of belligerents. If I believed the doctrine of those two speeches I would believe that it would be best if we were a hermit nation, having no contact or connection with the rights or pretensions of other nations, but I believe the contrary. If American citizenship means anything it means that the whole force of the organized government should be used to protect the American citizen in his lawful rights on land and on sea, on our own soil, or on the soil of our neutral neighbor. I regret that possibly the impression has grown up in the world that American citizenship is held too cheaply; that there is not back of that patent of nobility, American citizenship, a guaranty of protection which makes it of value in the eyes of men and in the eyes of the world. Now, I would not attempt to analyze such a speech as that of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] who a short while ago confessed he is ready to expend unlimited sums on naval armament and then refuses to vote to use that armament in the protection of American rights. His interest seems to cease when the people's money is expended and not to extend to the use of that expenditure in the protection of the rights of the people. But we are not called upon, gentlemen, to determine whether we shall enter upon a war. We are called upon to determine whether in a long period of forbearance the time has come when we declare a state of war to exist. I say that it lies upon the gentlemen who resist and oppose this resolution to show that their course would end the aggressions upon American citizens. If we forbear now, on how many more occasions will we be required to forbear? If we forbear for 30 days, for 10 days, for 24 hours, how are we to know that that course will secure us immunity?

I heard some of these same gentlemen argue that if we put guns upon American merchantmen that that act would invite war. Yet to give the lie to that argument those belligerent nations that have attacked our rights have attacked and sunk unarmed merchantmen; so the contention that the arming of merchantmen would invite attack has fallen to the ground. The same has been true of each of these arguments designed to paralyze the action of the American Government in extending protection to American citizens and to American commerce. Now, mark you, these gentlemen are not securing us against invasion of our rights; they are counseling submitting to it. As long ago as April 16——

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him for a moment, I want to call his attention to the fact that there was an unarmed American merchant steamer sunk to-day, the *Missourian*, probably belonging to some of the gentleman's constituents. I want to call his attention to the fact that it was bound to this country and had nothing aboard but ballast, and it was sunk without warning, and American lives were probably lost on it.

Mr. BORLAND. I am very glad to say the *Missourian* is not the property of any constituent of mine, and, so far as I know, of any citizen of Missouri. But it brings home to us the deliberate disregard of American rights involved in the present policy of Germany. Here was an unarmed ship, not carrying contraband of war, but returning empty, and yet it was sunk with the same ruthless barbarity. The contention which I have made is more than borne out by the events occurring since the sun rose this morning, that the arming of merchant vessels has not invited war. When you find unarmed merchant ships not safe from aggression, I say it lies upon those gentlemen who have opposed all means of protecting American rights to say what will do so. As long ago as April 16 we told the German Government that the pursuit of their submarine policy of ruthless and indiscriminate destruction would be regarded as an act of war against this country.

On May 4 they gave formal notice to us that they would desist from that course. On January 31, 1917, they gave notice that the former pledge had been revoked and the submarine campaign would be renewed with all its ruthless fury. Was that notice intended for our protection or given in just regard of our rights? No; it was the outcropping of their plot and design, for we find that on January 19, 12 days before the official notice was given to this Government that the submarine war would be renewed, the foreign secretary of Germany, Zimmermann, had already written to the German minister at Mexico advising him that the submarine campaign would be renewed and it would probably lead to war with the United States, and in that event the United States was to be dismembered, if possible, by a Mexican-Japanese alliance. Now, mark you, gentlemen, who are so anxious to apologize for the acts of an aggressor upon American rights and liberty, these words:

BERLIN, *January 19, 1917.*

On the 1st of February we intend to begin submarine warfare unrestricted. In spite of this it is our intention to endeavor to keep neutral the United States of America.

Did they intend to preserve our friendship, to respect our rights? No; to keep us neutral. And how did they intend to keep us neutral? They do not say; but it is written plainly in their acts that all the world may see that they intend to keep

us neutral through the force of an army of spies and an amount of expenditure sufficient for the purpose. They seek to influence American public opinion through the same methods of corruption and intrigue that they would use in Bulgaria or Turkey. They place our Government and our national honor and our ideals of citizenship on the same plane as that which they place those of Bulgaria and Turkey. They are going to keep us neutral, but they are not going to respect our rights. Ah, no; not a word said of that, but they say that in spite of unrestricted warfare they intend to keep the United States neutral. I commend those words to gentlemen who have been so anxious to find a defense for an aggressor upon American rights. Is there any virtue in American citizenship? Does the flag mean anything? If it does, a state of war exists now, and we ought to declare it. [Applause.]

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, I quote from Matthew xxvi, 51–52:

> And, behold, one of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest's, and smote off his ear.
>
> Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place; for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.

Mr. Chairman, since last Monday night, when the President appeared here and urged that war be made, those words, which have stood the test of centuries, have surged through my brain with a most persuasive influence, and while there may be others who can lightly overrule their philosophy, I for one can not brush aside their wisdom in the consideration of the resolution now before us.

And, Mr. Chairman, I pray you let me make it plain; there must be no misunderstanding. Should this resolution be passed by Congress I shall support the prosecution of the war to a successful issue with an unlimited devotion to my country's welfare—a devotion which I believe my colleagues here who are supporting this measure will accord me—the equal of which I freely accord to them.

We are invited to enter the European war. In other words, according to Gen. W. T. Sherman, this would ordinarily mean a polite request to submit ourselves to the tortures of the lower regions. He had seen the greatest war up to his time. He had not seen the present European war when he made his famous comparison. If he had, he would not have made it, for hell, from all reports, is a beautiful sunken garden, dotted with shrubbery and beautiful flowers when compared with the present European war. It is not war, but a conflagration—an atomization of human flesh "amid the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds." Is it a wonder that men desire to refuse such an invitation, and readily agree with Benjamin Franklin that "there never was a good war or a bad peace."

Mr. Chairman, my principal reason for opposing our entering the European war at the present time is a very simple one. We are not ready. This is well known to the apologists for war. It is not my purpose to set out the details of our unpreparedness, nor to lay the blame upon those who may be responsible. I have urged and voted for every measure tending to promote our strength in time of war that by the rules of this House I have been permitted to do. I even voted for the Kahn amendment to increase the Regular Army, which amendment was regarded with horror at the time by those who are now urging us on unprepared, and almost without discussion, into the European maelstrom. It is too late to discuss the past. The plain, cold fact is we are not ready. To show our complete helplessness I have but to quote some distinguished gentlemen whose views have already been made public.

It developed yesterday on the floor, upon inquiry by the gentleman from Illinois, that we have an insufficient number of officers to man our proposed army of conscripts. An unofficered army, then, is to march away to a foreign war! On March 22 last, in a special to the Washington Post, Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals, United States Army, retired, speaking at the regular luncheon of the Rotary Club, in the McAlpin Hotel, New York, is quoted therein as saying that—

> This country expected trouble, but did not prepare for it. Most of the expectation was taken out in talk and not action. Those in power were content to allow things to drift until the trouble was at the door. The naval appropriation of $150,000,000 is a great thing, he believes, but the ships that are to be built will not be ready until after the war is over. Land defenses have been prepared, according to the general, but he questions whether they could be put into operation.
>
> "Big guns for the Army are necessary," he says, "to oppose landing, but they are 'entirely lacking.'"
>
> "The country is sadly deficient," Gen. Goethals said. "The statement that there would be a 'million men in arms over night' was a joke," he declared, "since such a million would be merely a mob without training, clothing, or equipment, and useless for any purpose."
>
> The Spanish War taught a number of lessons, but the reports of authorities on these lessons in all branches of the service found a resting place in pigeonholes in various desks in Washington.

It was charged by the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] in February last, and undenied, that there was an insufficiency of rifles and artillery for the troops then organized.

The War College says, concerning invasion by foreign nations, that prior to the recent vast increases in the European armies Germany, unopposed by the fleet, of course, could land 387,000 men in 15.8 days and 440,000 men in 30.8 days. Japan and England could land 2,750,000 men in 45 days.

The illustrious gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], and one of the best-posted men in the House on military affairs, in an interview given to the press within the last week on the question of preparedness said:

> In the good old American style we have put off buying our powder till we see the whites of the enemy's eyes. To be sure, seven months ago we tardily voted to build a lot of new ships and enlist a lot of new men in the Navy, but the ships are not built, many of them are not even begun, and the men are not enlisted. Even when the men are enlisted they will be only raw recruits and not good for much for about a year.
>
> Everybody knows that we have no troops ready to send into the trenches. Even our Regulars would need a good deal of training. They know nothing about bomb throwing and practically nothing about trench attack. Nevertheless I confess that I am one of those sentimental people who would like to see at least a brigade of Uncle Sam's Infantry turn up on the fighting line and give the allies a hearty slap on the back and wish them well.

And so, while we have announced our intention of whipping the earth, of turning all monarchies into republics, to which not only Germany will object, but to which possibly our proposed allies—Italy, Belgium, Japan, Serbia, Roumania, Montenegro, and San Marino—might enter a protest, it appears from the testimony of our witnesses that we are to do all this work, including repelling the invaders, with, as Gen. Goethals says, "a mere mob without training, clothing, or equipment, and useless for any purpose"; unofficered, as shown by Mr. MANN; without sufficient arms, as stated by Mr. SHALLENBERGER; with no knowledge of bomb throwing or trench attack, as reported by Mr. GARDNER; a brigade of which, so untrained, must be sent to the European trenches, singing the "Marseillaise" for the French and slapping the English heartily on the back. God of our fathers, it would be ridiculous if not so pitiful and so tragic! Truly, according to this testimony, "We have left undone those things which we ought to have done and we have done those things which we ought not to have done." Yet there are those who say in big type, "Do it now!" Yesterday certain Members were loath to grant one day's delay before the consideration of this blood resolution was undertaken. Instead of rushing in unprepared, and thereby losing thousands of our young men for lack of all these essentials of modern warfare, would it not be better for the Nation that a delay at least be had for this preparation? And so, Mr. Chairman, these facts present to me an impregnable reason why I can not favor the passage of this resolution at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, the first step in raising an army for war in a republic is to win the hearts of the people to the cause for which it is asked to fight. The American people have been long trained in the art of self-government. They desire to think for themselves. Unlike the European people, the American must be shown the reason. He will fight harder if his heart is in the work. If ordered, the European fights. He has no choice. This is well illustrated in W. N. Ewer's beautiful poem, entitled "Five Souls," who meet in Spirit Land and greet each other:

FIRST SOUL.

I was a peasant of the Polish plain;
I left my plow because the message ran—
Russia in danger needed every man
To save her from the Teuton: and was slain.
I gave my life for freedom—this I know,
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

SECOND SOUL.

I was a Tyrolese, a mountaineer,
I gladly left my mountain home to fight
Against the brutal, treacherous Muscovite;
And died in Poland on a Cossack spear.
I gave my life for freedom—this I know,
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

THIRD SOUL.

I worked in Lyons at my weaver's loom,
When suddenly the Prussian despot hurled
His felon blow at France and at the world;
Then I went forth to Belgium and my doom.
I gave my life for freedom—this I know,
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

FOURTH SOUL.

I owned a vineyard by the wooded Main
Until the fatherland, begirt by foes
Lusting her downfall called me, and I rose
Swift to the call, and died in fair Lorraine.
I gave my life for freedom—this I know,
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

FIFTH SOUL.

I worked in a great shipyard by the Clyde;
There came a sudden word of wars declared,
Of Belgium peaceful, helpless, unprepared,
Asking our aid. I joined the ranks and died.
I gave my life for freedom—this I know,
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

And if this resolution is passed with the proposed conscription bill, we might well add the following:

I worked upon a farm in Illinois;
The squad appeared; I marched away.
Somewhere in France, amid the trenches gray,
I met grim death with many other boys.
I gave my life for freedom—this I know,
For he who bade me fight had told me so.

I have no reason to believe that the hearts of the people are in this proposed war. This is not true because they are afraid to fight. They are a brave and fearless people. They consider war in the enlightenment of the civilization which they still possess, of which no war has as yet deprived them. They have not fallen to barbarous ways of thinking. The days of cave-man ethics have not yet overtaken them as it has in a way overcome the people of Europe without their individual fault. The gloom of middle-age thought is not theirs. For four years they have listened to the charming voice of the Goddess of Peace. They have seen America stand like a rock, to which civilization is clinging in safety from the angry whirl about her. Like the monasteries protected and saved to humanity the art and literature of Europe during the Dark Ages, so they have hoped America, far from war, would preserve the precious legacies of a fast-passing civilization. You can not blame them now if they do not appear suddenly warlike and bloodthirsty—if they worship the ways of peace and love to quote the words of their President when he said, "The example of America must be the example of peace not merely because it will not fight, but of peace because peace is the healing and elevating influence of the world and strife is not"; nor if, when they think of the contentment of the land—war in the east, peace in the west—thank God, from whom all blessings flow; and neither can you censure them if to-day their opposition to this resolution is guided by that great moral and patriotic thought—the conservation of human blood.

But while it appears that we are not ready, in men, in arms, in our hearts, let no foreign foe imagine for a moment that American genius will not overcome these obstacles in a short time and swiftly move to a rapid victory.

Mr. Chairman, I hold no brief for Germany nor for any of the belligerents. Germany has told us in so many words that when we attempt to sail our boats to Liverpool she will, when they reach the prohibited zone, sink them without warning, with all on board, with her submarines. England has told us nothing, but if we attempt to sail our same boats to Hamburg a planted English mine says to us if we approach nearer it will sink them without warning, with all on board.

I leave the difference to Hudibras, who had the ability to—

Distinguish and divide a hair
'Twixt south and southwest side.

Mr. Chairman, Edmund Burke once said—

Because half a dozen grasshoppers under a fern make the field ring with their importunate chirp, whilst thousands of great cattle repose beneath the shadow of the British oak, chew the cud, and are silent, pray do not imagine that those who make the noise are the only inhabitants of the field.

The agitation for this war, against which the President held out so long, has not been created nor fostered by the great masses of the Nation. People who live in that strip of territory bounded on the north by New York and on the south by Washington and about the width of Manhattan Island, who by choice are provincial to that locality, who deny that there is any other railroad except the "Pennsy" and affirm that Pittsburgh is on the Pacific Ocean, have been listening to the half dozen grasshoppers under the fern leaf. But they are the strongest variety of grasshoppers and their voices are not modulated to a chirp. They consist of strenuous orators, patriots who failed to fight in sixty-one, philanthropists, bankers, and brilliant editors. Since the loan of $500,000,000 was made by Morgan to the allies their efforts have been persistent to land our soldiers in the French trenches. Step by step and inch by inch steadily they have pushed to this end, working a night and day shift. I do not charge these men with corrupt motives. I do not charge them with desiring to protect their loan. The loan was a legitimate one. They control the avenue of news. Perhaps they do not control these avenues but they are always gladly open to them. Large headlines, which supersede the old-time editorial no longer read, are theirs for the asking. It may even be conceded that these men may be patriotic and in the making and protection of the loan be acting from what they think is patriotism; nevertheless that does not alter the correctness of the observation that they and they alone and not the rank and file of the people who must die are responsible for 99 per cent of the manufactured war demands in the country to-day. It has been charged that there are 500 of them. Be that as it may, they are of the same kidney. Naturally the New Yorkers feel friendly to London, with whom they trade and barter. Frequent voyages across to London have been made by them; friends and business relations have been made and marriages entered into. It is but natural that these relations have made them sympathize with friends in other countries.

Many people say that it is their belief that this war cabal has made millions of dollars out of the war. I doubt it. If it is true, they ought to be satisfied and cease their agitation for the spilling of American blood. To-day their cry is for democracy against autocracy, while yesterday democracy was a failure. I can not believe that these men desire a republic of the common people set up against the monarchy of England. Their course in throwing this country into absolutism by the military procedure under the cry of war is dangerous to the liberties of the people. Armed plutocracy crying "Onward, Christian soldiers" is the order of the day. It is better, Mr. Philanthropist, to let the people alone and advocate the settling of differences with the European nations by arbitration, which I am satisfied the President would like to do.

The people in this country are getting hungry, Mr. Philanthropist. I speak kindly to you when I say no one can answer for the result if democracy is betrayed. One made great professions of friendship for Christ, but the Savior turned to him and said: "Before the cock crow thrice thou will betray us." I find the people are more interested in obtaining food than in the war. History is always a valuable aid. Let me read from Carlyle:

The Versailles ball and lemonade is done; the orangerie is silent except for night birds. Over in the Salle des Menus Vice President Lafayette, with unsnuffed lights, "with some hundred or so of members stretched on tables round him," sits erect, outwatching the bear. This day a second solemn deputation went to his majesty, a second, and then a third—with no effect. What will the end of these things be?

In the court all is mystery, not without whisperings of terror, though ye dream of lemonade and epaulettes, ye foolish women! His majesty, kept in happy ignorance, perhaps dreams of double-barrels and the woods of Meudon. Late at night the Duke de Liancourt, having official right of entrance, gains access to the royal apartments, unfolds, with earnest clearness, in his constitutional way, the Job's news. "Mais," said poor Louis; "c'est une révolte (Why, that is a revolt)!" "Sire," answered Liancourt; "it is not a revolt; it is a revolution."

That the news has been highly colored since the break with Germany, and even before, may be a scheme to excite the war spirit against her. The news may have been colored at the other end of the line. This would seem to be verified by the following wireless from American correspondents in Berlin August 2, 1916:

We, the undersigned American citizens, representing American newspapers in Berlin, and with the armies of the central powers, finding that many of our dispatches concerning both political and military events are suppressed, mutilated, or delayed by the London censor, call the attention of American publishers to this situation. We emphasize that under these circumstances we are unable to present to the American public a vital half or a true and fair statement of the most important events of the war.

The London censorship, which for a time treated our dispatches in a spirit of fair play, has gradually changed its policy, until to-day restrictions from an American standpoint are impossible. We have asked Ambassador Gerard to inquire if the American Government can secure to the American press the facilities for getting legitimate cable news unhampered by the handicap of the British censorship.

About the middle of last February Senator STONE made bold to charge that a cabal of great newspapers existed in this country for the purpose of coercing the Government into an attitude of hostility toward one of the warring nations. He ventured the statement that anyone making such false statement was a public enemy. For this he was not punished on the spot, but witness his trial and punishment in the press for the alleged crime of filibustering on March 4, 1917. Shortly afterwards Representative MOORE asked that the charges made by Congressman Callaway, similar to those of Senator STONE, be investigated. Soon after the break with Germany the press had our ambassador in irons—that he advised Americans not to sail with him, as he expected to be killed; that our consuls were held as hostages in Berlin. At this convenient point they began to talk about the President arming the ships; Carranza was given credit for securing the Zimmermann note; Gerard was to warn the United States on his return. It was charged that Senator STONE bared secrets of state—denied by John Hays Hammond, jr.; next a spy robs Mr. Gerard of papers; then they received a dispatch saying that Berlin admitted holding Gerard; London awaits Gerard's fate. While all this was going on tending to arouse the people, and are errors, as afterwards admitted, the speaking publicists for the philanthropists and voluntary advisers to the President warn Berlin and talk about raising troops; at this point Bernstorff gets his passports and the talk for an army of conscripts begins, and one says war is near, all arranged and prophesied to us 30 to 60 days in advance. Next our shame is appealed to by declaring that we are hiding behind the British fleet: then follows the instant and simultaneous "baiting" of Senator LA FOLLETTE and others for the defeat of the bill arming ships. Yesterday all talks for war were given prominence, while the prayers for peace could

be read in four lines. It is this combined and well-directed influence that Members hear and feel. It is not the voice of the people, nor the voice of God.

When I view the results of our action here to-day, if this resolution is passed, upon our country I could not utter the word "aye" when I should hear my name called by the Clerk. Like Macbeth, the murderer, "I could not say 'amen' when they did say, 'God bless us,' for 'amen' stuck in my throat."

The entry into the war by us means the death of the Monroe doctrine.

Thomas Jefferson said:

Equal and exact justice to all men of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none.

The adoption of this resolution overrules the wisdom of this sage, patriot, and statesman, who founded a party of the people. Ah, could his voice come to us now through some of my colleagues on the Democratic side as his reincarnation!

George Washington and his great wisdom are to be cast aside in the twinkling of an eye as worthless when he said, when speaking on foreign relations—

constantly keeping in view that it is folly for one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character.

With flippant ease we tear up his Farewell Address, in which he says:

The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation; when we may choose peace or war as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world.

Alas for Jefferson, alas for Washington, alas for our Republic!

In this moment he who hesitates barters
The rights which his forefathers won;
He forfeits all claims to charters
Transmitted from sire to son.

But, far fiercer in its results, the passage of this resolution, while we will win the war, sounds the tocsin of the coming slaughter of the common people, hurried on with deathly rapidity. Ah, that the great leaders of this House would throw off the shackles, unite, come forth, and say, "It shall not be," drive out the apologists for war, and shut off the call of the wild. Then indeed would it be true that "Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war."

The young boys between 18 and 23 conscripted soon are practically on their way to the trenches and shambles of Europe. Mr. GARDNER wants a battalion sent at once. The gas mask is being prepared for them in New Jersey. And this is to be done before Canada has furnished all her available men and while Australian youths are protected from danger under a referendum.

Never since the days of the Aztec Empire has such a cold, calculated slaughter of the multitude taken place. It is in a different form, but the result is the same—a hideous death.

Prescott says:

It was late in the afternoon when Alvarado reached his quarters, but the sun was still lingering above the western hills and poured his beams wide over the valley, lighting up the old towers and temples of Tenochtitlan with a mellow radiance that little harmonized with the dark scenes of strife in which the city had so lately been involved. The tranquillity of the hour, however, was on a sudden broken by the strange sounds of the great drum in the temple of the war god—sounds which recalled the noche triste with all its terrible images to the minds of the Spaniards, for that was the only occasion on which they had ever heard them. They intimated some solemn act of religion within the unhallowed precincts of the teocalli; and the soldiers, startled by the mournful vibrations, which might be heard for leagues across the valley, turned their eyes to the quarter whence they proceeded. They there beheld a long procession winding up the huge sides of the pyramid, for the camp of Alvarado was pitched scarcely a mile from the city, and objects are distinctly visible at a great distance in the transparent atmosphere of the table-land.

As the long file of priests and warriors reached the flat summit of the teocalli the Spaniards saw the figures of several men stripped to their waists, some of whom, by the whiteness of their skins, they recognized as their own countrymen. They were the victims of the sacrifice. Their heads were gaudily decorated with coronals of plumes and they carried fans in their hands. They were urged along by blows and compelled to take part in the dance in honor of the Aztec war god. The unfortunate captives, then stripped of their sad finery, were stretched one after another on the great stone of sacrifice. On its convex surface their breasts were heaved up conveniently for the diabolical purpose of the priestly executioner, who cut asunder the ribs by a strong blow with his sharp razor of itztli and, thrusting his hand into the wound, tore away the heart, which, hot and reeking, was deposited on the golden censer before the idol. The body of the slaughtered victim was then hurled down the steep stairs of the pyramid, which, it may be remembered, were placed at the same angle of the pile, one flight below another, and the mutilated remains were gathered up by the savages beneath, who soon prepared with them the cannibal repast which completed the work of abomination.

Mr. Chairman, Shakespeare once said, "Every subject's duty is his king's, but every subject's soul is his own." To-morrow, if this resolution passes, my duty is to the king, but to-day, I, as well as every man here, must deal with his own soul in the consideration of his vote. If you were upon a jury in a murder case you would be instructed by the judge that if you found a reasonable doubt in your mind as to the defendant's guilt you must acquit. And in passing upon these young men on the question of life and death, and while they have no spokesmen and are asking no favors, I find in my mind a reasonable doubt and release them from the ordeal. The country as a whole is overwhelmingly in favor of not entering the European war. And I would give more consideration to the prayer of a mother for her son than for a barrel full of philosophies. There is an awful responsibility resting upon us to-day.

The following poem, written in a State where women vote on war questions, should appeal to us to-day:

THE BLOOD VOTE.

[By W. R. Winspear.]

"Why is your face so white, mother?
Why do you choke for breath?"
"Oh, I have dreamt in the night, my son,
That I doomed a man to death."

"Why do you hide your hand, mother?
And crouch above it in dread?"
"It beareth a dreadful brand, my son:
With the dead man's blood 'tis red.

"I hear his widow cry in the night,
I hear his children weep,
And always within my sight, O God!
The dead man's blood doth leap.

"They put the dagger into my grasp,
It seemed but a pencil then,
I did not know it was a fiend agasp
For the priceless blood of men.

"They gave me the ballot paper,
The grim death warrant of doom,
And I smugly sentenced the man to death
In that dreadful little room.

"I put it inside the box of blood,
Nor thought of the man I'd slain,
Till at midnight came like a whelming flood
God's word—and the brand of Cain.

"O little son! O my little son!
Pray God for your mother's soul,
That the scarlet stain may be white again
In God's great judgment roll."

Mr. Speaker, I so propose to vote that in the future years no blinded boy can lift his sightless eyes to mine and say, "Thou did it without just cause."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SABATH). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 15 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I can not tell the Committee of the Whole anything new. You understand the situation. I would to God it were different, but we can not change it by wishes. But if I were making a partisan speech, as may be made in the future when the storm clouds pass by, I could say from my standpoint some severe things, perchance.

Under our Constitution the President is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. This is one part of the legislative body, and the third estate is the judiciary. Presidents have made conditions time and again that have forced the legislative body to make appropriations and to declare war because a state of war did exist. Mr. Polk was the first one. He ordered the Army across the Rio Grande River into a sovereign nation. That was war, and it was declared by Mexico, and then declared upon our part by the Congress, with authority to use the Army and the Navy.

That is behind us. It is a matter of history.

I listened to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] with great interest as he recited case after case that occurred prior to the disaster to the *Lusitania*, and then the *Lusitania*, and then destruction by one submarine after another, and another and another, until I think he counted eight or nine, with loss of life, contrary to what we claimed then and claim to-day is international law.

It is true there is a new weapon employed. We take the position, and upon that position must stand and do stand, that notice must be given before the ship of a neutral is destroyed.

It is broader than that, but for the purposes of these remarks I will not take more time in giving my understanding of international law. And if I were making a partisan speech, I would say that two and one-half years ago we ought to have been getting ready for this situation. Congress has always responded by ample appropriation of whatever has been asked to support our Army and Navy.

But it does no good to criticize now. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. KING], my good friend, has stated our condition. There is the Panama Canal, the Sandwich Islands, the Philippines, the most extensive coast line of any nation on earth, with 100,000,000 people, the richest country on earth, the best raw material on earth for fighting, for army, for navy, but almost totally untrained. I believe we can train our citizens for war if necessary, and if necessary we can call for volunteers. It may go to the extent, if you please, of resort to conscription or draft. We ought to have an army under all our conditions and all our responsibilities that is permanent and well trained. A stitch in time saves nine. If we had had 150,000 men in the Regular Army when we declared war with Spain, what an immense loss of life and treasure would have been saved. But so much for that. We do not have the army now. We are to get it. We have a Navy, but with not men sufficient to man the Navy. We have no modern submarines. We are minus aeroplanes and trained aviators; but if we go at it we can train perhaps as quickly as any other nation. It has taken England, I believe, a year and a half or two years to get ready on land. She is strong on the seas, with a courageous people, yet she was untrained. But now they are fairly well trained I am told. And so with Russia. So much for all that.

Now, what is the condition? The President on the 22d of January made an address to the Senate, and I went over there to hear it. You recollect it and are familiar with it. He said that when peace came, it must come without victory. Now, if that meant consolation to anybody it ought to have meant consolation to the central powers—to Germany and to Austria. That was on the 22d of January. Notes were exchanged, you know—proposals for peace. It was answered by the allies and answered by their objections. You recollect it. You are as familiar with it as I am. What was the answer that was given by Germany? A notification that on and after the 1st of February there should be drawn a line in the sea 300, 400, 500, or 600 miles out in the sea—the world's highway—and that every neutral ship that came across that line would be destroyed by the German Navy, by the submarine, without notice and without regard as to who was on the ship or what it was loaded with. That was Germany's reply. Well, what happened? They kept their word. They began the destruction.

By descent I am one-quarter German, one-quarter Irish, one-quarter English, and another quarter French. My God, if my ancestors are privileged to look down upon me they might upbraid me, perhaps. But I am an American. [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen say that we should not pass this resolution. I dare say there are people in the United States who would say we ought not to resent these outrages. I do not believe there are many, thank God, but no doubt there are some. Doubtless many of them are perfectly honest people. I am not throwing stones at them. But let me ask you if we are to reject the aid that may be given by the English Navy or the French Navy? Are we to say to the allies, "Keep off"? No. They are interested in our assertion of our rights. I am quite sure that we will not make war upon them if they help us in making war upon the central powers or upon Germany. We have not made war yet upon Austria. I do not know whether we ought to do so or not. The President withholds his power to make war on that country. I will not discuss whether it is constitutional or not. But he said he had the power to arm our merchant vessels, and did it. You know what happened. "Well," you say, "we can not help that." No. I heard a man say the other day that he ought to be impeached. Well, we would make probably poor headway in trying to impeach the President, would we not, under all the conditions? I am quite sure that if we did a two-thirds majority in the Senate would not convict him.

You must take the condition as you find it. I am awfully sorry about it. I have a constituency that is very considerably German. Then I have a constituency in one county which is, three-quarters of it, French. The German constituency is in many of the counties. Oh, I have seen them come and come and come. There are no better people than the American Germans who have come to this country and been naturalized and their children. I sometimes get angry when people doubt their loyalty. It is natural for them to sympathize with the Fatherland. Many of them have children or other relatives fighting there. But, speaking for my own German constituency, and I believe for all of them in the United States, they are six in loyalty to the flag, while the natural-born citizen, whether he is a descendant of the Pilgrim Fathers or wherever he came from or whenever his forebears came, is quite six in loyalty to any other portion of our population.

Now, I do not know that I can say anything further. Gentlemen say, "Oh, our boys are apt to go over there and be sent over there untrained and into the trenches." I do not believe it. Of course, we give the President power to use the Army and the Navy. You can not very well restrict his power or cripple him by legislative provision. If we go to war with Germany, we should use all the forces necessary for success. But we will be busy, in my judgment. Possibly they may go and be sent if they are trained. I doubt if the war lasts that long. But we have got our hands full on this continent, with our Monroe doctrine, in taking proper care for our own defense and our own protection, and whenever we do that we have got an insurance policy that we will not have to use the forces that may be organized.

Therefore, after much of thought—I have given the subject attention—I shall vote for this resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will donate that to the next brother that talks. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DILL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask, at the outset, unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DILL. Mr. Chairman, during the two years that I have been in this House I have heard Members repeatedly on important occasions say that we were face to face with a great crisis. But to-day, while nobody has talked particularly about that phase of it, I think everybody realizes that this is the greatest crisis that this Nation has ever faced, and probably one of the greatest crises of the world.

In the last campaign, as a candidate in the West, I went throughout my State, and from more than a hundred platforms I urged the people to vote for Mr. Wilson for reelection as President because he had kept us out of the European war and because I believed he would continue to keep us out of the European war. I am saddened to-day beyond expression that my prediction was wrong. I am disappointed more deeply than I know how to state it. But I am as certain in my mind to-day as I was then that this great free people do not want to go into that terrible holocaust across the sea; and believing that, as a Representative who pledged the people who elected me to do everything I could to keep this country from going into the European war, I intend to vote against this resolution. [Applause.]

When I have done that I shall have exhausted every power at my command to keep this country out of war, and thereafter I shall be loyal to the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, the President of the United States. I voted against—that is, in favor of tabling the McLemore resolution. I had some doubts about it then, but was led to vote to table it upon the theory advanced by the leaders of this House that that was the way by which we could keep out of war.

I voted for the armed-ship resolution the other day, again following the advice of the administration leaders that that was establishing a policy that would keep us out of this war, so far as taking sides with either group of belligerents was concerned. But they can not lead me up and vote me on this proposition on the theory that we are not going into war. You can not induce me to vote the boys of America into the very jaws of hell and then say it is for the purpose of peace. I know better. On the other occasions I saw through a glass darkly. Now I see face to face.

Oh, if we were asked simply to vote to protect American rights I would be willing and am willing to vote all the money and all the power that this Nation possesses to protect its rights. But when you ask me to vote that this country shall put its Army and Navy and all its resources in alliance with one set of these belligerents in order to destroy the Government of another, I refuse. [Applause.]

We have been told here that this is a war to establish democracy throughout the world. Well, it may be, but I have no faith in establishing democracy by joining my country's resources and its armies and navies with the Imperial Government of Japan [applause], with the monarchical Government of Italy, with the Government of England, call it what you will, a nation whose

500 years of history has left a bloody trail on every continent in the world; and I for my part will not take the step by which this resolution proposes, and go into this war on the side of the allies. This is a war upon the part of the allies and the other European countries for trade and territory. We have no interest in that. Our only interest is in the protection of our own rights.

So far as interfering with our rights is concerned, both groups of belligerents are guilty. England created a war zone, filled it with submerged mines, and warned us to keep our vessels out. We protested, but we submitted. Germany created a war zone, filled it with submarines, and warned us to keep our vessels out. We protested and sent our vessels in. They were destroyed. Had we sent our vessels into the English war zone they would have been destroyed. Under these circumstances, shall we join with the group of nations to whose affronts we submitted because we refused to submit to the affronts of one of the other nations?

I am not here to defend the actions of the German Government. I think they have been reprehensible. They constitute a just cause for war. In fact, we have had cause for war for months if the Nation desired to resort to arms. But I say to you that if this Nation, the last and only great Nation on earth still at peace, goes into this world war, what hope is there for that peace for which we have so long builded and which we have so long thought could be established throughout the world?

I do not know what other gentlemen think about this, but I can see it in only one way. When you take off all the fine-spun theories, when you strip away all the beautiful language and get down to the real reason for going into this war, it is for the purpose of trading with the allies. We try to trade with the allies, and our ships are blown up because they go into the zone which Germany forbids, although we do not go into the zone which England forbids. For my part I am unwilling to vote to send the boys to the European trenches because we can not trade with the countries now at war. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, what does this resolution propose? It declares that a state of war exists. That is a legal fiction by which we attempt to justify to the world our entering into this war. This Nation has never had a war with a foreign country that it did not begin, and if we go into this war, make no mistake about it, we begin it. Germany's attacks upon us are incidental in her attempt to destroy England and the other countries allied with England, and we take up the gage of battle on our own initiative, join the allies, and enter the European war.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DILL. I can not. I have but 10 minutes. I would gladly if I could. Gentlemen, I have thought about this as I have never thought about anything else in all my life. For nights I have been unable to sleep upon it. I have tried to bring myself to stand by the President's demand, thinking that possibly I was wrong. I thought how I might be able to go home and explain my vote for this resolution in some way or other. I thought I might say that the country had gotten into this situation, that it was every Member's duty to show a united front, and that I had to be patriotic, but I knew that if I did that I would know in my own heart it was a lie. We are not into it. The test of unity of the Nation is not before we go in; it is after we get in. This is the time when the Members of this Congress as representatives of the American people are to say whether or not we shall go in. For my part I am opposed to going in. [Applause.]

I have no illusions as to the consequences of my action. Newspapers and those who let the newspapers think for them will cry out "Traitor!" and "Poltroon!" no doubt. Many who have been my political supporters in the past will now oppose me, but that does not matter. I am a young man. Few, if any, Members of this House have had fiercer struggles to reach here than I have had. If I must leave public life because of my action to-day, I shall go; but it will be with head erect, able to look every man and woman in the face, because I have kept faith. I do not know what the future holds for me, and I do not care. I refuse to do a thing which my conscience revolts against. I refuse to do a thing which in my judgment is the greatest crime ever perpetrated upon a free people, namely, drag them into this hell of war by joining with the allies. [Applause.]

I believe more fully to-day than ever before in the powerful truth expressed in that old couplet—

> To thine own self be true,
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man.

But let me say this, gentlemen, that when this resolution passes, as it probably will, my opposition is over. I am an American from Revolutionary days, and I shall vote for every measure which is designed to help in winning this war. I believe that even though we go to war, the hope of civilization and freedom will still remain with the American Continent; and once we are in the war, I shall do everything within my power to see that that war is won. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a great date in the history of humanity, but a solemn moment for the Members of the American Congress who are charged with the weighty responsibility of final action on an issue of awful import. Upon the threshold of a fateful decision, our country awaits what the future may bring, unshrinking, and unafraid. Come weal, come woe, the sons of America will do their duty in their allotted stations. We are advised by the President that in his judgment the recent course of the Imperial German Government is, in fact, nothing less than war upon the Government, and the people of the United States. This being so, our country is deprived of choice. One course, and one alone is indicated. We must accept the status thrust upon us by the illegal actions of an adversary country, and take the steps which duty indicates, and our interests require. [Applause.]

American ships armed, and unarmed have been sunk without warning on the high seas, with a consequent loss of American lives. This is war, and our response is not a declaration of hostilities; it is but the formal recognition of a fact. War is already at our doors. It is true that the German Government insists that it is not making war upon the United States, that its acts are impelled by its own necessities, and that America is only one of many neutral nations that have suffered the savage strokes of unrestrained submarine warfare. It may be true that we are but one of many victims of frightfulness. But the illegality of these practices is not transformed by the claim that the blows under which the whole neutral world groans, are dealt with impartial hand. [Applause.]

> "Dark is not made light,
> Wrong is not made right,"

by the disclaimer of personal malice. The acts of the German Government in the execution of its submarine policy have thundered around the world. Hospital ships have been sunk, vessels carrying the healing gifts of gracious charity to stricken Belgium have been torpedoed without warning, hundreds of noncombatants comprising women and children have been sent to a violent, and in many instances, a painful death.

Every friend of humanity within the broad confines of the United States had hoped that this dread decision would not be thrust upon us. Our continued forbearance under circumstances of great irritation, deserved something at the hands of the German Government, and should have disposed that Government to modify toward us at least, a policy which has been a continued and insistent challenge to the whole neutral world. But it was not to be. Moved either by profound contempt for neutral opinion, or else confident in the conclusion that the rights of others were subordinate to, and fixed by its own necessities, the German Government has apparently been willing to challenge the world to arms, and commit its fortunes to the hazard of a dubious policy.

Each victim of this policy must determine its own course, having in mind its own interests, and its duties to its own people. This country does not seek war, but it does not shrink from war. It may be forbearing, it has been forbearing, but it is neither weak nor cowardly. In the interest of peace, we may be willing to long withhold insistence upon undoubted rights. No country should go to war over technical quibbles. But forbearance in time ceases to be a virtue, and becomes weakness. The exercise of forbearance by a nation is a sovereign right, and should not be prolonged to the peril of the Republic. [Applause.]

We can not admit the contention that the supposed, or the real necessities of a nation at war, are superior to the restraints imposed by civilized warfare, or that an appeal to those necessities will operate to deprive neutrals of their right to the use of the high seas, when that use is conformed to the established principles of international law.

This country does not challenge the right of blockade. But a blockade does not destroy, or suspend all neutral rights, nor does a blockade exist until it has been established according to the law of blockade. This country has never recognized the right of another country, belligerent or otherwise, to delimit great areas of the high seas, and forbid their use to neutrals seeking to approach the ports of a belligerent country, nor admitted the claim that this use would justify the destruction of neutral vessels, without warning, and in reckless disregard of the consequences to the lives of all on board. This country has heretofore asserted its right to use the highways of the

ocean, under the accepted restraints of international law. It has refused to recognize the pretended right of the German Government to sink our carriers without warning in the forbidden zone. We have notified the offending Government that we would travel these seas. We have armed our carriers, not for aggression, but for defense. By this act we have emphasized the purpose of this country to insist upon its rights. Nevertheless the sinking of our ships has continued. Within the last 48 hours the *Aztec*, an American ship armed for defense, carrying an American crew, and American bluejackets to serve its guns, has been torpedoed without warning, and sunk with loss of American lives, by a German submarine. A little later, another armed American ship, was sunk without warning. These offenses were subsequent to, and therefore not included within the indictment of the President's message. Facing this culmination of a series of like outrages, what course is open to the American people, or their representatives, save an appeal to the sword. [Applause.]

No real choice between peace, or war is presented. Our course is predetermined by the inexorable compulsion of the circumstances which confront us. A choice is possible when peace, or war, may be chosen equally with honor. When such a choice is presented, my voice will be raised for peace. I favor now and at all times, the policies which contribute to the maintenance of honorable peace, and have ever sought to develop a national attitude favorable to these policies.

But it is impossible for this country to deliberately choose the path of dishonor, by disregarding its plain duty to protect its citizens at all hazards against the unlawful attacks of other nations, when those attacks are systematically and continuously made, as an integral part of a national policy of deliberate aggression. [Applause.]

Such has been our attitude in the past, such will be our attitude in the future. We will never take counsel of timidity in order to avoid war. [Applause.]

The citizens of this country in the peaceful exercise of their vocations, must be protected by the Government alike at home and abroad, even to the extent of recourse to war, if war becomes necessary. Once the fateful die is cast, our country must make immediate use of all its powers to safeguard our interests, and calling these powers to its aid, fashion a weapon to its hand that will bring this strife to the speediest, and therefore the most merciful conclusion. [Applause.]

But while fully committed to a vigorous prosecution of this war, I can not agree in advance that I will support without modification all of the measures that will be submitted by the various departments in the name of war. Such an attitude would be an abrogation of our constitutional functions, and plain duty. The President has said, and justly, that our choice should be made with a moderation of counsel, and a temperateness of judgment, befitting our character, and motives as a Nation. These are wise words. We should, as suggested, put excited feeling away. Hence it may not be amiss for the Members of this destined-to-be-historic Congress, which will be responsible for the formal declaration of war against the great German Empire, to pause a moment on the threshold of the world-compelling drama, soon to unfold, and give serious thought to the policies that will be required to make effective the pledge of our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor, to the prosecution of this high enterprise. These policies relate to the methods of raising the money, and providing the men required for the successful prosecution of the war.

What are the suggestions in this connection of moderate counsel, and temperate judgment? First and foremost we should deal exclusively with legislation related to the immediate and in view, which is the successful conduct, and speedy termination of the war. No effort should be made in the impatience, and excitement of present public opinion, to enact legislation designed to establish permanent policies, for normal conditions. Not only is it true that laws are silent amid arms, but when arms are to the front, the state of the public, and therefore of the legislative mind, is such that just and adequate consideration of the measures that relate to the normal every-day life of the Republic, is impossible. Nor should we hastily order the levy of vast armies that can not reach the firing line in Europe before the war is over. Our energies, and our means may be more effectively and immediately employed in other directions. If the statements of military men both at home and abroad are to be believed, this country can not place in the trenches of Europe an adequately trained and equipped army of a million men in less than 18 months, certainly not in less than 16 months. The most potent weapon ready to hand for immediate and effective use is our preponderance of wealth. This wealth should be promptly mobilized for the defeat of Germany. The urgent need of France, England, and the other allies, is credit, munitions and food.

Says the French minister of munitions, the United States can help us in three ways.

First, by increasing our aerial fleet. This would be a decisive element.

Second, by doubling our supply of munitions.

Third, by affording other needed supplies.

Congress can afford this credit at once, and the bulk of the money used, need not leave the United States. With but little delay, an unending stream of ships can be put in operation to carry food and munitions to Europe.

In addition the Government should call for volunteers for the Aviation Service on the western front. The value of a single trained aviator is immense. A British expert recently quoted Lord Kitchener to the effect that one trained pilot in a machine is worth 2,000 soldiers. The control of the air will be a mortal stroke to the central powers. Every one who has followed the course of operations in the war, knows that the birdmen are the eyes of the artillery. The present superiority of the French, and English artillery over the German guns, will be enormously enhanced by the practical exclusion of the German aviators from the kingdom of the air in the area of active operations.

Our aid in this direction can be speedily afforded, while its value will be beyond computation. Ten thousand American aviators operating on the battle front in France, in cooperation with the forces of France and England, would be the equivalent of a great American Army. Such a force would be readily raised, speedily dispatched, and trained for service in France and England in the greatest aviation schools in the world. These men will not be needed at home, during the period of their service abroad. Later they can be incorporated in the aerial service of this country. We should fritter away neither time nor money, in raising home guards to repel invasions, and suppress domestic insurrections. Such action on our part will represent a form of wasted energy.

"There is not the least probability of a German invasion of the United States. No matter what the alarmists may say, the landing of a German force on the shores of this country is not rationally thinkable. Nor is there any likelihood that the coasts, or the cities of the United States will be bombarded. The war is not going to be fought in the waters, nor on the land embraced within the boundaries of the United States. The domestic peace of the country will not be disturbed. People will go about their vocations, and avocations as usual." The lanes of the ocean should be kept open by the use of our fleet. To that end our submarine chasers, and smaller war craft should cooperate with the allied fleets to reduce to a negligible minimum the operations of the German submarines in the forbidden zone, since it is within that area that our ships carrying munitions, and food will be exposed to the greatest dangers. While of course adequate provision will be made for the protection of our own shores, these shores will be in no great danger. There is no reasonable ground for believing that any extensive operations in our waters can be prosecuted by German submarines at this distance from their bases. One or more German commerce raiders may conceivably escape the British cordon, but their operations in Atlantic waters would be short-lived, in the face of the allied patrols, and of the full strength of the American fleet. The effort to raise our armies by conscription should not be made, and if made, should fail. This country has hitherto waged its wars by volunteers, and the effort to impose the hateful processes of conscription would divide our counsels, and introduce an undesirable element of friction, and discord at a time when our country should present a united front. Issue a call for volunteers for an expeditionary force to France, and it will find immediate and overwhelming response. Train and equip these volunteers, put them on the firing line, and the tale of their achievements will afford priceless additions to the heritage of valor bequeathed by Bunker Hill, and Gettysburg.

This Congress will not be niggardly in providing the sinews of war, nor slow in extending much needed credits to our new allies. There is no reason to believe that this will be a long war, or that it will require a gigantic army for service in Europe. The battle of the Marne determined the outcome of the European war, without regard to the advent of the United States as a belligerent. This was the greatest battle ever waged in the open in the long history of the war, and an inferior force of French, and English soldiers out maneuvered and out fought the great army of the Kaiser, defeating it with bloody losses, and bringing to naught the cherished plans of Imperial Germany to force France to her knees by one smashing stroke. Under the blows of the allied armies, France will soon be cleared of

the invaders. The battle of the Marne destroyed forever the tradition of the invincibility of the Germany army. I have no purpose to criticize that army, or the German high command. The German army has exhibited magnificent courage, and magnificent endurance. It has been magnificently led, and has won great victories which will reflect undying luster on the skill of German leadership, and the courage of German soldiers.

In the length, extent, and character of its preparations for war, the German Empire exceeded all of its opponents. But neither in courage, nor skill, nor dash, nor endurance, have the German commanders, or the German soldiers, established their superiority over the commanders, and the soldiers of France and England. The disparity in guns, men, munitions, and means of transportation, so painfully manifest in the earlier periods of the war, has been removed. The soldiers of France, and England swarm in the trenches. The big guns of the allies thunder their defiant answer to the big guns of Germany. The shells of the allies are as effective, and more numerous than the shells of their adversary. The thrill of victory runs through the ranks of the allied armies. Their morale rises higher day by day. When they strike they go forward with the steady and resistless tread of fate itself. Given equal skill, equal valor, equal tenacity, and equal incentives to combat, and who can doubt that superior man power, superior resources, control of the sea, and the sense that they are fighting the battle of humanity, and fundamental democracy, will bring inevitable victory to the allies. That victory will be hastened by the tremendous impulse of our participation. After two years and a half of war, the distantly related features of this gigantic conflict can be seen in proper perspective, and the value of the contributing factors fairly estimated. Hunger presses upon the population of the central powers. If it has not reached the soldiers in the trenches, it is sapping the vitality of a vast host of civilians. The overthrow of autocracy in the mighty Empire of Russia, and the facility with which a popular government has been installed, teaches an obvious lesson to the people of Germany who are fast finding the authors of their misfortunes, and sufferings, in the military junta of that country. Turkey is rapidly crumbling. The Capital of the Caliphs has passed into British hands. An English Army is at the gates of Jerusalem. A combined English and Russian force is steadily advancing toward the Euphrates. Day by day the great circle about the central powers contracts. The mighty barrier that these powers have erected with infinite patience and skill can not withstand forever the assaults of the rising tides of war that beat against it continually. No prophet is needed to decipher the writing on the wall, announcing the doom of the Hohenzollerns.

It is too hopeful a view to say that Germany has reached the limit of her resources, but her high hopes of victory, and universal dominion, have long since passed, and with a shudder she realizes that the day of reckoning is at hand. She is sinking in a sea of blood.

Standing under the darkening shadows, and grim menace of approaching war, we should gird ourselves to play the part befitting this Nation in a stupendous struggle. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I deem it my duty to vote against this resolution, and shall so do. I realize that I shall be criticized for my action, and the interests that are forcing us into this war will raise the cry of disloyalty. But I believe when I vote against this resolution I will vote the sentiments of the great majority of the common people, and I count it more loyal to be their representative than to follow the mad cry of the minority who are drowning the voice of the masses. Even mere loyalty to my own conscience tells me that to vote for this resolution would be an awful mistake. One reason I must oppose this resolution is because of the unseemly way it is being railroaded through this Congress.

We are urged to stand by the President, but I believe it more befitting, as a Member of this Congress, to stand by the people. The Government of this United States is vested in the people, and I therefore believe that it is my duty to vote as I believe a majority of the people of this United States would have me vote. [Applause.] Certain it is that the people in my district are strongly opposed to war under the present conditions. They have voiced their opinions in hundreds and hundreds of letters and in floods of telegrams. These have had but one tenor and that was that we should not sacrifice the flower of American manhood to swell the fleshpots of the few. It is a dangerous matter to force an unwilling free people into an unpopular war.

We are told that American honor is at stake, and that we must protect our self-respect and dignity, but I respectfully submit that that American honor that stood the strain of two or more long years on the Mexican border has not yet been worn so thin by European intrigues that we can afford to fight the battles of other nations on foreign soil.

If we declare war, we are plunging into the depths of a cataclysm the horror of which no man can conceive. And for what? Not to protect our land against a foreign foe, not to protect our industries, our national integrity, our homes, or our people, simply to assert our power to demand a doubtful right which we have not insisted upon equally from all nations.

I am a great believer in the sober second thought of the great American people. When waves of hysteria, such as we are going through here at the Capitol, are forced upon us, it is easiest to answer the call of the biggest clamor, to follow the path of least resistance. But I believe the sober second thought of the people, the calm, impassive judgment of the masses in the United States is against the projection of this country into the European conflict.

I count it my duty to say that none is more loyal to his country than I, as I view loyalty. Should I vote for war I would deem it not an honor but an imperative duty to find myself in the front ranks with those whom my vote had aided in sending to the front to battle with a foreign foe.

But the test of loyalty is not the answer to the bugle call, but is rather in the exercise of that calm, impassive judgment that will bring health, happiness, and honor to your home, your community, your State, and your country. I have pondered the matter deep and long, and I have come to the conclusion that I can best conserve the interests of those I represent in voting against this resolution.

In closing let me state that my vote on this question does not indicate that I believe in peace at any price, nor does it indicate that I do not believe in preparedness. I am now and have been for a preparedness that will protect the United States against all foreign foes. I believe our young men should be trained to protect the land of their birth or the land of their adoption. I believe we should make and have these accouterments that make for defense and for offense if necessary, but I do not believe that our industrial life should be paralyzed, our country desolated, and our homes shorn of their manhood that we might send troops on foreign soil to fight a foreign foe. If a majority of this Congress shall decide upon war, I bow to the will of the majority. [Applause.] I am with you for a splendid preparedness, and if we must fight for all that makes a nation great God grant we fight with all our might.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is recognized for 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, during the 16 years I have served in this House there has been no occasion that has filled me, and I dare say most of the Members of the House, with such distress as we feel to-day. It is easy enough to speak of war. I remember when this terrible conflagration was ignited in Europe soldiers went to the front singing—

It's a long, long way to Tipperary—

And the swing of that song went around the world. They are singing another song in the trenches over there to-day. It goes like this:

The bells of hell go ting-a-ling-a-ling
For you, but not for me.
For me the angels sing-a-ling-a-ling;
They've got the goods for me.
O, death, where is thy sting-a-ling-a-ling;
O, grave, thy victory?
For me the angels sing-a-ling-a-ling;
They've got the goods for me.

There is a great difference between the lightness of Tipperary and the despair of that trench song. But what is our duty here? The question to me is a simple one. This country can never maintain its standing among the nations of the earth if she does not protect the lives of her citizens. [Applause.] I consider one of the great illuminated pages of American history is that page which recites the activities of the American Army in China. We were over there to protect the life of the American Minister imprisoned in the foreign compounds in Peking. All the nations of the world sent their troops to defend their particular minister, and finally it was announced that there was to be a wait until the appointed commander in chief of all the allied forces could appear on the scene to lead the advance. Gen. Chaffee, representing the American troops, said in effect, "My Government intends that we shall march to Peking immediately to rescue the prisoners if no other nation follows us." That was the true American spirit. [Applause.] And the American troops were followed by the Japanese troops and by all the troops of the allies without waiting for the commander in chief to arrive. And the ministers of the foreign nations were rescued. Their lives were saved.

There is a difference of opinion upon this subject which we are debating in this country to-day. My opinion is that that difference of opinion is due to the fact that we have not protected American lives within the past four years. [Applause.] If we had gone into Mexico and told them over there that every American citizen must be protected and that our Army would come down there, if need be, to protect them, there would have been no massacre of 18 young men who were dragged from a car and shot down like dogs in Mexico. If we had theretofore protected our citizens in that Republic, that would not have occurred.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. No; I have not the time. If we had protected those 18 men as they should have been protected, we would have had no trouble in the North Sea or the English Channel, because the world would have realized that this Government was ready to protect the life of every American citizen at all hazards in whatever part of the world that citizen might be. [Applause.]

This resolution does not absolutely commit us to any foreign alliance. I for one hope that the war can be confined so that it shall be an American war. [Applause.] Let us protect American rights, let us protect American citizens, let us protect American lives, and let us protect American property. [Applause.] That is the view I take of this thing, and I hope that Congress will remain in session all through this trouble, so that the Congress, the war-making power, may keep its hands on the throttle and determine wisely and judiciously from time to time how far this Republic which we all love so dearly shall go into this matter. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, in every district in the United States there are constituents to-day who differ with the Members who represent them. Speaking for myself, I have had letters and telegrams galore on both sides of this grave question. I probably will offend many of those loyal constituents who have stood by me for many years, whichever way I may vote. I am following the dictates of my own conscience, and those alone. I am an American. To me the rights of this country are supreme. They are paramount. They transcend the rights of any other, yea, of all other countries. I do not believe that in this hour any Member should allow his sympathies for this or that set of belligerents to sway his judgment. He should look at the question purely from an American standpoint, What is best for our country in this crisis? Can we continue to stand idly by and see Americans murdered? It seems to me that our national honor demands that we must protect our citizens at all costs. As I said at the outset, there has been too much murder already. I conceive it to be my duty, therefore, in view of the situation to vote for the pending resolution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], who has just addressed the House, has stated he hopes that if we go to war we will make it an American war, that we will fight American battles, protect American lives and American property. But I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact, and I want to call the attention of Members of this House to the fact, that if you adopt this resolution your control of the course of events will terminate. [Applause.]

From the moment you adopt this resolution the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of your Army and your Navy, under the terms of this resolution, will determine where that Army and that Navy shall go.

That Commander in Chief, addressing this House only the other day, told us in language which can not be misunderstood what he will do if this resolution is adopted. He does not propose to make this an American fight. He proposes to enter into an alliance with the entente powers. He proposes to place at the disposal of these powers our Navy, our Army, our munitions, and the food and clothing which may be produced in this country.

If necessary, he will send American boys to the trenches in Europe. And how will those American boys be assembled? Will they be consulted, will the recruiting officer ask them if they want to serve "somewhere in France"? Not at all; because the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, has told you that he wants compulsory military service. In other words, the young men of this country are to be forced into the Army and placed at the disposal of the President of the United States, to be sent wherever he may order them.

I want the Members of this House to bear that fact in mind—that when you vote for this resolution you vote to give the President of the United States the authority to send American boys to Europe. I want to ask Members of this House, on the Republican and on the Democratic side, who among you last October and November, when you were asking for the votes of you constituents, dared to suggest to them that if elected you would send their boys to Europe? [Applause.]

Why, my friends, Woodrow Wilson running on that kind of a platform could not have carried a single State in this Union. [Applause.]

Oh, my friends, men speak lightly of war, but I want to say to you that war is the most serious business in human affairs. When Congress declares war it does not mean that Congressmen are ordered to the front. Congress has declared war heretofore, but the recruiting offices of this country have not been uncomfortably crowded with Senators and Representatives who wanted to enlist. [Laughter and applause.]

When Congress declares war, it means that the boys of the country have been ordered to the front. I say the boys, because the boys always have and always will fight the battle of this land.

Gen. SHERWOOD will tell you—and I want to call your attention to the fact that when the call came to save the Union in 1861, ISAAC R. SHERWOOD did not seek political office. He did not talk war and stay at home. He enlisted and went to the front to serve his country, first as a private and eventually as a brigadier general. [Applause.] He will tell you that in that grand Army of the Union of more than 3,000,000 men perhaps 75 per cent were boys under 21 years of age.

Mr. SHERWOOD. The average age was between 18 and 19 years throughout the whole Army.

Mr. KEATING. There is the testimony—boys who had never voted for Congressmen, boys who had never voted for Senators, boys who had never had an opportunity to pass on the question of peace or war. It was decided for them by Congress, as we are deciding it here to-day.

When I heard men on this floor to-day advocate war, some of them having sons, I wondered if they thought this cause such a sacred cause that they would send their first born into the conflict.

We have here the Speaker of this House. His son is the parliamentarian of the House and he stands at his father's right hand. I want to ask the great Missourian if this cause is such a sacred cause that he would give that son to his country and say to him, "Go into the trenches of France." The man who is not prepared to place his hand on his heart and say that he is willing to give a life which is more precious to him than his own in this cause should not vote to send other men's sons to the European battle fields.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. Not now. Mr. Chairman, it reminds me of a story that a brilliant English woman told me about an English general who returned from "somewhere in France." He said he had served in many lands; he was inured to all of the hardships and all of the experiences of warfare. He described those great guns that the Germans had invented—the "big Berthas" they call them—which hurled huge shells at the enemy; he described the poisonous gases which swept over the trenches asphyxiating the soldiers; he described the airships which flew back and forth, day and night, dropping bombs on the trenches. These new and terrifying vehicles of destruction did not affect him, but he said the thing that shattered his nerves was when night closed down over the battle field, "and our boys were holding their trenches and the German boys were holding their trenches, and the dead and the dying were lying out between the trenches under the stars. We could not reach our wounded and the Germans did not dare attempt to reach their wounded, and we had to stand there in the trenches during the long hours of the night and listen to those boys crying for their mothers, and we realized that the cry would never be answered." That is war, my friends; and if I understand the verdict rendered by the American people by a majority of 500,000 votes in November, we are here to-day with instructions to do all that honorable men can do to avoid such a calamity. We were not sent here to obey the instructions of some one else. We came here bound by our oath of office to discharge our constitutional functions, and I hope that every Member of this House will for the moment forget what some man or group of men outside this House may wish, and realize that the responsibility rests upon him and upon him alone, and that he can not, like Pilate, wash the blood from his hands, but that he must answer to his constituents, and eventually he must answer to the God who rules over the destinies of this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the American House of Representatives, as I have listened to some of the speeches made in this House to-day I have had strange feelings come over me. I was astounded as I listened to the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. That speech will be pleasing to Count von Bernstorff when he reads it. And, Mr. Chairman, I was surprised and utterly astounded as I

listened to the speech of the majority leader, Mr. KITCHIN, of North Carolina. I do not and I can not understand just why he made that speech at this time. It can serve but one purpose now, and that is to give aid and comfort to those who would handicap and hamper the President in his purpose to defend American rights and liberties. Of course, it was not made for that purpose; but that does not keep it from being used for that purpose. At this time that speech is inappropriate, out of place, and harmful to the plans and purposes of this Government. It contains many statements that the facts and the proprieties do not warrant, and it ought not to have been made.

The fact that it was made by the man designated as majority leader will give some weight to it, but the fact is, the speech did not and does not represent the views of the majority. If Mr. KITCHIN felt that he could not conscientiously lead us in this great crisis, he ought to have notified us so that we would have known what to expect and then he could have said to the House and the country that he was sorry that he could not see his way clear to vote for the resolution. If he had done that, I would not criticize his action, but when he comes in here at this critical and solemn time and makes an argument that can only serve to embarrass the President and the country in the discharge of a solemn duty, I must enter my earnest protest. I regret to have to say these things, but I feel that it is my duty to my country to say them. Mr. Chairman, if I had been majority leader and had prepared an argument arraigning the position of my Government, as he has done, I would have resigned as majority leader before I made that speech. [Applause and hisses on the floor and in the gallery.] Oh, you may hiss, you who speak for the Kaiser and not for the President of the United States. [Applause on the floor and in the gallery.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. The occupants of the gallery will refrain from manifesting their approval or disapproval; otherwise they will not be permitted to witness the proceedings of the House.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, just a few weeks ago, during the last days of the Sixty-fourth Congress, the President requested us to give him authority to arm our merchant vessels and send them through the danger zone, marked out by the German Government. The House gave him that authority, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] voted for that bill. We said by that act to the German Government that we propose to send American ships where we, under the laws of nations, have a right to send them and we are going to place guns upon these ships. Not only that, but we are going to shoot your submarines at sight.

What did that action mean, Mr. Chairman, if it did not mean that the Government of the United States was serving notice upon Germany that we would fight rather than permit Germany to drive us, with our products of farm and factory, from the sea. The entire Alabama delegation voted for that measure. This House went on record, by a vote of more than 400 majority, favoring a bill to authorize the President to require our gunners on American ships bearing our produce to foreign markets to shoot German submarines if they undertook to interfere with our rights to use the high seas for carrying on the legitimate business of our people. I repeat that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] both voted for the measure which called for the use of the implements of war to enforce our rights upon the high seas against the brutal conduct of the German Government. When these gentlemen voted to arm our merchant vessels so that they could defend themselves against German submarines, they said by that act that it was right and proper for the Government of the United States to send its merchant ships through the so-called German war zone, and that it was also right and proper to fight if Germany undertook to prevent their passage through the prescribed zone. Since these gentlemen and the House took that position Germany has continued to dispute our right to use the high seas; she has fired upon our flag, sunk our merchant ships, and murdered American citizens in the peaceful pursuit of their legitimate business. Germany has been and is now making war upon the United States. Strange indeed it is, Mr. Chairman, but these two gentlemen, who about five weeks ago voted to arm merchant vessels so that they could by force of arms defy the German Government and continue our traffic with neutral nations, are now refusing to support the President when war has been forced upon the United States. The situation is far more serious now than when these gentlemen authorized the use of guns on merchant ships to enforce our rights against the barbaric decree of Germany.

The President of the United States, the head of our Government, the man who has done so much to keep us out of war, has requested us to acknowledge the truth and to declare that a state of war exists between this Government and Germany, so that he can use our military and naval forces to protect and defend the rights and the lives of American citizens. But these two gentlemen, who voted to arm and to authorize our merchant ships to stand for American rights in and to fight their way through the so-called German war zone, now, strange to say, refuse to authorize the use of more effective weapons in resenting and resisting the brutal, the unwarranted, and the unlawful attacks made upon us by the German Government.

Mr. Chairman, when I contrast their position on the question of arming our merchant ships for the purpose of preventing German submarines from destroying our commerce with the position that they now take of flatly refusing to give to the President authority to defend the persons and the lives of our citizens against German rapine and murder, I am more than puzzled; I am sorely shocked and grieved. These gentlemen may be able to reconcile the difference between these two positions. I can not.

Mr. Chairman, there are some strange influences at work in this country—un-American influences. A strange propaganda has been carried on here ever since Count von Bernstorff held secret conferences in New York City a year ago. It is claimed that vast sums of German money have been expended in carrying on this propaganda, so dangerous to the people of the United States. Our country is full of spies representing the German Government. Some of our munition plants have been blown up and a bomb has been fired in this very building in an effort to blow up the Capitol. Germany's spies are being arrested to-day in various sections of the country, and maps showing drawings of our wireless stations, power plants, and fortifications have been found in their possession. Right here in our own country an effort by German spies to poison the food supplies of our soldiers has been discovered and prevented by the Secret Service men of the United States, and Zimmermann, a representative of the German Government, has appealed to Japan and Mexico to join Germany in making war upon the United States, promising that the German Government would give to Japan California and territory along the Pacific coast and give to Mexico the States of Texas and New Mexico.

A German plan and conspiracy to conquer this country and to dismember this Government! God of our fathers! where is the patriotism and the courage of these gentlemen who to-day are trying to tie the hands of this Government so that it can not defend itself from the dangers that threaten it? What has become of the oath that they took last Monday to defend this country against all enemies, foreign and domestic? Gentlemen, what does it all mean? It means that the German Government has planned our destruction and is now making war upon the people of the United States, and to-day, gentlemen of the House, it means another thing, and that is that there is no chance for you to dodge or evade the issue of this hour. You are with the Kaiser and the Imperial German Government or you are standing with the President and the people of the United States. [Applause.] The man who dodges a vote on this question is untrue to his country.

Mr. Chairman, there is no middle ground. All of us know what this Government's position is going to be before this time to-morrow, and you must decide now whether you will be on the side of the autocracy of Germany or stand with the people of the United States. The position taken by the President, the Senate, and by nearly 400 Members of this House is the courageous and the righteous, the honorable and the patriotic position. It is the position that men are going to fight for and maybe die for, and, Mr. Chairman, I do not propose that that position shall be misrepresented and placed in a false light before the country and the world by men who are hunting excuses for their failure to stand by their country in the hour of its peril.

Mr. Chairman, we hear it said around here that this Member and that Member has got to oppose this measure because he has a large number of German voters in his district. I do not care who the Member is, the patriots of German blood in his district ought to resent that indictment of their loyalty and Americanism. Gentlemen, many, many thousands of men and women left Germany in order to get away from the cruelties and the curses of autocratic power. They came of their own free will and accord and cast their lot with our people, and to-day, in the main, they are a loyal part and parcel of the greatest Nation of people on the globe.

When they reached the shores of this country they consecrated themselves to its services, and they and their descendants

have contributed to the strength and the glory of the Republic. You do them wrong who insinuate that they who have shared the blessings and benefits of American liberty are not loyal to this Government. You gentlemen who have large populations of American citizens of German blood in your districts do violence to the Americanism of these people when you presume that they would have you handicap and hinder the President of their country in his efforts to protect and defend the rights and the honor of the American people. When you take that stand, prompted by what you imagine is the desire of citizens of German blood, you not only raise the question of your own loyalty and Americanism but you insult their American manhood and cast a reflection upon the honor and the patriotism of these men who have sworn allegiance to the United States.

Just a day or two ago a loyal American of German blood sent this message by his Congressman to the President:

Tell the President that I know how patient he has been and how hard he has tried to keep out of war with Germany, but that it looks like we are going to be drawn into it anyhow. Tell him that I have two sons, one 19 and one 23 years old, and in case of war they want to go and fight for the Stars and Stripes, and their mother and I have given our consent for them to do so.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, here is a sample of the courage and the loyalty of the men of German blood in America who will be found fighting for American rights and liberties. The great body of our people of German blood will be as loyal as any other portion of our population. I know of loyal Americans of German blood who have offered their services to the United States in the event of war with Germany. I wish they could be here to-day. I wish that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] could see them and hear them talk; but thank God there are those here from North Carolina who will show by their votes that the position taken to-day by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is not the position of the North Carolina delegation. I have just listened to the speech of old Uncle JOE. He was born in North Carolina, and he is standing with the President and the country, and he will kill the vote of his colleague [Mr. BRITTEN].

Mr. Chairman, the man who is not big enough to throw his own political fortunes to the wind and stand with his country to-day is not worthy of a seat in the American Congress, and I do not propose that Members who are afraid of the voters of German blood in their districts shall put this Government in a false attitude while they, through the plea of conscientious scruples, play politics at the cost of my country.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] said that we made the fight in the last campaign on the issue of peace. We did. On every stump we said that the President had kept us out of war, and that is true. This Nation, at the expense of its pride and independence, has paid a fearful price to remain at peace with Germany. No nation in its efforts to keep out of war has ever suffered so many indignities and permitted so many infringements upon its rights and honor as has the Government of the United States in its efforts to remain at peace with Germany. Our appeals to Germany's judgment and conscience for justice and fair treatment have been treated with contempt and scorn, and our long patience in enduring insults has been regarded as an evidence of cowardice and fear. And having satisfied herself that we would submit to any insult, outrage, and wrong rather than fight, Germany has denied us the right to travel upon the high seas—tried to prevent our trade with neutral nations, and now she has destroyed our property and murdered our citizens. The German Government smote this Nation upon the cheek, and rather than go to war with Germany this Nation turned the other cheek. Then the Kaiser thought that we stood for peace at any price and he shot down our flag and murdered our citizens. Then the President was powerless to keep us out of war after the German Government had actually made war upon us. Germany is now making war upon us and the question is, Will we fight and defend our rights or will we fold our arms and cowardly surrender our national pride and honor while Germany drives us from the high seas and strips us of our national sovereignty? This war is not of our choosing. Let me read you what a paper published in Germany says. The Frankfurter Zeitung, in March, 1917, said:

President Wilson broke off diplomatic relations with Germany not in preparation of war, but, on the contrary, as a measure to avoid war.

Continuing, the paper said:

President Wilson does not want war.

So a great German editor practically admits that Germany is responsible for war with the United States. And yet the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] does not want us to acknowledge that a state of war exists. He has criticized his own Government for the step that it is about to take and he has made excuses for the brutal and inhuman conduct of the German Government. And, Mr. Chairman, on top of all this, he expresses the opinion that this Government under similar circumstances would have done as Germany has done. The German Government has violated all the rules of civilized warfare and all the principles of international law. It has murdered women and children in Belgium and now German submarines are destroying relief ships carrying food to the starving people of unhappy Belgium. The German Government has dynamited the earth and made unfit for farming purposes the most fertile fields of France. It has destroyed the fruit trees and placed poison in the streams and wells of a portion of France, and, Mr. Chairman, I resent the statement that this Government would have been guilty of any of these brutal and inhuman things.

Let me say to you gentlemen from the East, the North, and the West, who are standing loyally by the President and the country to-day, that the South, thank God, is with you. The descendants of the men who followed Stonewall Jackson and Robert E. Lee are ready to stand with the soldiers of New York and Massachusetts, California, Nebraska, and the other States in defending the rights and the honor of this Nation. To-day the South is saying to that flag, like Ruth to Naomi, "Whithersoever thou goest, I will go. Thy people are my people and thy God my God." [Applause.] We will not follow the suggestions of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. In the position that he has taken he does not speak for the people of the South. No man born south of the Mason and Dixon line is ready to surrender his country's self-respect and honor and lie down and crawl because the Kaiser has a Krupp gun and a submarine. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, let us be frank with each other to-day. Our own rights and liberties are involved in this European controversy and our safety as a nation is at stake. The success of the Kaiser means the death knell of popular government the world over. It requires no prophet to foresee the goal for which he is yearning. Nothing short of world power is his aim. Through the brute force of Prussian autocracy he hopes to rule the world. That is his dream and aim to-day. In the bloody path of this mad monarch the rights of neutrals are violated with impunity. The principles of international law and the rights of humanity no longer have weight with the Kaiser. He stands branded as an outlaw at the judgment bar of the family of nations. Mr. Chairman, in the name of democracy, liberty, and civilization, I indict this mad monarch of Germany as the most dangerous enemy to the peace and the happiness of the world.

Mr. Chairman, we will not agree that one nation in its efforts to destroy another nation shall be permitted to destroy us. The sea is the common highway of all nations, and the nation at war has no right to interfere with commerce between neutral nations. If one or two nations engaged in war can forbid trade and business intercourse between nations at peace with one another and at peace with the world, then the business of neutrals is destroyed and they are made to suffer the evil consequences of a war with which they have had no connection and for which they are in no way responsible. If Germany could have her way and stop all trade between our country and neutral nations, she would paralyze the business of our country, deprive us of our foreign markets, create stagnation in the business of farm and factory here and cause hunger and starvation among the people of neutral nations dependent upon us for their food supplies. Our Nation has the right to feed the hungry and to clothe the naked in these neutral nations, and our farmers and merchants and manufacturers have the right to carry on their business with these friendly neutrals without interference on the part of Germany.

We have said to the German Government, we have been selling to and buying from the neutral nations for years and years. We were buying from them and they were buying from us long before this war commenced. We have long-established trade relations with them, and now we are dependent upon each other for many of the necessities of life, and when you deny us the right to sell our products to neutral nations and deny us the right to buy the things that we need from neutral nations you are destroying our means of living and you are striking at our very existence. If we submit to it, we say by that act that we are not entitled to employ the means necessary to our life and well-being and that we are unworthy to have and enjoy existence as a sovereign nation. And we have said to the German Government, we have a right to use the high seas in carrying on business between this country and neutral nations, and when you sink our ships and kill our citizens for being where they have a right to be and for doing what they have a right

to do, you have become an outlaw and a murderer, challenging our national sovereignty and making war upon our people.

All that our flag stands for has been challenged by the delirium of this mad monarch of Germany. American ships returning home in ballast and flying the American flag are the prey of German submarines. They and the flag that represents our national sovereignty lie buried in the ocean. American citizens in the peaceful pursuit of their legitimate business were there standing beneath that flag, and they, too, lie buried in the ocean. If the mandate of Germany is carried out, we must sever our commercial relations with neutral nations, retire from the high seas, and stand humiliated before the world, despoiled of our national honor and stripped of our national sovereignty.

The rights and liberties that we enjoy to-day were achieved through the courage and the daring of our forefathers, and the curse of God Almighty will rest upon us if we fail to protect and defend them. [Applause.] But we are told that we should not resent the indignities, the insults, and the willful violations of our rights as a neutral nation, the sinking of American vessels flying the American flag, and the murdering of American citizens by the Imperial German Government, but that we should wait until the war is over and then take the matter up with Germany. But, Mr. Chairman, suppose Germany should be victorious in the mighty struggle now going on in Europe, and suppose she should say to us, "We have no apology to offer and no amends to make." Then and in that event what would these gentlemen have us do? They admit that we would then have to fight. If we would go to war then, why not go now, when it is certain that we can successfully resent the wrongs and outrages so contemptuously heaped upon us by the German Government, and help the allied armies of Europe to put an end to the war and at the same time destroy the most dangerous autocracy in all the world? Gentlemen of the House, if Germany, engaged in war with three of the great powers of Europe, will not now respect American rights and liberties, would you expect her to do so after she had triumphed in that war and had nothing to do but to give her whole time and attention to us? Do you not believe, gentlemen, from all that you have seen and felt for the last 12 months that if Germany is successful in this war that we will be the next nation that she will undertake to conquer? The Kaiser, with his warriors, returning home in triumph and marching through the streets of Berlin, would have as his slogan, "On to America." Do not be deceived, gentlemen. There is nothing surer in this world than if the Kaiser is successful we will have to fight him in order to preserve our rights and liberties. No thoughtful patriot can fail to see now that the welfare of the United States is vitally involved in the outcome of this war. We did not want war. War has been forced upon us, and there is no other alternative but to fight, unless we are ready to surrender our own self-respect, our honor, and rights as a nation.

If we are ready to do that, then tear down the American flag, call our ambassadors home, and write upon the Washington Monument and across the dome of this Capitol that we are the unworthy and degenerate sons of a heroic race of men who had the courage and the daring to fight and to die for our rights and liberties. [Applause.] God forbid that it shall ever be said of us that our fathers were willing to fight and to die to achieve our rights and liberties but that we were unwilling to fight and to die to preserve them. The God whose spirit brooded above the colonial battle line at Valley Forge, when we were fighting for our liberty, will not fail us now as we go forth to fight to preserve that liberty. Gentlemen of the House, I appeal to-day for an undivided loyalty for the unity of purpose and the solidarity of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the flag of our country represents the loves, the traditions, and patriotic incidents of a brave and mighty people. It stands for principles without which no republic can last and in the loss of which human liberty can not endure. All the brave spirits that have loved and cherished it encircle it now with a halo of light. Their blessings and benedictions are upon it. Look upon its sacred folds and thank God that you are an American citizen. Breathe upon it the blessings and benedictions born of love and loyalty. Its white stripes speak to us of the purity of its purpose and the justice of its cause. The red stripes remind us of the blood and tears, the sacrifice, and the suffering of those whose valor and heroism brought that flag into being. The blue plucked from the sky of the bended heavens and blossoming with stars reminds us that God's truth is everlasting—that right principles can not be shaken and that if we are true to our trust and true to ourselves we will be God's right arm in preserving our own rights and liberties and in preventing democracy and popular government from perishing from the earth. [Applause.] The hour has struck! The call of duty has sounded! America, incarnated spirit of liberty, make bare thine arm and strike for God and humanity! [Loud applause on the floor and in the gallery.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, owing to the shortage of time I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado makes the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to follow the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN], the distinguished spokesman of the President of the United States upon the floor of this House. I thank him for his reference to the loyalty of Nebraska. It was loyal between '61 and '65, when one out of every three persons in the Territory of Nebraska was fighting for the Union. [Applause.] In 1898 and 1916 combined 49 men out of every 10,000 inhabitants served the country in the Spanish-American War and the Mexican expedition, a record unequaled by any State of equal or greater population.

I was pleased to have the gentleman, as others have done, interject the President of the United States as an issue in this cause, because, rightfully or wrongfully, it is made to serve as the most potent argument in favor of this war. It is fitting and proper that the gentleman from Alabama should make the argument that he did, because he as the spokesman last fall was one of the leading guarantors of the policy of the President of the United States. The principal claim for suffrage was that the President of the United States would keep us out of war, and they gave to this country as a hostage for that promise the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. [Applause.] The next time the people take a pledge from the President or anybody else they will see to it that they take more valuable security.

This is the most momentous day in the history of the Republic. Hasty action here taken by this Congress in defiance of the well-known opposition of two-thirds of the American people under a glamour of patriotism may outlast the fateful month of April, when wars have so often been declared, but beyond that will present in its seamy side of preparation considerations which will rebuke many for to-day's ill-considered action.

"Stand by the President" was practically the opening sentence of Chairman FLOOD at the beginning of this debate. That plea might be properly made to-morrow after war is declared. But not now. We should to-day stand by the Constitution and Congress in this great deliberation. No wise judge would listen to an appeal to stand by the prosecuting attorney. This plea seems well answered in the speeches this day delivered by Majority Leader KITCHIN and Messrs. KEATING, of Colorado, and DILL, of Washington, all being of the majority party, who have cited this procedure as proof of violation of a sacred pledge to keep the country out of war and upon which pledge the American electors delivered a majority of votes.

We are the Congress of the United States, Members of that body which after full debate in the Constitutional Convention was given sole power to declare war. The theory was that as war must be waged by the people, then the people through their Representatives alone should have power to declare it.

And yet from August 1, 1914, the beginning of the European war, no Congressman or Senator, so far as I have been able to learn, has prepared and presented a resolution for a declaration of war with Germany, save and except the Gardner resolution of April 2, 1917. True, in both the Senate and House identical resolutions have been filed on the same day at this session by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] and also by the majority leader of the Senate. But upon the information of a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee this resolution was prepared by the President of the United States, which was not a part of his constitutional prerogative. So that the initial step for war was not with the people nor Congress, but with the President. Let him have credit or blame, but we can not wash our hands of this deed.

For more than 32 months the great European conflict has been waged. The announcement of neutrality was made in the beginning. The observance was almost immediately abandoned and in the presidential message of April 2, 1917, formally repudiated.

The two leading participants in the war, Britain and Germany, by mine and submarine, in violation of international

law, have sunk our ships and killed our citizens. This has been going on for many months. Yes; months before the last election. That election turned upon the question of credit to the successful candidate for having "kept us out of war." I was not of those who had any illusion about having been "kept out of war." In every speech made during my campaign I met the argument "He kept us out of war" with the evidence of his desire to involve this country in war with Germany and a forecast that he would drive this country into war. The vote soon to be taken will verify or rebuke that prediction. Right glad would I be to be so rebuked. What will it profit a President that he shall dethrone an autocrat if he keep not faith with his own people?

No substantial change of policy has been made by either Germany or Britain. The former, however, in recent weeks has intensified its submarine attacks upon our shipping with a ruthlessness brutal and indefensible which calls for our response by force, but not to take charge of the affairs of the world.

Near the close of the last session of Congress the President asked our sanction to arm our merchantmen which were to sail through the proscribed zones. At the same time he indicated that under the Constitution he had the authority to do so independent of Congress. The measure failing to pass the Senate, ships were armed by the Government, and with one exception experienced immunity from attack.

Nothing has occurred since not fairly anticipated or to have been reasonably expected. To us who voted to grant the President's request to be now told that it was unwise and a failure is a humiliation to which we should not be subjected. A fair trial should be given the method before it is abandoned. May not the Congress be given some consideration for stability, even though that quality has become so unpopular in other quarters? At this time it is considered a matter of heroism to take a new position—a disgrace to stand by it. [Applause.]

I shall offer a substitute resolution amplifying the powers of the President to protect our citizens and ships with all the strength of our Army and Navy. This is broader than any resolution which came to my desk before April 2. That was the date when war madness found a voice from yonder desk. It was voiced by a man who obtained the Presidency for "keeping us out of war."

Thrice before this the Congress of the United States was asked upon patriotic grounds to back the action of the Executive when such backing was declared as unnecessary but desirable. I voted for each.

The first one was the Vera Cruz expedition, the results of which we would gladly forget. The second was the border expedition, where our gallant soldiers acquitted themselves with credit, but the handling by the administration and the general results we all deplore.

Now we are asked to write down another "failure," and by this resolution say of the moving spirit of the country and times a failure in these minor matters fits him to conduct to a triumphant conclusion the greatest enterprise organized on earth since time began.

On the 22d day of January, 1917, standing before the Senate of the United States, President Wilson said, referring to the close of the European war, "Peace without victory." The world applauded; America generally approved. But you heard Monday night—

> And that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense, but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

A denial to the belligerents that measure of conquest now to be demanded by America.

I do not know what has come over the spirit of the American dreams. If one had said last October that a loan from the National Treasury would be suggested for any Government on earth, he would have been laughed at; if anyone had suggested that we send from one to three million conscripted Americans to the shambles of Europe, he would have been denounced as a madman and would-be murderer; if it had been seriously suggested that we enter the European war as an ally of either the entente or central powers, he would have been charged with little short of crime.

Yet from yonder desk Monday night the head of our Government and Army seriously proposed doing each of them, while this House and the Senate listened with manifestations of approval and a majority of the Supreme Judges applauded.

Why is this? Are the allies about to be crushed? Then we do not want to underwrite their insolvency with our blood and treasure. If, on the contrary, as I hear and read, the central powers, from outside attack and internal disorder, are on the point of being crushed, it would be unworthy a great nation to interpose its power at this time. There would be no credit and little advantage in such a course.

This measure is an offer to wager every dollar of wealth and every American life against nothing that the allies will win. If the allies win, we save that which should never have been placed in jeopardy; if the allies are overcome, we may stand to lose.

Many of us are deeply concerned about the conditions of man power and finance as well as the attitude of the powers involved in the war toward each other. Grave rumors as to separate peace are heard. Yet I find upon inquiry that those recognized as leaders of this House have not been fully conferred with and advised as to those grave questions, which should be known and communicated to the membership of the House. The controlling facts which now determine the prospects for victory or defeat should not be withheld. The American people will not tolerate or ever condone the withholding of any important fact which might probably materially affect the results.

If the vote hereon were deferred for 10 days, this war resolution in its present scope would not be passed. Already the sober second thought of the American people, including Congressmen, is making itself felt.

Why should it not be deliberated upon for days or longer when no attack against us is threatened? All or nearly all of us agree on a reasonable measure of equipment and preparation for defense and the enforcement of our rights. We resist this resolution on account of the appalling heights we as a Nation are asked to climb, the depths we are requested to sound, and the awful risk the Republic is demanded to assume.

The resolution before the House in its innocent phraseology has probably not received the consideration which its gravity deserves. Understanding that it is a substantial product of the presidential pen, his message delivered on the same day the resolution was produced will to many become the official interpretation of the resolution. Reading the resolution in the light of the message, we find that the American people, to the extent of every dollar of their property now and to be earned during the near future and every life of their citizens, are pledged to the following:

CONSCRIPTION.

Five hundred thousand additional men for the Army, immediately to be followed by like levies apparently only limited by the number of men in the country and the field necessities of the allies anywhere on the globe.

CREDITS.

Credits to the utmost limit of taxation, and that supplemented by bonds, to furnish funds for the United States in its mighty undertaking and financing in their weakened condition Britain, France, Russia, and Italy, and perhaps some of the small nations.

SUPPLIES.

Supplies which the various allied nations need and which we may have our Government is to have control over, with power to fix prices and form of payment to be made.

ALLIANCE WITH THE ENTENTE.

A departure from and a repudiation of Washington's Farewell Address warning against entangling alliances, which to Americans for more than a century has had the force and effect of an amendment to the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL BURDEN OVER THE ALLIES.

While the allies are fighting merely for victory and are in a situation to enter into peace with Germany through the Hohenzollern dynasty, we are committed to the full task of destroying that dynasty and establishing a different governing body for Germany.

TROOPS IN EUROPE.

Organization of from 500,000 to 3,000,000 of our men must mean our European activity. Germany can not reach our shores with troop transports. To carry out the proposed undertaking we must send our troops to Europe, there to fight and be maintained. To obtain these they will attempt conscription.

SETTLEMENT OF PEACE.

About a settling board we would be but one, with many hating enemies and envying friends. What figure would the United States cut in rearranging the map of Europe, designating dynasties, and fixing indemnities, remembering always that indemnities are fixed upon those who can pay?

NATIONAL PROFITS.

I leave this blank as best expressing my estimate: _____

_____

_____

NATIONAL LOSS.

The Arabic notation can not express it. The ages can not measure it. I love my fellow man, and I quail from consider-

ing the penalty to be administered upon those responsible by a righteously wrathful judge.

The press announces this morning in advance of the action of this House, where war measures should first be heard and fully discussed, that 2,000,000 men are to be conscripted, not to defend America or any right regarded by the administration as sacred until within the last 40 days. These men are called to go from the homes of the land to the European trenches to die. What for? To drive the Hohenzollerns from the throne of Germany.

Many would like to see the Hohenzollern dynasty—every member of it—driven from court and throne to the trenches under fire of French machine guns, taking the place of the peasant soldiers of that empire. But, gentlemen of the House, my constituents gave me no authority to wager every dollar of property and every young male life of that district that that dynasty should either leave the throne or go to the trenches. That is what every Congressman will be called upon to answer, and I would rather meet the impotent sneers here to-day than the griefs of mothers, fathers, and wives at home.

We have no place in the European war outside the enforcement of our rights upon the seas, and for that the American people will gladly furnish men and means. The message tells us that the soldiers are to be conscripted, something Britain has not done at home nor yet asked from its colonies. From the homes, schools, farms, and shops the fresh, bright-faced boys will be torn, driven to the shambles of Europe, there to march with the black, the brown, and the yellow races; there to die in the face of rolling riflery, dismembered and scattered by storm of shrapnel, or choked with poisonous gases.

Cold comfort to them that the first call came from yonder platform in the voice of him trying to prove "he kept us out of war" by ordering the young men into a foreign war. [Applause.]

To their sightless eyes on an alien soil what help will it be that the Cabinet of this Government was present abetting and applauding the Executive's appeal to Congress for their young lives' risk? What music to the disconsolate mother's ear will there be in the vigorous handclapping of the members of our Supreme Court applauding this historic demand for blood risk? Will it assuage the grief of fathers that for the first time in the history of this Chamber the diplomatic corps of many nations, including, of course, the entente, were here seated during a business session? Will it calm the anguish of wife and babe to know that the Executive message was delivered in the night session with a cordon of Cavalry about the Capitol Building and hundreds of Secret Service men, who coarsely halted Congressmen in their passage in and about the building, when the first demand for her husband's life risk was made?

The glory and pomp of Monday night, April 2, resting upon the privation, suffering, and death in the European trenches will soon lose its charm.

We hear much of liberty, much of humanity, much about relieving suffering and release from tyranny and oppression. No sentiment came from that platform Monday night that might not and did not in fact come in the beginning of the great martial campaigns conducted by Tamerlane, Alexander, Pompey, Antony, Cæsar, and Napoleon. [Applause.] In every case they conscripted the young, the tender, and the brave. In each there were men charged with a duty to oppose them, but in the hour of trial too much fear or respect for authority worked their nations' undoing.

What of criticism I present is directed against a declaration of war the avowed purpose of which, as stated by its authors, is to destroy a dynasty and give a different government to a great people who have made no effort to free themselves.

Each of those whom I have named had a foreign autocrat whom he would dethrone and a people he would free from a tyrannous ruler. In fact, the enterprise has all the objections known to history of the so-called campaigns for liberation without even the element of novelty to redeem it.

I can not vote for this initial measure which will be used as the basis for extraordinary demands for human life and blood and meet with a clear eye the mothers of the land.

At this time, after all our arguments are fairly in, permit me to say, should Congress do this deed, I shall then do as best I may the duty of the hour to make our national will supreme over all that may oppose us in battle and save the Republic for a people to whom reason may yet be restored.

But until the will of Congress is crystallized let me say, as the safest, best, and truest American doctrine, for defense of American rights on land and sea, let millions be called and billions voted; for an allied European war of aggression, no men, no money. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, no Member during the entire course of his life will ever be called upon to exercise a more solemn responsibility than he will exercise before we adjourn to-night. This is not a time for one to think of self or of political consequences to oneself, but to think only of his country. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, since Congress adjourned on the 4th day of March last events have transpired. Germany has made good her threat. Since that time she has sunk American ships and destroyed American lives without warning. Mr. Chairman, that is making war upon us. [Applause.]

America is composed not of material things but of hundreds of millions of people, and when any nation by the deliberate order of the sovereign head of that nation destroys American lives without just cause, that nation makes war upon us. And the question that we have to determine now is not whether there shall be war between Germany and the United States. Whether this resolution shall pass or whether it shall fail can not change that. A vote "yea" for this resolution means—and to my mind it means only—that we, the American Congress, propose to meet the war that is made upon us by Germany by war. [Applause.] On the other hand, a vote "nay" on this resolution, to my mind—and I have no criticism for those who differ with me—means that we will submit to Germany warring upon us without using force to prevent it. And in that view of what it means, Mr. Chairman, I can not vote "no" on this resolution. I must vote "aye." [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, what I especially rose to speak upon was not upon that subject, but upon the question of England's violation of international law as compared with Germany's. We all agree that there is a difference between the violation of rights involving property and the violation of rights involving human life. That is agreed. But the opponents of this resolution to-day and throughout the country have time and again declared that England is equally guilty with Germany, because she planted mines in the North Sea and created a military zone, and only because our ships kept out of that zone have lives not been lost at the hands of England. I think it ought to be said, Mr. Chairman, that the fact is that England's mining of the North Sea and the creation of the zone that she did create was not in violation of international law, and neither was Germany's mining of the sea and creation of a military zone in violation of international law. We are not complaining of military zones created by either England or Germany, but only of Germany's unlawful acts within the zone she has created. Not only is it not a violation of international law, but The Hague convention of 1907, to which we were a party, expressly recognized and regulated the planting of mines upon the high seas by a belligerent. And I want to read the first three articles of that convention. I read:

ARTICLE I.

It is forbidden—

1. To lay unanchored automatic contact mines, except when they are so constructed as to become harmless one hour at most after the person who laid them ceases to control them.

2. To lay anchored automatic contact mines which do not become harmless as soon as they have broken from their moorings.

3. To use torpedoes which do not become harmless when they have missed their mark.

ARTICLE II.

It is forbidden to lay automatic contact mines off the coast and ports of the enemy, with the sole object of intercepting commercial shipping.

ARTICLE III.

When anchored automatic contact mines are employed every possible precaution must be taken for the security of peaceful shipping.

The belligerents undertake to do their utmost to render these mines harmless within a limited time, and should they cease to be under surveillance to notify the danger zones, as soon as military exigencies permit, by a notice addressed to shipowners, which must also be communicated to the Governments through the diplomatic channel.

That is exactly what England did. She complied in every respect with The Hague convention, agreed to by the United States, by France, by Germany, and by most of the nations of the world. It is true that this convention by its terms was to last only for seven years, in this sense, that after 1914 any nation might retire from the convention and not be bound by it. But that meant, and it meant only, that if they did retire from it, they were not even bound by those restrictions. So that, as a matter of fact, in this zone in the North Sea created by England she has not violated international law. In notifying us of the zone she had created she complied with the very agreement that we were a party to.

But it can well be said that although it is not in violation of international law, the planting of mines in the high seas ought to be in violation of international law, and to that we will all agree. It may be interesting to you to know that in this Hague

conference there was a proposal to prohibit all floating mines upon the high seas and to prohibit all anchored mines upon the high seas that were not rendered innocuous within one hour after leaving their moorings; and it may be interesting to know that that proposition was made by Great Britain to the Hague conference; that it was supported by Austria-Hungary; that it was supported by Russia; and that it was supported by the United States. The opposition to that proposition was led by Germany.

I read from Westlake on International Law. He is an English writer, but this book was published in 1907, seven years before this war began:

At the opening of the conference she—

That is, Great Britain—

proposed that the employment of unanchored contact mines, or of any contact mines which do not become innocuous as soon as they get loose, shall be prohibited. * * * The opposition to the proposal was led by Germany, but received support from Austria-Hungary, Russia, and the United States.

Finally, when the articles that I have read to the committee were adopted, the English delegate, Sir Ernest Satow, in a speech, used this language:

Having voted for the Mines convention, which the conference has just accepted, the British delegation desires to declare that it can not regard this arrangement as furnishing a final solution of the question, but only as marking a stage in international legislation on the subject. It does not consider that adequate account has been taken in the convention of the rights of neutrals to protection or of humanitarian sentiments which can not be neglected. The British delegation had done its best to bring the conference to share its views, but its efforts in this direction have remained without result. The high seas, gentlemen, form a great international highway. If in the present state of international laws and customs belligerents are permitted to fight out their quarrels upon the high seas, it is none the less incumbent upon them to do nothing which might, long after their departure from a particular place, render this highway dangerous for neutrals who are equally entitled to use it. We declare without hesitation that the right of the neutral to security of navigation on the high seas ought to come before the transitory right of the belligerents to employ these seas as the scene of the operation of war.

Nevertheless, the convention as adopted imposes upon the belligerent no restriction as to the placing of anchored mines, which consequently may be laid wherever the belligerent chooses—in his own waters for self-defense, in the waters of the enemy as a means of attack, or finally on the high seas, so that neutral navigation will inevitably run great risks in time of naval war and may be exposed to many a disaster. We have already on several occasions insisted upon the danger of a situation of this kind. We have endeavored to show what would be the effect produced by the loss of a great liner belonging to a neutral power. We did not fail to bring forward every argument in favor of limiting the field of action for these mines, while we called very special attention to the advantages which the civilized world would gain from this restriction, since it would be equivalent to diminishing to a certain extent the causes of warlike conflicts. It appeared to us that by acceptance of the proposal made by us at the beginning of the discussion dangers would have been obviated which in every maritime war of the future will threaten to disturb friendly relations between neutrals and belligerents. But since the conference has not shared our views, it remains for us to declare in the most formal manner that these dangers exist, and that the certainty that they will make themselves felt in the future is due to the incomplete character of the present convention.

As this convention, in our opinion, constitutes only a partial and inadequate solution of the problem, it can not, as has already been pointed out, be regarded as a complete exposition of international law on this subject. Accordingly it will not be permissible to presume the legitimacy of an action for the mere reason that this convention has not prohibited it. This is a principle which we desired to affirm, and which it will be impossible for any State to ignore whatever its power.

The speech of the English delegate was replied to by Baron von Marschall for the German delegation, and it is interesting to note what he said on the subject of mines.

He said:

That a belligerent who lays mines assumes a very heavy responsibility toward neutrals and toward peaceful shipping is a point on which we are all agreed. No one will resort to this instrument of warfare unless for military reasons of an absolutely urgent character. But military acts are not solely governed by stipulations of international law. There are other factors. Conscience, good sense, and the sense of duty imposed by principles of humanity will be the surest guides for the conduct of sailors, and will constitute the most effective guaranty against abuses. The officers of the German Navy, loudly proclaim it (je le dis à haute voix), will always fulfill in the strictest fashion the duties which emanate from the unwritten law of humanity and civilization. I have no need to tell you that I entirely recognize the importance of the codification of rules to be followed in war. But it would be a great mistake to issue rules the strict observation of which might be rendered impossible by the law of facts. It is of the first importance that the international maritime law which we desire to create should only contain clauses the execution of which is possible from a military point of view—is possible even in exceptional circumstances. Otherwise the respect for law would be lessened and its authority undermined. It would also seem to us to be preferable to maintain at present a certain reserve, in the expectation that seven years hence it will be easier to find a solution which will be acceptable to the whole world. As to the humanitarian sentiments of which the British delegate has spoken, I can not [concluded Baron von Marschall, raising his voice to an appropriate pitch], I can not admit that there is any country in the world which is superior to my country or my Government in the sentiment of humanity.

And the author uses this language in commenting upon the two positions of England and Germany, and we should remember that it was seven years before this war began that this book was written:

Thus Germany claims the right to destroy neutral shipping and fishermen if absolutely necessary in order that she may win in a war. Great Britain declines to be bound by Germany's necessity to win.

Mr. Chairman, I have quoted this language, and I have brought it before the committee because I think if the people of the country are to form correct conclusions upon the great questions involved in this crisis, they ought to have the facts upon which correct conclusions can be based.

I am no apologist for Great Britain. She has violated international law, but not in the respect charged, involving human life. And so, Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this resolution, but in voting for it I want to say that I am not committed and shall not be committed to all of the program laid down by the President of the United States. In making his address to us he exercised his constitutional right in advising what measures he believed should be taken in the prosecution of the war; but later on we must exercise our constitutional duty in determining for ourselves what we think, in the interest of America, is necessary to be done, and not to follow blindly the orders of any man, even though he be the President of the United States, in the consideration of questions that belong alone to the legislative branch of the Government and not to the executive branch. [Applause.]

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, the far-reaching results of this legislation it is impossible for any human eye to foresee. It is one of the gravest acts in our whole national history. It not only engages us in a ruthless contest with the most powerful military nation of the world, but it necessarily makes us a prominent actor on the stage of world-wide politics. It abandons our policy of isolation. Everyone must regret the necessity of such action.

Personally I deeply deplore it. I spent a year in Germany when a boy, and I have the warmest admiration and affection for the German people. But I believe that under the military autocracy which has ruled and oppressed the spirit of that splendid nation during this war it has become a menace to democracy and to peaceful civilization. Unless that military spirit can be annihilated the whole world must continue an armed camp and dissipate its energies and fortune in accumulating vast stores of munitions and implements of war, and turn its young men from productive industry to the waste of military training.

With that martial policy which animates the German military aristocracy America can have no sympathy. We have all been hoping for months that some conciliatory disposition might be shown us and that this terrible alternative might not be forced upon us. But I agree entirely with the lucid and eloquent message which the President delivered to us. His reasoning is conclusive.

We have been so injured, insulted, and outraged that we can not longer disregard it. We are impelled to this action not only by feelings of self-respect and honor, but by a reasonable regard for our future safety.

If we do not resent these indignities now when we have allies who insure us temporary protection, we would be in the future an easy prey for hostile attack. I do not believe our helplessness against a nation equipped for modern warfare is appreciated. We are as unfit to cope with our enemy as a blind man is to fight with one who has his sight. We lack all the modern instrumentalities which make the European armies so terrible and so irresistible. To manufacture them requires months and sometimes years, and enormous expense. We are comparatively safe to-day through the protection of the allied fleet, but we can not ignore the possibility of a seperate peace in Europe, leaving us alone, and we must prepare to defend ourselves. It is dreadful to contemplate how our young men must be withdrawn from their normal tasks and trained for destruction, and what enormous expense it will involve. But there is no escape. In a spirit of solemn self-sacrifice the Nation must prepare itself for the emergency, recognizing that it is not only a patriotic but a selfish duty, for if neglected the fate of Belgium might be ours.

Though deficient to-day in all branches of military equipment, we have boundless resources. What we need now is energetically to mobilize them. In this great task I am sure there will be no division of parties or of races. I am confident that all Americans as they see that the issue is between democracy and absolutism, between permanent war and permanent peace, and that it involves both the future safety and the honor of our country, will unite in a spirit of serious determination and self-sacrifice to offer to the Government unstintedly every kind of support that the crisis shall demand.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

Mr. SIEGEL. I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] make the same request.

Several other Members rose.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are to be a large number of these requests, the Chair desires to get all the names. Does the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] desire to make a request?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a request for unanimous consent that general debate on this resolution close at 8 o'clock. Then we will take up the resolution for amendment and for debate under the five-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. We are in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. FLOOD. I thought it could be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. MANN. It can be done by unanimous consent in Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] asks unanimous consent that general debate upon this resolution shall be concluded at 8 o'clock.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask how many men are on the list uncalled?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). The present occupant of the chair will state that he can not answer that inquiry. The permanent Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], called the present occupant of the chair temporarily to the chair.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I merely make the interrogation because, without knowing the number of men who have not been called, I do not think we can comply intelligently with the request of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that after we get to the five-minute debate it is not my purpose to cut it off. It can run on for two or three or four hours.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will yield, I think it is the declared purpose to have a final vote on the resolution before we adjourn to-day. General debate has now been running for quite a while. There will undoubtedly be some amendments offered to the resolution, and I think full opportunity will be given to all Members to speak under the five-minute rule. That is the way I expect to present my views to the House. It seems to me it would be in the interest of those Members whose names are on the list to close the general debate about 8 o'clock and go ahead under the five-minute rule, even if we sit here until 11 or 12 or 1 or 2 o'clock.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I take it that under those circumstances there will be no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. I can not speak for anybody except myself. Of course, I would not like to see the matter abused.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] has stated to me, and I am sure he will make the same statement to the committee, that, while he expects to get a final vote on the resolution before we adjourn, it is his intention to allow debate under the five-minute rule to run liberally and probably as long as anybody wants to talk.

Mr. FLOOD. That was not the question of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY].

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Well, practically the question. I merely wanted to be assured that there was a liberal intention to allow anybody to speak who wanted to speak.

Mr. MANN. Of course no one can say in the committee whether objection will be made in the House to granting general leave to print. So far as I am concerned, there will be no objection, but general leave can be given only in the House.

Mr. FLOOD. When we get into the House I shall ask leave that everybody who desires to do so may print remarks within five days.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] presents a request that general debate close at 8 o'clock.

Mr. CALDWELL. I reserve the right to object. I want to say that when this debate first opened I went up and got some time to talk. It came to my attention that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN], a new Member of this House, is in a position where it is necessary for him to have at least three minutes of the time of this House. I offered him my time and the presiding officer refused to give it to him. Under these circumstances, unless it can be agreed here that under the five-minute rule Mr. LUNN shall have at least three minutes' time, I shall certainly object. Otherwise I shall have no objection.

Mr. MANN. Probably the gentleman will not have any trouble in getting that time, but I do not see how you can make any agreements of that kind.

Mr. LANGLEY. Everybody else will ask the same privilege. I should object to that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, I want to say that I made a request to extend remarks in the RECORD. Having taken considerable interest in this matter it has been my hope that I might obtain three minutes, but being unable to obtain any satisfaction I made a request to extend my remarks. If an arrangement can be made by which gentlemen shall have an opportunity to speak, I should like to speak for three minutes. Otherwise I would like to have my request for leave to print stand, although that is a very unsatisfactory way in which to express one's views.

Mr. MANN. If there is debate under the five-minute rule from 8 o'clock until 12 or 1 or 2 or 3 o'clock, as far as I am concerned, I do not see any reason why gentlemen will not have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. FLOOD. It seems to me we ought to conclude the matter by 12 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. There are a number of Members who want to talk. After all, we have been called in special session. A resolution is presented to declare war. There are more than 430 Members of the House.

Mr. LANGLEY. All equally interested.

Mr. MANN. Probably we will not be engaged in other business in the House to any extent for several days. I saw this House sit all night when we were discussing the question of the freedom of Cuba, and I have seen the House sit all night on various occasions. I think we can afford to stay as long as any Member wants to speak, and I am sure the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] does not feel otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). Is there objection?

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I made timely application and thought I was on the list for 10 minutes. Since then there has been a change in the occupancy of the chair, and I am unable to find out whether I am on the list or not.

Mr. LANGLEY. I was put on the list early in the day, but now I can not find out where I am.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the permanent Chairman left with him a list saying that it is not complete, that there were many gentlemen on the list, but these names were given in the order in which the present occupant of the chair was to recognize the various gentlemen.

Mr. STEENERSON. Unfortunately when I made application the gentleman from Missouri was in the chair. I did not think it was necessary to make a new application when the permanent Chairman returned. I mention the matter now, because I want the indulgence of the House.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, my colleague, Mr. ESTOPINAL, at the instance of the Louisiana delegation, would like to have 10 minutes to express his views on the subject. I would like to know whether he will be recognized or not. Not a minute of time will be consumed by any other member of the delegation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana understands the attitude of the present occupant of the chair. He is here temporarily. The Chair is advised by gentlemen at the desk that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ESTOPINAL] is on the list for recognition.

Mr. DUPRÉ. For 10 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Is there objection?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the Chair that the list is incomplete, I ask that the list be read in order to find out if we are to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. Perhaps the gentleman from Rhode Island misunderstood the present occupant of the chair. There was merely handed him by the permanent Chairman a list of six names of gentlemen who would be recognized until he returned. There is no other list in the hands of the present occupant of the chair. The Chair will state, however, that the list left with him by the permanent Chairman consists of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] 10 minutes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] 15 minutes, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BROWN] 10 minutes, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] 6 minutes, and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky 10 minutes. They will be recognized in that order.

Mr. MONDELL. Do I understand that is all the list?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not; but this was left by the permanent Chairman for the present occupant of the chair to recognize in their order until he returned.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request, and give notice that at 8 o'clock I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to address the committee for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, one of two things has to be done. We are either going to sit here to-night until we finish or adjourn over until to-morrow, and it seems to me the sentiment of the committee is to stay here. Now, I am and always have been in favor of this House giving every man a chance to express his opinion. [Applause.] This is a free country and we have a right to talk. There is nothing to be done to-morrow, and if this resolution is disposed of to-night we can afford to stay here until a late hour in the morning and get through with this thing and sleep to-morrow. [Laughter and applause.] That is, if we can sleep after this debate to-day. Most gentlemen will be satisfied with three minutes. Of course there are some men who can not express their opinion in three minutes, but they surely will be satisfied with five minutes, and if we stay here until 2 or 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning every man in the House can have a chance to express his views on this subject. [Applause.]

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] expresses the views I have in reference to it. My proposition was to go into debate at 8 o'clock under the five-minute rule——

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is exactly right.

Mr. BURNETT. But if that was done, gentlemen who have already spoken would have an opportunity to displace gentlemen who have not spoken.

Mr. LANGLEY. Some of whom have spoken already too long.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia withdraws his request, and the regular order is the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS].

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I despair of success in any attempt to influence the vote of the committee. I rise more in explanation of my contemplated action than with the view of adding anything of persuasive importance to this debate.

I can not refrain from saying, however, that the action and words of the majority leader, Mr. KITCHIN, on the floor this afternoon presented the finest example of sacrificial courage and statesmanship that I have ever witnessed. [Applause.] Coming as it did after a day of almost hysterical flag waving and lip service to the Republic, its calm dignity and noble poise was like "some one opening a window in a close and stifling room." I have been very fond of CLAUDE KITCHIN since I first met him, but my admiration and affection have been vastly enhanced by his conduct to-day. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] who presumed to stand in his place and criticize such conduct as this succeeded only in disclosing his inability to understand and comprehend that character of conscientious courage without which the Republic can not endure. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] unwittingly did a great injustice to those who oppose this war resolution when he said that we favored doing nothing in this grave crisis. I do not stand here urging inaction on our part; I do not advocate the policy of submission to the outrages from which we suffer. I hold no brief for Germany, nor for England, nor for France. I have no time to waste at this hour in vain criticism of an inconsistent course in submitting to the denial of our rights by one belligerent while resenting the somewhat similar but more aggravated conduct of another. The time has passed for that. We deal now with Germany, not, primarily, because she has destroyed our property and taken our lives, but because she has denied to us certain sovereign privileges to which the destruction of property and the loss of life are incidental.

As has been well said, the Boston tea party was not incited because of the paltry dollars concerned in taxation, but because of the denial of a sovereign right, because of a great principle which found its expression in money. One who sees nothing in this crisis but commercialism and money fails to grasp the real contention, namely, that of a sovereign people insistent upon an undisputed and time-honored right which another nation without justification assaults.

On February 17 last I addressed myself to this body and advocated action on our part to assert our rights to the sea. I suggested the defense of armed neutrality, and I was the first in either branch of the Congress to make the suggestion.

On February 26, just nine days thereafter, the President addressed the joint session and asked authority to adopt the armed-neutrality policy, stating—and with which statement I am in full accord—that under the Constitution he had such authority, but was reluctant to exercise it in the absence of affirmative congressional action.

The House almost unanimously passed the armed-neutrality resolution, but it failed of passage in the Senate.

The President thereupon acted upon his own responsibility and ordered armament placed upon merchant ships under the implied authority granted him by the Constitution. This action was instituted, so I am informed, about two weeks before the President requested the passage of this declaration of war.

When the President addressed the Congress on February 26, but a little more than a month ago, he used this language:

> I hope that I need give no further proof and assurance than I have already given through nearly three years of anxious patience that I am the friend of peace, and mean to preserve it for America as long as I am able. I am not now proposing or contemplating war or any step that need lead to war.

Again, he said in the same message:

> No course of my choosing * * * will lead to war.

I challenge any advocate of this resolution to arise in his place now and state the act of any belligerent occurring between February 26 and April 2 which changed the condition. Tell me and this House what transpired in the 35 days intervening between those dates that would justify one who did not "contemplate war" on the earlier date to demand war on the later date. I want to know why America should enter a war which the President said must end without victory.

Do nothing! Why, Mr. Chairman, not an opponent of this resolution has advocated doing nothing. I was the first who advocated doing something. I want every right of America protected, and those who stand with me want the same. I have always believed that armed neutrality would protect them. The President himself believed so some 30 days ago. Yet with only about two weeks trial, with nothing to disclose that the plan would not be successful, he now abandons it and demands a declaration of war.

If the logic of events should prove "armed neutrality" insufficient, I am willing to go a step beyond, but I will not go so far as war until events disclose that our rights can not be protected short of war.

I have heard the phrase, "Stand by the President," so many times to-day that I have grown weary of its repetition. The years of my life have been lived in a sphere of somewhat narrow limitations. It has been a life which some of you would regard as comparatively uneventful. Certain it is that no responsibility such as this has ever before been encountered. No man is there listening to me who has not walked alone in the night's solitude during the past week, few, very few of you, who have not looked up at the stars and asked your God where your duty lay. The burdensome responsibility makes it the one great event toward which you have journeyed since your first step. Are you to determine it in obedience to the command of another? Are you to speak the thoughts of another mind when conscience bids you speak your own? To do so would acknowledge your unfitness and to proclaim yourself unequal to the supreme test that the brooding years have reserved for you and me.

This responsibility is mine; I can not shift it. This obligation is imposed upon me by the Constitution and the suffrage of my people. I shall be true to it, else I shall prove representative government a failure by my unfitness.

Stand by the President! Oh, my colleagues, I see a long line of stalwart boys, eager, enthusiastic, full of the spirit of adventure, a line reaching from sea to sea. Lads they are whose parents by supreme sacrifice have fitted them to bear the burdens of citizenship when you and I shall have laid them down; boys whom we have equipped for the responsibilities of life while Europe has been killing hers; boys in the first flush of manhood; boys full of possibilities and promise; boys who are the hope of America; boys who would like, and who are entitled to live out their lives to the end, "even as you and I." I may be pardoned if my eyes linger upon certain forms that I see there, for in that multitude are those who are blood of my blood, who have centered upon them every enduring hope I have in this life. I think, Mr. Chairman, if I may do so without being unpatriotic, I should like to stand by them. [Applause.]

Do not delude yourself by the belief that we are not to take a full-size part in this war. You who have said that you would vote for this resolution, but would reserve to yourselves the

right of independent action on the remainder of the President's program are but deceiving yourselves. You who have said that you will oppose sending our boys to the trenches in France would better reconsider, for upon the passage of this resolution and when war is declared the disposition of the armed forces of America is under the command of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and you will have no voice. You will enter your protest to-night or forever hold your peace.

Within a few days, so we are told, the bill calling for the conscription of 2,000,000 men will reach the House in response to the President's demands. That is approximately 4,600 boys from every congressional district in the Nation. Bear in mind that England has not conscripted a soldier, nor has France, nor has Canada, yet the great Republic is to conscript, to draft her youth for trench warfare in France or elsewhere in Europe, to fight, perhaps to die alone in a far-away land, to lay their lives on the altar of a country not their own and for nations that have declined to enforce such service upon their own citizens. I will be a party to that when it becomes necessary, but not before.

You have said you will not vote for it. Yes; you will. This war from to-night becomes our war, and no patriotic Congressman will deny his country either the men or money necessary to wage the war to a successful issue.

I am aware that one is not justified in opposing a righteous cause because of the difficulties of performance. I have briefly referred to some of the consequences of war in order to disclose more prominently my reasons for opposing war until it becomes the only means by which our rights and honor may be preserved. War with me is justifiable only as a last resort, and no student of current history can declare that all expedients short of war have been exhausted.

I regret that my time has expired, as I can not adequately catalogue my opposition in so short a period. Never again shall we pass such another night as this. Never again, I hope, will the responsibility of shaping the ages fall upon me. We are breaking from the moorings where we have spent all of our national life. We are voluntarily entering a European alliance. The sky has been gray without all the day; the rain has fallen drearily, monotonously, as though the heavens wept at the contemplated action of the Republic. But a short while ago, just before the night fell, I stood at the west terrace and looked upon the hill beyond the river where sleep the lads who gave their lives that the Republic might live, and I was not surprised to note that the towering monument, erected to him who advised against entangling alliances, had hidden its head in the mist and the fog. Oh, my country, builded into an empire in your splendid isolation, you are at the parting of the ways, and I am powerless to prevent. [Applause.]

I am not unmindful of the personal consequences of my act, but I am doing the right as God has given me to see the right, and I shall not shrink nor complain whatever the price I may be compelled to pay. [Applause.]

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, without any mental reservation whatsoever, I give my voice and my vote to this resolution. It states the truth in plain, simple words. The Imperial German Government, without formally declaring, has nevertheless made and still is making, war upon the United States. While professing to obey international law, her submarines have sunk American ships upon the high seas without search or warning, and while professing friendship for our people and Nation, she has thus murdered our men, women, and children. While herself professing to desire a free sea and "a place in the sun," she has without authority of international law announced to us that from February 1, 1917, one American ship will each week be allowed by her to enter and one to leave a port of her enemies, provided we paint that ship such color as she may prescribe and carry such cargo as she may designate and enter such port as she may permit, and that otherwise, without any warning, search, or seizure, her submarines will sink American ships and send American citizens to instant death. And she has made good her decree to this time. Thus she has as completely blockaded our ports and shores as if her fleet rode triumphant in our waters.

At every American port great steamships, laden with the cotton of the South, the corn and wheat and cattle of the West, the multiplied products of the North, and the manufactures of the East, lie at anchor afraid to move toward their destination because the German submarine lurks beneath the sea to sink ship and cargo and murder every soul on board without warning. And at each American port each warehouse is filled with American merchandise of both the raw and finished product which can not be discharged because the steamships thus lie at anchor, although a ready foreign market awaits such legitimate products of American farms, fields, mines, and factories, and although under unbroken international law for centuries it is lawful for such commerce to move. As a result tens of thousands of freight cars are similarly loaded and at the various ports of the country, ready to discharge, but used only as warehouses, thus entailing congestion and the paralysis of the Nation's transportation business. If this situation is not relieved, the normal and proper processes of the domestic peace and prosperity of the United States must shortly cease, and endless loss, confusion, and distress must ensue. As a result factories must close down, throwing hundreds of thousands of men out of employment; strikes and riots will prevail; the prices of wheat, cattle, corn, cotton, and all other raw products must fall, to the injury, if not the ruin, of the farmers; and an indescribable list of calamities must befall our people. And hence it is true that Germany has in effect blockaded our ports and shores.

It is more distressing that a great nation should, in violation of the accepted principles of international law, for which she has herself always heretofore stood, dictate to the neutral nations of the world where their ships, cargoes, and citizens may or may not go.

But more appalling still is the fact that Germany should, in the conduct of her submarine operations, lose all regard both for neutral rights under international law and for human life itself; for, notwithstanding her note to the United States less than a year ago that she would no longer sink merchant ships of neutrals without conforming to that provision of international law requiring first warning and search and the safety of passengers and crews, she has broken that solemn promise by her decree of January 31, 1917, and since then has sunk American ships at will without warning and has thus murdered American citizens. Thus the Imperial German Government has made and is making war upon the United States. The situation is intolerable. Any other but a calm, friendly, and peace-loving nation would promptly have declared war on Germany when, by order of her Government, her merciless submarine sank the *Lusitania*, carrying over a thousand human beings to instant death, of whom more than 100 were American citizens. But, in friendship, we employed diplomacy to induce Germany to forego such barbarity, and she gave her solemn word thereafter to conform to international law. When, by her decree of January 31, she broke her plighted faith with us, ignoring our rights and the dictates of humanity, and trampled under foot our most sacred sovereign rights, there is no alternate left to us but abject debasement or resort to armed force. As for me, there is no room left for argument. They have broken faith and friendship and denied our rights, without which our national sovereignty itself would be dishonored. To me the issue appears as plain as the light of day. The cave man has once again broken loose upon the world. He is mad and crazy. He knows not the impulses of humanity; he respects neither his own treaties and agreements nor the rights of others; he feels not the sentiments of truth or sympathy or justice; he is bent on the unwavering course of brute force, pillage, and murder. That cave man is the crazy German Emperor, and the heartless Prussian military caste and oligarchy of autocratic power which surrounds, urges, and supports him.

They have uniformly perverted the truth, broken the faith of their treaties, persistently violated the law of nations, trampled under foot the highest rights of humanity, filled the world with conscienceless spies, debased the consciences of their countrymen, enslaved free peoples, violated their sacred promises to the United States, plotted to array other nations with the Imperial German Government and nation against us, violated our friendship and hospitality by constituting their Washington embassy a nest of spies and plotters against our industries, our institutions, and our sovereignty, murdered 240 of our men, women, and children upon the high seas, and persistently made war for many months upon the United States, her property, her citizens, her rights, and her sovereignty by ruthless submarine warfare upon the free high seas in admitted violation of her plighted word.

Our patient and peace-loving President, answering the united prayers of our peace-loving Nation, has uniformly pursued the methods of peace and diplomacy, making representations of our acknowledged rights, and, in the name of the ancient and unbroken friendship between the two great countries, appealed for justice, law, and the right to pursue undisturbed our acknowledged national rights. His representations have been evaded, denied, or spurned, and the sacred promises made by the Imperial German Government have been broken in an hour without warning. Further argument is in vain. The cave man with murder in his heart can not reason, will not reason. He has appealed to the elemental brute force. He must be put down or the free democracies of this world are doomed.

I am profoundly sorry for the kind and honest German people, who have been and are yet under the iron heel of the Prussian

military oligarchy. It has been forced to use the keenest development yet known of the human brain for the most diabolical purposes yet conceived in the human heart.

The issue thus forced upon the United States is whether we shall abjectly crawl before organized hostile power or whether this Nation shall preserve its interests, its self-respect, its honor, its national existence. If the allies who are fighting the battle of the free democracies of the world shall fall before the mailed fist of Prussian militarism, the United States must be the next victim.

The same Prussian military caste still controls the German Nation which pounced on little Holland in 1864 and appropriated the two States of Schleswig and Holstein; which in 1866 pounced on Austria, its neighbor and of its own blood; which in 1870, for conquest, pounced like a tiger upon France and appropriated the two States of Alsace and Lorraine and $1,000,000,000 in gold to constitute its present war chest; and which, while pretending that a grasping, barbaric Russia, a vain, revengeful France, and a selfish, plotting England brought about the present European war to dismember the German Empire, thrust itself with the thoroughness of a machine and the fury of a volcano upon an unsuspecting Europe for conquest, glory, and indemnity; and that same Prussian military caste has taught each citizen of the German Empire that but for American money and supplies victorious Germany would long since have celebrated her victory, her conquest, and her huge indemnities. They would stiffen their German people against Americans as predicate to the day of reckoning the Government is sure to plan and force if it shall continue in power, especially as half the gold of all the world is within our vaults and we are least prepared to defend our rights against the most puissant nation in all the world. I am not deluded in the task we are about to undertake nor in the burden thus thrust upon us if we are to preserve this matchless Republic from destruction.

In girding up our loins as a Nation for the serious burden cast upon us we shall need every ounce of strength of a united people. For one I am weary of hearing of antagonisms and bitterness in the United States between the North and the South, between city and country, between capital and labor, between Jew and Gentile, between Catholic and Protestant, between prohibitionist and antiprohibitionist, between railroads and employees, between the producer and the manufacturer, between borrower and banker, between different races, creeds, and interests, as if each were not desirable and necessary to the other in the free economic, intellectual, and spiritual life of our Nation. And I am weary of constantly hearing of differentiations such as Irish-Americans, Jewish-Americans, Italian-Americans, English-Americans, and German-Americans, as if any foreign-born citizen, heartily welcome to our hospitable shores, yet bore allegiance in law or heart to any other land than free America; and I fervently pray, as I devoutly believe, that one compensation for our sacrifices and sufferings will be that hereafter all hyphens will disappear and that the chief and only boast of all men beneath the Stars and Stripes will be that he is an American citizen.

Therefore, in final analysis, it is a war unto death between autocracy and democracy, and autocracy has brought the challenge to our doors.

But for the cave man the German people would resume their normal peaceful relations of friendship and honor with all the world. One of the hopes of the awful catastrophe of European war is that the cave man may be conquered and the noble German people set free. [Applause.]

The United States should do a man's part in this crisis—not a craven's part of pretended defense only. If money is needed, it should be supplied without stint; if food and clothing, then our fields and mines and factories should supply it; if ships, then the valor of the line of John Paul Jones, Farragut, Semmes, and Dewey will respond; if men, then the best blood of all the world, acting in freedom's holy cause, will respond with enthusiasm wherever duty calls.

Now that the American people must take their firm and final stand for their acknowledged rights, let timidity and diplomacy and foreign sentiment and cowardly pacifism be engulfed at once in the mighty tide of American patriotic enthusiasm to defend our national rights, to uphold international law, to preserve civilization against autocratic brute force, to overthrow the last vestige of absolutism on earth, and to maintain our national sovereignty as the last and best hope of mankind. [Applause.]

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a nation that would condone the atrocities committed by the German Government is not entitled to endure, but should perish from the face of the earth.

By the adoption of this resolution we will have declared that the civilization and liberty of the world shall not die. The people of this Government demand the passage of this resolution and will support it with their blood and might, with all the fervor of true and loyal American citizens, fully aroused to their patriotic duty.

Forces of circumstances over which we had no control have at last aroused the greatest Nation on earth and brought us into the most colossal war of all history. This decision has been reached slowly and with reluctance; but having been determined by a mighty people, every resource of this Nation will be placed in the scales of war, and there will be no turning back until German autocracy has been beaten into the dust before the victorious armies of the world, democracy reigns in its stead, and the peace and happiness of the world is assured.

Our indictment against the German Government consists of hostility to the sovereignty of the United States, to civilization, and to all mankind. From the very beginning of the war Germany has characterized her acts by deeds of perfidy and barbarism, succeeding each other with growing circumstances of ferocity and horror; the violation of treaties—mere scraps of paper; the poisoning of wells; the burning and looting of cities; even the destruction of fields and forests and all growing plants; the wholesale murder of inoffensive civilians, both men and women; Zeppelin raids upon undefended cities and hospitals; the atrocious and heartless submarine warfare; the robbery of citizens; the enslaving of thousands upon thousands of women and children; the plotting against the integrity of our national domain; the sinking of American ships engaged in legitimate trade; our citizens murdered and their bodies become the prey for the black-winged vultures of the sea.

In every dispatch from the war-swept countries of Europe tidings of new and accumulated horrors are brought to us, until at last the German Government is now running amuck; has thrown all restraint to the wind and has utilized her great achievements and scientific learning to such destruction of human life and property as never before recorded in the history of man.

For the crime committed by Cain, God placed a mark upon him; civilization to-day places a similar mark upon the German Government for her crimes against mankind.

Her prime minister declares that the barbarous submarine warfare shall continue and that if this Government seeks to protect the lives of her people the German Government will "overcome" this Nation. There is but one choice we can make. Incapable, sir, are we of following the path of submission. We accept this insolent challenge. The sword of the Nation must now be drawn in defense of our national existence; in defense of our freedom and liberty; in defense of civilization and the peace of the world.

Terrible as the war may become, awful as the sacrifice we may be called upon to make, the time has arrived when the mailed fist of despotism and savagery will be stricken down; Prussianism must perish from the earth; Hohenzollern must go.

In this hour of our national trial, party lines are no more; party politics are obliterated; internal differences forgotten; and to-day we stand as one people against the common enemy of our country.

The President's message—a declaration of liberty and freedom to mankind in every quarter of the globe—was but the voice of the Nation. It carried cheer to the hearts of the unconquerable soldiers of glorious France. It was the breaking of a new day of peace and happiness for the millions upon millions of Russians now drinking for the first time from the fountain of liberty and freedom. It was a ray of hope and inspiration to the noble sons of Britain and all her colonies as they beat back the hordes of barbarians of central Europe.

No longer shall we refer to the entente as the allies. By our decision to-day they have become our allies; our interests are in common; and by the adoption of this resolution the doom of the autocratic misrule of the German Government is forever sealed.

The spirit of our fathers who brought forth this Nation, which was dedicated to freedom, liberty, and human progress, lives within the breast of every American citizen; and the descendants of such sires, in the hour of the country's need will not halt or hesitate to defend our proud heritage with the last drop of blood and the expending of the last resource of this great Nation.

The spirit of our heroic dead from every battle field in the history of the Republic calls upon us to-day to fight for our flag and die for our flag, for reason hath primed our rifle in a holy and righteous cause and honor hath unsheathed the Nation's sword in defense of our national existence; and may the blessing of a just and merciful God rest upon the decision of the American people.

Mr. BROWNE. Mr. Chairman, in speaking and voting upon this resolution I realize that it is the most important duty that

in my lifetime I have had the opportunity to perform. As a Member of that great branch of the Government in whose hands the Constitution vests the sole right to declare war, I claim the right to vote and speak my convictions.

If the conclusion reached by the majority of this Congress is that nothing but war will satisfy the Nation's honor, I say in behalf of the people of the district which I have the honor to represent that the verdict will be accepted, and no more loyal citizenship will be found following the Stars and Stripes than comes from the eighth district of Wisconsin.

This resolution, read in connection with the President's message, means an alliance with England, France, Russia, and Japan. It means the sending of an expeditionary force to Europe composed of the young manhood of America to fight under the command and direction of European officers.

No one expects that the United States, entering the war at this time, can in any way carry out an independent campaign. The great directing minds at the head of the armies of the allies will command our troops and place them where they can use them best. They will move them about in as cold and calculating a way as if they were mere pawns on a chessboard.

The program contemplated by this resolution means, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, that the United States is to enter into a European alliance. In this evening's papers you will see that France congratulates the United States upon this step and accepts that alliance. It means the sending of an expeditionary force to Europe. It means conscription. It means that the strong arm of the Government will invade the sacred precincts of every American home and snatch an American boy and take him into foreign lands to fight under the flags of kings and emperors and foreign officers.

If you are not in favor of this program, now is the time to speak out; now is the time to assert yourself. These things will surely follow, and when we are in war it will be more difficult and may be too late to speak.

For almost three years the war has been going on. Nation after nation has thrown its strength on one side or the other in the firm belief that it would bring the war to an end. It has only added fuel to the fire and made peace more difficult.

Over 30,000,000 men have been called to arms in Europe. The tremendous economic loss occasioned by the withdrawal of these men from the farms and industries is too large to estimate. It is being felt all over the world, and the prices for the necessaries of life have risen so high even in America that our people are suffering, and we are having food riots in our large cities.

ALL THE WORLD WILL BE AT WAR.

If the United States enters this war, it means that the rest of the neutrals will soon be involved on one side or another, and the whole world will be in war.

How long will the war last, how many American boys will be sacrificed, what will be the cost of the war in the suffering of the people of the United States, no one can answer. The administration is making plans for three years ahead; after recruiting the number of troops under the present law, which will give us practically 500,000, we are to have a draft of 500,000, to be followed by other drafts of God only knows how many more five hundred thousands.

How will peace come about? Who will be the arbitrator of such a peace? Will the United States be able to have a commanding voice in such a peace? No one can answer with any assurance. Under this resolution the United States is "to exert all of its power and employ all of its resources to carry on war against the Imperial Government and to bring the conflict to a successful termination." A successful termination to the United States may not be a successful termination to Great Britain.

Germany and the United States might agree to a peace, but if Great Britain and the allies did not agree the war would go on.

If Great Britain and Russia insist on a peace that means the extermination of Germany the war must go on. Once in the United States must stay in until peace is agreed upon by the allies who are going to dictate the terms of peace.

Germany will undoubtedly fight to the last ditch before she would submit to the extreme terms of a peace that the allies propose, and the war may last for many years.

The President's plea for a peace without victory, which sentiment was applauded by the peace-loving peoples of the world, will be lost if this resolution passes.

ARMED NEUTRALITY.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, we should continue our armed neutrality that the President so recently advised and give it a fair trial.

During the Revolutionary War Sweden, Prussia, Austria, and Portugal accomplished their purposes by armed neutrality. During the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars armed neutrality was resorted to and Great Britain was forced to revise her rules of naval warfare.

In 1778 the United States broke off diplomatic relations with France, and Congress authorized American frigates to capture French vessels guilty of depredations on American commerce. Actual naval engagements were fought, but no formal declaration of war was made, and within a year France backed down.

Armed neutrality, which was advocated by the President only a few weeks ago, has not been sufficiently tried and no facts have been produced to show it has failed.

EFFECT OF THE WAR.

I believe that voting for this resolution means the signing of the death warrant of thousands and perhaps millions of the young men of this country and the placing of a staggering tax burden on the future generations. I believe that by entering the European war we forego the supreme vantage ground we now occupy as the one strong neutral by whom great mediatory steps may be taken in bringing about an early and lasting peace. I believe that in throwing 100,000,000 people who are now happy and at peace, who are now busily producing what is keeping the rest of the world from famine, into the world war we are wiping out the last great civilized area as yet unswept by hatred, the world's one remaining resource for reconstruction. I believe that by entering the European war we will nullify our power and postpone for maybe a century the day when international disputes shall be settled by international courts of arbitration instead of those methods that have wrecked Europe.

President Wilson in his message to Congress delivered December 7, 1915, said:

> We have stood apart studiously neutral. It was our manifest duty to do so. Not only did we have no part or interest in the policies which seem to have brought the conflict on; it was necessary, if a universal catastrophe was to be avoided, that a limit should be set to the sweep of destructive war and that some part of the great family of nations should keep the processes of peace alive, if only to prevent collective economic ruin and the breakdown throughout the world of the industries by which its populations are fed and sustained.

The President's statement was wise statesmanship then and it is to-day.

Every Congressman must decide this question for himself regardless of the view any other branch of the Government takes. The great popular branch of this Government, the House of Representatives, is nearer the people than any other branch of the Government and no war can be declared without its vote.

I accept the responsibility of voting against war knowing that many of my lifelong friends whose opinions I highly regard differ with me. The responsibility is mine, and I must meet it and vote according to the dictates of my conscience.

In his speech of February 11, 1847, Tom Corwin, of Ohio, said regarding our entering the Mexican War:

> If it be my duty to grant whatever the President demands, for what am I here? Have I no will upon the subject? Is it not placed at my discretion, understanding, judgment? Have an American Senate and House of Representatives nothing to do but obey the bidding of the President? With these doctrines for our guide, tell me, tell the American people, what is the difference between your American democracy and the most odious, most hateful despotism that a merciful God has ever allowed a nation to be afflicted with?

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to say nothing upon this resolution, but one or two statements have been made to-day which ought not to be permitted to stand without correction. It has been said that there is no more reason for a war with Germany than there is for going to war with Great Britain, that both these powers have violated international law and disregarded our rights. The gentlemen who say so fail to recognize that Germany is already making war on us.

These gentlemen say that England's announcement of November 3, 1914, warning neutrals of the presence of mines in the North Sea, was as certainly a violation of American rights as Germany's course when the Imperial Government proclaimed a barred zone about the French and British coasts and proceeded to sink American ships which ventured to sail within the prohibited area. It has also been asserted that two American ships have been destroyed by British mines, and that the only reason more have not been lost in the same way is because American ships have avoided the areas mined by Great Britain.

Let me say that it is only in America that the apologists for Germany make the assertion that the *Carib* and the *Evelyn* were destroyed by British mines. The German Government has not said so. On the contrary, in a note dated March 1, 1915, and addressed to the Secretary of State, Count von Bernstorff, the German ambassador, explains that these ships were lost because they did not follow sailing directions published by German authority.

Here is the letter:

IMPERIAL GERMAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1915.

MR. SECRETARY OF STATE: Pursuant to instructions, I have the honor to inform your excellency that the American vessels *Evelyn* and *Carib* were lost in the North Sea because, contrary to the directions given in the Nachrichten für Seefahrer (Notice to Marines) No. 2770–14 and 33–15, they ran along the East Friesian Islands by direction, as stated by the captain of the *Evelyn*, of a British warship.

The Imperial German Government urgently recommends all vessels for Helgoland Bay from the coast of the Netherlands to sail up to about the fifty-fifth degree of latitude from the Terschelling Lighthouse and then steer for Listertief and there wait for a German pilot. He alone can furnish reliable information to navigate the German Bay.

The safest course is that given in No. 3161–14 of the Nachrichten für Seefahrer.

Accept, Mr. Secretary of State, the renewed assurance of my most distinguished high consideration.

J. BERNSTORFF.

How any honest man, familiar with this letter, can assert that the *Carib* and the *Evelyn* were destroyed by British mines is beyond my comprehension.

Alike conclusive is the document which I am about to quote. It is the formal reply of the German Government to the charges made by Great Britain that Germany had been sowing the North Sea and other waters with mines in the track of neutral shipping without such warning and notification as would enable peaceful merchant ships to navigate in saftey. This statement of the German Government is dated November 7, 1914, and was communicated to the Government at Washington by the American ambassador at Berlin. The fifth paragraph of the German reply is as follows:

In the British protest the charge is made that the German Government never issued any proclamation as to the places where mines were laid. This charge is not founded in fact. On August 7, 1914, the German Government communicated to all the neutral powers that the trade routes to English ports would be closed by mines by Germany. Neutral shipping was therefore notified of the fact of the laying of the mines and of the zones where it had to look out for German mines. If the German Government did not give the exact situation of the various mines, this may well be understood from the conditions which forced the laying of the mines.

The German Government announces, be it remembered, that it was Germany that closed the trade routes with German mines, and that this was done August 7, 1914, three days after the German Army entered Belgium and brought Great Britain into the war. I ask you to compare with this announcement a note signed by Count von Bernstorff and addressed to the Secretary of State, bearing date of September 10, 1914. The first two paragraphs are as follows:

MR. SECRETARY OF STATE: By direction of my Government I have the honor respectfully to bring the following to your excellency's knowledge:

"No foundation for the idea prevalent among neutrals abroad that because of the blockade of German ports sea trade with Germany is tied up. No port is blockaded and nothing stands in the way of neutral States' trade with Germany.

"The assertions from England that the North Sea has been infested with mines by Germany are wrong."

This statement that nothing stands in the way of neutral States' trade with Germany seems to indicate that up to the date of that note, September 10, 1914, England had not placed mines on trade routes to German ports. The last sentence seems to deny what Germany admitted later, in the "reply" of November 7, quoted above, that Germany had laid mines on trade routes to English ports as early as August 7.

England's first announcement that her authorities had adopted a mine-laying policy as a countermeasure to that of Germany was made October 2, 1914, when she announced the fact and described the limits of the mine fields. It is not this proclamation, however, but that of November 3, erroneously cited as of November 2, that Germany's apologists have most frequently referred to as justifying Germany's submarine barred zone. The proclamation did give notice that the whole of the North Sea must be considered a military area within which all vessels would be exposed to the gravest dangers from mines. So far these gentlemen have often quoted it. I wish to call your attention to the last two paragraphs of the proclamation, which must be read with the warning if one would understand the document correctly. These paragraphs are as follows:

Ships of all countries wishing to trade to and from Norway, the Baltic, Denmark, and Holland are advised to come, if inward bound, by the English Channel and the Straits of Dover. There they will be given sailing directions that will pass them safely, so far as Great Britain is concerned, up the east coast of England to Farne Island, whence safe route will, if possible, be given to Lindesnaes Lightship. From this point they should turn north or south according to their destination, keeping as near the coast as possible. Converse applies to vessels outward bound.

By strict adherence to these routes the commerce of all countries will be able to reach its destination in safety, so far as Great Britain is concerned, but any straying even for a few miles from the course thus indicated may be followed by serious consequences.

BRITISH EMBASSY, *Washington.*

In view of the sailing directions given for the purpose of passing merchant ships "in safety, so far as Great Britain is concerned," it is difficult to understand the mental processes of those who say that this notification is a violation of neutral rights and an offense against humanity which justifies Germany's announcement of January 31, 1917, one paragraph of which I quote:

Under these circumstances Germany will meet the illegal measures of her enemies by forcibly preventing, after February 1, 1917, in a zone around Great Britain, France, and Italy, and in the eastern Mediterranean, all navigation—that of neutrals included—from and to England and from and to France, etc. All ships met within that zone will be sunk.

Neither in the policy pursued under this proclamation nor in that announced February 4, 1915, before the sinking of the *Lusitania*, has Germany even claimed to be observing the principles of international law. In the correspondence with our State Department the admission is made more than once that German submarines were not regarding the law of nations. On January 7, 1916, the German ambassador, acting under instructions from the foreign office in Berlin, notified the State Department as follows:

German submarines in the Mediterranean had from the beginning orders to conduct cruiser warfare against enemy merchant vessels only in accordance with general principles of international law, and in particular measures of reprisal as applied in the war zone around the British Isles were to be excluded.

German submarines are therefore permitted to destroy enemy merchant vessels in the Mediterranean—i. e., passengers as well as freight ships as far as they do not try to escape or offer resistance—only after passengers and crews have been accorded safety.

The plain statement of the German Government shows that the orders given to submarines requiring them to operate in accordance with general principles of international law applied only to those operating in the Mediterranean and not to those operating in the war zone around the British Isles.

That was the case even under the original submarine war-zone proclamation of February 4, 1915. The situation is far worse under the proclamation which went into effect February 1, 1917, little more than a month ago. Gentlemen have said in this debate that Germany has broken no pledges and has merely put into effect once more the policy of two years ago. If that were the case, the situation would be as intolerable as it was when the *Lusitania* went down, and the *Sussex;* but that is not the case. Two years ago, though admitting that her conduct was a violation of international law, Germany announced that she would destroy only enemy ships; now she announces that she will sink all ships found within the enlarged war zone, ships of neutrals included.

In a note of February 16, 1915, two years ago, the German foreign office made the following statements:

It is very far indeed from the intention of the German Government * * * ever to destroy neutral lives and neutral property. * * * The commanders of German submarines have been instructed, as was already stated in the note of the 4th instant, to abstain from violence to American merchant ships when they are recognizable as such.

Exactly one year later—February 16, 1916—the German ambassador expressed the regret of his Government for the loss of American lives on the *Lusitania*. In the course of the note he said:

Germany has * * * limited her submarine warfare because of her long-standing friendship with the United States and because by the sinking of the *Lusitania*, which caused the death of citizens of the United States, the German retaliation affected neutrals, which was not the intention, as retaliation should be confined to enemy subjects.

All this was under the former war-zone policy of February 4, 1915. Now the case is vastly different. The long-standing friendship with the United States is disregarded, American ships are to be sunk—have been sunk—as if they were enemy ships. Germany has made them enemy ships. She has already treated us as two years ago and one year ago she told us she could treat none but enemies. It was "far, indeed, from the intention of the German Government ever to destroy neutral lives and neutral property." She is now destroying American ships, knowing that they carry American lives, and insists that she intends to continue that destruction.

If Germany were operating under the law of blockade it would be necessary for her warships to learn whether a vessel which it is proposed to capture is violating the blockade either by going to or coming from a blockaded port. If the capture is to be made under the law of contraband it is necessary to know that the vessel is proceeding to an enemy destination and is actually carrying contraband goods. Visit and search will disclose the facts, but they can never be known if the vessel and all on board are sent to the bottom without examination.

These operations are not carried on under the law of blockade, for Germany has not proclaimed a blockade, nor under the law of contraband, for ships without cargo are sunk even when

bound for American ports. Germany has adopted a policy in violation of all law and hitherto unknown and unheard of. Sink the ship and drown the crew because the cargo is contraband? Then why not wreck the trains in a neutral country and kill engineer, conductor, fireman, and brakemen because the freight is of contraband nature? Sailors have no more authority to reject any part of the ship's cargo than brakemen have to refuse freight offered for transportation. But it is not contraband cargo that Germany is sinking. She has sunk American ships without cargo, one of them to-day sailing in water ballast from Genoa to a port in this country.

Another attempt to obscure the issue and to arouse sentiment in the House and in the country favorable to the lawless submarine policy of Germany is found in the charge made by the German Government and industriously circulated in this country that the United States Government has submitted to lawless acts of Great Britain while attepting to hold Germany to a strict observance of the requirements of international law.

It would not be worth while to spend any time in replying to this charge if there were not abundant evidence that even Members of the House have been misled by it. Even in this debate gentlemen have said that there would have been no attack by Germany upon American ships if our Government had not submitted to what these gentlemen call "England's blockade of neutral ports."

It is true that Great Britain has captured vessels carrying goods from American ports to the ports of neutral countries near Germany, on the ground that the goods in question had an ultimate destination in Germany. It is also true that our Government has protested against some of these captures and has called them "illegal and indefensible."

If I had time, I should like to outline the development of the doctrine of "continuous voyage" and the later doctrine of "ultimate destination of the goods." One would have to go back to the war between France and England which began in 1756, the American phase of which is known in this country as the French and Indian War. At that time the law of France, like the law of the United States to-day, permitted no foreign vessels to engage in the trade between the home country and its island possessions. When the war broke out France opened this traffic to foreign vessels. The English prize court held that foreign vessels engaged in this trade, which was closed to them in time of peace, were practically in the service of France and subject to capture as if they were actually of French nationality. This doctrine was embodied in what is known as "the rule of the war of 1756."

The same situation arose again in the war between France and England which broke out after the French Revolution. By this time the 13 American Colonies had become independent, and it was American vessels that now began to perform French service by carrying goods from the French West Indies to France. It was not long until the ingenious Yankee skippers devised a plan for evading the rule. To avoid making a voyage from Martinique to France, they would take out clearance papers at Martinique for some American port, and there take out new clearance papers for the real destination in France.

The British prize courts held that the interposition of a neutral port between the port of origin and the true destination was a subterfuge, and that the two voyages from Martinique to Charleston and from Charleston to Marseille constituted in fact one continuous voyage. Under this doctrine vessels were condemned by the prize courts. The rule was applied also to British vessels which traded with the enemy and attempted to evade the law by interposing a neutral port between the British port from which they started and the French port which was the true destination.

By the time our Civil War broke out the doctrine of continuous voyage was fairly well established, but its application had been confined almost wholly to the rule of 1756 and the law forbidding trade with the enemy. American courts accepted the doctrine of continuous voyage and applied it in two new ways. We applied it to the law of contraband and also to the law of blockade. Vessels that sailed from England to Cardenas, in Cuba, or to Matamoros, in Mexico, and to other neutral ports, were seized by our cruisers and condemned by our prize courts on the ground that the contraband goods which they carried had an ultimate destination in the Southern Confederacy, or that the noncontraband goods were destined for blockaded territory.

The most remarkable of these cases was that of the *Springbok*, a British sailing vessel which sailed from London for Nassau, in the Bahamas. We captured this British vessel, which had sailed from one British port to another British port, on the ground that the cargo which it carried was intended for transshipment at Nassau to an unknown destination in the Southern Confederacy. The voyage of the *Springbok* was to be ended at Nassau. She was to discharge her cargo there and return to England.

In previous wars no ship had been held under the doctrine of continuous voyage until after she had cleared from the interposed port with papers which showed unmistakably an enemy destination. We captured this vessel on the first leg of the voyage, when there was no intention that the vessel should ever clear for an enemy port. The doctrine of continuous voyage had developed into the doctrine of ultimate destination of the goods.

Appeal was taken by the British owner of the vessel from the decision of the prize court in New York to the Supreme Court of the United States. While this appeal was pending the British Government, February 20, 1864, instructed Lord Lyons, its minister at Washington, that they had considered the judgment of Judge Betts in the case of the *Springbok* and had decided that they could not officially interfere in the matter, adding: "The complicity of the owners of the ship with the design of the owners of the cargo is, to say the least, so probable on the evidence that there would be great difficulty in contending that this ship and cargo had not been rightly condemned."

Those who maintain that the decision in the *Springbok* case was right do so because they believe the law is a living thing which grows and develops as conditions change. Some who believe that the decision of the Supreme Court was wrong might say that the development of the doctrine of ultimate destination of the goods out of the doctrine of continuous voyage of the vessel was a violent distortion of the law.

Great Britain in the present war has accepted the American doctrine of the ultimate destination of the goods. It is true Great Britain has applied that doctrine more extensively than we did during the Civil War, and in one or two particulars has applied it in new ways. It is also true, I believe, that our State Department has protested against these new ways of applying the doctrine, and in letters to the British Foreign Office has said that in this particular England's course has been "illegal and indefensible." This claim on the part of our Government may be compared to the action of an attorney who in trying a case finds it necessary to file an objection to a ruling of the court in order that he may have ground on which to base an appeal. But it is utterly beyond reason to say that England's extension of the doctrine of ultimate destination of the goods is an offense against the laws of humanity, or that it in any way justifies the German submarine policy. It slaughters no noncombatants; it drowns no women and children; it does not shock and horrify mankind. It is a dispute about the law which can be settled by diplomatic means. If it is ultimately determined that England's course has been wrong, any damage that has been done may be repaired by indemnities.

As a final argument to induce us to submit to Germany's attack upon our ships and the lives of our people, we are told that international law no longer exists; that the strain of the war has shattered and destroyed it. If law ceases to exist when it is defiantly and persistently broken, this argument may have some weight. A somewhat careful examination of the decisions of prize courts of England and of France, and even of the imperial supreme prize court at Berlin, will show that these courts are applying principles of international law, are deciding cases on their merits, sometimes in favor of a foreign claimant and against the contentions of their own governments.

I have time only to mention the case of the *Zamora*, a Swedish vessel which sailed from New York for Stockholm with a cargo that included copper. This vessel was captured by a British cruiser and taken into port for a hearing before the prize court on the ground that the ultimate destination of at least a portion of the cargo was Germany. Before the court reached the case the officers of the Crown issued a requisition for the copper on the authority of an order of the King in council. The court allowed the copper to be taken, but required a bond, in order that when the case should be decided the court might have the value of the copper, if not the copper itself, to turn over to the claimant in case the award should be in his favor. The Swedish claimant appealed the decision concerning the requisition, bringing it before the judiciary committee of the privy council, which is the court of last resort in prize proceedings. This court reversed the decision of the prize court on the ground that the prize court must render its decisions in accordance with international law, and that the order in council was in contravention of international law. The court declared that a British prize court had no jurisdiction over foreigners on the high seas, except the jurisdiction of international law, and that the King in international law cases was merely one of the parties to the case.

The prize court, it was added, could not take orders from one of the litigants. The order in council was void and international law was sustained.

In the dealings of nations with one another ideal standards of righteousness have not been attained, but the highest achievements of civilization are bound up in the customs and usages, the court decisions, and the codes adopted by treaties, which, taken together, constitute the rules of international law. This law will change, will grow, will adapt itself to changed circumstances and new conditions, but we must not listen to those who tell us that it does not exist. International law is not dead and we must not let it die. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE WORLD WAR.

Billions for America, but not a dollar for the kings of Europe.
High cost of living oppressive now without war. If war comes, God help the poor—Congress may forget them.
The right to vote before declaring war will soon be seized by the peoples of the earth.
If you conscript men for war, conscript wealth for war.
Where Minneapolis and Minnesota stand.
Stand by the people.

Mr. LUNDEEN of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, these are times when the people should be consulted. Before war is declared let the American citizen express his opinion.

I have placed the ballot on war in the hands of the 54,000 voters in my district. I am breaking ground, but I do not fear. The pioneers have gone before me. The right to vote on war will soon be seized by the peoples of the earth. Since the President hurriedly advanced the special session from April 16 to April 2, and on account of the ox-team mail service now so general, my returns are not complete at this hour, but they run about 10 to 1 against declaring war on Germany. A preliminary count discloses nearly 8,000 against declaring war and less than 800 for war. The final count will not materially change the situation. We have enough ballots now to feel certain as to the result.

I do not believe a Congressman should trouble his constituents with a referendum or vote on minor questions, but questions of great national importance, such as war and conscription and any other great dominant issue, can easily be submitted by the Congressman to his people under his frank for a popular expression.

Of course, there are those who laugh at such methods and affect to deride them; but the great mass of voters are glad to take a hand in forming their own laws and express surprise that it has not been done long ago. If all of the Congressmen had placed the ballot in the hands of the voters we would never enter the world war. Let us not forget that Abraham Lincoln once said our Government is "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

Some hot-headed critics abuse me. I bear them no ill will. They are entitled to their opinions. Some say, "As Congressman you have inside information which we can not have, and you should accept the responsibility." As a matter of fact, in this great debate, so far not one line of inside information has been given out. No executive sessions have been held. No news "scoops" have been sprung. The people of Minneapolis know just as much about this question as we do here. We have all heard, carefully read, and studied the President's speech; so have they by now. Congress can not arrogate to itself all the gray matter in the country. As for myself, I learn more from the man in the street, the shop, and office; the man on the farm and in the factory, than from any book or theory or from any debate in the Halls of Congress. The people think. Let there be no mistake about that. They are thinking more and more every day. The people have brains of their own; they are doing their own thinking, and they refuse to let a few warped and war-mad editors do their thinking for them.

The President in his message states that the German people were not consulted about getting into this world war. I ask, were the American people consulted about getting into this same world war? They were not, except in the fifth congressional district of Minnesota, where for the first time in our national history all of the voters were given the ballot on war; and there the American people, living in that district, registered themselves overwhelmingly against plunging America into war.

To my shame, I see
The imminent death of twenty thousand men,
That for a fantasy and trick of fame
Go to their graves like beds, fight for a plot
Whereon the numbers can not try the cause.
—Shakespeare.

WAR LOANS.

When you have declared war you will have to finance the struggle with billions of dollars and perhaps tens and scores of billions. Already we have loaned the allies, through our banking system, up to December 31, 1916, the enormous sum of $2,325,900,000 in formal loans. Other huge sums have been loaned and millions have been added since that date. "Where your treasures are, there will be your heart also." That is one of the reasons why we are about to enter this war. No wonder the Morgans and the munition makers desire war. The munition makers desire to make more munitions, to deliver them and receive their money in return at high war prices. Our financiers desire that Uncle Sam underwrite these and other huge loans and fight to defend their financial interests, that there may be no final loss. It is already rumored that we are to loan or give to the allies about $5,000,000,000, perhaps more. All this, when millions of our own people are in great distress, when our own program of preparedness is woefully lacking.

Washington's Farewell Address says this: "* * * There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. 'Tis an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard * * *."

And yet when the war budget comes before us we will be compelled to vote for all of its provisions, swallowing the foreign-loan paragraph with the rest because it will be interwoven with the home defense and preparedness program in one great measure. In all probability we will be given no opportunity to register our protest except in the Committee of the Whole, where there is no roll call and only a voice or standing vote. I hasten to protest now in the name of the American people against any such action, knowing that it will soon be too late. Are you going to give point to the accusation made by many patriotic citizens that this is only "a dollar war"? I am opposed to placing our credit and the American Army and Navy under foreign control. The war in Europe has now cost the nations almost $100,000,000,000. I am opposed to placing this burden of the European war on our shoulders, that we may grow weary while they grow strong. Many military experts hold that the Teutonic powers are now about to collapse. If so, why loan money to the allies or declare war on Germany unless it be to help rebuild our rivals and fit them with the tools of trade to conquer our Nation in the war after the war. These billions may even now be forging weapons to be turned against us in some future day of trial. Stranger things than that have happened in the history of nations.

As for making loans or gifts to the allies, I have but one sentiment, and that is, billions for America, but not a dollar for the kings of Europe.

HIGH COST OF LIVING.

Bread and many other food products cost less to-day in Berlin and London than in our own cities. The situation is getting intolerable, and yet you are plunging us into war. The high cost of living is oppressive now without war. If war comes, God help the poor—Congress may forget them.

When the poor cry out for bread; when taxes rise beyond the power to pay; when riots for food may have to be repressed with the murder of our own people—then what will you say? What answer to the hungry? What will you say then, and what will your message be to the mother whose son dies in battle under foreign kings and emperors? What will your answer be? Already in times of peace serious riots have occurred repeatedly in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, and other important centers.

During the past 10 years the cost of living has steadily risen, and especially so during the great European war. If we are sincere in our effort to reduce the cost of living, we should certainly not plunge into a war that will make it almost impossible for the average American citizen and his family to live. If you insist on war, let common sense at once institute a complete Federal control over all necessary food products.

LABOR CARRIES THE HEAVY BURDEN.

In war the farmer and the laboring man must pay the heaviest toll. When killed their families suffer most. Often no means are left for their support. Do our millionaires care about this as they rush about loaning billions? Not a bit. Unless they do their bidding, they are either traitors or cowards. When conscription lays its heavy hand on their shoulder, then the worker and his son must go or be shot. How will you feed their families? Millions are now on the verge of starvation. Unheard-of prices are already oppressing the people, and yet you are plunging us into war.

VOLUNTEERS AND CONSCRIPTION.

Volunteers have always opened our great struggles. If we enter, a call for volunteers should open the world war for us. As a Spanish War veteran, holding a commission in the Guards for some years, I certainly can not be termed a pacifist. I be-

lieve in strong defense and preparedness. There are other trained Members who may command their regiments, brigades, and divisions. I volunteer here and now to lead an untrained but war-like and war-voting company of volunteer Congressmen into the trenches of Europe. Let a hundred Members enlist in some regiment for war. When you vote for war, send your name to Uncle Sam as a volunteer. The English Parliament has done as well as that; so has the German Reichstag and the National Assembly of France. Or shall we follow the example of Artemus Ward, who offered all of his wife's relatives? Let us not send our boys into foreign wars unless we are willing to go with them.

This may prove the most unpopular war in our history. Conscription, always distasteful to a free people, may soon stalk through the land, hand in hand with his brothers, war and death. If you conscript men for war, conscript wealth for war. While loudly talking of democracy, you prepare in an autocratic manner to force conscription upon the people. How many of you think a popular vote would favor conscription? Australia has just voted down conscription after two years of war. To force conscription at once upon the American people in this war, against their wishes, is to enslave millions in the interest of foreign nations. Let the American volunteer have a chance. If you have gone war mad and must fight, give the volunteer a fair chance. Then if he rebels at being slaughtered in Europe at the bidding of kings and emperors, you propose to lay the heavy hand of the law upon him and conscript these men who, through a mist of world tears, can only see America and the Star Spangled Banner of their native land.

ABSOLUTE NEUTRALITY.

We must place America first and observe absolute neutrality. The people of Minneapolis and Minnesota expressed both of these sentiments by their protests and their votes against war, emphasizing at this time that we should maintain impartial neutrality.

Great Britain and Germany have continually violated our rights on the high seas. Both have created great and dangerous war zones; both have warned us to keep out. England even closed the ports of neutrals to our shipping, unlawfully seized our ships and confiscated their cargoes. She has censored and rifled our mails; the whole of the North Sea has been made a military area by her orders. Both nations covered the ports of their enemies with war zones, strewing the seas with deadly mines and infesting them with ruthless submarines. In both of these zones we have lost American ships and American lives. Both countries openly and flagrantly violated international law, but neither aimed their warfare and weapons directly at us. They treated all neutral countries alike. They acted through necessity, self-preservation being the first law of life.

We submitted—we surrendered to Great Britain—yet we sacrificed no honor. Great Britain acted through necessity. Germany also acted through necessity. We could have remained away without loss of honor, but in the case of Germany we refuse to yield. We will not submit nor surrender, yet we did submit—we did surrender—to Great Britain.

Let us frankly admit that both sides have wronged us; both sides have sunk our ships and destroyed American lives. The Scandinavian and other countries had the good sense to put an embargo on ammunition at the beginning of the war. Let us frankly admit that these countries were right, too, in warning their citizens to keep out of the war zones. Australia and Canada, though at war and colonies of Great Britain, forbade their women and children passage on all ships to England.

Those who enter into an academic discussion of the relative merits of the European contest are wasting valuable time on problems which do not concern us in the least, and never should concern us.

Our task is in the Western Hemisphere—as yet far from completed. We can not hope to maintain the Monroe doctrine and at the same time interfere in the affairs of other continents. "Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground."

To choose between these war-mad nations and ally ourselves with one or the other is a crime against our civilization and our own citizens. I plead with you, do not permanently endanger the Republic. As between these the voice of Washington bids us not to choose. You should not choose; I will not choose. Thomas Jefferson, author of our Declaration of Independence and twice President of the United States, strongly urged Washington's policy of absolute neutrality as to foreign nations. Place America first—her honor and safety first—keep out of both war zones. Let us turn to our internal problems, holding ourselves always ready to be the Good Samaritan to a sorely wounded and tried world.

"STAND BY THE PRESIDENT."

There are those who insist on the slogan, "Stand by the President." Stand by the President! Which one—the one that "kept us out of war" or the one that plunged us in? You might as well say, "Stand by Congress." Its duties are just as important and its rights just as sacred as those of the Chief Executive. A better slogan would be, Stand by the Government. Garfield once said, "God reigns and the Government in Washington still lives." But why not have a still better and a still greater slogan and sentiment that comes out of the great American heart: Stand by the people. There are too many men who stand by Morgan; too many who stand by Rockefeller; too many, indeed, who stand by the Kaiser or the King. I choose none of these; I am for America before all—my native land. I refuse to crown the President with kingly powers. I am standing by Congress in the performance of its constitutional duties. The mandate of the people is the only command I recognize, and no one can swerve me from that position.

"HE KEPT US OUT OF WAR."

You now forget the slogan of 1914, "War in the east! Peace in the west! Thank God for Wilson." What became of the President's phrase, "Too proud to fight"? Where is the slogan of 1916, Peace, progress, and prosperity, which carried an election, coupled with that other war cry, "He kept us out of war"? The party in control would not have carried a single State in this Union on your present slogan, which seems to be: Wilson, willfulness, and war. In the campaign of 1916 these were the words of Woodrow Wilson: "In the dealings of nations with one another arbitrary force must be rejected and we must move forward to the thought of the modern world, the thought of which peace is the very atmosphere." Your platform pledges are null and void. You demand war at any cost. You promised peace, but war was in your hearts. I say to you, gentlemen of the majority, the ghosts of these slogans will yet rise up to haunt you. The blood of our people will be upon your hands, not mine. If defeated in our fight on this resolution, we can truly say, "We have fought a good fight; we have kept the faith."

DANGERS CONFRONTING US.

The people say:

Why should we mix in?
Let them settle their own quarrels.
Let them fight it out among themselves.
They started it; let them finish it.
Ten per cent of the people should not be permitted to plunge 100 per cent into war.
Give us the vote on war.

England thought she could settle this war with her fleet, so plunged in, declaring war on Germany. But she failed. Italy thought she could settle this war, and the allies urged her in. To-day, starving, without fuel, she trembles on the very edge of revolution. Bulgaria and Turkey thought they could settle the war—an idle dream. Poor Roumania had 600,000 stalwart men—ten times as many as we can spare for the field to-day. She chose her own time. In 100 days more than 350,000 of her best were dead, dying, or captured, and the remaining 250,000, with their fugitive king, were driven into Russia. We have never suffered a final defeat in war. We are potentially powerful, but let us not grow haughty; let us profit by their experiences.

The submarine is a real peril. In the month of February alone one-fiftieth of the entire world's tonnage went down. England's fleet has already sustained a loss equivalent to the entire American war fleet. Have you a weapon to meet the submarine? Can you meet it? Some day we may wish to use the submarine exactly as the central powers are now using the same, within our own war zones, other nations entering at their peril.

This very morning the British chief of staff, Robertson, appealed for 500,000 more men from England by July 1, stating that Germany now has 1,000,000 more men than at any other time since the war began. England at this very hour is reexamining her rejected recruits. My friends, this war will be no picnic. It will be war. Turbulent Mexico tears at our southern border; Colombia hates with a deadly hatred; all South America is suspicious of our intentions. Japan, our rival on the Pacific, is about to become our bosom friend. We are about to ally ourselves with England, with whom we have fought two deadly wars and who tried to destroy our Republic during the Civil War.

After careful reading and thorough study of the President's message I have come to the conclusion that he is now leading us into a succession of wars and unnumbered dangers. Once you have become involved in the whirlwind of war you will be swept off your feet into the general war policy of the allied nations.

"It is," indeed, "a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance."

Other nations may be drawn into this titanic struggle through our action. Men now forget that our country may perish, that some great tyranny may survive. As for me, I want America to live. I hope we will not enter, but if war is declared all will unite for that war. I have but one allegiance, and that to my native land. I have but one country, and that country is the United States.

WASHINGTON VERSUS WILSON.

In his message to Congress on the 2d of April, 1917, President Wilson states that we must make "extension to those Governments of the most liberal financial credit"; we must "supply the nations already at war with Germany"; we must "help them in every way to be effective there"; we must "spend the whole force of the Nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power." We are to stand behind the allies to the last dollar and back them to the last breath of man or horse. The President states explicitly and exactly that we must supply the nations already at war first, placing the United States in a secondary position, giving as the reason that they are already in the field. No other President has ever before announced such a policy. Let us seek first the good of America.

Listen to the words of Washington in his historic Farewell Address—a document which has been more widely read than any other state paper issued by a President of the United States:

"Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. * * *

"So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrel and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification. * * *

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens, the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy to be useful must be impartial; else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests. * * *."

"Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

"Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

"It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world. * * *

"* * * There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard. * * *

"In offering you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend I dare not hope that they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish—that they will control the current of the passions or prevent our Nation from running the course which hitherto has marked the destiny of nations. But if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism, this hope will be full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare, by which they have been dictated."

LETTER TO PATRICK HENRY.

"My ardent desire is and my aim has been (as far as depended upon the executive department) to comply strictly with *all* our engagements, foreign and domestic; but to keep the United States free from political connections with *every* other country, to see them independent of *all* and under the influence of *none*. In a word, I want an *American* character that the powers of Europe may be convinced that we act for *ourselves* and not for *others*. This, in my judgment, is the only way to be respected abroad and happy at home; and not by becoming partisans of Great Britain or France create dissensions, disturb the public tranquillity, and destroy, perhaps forever, the cement which binds the Union.

"GEORGE WASHINGTON."

(From a letter to Patrick Henry, dated from Mount Vernon, Oct. 9, 1795.)

If we are to choose between the policy of Wilson or the policy of Washington, as for me I will follow Washington.

DEMOCRACY.

We now chart a new national course. In terms of autocracy, we declare our intention to bestride the world with democracy. Our fixed determination is to thrust democracy with loving bayonets down the throats of unwilling peoples.

Let us look at the company we will keep in performing this benevolent function. We will be marching side by side with the King of Serbia; the King of Italy is our boon companion; the King of Belgium is there; so also the King of Roumania; the Emperor of India and King of England, our stalwart brother; not to mention the King of Montenegro and various other principalities and rulers, as well as chaotic Russia—only France is a Republic—and last, but not least, we are to be brothers in the blood with our dear friend the Emperor of Japan. And this our Chief Executive proposes as our "league of honor."

Their cause is made our cause, all our blood and treasure is placed at their disposal. I ask, is this the America of our fathers?

HUMANITY.

All of these nations have contributed their full share to the glory of civilization. Napoleon, incomparable in military science, a Frenchman. Shakespeare, illustrious forever, an Englishman. The very science of printing which has done more than any other one thing to perpetuate knowledge was given to the world by the German Gutenberg. Dante, Italian. Count Tolstoy, a Russian. Austria and every other nation involved has its long list of famed leaders. All of these peoples have come into our land. We are the melting pot of all of the nations. Here we have endeavored to join hands. Shall we sever these ties of a century-long friendship? Germany has never made war on us. For 140 years she has remained our steadfast friend. Hardly have the war wounds of civil strife commenced to heal before, in the words of Washington, you begin to "destroy the cement that binds the Union by becoming partisans of Great Britain and France." This war declaration may yet become a sore trial and tribulation for the spirit within you. Humanity has been the watchword before the election; why not after the election? Ideals and preachment have been freely indulged in. Why not practice as well as preach?

Let America show love, not hatred, to these battle-torn peoples. Let us show compassion, not revenge. Let sympathy and the helping hand, not death or destruction, be our motto. Let us play the part of the Good Samaritan. To miss this opportunity will be the most colossal blunder of the ages. The spirit of Christianity, peace, and sanity, its last refuge here, now makes one final plea to its only protector. Shall we answer with the sword? Shall we further bleed our own race white that the yellow peril may stand back and win in some final day of reckoning? Is that your ideal? Humanity! The word seems strangely out of place. These are disjointed times. On Good Friday, about to break, you are proceeding to add to the agony of a world already crucified by war.

The spirit of Washington seems to speak to us to-night in words of warning lest our far-flung battle lines melt away. Here in this hour I stand strong for peace with honor—the same honor that Sweden and Norway, Denmark and Holland, Spain, Switzerland, and the South American Republics regard as an honorable peace. They have refused to follow our President into war. Mr. Speaker, I vote "no" upon this resolution. God helping me, I can not do otherwise. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a few wires and letters from organizations opposing this war declaration. I am omitting all of the several thousand letters and messages from individuals, a mighty chorus of protest. I am also including certain tables for reference.

Unanimous consent was granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS TRADES AND LABOR ASSEMBLY,
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 31, 1917.*

To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that the bearer, R. D. Cramer (editor of the Labor Review), is the official representative of the Minneapolis Trades and Labor Assembly, to insist that Congress and the President keep the Nation out of war. (Representing 25,000 union men.)

DAN W. STEVENS, *President.*
LESLIE SINTON, *Secretary.*

—

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 2, 1917.*

Congressman ERNEST LUNDEEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Central committee of Hennepin County, Socialist Party, at a special meeting March 28, to consider the national crisis, concluded that war would not be in defense of national honor, but in defense of munition makers and food exporters. Unanimously decided to urge you to vote against declaring war.

A. E. GORGIAN, *Secretary.*

—

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 29, 1917.*

Mr. ERNEST LUNDEEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Bricklayers and Masons' Union of Minneapolis, composed of an organization of 700 members, went on record protesting against this country entering into war, and we earnestly hope that when Congress meets next Monday you will not vote in favor of any measures that will throw this country in a state of war.

Yours, truly.

THE BRICKLAYERS' AND MASONS' UNION,
By WM. C. ORTLER, *Secretary.*

—

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS,
HENNEPIN LODGE, NO. 477,
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 30, 1917.*

Mr. ERNEST LUNDEEN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the last regular meeting of Hennepin Lodge, No. 477, International Association of Machinists, the lodge representing the railroad machinists instructed me to write you asking that you use every effort to keep the United States out of war. Hoping you will give this matter your attention,

I am, yours, sincerely,

[SEAL.] A. C. TRUOG, *Recording Secretary.*

—

BROTHERHOOD OF
PAINTERS, DECORATORS, AND PAPERHANGERS,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 31, 1917.

Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Local Union No. 186, of the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America, at our regular meeting held March 27, 1917, unanimously passed a motion ordering the secretary to write the President, Senators, and Congressmen of this district, protesting against this Nation entering the European war.

Trusting that you will use every effort to prevent a declaration of war, and with best wishes, we beg to remain,

Respectfully, yours,

[SEAL.] DAN W. STEVENS,
Secretary Local Union No. 186.

—

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 3, 1917.*

Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Vote and work against war. If it comes, conscript all incomes over $5,000 to meet the expenses.

NELS NELSON,
President Carpenters Union No. 7.

—

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 3, 1917.*

Congressman ERNEST LUNDEEN,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The Cabinetmakers and Millmen's Local No. 1568, in executive session, have just carried a resolution unanimously which is opposed to war. We, as an organization and individually, do earnestly beseech you to use all your influence and power to avert war.

Sincerely, yours,

RAY CLOUGH, *Secretary.*

—

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 2, 1917.*

Hon. E. LUNDEEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the recent course of events has brought our beloved country to the brink of war with the Imperial German Government,

Resolved by the Swedish Tabernacle Church, of Minneapolis, in regular meeting assembled, That our Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, urged to use their best offices in the interception of any step of our Government tending to a formal declaration of an existing state of war.

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be wired to our Representatives in Congress.

Rev. GUSTAF F. JOHNSON,
S. A. MATSON,
SAMUEL N. NICHOLS,
Committee on Resolutions.

—

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 2, 1917.*

Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The St. Anthony Turn Society, consisting of 265 American citizens, passed a resolution protesting against plunging this country into war with European powers.

MAX SIMON, *President.*

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 3, 1917.*

Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN,
United States Representative, Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned ministers of the gospel, residents of Twin Cities, and citizens, respectfully urge you to oppose a declaration of war by Congress. Humanity can not be helped nor our rights and honor vindicated by dragging our country into the war in order to help one violator of international law and American rights punish the other. This view is held widely by those with whom we come into contact.

Rev. Oscar W. Carlson, Rev. A. L. Rystrom, Rev. C. G. Strom, Rev. Gustave F. Johnson, Rev. C. Olson, Rev. Nath. N. Franklin, Rev. C. F. Sandstrom, Rev. E. Dahlhielm, Rev. A. E. Palmquist, Rev. C. Hognander, Rev. F. O. Gustafson, Rev. K. E. Peterson.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 3, 1917.*

—

ERNEST LUNDEEN,
Washington, D. C.:

Do everything against war. If it comes conscript all incomes over $5,000 to meet the expense.

NORTHWESTERN COOKS ASSOCIATION.

(Same telegram sent by: Waitresses Local, No. 593; Barbers Union, C. S. Camp, president; and Bankers Union Local, No. 222, Olof Falt, secretary.)

—

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *March 28, 1917.*

Mr. ERNEST LUNDEEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The inclosed "Message from the Quaker Society of America" is sent you for your usual earnest consideration. Need it be said that the vast majority of American citizens are unqualifiedly for peace and not for war?

As the Rockies in Colorado tower over the foothills, so does the inclosed message excel the utterings of that faction which sees in the world war great financial gains and at the same time entirely discounting the means by which their ends are to be attained. War rights no wrongs. It is at best nothing more nor less than a senseless waste both on the economic field and on the greater field of human hopes and dreams for a future universal brotherhood.

It well behooves the Representatives in our Congress to ponder deeply ere plunging the Nation into this damnable insult to twentieth century intelligence.

Sincerely,

H. L. PLUMMER, *2819 Pleasant Ave. S.*
HARRY A. JOHNSON, *1518 3rd Ave. S., Flat K.*

—

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 1, 1917.*

Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, M. C.
Washington, D. C.:

You will soon be called upon to help by your vote in Congress to decide whether this country shall join in the terrible destruction of nations or refrain therefrom. We strongly urge upon you, our Representative, to use your vote and influence for peace. Adopted unanimously at regular meeting of Bernadotte Lodge Independent Order of Good Templars, Saturday, 31st, 1916.

BERNADOTTE LODGE INDEPENDENT ORDER OF GOOD TEMPLARS,
By OSCAR SUNDBERG.

—

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 3, 1917.*

ERNEST LUNDEEN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Jupiter Lodge, No. 6, I. O. G. T., asks you to remember our homes and beloved country and that you kindly use your influence to prevent the threatening war.

JUPITER LODGE,
By BERT NORMAN,
505 Walnut Street SE.

—

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 3, 1917.*

ERNEST LUNDEEN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

For God, humanity, and the American Nation, let us have peace. Ornen Temple, Templars of Temperance, ask you to use your strong influence against war.

ORNEN TEMPLE, TEMPLARS OF TEMPERANCE.
By OSCAR G. ERICSON.

—

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 2, 1917.*

Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN,
Representative District No. 5 of Minnesota,
Washington, D. C.:

Faculty and students assembled resolved sending appeal to you to use utmost influence against declaration of war.

L. J. PEDERSEN, *President,*
FACULTY, AND STUDENTS,
Bible Institute and Academy, 243 Twentieth Avenue S.

—

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 2, 1917.*

Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Please keep our country out of the European war. Let England and the ammunition leaders care for their own affairs.

LEBANON EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Rev. C. E. ELVING,
F. T. GUSTAFSON,
OSCAR PETERSON,
Committee.

—

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 4, 1917.*

Congressman ERNEST LUNDEEN,
The Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

Can you in justice to those democratic principles we prize vote for war without consulting your constituents? "It is a fearful thing to lead this great, peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance." We do not want this war to be determined upon "as wars used to be

determined upon in the old, unhappy days when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers." We beg you to consult the people themselves on this vital issue by an advisory referendum, and in the meantime to appoint a joint high commission to find a sane adjustment of our difficulties.

EMERGENCY PEACE FEDERATION,
LELLA FAYE SECOR, *Secretary.*

Just before I rose to address the House the following wire was handed me:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *April 5, 1917.*

ERNEST LUNDEEN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution unanimously passed against war. We back you for peace.
YOUNG MEN'S CLUB, TRINITY LUTHERAN CHURCH.

The following ballot on war was submitted to all of the registered voters of the fifth district of Minnesota:

I believe that the people should be consulted before Congress declares war.

	Yes.	No.
Shall the United States declare war on Germany?		
Do you favor universal military service for our national defense?		

Full name _____
Address _____

Clip this vote now and mail to

ERNEST LUNDEEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Your name will be held strictly confidential.

NATIONAL LEADERS OPPOSED TO THE RESOLUTION.

Gen. SHERWOOD, a Grand Army man who fought in 42 pitched battles; Col. LITTLE, of the "Fighting Twentieth" Kansas, and a number of Spanish War men oppose this war resolution. Of the Nation's four leading Democrats only the President is speaking for war. Congressman KITCHIN, Democratic floor leader, and Congressman WOODS of Iowa, chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee, are opposed. So also are Congressman BURNETT, author of the immigration law and chairman of the Immigration Committee; Congressman HAUGEN, for 18 years a Member of Congress from Iowa; Congressman COOPER, for 24 years a Member from Wisconsin and senior Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee; and many others of prominence. Six Senators, among whom are ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin; GRONNA, of North Dakota; NORRIS, of Nebraska; LANE, of Oregon; and VARDAMAN, of Mississippi, are outspoken in opposition. Senator STONE, of Missouri, opposes the resolution. The Senator is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate.

These men are not afraid to voice their convictions.

We will speak out; we will be heard,
Though all earth's systems crack;
We will not bate a single word,
Nor take a letter back.
* * * * *
Whatever we have dared to think
That dare we also say.

We speak the truth, and what care we
For hissing and for scorn,
While some faint gleamings we can see
Of Freedom's coming morn.

—James Russell Lowell.

STATISTICAL TABLES.

Both Germany and England have sunk American vessels, killing American citizens:

SHIPS SUNK BY BRITISH MINES, RESULTING IN LOSS OF AMERICAN LIVES, IN BRITISH MILITARY AREA OF NORTH SEA.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 1, 1917, page 5200, minority report of the Foreign Affairs Committee, signed by Congressman DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD, says:

Two of our ships, the *Carib* and the *Evelyn*, went into that (Great Britain's) war zone, where they struck mines and went down, with loss of lives of our citizens in both cases.

Edwin J. Clapp, professor of economics in New York University, in his book, Economic Aspects of the War, page 8, says:

Because of these [Great Britain's] floating mines in the North Sea literally scores of vessels were lost, mostly belonging to the Scandinavian countries and Holland. Three American vessels were included—the *Greenbrier, Carib*, and *Evelyn*. Because of the danger of mines ocean freight and war-risk insurance rates became a very heavy burden on shippers and buyers and in the case of some commodities became prohibitive of commerce; a policy of uncertainty and fear was thrown over the commercial world.

Ships sunk by German submarines, resulting in loss of American lives, beginning of war to March 29, 1917.

[State Department.]

	Vessels sunk.	Americans killed.
American vessels sunk (without warning), killing American citizens	3	
Number of Americans killed on these vessels		14
British vessels sunk (without warning), killing American citizens	11	
Number of Americans killed on these vessels		165
British vessels sunk (warned), killing American citizens	2	
Number of Americans killed on these vessels		14
British vessels sunk (shelled by submarine), killing American citizens	4	
Number of Americans killed on these vessels		24
Italian vessel sunk (without warning), killing American citizens	1	
Number of Americans killed on this vessel		7
French vessel sunk (without warning), killing American citizens	1	
Number of Americans killed on this vessel		1
Norwegian vessel sunk (without warning), killing American citizens	1	
Number of Americans killed on this vessel		1
Total	23	226

The British ship *Armenian* was ordered to stop by the submarine commander. Her captain tried to escape and the vessel was sunk by a torpedo, killing 23 Americans, June 28, 1915.

The British ship *Iberian* tried to escape from a submarine; was stopped by shell fire and sunk, killing 3 Americans, July 21, 1915.

A friend writes me:

The voice of the people is the voice of God. If the people were given to decide, there would be no war.

Votes on war.

	Votes cast.	Against war.	For war.
New Ulm, Minn	485	463	19
Monroe, Wis	1,049	954	95
County of Sheboygan, Wis	2,051	2,051	
City of Sheboygan, Wis	[1] 4,133	4,082	17
St. Peter, Minn	289	263	26
Flint, Mich	156	130	26
Minneapolis, Minn	8,809	8,000	109
Nonpartisan League and American Society of Equity meeting at Grand Forks, N. Dak	2,002	2,000	2

[1] 34 blanks.

On 20,000 post-card ballots sent out by the Emergency Peace Committee in the State of Massachusetts, 66 per cent of the returned votes were against war.

Senator LA FOLLETTE reports that out of 15,000 letters and telegrams from almost every State in the Union, 9 out of 10 are against war.

The flame of war spreads from nation to nation and leaps the oceans from continent to continent—in truth, a world war.

Declarations of war.

1914.

Austria-Hungary declared war on Serbia, July 28.
Germany declared war on Russia, August 1.
Germany declared war on France, August 3.
Germany declared war on Belgium, August 4.
Great Britain declared war on Germany, August 4.
France began hostilities on Germany without a formal declaration of war, August 4.
Austria-Hungary declared war on Russia, August 6.
Montenegro declared war on Austria-Hungary, August 7.
France declared war on Austria-Hungary, August 10.
Austria-Hungary declared war on France, August 10.
Great Britain declared war on Austria-Hungary, August 12.
Montenegro declared war on Germany, August 12.
Japan declared war on Germany, August 23.
Austria-Hungary declared war on Japan, August 25.
Austria-Hungary declared war on Belgium, August 28.
Turkey began war with Russia by bombarding Odessa from the sea, October 29.
Russia declared war on Turkey, November 2.
Great Britain declared war on Turkey, November 5.
France declared war on Turkey, November 5.
Belgium declared war on Turkey, November 7.
Serbia declared war on Turkey, November 7.
Montenegro declared war on Turkey, November 10.

1915.

Italy declared war on Austria-Hungary, May 23.
San Marino declared war on Austria-Hungary, June 3.
Italy declared war on Turkey, August 20.
Russia made an ultimatum to Bulgaria, October 4.
Bulgaria rejected Russian ultimatum, October 6.
Bulgaria declared war on Serbia, October 14.
Great Britain declared war on Bulgaria, October 14.
Bulgaria declared war on Russia, October 16.
France declared war on Bulgaria, October 16.
Italy declared war on Bulgaria, October 18.
Montenegro declared war on Bulgaria, October 18.

1916.

Germany declared war on Portugal, March 9.
Portugal declared war on Germany, March 10.
Austria-Hungary and Portugal began hostilities without a formal declaration of war, March 16.
Roumania declared war on Austria-Hungary, August 28.
Italy declared war on Germany, August 28.
Germany declared war on Roumania, August 28.
Roumania sent an ultimatum to Bulgaria and war began, August 30.
Turkey declared war on Roumania, August 30.
Bulgaria declared war on Roumania, September 1.
[German troops entered French territory without a declaration of war August 2, 1914, and each nation's representatives demanded his passports August 3; France held that war began automatically with the attack on her frontier. The German minister left Serbia August 9, 1914. The Turkish ambassador left Petrograd November 1, 1914. The five allies joined in a formal declaration of war against Turkey November 10, 1914.]
(From Current History and The New York Times.)

Europe has been bled white in the shell-torn trenches. The casualties in the world war, 22,853,800 men, have been more than the total number of men of military age in the United States. And, in addition to these millions, thousands lie on the bottom of the seven seas.

Casualties estimated by military experts (killed, wounded, captured).

Country.	Estimates of German experts to December, 1916.	Estimates of the Copenhagen Association for Research into the Social Consequences of War, December, 1916.		Estimates of Frank H. Simonds, military expert for the New York Tribune, Oct. 14, 1916.		Calculations of Maj. Gen. Hugh Scott, U. S. Army, for the first 2 years of war.	
		Casualties.	Killed.[1]	Casualties.	Estimate of permanent losses: Killed, invalided, captured.	Casualties.	Killed.
Russia	[2] 6,000,000	8,500,000	1,700,000	5,750,000		5,000,000	1,000,000
France	3,800,000	3,700,000	740,000	2,500,000		2,000,000	800,000
Great Britain	1,300,000	1,200,000	240,000	1,400,000		620,000	150,000
Serbia		480,000	96,000				
Roumania		200,000	50,000	[3] 350,000			
Italy		800,000	[4] 50,000			175,000	35,000
Belgium		220,000	[4] 47,000			150,000	30,000
Entente		15,100,000	2,923,000		5,000,000	7,945,000	2,015,000
Germany	[5] 4,087,692	[4] 3,401,800	[3] 988,329	4,000,000		3,162,627	907,327
Austria-Hungary		[4] 3,644,000	1,000,000	4,000,000		2,000,000	500,000
Bulgaria		[4] 103,000	[4] 25,000	[6] 100,000		150,000	40,000
Turkey		[4] 605,000	[4] 150,000			300,000	60,000
Central Powers		7,753,800	2,163,329		4,500,000	5,612,627	1,507,327
Grand total		22,853,800	5,086,329		[7] 9,500,000	13,557,627	3,522,327

[1] Computed on a basis of 20 per cent of casualties dead; German figures show 24 per cent dead.
[2] Estimate to Oct. 2, 1916.
[3] New York Times to Jan. 1, 1917.
[4] Estimates for first 2 years of war.
[5] British calculation to Feb. 1, 1917.
[6] Hilaire Belloc in "Land and Water," Dec. 14, 1916.
[7] Simonds's estimate of the killed to Oct. 14, 1916.

In spite of these tremendous losses, the man power of the belligerents is far from exhausted. The men actually on the firing line yet total 18,150,000 soldiers. The "present effectives" number almost 34,000,000 men.

Men actually fighting, December, 1916.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 17, 1916.]

WESTERN FRONT.	
Allies	4,000,000
Germans	3,000,000
SALONIKA FRONT.	
Allies	750,000
Central powers	400,000
ROUMANIAN FRONT.	
Roumanians	600,000
Central powers	400,000
RUSSIAN FRONT.	
Russians	5,000,000
Central powers	4,000,000
Grand total	18,150,000

"Present effectives" at end of second year.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 17, 1916.]

Entente		23,300,000
Russia	9,000,000	
France	6,000,000	
Great Britain	5,000,000	
Italy	3,000,000	
Serbia and Belgium	300,000	
Central powers		10,600,000
Germany	7,000,000	
Austria-Hungary	3,000,000	
Turkey	300,000	
Bulgaria	300,000	
Grand total		33,900,000

Roumania in August and September, 1916, mobilized 600,000 men.

What the belligerents have occupied of rival territory:

Territory captured by central powers in Europe.

	Square miles.
Roumania (estimate of the New York Times)	42,000
All of Servia	34,000
All of Montenegro	5,650
Albania	8,000
Belgium (estimate of the American Association of Commerce and Trade, Berlin)	11,197
Russia (almost)	100,000
France (about)	7,000
Italy (estimate of the New York Times)	60

Territory captured by the entente allies in Europe.

(With the exception of a part of German East Africa, the whole of the German colonies in Africa, Asia, and the Pacific are now in possession of either Great Britain, France, or Japan.)

	Square miles.
Austria-Hungary (Italian front) (estimate of the New York Times)	3,030
Alsace (estimate of the American Association of Commerce and Trade, Berlin)	405
Austria-Hungary (eastern front) (about)	8,000

The sudden drive of Germany through Belgium cost France the greater part of her resources in coal and iron ore, and took from her the equipment and skilled labor of the great industrial centers of the north and northeast. Here is an estimate of what France lost:

Forty-nine per cent of her coal resources.
Ninety per cent of her iron ore.
Eighty per cent of her coke, cast iron, steel, and equipment. Out of 112,000 workers in metals, France lost 60,000.
(From Swiss Military Review, December, 1916.)

The world war is costing the belligerents the sum of $105,000,000 a day. For the first 28 months the total cost is estimated at a figure close to $62,000,000,000.

Daily and total cost of the world war to January 1, 1917.

[From The New International Encyclopedia, 1917, and the Wall Street Journal.]

Country.	Total cost to Dec. 31, 1916.	Average cost per day, Dec. 31, 1916.
Great Britain:		
United Kingdom	$14,374,000,000	$23,500,000
Canada	400,000,000	900,000
Other colonies	600,000,000	600,000
Total Great Britain	15,374,000,000	25,000,000
Russia	8,500,000,000	16,000,000
France	12,200,000,000	18,000,000
Italy	4,000,000,000	7,000,000
Belgium	490,000,000	1,000,000
Serbia	330,000,000	1,000,000
Roumania	250,000,000	2,000,000
Total entente allies	41,144,000,000	70,000,000
Germany	14,600,000,000	21,000,000
Austria-Hungary	5,000,000,000	11,000,000
Turkey	650,000,000	1,500,000
Bulgaria	375,000,000	1,500,000
Total central powers	20,625,000,000	35,000,000
Grand total all nations	61,769,000,000	105,000,000

To carry on the war the belligerent nations have placed the following formal loans at home and abroad:

Entente allies		$37,365,400,000
British Empire	$16,021,400,000	
France	12,040,000,000	
Russia	7,035,000,000	
Italy	2,125,000,000	
Belgium	100,000,000	
Japan	26,000,000	
Serbia	18,000,000	
Central powers		16,353,000,000
Germany	11,833,000,000	
Austria-Hungary	4,140,000,000	
Turkey	350,000,000	
Bulgaria	30,000,000	
Grand total, belligerents		53,718,400,000

(From records kept by the Wall Street Journal.)

As a result of the disrupted financial relations of the world and the demand for military expansion, neutral nations have placed formal loans aggregating $459,380,000 since the beginning of the war.

—

Morgan and his bankers bet their money on the allies—

Writes a farmer—

And now they want the Government to underwrite their loans.

Loans floated in the United States by belligerent and neutral nations since the beginning of the world war to December 31, 1916, total $2,325,900,000.

The loans are classified as follows:

Belligerents		$2,078,900,000
Great Britain	$908,400,000	
France	695,000,000	
Canada	270,500,000	
Russia	160,000,000	
Germany	45,000,000	
European neutrals		85,000,000
Latin America		157,000,000
China		5,000,000
Total foreign loans		2,325,900,000
Less estimated amount paid		175,000,000
Net foreign indebtedness		2,150,900,000

(From records kept by the Wall Street Journal.)

—

Estimated expenditure for direct military purposes if the war lasts three years (exclusive of cost to United States.)

[From figures computed by experts of the Mechanics and Metals National Bank, New York.]

Country.	Daily cost.	For 3 years.	Per capita.
Great Britain	$25,000,000	$16,500,000,000	$351.00
France	18,000,000	14,000,000,000	350.00
Russia	16,000,000	11,750,000,000	67.10
Italy	7,000,000	3,900,000,000	108.00
Rumania	2,000,000	450,000,000	59.30
Belgium and Serbia	2,000,000	1,600,000,000	133.40
Entente allies	70,000,000	48,200,000,000	151.50
Germany	21,000,000	16,500,000,000	242.60
Austria-Hungary	11,000,000	9,250,000,000	174.50
Turkey and Bulgaria	3,000,000	2,000,000,000	75.50
Central powers	35,000,000	27,750,000,000	188.10
All belligerents	105,000,000	75,950,000,000	163.30

If the war lasts three years, according to these figures, it will have cost, exclusive of the expense to the United States, three times the Napoleonic Wars, the Civil War, the Franco-Prussian War, the Boer War, and the Russo-Japanese War combined.

The experts' total is twice as large as the total indebtedness of every nation in the world, as that debt stood in 1914. It will represent a sum seven times greater than the combined deposits of all the 7,600 national banks in the United States, and also seven times greater than all the world's supply of minted gold.

THE SUBMARINE CAMPAIGN.

Many experts predict that the submarine will rebuild the navies of the world, just as Ericsson's *Monitor* scrapped the "wooden bottoms" in Civil War days.

Far called, our navies melt away.

—Kipling.

Naval warfare—Year's loss in capital ships, 1916.

[From the New York Times.]	Tons.
Great Britain, 8 capital ships	110,350
Germany, 2 capital ships	28,000
France, 1 capital ship	12,728
Italy, 1 capital ship	22,000
Russia, 1 capital ship	22,500

The world's merchant marine, as well as the world's navies, is disappearing under the U-boat campaign.

Merchantmen sunk by German submarines during February, 1917.

	Gross tons.
Germany's claim, 368 vessels	781,500
Admiral Bereford's estimate, 281 vessels	500,000

More than 1,000,000 tons of merchant shipping has been destroyed by German submarines and mines since February 1," said the New York Journal of Commerce at the end of the second month of the U-boat campaign.

This total shows that the loss of the first two months of the unrestricted U-boat campaign have been more than one-fifth as great as the total losses of the preceding 30 months of the war, which were something less than 4,500,000 gross tons. Germany has officially reported, so far, the destruction of 444 vessels of 861,500 gross tons, of which it is claimed that 368 vessels of 781,500 gross tons were destroyed in February. Of the February losses, 292 vessels of 644,000 tons are reported to have belonged to the allies and 76 vessels of 137,500 tons to neutral nations.

Merchantmen and tonnage lost from beginning of war to March 1, 1917, due to war causes.

Vessels sunk	2,558
Gross tonnage	4,811,100

These figures represent 10 per cent of the world's merchant marine at the beginning of the war.

Country.	Number of vessels.	Gross tonnage represented.
Entente losses:		
Great Britain	1,276	2,821,849
France	164	294,338
Italy	121	225,114
Russia	64	77,803
Japan	9	31,901
Belgium	16	23,683
Portugal	9	10,879
Roumania	1	3,688
Canada	1	3,461
Total entente losses	1,661	3,492,722
Teuton losses:		
Germany	83	195,887
Turkey	101	55,282
Austria-Hungary	11	22,439
Total Teuton losses	195	293,608
Neutral losses:		
Norway	340	464,560
Holland	68	165,146
Denmark	96	101,475
Greece	52	100,972
Sweden	97	95,332
Spain	35	64,607
United States	12	29,001
Brazil	1	2,258
Peru	1	1,419
Total neutral losses	702	1,024,770
Grand total shipping lost	2,558	4,811,100

The Teutonic losses are 5 per cent of the total.
The allies' losses are 75 per cent of the total.
Neutrals' losses are 20 per cent of the total.
(From the New York Journal of Commerce records.)

Eight leading nations spent the following amounts in the two years previous to the world war:

Cost of armament.

[From the World Almanacs, 1913, 1914.]

Country.	Fiscal year 1913-14.	Fiscal year 1912-13.
Great Britain	$448,440,000	$359,727,000
Russia	440,300,000	370,471,538
United States[1]	409,238,448	379,593,645
Germany	294,390,000	350,130,000
France	311,142,800	296,583,500
Italy	133,928,000	121,072,000
Austria-Hungary	124,300,000	119,274,570
Japan	95,500,000	101,079,050

[1] Includes pensions.

The armed strength of leading nations at beginning of the world war (United States excepted).

[From the World Almanac, 1914.]

Country.	Peace strength.	Reserves.[1]	Total war strength.	Available for duty; unorganized.[2]
Russia	1,290,000	3,300,000	5,500,000	5,200,000
Germany	870,000	4,430,000	5,200,000	1,000,000
France	[3] 720,000	3,280,000	4,000,000	1,000,000
Turkey	400,000	300,000	700,000	2,000,000
Austria-Hungary	390,000	1,610,000	2,000,000	3,000,000
Great Britain	[4] 254,500	[5] 476,500	730,000	2,000,000
Japan	250,000	950,000	1,200,000	2,000,000
Italy	250,000	950,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Roumania	95,000	100,000	500,000	175,000
Sweden	84,459	551,541	600,000	[6]
Bulgaria	60,500	320,500	380,000	100,000
Servia	32,000	208,000	240,000	60,000
Norway	18,000	92,000	110,000	129,178
Denmark	14,000	69,000	83,000	192,708

[1] Except as to some of the principal and a few of the minor States, it is doubtful whether the numbers given of the reserves or auxiliary forces could be mobilized and made effective within a considerable period of time.
[2] These figures are based on estimated male population of military age, deducting "total war strength." In some States all men of military age are enrolled in national militia and are partly trained.
[3] Including colonial troops.
[4] Including regular forces at home, in the colonies, and 76,000 men in India and excluding the native Indian army of about 175,000.
[5] Includes army reserves and territorial force.
[6] Every able-bodied man is liable for military duty.

Leading navies of the world at the beginning of the world war.

[From the World Almanac, 1914.]

Country.	Modern battleships.	Cruiser battleships.	Older battleships.	First-class cruisers.	Second-class cruisers.	Third-class cruisers.	Gunboats.	Monitors.	Destroyers.	Torpedo boats.	Submarines.	Personnel: Officers and men.
Great Britain	29	10	38	42	37	33	10	....	227	58	85	[1] 137,500
Germany	19	7	20	9	6	39	7	....	141	47	30	[2] 66,783
United States	14	....	25	5	5	15	28	9	62	27	50	[3] 64,780
France	17	....	15	18	4	9	6	....	87	173	90	60,621
Japan	9	5	13	12	10	9	5	....	60	54	15	[4] 51,054
Russia	9	4	8	6	6	3	8	....	105	23	48	52,463
Italy	8	....	8	7	3	10	5	....	35	73	20	33,095
Denmark	....	....	1	....	....	3	....	3	8	15	3	4,000
Austria-Hungary	4	....	9	3	2	7	3	....	18	53	15	17,581
Sweden	....	....	....	1	....	....	9	....	8	33	6	5,715
Norway	....	....	....	1	....	....	15	2	4	28	5	1,003

[1] Naval Reserve seamen, 26,200.
[2] Reserve of 110,000 men.
[3] Naval militia, 7,526.
[4] Reserve of 114,000 men.

Air craft in the world war.

Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rained ghastly dew,
From the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue.
Tennyson: Locksley Hall.

Country.	August, 1914.		April, 1913.[1]	
	Military dirigibles.[2]	Military aeroplanes.[3]	Military dirigibles.	Military aeroplanes.
France	31	1,400	13	450
Germany	35	1,000	17	152
Russia	16	800	9	250
Great Britain	15	400	3	141
Austria-Hungary	10	[3] 350	5	46
United States	....	23	[4]	25

[1] U. S. Navy Dept., Oct., 1915.
[2] Estimate of Henry Woodhouse, editor, "Flying."
[3] From U. S. Advisory Board for Aeronautics, Feb. 2, 1915.
[4] One dirigible, practically useless, on hand.

Statistics as to the present size of the belligerents' aerial fleets are not available, having been suppressed by official censors.

Waldemar Kaempffert, in the Review of Reviews, March, 1916, states that "there are certainly no fewer than 5,000 aeroplanes in actual use, and such is the wastage of battle that their flying life is not longer than a fortnight." He estimates that it is necessary to build 50,000 machines a year to repair the ravages of war.

The United States had 125 aeroplanes and 3 war balloons on hand January 1, 1917, according to the World Almanac. One dirigible was under construction.

Here is a statement of the yearly per capita cost of armament in the leading belligerent nations and the United States previous to the world war:

Total armament charge per unit of population—Nine nations (fiscal year 1912–13).

[From the World Peace Foundation Publication, June, 1913.]

Country.	Estimated population.	Cost of Army and Navy.	Cost per unit of population.
Great Britain	45,000,000	$351,000,000	$7.80
France	39,000,000	259,000,000	6.64
Germany	65,000,000	313,000,000	4.81
Italy	35,000,000	125,000,000	3.57
United States	92,000,000	[1] 244,000,000	2.65
Austria-Hungary	51,000,000	131,000,000	2.56
Spain	20,000,000	50,000,000	2.50
Russia	160,000,000	372,000,000	2.32
Japan	52,000,000	94,000,000	1.81
Total	559,000,000	1,939,000,000	3.47

[1] Exclusive of pensions.

The United States spent vast sums for armament in the years preceding the outbreak of the world war, yet is unprepared. This was due in part to the high cost per man in the Army. Official estimates, says former Congressman Clyde Tavenner, are that the actual cost of a ton of armor plate is $247.17 per ton, but the Government has been paying the armor ring $440.04 per ton since 1887.

Cost of armies per unit of fighting force.

[From the World's Peace Foundation publication, 1913.]

Country.	Fighting force.	Cost of army.	Cost per man.
Austria-Hungary	415,000	$115,381,000	$278
France	610,000	177,656,000	291
Germany	656,000	201,033,000	303
Great Britain	262,000	[1] 98,963,000	378
Italy	305,000	83,284,000	273
Japan	[2] 225,000	47,066,000	[2] 209
Russia	[2] 1,250,000	289,911,000	232
Spain	129,000	36,353,000	282
United States	82,000	107,787,000	1,314
Total	3,934,000	1,157,404,000	294

[1] Omitting charges for noneffectives (pensioners, etc.) $18,803,000
Omitting charges for special reserves and territorials 17,084,000
Total 35,887,000
[2] Approximate.

The Armies of the United States at the beginning of the world war.

[From the report of the War Department.]

REGULAR ARMY.

Officers	4,701
Enlisted men	87,781
Total	92,482
Average strength (including cadets, Hospital Corps, and Philippine Scouts)	97,120
State Militia (total commissioned officers and enlisted men, World Almanac)	122,674
Total	219,794

Although her armies are small, the man power of the United States is tremendous.

Man power in the United States, 1910.

[From the Bureau of Census Report, 1910.]

Male citizens and prospective male citizens of ages 18 to 45 years:

Native whites	14,224,000
Foreign-born whites	2,857,000
Negroes	2,052,000
Indians	50,000
Total	19,183,000
Alien whites	1,796,000
Other aliens	92,000
Total	1,888,000
Grand total	21,071,000

Wars of the United States.

Wars.	War declared.	Treaty of peace.	Immediate cost.	Loss of life.	Total forces.
Revolutionary War.	Apr. 19, 1775	Sept. 3, 1783	[1] $170,000,000	[2] 6,500	[3] 395,858
War of 1812	June 18, 1812	Dec. 24, 1814	[3] 198,000,000	[4] 3,177	[3] 521,622
War with Mexico.	May 13, 1846	....do....	[5] 63,605,000	[3] 13,780	[3] 104,284
Civil War	[9] Apr. 12, 1861	[6] Apr. 9, 1865	[7] 5,000,000,000	{[8] 349,944 [8] 133,821	[8] 2,772,408
Spanish-American War.	Apr. 21, 1898	Dec. 10, 1898	[7] 1,165,000,000	[7] 20,000	[8] 274,717

[1] Thomas Jefferson's estimate.
[2] Killed in 20 important engagements.
[3] Source: Military Hist. of U. S., Maj. Gen. Emory Upton.
[4] Killed in battle only; Heitman's figure.
[5] Source: Financial Hist. of U. S., Prof. D. R. Dewey.
[6] Surrender of Lee at Appomattox.
[7] Source: Mass. Com. on Cost of Living, Report 1910.
[8] Source: World Almanac.
[9] Fort Sumter fired on.

After war, the deluge of pensions:

Amounts paid to pensioners of five United States wars (1790–1915, inclusive).

[From the Report of the Commissioner of Pensions, 1915, p. 18.]

War of the Revolution (estimated)	$70,000,000.00
War of 1812 (service pension)	45,972,895.76
War with Mexico (service pension)	49,618,948.68
Civil War	4,614,643,267.43
War with Spain and the Philippine insurrection	49,944,441.84
Total	4,830,179,553.71

VOLUNTEERS VS. CONCRIPTION.

Without the compulsion of a draft law there has come forward in the British Empire for duty over seas a mighty volunteer army of 6,664,000 men.

British volunteers in the world war.

England (approximately)	6,000,000
Canada	400,000
Australia	264,000

Figures on England from London Army and Navy Gazette, January 8, 1916. Figures on Canada from Sir Herbert Ames, March 27, 1917. Figures on Australia from Premier Hughes, September 18, 1916.

On October 28, 1916, after 26 months of war the people of Australia rejected conscription by a majority of 81,280, when it was referred to them for a referendum vote.

The Australian soldiers in the trenches, all volunteers, returned a majority of 20,000 against conscription.

Volunteers in American wars.

Uncle Sam's armies have all been volunteer forces, except for the 52,000 conscripts in the Civil War.

Wars.	Volunteers.[1]	Conscripts.
Revolutionary War [2]	395,564	.....
War of 1812	471,622	.....
War with Mexico	101,282	.....
Civil War (Union Army)	2,707,012	52,037
Spanish-American War	216,029	.....

Figures from American Almanac, compiled from official sources and edited by Ainsworth R. Spofford, Librarian of Congress, 1889; and from reports of the Secretary of War.

[1] Exclusive of volunteers in Regular Army.
[2] Includes Continental soldiers and volunteers.

For the Mexican War, President Polk called for 50,000 volunteers; double that number responded. In four months President McKinley's call for 200,000 volunteers for the Spanish-American War had been reached, and exceeded by more than 16,000 men.

During the revolution, the Original Thirteen States, with a population of 3,231,980 (exclusive of slaves), raised an army of 395,064 men—a soldier for every 10 persons. On that basis to-day the United States would raise an army of 10,000,000 fighting men.

On the basis of enlistments in the War of 1812, in proportion to the population of that time, America to-day would get a volunteer army of 7,000,000.

Under the voluntary system Australia has sent over seas a number of men that, in proportion to population, represents a United States army of 6,000,000; Canada, an army which on a similar proportion of volunteers would give Uncle Sam a fighting force of 7,000,000 soldiers.

HIGH COST OF LIVING.

We don't want war—
Writes a mother—
I have war enough trying to feed my babies.

A comparison of prices on December 15, 1912, and December 15, 1916, shows an advance in the prices of all articles combined of 29 per cent.

Every article, without exception, for which prices are shown for the four-year period were higher on December 15, 1916, than on December 15, 1912:

	Per cent.
Potatoes increased	120
Flour increased	66
Lard increased	37
Butter increased	9

[From the Monthly Review of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, February, 1917.]

Article.	Unit.	Average money price Dec. 15.				
		1912	1913	1914	1915	1916
		Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
Sirloin steak	Pound	23.2	25.0	25.5	25.0	26.8
Round steak	...do	20.0	22.5	22.8	22.3	23.7
Pork chops	...do	18.1	20.3	19.5	18.5	21.5
Bacon, smoked	...do	26.2	27.1	28.1	27.6	30.1
Ham, smoked	...do	24.8	26.3	26.6	26.6	30.2
Lard, pure	...do	15.8	15.8	15.4	14.5	21.7
Eggs, strictly fresh	Dozen	41.5	46.9	46.9	45.9	51.9
Butter, creamery	Pound	41.8	40.0	39.6	38.9	45.4
Cheese	...do	.....	.....	.....	23.6	31.0
Milk, fresh	Quart	9.1	9.3	9.2	9.0	10.2
Bread	Loaf [1]	.....	.....	5.2	5.6	6.9
Flour, wheat	½-bbl. bag	80.3	78.3	90.3	91.3	$1.334
Corn meal	Pound	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.1	3.8
Rice	...do	.....	.....	.....	9.1	9.2
Potatoes	Peck	23.1	27.3	21.5	27.5	50.9
Sugar, granulated	Pound	6.0	5.4	6.1	6.8	8.3
Coffee	...do	.....	.....	.....	30.2	30.2
Tea	...do	.....	.....	.....	55.1	55.1

[1] 16 ounces.

Bread costs less in Berlin and London than in New York and Philadelphia.

Cost of certain staple articles of food here and in the warring capitals.

[From the monthly reports of the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.]

	New York.[1]	Philadelphia.[1]	Average United States.	London.	Berlin.[2]	Italy.[3]
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
Bread .....16-ounce loaf	7.1	5.7	6.9	[4] 5	[4] 5.9	4.1
Potatoes.....peck	59.4	64.6	50.9	.....	[5] 57.1	.....
Beef.....pound	27.1	27.2	26.8	.....	27	20.7
Lard.....do	22.5	21.5	22.5	.....	43.3	.....
Milk.....quart	9.9	8.8	10.2	.....	.....	7.1
Eggs.....dozen	61.6	48.1	51.9	.....	45.7	.....

[1] December 15, 1916.
[2] Berlin prices are for week of Oct. 23, 1915.
[3] Italy prices are for October, 1916.
[4] When purchased in 4-pound loaves.
[5] Average price, wheat and rye breads.
[6] Price October, 1916.

A laboring man asks:

What glory from this war; what will history say? For if the United States becomes involved more than half the population of the world will be arrayed against less than one-tenth.

How the population and wealth of the world is divided in the great struggle.

[From Theodore H. Price in the Outlook, Dec. 27, 1916.]

Resources controlled by—	Habitable area of world is—		Population of the world is—		World's economic wealth is valued at—
	Sq. miles.	*Per cent.*		*Per cent.*	
Central powers	2,960,082	5.60	164,000,000	9.38	$108,000,000,000
Entente allies	29,208,528	55.29	862,200,000	49.24	272,500,000,000
United States	3,741,828	7.08	110,000,000	6.30	250,000,000,000
Other neutrals	16,914,095	32.03	615,500,000	35.08	67,400,000,000
	52,824,533		1,751,700,000		697,900,000,000

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, those of us who address the House to-day, before war is formally declared, do so, in so far as the practical situation is concerned, just as if the addresses were made after the war has been formally declared. In other words, every man, woman and child in the Nation, as well as those throughout the civilized world, already knows that a determination has been reached by the American Congress, and that but a mere formality now stands between us and a declaration of war, and that that formality will be behind us within a few hours.

With that situation standing out before me, I shall refrain from saying what I might have said if the die already had not been cast.

Since everybody knows what will be done within a few hours, for all practical purposes we are in exactly the same position now as we will be after those few hours have elapsed.

If any hope whatever for peace were left I might argue, plead and pray for peace; but, with all hope gone, I still shall not join the advocates of war, but I am willing to go with the warriors, even to death itself, to preserve this great Republic. As I have just said, our country will be no more at war when this resolution has been adopted than it is now, for the reason that it is an absolute certainty that the resolution declaring that a state of war exists will be adopted. In consequence I shall not discuss what Germany has done, what England has done, or what our own country has or has not done.

Those, during the two and a half years just passed, who have demanded that the United States go into this world war have divided American citizenship into two classes—patriots and cowards. If, for no other reason, at least for discussion's sake, until the President came before the Congress with his message of war, I willingly and cheerfully admitted myself as belonging to the jingo's class of cowards. In doing so I did not doubt that I possessed sufficient physical courage to defend myself, my neighbor and my country against aggression. As an individual I have defended my personal rights against all comers, but in doing so invariably I have been too "cowardly" to involve others in trouble or in danger because of any impending peril of my own. During the months gone by this same spirit of alleged "cowardice" many times has made me shudder with fear at the idea of involving my fellow countrymen in a war which I know they have not wanted, but which now both they and I must support. I have been too much of a "coward" to counsel a situation which, in my apprehension, meant a toll of treasure and blood unparalleled in the history of the world.

While admitting my "cowardice" in these respects, at this time I can but proclaim my own patriotism as well as that of those whom I represent in this Chamber. They and I have longed and prayed fervently for continued peace. But now that no hope for peace is left we have changed our prayers, and pray for the success of our country in the unfortunate struggle upon which we enter. [Applause.] Before this declaration of war they and I were genuinely for our country, but now we are more for our country, because our country needs us more now than then. [Applause.]

During the days of uncertainty I was the "coward" I have just admitted myself to be. I am as much a "coward" now as I was then, and I am "coward" now only to the extent that I am ready to give my life and my all for my country. [Applause.]

It is folly for me or for any other man to stand in this Chamber to-day and say what might have been. Now it is our duty to say what shall be. And instead of that dissension which now can serve no purpose other than to give comfort to those who from to-day on are our enemies, we must patriotically show a solid front, with no man shirking his country's cause.

Again accepting for myself the epithet applied by those who have claimed to have a corner upon all of the patriotism of the country, I will say that I have been too "cowardly" to help set a prairie afire, which when once afire becomes beyond human control. [Applause.]

It is but an easy reach of the imagination to see those Americans who, out of reckless abandon, lost their lives at sea, and upon whose account this war is largely to be waged, looking back from the "other side" upon bended knee and with uplifted arms imploring a merciful God to save themselves and their country from the consequences of their own acts.

But, the die is cast; war is on; and no man should be heard to say else than "It is my country for which I live and am willing to die." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission at the outset to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, when history records the truth about this awful act we are about to commit here, which means the maiming and dismembering of thousands of our noble boys and the deaths of thousands more, it will record that the Congress of the United States made this declaration of war under a misapprehension of the facts inexcusable in itself and that the people at large acquiesced in it on the theory that the Congress should have the facts, and would not make a declaration of war not justified by every rule of equity and fair dealing between nations, impartially applied by this country to all belligerents, and that after our following that course one of these contesting nations, despite our impartial action, had wantonly destroyed our legitimate commerce and destroyed the lives of some of our people.

I say the people acquiesce in our actions here to-day on exactly that false assumption of the facts. We have not treated, as a Government, these belligerents with any degree of impartiality; but, on the contrary, have demanded of one of them absolute obedience to our ideas and interpretations of international law, and have allowed at least one of the other belligerents to override at will the established rules and practice of all the civilized nations of the world for a hundred years with but feeble protest, and, in many cases, with no protest at all.

We surrendered to Great Britain practically all we contested for in the War of 1812. It is true, as far as we know, that she has not impressed our seamen, but she has seized and appropriated to her own use entire cargoes and the ships that carried them. Not carriers in European trade, but carriers to South America.

One of the undelying causes of the awful holocaust in Europe was because Germany had by her systematized reductions in cost of manufacturing, by subsidization of transportation lines and methods of credits made such serious inroads on Great Britain's trade in South America as to seriously disturb her equanimity and threaten her prestige as well as attendant profits.

Mr. Chairman, this war now devastating Europe so ruthlessly is not a war of humanity, but a war of commercialism, and there is not a student of economic conditions within the sound of my voice but knows that to be the fundamental cause of that war, although there are many primary and intermediate questions entering into it. But I digress, Mr. Chairman. I have said that Great Britain has seized our ships engaged in peaceful commerce on the Western Hemisphere, surrounded by all the hallowed shades of the Monroe doctrine, which we are about to abrogate; has taken them to England and impressed them into her own service, and apparently without protest from our Government now demanding a strict accounting by Germany.

Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt in my mind but that Germany's action in regard to her submarine warfare is reprehensible, is wrong, and would merit punishment; but, Mr. Chairman, can we consistently declare war on Germany and enter into an alliance with "perfidious Albion," who, without regard to international law, laid down a prescribed zone in the Atlantic Ocean and the North Sea sowing those waters with deadly contact mines. Three of our vessels were sunk in this prescribed zone with attendant loss of life; many other vessels were likewise destroyed without protest by our Government, which by indisputable evidence has, to some extent at least, suppressed the facts in regard to the matter.

Mr. Chairman, is a life lost by the destruction of a vessel coming in contact with a floating mine less dear than one lost on a vessel sunk by a torpedo fired by a submarine? Is the water less cold or wet?

Mr. Chairman, the highwayman who holds you up is less culpable than the coward who sends you a bomb by express or through the mail or sets a spring gun. The floating mine, in my judgment, is more despicable than the submarine, whose operators are at least taking some chances of losing their own lives. We are asked to go into partnership with the belligerent who prescribed a zone and sowed it full of mines to help it destroy the belligerent who prescribed a zone and in that zone uses submarines. Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel! * * *

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States in his message to Congress intimated that Germany had maintained a spy system in the United States, even to the extent of having spies in some of our departments. Mr. Chairman, that declaration was made no doubt for what it was worth, as far as affecting the judgment of Congress was concerned, but it was really meant for the consumption of the people at large, who are mostly unaware that the State Department of the United States Government has a secret fund for paying our own secret spies throughout the world, maintained in time of peace as well as in war time. Are our boys to be sent to punish Germany for doing that which, to some extent at least, we practice ourselves?

Mr. Chairman, this is probably no time for recrimination nor for referring to past mistakes, in my judgment, of the administration; but, Mr. Chairman, an administration which can not stand fair and open criticism of its action as an administration is unworthy of the respect of a democracy, and an attempt to stifle in any way such criticism is an attempt to shackle the

liberties for which our forefathers contended, and future generations will pass judgment, probably unerringly, on an Executive who classed as willfully expressing no opinion but their own 12 men in one of the branches of the American Congress who did not supinely agree with him in a course that he himself subsequently characterized as ineffective and futile. These men had taken the same oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States as had the President. Their prerogative was legislative, his was executive. He has under the Constitution a right to advise, but that does not carry with it the right to criticize because his advice is not acquiesced in by all the Members of the Congress. Such criticism is, in fact, an attempt at coercion and intimidation which augurs but illy for our liberty if supinely submitted to.

The President of the United States in his message of the 2d of April said that the European war was brought on by Germany's rulers without the sanction or will of the people. For God's sake, what are we doing now? Does the President of the United States feel that the will of the American people is being consulted in regard to this declaration of war? The people of Germany surely had as much consideration as he has given the people of the United States. He has heard the cry of the Shylocks calling for their pound of flesh; later on he will hear the cry of Rachel weeping for her children and mourning because they are not, sacrificed to make good the pound of flesh in the name of liberty. The exclamation "O Liberty! Liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name!" was well made.

Ours is the greatest Nation on the face of the globe. We have had a chance, if we had maintained a strict neutrality, to have bound up the wounds of the oppressed and to have upheld the tenets of the highest civilization throughout the world. But, no; we are asked to go into partnership with the country that has never allowed justice and right to have any weight with her when conquest and gold were placed in the balance. In India, which she held by right of conquest, as a punishment to those natives of that country who desired to be free of England's yoke and rebelled, even as did we in our Revolutionary period, she mercifully tied many of the rebels to the mouths of her cannon and humanely blew them to atoms as a sample of English Christianity. She destroyed the Boer Republic by intrigue and force of arms; she forced, for love of gold, the opium trade on China. Christian England, our would-be partner! In the Napoleonic wars she, by force of arms, confiscated the entire shipping of small but neutral nations to her own use, just as she has in a smaller degree appropriated ships of our citizens to her own use within the past two years. During the Civil War she fell over herself to recognize the Confederacy, and gave it every encouragement possible. Now we are asked to become her faithful ally against a country that, whatever her faults, surely has no blacker record than that of Christian England; to contribute our money and our people in the holy name of liberty to destroy one belligerent, which the President designates as Prussian militarism, a menace to the world; but English navalism, which is surely as great a menace, we enter into partnership with. George Washington said, "Avoid European entanglements," but we are recklessly entering a path to the end of which no man can foresee or comprehend, at the behest of, in many cases, a venal press and of a pacifist President.

God pity our country, gentlemen of the House of Representatives, if you desire that this cup be placed to our country's lips to quaff for crimes committed by a country for unneutral actions and that we enter into an alliance with another country which has been much less neutral. You may do so; I can not so vote at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am of French extraction; my forefathers fled from France to escape the ax after the edict of Nantes. I hate oppression; I hate deceit; I love liberty as my life. My ancestor after fleeing from France came to this country and settled in New Jersey when it was a wilderness, and gave his life in trying to conquer it. He escaped the ax in France, but was burned at the stake by the Indians in the then wilderness west of the settlements in New Jersey. He left three boys, all of whom took part in the Revolutionary War, and the one from whom I descended has his name inscribed on a tablet in the courthouse of the county seat of Putnam County, Ind., as one of the Revolutionary soldiers residing and dying in that county.

Mr. Chairman, I have one uncle lying in a soldier's grave at Marietta, Ga., who was with Sherman on his march to the sea and who gave up his life that Old Glory and all she represents should not perish from the earth. Mr. Chairman, the man who says I am not as patriotic as he lies in his throat. Is it a gauge of patriotism to vote calamity, debt, death, and destruction on our country in the judgment of a man who is not himself infallible? Have not those who view it the other way the same right to consideration and respect as those who see relief only through a sea of blood? God forbid that in free America such an unjust discrimination can ever be made. Yet the press is holding up to ridicule and contempt those of our citizens who counsel against entering into this awful carnival of death. They are sowing the wind, and later on will reap the whirlwind in all probability. The American people, if they value their freedom, will not long tolerate such a spirit of nontoleration.

Mr. Chairman, throughout the country patriotic meetings are being held to encourage enlistments of our young men and boys into the Army to engage in this war in advance of our declaration.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest a resolution, which should be passed and adhered to by the young men of our country and by our soldiers who are asked to enter the trenches of Europe:

"I hereby pledge myself to the service of my country and will guarantee to go and uphold its honor and its flag as soon as the sons of all the newspaper editors who have stood out for our entering the war, and who are of age for enlistment, have enlisted for the cause and the proprietors and editors themselves have patriotically enlisted, on the theory that they should feel it their duty to do so as instigators of the act."

Likewise, Mr. Chairman, the sons of manufacturers of ammunition and war supplies, and all stockholders making profits from such trade. They should freely offer their sons on the altar of their country and, in case of their being under military age, go themselves. Likewise, Mr. Chairman, the J. Pierpont Morgans and their associates, who have floated war loans running into millions which they now want the United States to guarantee by entering the European war; after they and all the holders of such securities have offered their sons and themselves, when of military age, on the altar of their country, and, Mr. Chairman, when the above-mentioned persons have no sons and are too old themselves to accept military service, then they shall, to make good their desire for the upholding of American honor and American rights, donate in lieu of such service of selves or sons one-half of all their worldly goods to make good their patriotic desire for our entering the European war in the name of liberty and patriotism.

Mr. Chairman, it will be fitting for those who have really nothing at stake in this war but death to enter into it and give their lives in the name of liberty and patriotism, after the persons covered by the above resolution have done their part as above suggested and many thousands of our citizens will see it that way ere long.

Mr. Chairman, I have voted since I have been a Member of Congress at all times for the largest supply bills offered to take care of and build up our Army and Navy and put ourselves into a state of reasonable preparedness for any difficulties which may arise, and I shall, while I am a Member of the House, in case this cup is put to our country's lips, vote for everything which in my judgment is essential to her success, keeping in mind always the fundamentals of our liberties; but, Mr. Chairman, while I am a Member I shall claim the same right to free speech and expression I am willing to accord to my compeers.

May God guide us and keep us. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Such an important question as this we can not have any time to discuss.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I have tried for several days to work myself up to a conclusion that it was my duty to support this resolution. I believed even in the early part of to-day's session that I had reached that conclusion, but, gentlemen, the longer I have thought about it the bigger the question grew, and the more doubt I have had on the question, until I have reached the deliberate conclusion that, let come what may, I can not stultify my conscience by voting for this declaration of war. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I am English, so far as my ancestry is concerned, all the way through. My ancestors on both sides come down from the Revolutionary sires, and the very natural impulse of heredity would cause me to desire to be with those people who gave birth to that ancestry. But, Mr. Chairman, I have seen one war. I was a boy 7 years old when the first gun was fired at Sumter. I saw the first company of gray jackets that went out from my native town and county. I saw them as they went out to follow the Stars and Bars in the Maytime of 1861, hopeful and happy and buoyant. I saw them as they came back in the springtime of 1865, the few that did come back, but oh, how changed. Running back through the vista of these 60 years I remember then, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, hearing the same kind of war-mad speeches that I have

heard to-day on the floor of this House. I heard men who declared that they would wade up to their armpits in blood; that they would catch all the bullets that were fired and drink all the blood that was shed. But, Mr. Chairman, when the tocsin of real war was sounded, when brave men that wore the blue met the brave men that wore the gray in the death grapple, these men who made those declarations were never the ones that smelled gunpowder. [Applause.] I undertake the prediction, Mr. Chairman, that you will find some of these Members of Congress who to-day call the men who differ with them cowards and traitors will not be willing to risk themselves in war and will not be among the men who face the bullets in real war. [Applause.]

Oh, gentlemen have inveighed—my colleague from Alabama, whom I love and honor and respect, has undertaken to attack the leader of the Democratic Party here because he had the courage of his convictions to declare his principles here.

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not assault him for speaking his convictions but as the majority leader arraigning this country for the course that it has taken.

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman from Alabama said that the gentleman from North Carolina ought to resign his position in Congress and resign his position as the leader of his party. Now, then, I challenge the gentleman on to-morrow to start his petition asking the Democrats of this House to ask the gentleman from North Carolina to resign and see if he will not be the lone man on the petition. [Applause.] I invite my friend on to-morrow, when war is declared—and it will be, and the resolution will be signed on Good Friday, that day which commemorates the death and crucifixion of Him against whom the mob cried, "Crucify him! Crucify him!"—by the same token I invite my colleague to go back to Randolph and Coosa Counties and take his place among the privates and those good people there who will go into the Army. [Applause.] We will see whether he will do it or not. We will see whether he is war mad. Let those and their sons and sons-in-law go to war and face the bullets there.

Mr. HEFLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to, and if I can have five minutes more I will be glad to yield and yield and yield to my friend.

Mr. HEFLIN. Just one question.

Mr. BURNETT. I will yield for one question.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am willing to resign and fight for my country——

Mr. BURNETT. That is not a question.

Mr. HEFLIN. One son of my only sister has come from the border. I have another nephew that will go, and now my only son——

Mr. BURNETT. Oh, I object, Mr. Chairman; that is not the question. I decline to yield further for a speech. Oh, yes; these fellows who were going to drink all the blood were willing to send somebody else to war. [Laughter and applause.] They were willing to have their sister's sons go; they were willing to have their neighbors' boys go; but they never got where the death grapple raged between brave men who wore the blue and the brave men who wore the gray.

What will result? I will vote for this resolution if we can have an amendment as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, which says that we must not send these brave sons of America to fight the battles of England, the ancient enemy of this country, that has given us more trouble than any other. I will vote for that.

As I started to say, Mr. Chairman, conscription is coming this week or the week after. Read the resolution; see the power that is given by Congress to the President; and next week we will be asked to carry out the provisions of this resolution by conscription. Why conscription, if the country wants war? [Applause.] Oh, gentlemen say they are going to vote for it because the people want it. If that be true, the patriotic impulse of the American boys will cause them to enlist without conscription.

Now I want to submit to my colleague, and I will give him half a minute to answer it, when they bring in the bill for conscription of the boys in his congressional district, will he vote to conscript them and send them to war? [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. I have not reached that question yet, and I want to do anything for the good of my country, to help it beat Germany. [Applause and cheers.]

Mr. BURNETT. Oh, your country! Then you ought to go and fight for your country. [Applause and cheers.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. The committee will be in order.

Mr. HEFLIN. I ask you to pay as much attention to your constituents as you do to the Germans. [Applause and cheers.]

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. And to speak for your own people and not for Germany.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I speak——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is out of order. Both gentlemen will take their seats. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. I speak for the women and children of my country, and not for King George.

[The Sergeant at Arms approached Mr. BURNETT with the mace.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is recognized.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Are we not in the Committee of the Whole?

The CHAIRMAN. We are.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What authority has the Sergeant at Arms to produce the mace in the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the direction of the Chair, under the rules of the House.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The Chair has no such power.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to apologize to the Chair. I did not know that my time had expired. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNETT. Under the leave to extend, I desire briefly to review the recent history which has led up to this declaration.

During the campaign last fall some of the war-mad patriots of the East were reviling our President because they said he would not fight. The States, the cities, the city papers, and the private interests which have fed and nourished this war propaganda were all against them, and none of their electoral votes were cast for him. The peace-loving West and South elected him. In the States where women vote thousands of noble wives and mothers and sisters voted for him, although the Republican candidate declared for woman suffrage. This because they did not want to see their loved ones torn from their homes and butchered in a war for which we were not responsible. I believe that our great President still wants peace, but he has been badgered and abused and slandered until he has taken a step from which I feel that this Congress ought to save him. But for the people's love of peace he would not be in the White House to-day. But for your promises to keep the peace many of you Democrats would not be here to-day.

Your people trusted you to keep their sons out of war, and now will you observe that trust?

Had you told them that you were going to tear the young men of America from the hearts of the mothers who passed through the very shadow of death to give them birth, and have them butchered 3,000 miles from their homes, do you believe you would have been in this hall to-night?

I admit that the provocation is great. I am no German sympathizer. I believe that they have cruelly violated the laws of God and of nations. But, gentlemen, England has done the same. For nearly three years she has treated with comtempt and scorn our protests against her assaults upon our ships and the products of our land. In order to beat down the price of the cotton of our southern farmer and rob him of his honest sweat and toil, she has seized and searched our ships and confiscated their cargoes. For three years she has robbed the western farmer of his corn and wheat and meat. The Secretary of State said it was wrong and sent notes of protest time and time again, but she gave heed to none of these. Did the war dogs of the East then rush from their kennels and loudly bark for war? Did the metropolitan press then urge war in behalf of the southern and western farmer? I myself wrote the Secretary of State condemning these wrongs to my people, and others did the same, who to-day stand on this floor as the apologists for those buccaneers, and are willing to send the sons of the farmers whom they robbed to fight beside theirs and die with them, and be buried with them 3,000 miles from a mother's gentle hand to wipe the death damp from the brow of those for whom she would gladly die.

True England did not destroy our ships or murder our people, but she was ready to do so. She laid the mines in the

North Sea to keep our commerce out of even neutral ports, and would have blown up our ships and slaughtered our men had they not observed her warning to stay out. When we have permitted all these outrages from England are we willing for her unholy hands to touch honest American boys in a war where she in the end will demand whatever advantage she may gain even over her allies? She has been the ancient enemy of the United States, and hates any nation that vies with her in commerce and in trade.

In 1776 she was our enemy, in 1812 the same, and in President Cleveland's administration had to be brought to her knees. Who can trust her in war or peace?

Her centuries of wrong to poor, oppressed old Ireland would mar the page of even pagan history; and yet men talk about her Government being a democracy and this war being a war for democratic ideals.

I tried hard to square my convictions with our great President's views. But when I read this resolution and realized what it commits us to, when I heard the great and candid speech of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. FLOOD], the able representative of the President in this contest, and heard him declare the extent to which he and the President expect us to go, I determined that, come what may, I can not help to put this yoke upon people who have trusted me for 18 years.

Gentlemen, the country does not approve this war. If it did, the patriotic hearts of those who love our fair land would burn to enter the fray and the talk of conscription would be an insult to those brave hearts.

In some of the towns in my district good people are urging war, but the quiet man behind the plow who trusts his cause with me does not want it.

I insert a letter from an old Confederate soldier, Mr. G. M. Simpson, who followed the Stars and Bars from Sumter to Appomattox. Read what he says. I quote from a letter of R. A. Statham, another friend, who sees with a prophet's eye the starving babes in our land while our food is sent to feed the warring world. I have many more letters of like kind. I append a petition from Collinsville, a beautiful little town in my district nestled between the towering crags of old Lookout and Big Sandy. Read what they say.

Were our land invaded by a foreign foe, from every home and hamlet would spring the sturdy sons of toil to strike down the foul invader, and into the very jaws of death and hell they would rush to defend their homes and flag.

The great masses of the people believe in the sincerity of our President, but they believe that he is being misled by those whose interest it is to have war.

Then let us look well, gentlemen, before we take this leap. It is easy to bring on war, but, oh, how hard it may be to woo back the soft-winged dove of peace.

By whose side will our brave boys have to fight? Who will be their allies? The proud and treacherous Jap that has long looked with covetous eyes upon our islands in Pacific Seas; the cruel Cossack that amid the centuries has driven Jew and Gentile alike who dared even hope for liberty through Siberian snows to rot inside dungeon walls; the Sicilian who, with bomb and stiletto, carries robbery and death at every secret step; the swarthy Hindu, another victim of John Bull's boasted democracy.

With the Germans and Austrians is the unthinkable Turk, and others almost as bad. I would oppose an alliance with them, were it contemplated, just as I do with the entente allies. The grievance is against us; let us make no entangling alliance with any, but let it be our war, and ours alone. This was Washington's advice, and could his voice be heard I doubt not that would be his warning still.

The country press and those whom they represent do not want us to rush madly into this holocaust of men.

From the Farmers' Tribune, of Anderson, S. C., I clip the following:

Why should we fight England's battles? Has not she persistently and outrageously, from the very start of this awful war, raped our neutral rights and impudently interfered with our commerce with other neutral nations, like Holland, Sweden, and Norway, merely because she did not want us to establish trade relations and found a line of credits which might result in our increasing trade with those countries that would continue after this European rumpus was a thing of the past? What about our cotton? What about other noncontraband articles which England just went and took from us on the high seas in our vessels destined to merchants in those neutral countries, on the theory that some of those noncontraband articles might be shipped from those neutral countries to Germany?

I give one among many articles opposing war which appears in the Farmers' Fireside Bulletin, the official organ of the Farmers' Union of Texas and several other Southwestern States:

My work puts me in touch with farm audiences and country schoolhouses nearly every night in the week. We always discuss the war question and universal military service. I know nine out of ten farmers are absolutely opposed to both. We farmers are unalterably opposed to war unless an enemy lands on our shores.

JOHN A. SIMPSON,
President Oklahoma Farmers' Union.

Gentlemen may ingratiate themselves with the President and with the metropolitan press and the gamblers of Wall Street by a vote for war, but for my part I had rather have the knowledge that my vote represents the wishes of the poor and oppressed of my people and the approval of my own conscience than to have the plaudits of a war-mad horde.

ODENVILLE, ALA., *March 22, 1917.*

Hon. J. L. BURNETT.

DEAR FRIEND: It seems that we are on the verge of war. I see from the statement of Vice President Marshall and Senator UNDERWOOD that the tendency is to call out an army of 1,000,000 men and send them to Europe. Had pleasure seekers and munitions merchants kept off the seas we would not have been in any way involved. Now have we got to have our sons conscripted and forced to leave the home land and go across the ocean just to let rich people get richer, and our dear boys never see home again? Let the allies do their own fighting. In the war of 1860 England blockaded every seaport on the ocean and then allowed the skim of Europe to slip through the blockade and join the Yankee Army, and we had to fight the very element that you have been trying to prevent from coming over here. And now send our sons to help such people? No! Arm merchant ships if thought best, and if any man is big enough fool to go out on one of them, let him go, but more will have to be done than is done or he will land in the bottom of the ocean. Raise the old Confederate flag and play Dixie, and we old Confederate veterans will make an army, and if you will let Germany come over here we will whip them before breakfast. We know how it is done, for we have tried it, and our blood still runs hot for Dixie Land, and if we could not shoot them out we will charge them and stick bayonets in them as we did in the sixties, but by all means let them come here. We have had to whip England twice and did it when they came over here, and now propose to go over there and help them, our oldest enemies. No, never; no, never! Sure, 'tis this way: If we have war stuff to sell, let any nation of the world come over here after it, and if she can get home with it all right, but never raise an army to help her home. And besides, you see that Germany is hard to handle, and for the United States to join the allies against them will incur the ill will of Germany as long as time lasts. I am willing to allow that you are in a position to see farther than I do, but a numbskull can know some things. I hope when you have time you will read this, and if thought worth anything give it due consideration, for evidently we are confronted with the most serious proposition that ever came before a nation.

Your old tried friend,

G. M. SIMPSON.

LEHIGH, ALA., *April 2, 1917.*

Hon. JOHN L. BURNETT, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURNETT: I hope you will view this war question from all the sides it has got. Secretary of War Baker said in Birmingham a few weeks ago that there was not a child under 6 years of age in Poland and Belgium, Serbia and Roumania. I suppose this was caused by lack of food. You know the price of food in our country. If we are to have war with Germany, will prices go higher? If they do, our babies will die. They are starving now. This is a terrible price to pay for national honor when our country has not been invaded. If you people who are the Government will keep cool, probably you can avoid war. Let us hope so. But if us men have to go to France to the trenches, protect our women and babies from these thieves who have our food stocks cornered, or there will be very few to go until conscripted.

Very truly,

R. A. STATHAM.

COLLINSVILLE, ALA., *March 26, 1917.*

To the Hon. JOHN L. BURNETT,
Representative of the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama:

We the undersigned ask your honor to use all your influence to prevent war between the United States and Germany because Germany sinks any merchant ship loaded with war munitions or supplies to be shipped to the allies.

The above adopted by the undersigned in mass meeting.

J. O. Meadows, A. A. Madden, J. E. Farmer, W. A. Cleland, J. F. Meadows, J. A. Reece, C. M. Ayers, N. C. Meadows, T. V. Gipson, G. C. Hawthorne, R. W. Brock, Dock Kelley, S. T. Everett, G. N. Cleland, M. T. Oliver, C. E. Oliver, M. H. Hairell, W. M. Brock, W. G. Lawson, Ellis Hairell, J. B. Bates, E. D. Whorton, H. M. Smith, L. E. Camp, S. M. Meadows, Carl Smith, M. J. Green, L. M. Smith, A. E. Smith, R. L. Lee, D. S. Sayre, John Meadows, W. B. Anderson, F. M. Davis, E. B. Oliver, F. D. Oliver, J. M. Sims, S. H. Everette, J. E. Fitzpatrick, R. E. Henderson, J. T. Rowan, W. H. Wood, R. T. Smith, E. T. Hearrill, W. F. Reeves, J. B. Reeves, T. H. Gipson, Harvey Gipson, J. L. Cox, A. L. Barkley, V. H. Cox, S. T. Meadows, J. W. Cox, David Bobo, G. W. Cox, Day Gladden, C. M. Cox, Lee Day, G. T. Cox, Joe Bobo, John Bobo, R. L. Johnson, Virgie Bobo, J. A. Bobo, J. S. Johnson, Jeff Bobo, G. W. Wright, Smillie Wright, J. J. Everetts, F. T. Kirby, A. E. Reagan, L. E. Hardin, Larkin Henderson, C. L. Reagan, Grady Reagan, Chester Kirby, William Brock, Walas Gregory, E. B. Battles, C. C. Woodall, R. L. Goza, W. T. Reagan, J. A. Reagan, J. L. Rice, G. W. Bachelor, J. M. Bachelor, J. L. Fox, W. J. Oliver, W. J. Morgan, W. A. McKee, J. H. Oliver, J. H. Sheppard, J. H. Mitchell, Alex. J. Graves, H. F. Smith, M. C. Kirby, O. L. Hall, H. H. Smith, J. M. Collins, J. V. Mitchell.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope that during the brief time which I shall occupy I may discuss the question now under consideration without excitement or agitation. I am mindful of the fearful responsibility which must burden the heart of every Member of this House at this hour. I feel its weight as others feel it. I have hoped and prayed that this hour might not come, and even now I wish that the cup might pass from me. But the time has come when we must act. We must meet the responsibility and perform the duty like men. It can not be dodged. It ought not to be evaded.

It is not an easy thing nor is it a matter of light consequence to vote a nation into war. It is a step which ought not to be taken, except as a last resort, after every other means of adjustment of the difficulties has been exhausted. That time, however, has arrived in our relations with Germany. Every art of diplomacy has been tried. They have failed. Every power of persuasion has been invoked. That, too, has failed. Every appeal to justice, to international law, to the humane instincts of the heart has fallen on irresponsive ears. For nearly three years our Government has sought to protect our just rights among the family of nations. We were not responsible for the European war. We had no part in the things which produced it. All we have sought has been the preservation of the undisputed rights of a free people, rights for which our forefathers suffered and died, and rights which have been universally recognized by every civilized nation under heaven.

While we have for these many months sought to protect our people and preserve our national integrity by peaceful and patient methods, the German Government has murdered our citizens without warning; has violated our neutrality in countless ways; has sought to destroy our property on land and sea; has filled our friendly and hospitable land with spies; has made her embassy and consulates the nesting places for conspiracy and vicious intrigues; has sought to drive us and every other neutral nation from the high seas, the God-given highway of the nations; has sought to undermine the loyalty and devotion of our own citizens; and by the most brazen and astounding proposal of modern times has sought to array against us in bloody conflict two friendly nations with whom we are at peace, offering as a reward to one the partial dismemberment of our Republic.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not impugn the motives of any man who represents a constituency upon this floor. I like to believe that men are governed by their consciences in the performance of their public duties. But I have listened in vain for those who oppose their Government to-day to tell us what will be our status at home and before the world if this resolution declaring a state of war to exist shall be defeated. Must we not only continue to submit to injuries and insults and invasions of our sacred rights, but shall we by our vote give encouragement to greater brutality and hold our Nation up before the world as divided, impotent, and contemptible? Shall we give notice to the world in general and Germany in particular that we repudiate our President, the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, and brand him as being no longer worthy of confidence either at home or abroad? He has told us repeatedly the unparalleled efforts he has made to keep us out of war, and all who have been in touch with conditions have known that he has told the truth. We know that not since the great Lincoln has any President in the face of insult and injury manifested the sublime patience manifested by President Wilson. He has told us what we all must now acknowledge, that we can not longer choose the path of submission without surrendering, at the command of brute force, the cherished rights for the enjoyment of which our forefathers, through blood and sacrifice, set up this Nation, nearly a century and a half ago, and for the enjoyment of which the enlightened democracy of the world is yearning and fighting.

What, then, shall we do in this crisis? Shall we support our Government or shall we betray it? Shall we uphold the hands and the efforts of the President to maintain our rights, our honor, and our sacred traditions, or shall we haul down the flag and give universal notice that it is without meaning? Others may choose such course as their judgment may dictate, but as for me, I take my stand, without reservation and without apology, beside the President of my country and the flag of our fathers. [Applause.]

This conflict is not of our choosing. It has been forced upon us not by the will of the great German people, whom we have long admired, but by that ruthless, vain, inhuman, and barbarous remnant of the Middle Ages, which calls itself the Imperial German Government by right divine. To submit to such an autocracy or to consent that it shall impose its cruel and inhuman will or its debased standards upon a civilized world in which we are a part would be to repudiate the achievements of a glorious past and shame the memory of unnumbered heroes who have died in freedom's battles to rid the world of such a scourge, and while I abhor war and love peace, and have striven as best I could to help preserve our peaceful relations in the family of nations, in the crisis which now confronts our Nation I can not do less than my duty as God in His mercy and wisdom has given me light to see it. Wherefore I support the resolution and am ready to give whatever may be my portion, in sacrifice or service, to the cause of my country. [Applause.]

We are told that the step which we shall take to-day will involve the destruction of property and the loss of life. We are told by those who are not in harmony with the policy of their Government that to maintain our rights and our sovereignty and to protect our citizens in the enjoyment of freedom and their peaceful pursuits will involve the expenditure of money. No honest man will delude himself into the belief that war can be conducted without the expenditure of money, the destruction of property, and the loss of human life. No sincere man can fail to deplore the necessity for such a step. But if our forefathers, who established this Nation, had stopped to count the cost in money or property or in human lives we might not now be citizens of the greatest and freest Republic in the world's history. As I have listened during this debate to those who oppose this resolution, I have been wondering if they would have been opposed to a declaration of war if they had been members of the Continental Congress in 1776 because it would have involved the destruction of property and loss of life to have voted for independence of Great Britain, the mother country. There was no Nation, in the true sense of the word, in those days; there was no Republic; there was no Army and no Navy. It would have involved less danger to have submitted to the wrongs sustained by the Colonies at the hands of Great Britain. But they did not submit, and their heroic deeds have been the inspiration which has guided us in emulating their example in sacrifice and devotion to the cause of freedom. I have been wondering what would have been the result if the Members of Congress in 1812, when our seamen were impressed and our rights invaded by Great Britain, had raised their voices then against war with Great Britain, as these gentlemen raise theirs now against war with Germany, because it might entail destruction of property and loss of life.

When I hear gentlemen here say that in order to keep out of this conflagration we ought to withdraw our ships and our sailors from the high seas, or, if they are to be sent out with the products of our industry, that we should withdraw from them protection against cruel and unlawful assassination, I have been wondering whether 105 years ago to-day there were men in the American Congress who were willing to keep our sailors, then, from traversing the highway of nations, in order to keep out of war with Great Britain; and I have been wondering what would have been the result if, instead of fighting for our rights, we had cravenly abandoned them. I have been wondering what would have been the attitude of these gentlemen, if they had been Members of Congress in 1861, when the great War between the States was breaking upon our Nation. I have wondered if those who came from the North would have been willing to let the Southern States secede, or whether those who came from the South would have been willing to submit to what they believed was an unjust and unconstitutional invasion of their rights, as the price of peace between the two great sections. To ask this question is to answer it. On both sides of this great struggle, great principles, dear to the hearts of the people, were involved, and in asserting and maintaining those principles they lost sight of the material considerations that might be involved.

As I have listened to those who sought to excuse the German Government for the wrongs which have been perpetrated upon our citizens and upon our Nation, I have wondered whether they would have stood on the floor of this House in the Congress of 1898 and opposed war with the Kingdom of Spain, which was about to be fought in an unselfish way for the freedom of a brave and downtrodden people, because to enter such an undertaking meant the destruction of property or the loss of life.

And when I recall the statement of some that they would be in favor of upholding our rights and sustaining our Government if we were about to be actually invaded by a foreign enemy I would recall that Spain was not then either attempting or threatening to invade the United States. Neither had Mexico invaded the United States when we declared a state of war to exist with that Republic in 1846; neither had we been invaded by Great Britain, when we declared war upon her in 1812, and there had been no invasion of the thirteen Colonies by force of arms when they declared war against Great Britain in 1776 and started out on the perilous course of es-

tablishing their independence as a free nation. To say that war would only be justified in case of actual invasion would be to say that our Nation would only fight when our property was about to be taken and our ease and comfort about to be disturbed. Every war which we have been forced to fight since the Declaration of Independence has centered around the rights of humanity and the liberty of mankind. From the Revolutionary struggle on through every war, great and small, which has been fought by our Nation our flag has never been unfurled in battle nor our sword drawn in conflict except to strike shackles from the limbs of humanity or to give greater freedom to the hopes of men. [Applause.] Whether we have fought Great Britain or Spain, Mexico or among the Boxers of China our strength has always been exerted to free men from the burdens of tyranny, never stopping to count the cost to ourselves, if only we might carry the light of freedom and of hope to the people of the world, on land and sea alike. [Applause.]

Since the outbreak of the great war in Europe, the details of which have been so far beyond our comprehension, I have wondered if there might be back of it all some great divine purpose. It has appeared impossible that such sacrifice could be endured without affording some compensation to the people upon whom the burdens must fall. It has been my hope that out of it there might come a greater freedom, a greater portion of self-government among all the peoples of the world. And while the sacrifice has been untold and the burden heavy, if a great world-wide democracy should arise from the ashes, making it impossible in the future for autocratic rulers to engulf the world, or any portion of it, in the vortex of bloody war without the consent of the people, we may console ourselves with the feeling that, though the price has been great, the reward also will be great, not only for this generation but for countless generations yet unborn.

If this world war, as now appears, has resolved itself into a conflict between autocracy and democracy, between the rule of kings and the rule of the people, there is but one side upon which this Nation can take its stand and feel at home. That side is the side of democracy and the people. There ought to be no division among us upon such a question nor at such a time. As the President so feelingly and so truly said in his great message, we have no quarrel with the people of Germany. We hope that in the fullness of time they themselves may rise among the family of nations as a great republic, denying, as we have done, the right of any man to govern by mere accident of birth; and if at the end of this great conflict that shall be their portion, we shall be glad to welcome them among the world's republics. [Applause.]

It is against the wrongs of their autocratic and ruthless Government that we protest. It is in behalf of the inalienable rights of free peoples that we shall strike, if strike we must; and I hope and believe that when the clouds have cleared away, when the battle drums are hushed and the flags are furled again in peace, when the czars and kings, the emperors and kaisers shall have been dethroned and their malicious and secret diplomacy shall have been spewed from the mouths of men we may behold a self-governed, liberty-loving democracy set up in Europe and in all the world; and if our sword must be drawn in such a conflict, God grant that it may shine as with the light of heaven, and that our sacrifice and sorrow, and all that we are and all that we hope to be, may be sanctified and consecrated in the cause of a true civilization, hoping yet to see the dawn of that day of which the Master Himself was the great Advocate and Exemplar, "Peace on earth, good will to men." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. ROBERTS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to talk very long. I merely want to express the conviction of an humble Member of this House who feels deeply the responsibility resting upon him at this hour. It is true that politics makes strange bedfellows; but I am led to the conclusion that war makes still stranger bedfellows. All crowned heads look alike to me, and I do not want to sleep with any of them [applause], whether it be the Kaiser, the Mikado, John Bull, or even the Sultan of Turkey. This fight is not of our own making, and we had better keep out of it. I do not think Uncle Sam looks good mixed up with any of them. [Applause.] I come from the "battle-torn" State of this Nation, a State which has never shirked its responsibilities in time of war and never will; and if this Congress passes this resolution to-night I know that the people of my State will prove loyal and back up the administration, even if they do not approve of it. I am opposed to becoming allied with any foreign power, and that is what will happen. I have had three years of military training, and whatever that may mean for the good of my country I am ready to do. If it is necessary, I am ready to do my part, even to shouldering a musket, if we adopt this resolution. We have no quarrel with the German people themselves. As I stand here on the floor of this House and look at that picture of the Father of His Country looking down upon us I am thinking of his admonition to the people of this country to beware of entangling foreign alliances, and I can not lead myself to believe that we are following out his precepts.

I believe, my friends, we will get into trouble that will never end and which we will ever regret. You can not measure this matter in dollars, however; neither can you measure it in blood. It means that our children and our children's children will be paying for this war for years to come. For my part I shall oppose the resolution. I do not intend to vote my people into this awful affair. The people of Nevada gave Mr. Wilson a majority of 6,000 because they thought he would keep us out of war, while they gave me a majority of 1,000 because they were afraid I would get them into war. I tell you the people of this country do not want any war unless they know what they are warring about. They do not want to go to war on doubtful issues. Whenever the issue comes as it did in 1776 and 1861 they will arise to the occasion.

One distinguished gentleman here, for whom I have the highest regard, a moment ago said that this country was not invaded in 1776. If he will read his history, he will find out it was. I want to tell you that every man, woman, and child in this country would applaud if we would take both John Bull and the Kaiser and bump their royal noodles together, open up all seas, and treat them both alike. The average American citizen wants to do about what is right. He does not want to play any favorites. The average Congressman wants to do about what is right. He does not want to play any favorites, and, like the little schoolboy, if he has any sympathies at all they are always on the side of the "under dog." Ah, my friends, I want you to stop and think a moment. Do you want to send our boys to the trenches in Europe? I do not. These war germs are both epidemic and contagious. They are in the air, but somehow or other they multiply fastest in the fumes around the munition factories. You will not find many in our climate. They also multiply pretty fast in Wall Street and other money centers. I am opposed to declaring war to save the speculators.

I am not convinced that it is necessary for this Nation to become involved in war in order to maintain a strict neutrality. This awful European war was not based upon any just cause. No one contemplated its awful consequences. It came about by somebody going off "half cocked." Let us see to it that we do not do likewise. Remember that the lives we lost were only incidental to a fight being waged between other parties, neither of which desired to injure us. Both sides since the beginning of this war treated all neutrals with absolute disregard. Each party to the controversy has construed international law to suit itself.

Are we prepared to become the world's "big stick"? I think not. We are, however, not "going to go to sleep at the switch," but will prepare ourselves. We will support the administration with all our might as long as this fight is being waged, regardless of what our individual opinion may be at the time of the adoption of this resolution. It will go through and go through with a rush, but I do not feel justified in involving my people in war with all its awful consequences to maintain what to my mind, to say the least, are doubtful rights. Let our people who want to "joy ride" or trade or traffic in the war zones of either of the belligerents do so, but at their own peril and not with the sanction of this country.

I want to say to you I am going to act according to the dictates of my own conscience. I suppose some fellow will say that I am a coward. I hope he will do it to my face. I do not care whether he is in the House or where he is. I am voting as I believe for the best interests of the State I represent and the country I love. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for 10 minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay a tribute to the courage of those Members of the House who in the exercise of the responsibility cast upon them have had the courage to express their opposition to the pending resolution, and I want particularly to pay my tribute to the rare courage of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. [Loud applause.] I do not agree with them [applause], but this is a time when the Members of this body, aye, all the citizens of the country, have the right to express their opposition to the war, for to-morrow, when the war is declared, it will become the duty of all citizens to hold up the honor and the power of the Republic. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, for two years and a half I have done everything within my power, by voice and vote, to keep this country out of the European war. I have believed it was to the advantage not only of our people and our country, but to the advantage of civilization and humanity, that we should keep our skirts clear of war at this time. But, after all, it was not because I fear war. The American people may prefer peace, but not from cowardice. [Applause.] It is not because we are afraid to fight that we may have preferred to avoid a fight. But now, Mr. Chairman, the situation is changed. The President of the United States, who represents us in our dealings with foreign countries and who is the spokesman of the American people to the nations of the world, has asked us to declare war. We have a resolution to that effect pending before us, upon which we must vote. We must vote authority to declare war or must vote down the resolution. In either case we make a declaration to the world. What position will we be in both as to our own self-respect and the self-respect of the world if we should vote down the recommendation of the President and declare in effect to the world that we are afraid to go to war? [Applause.]

In my judgment, the only thing left for us to do is to stand by the President, elected by the people, carrying on the negotiations with the world [applause], and when we have declared the war, prosecute it as best we may.

I know the agony that comes from war. I am one of the few Members of this House who have voted once before to declare war, and many times since then I have almost regretted that vote. And yet we can not say to the world that our only goal is gold, that our only desire is wealth. We must, it seems to me, when the question is presented to us declare that we will maintain the rights of Americans abroad as well as at home. [Applause.] There is a difference between a deliberate affront to a nation and an incidental injury. We have had many incidental injuries both from England and Germany. A direct affront from either nation would have brought war long ago. Perhaps what we have suffered may have been incidental injuries. We know we have suffered many incidental injuries from Great Britain. We know we have suffered many incidental injuries from Germany. And yet, it seems to me, that now we are required to say a deliberate affront has been made to our Nation by the German Government, and having a deliberate affront there is nothing left for us to do but to follow the recommendation of the Chief Magistrate and engage in war and maintain our rights, our honor, our dignity, our civilization. [Loud applause.]

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FITZGERALD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration Senate joint resolution No. 1, declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial German Government and the Government and people of the United States, and making provision to prosecute the same, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Senate joint resolution No. 1.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, pending that I move that all general debate on that resolution be closed.

The SPEAKER. And pending that the gentleman from Virginia moves that general debate on the resolution be closed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, of course, anybody can cut it off. If the gentleman goes back into the Committee of the Whole under the five-minute rule, is it his intention to let the committee run along for such time as will probably be necessary to accommodate the wishes of all the Members who desire to speak?

Mr. FLOOD. That is my wish and my purpose. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that to-morrow is Good Friday, and some gentlemen would like to finish this bill before 12 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. It would be the legislative day of Thursday. A large number of the Members of the House early to-day gave their names to the Chairman, and it does seem to me that on a matter like this every Member of the House who desires to express his opinion should have at least a brief opportunity. I suggest to the gentleman from Virginia in advance that if nobody objects he might ask for general leave to extend now.

Mr. TALBOTT. I am not going to object, but I would like to have from three to five minutes, and I want it understood that I can have it.

Mr. MANN. I think we ought to stay here until every Member has had a chance to express his views.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion to go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, I make the request that every Member who desires to do so may have five legislative days in which to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. TALBOTT. I want to say what I have to say on the floor of the House.

Mr. FLOOD. I am not referring to the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. MANN. I suggest 10 days.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, 10 days, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD] asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen may have 10 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana reserves the right to object——

Mr. DUPRÉ. Do I understand the proceedings will follow after the agreement?

The SPEAKER. The debate will be under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MANN. Let us stay here long enough to give everybody a fair chance.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The gentleman from Illinois answered me in the way I expected him to answer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all Members may have 10 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. FIELDS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, that includes those who have not spoken as well as those who have?

The SPEAKER. Of course; it embraces 433 men.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask if it is the present intention of the committee, if this measure does not reach a stage where a vote can be taken to-night, to press its consideration to-morrow, in view of the fact that to-morrow will be Good Friday?

Mr. FLOOD. I made that suggestion. I would be very glad to have unanimous consent that a vote be taken at a quarter to 12 to-night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DUPRÉ. Reserving again the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have an understanding as to whether my colleague, Gen. ESTOPINAL, shall be allowed to speak 10 minutes on this subject?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not answer.

Mr. MANN. It is to be hoped so, but we can not tell.

The SPEAKER. I shall not be presiding in the Committee of the Whole. Otherwise I could answer the gentleman's question. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Now the gentleman from Virginia moves that general debate close. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The general debate is closed. Now the question is on the motion that the House go into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of Senate resolution No. 1.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] stated what seems to be the idea of the House, that all gentlemen should have the opportunity to express themselves. We go into the committee now under the 5-minute rule?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Necessarily an amendment, pro forma or otherwise, will have to be offered. Is that correct?

The SPEAKER. An amendment must be authorized to what?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. An amendment to the resolution, as I understand, whether it is pro forma or not. When an amendment is offered the mover of the amendment will have five minutes?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. And some other Member will have five minutes in which to reply?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will not that necessarily cut the participants down to a very few Members?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. MANN. Not under the proposition.

The SPEAKER. We can continue these proceedings until sunup. [Applause.] The question is on agreeing to the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of Senate joint resolution 1, declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial German Government and the Government and the people of the United States, and making provision to prosecute the same, with Mr. FITZGERALD in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 1. The Clerk will report the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial German Government and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same.

Whereas the Imperial German Government has committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial German Government; and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, after eight years in which I have gone up and down this country talking against war, being opposed to war under any form or for any reason, when after that position a man can come to the place where he is willing to admit that there are occasions when war is the only arbitrament and makes that decision, it takes as great or greater courage than it would take at this time to vote against this resolution. I say that it would be easier for me a thousand times to vote "no" than to vote "aye."

But, Mr. Chairman, we are facing the greatest national crisis in our history, and we have only two ways open to us. One is to accept a war, thrust upon us by the repeated aggressions of a power which recognizes no law but its own imperial will. The other is to defeat the resolution and adopt the policy of absolute submission.

The latter course to my mind is unthinkable. We simply can not and must not submit. Let anyone on the other side persuade me that we can preserve our principles, that we can stand by the ideals of our fathers and not forfeit anything in the way of national honor or sacrifice the principles of democracy in government, and I will vote "no," because I do not want to vote "yes." It is well enough for some men to get up here, as some have done, and argue for war; men who had no effect on me; not so much effect as that splendid gentleman, the leader of the majority, who showed by his remarks his absolute conviction and his absolute devotion to his ideal.

While I can not agree with him I am more influenced by him than by those who have been yelling war without giving any impression that they realize the tremendous issues involved. I know what war is from my experience as a volunteer in 1898, when the other side, who had charge of the administration, fed us rotten meat and embalmed food. We want none of that kind of management of military affairs. In supporting this resolution I want to say that while some here on this floor have intimated that we can not object in the future to what the administration may do I reserve the right and any man has the right to oppose by the strength of one vote at least any proposition which does not carry with it his own convictions.

To my mind, the time has come for action. We can not submit without denying the fundamental principles on which this Nation is based. I have listened to those gentlemen who vividly picture the horrors of war, but, Mr. Chairman, there are things in life worse than war. So thought our fathers who founded this Republic; so thought the great Lincoln when reluctantly he called the Nation to defend the principle of national unity. President Lincoln exercised the greatest patience before he made the final decision which meant for our people sacrifice and suffering which we in this day can only dimly realize. I am one of those who believe that there is no man in this Nation who would rather see this country kept out of war than President Wilson. He has patiently submitted to aggressions, endured insults to this country, hoping against hope that these aggressions and these insults would cease. Certain of our people have clamored for war almost from the beginning of the terrible European conflict. He has stood steadfast.

The President has been accused of vacillation when he should have been appreciated for his noble patience. The time has now come to act according to the decision of that man on whose heart the horrible possibilities of war rest with as heavy a burden as can possibly rest upon you and me. Every possible avenue of honorable escape has been scrutinized. Everything humanly possible to preserve this Nation in peace has been done by the President. I do not support his course blindly. I support his course because I can see no other way except that of submission to the tyranny of the autocratic Imperial German Government, whose heart has turned to stone, whose soul has become atrophied.

Some have asserted that our entrance into war means a departure from the wise counsels of Washington in his Farewell Address. I do not so construe it. To my mind we are not entering into foreign alliances, but we are resisting the attempt of a mad Government in its determination not only to deny all our rights upon the high seas but even dares through its spy system to disrupt our domestic affairs.

Mr. Chairman, I hate war. I hate war as Washington hated war. I hate war as Lincoln hated war. I hate war as President Wilson hates war; but there is no other way. The Imperial German Government has run amuck. Mad men are destroying civilization. Tyrants are threatening every principle and ideal of democracy. We must resist, and in resisting, in defending our national right, in standing for the higher ideals of humanity, we must do so with a full realization that it means consecrated service and genuine sacrifice. And in that sacrifice let us determine that our patriotism shall allow no special privilege. Let not wealth escape its responsibility. In behalf of the thousands who toil I urge that the present wealth of this country shall bear the present burden. Those who want conscription of men must insist on the conscription of gold. Labor will show its patriotism. Will wealth as faithfully accept its duty? If not, let this body in its revenue measures compel it.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote aye for this resolution, but I do so with a heavy heart, a saddened soul. I, too, have hoped for peace, prayed for peace, but I can not be of the number who cry "Peace, peace, when there is no peace." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen in and out of Congress who oppose this war resolution find solace in an argument which runs somewhat like this: "Because some 200 Americans have been killed is it right to sacrifice the lives of countless thousands of the flower of our youth, only to slake our thirst for vengeance?"

My friends, the American people have no blood lust. No thirst for vengeance animates us. Deeply as we lament the loss of our dead, it is not to avenge them that we put our armor on. A higher purpose animates us. Shoulder to shoulder with the world's democracies we go to war for the rights of man.

In 1775 the embattled farmers of Massachusetts lighted the fire of war because they loved liberty. Doubtless the pacifists of those days, in the name of American mothers, protested against the slaughter of our manhood. Doubtless they told their countrymen that a sordid question of taxation was not worth the bloodshed which war entailed. Patrick Henry in the Virginia House of Burgesses gave to history the tale of those timid souls who cried "Peace, peace, when there is no peace."

In 1861 the Southern Confederacy fired on the Union flag at Fort Sumter. Not a single life was lost; only a flexible fabric was shot to pieces. Yet we went to war. Perhaps the pacifists of those days thought at heart that the difficulty could readily be settled for the cost of a new fort and the price of a new flag. But the North and the South, brothers in character and in manhood, settled their differences in no such mean fashion. They settled their differences like men, not like money changers on the corners of the streets.

For two years on the battle fields of Europe autocracy trampled on democracy, but to-day democracy all the wide world over is struggling to its feet, and now it is autocracy's turn to tremble. Too long have we allowed other nations to fight our

battle for civilization and popular government. Too long have we occupied the spectator's slothful seat. To-day we leave that seat of ease and we enter the arena of blood and lust, where true men are to be found.

To-day I listened when that great North Carolinian who leads the Democratic side of this House spoke so movingly against this resolution. I know full well how much his decision cost him; I know full well that nothing but his conscience dictated his course. Politically his interests must needs lie in the opposite direction. Men in this House who to-day will vote against the war will when the die is cast outstrip in patriotism many of us whose beliefs lead us to vote for this resolution. From the time that war is declared the United States will have no stouter champions than some of the men who to-day will vote for peace. As for the rest, we shall not heed them.

Let him who wavers lag behind. It is nothing to us whether he follows the fanciful mirage of pacifism or the yellow banner of timidity, or whether he displays the red flag of socialism. We fight for the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this resolution as a patriotic duty. I shall vote for it in the same spirit with which over half a century ago I offered my young manhood to my country on a similar call from President Lincoln, although I fully realize that our action to-day will bring more rejoicing to the descendants of old King George III at London than any act in the world's history since Wellington's victory at Waterloo and Napoleon's exile to St. Helena.

I shall vote for it because our present duly elected Chief Magistrate has said to us, in effect, that he has exhausted all proper means of avoiding war with a nation which, happily, heretofore has been at peace with us during all our national life. As the President has well said, "It is a most fearful thing to lead this great, peaceful people into war," but his is the responsibility; our duty, in a sense, is of lesser degree—that common to all official and patriotic citizenship.

I represent a district in which there are many so-called pacifists, sturdy, rugged, conscientious believers in the peaceful doctrines of William Penn, nonresistants, if you please, and yet men and women of the type of martyrs, unafraid in any human presence. I honor them. Family traditions and teaching point me in the same direction; and yet, as in the lurid days of the Civil War, placing country above family ties or personal considerations, I must respond to duty as I understand it, answer the call of the President, and stand by him in matters of immediate concern such as the resolution we are now considering, reserving only matters of conscience and the future exercise of deliberation and judgment on doubtful governmental policies which may or may not arise after the exigencies of the hour shall have passed.

With me it is not a matter of excitement or hysteria caused by war propagandists or aroused by the more serious and burning words of the President. I do not agree in sentiment with all he has said; I have felt that absolute neutrality, even to the extent of an embargo on the shipment of arms and ammunition to belligerents, was the duty of this great Republic, and I am loth to waiver in judgment in this respect, yet when I returned to Washington on the day before the meeting of this extraordinary session of Congress and found on my office desk awaiting me many friendly letters and telegrams of advice, some making demands with which I could not comply, and a few making threats, which were ignored as unworthy, I at once, without hesitancy or doubt, wrote to my good friends of peace the following letter, omitting only the names:

OFFICE OF D. A. HOLLINGSWORTH, M. C.,
EIGHTEENTH OHIO DISTRICT,
WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 1, 1917.*

RESPECTED FRIENDS: I have your interesting and, I assure you, most appreciated letter on peace and good will among men and nations, now in imminent danger of being broken, which I regret certainly as much as anyone can, my own early training, environment, and feelings being much like your own, but I fear we are approaching a condition where not to stand by the President—elected for four years by the people, and the only one we have or can have in the present emergency—would be like attempting to tie the hands and embarrass the executive branch of the Government, a thing which I feel no Member of Congress ought to be expected to do in such an hour of national peril.

This does not mean that all Members of Congress should follow him in extreme ideas for the future, such as the construction of big battleships in large numbers which can not possibly be put in commission until after present dangers are past, or in big standing armies for the future formed by compulsory military training; in other words, abandoning the ideals of the Republic for the reactionary ideals of monarchy. My hope has been that permanent peace and disarmament might come together.

And, writing on the eve of a possibly fateful to-morrow, I yet have hope that the dire extremity of war may be avoided with honor, and that America may yet be able to lead the nations upward by means other than the sword.

But if war comes, or the alternative of national dishonor be presented, my instincts, feelings, and endeavors will be with my country, its flag, and American ideals.

Very respectfully, D. A. HOLLINGSWORTH.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. I do not think I will need that much time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DECKER] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Congress, the time has come for us all to stand by that flag. [Applause.] But let us not forget what that flag stands for. That flag stands for a constitutional government. [Applause.] That flag stands for a free government. That flag stands for a government where the President executes the laws, where the Supreme Court interprets the laws, where the Congress makes the laws, and one of those laws is the law that says peace or war. A Representative is not a traitor who stands to-night and voices his honest convictions on the questions of peace or war. I do not insinuate against my fellow men. It takes courage for an honest man to vote for war, and I pause to pay some of you men, all in fact, my tribute. But I say a Representative is a traitor and a coward who believes as I believe and does not say so to-night, the last chance on earth which I may have to protest against this war and still be a loyal American. [Applause.] The argument of the gentleman from Illinois, and I respect him greatly, was the one that made me pass these sleepless nights this week. All of you know how I feel on this question, but I kept saying to myself, "What can I do, I do not want to cast a vote that may do harm, but I do not want to cast a dishonest vote." You told me a year ago when I raised my voice against what I thought would lead to war, that I was premature. To-night you can not tell me I am too late. There must be a proper time somewhere, as a situation like this develops, for a Representative to speak for or against war. [Applause.] When I speak to-night I speak as a man who loves his country. I have but one question to decide. Is this war a good thing for my country? I do not believe it is a good thing for my country, for my country's honor. I do not think it is a good thing for the world and I love the people of the world, although I have not seen much of it, but they are all human, made by the same God. I suppose when I say this the gentleman from Alabama will say I am affected by propaganda. It may be a propaganda, but it is a propaganda that started over nineteen hundred years ago to-morrow when One died that men might live and love one another.

You may say I am not good enough to refer to Him, but even the wicked sailor in the storm at sea has the right to pray. I can not forget that next Sunday is Easter morning. I do not believe this war is a good thing for my country. I believe in national honor; yes, I do. I have yielded my rights sometimes, and so have you, and still not sacrificed my honor. I have voted to yield rights for the sake of peace. I do not believe I have voted to sacrifice honor. Sometimes we have to pay a price for peace. You can not maintain every national right all the time and still not have war most of the time. I would not intentionally sacrifice national honor. You can call it submission if you please, but I do not believe that we would sacrifice the national honor if we refused to go to war at this time, because if a nation sacrifices its right for an honorable purpose, no man can say that that nation has dishonored itself. England can not dishonor us, Italy can not dishonor us, Germany can not dishonor us; we alone can dishonor ourselves. We may give up some of our rights for a noble purpose—that is not dishonor.

Ah, gentlemen, many have asked the question, which I asked myself day and night since the President came, what will they say if we should defeat this resolution? What would Germany say, what would proud, haughty Germany and the German people whom the President says we love, but are ruled by a madman, say? What would the German people say, what would the Italians say? What would England say? I do not mean King George; I do not mean alone the men that sit around the cabinet table, but I want to know what the English people would say. I think I know what they would say; I think I know what the people of Germany would say if the American Congress should exercise its power—a power that it can not delegate—and defeat this resolution. I think I know what they would say.

They might not say it to-night when the blood lust is on. They might not say it when the storm of war is on. But after the war is over I think I know what they would say. After they begin to stagger home with eyes that can not see, begin to stagger home with bodies partly shot away, begin to stagger home to firesides where the chairs are empty, when they begin to take up the burdens of this war I think I know what they would say. They would say, "Would to God that we, too, had

lived in a Republic like America, where the American Congress before it voted for war kept in mind the wishes and welfare of the people who have to do the dying when the war has come." [Applause.]

Oh, I do not mean that the rich men will not die. God knows they are patriotic men, the most of them. They will give up their money and some of them will bare their breasts. My friends, look to the future of your country and be careful not to confuse vanity and honor. I am for my country, Mr. Chairman; yes, I am. I am for my country. This is my last argument against this war if this resolution passes.

To thine own self be true,
And it must follow, as the night the day,
Thou canst not then be false to any man.

I shall vote against this resolution. I wish that I had the power to defeat this resolution. I would if I could, and assume the responsibility before my God and my fellow man. But if I can not, you will have to admit I have done all I could in my humble way.

To-morrow I am like you; I am for the prosecution of the war which my country has declared. Let me tell you something. Some who are for this war say they will vote against conscription. I will not say that. It may be necessary. I am the son of a Union soldier. We had conscription during the Civil War. They had it in the South the first year and in the North the second year of the war. They are bleeding France white; they are bleeding England white; they are bleeding Germany white; and yet if you go into this war I can not say that I will not vote to bleed my own people white for the sake of that flag, because when we are in the war all will have to admit that it is a democracy against imperial Germany, and I am for my country, God helping me. [Applause.]

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I have felt from the first that if this great war in Europe lasted long enough we were almost sure to be drawn into it, just as we were drawn into the last great European war in the days of Napoleon, and I have at times criticized the President for what seemed to me his lack of vision, in delaying preparedness for a whole year, and for utterances that could have no other effect in a world of war madness than to make the belligerent nations think that America had lost entirely the spirit of '76, and was so engulfed in prosperity and pleasure seeking, and in dreams of world peace, that it would allow itself to be trampled upon and its rights invaded indefinitely without resistance. But since the magnificent address that was delivered by the President to this Congress on Monday evening last I am sure no one can have any disposition to criticize. I do not see how anybody who listened to his words on that memorable occasion can hesitate for a moment as to his duty. We should be glad, "now that we see the facts with no veil of pretense about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world."

We have been patient, altogether too patient, in the face of a long series of outrages and murders of our citizens on the great ocean highway. The list of Americans who have lost their lives, and of American ships destroyed, as set forth in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is appalling, and it seems incredible to me that there can still be men in this House who seek to find excuses for these things, and intimate that we should continue to temporize over them and submit to them. Now that we are on the verge of war I think it should be said that these gentlemen who have been continually crying "Peace, peace, when there is no peace," are not without a share of responsibility for bringing on war. They have at times made so much noise that the Imperial Government of Germany has in all probability been led to doubt whether the Congress would support the President in a declaration of war.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago, on March 6, 1916, when the discussion began on the McLemore resolution, which would have served notice upon the world that our American Nation did not propose to give any measure of protection to its citizens going about their business by way of the sea, I said:

If we are going to be so cowardly as to say in advance that we are not going to give them any protection, I, for one, feel as though I should like to renounce my American citizenship. I do not like to belong to a Nation of such cowards.

But this is not a Nation of cowards. Of course nobody wants war, but that does not mean that we should keep out of war at the cost of national respect, at the cost of everlasting dishonor and disgrace. There appear to be still some people who do not understand the situation, but the American people have always risen nobly to face every other crisis, and they will not be found wanting in this one when they, too, "see the facts with no veil of pretense about them."

Mr. Chairman, we ought to pass this resolution unanimously. [Applause.]

Mr. ESTOPINAL. Mr. Chairman, this is not the time for words; it is the time for action. We have been very patient with both the allies and the central powers in their interference with our rights on the seas. But the allies have had the color of international law for their acts, and their transgressions, beyond the plain provisions of that law, were more or less of minor significance and amenable to processes of arbitration and discussion. They did not involve the intent of hostility, the wanton destruction of life and property. They were irritating, but not sinister. But the actions of Germany are, and have been for some time past, sinister attacks, not to say open warfare, which have destroyed without warning the lives and the property of American citizens.

There is no justification in international law for a mandate which forbids our ships to sail the open seas. We can not recognize the closing of open trade channels by mere declaration, and we would be but a collection of cravens should we submit to such imposition from any nation on earth.

What Germany has been imposing on us is so patent a violation of American rights and of international law that it is bootless to even discuss it. It is as plain as the noonday sun.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the pending resolution, but it is with a feeling of deep sorrow that I shall do so, notwithstanding my indignation at the causeless murders, wanton destruction and contempt for our rights which have called us to action. Warfare is such an inconclusive method for human adjustments. In the civilized world science has brought life to such a fullness—such a state of repletion of opportunity—that it seems almost beyond reason that we should have to hark back to the savagery of warfare.

At this time the world is progressing in the discovery and utilization of those things which contribute to human advancement, and which should contribute to a new spirituality more in generations than it formerly progressed in millenials. But instead of science, with all its achievements in linking people together, rescuing us from this relapse to barbarism, it is contributing to make this war a hell of ingenious destructiveness.

And it is not only, Mr. Chairman, with a feeling of sorrow that I shall vote for this resolution, but equally with a sense of humiliation that this great Nation, which was founded on a manhood basis for human rights and dedicated to the purpose of promoting freedom, justice, and equality, should not have been able by example and precept to bring harmony of purpose and action to the world.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have no alternative. A great people not ready and willing to maintain their rights are no longer a great people. And a nation filled with such people must inevitably finally dissolve of its own weaknesses, of its own ineptness, and sink to oblivion under the weight of the contempt of the world and its impositions.

As we enter this war it will be with no illusions. We know that our opponents are still strong, notwithstanding the depletions of war. We know that Germany has mobilized her entire civil population, to support her military forces. They have hundreds of thousands of prisoners whom they are compelling to labor, and they have expatriated from the conquered sections hundreds of thousands of French, Belgians, Poles, and so forth, as additional economic support to their armed forces.

We may have to use tens of billions of dollars, millions of men, and a vast aggregation of mechanical instruments of destruction. We will be in actual alliance with nations, both of the east and the west, which have vast reserve forces of men more or less untrained and unequipped and without competent machinery to make them capable of extending the aid which they will be ambitious to give and which the situation may require from them. These nations must look in part to our vast mechanical energy, our engineering skill, and our science to prepare them for the first and second line of offense; and we must respond to their needs to the fullest extent. These combined powers may be needed to literally blast a way through the German ring of men and steel and concrete—to project through this ring a weight of steel from batteries of artillery the like of which the world has never imagined.

We must be prepared to pay this price to relieve the world of the menace of a whole people gone mad. That this can be done and will be done, if necessary, is as certain as that the sun will shine to-morrow.

But the earnest prayer of these United States will be, Mr. Chairman, that a sober thought of the German people will cause them to rise against the cruel military machine which holds them and halt this enormous preparation for destruction by a demand for peace.

Mr. Chairman, as my time is very short, I wish to make just a few remarks in response to some statements I heard upon this floor to-day in respect to the youth of the country. One

man depicted the battle field and the scenes upon the battle field between the lines, the horrors of the battle field, and he pointed to the Speaker and said that he had a son who stood beside him all day long in his position in this House, and asked him if he would send that son to the war. I say to you that the youth of this country are prepared to defend their country. It is not true that the youth of this land will not respond to the country's call. [Applause.] It is not true that we will have to resort to conscription. I believe that 500,000 men will be raised in 30 days when the President calls for volunteers. I believe that the northern boys and the southern boys and the western boys and the eastern boys will respond to their country's call, and I would be humiliated and would want to change my citizenship if I thought the youth of our country would not respond to that call to defend the country's honor and its rights. [Applause.]

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, I think I realize as fully as I am capable of realizing anything the great responsibility which rests upon this House to-night. I think I appreciate the awful character of modern war and what it means to those engaged therein, whether on the battle field, in the walks of industry, or in the homes of anxiety and sorrow. I recognize the dreadful toll that war exacts of human life, shattered bodies, sightless eyes, and broken hearts; but, as much as I realize and appreciate these things, I shall support the resolution. I shall do so without hesitation, with the firm conviction that I am acting in accordance with my duty as a Member of this House, for I deeply feel that our Nation has gone as far to preserve peace as any nation can go without forfeiting the right to the confidence and respect of its citizens; that this war is not of our making, but has been forced upon us; and if we free Americans are to continue to breathe the air of freedom and independence that we can not ignobly submit, but must accept the gage of battle so unfairly, so unjustly, and so brutally cast at our feet, and we must fight with all our strength and all our resources, at whatever sacrifice it may be necessary to make, that we may maintain our rights, uphold the cause of civilization and humanity, preserve our liberties, and safeguard our institutions, so that our beloved country, with undiminished power for usefulness, for human happiness, and for good, may endure to bless the countless generations yet to be. [Applause.]

Mr. TALBOTT. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to address the House on this resolution, because every man, woman, and child in the congressional district that I represent knows as well as they know that they live that I am for my country and for every right that belongs to it on the land or on the sea. [Applause.] I would not make an address at all, except some gentlemen have addressed the House and have indicated that there is a lack of preparation for this emergency. That is not correct. This Nation to-day is prepared to meet any other naval power on the globe except England. Man for man, gun for gun, ship for ship, we can lick the world; and it is not good taste and it is not patriotism to try to convey to the people of this land that we are not prepared when we are. [Applause.] We are a great deal better prepared than the world knows of, and it is good policy that the world should not know all that we are doing and have been doing in the past. This resolution is going to be adopted, and it is a very serious and a very critical time in the history of this Nation. War is all that Gen. Sherman said it was, and he helped to make it so [laughter], and I would tell him so if he were alive.

I had a little something to do with it, not very much, but in my humble way I did, and I do not wish to talk about it. What in the world is this Nation to do? What in the world can we do except fight, and we know how? We have got to fight. Now, do not be uneasy, do not be at all uneasy, about the outcome. It is going to cost some money and it is going to cost some lives. Now, this war is not half as vital as some people think. It is not half as dangerous just now as some people think. We had a hearing in the Committee on Naval Affairs where everybody asked questions, although I did not ask many. Admiral Benson, I think, was on the witness stand. I said to him, "Admiral, if this country was to get into trouble and we had to transport an army to the Philippines or to Hawaii or to some place and as admiral of the Navy you would be called upon to see that they got there safely, what is the first thing you would do?" He said, "The first thing I would do would be to clear the ocean of the enemy's fleet." Now, that is all in a nutshell. [Laughter and applause.] That is the whole case. Now, before the enemy gets here they must clear the ocean of our fleet. For God's sake, let us have a fleet and have one that they never will clear off the ocean. [Applause.] Now, that is all of it. We need not fear invasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TALBOTT. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes additional. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TALBOTT. We need not fear any power on earth so long as we have a Navy, one that can not be cleared off the sea. It is the duty of our people to see that we have a Navy like that and to maintain it. You know I am the proudest man in this House, and I have a right to be. I introduced in the Forty-seventh Congress the original resolution giving authority to the Naval Affairs Committee to take up the question of the rehabilitation of the Navy of the United States and had it passed, and introduced an amendment that established the gun factories. I am a Navy man, and I believe a navy is the one safeguard of this Nation [applause], and if you will only have a Navy you can lick the world. [Applause.] Now, I am not going to talk about the resolution. Everybody knows who knows anything about me that I am ready to fight at the drop of a hat. [Applause.] And I am ready for my country to fight at the drop of a hat, and I am going to maintain that position as long as I represent my people, and I do not believe my people will ever change me as long as I say that. [Applause.] Now, some gentlemen may for various reasons vote against this resolution. Some people may say, I have got this kind of a constituency or that kind of a constituency. They are all mistaken. Any man who votes here because he has got a constituency of a certain nationality and votes to please them makes a mistake. [Applause.] I want him to know that the people who he is voting to please came here to get rid of that kind of a government. [Applause.] That is why they are here. They are not here because they love us so much, but they hated where they came from. [Laughter and applause.] I want to tell you one thing. Do not you think for a moment that by so voting you are going to please them. They will not respect you for that vote. [Applause.] And the people that agree with the President of the United States and me will not respect you. [Applause and laughter.] So you are going to be caught, like the nigger's coon trap, agwine and acomin'.

I did not intend to talk at all if certain gentlemen had not insinuated that we were not prepared and that the Democratic administration had not done its duty. Otherwise I would not have opened my mouth. They have been doing nothing for the last four years except getting ready for this thing. [Applause.] That is all. For four years they have been getting ready for this condition. You rascals, you had control of the country for 40 or 50 or 60 years and you did not prepare. You had the House and Senate, and the distinguished ex-Speaker [Mr. CANNON] stated he did not want any partisan discussion. Why, the gentleman was Speaker of the Republican House for six years. Why in the devil did not you get ready for this thing? [Applause.] But, gentlemen, let us all forget our shortcomings. It is the right thing to do—forget our shortcomings. There is no particular credit to our party and no credit at all to yours for this condition. We are now on the verge of war, and it is going to be a big war I expect, if it is one at all, and we must all stand together, man to man and shoulder to shoulder. The old Confederate will join the old Union soldier, the sons of the old Confederates and the sons of the old Union veterans will all join together and we will have a great big United States victory as the outcome of this war. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, the real ring of Americanism appears in the following words of the President in his message on Monday:

> There is one choice we can not make, we are incapable of making; we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

The plaudits of the American people responded to that sentiment in the most patriotic spirit. During the progress of the debate in the Senate, as well as in the debate here to-day, the events which have led up to the momentous action we are soon to take have been thoroughly explained and brought forth in chronological order. It is unnecessary for me to rehearse them. Wanton destruction of American property, official intrigue with spies, insults to American citizens and representatives, loss of American lives on foreign and American ships tend to one end indicative of the evident feeling toward this country of the ruling power in Germany.

The Imperial German Government has shown its absolute disregard for its treaties and its promises to this Government since

the war began. The crisis came when the German Government notified this Government that it would no longer respect the rights of the American flag on the high seas and would destroy American commerce and American life in its submarine warfare.

We are proud that there are in this country to-day thousands of loyal Americans who either by birth or ancestry have German blood in their veins. We will find none more loyal to the Stars and Stripes than these very men and women.

We have been too patient and too long suffering as a Nation. If I were to offer any criticism of the conduct of the administration, it would be that it too long delayed taking the step it did on Monday in asking Congress to declare war upon Germany. We are to-day only in a formal manner performing the duty we owe to our country and our flag in placing them above German threats and treacherous conduct.

In the destruction of American property and the taking of American lives Germany has waged war upon us too long without resistance. A one-sided war is an impossibility, and a continuation of this condition would simply mean that we intended to make exactly the choice the President said we were incapable of making, namely, "submission."

The President well said that we have little concern over the loss of property—

> Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people can not be.

A few sentences further on he said:

> Our motive will not be revenge or the victorious assertion of the physical might of the Nation, but only the vindication of right, or human right, of which we are only a single champion.

We realize that we are right, that this country has done its full duty in the vigorous effort to avoid the step we take to-day, but I for one feel that never has a nation become involved in a conflict with a more just cause than ours. The accumulation of insults and indignities has now gathered for nearly two years, and when the so-called war zone was established and notification given that "all ships met within that zone will be sunk," we reached the point where forbearance could no longer be expected and patience ceased to be a virtue. Nothing more can be expected of this Government; nothing less would be either patriotic or human. This Nation has never yet failed in any undertaking, and it will not fail in the present one. By the adoption of this resolution to-night we give notice to the Imperial German Government that every resource with which we are possessed is to be used in carrying out the purpose of the resolution. The sooner that Government awakens to this fact the shorter will be the duration of the struggle and less the cost in lives and money.

We know not whither the emergency of the hour will lead us, but we do know that it will eventually bring us to the goal of a triumphant peace. The way has been pointed out, and the President's address receives an almost unanimous response from the Congress and from the American people.

It is true our hearts are heavy. Such action as we are about to take can not bring joyful exuberance, but we, as the representatives of the American people, could be almost classed as cowardly were we not willing to-day to face our responsibility and vote for the adoption of the resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this is not a time for recriminations. It is not a time to speculate upon what might be under different conditions. It is not a time to criticize, to find fault with what has been done and can not be undone. It is not a time to present our personal views as to what we might have done if charged with the responsibility in the place of what others have done charged with that responsibility. We are to-night facing one of the most momentous occasions in the history of the American people. We are called upon to perform one of the most solemn and one of the most difficult duties that devolves upon men in public life.

Following the address of the President of the United States, we are asked to say by our votes that as a matter of fact the Imperial German Government has committed repeated acts of war upon the American people. That is the one single question before the House at this time. Has the Imperial German Government committed repeated acts of war against the American Government and the American people, and are we to have the manhood and the courage to meet the situation and to accept the challenge that has been thrown at us by that Government? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I abhor war. I have hoped that our people might escape being embroiled in any of the existing conflicts. My sympathies are not sufficiently with some of the parties to this conflict to make me wish that our people should in any way contribute to their success. But this is not a time for personal prejudice or inherited bias to affect Members of this House in the discharge of their solemn responsibilities and duties. We are a great, powerful, and a patient—very patient people. All of the belligerents, practically, have infringed our rights; but the one belligerent that has defiantly and arrogantly and contemptuously committed act after act in derogation of our rights and in contempt of our power is now arraigned at the bar of public opinion, and we are called upon to pass judgment upon it. I have heard it urged as an objection to the adoption of this resolution that we are to be embroiled in entangling alliances with foreign nations.

Mr. Chairman, I sometimes delight in wondering whether the spirits of the immortal great revisit the scenes of their activities. I attempt to picture what they might do under the changed conditions which they would find. And I feel to-night that it would be intensely interesting to know that if the spirit of Washington should look down upon us what it would prompt us to do at this time. He did not hesitate to engage in deadly conflict in order to free the American people and to erect for the admiration of mankind this free Government so beneficial to our own people and so inspiring to peoples aspiring to freedom the world over. After he had gone into retirement enshrined in the hearts of the American people for his disinterested and patriotic services, he was called out to take command of the military forces of our Government when it appeared that war would be the only way in order to resist what then threatened to be an invasion of our rights.

Sometimes I speculate upon what would happen if the spirit of the immortal La Fayette would come into our presence to-night. [Applause.] Those companion pictures set upon either side of the Speaker's desk should be an inspiration upon this occasion. There was no question of an entangling alliance with France during the dark days of our revolution. There was no fear that some foreign power might be united with us in a common purpose. In this great and solemn hour of our existence, looked down upon as we are in spirit by Washington and La Fayette, and recalling those early days of our struggle for our freedom, we should be strengthened in the determination to unite for the destruction of the great outlaw nation of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if we do what we should do to-night, it is not an inconsiderate thing. It means sacrifice. It means heartrendings. It means bloodshed. It means overwhelming burdens of taxation for the American people. But there are some things worse than war, worse than sacrifice, worse than toil and burdens and hardships. Nothing is more contemptible or to be more condemned than that state of a people when they have so lost their self-respect that they will not uphold and maintain those rights and those things which alone entitled them to rank with the independent, self-respecting nations of the world. [Applause.]

Our relations with Germany are different from those existing with France and Great Britain. They have done us grievous wrong, largely wrongs to our property rights. They can be and should be, and, if I know the temper of the American people, will be redressed within reasonable time.

The situation which we are confronting is not identical with the Mexican situation. The organized and constituted authorities of Mexico did not commit repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States. There were expeditions against our people. They were by bandits and lawless bands. There were attacks against our people by irresponsible factions. There was one act that might have been considered an act of war by the American Government; but great, powerful, long-suffering, and ever patient, our people have endeavored to avoid being precipitated into conflict. We have not been quick to take offense. They have ignored acts which justified forcible resentment. No one can charge that Woodrow Wilson has hurried this Nation into war. [Applause.] Only the imperative and unavoidable necessity of the occasion compelled him to lay before us these unanswerable arguments in his memorable address of April 2 and to ask the action we are now about to take.

I regret that we are to have war; but if we are to maintain our self-respect, if we are to encourage the cultivation and development of those virile and patriotic virtues among our citizens, without which our Government can not and should not survive, if we are not to become the laughing stock of mankind, mocked at and reviled by every other nation of the world, if we

are not to be derided and sneered at as a Nation of degenerates, of money changers, and of cowards, is anything left to do consistent with a decent self-respect than to acknowledge the unquestioned fact that the German Government has waged war against us, to accept the challenge that has been so recklessly repeated in continued acts of war and aggression against us, and to meet it like and in the only manner befitting a great and a patriotic and a manly Nation? [Applause.]

I shall vote for the pending resolution. But more will be necessary. I am ready to pledge to the administration, in the words of the resolution, all of the resources of the country in order to bring this conflict to a successful termination.

This is a critical occasion. It calls for the exercise of courage. I concede to all the same conscientious and patriotic motives that I know actuate my action. Fully conscious of the grave responsibility resting upon me, realizing the seriousness of the action proposed, I shall support the resolution because of an overwhelming conviction that it is the imperative duty of the United States to cooperate with every nation in making common warfare against the common enemy of the civilized world. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SIEGEL] is recognized.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Chairman, on March 1 I voted for the armed-ship resolution. I pointed out then that under international law and under the very terms of the treaty existing between the United States and Germany we were acting strictly within our rights. I expressed the hope that the effect of the passage of the resolution might be the means of saving us from being participants in the most terrible conflict that man has witnessed. It is, however, now evident that merely arming our ships is of no avail. At the very moment that the President was delivering his message came the news that the *Aztec*, supposedly protected by having naval guns and gunners on board, had been torpedoed at night without warning and a number of American citizens killed. Is there any Representative here who can truly deny that the German Government has committed many wrongful acts against our people; that it has tried to create trouble for us with Japan and Mexico; that it has permitted its submarines to torpedo our vessels, killing Americans regardless of whether they were men, women, or children and, according to its own announcement, is prepared to sink American ships on their way to Europe and return without notice and without warning, whether in the restricted area or without?

Let me call your attention to an additional fact, not generally known. At my request we sent the cruiser *Des Moines* and the collier *Caesar* to Alexandria, from which port they were to proceed to Beirut to rescue about 1,000 women and children in order to have them reembark in Spain for the United States. Does Germany guarantee the safety of these American women and children? No. She declines to expressly guarantee their safety from attack by her submarines. I have been repeatedly asked for months whether this intolerable condition was to be endured forever. Let me say to the credit of the men in the Department of State that they have begged and beseeched for action. They have shared our belief that Americans abroad must be protected. Weighing all these facts, is there any man who can upon his conscience say that these acts do not constitute war? It does not require any legal acumen or stretching of the reasoning powers to immediately reach that conclusion. What more shall we allow Germany to do before recognizing the true state of affairs?

The lives of our citizens have been systematically taken from us, our commerce has been violently interfered with, and our rights as men and citizens have been trampled upon. History will record that we were extremely patient under these most trying circumstances. The mission of the United States is peace. I have come from a people that for thousands of years have been taught to love peace. I can not shut my eyes or close my ears to the fact that, though we cry peace, Germany answers by warring against us.

No man who will cast his vote here to-day has given more consideration and deliberate thinking to this most serious problem than I have. I shall not hide the fact that I have spent several sleepless nights pondering over what was the best course to pursue in this great crisis. My final decision was greatly strengthened by these words of Col. Roosevelt:

> We are the citizens of a mighty Republic consecrated to the service of God above, through the service of man on this earth. We are the heirs of a great heritage bequeathed to us by statesmen who saw with the eyes of the seer and the prophet. We must not prove false to the memories of the Nation's past. We must not prove false to the fathers from whose loins we sprang, and to their fathers, the stern men who dared greatly and risked all things that freedom should hold aloft an undimmed torch in this wide land. They held their worldly well-being as dust in the balance when weighed against their sense of high duty, their fealty to lofty ideals. Let us show ourselves worthy to be their sons. Let us care, as is right, for the things of the body; but let us show that we care even more for the things of the soul. Stout of heart and pledged to the valor of righteousness, let us stand four-square to the winds of destiny, from whatever corner of the world they blow. Let us keep untarnished, unstained, the honor of the flag our fathers bore aloft in the teeth of the wildest storm, the flag that shall float above the solid files of a united people, a people sworn to the great cause of liberty and of justice, for themselves, and for all the sons and daughters of men.

That there is no other alternative is now being recognized by all men who have the best interests of the Nation at heart, and although they may have heretofore differed regarding the policy to be adopted with Germany, they are now united, and one striking example of that is shown in the attitude of the New York American, which yesterday printed a long editorial upholding the President and closing with these words:

> The American has stood for the postponement of war to the last possible moment of postponement. The President has declared convincingly that the last moment has passed.
>
> We are now for the strongest and most effective war that it is possible for our great Nation to make.
>
> When the President, with all the information that we can have and with other information that we can not have, solemnly declares that the German Government means to make war upon us at a moment which will be most opportune for it, the only possible course of sense and safety is for us to make war at the moment which is most opportune for us.
>
> That strategic moment is now.
>
> War it is. So be it! Let us make ready with all possible haste, counting no cost, to wage a powerful war, an overwhelming war, a war that will bring victory to our standards and, please God, universal freedom and permanent peace to the inhabitants of the world.

Mr. Chairman, the American Hebrew of this week will contain the following editorial statement by Herman Bernstein:

> Not with hatred, nor with malice, not with vengeance nor with greedy lust for greater power, is the United States entering the war.
>
> America goes into the war for the sake of peace, for the sake of establishing a lasting universal peace based upon justice, liberty, and equality.
>
> America now takes its place beside the democracies of the world against the autocracy which has deliberately misled even its own people into this universal slaughter.
>
> America is entering the war for the purpose of liberating the world from the menace that is threatening the peace of the democratic lands on both sides of the Atlantic.
>
> By defending the rights of America she will also protect the rights of mankind everywhere.
>
> Our great peace President has exhausted every means at his command to bring about peace among the warring nations; he has been supremely patient, strong, and energetic in his efforts to end the European catastrophe.
>
> Now, the cup of patience is full. The head of the American people can no longer tolerate the German policy of duplicity and subterfuge, a policy which has meant the killing of innocent babies and women, of the destruction of the lives of noncombatants without any warning upon the seas, the spreading of hatred, and the stirring of nation against nation—the policy pursued by the Kaiser's Government systematically, deliberately, and efficiently.
>
> America is entering this war with clean hands and a clear conscience, with the highest purpose and the loftiest ideals for which men ever shed their blood.
>
> America is entering the struggle to war on war, to war on the forces that stand in the way of the liberation of the world, to war on a system that in its blind arrogance is sacrificing millions of human lives even now that Germany's alleged excuse for the war is removed by the overthrow of the Russian autocracy.
>
> The unprecedented sacrifices made in this war have already been partly justified by the liberation of the Russian people.
>
> Russia has become a democracy before America enters this war, so that now we can throw our powers on the side of the democracies for the liberation of the world, the emancipation of the peoples, for a lasting peace.
>
> The freeing of mankind from a system that, through mere caprice or whim, can hurl millions of human beings into slaughter, is the only justification for America to enter the war. Such a cause is worthy of our greatest sacrifices.
>
> It is hardly necessary to say that the Jews of America love America and her ideals with an undivided love.
>
> I feel certain that American Israel is ready for any sacrifices the American people may be called upon to make for the sake of American rights, for the sake of justice, liberty, and equality.

We are entering this war without a desire of spoils or conquest, and the spirit is best exemplified by the words of Abraham Lincoln, when said:

> The issue before us is distinct, simple, and inflexible. It is an issue which can only be tried by war and settled by victory. The war will cease on the part of this Government whenever it shall have ceased on the part of those who began it. * * * We accepted war rather than let the Nation perish. With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, and to do all which may achieve a just and lasting peace among all nations.
>
> HERMAN BERNSTEIN.

Mr. Chairman, whether one is in private or public life he must be imbued with the idea that his duty to his country is paramount and above all other considerations. During this week intimations have come to me that political expediency required me to cast my vote against this resolution, and that contrary action on my part would mean a general effort from now on to end my congressional career. If such it be, I shall at no time

regret having performed the duty that I had hoped would never fall to my lot. I would be unworthy of American citizenship were I to be deterred from acting by such warnings.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that I know the citizenship of my congressional district far better than the gentlemen who have seen fit to tell me what is going to occur there. I know that the twentieth congressional district is just as loyal and just as devoted to American institutions and our country as any in the whole of the United States. The records of the War Department and of the Navy show that this district has more than furnished its quota in times of peace, and when the clarion note of duty is sounded by Congress and the President that it will not fail the Nation in its day of need.

I say to my colleagues who are now hesitating as to what they shall do that by their acts the people will know whether they are for this great land of freedom and religious liberty or whether they are going to be guided simply by the selfish question as to whether they will obtain more votes in 1918 by standing on the side of our foe. I say to them that the time has arrived for American citizens to realize that with the common benefits and opportunities which this great and prosperous country affords them comes the common duty and obligation to serve it in every way in its hour of danger. Let us give evidence to the world that we are united and standing shoulder to shoulder, prepared to make those sacrifices which a free people are called upon to do, to sustain their very existence as a nation. It is not a time for hesitancy. It is a time to go forward, placing reliance in God, who is the final arbiter of the destinies of both nations and men. [Applause.]

Let us give notice to the world that in this Republic of ours at least that we are all American citizens of equal rank, character, and quality, whether that citizenship be lately acquired or whether it be by birthright, and that in the defense of our flag and country we recognize no distinction of wealth or position; and that we shall be guided in our actions with the one common thought of victory in the conflict that we are now entering. Mr. Speaker, we shall not rest until we shall have achieved those objects which we are seeking, namely, the same equal rights for all men whether on land or on sea. God grant that the struggle may be short; but, no matter how long it may last, let us constantly bear in mind that the duty of the hour requires us to be courageous and firm in our convictions that America is right, and "that wrong backed by might" must fail.

Let me also add that I have many intimate friends and associates of German descent among the people of my city, and you will find them loyal in every respect.

Mr. Chairman, I can not conclude without reading two poems which I hope will stir American youth into action. They are entitled—

"EACH AMERICAN'S OFFERING."

[By Calvin Dill Wilson, Glendale, Ohio.]

Great land for which our fathers bled,
That men might live with unbowed head,
Now to thine altars, without price,
I bring my all for sacrifice.

For thee, America, I'd die
And with thine elder soldiers lie;
That harm be far from thy blest shore
I offer here my life and store.

That thy pure flag be free from stain
I'll stand where all the bullets rain.
What is my life or what am I
That I should fear for thee to die?

Accept me in thine hour of need;
Give me the joy for thee to bleed;
Great mother, hear my earnest prayer
And let me boldly do my share.

Give me a heart, an iron will,
That's worthy of the fathers still,
As son of them who cast out kings
And died that men be more than things.

In thy wide bosom grant a grave,
A resting place among the brave,
And near thy heart, where heroes slept,
That thou in hour of stress be kept.

Avert, O God, the need of sword;
But, called, may I not shrink, O Lord.
Forever, fronting both our shores,
May taintless flag guard all our doors.

"AMERICA, MY COUNTRY."

[By Jens K. Grondahl.]

America, my country, I come at thy call,
I plight thee my troth and I give thee my all;
In peace or in war I am wed to thy weal,
I'll carry thy flag through the fire and the steel;
On sea nor on land shall it suffer disgrace,
Unsullied it floats o'er our peace-loving race;
In reverence I kneel at sweet liberty's shrine—
America, my country, command, I am thine.

America, my country, brave souls gave thee birth,
Who yearned for a haven of freedom on earth,
And when thy dear flag to the winds was unfurled
There came to thy shores the oppressed of the world;
Thy milk and thy honey flow freely for all—
Who takes of thy bounty shall come at thy call,
Who quaffs of thy nectar of freedom shall say,
"America, my country, command, I obey."

America, my country, thy flag I adore,
It glories in peace but it fears not in war;
When tyrants would trample its folds in the dust,
Old Glory, undaunted, is true to its trust;
Its stars ever twinkle from liberty's dome
A message of hope to mankind through the gloom;
And children of men bless the red, white, and blue—
America, my country, the tried and the true.

America, my country, now come is thy hour—
The Lord of Hosts recks on thy courage and power;
Humanity pleads for the strength of thy hand
Lest liberty perish on sea and on land;
Thou guardian of freedom, thou keeper of right,
When liberty bleeds there is task for thy might;
"Divine right" of kings or our freedom must fall—
America, my country, I come at thy call.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] is recognized.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that our country for all time might remain at peace with all the countries of the world, for I have believed it the province of America to extend the benefits of the policies of our republican form of government to all nations by example and precept.

American honor in government and the high character, enterprise, and industry of its citizens compose the strength of our national appeal.

All war is abhorrent not only because of its tremendous cost in men and money, its destruction of life and home, its ravages of illness and disease, but that it brings the peoples of nations to hate, and just now the people of America entertain no feeling of hatred for any people.

The complete realization I have for the dire calamities of war impresses me with the solemnity and responsibility of a finding of the Congress of the United States declaring a state of war to exist.

I am still hopeful that the miracle of Russia may be reenacted in other European countries, for what there happened is the greatest triumph for governmental freedom since Cornwallis surrendered to Washington. What was thought impossible in Russia has come to pass almost in a day and with universal acclaim.

When the bleak road to Siberia was opened and men and women who suffered imprisonment and torture because they believed they had a right to participate in the government of the country in which they lived came back to their families and friends they carried a message of hope and confidence which is destined to extend broadly and firmly the principles of self-governing nations, those who derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

But now, after months and months of patience and forbearance, we are brought by the declaration of the Imperial German Government to the gauge of battle or the acceptance of a submission amounting to our national humiliation.

Distinctly, then, we realize the difference between the republic and the autocracy.

Without any quarrel with the German people, we recognize its sons and daughters among our most valued citizens, and they, many of them, came to America to escape the military autocracy which holds subject the people it rules and now seeks to hold subject likewise the peoples of the world.

I stand firm for the observance and protection of American rights, and I believe the American flag should be a sanctuary and that its folds should protect to the last ounce of the power of this great Government every law-abiding American citizen, on land or on sea. [Applause.]

To cast a vote for war at any time is a momentous thing, but to cast a vote against war at this time would be a futile thing, for war has been forced upon us as the sole method of defense of our rights.

The United States must take its rightful place at the very forefront among the nations, unafraid, and carry on, even through the clash of arms, to all peoples our national message of liberty, freedom, and equality under the law.

Marred by no selfish taint of aggression or conquest, we are conscious only of the highest purpose and that the extension and maintenance of governmental liberty to all peoples. [Applause.]

In this purpose we are united, and whenever the Congress of the United States has spoken throughout all this broad land there will be no division of devotion, only a devotion in patriot-

ism to our country that our country in asserting the rights of free men may bring freedom and liberty and peace to all others. [Applause.]

I ask to have read in my time one letter, which I send to the Clerk's desk, and which I have this day mailed.

The Clerk read as follows:

APRIL 5, 1917.

Hon. WOODROW WILSON,
President of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I herewith tender my services to the support of American liberty and freedom whenever and wherever called.

Very truly,

WARREN GARD.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH].

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this resolution as a patriotic duty. I shall vote for it in the same spirit in which, over 50 years ago, I offered my young manhood to my country on a similar call from Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.] And I shall do so although I realize that our action here to-night will give more joy to the descendants of old King George III than anything that has happened in history since Wellington's victory at Waterloo and Napoleon's banishment to St. Helena.

I shall not take up further time of the House, but ask, Mr. Chairman, that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman already has that privilege. The Chair will next recognize the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, to the thrice-repeated question, "What is oratory?" the greatest master of the greatest art replied, "Action, action, action." If the eloquent expression of patriotism is action, patriotism itself can be nothing less than action—action intensified, glorified, and effective.

On this occasion words, in comparison with deeds, are but "sounding brass" and prolonged speeches are but "tinkling cymbals." Therefore I shall not consume all of my time, but shall content myself in this, the most solemn, sad, and serious hour in the life of the Republic by voting to enter this war. [Applause.] Not against the oppressed and bleeding people of Germany, but against the most despotic, cruel, and destructive military autocracy that has ever existed since the birth of time.

We shall go into this bloodiest of all bloody struggles seeking no territory, no spoils, and no reward, but solely seeking to annihilate a military system which has usurped the liberty of mankind and devastated more than half the world with fire and sword.

Diplomacy, pleadings, and supplications have failed us in our earnest effort to live our life in peace. The Imperial German Government, by its wanton violation of our rights of property, by its willful insults to our flag, and by its ruthless destruction of the lives of our people, has at last forced us into war.

We are now compelled to fight. The honor of the Nation, the institutions of civilization, the ghosts of murdered men, and the spirits of slaughtered women and butchered children are pleading with us to draw the sword. We shall not turn a deafened ear to this pathetic appeal. We shall—

Strike till the last armed foe expires,
Strike for the green graves of our sires,
God, and our native land!

And as we go forth to battle with this mailed monster of Prussian militarism, in order that tyranny may die and liberty may live, I thank God that the German-Americans of my district will be found marching by the side of those who were born on American soil. [Applause.] Those whose ancestors came from the banks of the Elbe, the Oder, and the Rhine will keep step with those who first saw the light of day on the banks of the Potomac, the Ohio, and the Mississippi. They will fight loyally, enthusiastically, and courageously for the American flag, under which they have found prosperity, security, and peace. They will fight for—

Your flag and my flag—
And, oh, how much it holds!
Your land and my land
Secure within its folds.

Your heart and my heart
Beat quicker at the sight;
Sun kissed and wind tossed,
The red and blue and white.

The one flag! the great flag!
The flag for me and you!
Glorified, all else beside,
The red and white and blue.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWITZER] is recognized.

Mr. SWITZER. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that this is not the time to indulge in criticism. But I have listened to the vehement denunciation of many of our citizens made by Members of Congress during the past two days at both ends of this Capitol, and I feel it my duty to raise my voice against such an exhibition of intolerance. It certainly can do no good and can have no effect other than to arouse and stir up animosities and tend to drive people to be disloyal. It certainly ill becomes any representative of the Democratic Party to participate in such denunciation, for no party, sect, or ism has done more to spread throughout the length and breadth of this land the spirit of pacifism than the Democratic Party. In support of this assertion I cite you to your national campaign textbook of 1914 and invite you to read it again and again.

I shall support the resolution, but in doing so I do not want it understood that I believe that this great and powerful Nation has been absolutely neutral between the two groups of European belligerents. I am one of those who believe that had we been strictly neutral, had we been prompt and firm in the assertion of our rights under international law, firm in resisting the aggressions of both Great Britain and Germany, we would not be confronted with the situation that faces us to-day. The standard of neutrality advocated by the party in power immediately following the breaking out of the European war in 1914 has been trampled in the mud and mire of humble submission so deeply that it can be no longer recognized; and in the last political campaign, as a compensation and justification for the complete surrender of American rights upon land and sea it was pointed out that the "President had kept us out of war." On this party slogan he was reelected and his party continued in power. The people by a referendum have publicly expressed their confidence in the ability of the President to keep us out of war. And while I recognize that the method that he now recommends for our future safety, for the future security of this Nation, is in radical disagreement with the policy he advocated back in 1914, I also recognize that world conditions have changed.

The Imperial German Government now insists on the ruthless hunting down of our merchant ships and assassinating our citizens; and I feel it to be my duty as a Member of this Congress to vote to give the President the active and full use of our Army and Navy for the purpose of maintaining American rights and protecting American lives upon the high seas, even if it leads us into the very jaws of the terrible European conflagration. [Applause.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, in the few minutes allotted me I can not, of course, make any elaborate expression of views on the causes of the war that Congress is about to declare. It would not be a pleasant task if I had the time. I have hoped against hope that this cup might pass. But it must be drained, bitter as it is.

I have no doubt about the result of the war, which I have striven so hard to avoid, which I have so devoutly prayed we might escape. But even that impression does not make me happy, and I think no unhappier lot of men ever assembled under this roof than the Members of this House. They approach their solemn duty to-day with the seriousness that befits the occasion even if they apprehend no military disaster.

As a result of our action to-day, other consequences even more disastrous than defeat in battle may come. In its far-reaching influence on the future of our country no vote cast in the American Congress since the great Civil War has been so important. That the decision to engage in a European war, a war that had its origin in purely European and dynastic questions, will immediately and seriously imperil our independence I do not believe. That it will have a tremendous influence on the future of our Republic no thoughtful student of history and world politics will deny. Whether that influence will be for good or evil only the future can disclose, for the conditions that will flow from our decision to-day must be met and the questions they create solved by later generations.

On some of the results of our participation in a European war, not directly aimed at us, I believe we may all agree. It involves a reversal of the policy of the United States from the adoption of the Constitution down to this moment. Contrary to the advice of George Washington, we are about to make an entangling alliance with certain European Governments. In promoting the purposes of that alliance we are asked to help with credit and money, and to supply our allies with food, munitions, and other material essential in war. Their leaders become our leaders, their policies our policies, and their plans for the post bellum settlement our plans. Whether they will be

wise only the event will disclose; but wise or unwise we are in for it. It is an absolutely entangling alliance.

That it will make an end of the Monroe doctrine seems very clear to me. How can we claim and exercise the right to hold colonies in Asia? How can we claim and exercise the right to interfere in the political affairs of Europe and consistently deny the right of European countries to have a part in the settlement of American questions? I do not believe that we can hold so illogical and selfish a position, and so I look upon this entrance into the great world war as the passing of the Monroe doctrine. Being an American and sincerely loving my country and its representative, democratic government, I shall hope and try to believe that it is all for the best. I shall try to comfort myself with the thought that whatever additional perils we are bringing to America may be compensated in the development of a world-wide democracy. With that done wars will almost cease, for they are made by and for kings and the people can be trusted not to condemn themselves to destruction.

I have labored humbly but persistently, Mr. Chairman, to prevent all wars, this war in particular, for it has threatened us since the *Lusitania* went down. For more than two years I have been oppressed by the horrors of European battle fields. I have spent anxious days and sleepless nights trying in vain to devise some means by which my country might be spared this trial. The President has tried to avoid what is about to happen—what in fact has happened. I believe that all Americans, except that limited although influential class which is willing to go on shedding other men's blood to protect its investments and add to its accursed profits, have abhorred the thought of war. But the fates have decreed otherwise. My efforts and the efforts of millions of others who stood for peace have been in vain. We have been at war for more than a month. We have been at war since Germany decided to adhere to her submarine war plans regardless of the rights of neutrals to navigate the seas she had warned them not to enter. It was a challenge that was sure to be accepted, and we are now to have the consequences that all expected, that even those of us who tried to avoid them expected. We have lost the opportunity to play the great part of mediator between our unfortunate brothers in Europe. They will probably go on with the struggle to exhaustion, until all are bled white, until all countries are bankrupt and the comfort and happiness of unborn generations shall be mortgaged to the money lenders, who thrive in the misery of fellow men.

It is no longer a question of whether we shall have war. That is settled, and the vote to be taken here is the merest formality. The only thing to be considered now is, What is one's duty under the circumstances? I am an American, and, greatly as I deplore the situation, I shall, much as it distresses me, stand by my country. If my vote could avoid war, there would be none; but I realize that the President was right when he said that we had in fact been at war since the 1st of February. When the United States are in peril we must stand as one man.

For the time being, Mr. Chairman, the preachers of the gospel of peace are beaten back, but they are not destroyed. The war is pleading their cause; its horrors emphasize their arguments. After it is over, when the crippled and bankrupt survivors look about and consider the restoration of orderly and civilized society, they will realize the horror of it all, and they will forbid its recurrence. That can only be done by taking arms from the nations, for while nations have weapons and men trained to use them they will be used. As an assurance of peace big armies and navies have failed dismally, utterly. Men and women who are working so unselfishly for peace must devote themselves very earnestly to the task of disarming the nations.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I propose to vote for this resolution. That war exists between this country and Germany there is no question; the passing of the resolution is the declaration of a self-evident truth. In the few minutes that are allotted me I wish to give some of the reasons why I propose to vote for it. Whenever opportunity has afforded itself in the past three years, I have advocated the enforcement of American rights wherever those rights have been transgressed. I have insisted that our rights in Mexico, as to individual American citizens resident there, should be protected, and that those rights guaranteed by solemn treaty should not be withheld from them.

During all this time I have also advocated that the rights of American citizens upon land and sea transgressed by the British Empire should also be redressed by the United States. During all this time I have also advocated that the rights of the American people, on land or sea, that have been infracted and transgressed by the central powers should likewise be redressed by the United States Government. I am glad, though late as it is, to see that this Government, which owes to our citizens, wherever they may be, that protection guaranteed them by the Constitution of the United States and the flag, is awakening to the fact that if we are to survive as an independent Nation it needs to give them that protection.

I am voting for this resolution in the hope and belief that we have awakened to the duty we owe our citizenship, and that the rights that have so long been infracted and transgressed in Mexico will likewise be redressed.

I am also led to believe that this Government that has now awakened to the duty it owes to its citizenship will redress the wrongs that have been done to American citizens by the British Empire.

While I have committed myself to this resolution and shall support it, I wish it to be understood that I do not commit myself to the propaganda announced by the President of the United States here when he delivered his message. By voting for this resolution I do not propose to commit myself to the support of the suggestion that we should become the guardian of the nations of the world. I do not propose that we shall depart from the teachings of Washington, when he said that we should be careful about our foreign entanglements and alliances. I do not propose to commit myself to a propaganda that will mean the abandonment of the Monroe doctrine.

We will sail upon an unknown sea, without chart or rudder, whenever we break away from the traditions and teachings of the past. Ours, the greatest republican Government ever formed for a liberty-loving people, by its precepts and teachings, should be an example to the nations of the earth, inspiring them to follow us, rather than by force of arms compelling them to do as we are doing. I believe that every people on the face of the earth have the right to choose their own form of government. If people desire to live under monarchies, that is their business and not ours. If they desire to live as the people in China have lived throughout all these centuries, that is their business and not ours. If they wish to reform their government and become republican, like China did, they should do it by virtue of their own right, of their own convictions, and not by reason of the dictation of any other nation upon the face of the earth. Therefore I say that when I commit myself to this resolution I do not propose to commit myself to the theory that this Government of ours should be the keeper of the peace of the world or dictate to the nations of the earth what their forms of government shall be.

When this war is on, from its start to its finish, the yeomanry of the Union will stand in solid phalanx in support of their country. And whether the trial be long or short, they will persevere to a successful end. Whether born on the native heath or transplanted from foreign soil, all will prove themselves Americans, true to the country of their birth or of their adoption, with one aim and one purpose—the triumph of the land they love.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, during the 12 years that I have served in this House I have never met so awful a responsibility as rests upon me to-night. The eyes of the world are fixed upon this House of Representatives, and the electric wires are waiting to flash to the uttermost corners of the earth the action taken by the American Congress. The responsibility might not seem to me so grave if the flush of youth were upon my checks and I could go into the service, and I would feel less reluctant to vote to send others into this awful struggle if it was so that I could go with them. It is an awful responsibility to throw this country into the great holocaust in Europe. It is a responsibility, however, that this Congress must shoulder, and I have simply risen at this time to say, whatever may be my individual abhorrence of war, whatever may be my personal opinion as to all the facts leading up to it, we are confronted to-night by a condition and not a theory. The war does exist. We are in it, and it is incumbent upon every American citizen to do his full duty in whatever sphere he may be placed. [Applause.]

I shall vote for the resolution regretfully, reluctantly, but the die is cast. My country is involved, and wherever the flag of the Union floats it is my duty and your duty to take our stand beneath its ample folds. America first, American rights first, should be uppermost in the mind of every real American in this hour. The passage of this resolution to-night will send the word around the world that the old spirit of the fathers still survives and that we intend to protect the citizens of this country upon land and upon sea in the enjoyment of their just rights, no matter what country may dispute those rights.

America's answer to-night to the challenge of Germany will be in keeping with the spirit of '76. The resolution must be passed. We have no time to halt, no time to parley. Wherever the flag leads let us follow. Let us make a record that will be in keeping with our honorable past. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the people of these United States are a peace-loving, patient, forbearing people. We know what war is and

we dread to engage in it. We dread to send the flower of our young manhood to fields of carnage and death, and for this reason the great apostle of peace, who is to-day President of the United States, has for the past two years given to the world the most sublime exhibition of patience recorded in the annals of time. The Imperial German Government has misinterpreted the motives of Woodrow Wilson. His long forbearance, his unexampled patience, his submission in many instances to indignities and insults have all been attributed to the cowardice of the President and the people for whom he speaks. Mr. Chairman, we knew that our great leader was actuated solely by a desire to preserve the peace of America, and aid, if he might be able, in bringing back peace, contentment, and happiness to the war stricken and blood stained countries of Europe. The fates have decreed against our dream of universal peace and our beloved country against our will has been drawn into the awful struggle. Our hands are upon the plow, and now there will be no turning back. The command is "Forward!" and America wants no laggard among her people.

I desire to call attention to a telegram I received from a man at Daytona, Fla., which is demonstrative of the fact that we are harboring some traitorous souls in our midst. Let us hope that in all the broad domain of the Republic there are exceedingly few of the pusillaminous breed of this man O'Boyle. God knows, I sincerely hope he is only a temporary sojourner in my beloved and patriotic Florida. Here is the creature's telegram:

DAYTONA, FLA., *April 3, 1917.*

Hon. FRANK CLARK, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Floridians want no war at best; Wall Street and munition manufacturers, stop blockade running by Anglo-Americans on munition-laden ships for allies, and represent your constituents instead of J. P. Morgan & Co. Show some independence and cease following one who is practically a traitor to our country.

J. F. O'BOYLE.

Mr. Chairman, I immediately replied to this telegram, as follows:

WASHINGTON, *April 4, 1917.*

To J. F. O'BOYLE,
Daytona, Fla.:

Real Floridians are with Woodrow Wilson and other patriotic Americans who, while not seeking war, will not shirk it, and will, to the last man, defend American rights. Your infamous reference to the President is treasonable, and I would advise you to seek a more healthy location than Florida for your traitorous utterances.

FRANK CLARK, *M. C.*

After dealing with a character like O'Boyle, it is certainly refreshing and inspiring, Mr. Chairman, to receive such patriotic messages as one from the exalted ruler of the Lodge of Elks at Tampa, Fla., and one from the mayor of the city of Ocala, Fla., both of which I shall print as part of my remarks.

TAMPA, FLA., *April 2, 1917.*

Hon. FRANK CLARK, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

Tampa Lodge No. 708, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, with a membership of over 500 of this city's leading citizens, pledges its unqualified support to you in taking steps not only to put the country in thorough state of defense but also to exert all of its power and employ all of its resources to carry on war against the Imperial German Government, and bring the conflict to a successful termination.

P. J. VANPELT, *Exalted Ruler.*

OCALA, FLA., *April 2, 1917.*

Congressman FRANK CLARK,
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the sinking of American vessels without warning, causing the loss of American lives, constitutes under the laws of nations acts of war levied against the United States, to which there can be but one reply in honor, in dignity, and in sacred duty to civilization; and

Whereas the President of the United States has called Congress to meet in extraordinary session to deliberate upon and determine what action should be taken to put an end to the outrages committed against American citizens by the German Empire: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the citizens of Ocala, Fla., urge Congress to prompt action, and recognizing our full duty to God and country hereby offer our entire support to President Wilson in whatever course Congress may direct him for the protection of American rights.

Resolved further, That copies of these resolutions be telegraphed to President Wilson and to our delegation in Congress.

J. E. CHASE,
Mayor, Chairman Citizens' Mass Meeting.

Mr. Chairman, the patriotic people of my district and State are ready to make sacrifice of life and fortune in defense of "Old Glory." Realizing the tremendous responsibility resting on me as a Member of this great body and the representative of a quarter of a million of brave, chivalrous people, I shall cast my vote for this resolution in the confident assurance that my people will approve my course, in the fervent hope that it will result in an early termination of the ruthless slaughter across the seas, and in the solemn conviction that it will make for a prouder, grander, nobler, and more indestructible Union.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, at no time during my service in this House has my duty seemed so clear nor my task so hard as it does to-night. I have approached this day, which all of us have thought would come, with a resolute mind to resolve all doubts in favor of peace. I have been firm in the conviction that I should not vote for war against Germany until I was impelled to do so to maintain the honor of our Nation. I say to you frankly that from the very beginning I have felt, and do now feel, a deep sympathy for the German people, but the Imperial Government of Germany has made willful and deliberate war on us, and our national integrity demands that the American people strike back. It is sad that our blows will fall on those against whom we have no malice and who, I believe, have none against us. It is plainly the Government and not the people of Germany that compels us to this resolution of war.

What is the proposition that is submitted to us to-night? This resolution contains two simple questions. The first is a declaration of an evident fact. It simply states that Germany has made war on the United States. I marvel that some gentlemen to-day have dared to say to this House that Germany has given us no cause for war.

In all the history of our Republic, in the history of every war in which we have been engaged, we do not find recorded so plain a cause for war as we find in the events which have happened on the seas in recent months. They have sunk our ships and destroyed the lives of American citizens, the gravest offense that may be committed by one nation against another and an offense which, if borne without resistance, must speedily result in the ignoble extinction of the nation who suffers it to be done. A nation who will not protect the lives of its people can not and is not worthy to endure.

It is a maxim of the law—an ancient maxim observed by all nations—that a ship on the high seas is a part of the territory of the nation whose flag it floats. The law writers and teachers so state the law, and the Supreme Court of the United States have so announced it many times. These ships floated the American flag, and these sailors were on American territory. These American sailors, as they walked the decks, were trodding American soil just as you and I are trodding American soil to-night. They were entitled to the protection of their Government just as much as you and I sitting in this Chamber to-night are entitled to the protection of our Government. Who is there in this House to-night that will deny that an American citizen on American territory on the high seas is not equally entitled to the same protection to which we are entitled? The assault on these ships was as much an act of war as though Germany had landed an armed force on our shores and burned our cities and destroyed our citizens.

Germany has made war on us. When we have reached that inevitable conclusion, what must we say as to the second question involved in the resolution? Shall we resist? Shall we make war against war? The President was right when he said "the American people will not choose the path of submission." He need not tell us that. When the American people by the logic of events know that they have been assailed they answer, "We will resist." Gentlemen who imagaine that this people, in order to escape the costs and the horrors of war, will submit to the destruction of American lives and to a denial of American rights on the highways of the nations, do not understand the temper of the American people. We will not lie supinely by and see our most sacred ideals of liberty and freedom destroyed by the despots of European autocracy. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty now as it was in the days of the Revolution, and it is in the hearts and souls of Americans to preserve that liberty.

Let us think for a minute what a negative answer to this second question means. Shall we, by the rejection of this resolution, answer to the world that America will not resist? Shall we say to all the peoples of the earth—for all the peoples of the earth are listening for this roll call to-night—that America does not intend to defend the rights and the lives of its citizens against foreign aggression? Shall we say, what is a thousand times more infamous, to the people of America that their Government does not owe and will not give them protection against a foreign foe? That is not my country; that is not this country. I still cling to the faith which was given me when a child, that America is strong enough and proud enough to assert its rights against every enemy who dares dispute them. Let us say by the passage of this resolution the plain and simple truth, that Germany has made war on America and that America will resist.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, let no man in this House underestimate the importance of the step we take this night. We are preparing to enter into armed combat with a nation which for 20 years has carefully prepared itself for this spring at the throats of the civilized nations of the world.

The condition in which we find ourselves to-day is not without its parallel and its precedent in the history of this Republic. At the beginning of our national life we found the Mediter-

ranean Sea closed by the piratical States comprising the Barbary confederacy. The smaller nations of the world paid tribute and the larger nations of the world made treaties.

We were protected before the Revolutionary War from their depredations by the treaties that England had entered into with Morocco and the other States. At the beginning of our career as a Nation we heard arguments throughout the land similar to these arguments advanced here this evening. Morocco, Algeria, Tripoli, and Tunis are 4,000 miles away; they said, we are an isolated Nation, our business is here and not there; it is cheaper to stay out of war, and we did. We concluded with the pirates of the Barbary States in 1785 a most disgraceful treaty, because it was the easiest way, because it meant no sacrifice of human life, it meant only a sacrifice of our national honor, it meant only an abandonment of the right of our merchant vessels to sail the seas, and we submitted to the exactions of these piratical States until the victories of Dale and Morris and Preble in the early years of the last century opened up again to us the Mediterranean Sea.

Then followed that disgraceful period of the embargo lasting until 1815, when we voluntarily submitted to the same conditions that Germany is attempting to force upon us to-day, and during that period of time our trade and our shipping suffered almost irreparable damage and loss.

After the conclusion of the War of 1812, which we believed gave us the right to sail our ships upon the ocean highways of the world, we submitted again to the closed seas of the piratical States until we sent an expedition under the younger Decatur 4,000 miles through the oceans of the world—in opposition to the wishes of the pacifists of the country and in opposition to those who pointed out the horrors of war, but in the defense of the rights of this young Republic. The victory we gained on the Barbary coast, the success of this expedition, struck the first successful blow against that kind of piracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. To-day we find ourselves face to face with almost the same conditions, except that the enemy we face across the seas fights not under the sun of the day but fights in the nighttime. The enemy when we fought the Algerian pirates fought on the surface of the sea, and every man had his opportunity to resist and to defend his life. The enemy against whom we declare war this night fights under the sea, strikes without warning, in violation of all of the precedents of war which have governed civilized nations since the end of the dark ages. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, there are men here who speak for Germany. There are men who call attention to the accomplishments of the Germans here on this continent. I yield to no man in my admiration for the career of Steuben, for the German regiment at Brandywine, at Princeton, and at Valley Forge; for Armand's Legion at Savannah in the war for our independence; for the 53 men and 14 officers who comprised Washington's bodyguard, every one of them a German, selected because they were Germans. But I remember that in the war for our independence there were 29,000 Hessians brought over here at an expense to our enemy in eight years of $170,000,000, and the wounds inflicted by Hessian bayonets have barely healed. I remember that it was Germans under Steuben who opposed the Prussianism represented by the Hessians. The Germans who came here came here for the purpose of avoiding the Prussianization of Germany; came here for the purpose of escaping from the rule of the Hohenzollerns. As this debate proceeds I am reminded that we did not get our Magna Charta or our Bill of Rights from Prussia.

A great American writer, careful always and accurate in his facts, has made a compilation of recent utterances of the German Emperor and German officers and German leaders. He has compiled them—every one of these utterances was actually made, and made with the approval of the Hohenzollern rulers of Germany. I desire now to read some of them, and I read from the Pentecost of Calamity, by Owen Wister. I quote:

"We Hohenzollerns take our crown from God alone. On me the spirit of God has descended. I regard my whole task as appointed by Heaven."

Does that sound like the principles we stand for? I read further:

"The efforts directed toward the abolition of war must not only be termed foolish, but absolutely immoral. The peace of Europe is only a secondary matter for us. The sight of suffering does one good; the infliction of suffering does one more good."

"The Belgians should not be shot dead. They should be so left as to make impossible all hope of recovery."

"German should replace English as the world language. English, the bastard tongue, must be swept into the remotest corners until it has returned to its original elements of an insignificant pirate dialect."

"The civilization of mankind suffers every time a German becomes an American."

"They call us barbarians. What of it? The German claim must be education to hate, organization of hatred, education to the desire for hatred. Let us abolish unripe and false shame. To us is given faith, hope, and hatred; but hatred is the greatest among them."

Mr. Chairman, this is the Prussian creed, this is the Prussian ideal. We war not against the German people; we war against the Hohenzollerns and all they stand for. [Applause.]

It has been seriously contended that our real enemy is England on account of the events of a hundred years ago. The battles of a hundred years ago have passed into history. We can not fight them over again. We are face to face with the events of the present. No allied nation has deliberately planned the dismemberment of the United States, giving to barbarous Mexico a part, to Japan a part, keeping the best part for herself. No other nation than Prussianized Germany has brazenly admitted that in time of peace, while professing friendship, she has deliberately attempted to induce nations at peace with us to invade our territory. We war against that nation which wars against us.

Fathoms deep under the seas lie our great merchant ships, victims of German submarines, the American flag still floating from their mastheads, the American flag still painted on their hulls, sepulchers for the bodies of American citizens, while we build memorials for them on the land; and yet we hear to-night a defense of the German submarine warfare. My sympathy is with my murdered fellow citizens, not with their murderers.

We are to-day loaning money to France in her dire extremity at usurious rates of interest. In our struggle for independence France loaned us millions of money without interest and expended from $400,000,000 to $700,000,000 in material aid for our young Republic, which we have to this day never repaid. France gave us Lafayette, whose picture hangs here on this wall side by side with the picture of the great Washington. Prussia sent us the Hessians—mercenary soldiers—the murderers of our Revolutionary War. My sympathies are with France in this struggle, not with Prussianized Germany.

We are to-day the richest, the most powerful Nation the world has ever seen; we are to-day the greatest exporting nation in all the world. In the temple of the Omnipotent the clock of the centuries has struck the hour. This night we throw aside the grave clothes of our isolation and take our proper place among the nations of the world.

We fight for our rights upon the seas. We fight the battle for civilization, for humanity, for free Governments in central Europe and against the tyranny of the Hohenzollerns which has come down to us from the darkness, the murder, and the bloodshed of the Middle Ages and which has no place in this new century. We do not enter this war for territorial aggrandizement or for money indemnities. We enter this war for the purpose of keeping the lights of civilization burning brightly on the ocean highways of the world, for the purpose of keeping the nations of the world from slipping back into the darkness of the Middle Ages. We fight for the flag upon whose starry folds the sun never sets. We fight for the flag which brings freedom wherever it goes. Having full confidence in the justness of our cause, we bring now into this war all the tremendous resources of the greatest and most powerful Nation in all the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, I am for this resolution. Almost from the very inception of the European conflict the rights of this countrty as a neutral have been to greater or less degree violated on the seas. Such violations have for the most part occurred under color of law and were at times simply illegal extensions of recognized belligerent measures. They occasioned no loss of life but resulted in the destruction of property, confiscation of ships and cargoes, and interference with our legitimate commerce with neutrals. These invasions of our rights were made by our Government the subject matter of protest, diplomatic negotiation, and prospective adjudication. It was recognized that they were not actuated by malice or hostile intent toward us, and that they were incidents, ultralegal to be sure, of a policy of blockade fundamentally based on recognized principles. It is worse than idle; it is mischievous at this

time to conjecture whether it would have been the part of wisdom to have resisted these infractions more forcefully and by measures of retaliation sought to end them.

The German Government instituted its U-boat warfare. It made no pretense that such operations had the sanction of either the law of nations or the principles of humanity, but sought to justify them on the ground of necessity. Necessity may know no law, but the Government of the United States does and intends to enforce it in behalf of the American people. These operations, resulting in the loss of American lives, were likewise made the subject matter of protest and diplomatic negotiation. On only one theory can this course of our Government be justified, that the wrongs inflicted by the German submarines were likewise not actuated by malice or hostile intent toward us and that they were incidental to the desperate conflict.

But in the first month of this year the German Government formally and solemnly announced to us that after the 1st day of February it intended, by the use of its U boats, deliberately and intentionally to sink without warning every American vessel sailing a large portion of the high seas adjacent to the western coast of Europe and the eastern part of the Mediterranean. This policy the German Government has subsequently pursued to the best of its ability, sinking American ships and destroying numbers of American lives. Previous to the declaration Germany's U-boat activities may well have constituted a cause for war. But the declaration and its execution are not incidental to its operations against the allies; they spring from hostile intent and are directed deliberately against the American people. In other words, the German Government has found it expedient in the struggle with the allies to declare and make war upon us.

Thus we, seeking only the paths of peace and having suffered much to continue therein, are wrongfully and wantonly attacked by an enemy, the Imperial German Government. Shall we, craven, cringe supinely and bend our backs submissively to the blows? Shall we limit our defense to means similar to those our enemy has for the moment found it convenient to employ? The sword has been thrust in our hand. Let us wield it with the full strength of the Nation. Let us have universal service, in one capacity or another, by every American. Let us use every resource at our command to bring this issue to such a conclusion that never again the right of America to peace and freedom will be challenged. [Applause.]

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HULBERT. It is apparent, unless the previous question is moved, that the debate will not be exhausted before 12 o'clock, and we will then be on the morning of Good Friday. I would like to ask, if it is in order, if a vote is not reached by 12 o'clock that this question be laid over until Saturday or Monday for final determination. [Cries of "No!"]

The CHAIRMAN. Such a motion would not be in order in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SIMS. But it will be in order to make points of order against further debate, as the debate on the pro forma amendment is exhausted, and all this debate is now on one side. It is really no debate.

Mr. DILLON. Oh, no it is not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SIMS. Has not debate upon this paragraph in the Committee of the Whole been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

Mr. SIMS. What is before the committee, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thought I had been recognized.

Mr. SIMS. What motion is there before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to strike out the last word, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the President has asked Congress for its support in a war which in his address of April 2 he declared exists with the Government but not with the people of Germany.

Proclaiming that peace, democracy, and civilization are threatened by German Government aggressions, the President invokes immediate action on the part of Congress to maintain those ideals, not only for the United States, but for all of the world.

The resolution now before the House, which the Senate has adopted, is appropriate to the maintenance of the honor and the dignity of our country, if our country has been wronged and defied as indicated in the President's address. It does not, however, as I understand it, deprive Congress of its constitutional right to receive further information from the President as to such war measures as he may have in contemplation, to consider them, or to amend or reject them as it may deem proper.

Personally I had hoped the President, by diplomatic negotiations or otherwise, would have kept us out of a European war. I had hoped he would steer us clear of "entangling alliances" with foreign nations, and that if he found it necessary to proceed to war it would be for the preservation of American rights upon every sea and in every land. Our experience in Mexico also led me to hope for an early and substantial preparedness that would sustain the country's honor and reduce to a minimum the dangers and sacrifices of war.

But these questions and others of relative importance which appeal to our sympathies and our hearts can not now be adequately discussed. We must face the inexorable condition. We must vote yea or nay upon the resolution which the President holds necessary to put this Government in a position to war for its rights.

The President's plans are not fully before us. They may put the country through the severest ordeal of its history; but there is no escape now from the responsibility that confronts us.

If our institutions are menaced, if our liberties are threatened by Germany or by any other foreign power, we must unite for "the common defense." [Applause.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I realize, as every Member of this House must realize, the grave responsibility of this hour. I am by instinct and training a man of peace, but we all know that we are to-day upon the threshold of war. Our peace-loving President has made every possible effort and used every proper influence and power of his great office to keep us out of war, but the Imperial German Government has heaped insult, injury, and injustice upon the United States until the limit of our countrymen's forbearance has been reached. That Government has destroyed many of our ships; it has murdered hundreds of our citizens, men, women, and children, without warning and without giving them a chance to either fight or flee; it has denied us the just right to sail the open seas under threat of death and destruction; it has undertaken by secret plot to form an alliance with Japan and the Republic of Mexico upon our southern border for the future destruction of this Government.

The President of the United States has solemnly declared to us that a state of war between the United States and the German Government now exists and that it was brought on by that Government's ruthless disregard of international law.

What shall we do? I have confidence in the ability, the integrity, and the patriotism of the President of the United States, and for my part I shall stand by him and his recommendation, and vote to hold up his hands in this hour of our national peril.

I have no feeling against the German people, and especially against those who have come to our shores to make their homes among us. I have lived among German-American citizens as neighbors and friends, and have found them to be industrious, honest, and a thrifty people. This is not to be a war against German-American citizens. I believe they will be loyal to their adopted country and its flag.

I realize the momentous consequences that may follow our action to-day, and look to the future with fear and trembling. As a boy I saw enough of our own fratracidal strife in the sixties to know something of the horrors of war; but as one who has enjoyed the liberty for which our revolutionary fathers fought, I have always been impressed with the belief that I and all of us should as patriots stand ready at all times when necessary to aid in every way possible to preserve this priceless inheritance for those who shall come after us. I vote for this resolution to-day conscious of its possible serious consequences, but I do so because I believe the honor of our flag and the liberties of our American citizens are involved, and because I believe war is preferable to dishonorable peace, and cowardly submission and national disgrace worse than war. [Applause.]

I will vote for the resolution.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HULBERT. For a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HULBERT. If the chairman of the committee does not now desire to move that the committee rise, I would like to ask if it is not in order that I move that the committee rise and report the resolution with sundry amendments and with the recommendation that it do pass?

The CHAIRMAN. That motion is not in order at this time. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio——

Mr. HULBERT. Why is not that motion in order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER]. The motion is not in order. The Chair can not undertake to explain why every motion is not in order. [Laughter.]

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I feel a great responsibility——

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is there an amendment now pending?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] has the floor.

Mr. HULBERT. Is an amendment pending?

The CHAIRMAN. It is.

Mr. HULBERT. What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER] has the floor, and the gentleman can not take him off the floor by an inquiry of this character.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful of the great responsibility that rests upon me when I vote for this resolution to-night. There is not a Member of this Congress, as a Representative of the people, but what for the last two or three days has felt heavily a great responsibility tugging at his very heartstrings. Aye, we have got down on our knees and we have asked Almighty God for His guidance during this hour, while our Nation is passing through what I believe to be the most critical period in the history of our national life and our Nation. For two years I have cherished the hope that we would be kept out of this bloody war in Europe. It was my earnest prayer that we would be spared from entering into this great conflict. The American people do not want war. They do not want war to-day. For the last two years, though, they have been very patient. Our property has been destroyed and our citizens have been killed by the hundreds by the Imperial Government of Germany. Therefore it seems to me that the question which this Congress is facing to-night is not a question as to whether or not we are going to go to war with Germany. That is not the question we are facing to-night. The question which we are facing to-night is as to whether or not we, as a free, independent people are going to stand as one body to maintain our national honor and protect the lives of American citizens wherever they may lawfully be. Therefore I feel it to be my duty as a Representative of the people, coming from a district which gave to this country Garfield and McKinley, to cast my vote for this resolution and stand by the President, while he is passing through this critical hour. Ah, this afternoon we heard some graphic descriptions of the American boys if sent to the European trenches. I do not want the boys to go to the European trenches. Over there in Ohio to-night in a humble little home is a mother and five boys. They come very near and dear to my heart. The oldest boy, the pride and joy and life of our home, last summer, when the President issued his call, was one of the first to volunteer to go to the border in Mexico, and he served his country in the sand hills of Arizona until last December.

I do not want to see that boy go to the trenches; but if it is necessary for him to go there to protect the lives of defenseless American women and innocent little children, I say, "God speed you, my boy. Go to-morrow." [Applause.]

Ah, there is something worse than sending our boys into the trenches. What is it? Ah, it is the willful murder of defenseless American women and innocent little children. Ah, the gurgle and the cry of those little children as they went down into the icy waters of the Atlantic was far worse than sending the American boys into the trenches. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, we are to-night face to face with the greatest crisis that we as a nation have met in the history of our country. Oh, that we may quit ourselves like men and face this issue as true Americans! And I pray to God that when this great conflict shall have passed away that the world will see the dawning of a brighter day, when all the people of the earth can look forward to an everlasting peace and good will on earth toward all men. [Applause.]

Mr. HULBERT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. Has debate on this amendment been concluded?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is inclined to think that debate upon the pending amendment has been concluded.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] is recognized.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, let us proceed in order about this matter. The Chairman does not want to make an absolutely improper ruling here without giving any reason for it. There has not been any motion before the committee except to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that it is not the province of the Chair to suggest either the rights or the duties or the privileges of Members under the rule. He is not expected to furnish information. All the Chair is required to do is to rule upon questions presented, and the Chair does that accurately and impartially under the rules. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. SIMS. I make the point of order that the debate has been exhausted on the motion to strike out the last word, because there have been four speeches on that amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard a moment on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest to the gentleman that whether the debate is exhausted or not it can only be raised in one way, and unless some gentleman desires to raise that question it is not the duty of the Chair to do it under the usages of the House.

Mr. SIMS. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no point of order pending.

Mr. SIMS. I made a point of order and asked for a ruling.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman made a point of order. Now, if we are going into war, as we are—and this may not be strictly on the point of order—we will all have to exercise a good deal of patience and give a good deal of time, and I think we might well afford before we declare war, before we vote upon the resolution, to give all Members of the House that want to be briefly heard upon it an opportunity. Why not? We can stay here.

Mr. SIMS. I know the gentleman is fair; but let me just say that when a similar resolution came before this House prior to the War with Spain, when Mr. McKinley was President, and the Republicans were in power, that every Democrat voted "yea" and no dilatory tactics were resorted to. We are frittering away the time here when every speech is in favor of this resolution. Why is it done, unless there is some purpose to delay the action which the House by an overwhelming majority is anxious to take without further delay? [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentlemen who applaud that have not a sufficient patience to go into war.

Mr. SIMS. Well, this night some American citizen may be in the cold, icy ocean as the result of a torpedo from a submarine while we stand here and talk. [Applause.] If we are going to pass this resolution, let us do it quickly.

Mr. MANN. This resolution will not go to the President any quicker if we pass it now than if we pass it to-morrow morning at 6 o'clock, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. SIMS. Nearly 14 hours of debate have already been exhausted.

Mr. MANN. And if we had 40 hours of debate it would not hurt the country.

Mr. SIMS. But the gentleman did not favor such delay in the War with Spain when the resolution was before the House. I do not understand the unnecessary delay now.

Mr. MANN. The delay is caused by the desire of gentlemen to express themselves.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Did not the House practically unanimously agree that all the gentlemen should be heard?

Mr. MANN. I think that was the understanding. It was not objected to, and the general debate ran a long time with that understanding. Now it is not possible to get a vote upon the resolution, a final vote, before 12 o'clock.

Mr. SIMS. When will it ever be possible to get a final vote proceeding as we are now?

Mr. MANN. No gentleman has been recognized twice up to this present time.

Mr. SIMS. But time has been extended frequently.

Mr. MANN. In one or two cases.

Mr. SIMS. I do not think there is a man in favor of this resolution to-night that wants to delay the vote further in order to talk in favor of it for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. There are many of them who want to be heard, and if I had not been heard I would want to be heard before I voted for it. Give the other boys a chance to be heard. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, 10 days has been given to every man to print remarks in the RECORD, and those in favor of this

resolution do not want to fritter away any more time uselessly.

Mr. MANN. They want to be heard before the vote is had. Let us have the patience to hear them if we are going into war. We will need a great deal more patience afterwards to carry it on. We have all got to be patient.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] makes the point of order that debate has been exhausted.

Mr. SIMS. And I make it most seriously.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the pending amendment, to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. The first amendment was to strike out the last word.

Mr. SIMS. I demand a vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the pending amendment, to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that that amendment be withdrawn.

Mr. SIMS. I consent for this time, but this is the last one. We are frittering away our time, and I am getting tired of it.

Mr. MANN. What the gentleman needs is sleep.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. O'SHAUNESSY] is recognized to strike out the last word.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, had it not been for the interruption of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] I would have concluded my remarks long ago. I merely wish to say, in company with a large majority of this committee, that I shall support this resolution, and I am very proud of the fact that considerable time is being taken by the committee to give the resolution its earnest consideration.

War is too serious a question to be lightly considered. Even if we stayed here another day I would be in favor of every man expressing himself; and at this moment I want to say, even though I favor the resolution, and even though I believe that the time has come for America to assert her rights and to stop being patient and to say to the world that the indignities that have been offered her should be redressed and that her rights should be sustained, that I wish to pay my tribute of respect, nevertheless, to the conscientious Members of this House who believe in their hearts that there is not a cause for war and who have the manhood and the courage to say so. [Applause.]

It would be a sad day for the American Government if men refused in this representative body to express their real convictions and permitted themselves to be guided by the thought, the action, or the domination of some other person.

And so I join in loving tribute to the Democratic leader of the majority in this House, the Hon. CLAUDE KITCHIN, than whom there is no more lovable person on the face of God's earth. [Applause.]

However, I favor this resolution. When the war began it did not enlist our sympathies as it does to-day. The situation was paradoxical, so far as the allies were concerned. We hesitated to believe that the nations of the entente were struggling for liberty and fighting for freedom when they were tied up with autocratic Russia. But if this war has done nothing else in the world, it has brought to that benighted country liberty and freedom; and it is my earnest wish and prayer to-night that the new-found thought of that revolution that has come into the hearts of the Russian people will stay there forever, and that it has come permanently to join with this great Republic of ours. [Applause.]

I wish to voice another thought. It comes from the bottom of my heart. Oh, if America is to join the allies and go into this great war, if that flag, perchance, should go across the sea—and it may be necessary for it to go with our troops—I hope that wherever it is seen it shall awaken in the hearts of men a longing for real liberty, a desire for real freedom! Oh, how I pray that the revolution among men will grow, and that kings, no matter where, shall totter from their thrones.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I regret that I can not yield. I exempt no king; I exempt no czar; I exempt no emperor—the Czar of Russia, the Emporer of Germany, or the King of England, if you please. Oh, I hope that this revolution will grow! How I hope that it will bourgeon beyond the fight of an emperor against a czar, or of a czar against a king, and that the mighty voice of the people will be heard throughout the world giving to the people of the belligerent powers and their possessions the sovereign power.

And so I say in the American House of Representatives to-night, when we are about to join the allies, Long live the people and forward the revolution of the masses! [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan and Mr. DILLON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I rose to oppose the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not underestimate the great importance of the measure we are now considering. I have given it careful, prayerful, and most serious consideration. It has for days weighed heavily on my heart. I had hoped that our country might have escaped the horrors of war. But that was hoping against hope, and to-day we are at war. If I had my choice, I do not think I would have declared war in the first instance, but I would have mobilized our industries and supplies of every kind and nature, called our citizenry to training, and made unequaled and unheard of preparation; then when we struck we could have set the sword aflame. It seems to me that our participation in this struggle should have been avoided. All that would have been necessary was for Germany to have given our ships notice of attack and a chance for our citizens to save their lives. The rules of civilized warfare, of international law, and of humanity entitled them to this notice and this opportunity, and I think that where an unarmed merchantman is attacked and sunk without this notice and this opportunity it is not only an act of war but of barbarity, piracy, and relates back to the Dark Ages.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the various Members address this Chamber on the causes of war. We will often be asked to explain the reason of going to war. To me we have passed the stage of what the causes of war were. We are now at war. We are at war with a great empire. What matters it now that we had a cause for war with Mexico or England, or it was munition makers or the press? We are to-day at war with Germany. Two wrongs never made a right. Because we did not war with Mexico or England or stop munitions or the press are things of the past. Our Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy has asked for the use of the Army and Navy to defend and maintain the rights and institutions of the Republic. He has given the reasons to the Congress and the country. Now is the time for action. I for myself will grant his request and vote for the resolution. I do not want it said of me that as one of the Representatives of my country I was wanting in the hour of need to sustain the honor and integrity of our free institutions. I may go down to my grave unknown and missing, but it will not be said of me that I failed to sustain, as far as in me lies, the glory and honor of the Nation. We are now, as I speak, at war. Germany has waged ruthless, barbaric war on us. She has given us servile and subversive orders. Orders from an emperor to keep out of the public domain. Such orders as will best fit an autocrat and a monarch. We are a free people. If we would not fight for our freedom and our rights, we are not true descendants of our forefathers or loyal American citizens. Let us present a united front to the world.

How easily Germany could have satisfied the country and kept us out of war. All this by observing the law to which she agreed. I do not overlook the splendid German citizenry of our land, loyal and true. To them it will be an added burden. They will come to the colors at the first call. They are patriotic and ready to uphold and maintain and fight for the perpetuity of our institutions. They are fighting the cause of liberty and justice that their children and our children may have a safe and happy abode. I stand by such loyal German Americans, and know full well that they do not agree with or approve of the course of the Emperor. Like one man, with one single purpose, do we rally again around the flag. And, now that we are in, let us adopt the watchword "Everything for victory." God bless our land! [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] is recognized.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I pray that I fully comprehend the gravity of this occasion that all hoped we might avert.

No sane man wants war. Practically every nation on the civilized globe has witnessed its horrors and keenly felt its harrowing consequences.

It is my wish to reflect the sentiment of a patriotic constituency in what I shall say upon this solemn occasion.

Mr. Chairman, we are a peace-loving people, a Christian-spirited people, and yet in the life of our Republic we have entered five great wars, and in each instance we entered it to vindicate human liberty and sustain democratic government.

Gentlemen seem to justify their vote against this resolution upon the fact that we have suffered injustices and wrongs from nations other than Germany. That may be true; neutrals always suffer materially in great wars. But there is a great distinction between the character of wrongs we have suffered from other nations and those inflicted upon us by Germany. In the one case they were reparable wrongs; in the case of Germany they were irreparable. In the one case money as damages could repair the wrong; in the other case no amount of money could repair the injury.

Mr. Chairman, in like manner gentlemen have called attention to the taking of the lives of American citizens in Mexico, and say that as we failed to declare war against Mexico we should permit Germany to take as many lives of American citizens as the exigencies of war may demand. These gentlemen seem to be unable to differentiate between a government in the process of reconstruction and wrongs committed by bandits and outlaws and the same acts committed by and with the consent of a well-organized, responsible, and civilized Government—the one an irresponsible, unorganized, and weak government; the other a highly responsible and strong nation.

We have endured with patience and forbearance an almost unbroken chain of overt acts in violation of our rights upon the high seas on the part of the German Government. We have shown by many generous expressions of a great peace-loving President that we did not want war with Germany. Our entreaties and demands would be met with promises by Germany to adhere to the rules of civilized warfare and international law, only to be broken time after time.

Our President was severely criticized for his forbearance with and credulity in the pledges of the German Government. He had received assurances that our rights upon the seas would be respected and the lives and property of our citizens held inviolate.

In the face of these pledges our country was filled with spies attempting to destroy by violence our industries and to foment strikes and industrial unrest. The German Government attempted to form alliances in contiguous and noncontiguous countries to declare war upon us, going so far as to mention specifically the prize they would draw in territory if we were conquered. She has violated our neutrality by disabling interned vessels, and even sinking them in the channels of our ports. She has ruthlessly destroyed our commerce legitimately upon the high seas, and engaged in the dastardly murder of men, women, and children, citizens of our country, who under the law of nations had as much right upon such vessels as they had upon any foot of soil in this Union. Only the mercy of God has saved hundreds of our citizens who have been turned adrift upon the sea in open boats without aid or succor, to be tossed about by the storm-swept waves, exposed to icy winds and snow.

Mr. Chairman, we are not the instigators of this war. Germany has driven us into it. Even at the hour the President was delivering his great message to the American people Germany reiterated her intention to destroy our commerce and the lives of our citizens wherever found, whether engaged in legitimate or contraband trade.

Germany has laid off a zone 1,500 miles long and demanded that ships flying the Stars and Stripes shall not come in except at the risk of the cargo and every American life aboard. If we, sir, ignominiously surrender such rights as we have always maintained upon the seas, and be run from the seas to our land, I predict that it will not be many years before this haughty and autocratic government will attempt to drive our people from the land into the sea.

If we permit a destruction of our right to trade with the world, then you destroy our prestige and greatness as a Nation. To the degree of the usurpation of this right upon the high seas are our agricultural, industrial, and financial resources made impotent.

Mr. Chairman, we have won our place among the great civilized Christian nations of the world. For our eternal peace; for God and the Christian faith; for a civilization that stands for that which is nearest and dearest in every human breast—liberty, freedom in religious worship and democratic government—we must maintain that place at any cost.

Mr. Chairman, this vote to-night is only a formality. We are at war now. Germany has coolly and deliberately chosen this course. In this hour of the Nation's peril no time should be given for consideration as to whether our action will please a constituency who have an allegiance across the seas. Let the clarion voices of Americans only be heard to-night.

Let us adopt no weak-kneed policy toward the enemy. Let a great Nation raise its massive head above the clouds of dissension and political differences and draw the sword of a mighty Nation in defense of peace—world-wide peace; freedom—world-wide freedom; Christianity throughout the world, for the perpetuity of the principles for which our forefathers died.

To the accomplishment of which, Mr. Chairman, Georgia, the Empire State of the South, consecrates her patriotic services to the Nation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have not supported many of the policies of Woodrow Wilson, but I shall support this resolution with all my might. That is the only step now. Further, I shall support Woodrow Wilson, the President of the United States, in every act that he shall perform for the successful prosecution of this war which is now upon us and which can not be avoided. [Applause.] I give the President full credit for having tried to keep this Nation out of it. I believe that the people of my part of the great State of Washington have realized for a considerable time that this conflict was inevitable. The reason why I think our people knew that it was sure to come is because our legislature, last winter, made a very large appropriation for the maintenance of the armed forces of the State of Washington. Also, by resolution, the legislature pledged the entire resources of that State to the Federal Government in the maintenance of its honor.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, the people of Tacoma and Pierce County have bonded themselves in the sum of $2,000,000 in order to enlarge the Government's encampment ground there at American Lake and provide the Government with a great training ground of 80,000 acres—a tract about 15 miles one way and 12 miles another in area—and they are presenting it to the Government absolutely free. The people of the district I have the honor to represent are 27 per cent foreign born. I have just come from that district, and I pledge to the full support of the Government in this tremendous and unsought emergency the whole people of that patriotic district, although many of them have stood firmly, until the President's address of April 2, against war. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I shall avail myself later of the opportunity which has been offered to extend these remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, we go to war this day with the German Empire because for two and a half years she has wantonly committed acts of war against us.

Second. We go to war this day because on January 31, 1917, the Imperial German Government notified us in writing that she would sink on sight any ships in certain areas, and later, on March 16, 1917, she did sink three American merchant ships—the *Vigilancia*, the *Illinois*, and the *City of Memphis*—engaged in legitimate commerce.

Third. We go to war to-day because war has, amidst all our prayers and appeals for peace, been willfully and wantonly thrust upon us.

Fourth. We go to war to-day because the merchant ships *Falaba* and the *Lusitania* were sunk and the lives of 115 American citizens were snuffed out without warning and without provocation.

Fifth. We go to war to-day because 15 American ships engaged in legitimate errands upon the high seas have been sunk without warning, without cause, and without mercy.

Sixth. We go to war to-day, not for dollars nor for the 15 ships sunk, grave as that offense may be, but because with the sinking of those 15 ships the lives of 224 innocent men, women, and children were lost, whose only crime was the traveling where they had a right to travel, transacting business they had the right to transact, molesting no one, and whose only desire was to be let alone and be free in the tasks and business they were undertaking to do.

Seventh. We go to war to-day because of the Zimmermann plot, which sought, by intrigue, sinister motives, fraud, deceit, wantonness, to dismember the Republic and carve from our very boundaries the States of Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona and hold them up as a price for the perfidy they sought to have carried out. The fact that the effort aborted and failed does not in any way lessen the gravity of the offense.

Eighth. We go to war to-day because of the crimes, arson, rape, and inhuman warfare visited upon poor little Belgium, whose only crime was her desire to live in peace and attend strictly to her own affairs.

Ninth. We go to war to-day because the Imperial German Government has invaded every right vouchsafed to us by the fathers who founded our Constitution and the Republic in which we live.

Tenth. We go to war to-day because for almost three years Germany has carried on an inhuman warfare against civilization, humanity, and the world.

Eleventh. We go to war to-day because submission to wrongs and dishonor heaped upon us by the German Empire will not and

can not beget a lasting peace, but will surely reduce us, disintegrate us, and undermine us.

Twelfth. We go to war to-day because for more than two years President Wilson has faithfully, earnestly, patiently plead with the German Government to respect our rights; to allow us the blessings of peace and the right to enjoy the public thoroughfare of the high seas free from assault, free from submarines and the ensuing death and disaster that follow in their wake; because he has been patient, because he has counseled patience, because he and his Nation are worshipers at the shrine of peace, all of those pleadings, all of those protestations and appeals, have gone unheeded, ignored, and been trampled under foot.

Thirteenth. We go to war to-day because it is our belief that the sturdy sons of this day would have us, acting as their representatives, stand true, stand erect, stand strong, and spare succeedings generations the bitter cup of dishonor, disintegration, cowardice, and disgrace.

Fourteenth. We go to war to-day because there comes to our ears in this trying hour a sound clear and emphatic from the long-ago, which bids us stand true, stand strong, that the Republic, conceived in liberty, freedom, and equality shall not perish from the earth.

Fifteenth. We go to war this day because the issue is not one of peace or war; it is a question of standing erect against a war that has been and is still being waged against us.

Sixteenth. We go to war to-day because patriotism is not dead and because we are still the sturdy and worthy sons of our sires who founded a Republic conceived in liberty and equality, and because we desire to preserve it as a haven for the oppressed for all the people of the earth.

I have enumerated but a portion of the indignities and wrongs heaped upon us by Germany. I have but scratched the surface of the far-reaching plots, intrigues, and crimes committed against us.

WHAT WOULD SUBMISSION MEAN?

It means the United States can not ship products of the mine, field, forest, or factory through an arbitrary, proscribed zone on the high seas 1,200 miles in length and 1,000 miles in width without being sunk on sight by German submarines. Through this zone three-fifths of all our export commerce passed last year.

Second. It means we must abandon the shipment of $3,382,000,000, out of a total of $5,481,000,000, of export products for the ensuing year and either allow such products to go unmarketed or find markets for them we know not where. It means that of our export business two-thirds of our wheat, five-sixths of our hog products, six-sevenths of our cotton products, seven-eighths of our beef products, three-fifths of our tobacco products will be without a market they have at all times enjoyed in the past—without a market they are now entitled to enjoy.

Third. This could mean nothing but paralysis and disaster to our 6,500,000 farmers; destitution and want to our 20,000,000 toilers who earn their living by their daily wage, a closing of our factories, depression, panic, disaster, injustice, deterioration and want to a Republic whose only wrong is to carry on its legitimate business molesting or interfering with the rights of no one.

Fourth. It means that the proud young Republic will sit in ease and plenty and allow innocent American-born men, women, and children to be slaughtered, murdered, drowned, without hope, without warning, and without God. It means the withdrawal of the advantages of the high seas furnished to all mankind as an open thoroughfare by the God of the Universe.

Fifth. It means that the blood of our fathers no longer courses through our veins, and that patriotism is withered, disintegrated, and gone.

Sixth. It means that virility, ambition, hope, and determination that democracy, liberty, freedom, and justice shall reign shall receive no word of hope or defense from us.

Seventh. It means that we would follow in the wake of the pacifist who may be honest of thought and sincere of purpose, but whose whisperings of timidity, cowardice, and craven would furnish but a dim light to lead the Republic during this trying hour.

Eighth. It means that lasting peace shall be imperiled by the comforts of the day; that fallacy, pacifism, and misconception of duty shall prevail and that peace will be but fleeting rather than permanent and lasting.

Ninth. It means that liberty and justice shall cringingly give way to Prussianism, militarism, kaiserism.

Tenth. That submission to such wrongs would publish to the world our degeneracy, inferiority, disintegration, and dishonor.

To such a course of submission I can not subscribe; such a course of submission I can not believe the thoughtful, teeming millions of the Republic would have their President and the Congress this day traverse. Peace is and has always been a controlling passion with me. It is a passion with the people I represent. I abhor war. They abhor war. Still there is something in the blood that tingles when Old Glory is unjustly attacked. There is something in our love of country that makes us wonder if a Republic conceived in liberty and resting upon a foundation of equality can survive. There is something that seems to speak to us out of the long ago that the Republic can only live by the preservation of its every right, and that timidity, cowardice, and submission to the invasion of our well-established rights will bring about disintegration, will disrupt and dissolve us, will cause us to wither and die.

WHO CAN DEFEND GERMANY'S CONDUCT?

Who can rise in his place and defend the Imperial Government of Germany in its submarine policy that has caused the sinking of 1,276 merchant vessels, 425 of which were sailing under neutral flags? The following is a list of the ships sunk under this policy:

Great Britain, 369; Norway, 410; Italy, 137; France, 90; Denmark, 44; Holland, 61; Greece, 50; Sweden, 111; Spain, 33; Russia, 24; United States, 15; Portugal, 6; Belgium, 5; Peru, 1; Brazil, 1; Japan, 1; Argentina, 1.

This ghastly toll of life and property can not longer be endured by the civilized world. Germany has neither spared life, property, nor humanity. Her career has been one of butchery, slaughter, and disgrace. Excuse might be offered, vicious and inhumane as it may be, against belligerents, but surely there can be no adequate defense conjured up for her attacks upon the neutral countries of the world, who neither desire to harm her nor injure her, but whose only passion is peace on earth, good will to men.

WE ENTER THE WAR FOR NO SELFISH PURPOSE.

In entering this unjust and inhuman war, ruthlessly thrust upon us by the Imperial German Government, we differ from all the rest. France fights because she is being invaded and seeks to recover her lost Provinces; England fights in support of her treaty relations with bleeding Belgium; Russia fights to gain Constantinople; Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey are fighting with some hope of reward. Germany fights to control central Europe and conquer the world. We enter the war not for dollars, not for empire, not for conquest or hope of reward, but only for the preservation of our modest and undoubted right to be free, to be let alone, and only after an unholy war has been waged against us for more than two years. Could any nation enter a war so completely without selfishness and without guile? Ours is a war against crime, against murder, against autocracy, against militarism, against the overthrow of our freedom and our liberty, against imperialism; ours is a war for democracy, for justice, for freedom, for liberty, and that the republics of the world may endure and live.

THE REPUBLIC IS NOT A MILITARY NATION.

Our Republic has never been a military Nation. Our people do not lean toward militarism, imperialism, and conquest. We have never believed in large standing armies or great navies. We are a giant, young Republic, whose only purpose has been to build and perpetuate the freest, truest, and bravest Republic in all the world. We have preferred to lean on the pent-up fires of patriotism that burn in the hearts of our citizens. The time has come for patriotism of the truest sort to assert itself. The best, the truest, the bravest, are none too good to serve the Republic this day.

The policy of this Nation in the past has been to avoid tax burdens incident to military preparedness, and it is not sufficiently prepared from a military standpoint to enter a world war. It therefore becomes the patent duty of our citizens to rise in unison and accord and generously give of our time and means such services as the Nation deserves and demands.

WILL OUR CITIZENSHIP MEASURE UP TO THE STANDARD?

We are told that our citizenship, busy with the affairs of the day, will not respond to the call of their country, in peril though it be. For me and mine I adopt no such conclusion. I am as firm in the belief that our citizenship will stand true as I am that I live. I am as certain as that I live that the fathers did not build this Republic in vain. I am as certain as that I live that in Dixie land in the South, on the broad prairies of the West, in the factories and congested centers of the North and East that patriotism is not dead. I am as certain as that I live that from mine, field, forest, factory, bench, and bar will come teeming responses to the country's call to defend it, to uphold it, to protect it.

SHALL WE SUCCEED?

We shall succeed in the defense of our rights, but in so doing we must wage no timid or hesitating warfare. We shall succeed, but it will be by the brave and concerted effort of patriotic hearts who are unwilling to listen to words of cowardice, pacifism, and degeneracy which have emerged from the darkness but to strike and which on the coming morrow will retire to the darkness from whence they came.

We shall succeed because we ask only justice and to be let alone. A war so waged can not fail, it must not fail. With justice, liberty, democracy, and freedom from any selfish purpose as our only goal, in the words of the gifted ex-Gov. Glynn, "Let us wage a victorious war while reason primes the rifle and honor draws the sword."

Therefore, not in gladness but in sorrow, not in pleasure but in pain, I am standing not alone with President Wilson and the perpetuity of the Republic, but with the fathers who have gone on before who have decreed that this Republic shall live. I take my stand and vote for this resolution to-day, believing that it is the only honorable course consistent with every teaching that we know, with every idea of liberty and freedom that we enjoy. [Applause.]

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am going to vote for this resolution, but I am going to reserve the right to oppose in the future any attempts to send American boys to European trenches. I do not believe that any American soldier should be drafted to be sent to the battle fields of England to fight Great Britain's battles that her own sons have refused to fight. [Applause.]

I do not want to vote to send any American boy to listen and keep step to the strains of "God save the King."

Mr. CALDWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes.

Mr. CALDWELL. I want to ask the gentleman if he has read section 79 of the national-defense act passed June 3, 1916, which I believe the gentleman voted for, and which provides for the draft in the event that this country gets into war?

Mr. KEARNS. Yes; I am willing whenever my country goes into war to draft our boys if they refuse to volunteer to fight the battles of America, but I am not willing that our boys be drafted and sent to England to fight her battles, as I said before, the battles that her own sons have refused to fight. [Applause.]

If I get an opportunity to-night—and I am willing to stay here until morning in order to vote for an amendment that will not give any one man in this country the power to take the young men from their homes and send them to foreign trenches. I am going to pause here in my own time and ask the Members of this Congress how many of them, if we should declare war to-night—which we will, as it is our duty to declare it, because we are in a position where we betray our own country if we do not—I am going to pause here and ask all of you who are willing to volunteer as privates to rise to your feet.

I want it to go to the country that I paused and asked the question and only three Members have arisen to their feet. I want the country to know this.

A MEMBER. We will all go.

Mr. KEARNS. I want to know whether you are going as privates. I have had letters from my district from men who want commissions, but I have never yet received a letter or telegram from anybody who wanted to volunteer as a private. I want to say here, in passing, that when it comes to fighting in the quarrels of America there is not a man or boy in all my country, of fighting age and health, but would rise as one man in defense of that flag.

I am not going to ask the boys of this country to go onto a foreign soil and fight some other man's trouble and to battle in some other man's quarrel unless gentlemen who vote that way are willing to go themselves. I want to go on record here by saying that I believe that when war is declared we will be a united people. I have a German constituency, in part, and I know that these men are just as loyal and just as patriotic as some gentlemen are who have by innuendo, at least, challenged their patriotism. They have proven their love for that flag on a hundred battle fields and I can not quite understand when Germany and England met on the field of battle, at a time when we at least professed a neutrality, why you challenge their right to sympathize with their brothers, uncles, and cousins over there who are engaged in that awful struggle that is destroying Europe.

I have in my own family a relative who was born on English soil and up to this moment she has been a bitter British partisan and I could not, and neither could my family, love her with the devotion that we do had she forgotten the home of her birth, or had she forgotten the country where the bodies of her father and mother were buried and where she has a brother engaged in that awful struggle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the Whole has under consideration the following resolution, which reads:

Whereas the Imperial German Government has committed repeated acts of war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial German Government which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial German Government; and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

If this resolution does not state the truth, it is the duty of every Member of this House to vote against it. On the other hand, if the facts as stated are correct, there is no alternative for a brave and patriotic people but to resort to armed force to repel the attack which has been wantonly and ruthlessly made.

When the issue comes the American people will be found as loyal and true as they have ever been in the defense of their country. The people of the North, South, East, and West will all rally beneath the one flag of our reunited country in its common defense.

The first "preparedness" parade in the United States was held at Shreveport, La., in the fourth congressional district, which I have the honor to represent. The magnificent floats used on that occasion were placed on exhibition at the Louisiana State Fair at Shreveport and attracted great attention. The mayor of that city has ordered the United States flag displayed from all public buildings, and a magnificent electric flag, displaying in flashing lights the red, white, and blue, is to be placed on the courthouse there. They are to have a large patriotic demonstration there to-morrow night when the passage of the resolution we are now considering is flashed over the wires. Only last week the medical society for the fourth congressional district of Louisiana passed resolutions indorsing the acts of President Wilson and offering their services in the event of war.

These instances are cited to show the patriotic sentiment which prevails in the South. Only a few minutes ago we listened to the patriotic speech of the gentleman from Louisiana, Gen. ESTOPINAL, who is a veteran of the Civil War. He has nine sons eligible for enlistment, and his declaration in favor of the passage of this resolution came after the most mature deliberation.

The intrigues of the German Government, in an effort to effect plans with the Mexican Government to form an offensive alliance with Japan against our Government, indicate her animosity toward us, and the explosions of munitions plants in the United States show the desperate measures to which they will resort. The effort to incite the negroes against the whites in the South confirms the view of the deep-seated animosity which the German Government bears toward the people of the United States.

A simple embargo on our ships, preventing the carrying of our cotton and other agricultural products to the markets of the world would be bad enough, but when a dead line is made hundreds of miles out in the ocean and all the world is forbidden under penalty of death from passing over it, the time is at hand to call a halt. Men, women, and innocent children have been ruthlessly and unmercifully blown into eternity by the German submarines without warning while they were traveling on the high seas on peaceful errands, where all people have a perfect right to go.

Since the beginning of hostilities in Europe, according to Associated Press dispatches, 226 Americans have gone to their death through German and Austrian submarine operations. Most of these Americans were traveling on unarmed merchant ships, and, under the rules of international law and humanity, believed themselves secure. The first American to lose his life was Leon T. Thresher.

The first American ship attacked was the *Gulflight*, an oil tanker, from Port Arthur, Tex., to Rouen, France, torpedoed without warning off the Scilly Islands May 1, 1915. The destruction of the *Lusitania* occurred May 7, 1915. She was unarmed and carried between twelve and thirteen hundred passengers, of whom 159 were Americans; was sunk as she was nearing Liverpool, and of the 1,198 lives lost 114 were Americans, many of them being men of national prominence. Everything pointed to a prearranged German plan to torpedo the ship.

While the *Lusitania* case still was fresh in the public mind, a German submarine torpedoed the American ship, the *Nebraskan*, without warning on May 25, 1915. Though, as in the case of the *Gulflight*, she did not sink but owed her safety to her seaworthiness and reached port, damaged, under her own steam. The *Nebraskan's* name was painted on her sides in letters 6 feet high. The German Government expressed its regret, claiming a mistake, and promised to pay damages.

On June 28, 1915, 23 American muleteers on the Leyland liner *Armenian* were killed by shell fire and drowning when the *Armenian* failed to escape with her cargo.

The American sailing ship *William P. Frye* was the first American vessel sunk in the war.

Another crisis came on August 19, 1915, when the White Star liner *Arabic*, from Liverpool to New York, was torpedoed without warning near the *Lusitania's* grave and sunk in about 10 minutes. Out of the 375 passengers and crew 48 were lost. There were 30 Americans on board and 3 lost their lives. Germany again expressed regret and gave assurance for the future safety of passenger ships.

Austria's first submarine operations began with the destruction of the Italian liner *Ancona* in the Mediterranean Sea November 7, 1915. She carried hundreds of passengers, many of them being women and children, bound from Naples to New York. Twelve Americans were on board and nine lost their lives.

Another crisis was developed by the destruction of the British liner *Persia*, December 30, 1915. American Consul McNeeley, on his way to his post at Aden, was among the 335 persons who lost their lives, of which two or more were Americans.

On March 27, 1916, a German submarine sank the Dominion liner *Englishman*. Six Americans were lost; many other Americans were on board. One of the rescued Americans testified that the submarine was the *U–19*. On the same day came the destruction of the French steamer *Sussex*, and this was the culmination of the long list of submarine outrages which caused President Wilson to lay the situation before Congress and to notify Germany that unless these methods were discontinued the United States would be compelled to break off diplomatic relations with her.

On April 18, 1916, the President delivered his message to Congress, relating to the sinking on the 24th of March, 1916, of the steamer *Sussex* by a German submarine, without warning, resulting in the loss of the lives of several citizens of the United States, at which time the President addressed a note to the German Government, protesting against the further destruction of vessels by indiscriminate use of submarines, in which he stated that unless the German Government should immediately declare and effect an abandonment of the submarine warfare against passenger and freight carrying vessels the Government of the United States could have no choice but to sever diplomatic relations with the German Empire.

To this note the German Government gave an assurance of the freedom of the seas, stating that instructions had been given her officials to recognize the international law and not to destroy merchant vessels outside of the war zone without warning and without saving human life, unless these ships attempted to escape or offer resistance. On the 18th of May, 1916, the Government of the United States replied, accepting the statement of the German Government as sincere and as made in good faith.

On the 31st of January, 1917, the German Government served notice upon our Government that after February 1, 1917, in a zone around Great Britain, France, Italy, and the eastern Mediterranean all ships, including those of neutrals, from and to England and from and to France would be sunk.

The President of the United States on January 22, 1917, had made his address to the United States Senate for a league for peace, in which he submitted proposals intended to procure and preserve universal peace; and this note of the German Government on the 31st of January, 1917, was, in effect and to all intents and purposes, a reply to this humane address of the President.

In his address to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, February 3, 1917, the President of the United States announced the severance of diplomatic relations between the United States and the German Empire, in which address the President deplored the renunciation by the German Government of its assurances and stated that he refused to believe that it was the intention of the German authorities to do in fact what they warned us they would feel at liberty to do and destroy American ships and take the lives of American citizens in the willful prosecution of the ruthless naval program they had announced their intention to adopt.

However, in spite of this confidence expressed by the President, they proceeded with the indiscriminate destruction of our vessels upon the high seas, which are free to all peoples of the world, and proceeded to destroy the lives of the citizens of the United States with a wanton disregard of the laws of nations as well as the treaties existing between our country and Germany.

Following is an approximately correct list of all American ships damaged or destroyed by German submarines and ships sunk with loss of American lives:

American ships damaged or destroyed by German submarines.

Name of vessel.	Date.	Particulars.
Gulflight	May 2,1915	Torpedoed.
Nebraskan	May 25,1915	Do.
Leelanaw	July 25,1915	Torpedoed and shelled.
Seaconnet	June 16,1916	Damaged by mine or torpedo.
Oswego	Aug. 14,1916	Fired on 10 times by submarine.
Lanao (Philippine)	Oct. 28,1916	Sunk by submarine.
Columbian	Nov. 7,1916	Do.
Colena	Nov. 26,1916	Fired on.
St. Helen's	Dec. 10,1916	Attacked by submarine.
Rebecca Palmer	Dec. 14,1916	Fired on; slight damage.
Sacramento	Jan. 9,1917	Fired on.
Housatonic	Feb. 3,1917	Sunk.
Lyman M. Law	Feb. 13,1917	Burned by submarine.
Vigilancia	Mar. 16,1917	Torpedoed.
City of Memphis	Mar. 17,1917	Sunk by gunfire.
Illinois	....do.....	Torpedoed.
Aztec	Apr. 1,1917	Do.

SHIPS SUNK WITH LOSS OF AMERICAN LIVES.

British ship *Falaba*, torpedoed March 28, 1915 (warned); 1 American lost.

British ship *Lusitania*, torpedoed May 7, 1915 (no warning); 114 Americans lost.

American ship *Gulflight*, torpedoed May 1, 1915 (no warning); 2 Americans lost.

British ship *Armenian*, torpedoed June 28, 1915 (ordered to stop; tried to escape); 23 Americans lost.

British ship *Iberian*, sunk July 31, 1915 (tried to escape; stopped by shell fire); 3 Americans lost.

British ship *Anglo-Californian*, sunk July 4, 1915; 2 Americans lost.

British ship *Hesperian*, torpedoed September 4, 1915 (no warning); 1 American lost.

British ship *Arabic*, torpedoed August 19, 1915 (no warning); 3 Americans lost.

British ship *Persia*, believed to have been torpedoed; sunk December 30, 1915 (no warning); 2 Americans lost.

Italian ship *Ancona*, torpedoed November 9, 1915 (no warning); 7 Americans lost.

British ship *Englishman*, torpedoed March 27, 1916; 6 Americans lost (1 more whose nationality is doubtful).

British ship *Sabota*, sunk by gunfire October 20, 1916; 1 American lost.

British ship *Marina*, sunk by gunfire October 28, 1916 (warned); 8 Americans lost.

British ship *Russian*, torpedoed December 14, 1916 (no warning); 17 Americans lost.

British ship *Eaveston*, sunk by shell fire February 5, 1917; 1 American lost (1 other whose nationality is doubtful).

British ship *Vedamore*, torpedoed February 7, 1917 (no warning); 10 Americans lost.

British ship *Turino*, torpedoed February 7, 1917 (no warning); 1 American (?) lost.

French ship *Athos*, torpedoed February 22, 1917 (no warning); 1 American lost.

British ship *Laconia*, torpedoed February 26, 1917 (no warning); 8 Americans lost.

Norwegian ship *Sjostad*, believed torpedoed March 2, 1917 (no warning); 1 American lost.

American ship *Vigilancia*, torpedoed March 16, 1917 (no warning); 5 Americans lost.

American ship *Healdton*, torpedoed March 21, 1917 (no warning); 7 Americans lost.

British ship *Crispin*, torpedoed March 29, 1917 (no warning); 68 Americans on board, 1 killed, 18 missing.

Total, 226 American lives lost.

On the *Lusitania* there were also 24 children born of foreign parents on American soil.

In committing these outrages the German Government not only violated international law but the pledges contained in her solemn treaty with the United States:

The twelfth article of the treaty concluded between the parties in 1785 and the articles from the thirteenth to the twenty-fourth, inclusive, of that which was concluded at Berlin in 1799 * * * are hereby revived with the same force and virtue as if they made part of the context of the present treaty.

ART. 12. If one of the contracting parties should be engaged in war with any other power, the free intercourse and commerce of the subjects or citizens of the party remaining neuter with the belligerent powers shall not be interrupted. On the contrary, in that case, as in full peace, the vessels of the neutral party may navigate freely to and from the ports and on the coasts of the belligerent parties, free vessels making free goods, in so much as all things may be adjudged free which shall be on board any vessel belonging to the neutral party, although such things belong to an enemy of the other; and the same freedom shall be extended to persons who shall be on board a free vessel, although they should be enemies to the other party, unless they be soldiers in actual service of such enemy.

The President of the United States on last Monday, in his address to Congress, portrayed in vivid language the outrages perpetrated upon this country by Germany and called upon us to adopt the necessary measures to vindicate our honor and preserve our integrity as a nation.

With this duty confronting us, our answer should be—

READY!

We are with you, Mr. President, whatever you may do,
Though in the past, perhaps, we oft have disagreed with you.
The time has come for bickering and argument to cease,
For threats of war loom ominous where formerly was peace.
Behind you we are standing,
To pursue the course you wend.
We are with you, Woodrow Wilson—
We are with you to the end!

From Vermont's green cragged mountains to the California shore
Stand the people of the Nation as they oft have stood before;
From the northern barren stretches to the sunlands of the South,
They are ready, though the order calls them to the cannon's mouth.
'Tis no no time for hesitation,
With a matter thus to mend.
We are with you, Woodrow Wilson—
We are with you to the end!

We have neither creed nor tenet when a crisis bids us come,
For all questioning dissension has been silenced and is dumb.
The melting pot has bubbled long its finished cast to yield,
A people of one purpose, that will neither give nor yield.
And a Nation undivided,
That no foreign foe can rend,
Stands behind you, Woodrow Wilson—
It is with you to the end!

The Austrian prince was assassinated by the Serbians and war was declared by Austria against Serbia.

The battleship *Maine* was sunk and the United States Government declared war against Spain.

We have heard to-day recitals of the most blood-curdling character, relating the atrocities of the Germans in Belgium, France, and upon the high seas. Every impulse of our nature impels us toward a resentment of these outrages; but above and beyond everything else the love of our country and the desire to perpetuate its institutions and that love for freedom and justice with which our hearts are imbued impels us to resent to the uttermost the depredations of a foreign foe.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BORLAND). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] is recognized.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I should prefer to be heard in opposition to the amendment about to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] if I may be. If not, then I should like to be heard now.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

Mr. DILLON rose.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Chair if I will be recognized in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. At 11 o'clock I asked the then occupant of the chair for recognition, and I have been waiting ever since to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets to inform the gentleman that that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

As the Chair understands the situation, the gentleman from Illinois desires to offer an amendment without debate, being the amendment to which he referred at the time he had the floor. Is that correct?

Mr. BRITTEN. That is not quite correct, Mr. Chairman. I do not know on what the Chairman is basing that statement. I desire to use five minutes upon my amendment, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair's recollection is that the gentleman offered an amendment or had an amendment read in his time which he proposed to offer.

Mr. BRITTEN. The amendment was merely read in my time. The Chair is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I understand the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois is offered?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not offered. The gentleman from Illinois has been recognized once, and until gentlemen who have asked for recognition——

Mr. LONGWORTH. As I stated to the Chair, I would prefer to be recognized in opposition to the amendment if I can be assured that I will be recognized after that. I prefer it to being recognized at this time.

Mr. BRITTEN. If the Chairman pleases, I will offer the amendment to be read at this time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I be recognized in opposition to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the amendment be read——

Mr. MANN. It has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is it necessary to have unanimous consent in order to present the amendment?

Mr. MANN. There is an amendment pending now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands that there is an amendment pending now. The Chair is prepared to recognize gentlemen in opposition to that amendment.

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has been recognized.

Mr. SIMS. Has the amendment been read?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has been recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SIMS. But the amendment has not been read.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is for gentlemen to take their seats and give attention to who has the floor.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SIMS. Has the amendment been offered and read as an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the Chair so understands.

Mr. SIMS. I understood it was only offered and read in debate, for information only.

Mr. MANN. The only amendment offered is to strike out the last two words, and let us see whether we will strike them out.

Mr. SIMS. I make the point of order that debate on the amendment has been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. SIMS. Then I appeal from the decision of the Chair, because there have been a dozen speeches——

Mr. MANN. I do not think the gentleman ought to filibuster.

Mr. SIMS. I know exactly what the gentleman from Ohio desires to debate. He desires to debate the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois; that is what he wants to discuss, and not the motion to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN. Do not take up time that way.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in order to obviate all discussion, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. MANN. There is an amendment to strike out the last two words.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, if I could permit myself to be influenced as gentlemen in this body have indicated that they are influenced and as gentlemen in another body have indicated that they are influenced by a census taken of messages they have received for and against war; if I were to permit any solicitude for my immediate political future based upon that census to govern my action to-night, I might, I do not say that I would, but I might hesitate as to what course to pursue. But, gentlemen of the House, this occasion is too big, the issues confronting us are too overwhelmingly important to allow any petty thing like personal interest to influence my vote. The only interest to which I give heed to-night is the interest, as I see it, of the American people. [Applause.] The only future to which I look is the future of my country. From that standpoint but one course seems clear to me, and that is to resist all amendments to this resolution, including the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [applause], and to vote for it exactly as it comes to us from the Senate of the United States. It is true that we give the President of the United States enormous powers under this resolution. It is true that we give him almost unlimited discretion, for we pledge to him the entire strength of the military and material resources of the American Nation. We could hardly do more; but, gentlemen, we ought not to do less. [Applause.]

If we are to take part in this gigantic conflict we ought to take a man's part. [Applause.] If we are to make war, let us make war with what energy and efficiency we may. To make war feebly in this crisis would be nothing short of folly. America, gentlemen, is not responsible for the situation we are facing. God knows we have been patient, but always the time may come when patience ceases to be a virtue, and that time is now. The one recourse that we have is to pass this resolution unamended.

We accept the responsibility and we accept it with no ambition or desire except to preserve the rights of the people of the United States and to uphold Christian civilization. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to vote. [Applause.]

Mr. BRITTEN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman. The amendment pending is a pro forma amendment. I desire to offer a bona fide amendment, which I think should be recognized by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. DYER. I make the point of order there is an amendment pending.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no amendment pending except a pro forma one.

Mr. DYER. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the pro forma amendment, which has not been disposed of.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BRITTEN: On page 2, after line 16, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"*Provided, however*, That no part of the military forces of the United States shall be ordered to do land duty in any part of Europe, Asia, or Africa until so directed by act of Congress, excepting those troops who specifically volunteer for such service."

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just read by the Clerk is the same amendment that was read during my time in the general debate this morning, with the exception that on the advice of several Members of the House, on both sides of the Chamber, who desired to vote for an amendment of this character I have added the last two lines, "excepting those troops who specifically volunteer for such service." Now, there may be men in the New England States, young men of valor and of vim, who desire to go to Europe, who desire to enter into this trench warfare and fight the Germans. Let them go if they wish. The boys of my district do not want to go. The boys of many of your districts do not want to go. There is going to be a conscription forced upon them. Their people do not want them to go to Europe, but they are willing to give every ounce of blood in their bodies in defense of America on American soil.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. Not just now.

If my amendment is added to this declaration of war it will give the country and Congress time to deliberate. We can not possibly recruit 500,000 or a million men in a year under volunteer service. It has got to be conscription, and in six or eight months from now you and I may feel that we do not want our boys to go against this awful slaughter. Suppose the near future should bring about the downfall of the Hohenzollerns in Germany and the Hapsburgs in Austria-Hungary, and the people of a new duo of republics arranged for a separate peace with the new Republic of Russia? Would you still feel inclined to send our troops into France or Saloniki because England would not agree to a separate peace? Would you then favor sending our boys into the fertile fields of Mesopotamia in order to gratify England's wishes? Surely nothing can be further from your desires; and yet that very condition is as likely to occur as many others suggested on the floor of this House to-day. Military experts advise us that it takes three years to make a good soldier, and still a distinguished Member of the Senate suggested the other day that we ought to send 10,000 of our men at once to France—for the moral effect—at once. Send 10,000 of the finest specimens of American manhood to France at once to be slaughtered for the moral effect it will have on certain European nations now in a bloody death struggle. Are we too becoming war mad? The people of the country are against entering this war by a majority of from a hundred to a thousand to one. You owe it to the mothers, the sisters, the families of these boys to adopt my amendment.

Last Saturday I drove up Michigan Avenue and I saw some of our boys being taught to drive a bayonet through a ring of that size [indicating]. It was instruction in bayonet warfare. Do you know what that means? That means "going over the top" and landing on a human being and stabbing him with a bayonet. That is what our boys are practicing to-day in Chicago. It is not fair nor humane to send our soldiers up against those trained forces in Europe. It is like throwing a fine greyhound into a pit for a death struggle with a trained bulldog who has seen many victories.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRITTEN. No; I can not. I have only five minutes. I do not desire to be discourteous at all.

I think we owe it to our own people to adopt an amendment, not necessarily mine, but an amendment of this character. A thousand things may be done in the next 12 months that will justify us in keeping our boys here. Suppose we have a terrible conflict with Mexico, or as terrible as Mexico can make it, we will need our soldiers here and not in France.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE], a member of the committee, is recognized.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, I do not come from a district such as the gentleman represents. I come from a State the people of which do not want war, but when once that flag is given to the breeze it means that when they come into the service of these United States they come to serve where their services are needed. [Applause.] Our people know, and every Member of Congress here knows, that with the great waters between us and Europe there can be no service limited to this land. Does the gentleman want the boys from the other parts of this country to go across the water and do real service while his "slackers" stay at home in places of security and safety and get the name of heroes who are serving their country? [Applause.]

I come from a State that does not want war, but we do not want to reconsider once we go to war. The President of the United States has said there must be war. There is war, and we say that there is war by this declaration. When we take that position, so far as I am concerned it means that every particle of power that I should give from my State to this Government to defend that flag at home, on the high seas, or elsewhere, shall be given. I stand with those with whom we fight on any soil under the sun, and all the aid in my power shall be given to the President to bring this war to a successful conclusion in order that that flag may be what it has been in the past [applause], a flag that fears no foeman, a flag that will be waved in the face of Imperial Germany and not kept at home where shells may not reach the hands that hold it. [Applause.]

South Carolina does not want war, but when war comes South Carolina is for a vigorous prosecution of the war, and her sons will go where the flag goes. Men and treasure shall be given from her, if the President wants them, in unstinted measure, even if it requires conscription and burdensome taxes, to uphold that flag and all that it stands for in these United States in association with the allies with whom she must fight in this tremendous conflict. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is recognized.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, the resolution we are now considering truthfully states that the Imperial Government of Germany has committed repeated acts of war against the Government and people of the United States. The free seas of the world have been closed to us and the lives of our citizens ruthlessly destroyed. From almost the beginning of the European war accredited officials of Germany to this country and their agents have committed, in violation of our rights as a neutral nation, acts of the gravest character. No recital of them need now be made; the memory of them is fresh with all who are willing to know. The patience of a people loving peace as a passion has endured these wrongs until further forbearance would be cowardice. If the soul of a free nation is not to be destroyed and those ideals for the attainment of which our Government came into being lost, we must draw the sword and with all our might and at whatever sacrifice make secure that freedom which is our birthright and without which national life is vain.

We shall not go into this war out of any careful weighing of cost, of profit and loss. I repeat, we go into it because those things that make life worth living, that make a nation's true greatness, have been challenged, and men are not worthy of the heritage of freemen who are not willing, by their lives if need be, to preserve for those who follow after the heritage that has been handed down to them.

I should deplore that my country should not have the courage and the manhood to accept the gage of battle that has been thrown down. War exists. We must fight or be craven. And if we are to fight, let us fight as men. Let us not undertake to cripple this declaration of war by conditions as to its terms. [Applause.] We have no power as legislators to pass the amendment that is offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. The President of the United States is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and when war is declared this Congress can not, by such a proposal as is here offered, control his power to direct how that Army and that Navy shall be used. But if it had the power I should scorn to exercise it in so ignoble a manner. [Applause.]

In the wars of the past that this country has engaged in we have never stopped to say that our men should fight only on our soil. We have sought our enemy, and we have sought him though he might be at the ends of the earth. While we go into

this war because of many wrongs to America and American sovereignty; while as justification of our action we need not recite, though we unfortunately may not forget, the barbarities committed by the German Government against the civilization of the world; it is to me a matter of splendid satisfaction that in fighting to redress our wrongs we are also fighting to redress the wrongs of outraged humanity [applause]; that in fighting to preserve our civilization we are paying back in some small degree the debt we have owed for a century to heroic France [applause]; and that the men of America, in standing for the ideals of America, will help to preserve the ideals of free people everywhere. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is recognized.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, if I understood correctly the reading of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] and interpreted it properly, it means that while we shall declare war, we will not fight. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if upon this dark day I could catch a glimpse of a rainbow that gives or would give reasonable promise, I should take the course of opposing the resolution that is before the House. If lingering hope could see a star amid all this gloom, I should be delighted to see it. If the gentlemen who to-day have opposed the adoption of this resolution could give to me a reasonable assurance that by not adopting it there were a hope for peace with justice; if the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], whom all of us admire and whom most of us love, could have given an assurance that by the voting down of this resolution our situation would be improved, I should be glad to cast my lot with him, while waiting to hear this as a result of the fact that the resolution had not passed. But there is no such assurance given, either in the addresses made here or in the developments of events.

The issue is very clear to my mind, and very simple. The freedom of the seas is a right recognized by every precept of international law, and those American citizens who went down to sea in ships not bearing contraband and were sunk without warning or notice had their rights violated as much as would my rights be violated if my life were taken as I walked across the street this evening upon a peaceful mission.

Does any gentleman deny that? Is there anywhere to be found a voice that will declare that to be not a sound and recognized principle of law? If it be the law, if that legal right exists, then, sir, how long can a nation stand which declares that it will not protect its citizens in the exercise of a legal right? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it possible, Mr. Chairman, for me to have five minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STEENERSON. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota objects. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. As many as are in favor of the amendment will signify that fact by saying "aye."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] is recognized to oppose the amendment.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, when the military appropriation bill was before this House in May, 1916, the gentleman who wishes to amend this resolution [Mr. BRITTEN] claimed that the bill did not produce the kind of an army or an army of the size that we needed. Yet that bill provides for the use, in time of need, of all the men and money of our country. To make this possible, section 111 provides that all the organized forces of this country not in the Regular Army and Navy may be drafted in time of war by the President of the United States and thereon become a part of the Army of the United States, which may be sent to the four corners of the earth in defense of American rights.

By section 79 of that act it is provided that a reserve force shall be created, out of the unorganized militia, as fast as the armed forces are drawn to the National Army from the States by draft, if necessary, and are to be armed, equipped, and trained. When ready they, too, can be drafted by the President of the United States and sent to the four corners of this earth in defense of American rights whenever the American people say that this country is to engage in war.

The act also provides that the Government may take over any and all industrial plants required to produce necessary supplies and equipment for the Army.

The gentleman says we should declare that a state of war exists, and yet he urges that after that the Army shall stay here. That would nullify the very resolution he offers.

The national-defense act was not at the time of passage big enough and strong enough to suit him, and it was not the kind of preparedness that he was advocating here on the floor of this House. How does the gentleman explain his position? Is he consistent? Why should a man come here and ask that the citizenship of the United States be armed, equipped, and trained to the fullest extent—even complain that the preparedness we gave was not big enough for him—then vote for war and at the same time demand that the force that has been organized for this very purpose should be kept at home and not used [applause], basing his suggestion upon the belief that the people of his district so desired him to vote?

I will vote for this resolution without amendment, fully realizing the responsibility that rests upon me and the consequences of my act. If I would give up my life for my country, how willingly should I risk my political future in the discharge of my official duty to the Nation. Germany has directed its U-boats to sink American ships whenever found within the war zone. She has declared her intention to continue to do so as long as the war lasts, and has sunk at least one outside of the zone. The American ships have been armed by the Government and directed to repel German attack. That is armed conflict between Governments and is therefore war. The condition has been forced by Germany and is not of our choosing. The resolution therefore speaks nothing but the naked truth. The resolution makes no war; it recognizes conditions as they are and releases the unconquered strength and spirit of the American people and pledges our lives and fortunes to support the American ideal. If necessary, let us train all our men and mortgage posterity for the preservation of our national character.

No war has ever terminated until one side or the other surrendered. For my part America will not surrender till the last dollar is spent, the last grain of powder shot, and the last man has fallen. I vote for this resolution as it is written, in sadness but whole-heartedly; and, come weal come woe, I shall never regret my decision, for I would be unworthy of my name and ancestry were I to hesitate in the discharge of this my plain duty to my country. [Applause.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, is this a substitute?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCULLOCH: Page 2, at the end of line 8, add the following:

"*Provided*, That none of the military forces of the United States shall be transported for service in any European country without the express authorization of Congress."

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, the distinction between the two amendments, as I understand it, is that my amendment eliminates the volunteer feature of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN]. Now, there are one or two features in connection with this matter that I want to call to the attention of the House.

Should this amendment be adopted, it will at least express the intention of Congress that it is not the purpose of Congress in passing this war resolution to send the military forces of the United States to foreign countries, and it will prove to the country and be a notice to the President that in passing this war resolution it is the intent and purpose of the Congress that the President should confine the use of the military forces of the United States to protecting the rights and liberties of Americans and in defense of our country, and that it is not the intention or the purpose of Congress in passing this war resolution that we should assist any foreign countries by sending soldiers to such countries to help fight their battles, and if it should become necessary later to send soldiers abroad, that it can only be done upon the authorization of Congress.

If it should be contended that this amendment will have no binding effect, it must at least be admitted that it will express, if adopted, the intent of Congress.

I regard the action I am called upon to take to-day as one involving the most solemn responsibility that has ever been laid upon me, and I would feel that I were untrue to the oath of office I have taken if I were influenced in the slightest by preju-

dice, by partisanship, or by a feeling of sympathy for any of the powers engaged in the European war.

I have faith in my country and its people and in their ability to meet and deal intelligently and wisely with every question that may affect the future of this country as a Nation. So much faith have I in America, in its institutions, and in the principles upon which our Government was founded and has been maintained, that I feel we could live and exist in prosperity, in happiness, and contentment if we were cut off absolutely from the rest of the world.

But we are one of the great family of nations, and as such, under the rules of international law, have certain rights. One of these rights is the free and unrestricted use of the seas—the great public highways of nations.

The executive branch of our Government has endeavored to maintain our rights upon the seas through diplomacy and has failed, and because our rights on the seas have been violated the Congress is now called upon to declare that a state of war exists and to authorize the President to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial German Government, which Government has disregarded those rights.

I shall not review the course of events which have step by step led us up to this present crisis and to the consideration of the resolution now before the House; but as a basis for my saying that it had been my purpose and constant desire as a Member of Congress to do everything in my power to keep this country out of war, I desire to refer to one or two of the steps which were taken in connection with the international situation and my attitude in regard to them.

When the McLemore resolution was under consideration by the House I voted not to table that resolution, and favored a resolution of warning to American citizens to keep out of the danger zone and the use of every means within the power of the Government to dissuade Americans from entering the danger zone. My action was heralded as being in opposition to the President and to what he desired; but I believe that had such a resolution of warning been adopted and had Congress refused to sustain the President in the policy he was carrying out in the beginning that we might not to-day find ourselves in the situation we are in.

I opposed the President because I believed that he was wrong and because I was not willing to vote to sustain him in the carrying out of what he himself declared to be a doubtful legal right.

When the armed-neutrality bill was up for consideration in the House I supported the Cooper amendment, providing that munition ships should not be armed. When that amendment was defeated I then supported the bill. I voted for that bill because there can be no doubt that the announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after the 1st day of February, this year, it was its purpose to use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the west coast of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean was in violation of our rights and an infringement of our liberties.

This announcement, it was apparent, could not be carried out without a loss of American lives and the destruction of American property. Therefore I felt that if we were to continue to maintain ourselves as a nation we must protect American lives and American property against such interference, and that perhaps the best way to protect American lives and American property in that situation was by arming vessels for defensive battle against submarines.

The President now says that armed neutrality is ineffective, and he desires that Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be nothing less than war against the Government and the people of the United States.

The President recites and reviews the history of the overt acts of the Imperial German Government which has brought us to the present crisis. It is clear from the address of the President that our one sole complaint against the Imperial German Government which would lead us to a declaration of war against that Government is the unrestricted use of the submarine against neutrals and the effect of the unrestricted use of submarines upon American lives and property.

But the President, it would seem, is unwilling to confine the war which we are to wage to the enforcement of our rights and to the protection of American lives and property upon the high seas. In his address before the joint session of Congress he made it clear that it is his intention that this Government should become allied with the powers now fighting Germany, not alone for the purpose of protecting American rights, but for the purpose of ending the war and for the purpose of establishing a world-wide democracy.

I trust that this war resolution will be amended so as to limit our action and our course to standing for the enforcement of the rights and liberties of America, and that we will go no further. I can not agree with the course outlined by the President, that we should enter into this war for reasons other than or in addition to those of maintaining our rights; but I believe that we should enter this war, if we enter it at all, merely for the purpose of protecting our rights, and when we have succeeded in forcing Germany, if we should so succeed, in recognizing our rights on the seas and in modifying her submarine warfare, then we should withdraw and have nothing further to do with the controversy.

If we only go this far, it will not mean that we intend to intervene in the European war; it will not mean that we intend to send men into the trenches of Europe; it will not mean that we intend to sit in and help determine the terms of the settlement of the European war; but it will mean that the American people intend to maintain by force the liberty and rights of American people on the high seas, and when these liberties and rights have been recognized that we will be through with the conflict.

Nothing that has been done up to this time obligates this country, morally or otherwise, to do more than protect the rights upon the high seas which it claims have been violated by Germany.

By her own admission the Imperial German Government has become an outlaw, and there is no pretention made upon the part of the Imperial German Government that her submarine warfare can be justified under international law, because the Imperial German Government has announced that she will sink without warning neutral ships and destroy neutral lives within certain zones, and I should not have so much hesitancy in voting for the resolution should it be amended so that it would be understood that we will go no further in this controversy than to protect our rights which have been violated.

I shall therefore support any amendment properly designed to restrict and limit our activities in this war to a protection of American rights. I believe that we should do everything in our power to prepare to protect this country in a defensive way. I am in entire accord with the recommendations of the President that the Army and Navy should be made as efficient as possible for the purpose of defense and for the purpose of insisting on and securing the recognition of our rights upon the seas. To go further than that is to involve ourselves in a controversy on another continent where we have no direct interest, which is a contest that is no quarrel of ours, and which we are under no obligation either to end or to continue.

I do not believe that this country is under any moral obligation to help fight to a successful conclusion that war in the interest of any foreign country. We will do well to look after America and the interests of the American people by insisting upon our rights and by keeping out of this European quarrel except only in so far as our rights are involved.

Should an amendment to this resolution not be adopted limiting the power granted to the President I shall still vote for the resolution, but I shall do so with the deepest mental reservation, and only because I desire that this country should show a united front to the nations of the world upon any policy which we may determine upon.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, this is indeed a sad day for me, the early dawn of Good Friday, the day our Lord was crucified upon Calvary. On this day we have our country weighing in the balance.

President Wilson has called on us—stated the facts—and requested Congress to declare a state of war existing with Germany. I trust the President and shall stand by him. All through my career as a Member of this House I have been a man of peace, and have on all occasions done all in my power to prevent anything that tended toward war. But, gentlemen, according to my conception of the state of affairs this country is now at war with Germany; not a war of our own making, but already the war is upon us. The Kaiser's henchmen are at our gates. We have had in this country spies from the German Government, in the very Capital of this Nation, in all the cities of this Republic, and even throughout all the territory of the United States spies have been present for many months from the German Government to undermine the Republic of America. You have had in this great Capital conspirators, the accredited representatives of the German Government, intriguing and plotting with Mexico and Japan to make war on this Nation while pretending to be on friendly relations with our country. Two hundred and forty American citizens have been slaughtered on

the high seas by the assassins of the Kaiser, the iniquitous submarines. American commerce has been destroyed on every hand. All the indignities and outrages conceivable to an independent Republic have been perpetrated by the autocracy of Germany. The Kaiser has even taken hold of the chin whiskers of Uncle Sam, pulled open his mouth, and spat in it. I think it is time for the American people to resent this. Are we to be so craven as to allow American manhood to be debased in this hour of our Nation's trial? Are we to be so ignoble as to prove ourselves unworthy of the splendid heritage left us by our fathers? Shall this Republic submit to any more barbarities, outrages, and insults and indignities, and still cry for peace? We all want peace; we all love peace; but America has suffered enough. It is time to fight! [Applause.] I stand by this resolution. I say do not let our soldiers stand around idle in our great cities, but if we are going to be true to our country, and to the ideals of this Republic, let us not wait for the enemy to come and run his saber through the heart of the Nation, but beat him to it, and get there first. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, as I stand in the somber shadows of this awful war that we are preparing to enter, wondering how much it will involve and where it may end, I wish that I could fitly express, as some of you have the gift to do, the thoughts in my mind and the sentiments in my heart regarding the past and the future of our country.

That Germany has ruthlessly trampled upon our rights and forced upon us the status of belligerents can not be denied. That our dignity and honor as a great Nation demand action on our part is to me conclusive. The only question with me is as to how far we should go. If it be prudent and proper for an individual, acting for himself alone, to hesitate and count the cost of a step upon which his whole future vitally depends, surely it can not be deemed unpatriotic for one to do likewise when acting for and as the chosen representative of hundreds of thousands of people. It is manifestly the well-nigh unanimous judgment of the body in which the organic law of the land wisely vests the power to declare war that this resolution should be adopted, and I feel it my duty to acquiesce in that judgment. At the same time I can not refrain from expressing my profound conviction that the necessity does not now exist for going as far as some contend we should go, nor as far as the broad terms of this resolution might admit of. Reference has been made by my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] and others to our obligation to France. I am not unmindful of the debt of gratitude we owe to certain nations for their sympathy and aid in the dark days of the Revolution and later, but there is a limit to the sacrifices that should be made in the payment of such a debt.

I can not believe that it requires us to abandon all of the sacred traditions of the Republic. I can not believe that it requires us to cast aside the time-honored doctrine of Monroe and substitute for it the chimerical scheme of a "Monroe doctrine of the world," or to take a step that may make this God-given land of the free a mere satellite of the monarchies of Europe, or, forgetting the admonitions of the fathers, to turn the picture of Washington to the wall and put in its place the visage of King George. The history of civilization shows that every great principle of liberty has been purchased by the shedding of human blood. The people of Europe are paying that price for their liberties now, just as we have paid it for the liberties we enjoy. I have too much faith in the inscrutable justice of Divinity's decrees to believe that we must pay it in full measure again for the liberty which has already cost us so many hecatombs of lives and so many billions of treasure. I can not believe, as some say they believe, that the civilization of the world is in the balance or that the perpetuity of our own form of government is at stake. On no other grounds would I ever give my assent to sending our American boys to the death trenches—those slaughter pens across the sea.

Mr. Chairman, sorrowfully and with aching heart I shall support the resolution, but in voting to confer this unrivaled power upon the legally constituted authorities of our Government, I beg them, in the name of the people I represent, constantly to remember, while exercising that power, that in conservatism there is national safety and that in the multitude of counsel there is always wisdom. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman and Members of the committee. I have listened, I believe, to this debate as attentively as one well could, with an earnest desire to see both sides of the question, if two sides there are; and now, with this debate almost closing, I say to you from my heart that I can see only one course open to me as an American Representative, and that is to vote for the passage of this resolution without any amendment and just as it came to us from the Senate. [Applause.]

I am firm in the conviction that this solemn day in American history is not so much a day of decision as a day of consecration. Before us lies no confusing choice of perplexing alternatives. The die is already cast. We are in a state of war, and the question is whether or not we shall recognize a self-evident fact. Surely there can be no choice of a murderous peace based on the surrender of every American right.

Pitiless necessity makes armed conflict inevitable. Our action to-day means the recognition of war, but we shall not war against any people, but against ruthless violation of sacred rights, against defiant aggression, against the brutal use of evil power. It will be our war against war and for peace. It will be our war for the freedom of the world, the future of democracy, and the rights of every nation and of all mankind.

Since August 1, 1914, we have lived in a world made strange and terrible by the conflict of mighty powers. World events have been crowding so swiftly that they could scarcely be realized. Dynasties have fallen while we watched; governments have been raised up and thrown down; cities have been destroyed in a day; rivers of blood have been shed in vastly separated quarters of the globe. Millions of men, women, and children have been enslaved in one place while other millions have been emancipated elsewhere. Age-old customs, creeds, and traditions have shriveled in the fire of new conditions, and the entire relationships of mankind have undergone vital and fundamental changes.

In the midst of this welter of world war the American Republic has been guided by the hand of a Chief Magistrate raised up, I believe, by divine providence for this perilous time in the history of the new land of promise.

President Wilson has done all that mortal could do to hold to ancient landmarks of peace and righteousness. As the embodiment of the great Republic of the West, he held out both hands to the warring world in a plea for peace. Nobly has he sought to steer the ship of state through the tempests, past the rocks and false lights, to a peaceful harbor. With patient and steadfast purpose he sought to prevent America's entrance into the inferno of strife. He has been long-suffering, enduring great provocations in firm perseverance toward the goal of honorable peace. Harassed by hands that hindered, both militarist and pacifist, he has been clear of vision and steady in judgment. Bearing a burden greater than any since the immortal Lincoln, he has been calm and serene and unhurried by any false cries of hurrah patriotism. With malice for none and charity for all, he has followed the right as God gave him to see it and as the great heart of America desired.

Now that he has reluctantly and with stern regret come to the decision that war is the only solution for an intolerable situation and has so informed this Congress, there can be no wavering. His clear and convincing summary of the record since February, 1915, is an indictment which is conclusive. The clear call to American duty must be answered, and with the sword of justice in hand we must carve out an enduring peace as a united people and an undivided Nation.

I am not seeking to evade my responsibility as a Member of the legislative body of this Nation, but I demand that those opposed to this resolution accept their responsibility and not attempt to put it upon the majority of this body, which, they say, is certain to vote for this resolution. [Applause.]

I am standing by President Wilson, because I believe he speaks true for America. He is interpreter and voice for this Nation now no less than during his steadfast efforts of peace.

The American people realize all the horrors and frightful waste of war under twentieth century conditions. They have seen European history written with the sword point for two and a half years. They have listened in anguish to the thunders from battle fields 150 miles wide, while whole countries were turned from hives of industry to heaps of wreckage. They have seen blood and treasure poured out in profligate abandon in a conflict on many lands and the seven seas.

They have striven and prayed for peace as their very hearts' desire, willing to suffer and endure much to be spared entrance into such a death drama.

But make no mistake. The American people, peace loving as they have been and are to-day, have demanded that their peace be one of righteousness. They have never imagined that strife is to be stilled by self-betrayal and wrong conquered by submission. They have known that there are worse things than war. They have known that our independence as a Nation was won with the sword and, if necessary, must be preserved with the sword. They have known that the liberties, painfully created through long years of travail, are too sacred to be thrown away, even though their continued possession entail the last full measure of devotion. They have always believed that dishonor is too dangerous a flame to burn at a nation's heart. Deep

underneath their love for peace has ever been a willingness to sacrifice money rather than the things that money can never restore, lives rather than the things which make American life possible. This very love of peace, cherished by Americans, compels conflict now. For if the "first duty of mankind is peace, the second duty is to fight to secure it."

Americans demanded of their Government from the beginning of this world conflict such conduct of their international relations that war would come only when peace became impossible. Faithfully has President Wilson carried out their will. With each advancing step of the complications leading to this fateful hour he set a high standard of honor, with no bitterness or rancor to mar future developments.

But all efforts were unavailing in the face of a determination on the part of the insane militarism of German autocracy to force this Nation to defend its rights as a sovereign State. Wantonly and deliberately the Kaiser has forced the issue upon us. No man can deny the intent of the policies put into force by the Imperial German Government. Even Count von Bernstoff, former German ambassador, when informed of the severance of diplomatic relations between his country and ours, frankly remarked, "I am not surprised. There was nothing else left for the United States to do."

In view of the events since that time, the slimy trail of intrigue, the prosecution of the ruthless submarine warfare, whose threat led to the breaking of relations, no one can fail to recognize that the passage of this resolution is our only answer that "there is nothing else left for the United States to do."

I believe that the American people know this fact. No one who has mingled with the people in home and shop and store and mill during the past few weeks could fail to feel that throb of heart whereby a great peace-loving people rises in noble anger against brutal wrong. Everywhere has been the choice of sacrifice and danger rather than sloth and shame. Everywhere has been evidenced faith in the ideals of America and stamina to stand for them, whatever may befall. In the beating of America's mighty heart comes the ringing declaration that this is still "the land of the free and home of the brave."

I have had that experience and felt that inspiration. I stand here to speak for the Pittsburgh district, the "workshop of the world." Those who have given it that name are ready to answer every challenge to their patriotism with vigor and virility. That district has witnessed countless victories of peace by workers marshalled in the army of human service. Its production of the countless products that make for the comfort and convenience of mankind has astonished the world. Not less inspiring is their loyalty to America and the ideals embodied in that hallowed name.

The district which I have the honor to represent here was the scene of the first exploits of George Washington in those far-off days of the French and Indian War. Its men have followed the banner of the stars in every war since independence was proclaimed. They have fought in foreign wars and civil strife for the Republic and its unity. They have stood firm for national freedom and justice, and they will stand firm for international freedom and justice.

That district is the "melting pot" of the Nation. Into its life enters the blood of every nation on earth. Since this world war broke out many of its people have agonized over the recital of tragic deeds enacted in home lands across the seas. While this Nation was officially neutral they gave expression to their sympathy for the cause they held dear. Those of German ancestry as well as those of other lineage have hoped and prayed that America might be spared participation in the strife. They have spoken and written in every possible effort to preserve peace.

But to-day, when hope has become a coward's refuge and peace a futile cry, they have enshrined America's banner of freedom in their hearts and are ready to do all and dare all for the land of their choice and supreme love. They are pro-American and nothing else and they will help to defend, safeguard, and preserve this Nation against any and all foes.

The Pittsburgh district can be mobilized for America the moment the Nation calls. There are in war three graces—Army, Navy, and industry—and the greatest of these is industry. The greatest industries of the world are located there, and they are at the command of the Nation. Manufacturers and mill men, employers and employees are ready to meet governmental needs and the vast resources for producing equipment of every kind can be used as Uncle Sam deems best. Partisanship has disappeared before patriotism and faction and division have perished in the flame of a common love for country.

But it is not one district that is loyal. All districts are loyal. I am firm in my faith that the declaration made by this Congress to-day, in the passage of this resolution, to be sealed in all human probability with fire and blood, will prove for this Nation a new birth of freedom. Democracy is in a death grapple with despotism, and in such a conflict there can be, in Divine purpose, but one result. The tide of the common rights of man will not be stayed by any word or deed of absolutism. Despotic institutions and imperial systems are doomed. Autocracy, irresponsible and absolute in its control of human destinies, is a menace to civilization, a burden upon humanity, not longer to be endured. In the fiery light of this world conflict this system is seen to be a deadly danger, not only to the subjects of the despot, but to all men and women everywhere, none of whom can be assured of safety from the perils of royal greed and unbalanced ambition. We may rest assured that the downfall of that system is but another step in the way of human progress; it is the onward stride of Almighty God Himself.

America, too, in this action moves onward and upward on the difficult, rugged path, marked out for her by the founders—the path of justice and democracy, tenderness for the weak and restraint in the strong. A united people testify to their willingness to serve this righteous cause. We must not repay them for their altruism with shameful neglect at home. It will be the final tragedy of ingratitude if America fails to resolve definitely now that every American is entitled to all the rights of true democracy at home. If she does not do that, she will slay the very soul of America, this soul now so chivalric and devoted, so careless of every danger before the summons of duty.

Under the shadow of these new and fateful responsibilities we must make a new pledge of faith. Right is right, and this Nation can not afford to compromise with wrong and oppression within her own borders while she wars against them abroad. We must take from the throat of the Republic the fingers of organized greed. We must see that justice is done the common manhood and womanhood and childhood of this country. We must see that no gold-lustful men build traitorous fortunes from the Nation's necessities. We must prevent the exploitation of the people by pirates of unjust prices and manipulators of produce. We must make it assured, both now and in the future, that those who are willing to sacrifice all, if need be, for their country shall have a country worthy of such devotion, its gratitude proven by its protection of their rights against every power that might seek to prey upon them.

In this war there must be no shirking on the part of the wealth of the country. It is not just, when the manhood of the country fights its battles to load them and their children with a war debt to be paid to those who profited during the hour of peril. There are incomes which must be shared with the Government, profits to be regulated. The incomes must be enlisted in this war as well as the men.

Let this war witness the adoption of the principle that those who have money must give it, not only for war debt but to make this country worthy of devotion on the part of those who offer their lives in its behalf. Then, indeed, will its result be commensurate with the cost of the effort made.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, let us act now. We are compelled to make a momentous decision, the most important that any of us will make in all our lives. But it is made here in the open, not by stealthy agreement between despot and subservient creatures. It will be the act of the chosen representatives of a free people, after every resource of long enduring diplomacy has failed.

We enter upon a conflict forced upon us. We shall fight, but not for conquest. There is not a dollar nor a square mile nor a right of any nation that we desire or would destroy. It is not for the subjugation of any people but for the liberty of all. It is not for vengeance, but for the right of the law abiding to go about their business unmolested by lawless arrogance. It is not for any self-interest, but for an orderly world, a community of nations, all standing equal before the law of nations.

We enter upon the armed conflict because we are willing to pay again the price of liberty; because America is true to herself and what she has dared to dream of in the past dares to do in the present. In this hour the duty of every American Representative is to the Nation and the duty of the Nation is to civilization. I do not doubt but that the end of this epoch on which we enter to-day will be the beginning of a new and better time for America and for the world. And the determination of this Nation to have its place in a forward movement for the world of such magnitude as this is but the fulfillment of its destined purpose, it is the choice of that "wisdom which is better than the merchandise of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold." [Applause.]

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I have listened with much interest and with great care to the

discussion that has been made for and against this resolution. I want to call attention to a statement made by the distinguished Member from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] when he cast a reflection upon the city of Philadelphia, in which I live, saying that on last Sunday night free speech had been interfered with by the police authorities. I want him to understand that the people of Philadelphia are law-abiding, God-loving, and God-fearing people. They devote the first day in the week to the exercise of their religious rites. We have a regulation in that city that when any extraordinary meetings are held there must be permission applied for to the regular authorities. I will ask the Clerk to read a telegram from the Director of Public Safety in Philadelphia.

The Clerk read as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Hon. WILLIAM S. VARE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Under the rules of the department of public safety meetings in theaters on Sunday are forbidden unless a request for same is approved by the department, and then only when no charge for admission is made. No application for the peace meeting of Sunday last, scheduled to take place at the Broad Street Theater, was made to the department. That no intention to abridge the right of free speech existed is established by the fact that those interested in the peace meeting went to the Forrest Theater, one city block away, where a permit had been issued for a religious service, and the leaders of the peace meeting were permitted without interference to address the audience.

WILLIAM H. WILSON,
Director of Public Safety.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] spoke of a parade in the great city of Chicago on Saturday last. He said a great multitude of people had lined up on the sidewalk and there were no demonstrations and no applause. I was not present, but I am quite convinced as a patriotic Member of this House that his statement is correct, but I do not believe that that silence was from lack of sympathy with this Government. I do not believe that the silence was a lack of sympathy for the President of these great United States. At the same time the parade was going on in the city of Chicago there was a great meeting in Independence Hall in Philadelphia, within the shadow of the liberty bell, within a stone's throw of where the Declaration of Independence was signed, and hundreds of thousands of Philadelphia citizens turned out in a mass and pledged their loyalty to this great Nation of ours and to the President of the United States. [Applause.]

I represent in this House the most stalwart Republican district in this whole country, a district in what is known as the southern part of Philadelphia, which gave Charles E. Hughes nearly 40,000 Republican majority as candidate for President of the United States. Last Saturday a Republican club, of which I have the honor to be a member, paraded upon our streets, and 5,000 men marched behind a picture of Woodrow Wilson, testifying their loyalty to the President in this crisis. We have heard much about peace. We are all for peace. God grant it might be possible to secure it, but we are beyond that stage. Our country is in a state of war now, and we will be officially in a state of war to-morrow.

The only question which this House is called upon to answer, to my mind, is whether the Nation is to preserve its rights under international law or whether it is to submit tamely to the deliberate abrogation of these rights?

Upon the answer to this question, which the Members of Congress will give, depends not merely the security and welfare of native-born Americans, but the security and welfare of naturalized citizens, and even those who, although not citizens, have sought liberty and freedom in the United States.

Most of the immigrants who came here did so because they wanted greater freedom and liberty in the pursuit of happiness. Their interest in the maintenance of the rights of America is as clear and definite as that of the native-born citizen.

For months a state of war has existed between the United States and Germany. The situation has not been of the choosing of the United States. Germany has admitted that she has disregarded our rights under international law. She has said that she has been forced to her course of ruthless submarine warfare to protect her own rights. She has forced a situation in which we are now compelled to protect our rights.

The passage of a resolution proclaiming to the world that a state of war exists between the United States and Germany will not be the act that provokes war. It will merely be a formal recognition of what the people of this country and the whole world already know. The acts that brought about the state of war which now exists were committed by Germany. She knew the result of those acts when they were committed, because this Government warned her of the consequences, not once, but many times through a period of two years.

There is but one way to preserve peace now and that is by tame submission to aggression. If we are willing to see our ports blockaded, our ships swept from the seas, and hundreds more of our citizens killed without a chance for escape, we can defeat the President's effort to uphold the honor of the Nation. But if we want to preserve American lives and American rights we must deal with a big problem in a big way.

There should be no half-hearted measures, based upon a hope that the situation will right itself. That hope, entertained as it has been for more than three years, has left us unprepared.

If there had been more foresight, if Germany had been convinced at the beginning that this country was prepared to defend its rights aggressively, I doubt whether there would have been the violation of our rights that has brought about a state of war.

Now that the situation is here, we should face it frankly and unhesitatingly. The natural leader of the country at a time like this is the President of the United States. He has shown such infinite patience that there can be no question now that if there were any other way out consistent with the national honor he would have found it. But there is no other way out. We are formally recognizing a condition which is already existent. Germany is making war against the United States. She is torpedoing our vessels on sight. She has announced that she would do it, and she is doing it. The Chancellor of Germany has notified the world that there will be no change in this policy, which provides for the ruthless sinking of American ships. There is but one answer we can make to this war against us, and that is to defend ourselves with all the strength at our command.

So long as there was any hope of peace, with honor, I was for peace. I urged with all my strength that in these times of world stress we should prepare for national defense. Little was done because of the vague hope that peace might be disturbed by preparedness. That foolish belief has made doubly necessary the preparations that are being made now. But in preparing fully for the present situation we will prevent the recurrence of the present dangerous situation in the years to come. If we prepare fully now, no nation can say in the future that hasty remedies are directed against any particular nation.

I believe we should go into the contest that has been forced upon us face forward. We should not back in. I believe we should be prompt and liberal with appropriations. Preparedness costs more to-day than it would have cost three years ago, but we can not count the cost for preserving American lives and American honor.

Since war has been thrust upon us we must organize efficiently, so that the sacrifices which must be made will not be made in vain. In all belligerent nations the highest form of efficiency has been demanded by the people from the government. Officials who have not been efficient have been swept aside. Inequalities and special privileges have been eradicated. So it must be in the United States.

I believe in universal military service, because it is the only military system suitable to a democracy, because it involves the least amount of hardship and an equal distribution of the burden. Under any other system there is danger that the men most needed at home, those, for instance, who are trained in the manufacture of munitions, would be the first to respond to a call for volunteers, while those who should enroll, those without responsibilities, would be the ones to stay at home. Personal convenience must be subordinated to the national welfare, and universal military service should be adopted at once, so that equality may be the order of our national life in this trying period.

There should also be a thorough understanding and working agreement between the United States and the other allies; otherwise we will become a hindrance rather than a help. If we go about it the right way we can equip and supply an Army of our own without withholding the supplies we are now sending to the allies, whose men are already trained. A department of munitions should be created at once, separate from the War Department. Muntions and supplies constitute a manufacturing problem. The War Department has enough to do in handling the problems of organization and strategy. England learned this lesson a year after the war began. We should profit by England's experience and handle the problem in the right way without loss of time or energy.

We should stand with the President and cooperate with all who are reaching for one common purpose. Let us pray that the combination of all the resources at our command will bring the conflict to a successful, speedy conclusion. [Applause.]

Some one has said that "if you have a wishbone where your backbone ought to be, then you should wish for peace; but if you

have a backbone where your backbone ought to be, then you must fight for peace," and I believe the American manhood will support the President for peace. [Applause.]

Mr. DILLON. Mr. Chairman, Congress has the sole power to declare war. This responsibility rests upon this membership and not upon the President. This, the greatest of all questions, rests heavily upon my conscience. I stand here to-day in a representative capacity. My vote is the vote of my people. My conviction is that a great majority are opposed to this broad declaration of war.

I know that we stand upon the brink of war, but it has not yet been declared, and until it is declared we hope that it may yet be avoided. If this matter could be postponed for 10 days, this awful tragedy might be avoided. Germany has again and again declared that she has no hostile intent against our people. The press reports from Berlin state that "Germany will not declare war nor take any steps to wage war against the United States."

These people bear no enmity toward our people. Why, then, should we hasten this sweeping declaration of war? Is there no escape from this tragedy? The door is still open; let us not close it. The statesmanship of this country ought to find some way to avoid it.

I do not seek to justify the belligerent nations that have trampled upon our international rights. We know that they have sorely tried the patience of all neutral nations.

This resolution is unlimited in its powers. It directs the President to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and all its resources to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Germany and pledges the resources of the country to an unlimited warfare.

It means the sending of thousands of our young men into the European trenches, there to offer up their lives in a combat against a people that bears us no evil. It means a European partnership and an entangling alliance, which we have avoided since the days of Washington. It means we are to finance the allies' campaign and become a full partner in this awful strife. It means that we will prolong the war and stir up strife and hate among the people of the world. It will put to a severe test our own democracy.

It is said that we must establish a world democracy, yet the morning papers state that the Reichstag by a vote of 277 to 38 passed a measure providing for the appointment of a constitutional committee of 28 members to revise and liberalize the constitution of the German Empire.

In my judgment it is a fateful blunder to shoot universal democracy into the people of the Old World; a big task, one that is not easily consummated. We ought to content ourselves with enforcing the Monroe doctrine on this continent and leave the Old World countries to manage their own affairs. For 2,000 years we have had the teachings of Christ, founded on love, and they have failed to establish universal democracy. Why, then, do we think that Congress can establish it by its decrees?

Thirty million people are now engaged on the battle fields. Why is it that we long so to get into a fight that does not concern us? Five million men have already lost their lives, and we must now call on the youth of our own country for a greater sacrifice.

I do not at this time approve of sending our boys to the trenches of Europe nor the forming of a partnership alliance with any nation of Europe. We have in the past successfully gone alone; let us continue that policy.

If any nation sought to invade our country we could raise an Army of 25,000,000 men for defensive purposes, to eject those who would set hostile foot upon our soil.

In view of these facts, I shall exercise my constitutional right of voting against a resolution giving unlimited powers.

I know this resolution is going to pass, but it is too broad; it has no limit. It means everything to this Nation. But when it does pass it will become the duty of every citizen to uphold the hands of the Executive. Their loyalty, their Americanism will not be questioned. We will all remain a unit in giving support to the war and will remain a united people with common purposes and aspirations. [Applause.]

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly well aware that anything that I may say at this late hour will not have any influence upon the action of the House on this resolution; but this resolution is a matter of such tremendous importance that I am not willing to vote upon it without being allowed to give some of the reasons influencing my action, even though the time afforded me be very brief. No more important resolution could possibly come before Congress. No resolution of such great importance has come before Congress during the service of even the oldest Member upon the floor of this House, and it does seem to me that Members should be patient and should permit the representatives of the people upon a matter of this importance to express their views upon it before they are called to vote.

I shall vote for the resolution as it came from the Senate. I am opposed to the pending amendment. As stated, Congress has no authority, in my opinion, to limit the power of the President in the disposition of the Army and the Navy after war has been declared. I do not believe that it will be necessary to send our troops to Europe. I certainly trust that it will not be necessary and that it will not be done; but neither do I believe that in the very beginning of the conflict, which I hope will be short, and which may be long, the Congress by solemn act should indicate to Germany and to the world that it does not intend in this war to do everything necessary to carry it to a successful conclusion. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, as I say, I shall vote for the pending resolution. I shall do so with a full and solemn sense of the responsibility resting upon me as a Member of Congress. I do not in any way seek to deceive my own mind as to the possibilities which may follow a declaration of war, although I have no doubt as to the ultimate result. If the United States enters the war, it must be with a firm purpose to achieve its object and make every necessary sacrifice to that end. We hope for an early and favorable conclusion, resulting in the destruction of militarism and the establishment of a durable peace throughout the world. We hope that in the full performances of its duty our country may not be called upon to sacrifice much, either in blood or in money; but, having entered, we must be prepared to pursue it to the end and until the honor of the Nation has been vindicated and the purpose of our participation accomplished. Personally, Mr. Chairman, I have been very much opposed to our country becoming involved in the hostilities of Europe. I had fondly hoped that war might be averted with entire honor to our Nation, and have contributed what I could to that end. For nearly three years the President of the United States, with a patience and forbearance, a wisdom and a patriotism which stamp him one of the greatest Presidents this country has ever had, has stood like a rock for the preservation of our peace and at the same time to maintain our national honor and the respect of all the other nations of the world, which is so essential to the future existence and influence of our own Nation. In his address to Congress he has furnished facts showing that war has been made upon us in the slaughter of our citizens and the destruction of our ships and commerce, and has declared that he has information, as the head of the Nation, which requires this step to be taken in defense of our plain international rights and in the cause of humanity. That Congress will follow his counsel and advice there can be no doubt. We are already actually in a state of war; and I believe it to be the duty of every Representative to vote for this resolution. There should be no division in this crisis.

The impression should not be given to the world that there are any serious differences existing among the Members of Congress. On the contrary, the world should know that we are united in support of our flag and all that it symbolizes, for in that fact lies our greatest strength and force in the serious and solemn undertaking which now confronts us. The President, as the accepted and trusted head of the Nation, has declared its policy and attitude with respect to its rights upon the seas. There are but two courses for Congress to pursue—either to sound a retreat and abjectly surrender the rights which have been so firmly asserted, or to stand firmly in support of them. For my part, I propose to stand by the President of the United States and my country.

I am fully aware that Germany is not the only one of the belligerents which has been disregardful of the rights of our commerce upon the high seas, as has been shown by the treatment accorded to the shipments of a great product of the soil of the section from which I come. But, Mr. Chairman, commerce is not to be considered on the same plane as human life and the rights of humanity. The President has declared that this is not to be a war for the acquisition of either territory or power; it is not to be a war against the people of any nation. It is to be a war against the autocratic government of a nation which has defied the international rights of our people and the rights of humanity in general. If our participation in this war will result in the lasting and durable peace of the world during the years to come, the dethronement of autocratic rule and militarism, and the enthronement of democracy among all the nations of the world, then, indeed, will our sacrifices, whatever they may be, not have been in vain. These things are worth while, even though it may be necessary to fight for them.

As I have stated, Mr. Chairman, this action has been thrust upon us. It is not of our choosing. We are now in a state of war. Conditions have been brought about so that there is noth-

ing else that Congress can do. It will be an American war for the preservation of American rights and ideas, and with no other object or purpose.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to exaggerate the gravity and importance of the step we are about to take. On the passage of this resolution we instantly change from a neutral to a belligerent power. We declare war on Germany, and from that moment every man, woman, and child within our dominions and owing allegiance becomes an enemy of the German Government and nation, and to bring the conflict to a successful termination the lives of our citizens and all the resources of our country are pledged. It is impossible to avoid this result. The President has already decided that a state of war exists, and has recommended this action in the strongest possible terms. The Senate, by an overwhelming majority, has voted it. This body in a few hours will also pass the resolution.

The President has conducted the affairs of this Nation with relation to those engaged in that great war in Europe to the best of his judgment. He has tried his best, he has said, to keep us out of that war. I have believed, and now believe, that a better way might be found out of our present difficulties, and, if it were in my power to choose such a way, I would gladly do it. During years that I have been a Member of Congress I have sought to promote the settlement of international disputes by arbitration. I voted for the McLemore resolution to warn our citizens off belligerent ships. That was to avoid occasion for war. Had that course been followed, we might not now be confronted with this crisis. On the 26th of February last the President of the United States addressed Congress, and, after recounting the relations between Germany and the United States and the failure of diplomatic means to protect neutral rights, he said:

> There may be no course but to armed neutrality which we shall know how to maintain and for which there is abundant American precedent.

He further said:

> I am not now proposing or contemplating war or any steps that need lead to it. I merely request that you accord me by your own vote and definite bestowal the means and the authority to safeguard in practice the right of a great people who are at peace and who are desirous of exercising none but the rights of peace to follow the pursuits of peace in quietness and good will—rights recognized time out of mind by all the civilized nations of the world. No course of my choosing or of theirs will lead to war. War can come only by the willful acts and aggressions of others.

I voted for the bill embodying these recommendations, and I took occasion to say that it did not mean authority to begin war, but was a peace measure. Now the President says armed neutrality is impracticable. Evidently he was mistaken when he thought there was great efficacy in it and when it was almost treason for Senators to filibuster against it.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. DILLON] reminded us of the fact that the war power is in the Congress. That is true, theoretically. He overlooked the fact, however, that the authority and power of the Chief Executive of the Nation over the foreign affairs and relations of the Nation are so complete that he can and sometimes does create situations that make it the imperative duty of Congress to support him. Otherwise we would occupy an impossible position toward the rest of the world. For instance, take the situation two or three years ago when a resolution was asked by the President authorizing him to employ the military and naval forces of the United States to demand reparation for indignities suffered in Mexico. Before that resolution had passed the Senate our military forces had entered the domain of that nation and hostilities had been commenced. How could the Senate of the United States, in the face of that situation, refuse to pass the resolution giving the Chief Executive authority to employ those military forces? To have done so would have been to place us in a most embarrassing attitude, for killing under such circumstances would be unlawful.

In the present situation Congress must follow his recommendations to—

> declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the Government and people of the United States.

To repudiate his management of our foreign relations would be a course so humiliating before the world that no patriotic citizen would follow it except under circumstances so extraordinary as to be inconceivable. The result is that Congress practically has no choice, for the Nation has already been committed to a definite course. The President's address begins with the following sentence:

> I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making.

Then follows a recital of the grievances against Germany and the conclusion that Congress must declare war and the country assume the status of a belligerent.

I have read the address most carefully, but I am unable to see wherein Congress has been left any choice of policy whatever. He states that there are serious "choices of policy" to be made, but the only conclusion to which he comes is that Germany has committed acts of war, has actually begun war on us, and he recommends that we recognize and declare this fact. The only allusion there is to any other course is in the following words:

> There is one choice we can not make we are incapable of making—we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated.

No patriotic citizen can choose this course. I submit therefore that in the present situation, Congress has not the free choice of declaring or not declaring war. The truth is that so complete and all-embracing has the control of our Chief Executive over our foreign relations become that the power to declare war, vested in Congress by the Constitution, has become practically impossible of exercise. I regret that the representatives of the people are thus placed; that they have no choice except between repudiation of the whole administration of our foreign affairs and supporting what is proposed to be done. In these circumstances, knowing that it is impossible to avoid war and that it is a time when every loyal citizen must support the Government, I feel in duty bound to vote for this resolution. The people of Minnesota are for peace, but, having reached a position through the leadership of our chosen Executive where we have no choice except between our country and its enemies, they stand as one man for the flag. In the War of the Rebellion, when Abraham Lincoln issued his first call for volunteers, Minnesota, then a new State, was the first to offer a regiment in defense of the Union, and out of its frontier homes came the men who constituted the First Minnesota, whose undying fame at Gettysburg and other bloody fields of battle constitute a rich legacy of honor and glory to the people of the State and Nation. So, when the first call comes in this war, Minnesota will respond gallantly and bravely and do its full share in the great struggle to come.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, it was a matter of keen regret to me that the vote upon this resolution could not have been taken before the hands of the clock passed the hour of midnight, and I felt that it were better if its further consideration and final vote might be delayed until Saturday or even Monday, because, Mr. Chairman, in the trenches, where death stalks about in a grim and ghastly search for his victims, the religious fervor of those so solemnly engaged there, no matter what their respective creeds may be, is especially intensified upon this, the sacred anniversary of the crucifixion of Christ and the glorious ascension of our Redeemer. So, Mr. Chairman, if by chance the wonderful epistle to humanity delivered by the President in this Chamber last Monday evening has been disseminated among or its spirit has even permeated the ranks of the forces of the central powers, it may have the effect of arousing the German Government, which I do not use in the sense of including the German people, from their barbaric trance, restore their enlightened senses, and reestablish the precepts of civilization, just as the beacon light of divine right of the people set all Russia aflame with a new era of liberty and freedom.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is no prejudice, no superstition, or call it what you will, that I will not endeavor to cast out or put aside to discharge upon such a solemn and serious occasion as this what is first above all my bounden duty to my country and the constituency which I represent, and come what may I now have no hesitancy in voting for the right upon the consideration of this resolution, no difference what the day or what the hour. For, Mr. Chairman, as I have sat here and reflected upon this momentous question, there has appeared to me to be great significance in the fact that nearly 19 centuries ago Christ gave His life upon the cross that mankind might gain the Kingdom of Heaven, while to-night we shall solemnly decree the sublimest sacrifice ever made by a nation for the salvation of humanity, the institution of world-wide liberty and freedom.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH] referred rather disparagingly to the practice of taking a census of one's constituency. It is a practice which I adopted in my first term as a Member of this House. Last Friday I again sent a communication to every one of the 32,700 registered voters in my district, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 29, 1917.*

MY DEAR SIR: The President of the United States has called a special session of the Sixty-fifth Congress to convene on Monday, April 2, 1917. In conformity with the precedent which I established when I took office as a Member of Congress two years ago, I am writing to invite

you to give me your opinion with respect to the international situation, which will be presented to the Congress for its determination.

The point upon which I should like chiefly to hear from my constituents is whether, in the event of a declaration of war by or against the German Empire, the United States should (1) afford the allies financial assistance, (2) send an expeditionary military force to Europe, or (3) confine our activities to the operations of our Navy, retaining our land forces to repel invasion or for other domestic protection?

* * * * * * *

Yours, very truly,

MURRAY HULBERT.
Representative Twenty-first Congressional District, New York.

This is "a government of the people, by the people, for the people," and I have a very high estimate of the intelligence of my constituents, and justified confidence in their good judgment, and sincerely appreciate their earnest desire to be helpful to me in the discharge of the sacred trust they have reposed in me. From the thousands of replies that have been received, the greater number of which indicate a clear conception of the issues involved, and, except in a few cases, a sincere, unselfish, and patriotic opinion thereon, it is apparent to me that the people of the twenty-first congressional district are in favor of a declaration of war, and while the majority are now opposed to sending American boys to the trenches, their devotion to their country and their loyalty to its Chief Magistrate when the declaration of war has been formally made will prompt them to support whatever may be necessary in order to achieve the complete success of our forces.

I had hoped that the President would be able to keep us out of war, as I am satisfied that he has done his best to do; I have always been opposed to any entangling alliances with foreign nations. But we are confronted with a condition and not a theory which, in my opinion, can best and only properly be made by a union for "the common defense." In his last address to the Congress the President said:

> There is one choice we can not make, we are incapable of making; we will not choose the path of submission, and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored and violated.

As the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy he has, in the exercise of his constitutional right, informed us what measures he believes should be taken in the maintenance and defense of those rights; but we, in the exercise of our constitutional rights, have a duty to perform in determining what in the interest of our country is necessary to be done, and my vote with this reservation shall be for the resolution as it passed the Senate.

In conclusion, I desire to submit the following tribute to

OUR FLAG.

[By D. R. O'Brien.]

The Red, the White, the Blue,
Our flag, Red, White, and Blue,
To thee, fair flag, we are, and always will be true.
Through all our days
To thee
The loyalty that's due
We'll pay eternally,
Our flag, Red, White, and Blue,
Our treasured banner fair, the Red, the White, the Blue.

In all the changing years,
Befraught with hopes and fears,
No stain upon thy glorious field appears;
Ah! dear Red, White, and Blue,
Our loved Red, White, and Blue,
To thee fair flag, we are, and always will be true.
Time only brought
To thee
A fame that fairer grew
With each new century.
Old flag, Red, White, and Blue,
The flag of freedom's cause, the Red, the White, the Blue.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this resolution and vote against any amendment to it. [Applause.] Intimations have been held out that the Members of this great body would not be willing to fight for their country. That is a reflection upon every Member of this House that is without justification. The men who are willing to fight through the ranks, who accept the opportunities that our splendid Government affords them to become Members of this great body, are not selfish enough to be slackers and not be willing to perpetuate those opportunities for others who may follow. We went to Cuba and to the Philippines to free the people there and to enable them to enjoy the opportunities that we have. If necessary to maintain the freedom of this glorious country, there is no place to which we would not go. I hope that it will not be necessary to leave our country, but I vote for this resolution with the full realization of that possibility. I hope that this great war will come to a close within six months, as some predict. I do not believe that it will. I do not think that our entrance into it will shorten it to any great degree.

Germany has been the wonder of this great war. Numerically she is stronger to-day in the field than she was when she started, and on the sea she is more powerful than before the war. She may be retreating now, but it is for a better foothold, and we must not be deceived into thinking that we are going into a ping-pong game when we enter into this great tragedy. We have been a peaceful nation, a patient, forbearing one. We have endured many insults. We have had women, children, and men ruthlessly killed. We have seen our ships torpedoed one after the other, and every effort has been made in our endeavors to induce Germany to cease her warfare upon us, but without avail. There is only one thing for us to do now, and that is stand up and defend our rights, protect the lives of our citizens, or lie down and permit a further trampling upon us, a further killing of our people, and a further destruction of our property. We must fight or run. I believe the time has come for us to fight, to insist upon our rights being respected, to insist on the protection of our property, to insist that our people shall not be killed. I represent a district in which there are many thousands of Germans and the sons and daughters of Germany, splendid citizens. Naturally they have been in sympathy with the fatherland. I know how their heartstrings will be hurt; but they are Americans. They have not defended the ruthless conduct of Germany. They are not in sympathy with its attacks upon us, and when we announce to-morrow morning that we are at war with Germany their duty will be clear and their allegiance unquestioned. [Applause.]

Permit me to sound a note of warning. One of the great, vital questions immediately confronting us is that of food. Wheat has already gone above the $2 mark per bushel. Cotton is up to 20 cents. Foodstuffs must be conserved and the people safeguarded against those who would take advantage of this crisis to enrich themselves. The world faces a shortage of food that will become more acute. The surpluses of the past bountiful seasons have been exhausted. Crops of the extent of other years will not be sufficient, and every effort must be made to increase them, that our people may have proper sustenance at reasonable prices. It is the duty of the Government at once to give thought to this question and to benefit by the experience of the countries in Europe now at war. Action can not safely be postponed. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, the time for talking, for discussion, for argument, for differences of opinion as to war or peace has passed. The imperative duty of the hour is for every true American to do a man's part for the honor of the Nation, for the glory of the flag, for the triumph of law and humanity, for the vindication of the rights of every citizen of the Republic. The President who kept us out of war for more than two years now sounds the tocsin of war. He appeals to the Congress and the American people to follow him in a contest to maintain the invaluable and time-honored rights of our citizens, to uphold and make good the blessings of justice, liberty, and protection beneath the glorious flag of our country on land and sea. In this Republic of free speech, where political and other differences exist, on the passage of the pending declaration of war there will be but one sentiment, one thought, one united, harmonious people, from ocean to ocean, willing and ready to make every human, every earthly sacrifice for the honor, dignity, and glory of the Nation; for world-wide democracy, for the universal brotherhood of mankind, for a boundless humanity, for the vindication and enforcement of international law, for equal and exact justice to all men. We can not escape our solemn responsibility to maintain and safeguard the priceless Government established by Washington, and his compatriots, and preserved by Lincoln and his invincible heroes. Such a Government is worth fighting for, worth dying for. If necessary, every patriot, every freeman, every American, will draw his sword to uphold, vindicate, and make good the wise and patriotic stand taken by our President in his address to Congress on last Monday.

Our great leaders Wilson, Taft, and Roosevelt insist we can not shirk, we can not retreat, we can not back down.

The brave, generous, and patriotic people I represent as a Member of this House desire peace with all the world, but peace only with honor, without yielding a single cherished right, without compromising the dignity of the Nation, without confessing to the world our unwillingness to protect the lives of American men, women, and children, at home or abroad, without admitting that we are too cowardly to fight when, without cause or excuse, war is made upon us. For Tennesseeans not to do their loyal and patriotic duty under the circumstances history would justly brand us as unworthy of the rich heritage, the imperishable glory handed down to us by countless thousands of heroes, who fought with John Sevier at Kings Mountain, Andrew Jackson at New Orleans, Farragut and Forrest in the Civil War.

The Volunteer State, which in every war has furnished more than its quota of soldiers for the armies of the Republic, will maintain its unsullied record in the coming war with Germany. Its splendid people are not lacking in love of country, devotion to the flag, unceasing fidelity, and exalted patriotism. [Applause.]

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to make a speech. The pending question is too serious and momentous to create such desire. I merely want to say a word, stating my position, because I feel it my duty to do so.

I have always been against war. Any war of aggression is, in my judgment, barbarous, un-Christian, and uncivilized. It shocks the sense of right and justice to see great nations using and concentrating their tremendous power solely in the destruction of property and of human life.

The question, however, "Can war be averted?" has been answered, because a state of war has existed for some time between Germany and the United States. The Stars and Stripes flying upon merchant ships, unarmed and engaged in peaceful pursuits upon the high seas where they had the lawful right to be, have been ruthlessly attacked without warning, the ships and their contents sent to the bottom of the sea, with the resultant loss of the lives of many American citizens.

While under the Constitution the power to declare war is vested in Congress, yet the policy of the executive branch of the Government may create such a condition of affairs as to leave no discretion to Members of Congress in the premises. Such a condition exists to-day. There is no alternative.

One of Rome's famous legends says, "Let what each man thinks of the Republic be written on his brow." I speak in the spirit of that injunction, with malice toward none and charity for all. We are willing to make all necessary sacrifices for our country. We have not been proally nor pro-German; we have been Americans, for America first, last, and all the time. [Applause.]

I have always been fond of the German people, and I can not believe that they approve of the murder and assassination of women and children and noncombatants upon the high seas.

I deeply feel that this is a time when we should show not by words but by action that we are Americans in the fullest sense of the word; that we are worthy of American citizenship; and that we are determined to uphold at all times, at all places, at all cost, and at all hazards the dignity, the honor, the rights, and the traditions of our country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. DALE] is recognized.

Mr. DALE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, for our country, which has never lowered its flag to another, there are but two courses through an international crisis. With it, in a vital issue, where diplomacy ends war begins. The German Empire had the impression that diplomacy would reach with our Government far beyond the limit endurable to a self-respecting nation, or else the imperial statesmen directed affairs with a purpose to end with our country diplomatic relations. It matters not to us whether in Germany the impression that would hold this Government in dishonor or the purpose to force us to the defense of our national obligations was the final cause of the present necessity. It is not material now whether on the part of either Government negotiation more skillful or perception more clear might have avoided the conclusion that has been reached.

The discussion of causes is not important, for the time is passed for the selection of a course. An American would die rather than lower the flag. Diplomacy has been exhausted to keep it afloat unstained. All the logic of statesmanship opens but one way. Members who say they will not vote for the pending resolution stand on a rule of conduct that has been discarded—it was diplomacy. The conditions of the time demand a new rule of action—it is war. Before the declaration that opens to that inevitable course I stand appalled. I approach it in expectation that it will lead to all that the President indicated in his message. The flag on land, on sea, and overseas, and with it learning the deepest sense of adoration for—

Your flag and my flag,
Your boys and my boys.

I stand in awe before the requirement, but face it as I would death shorn of its doubt of immortality. I can not evade the call; it is useless to question as to the reason, and I respond to it in the spirit of the immortal hope without which men ought not to live or die.

Supporting this responsibility, than which none of more public consequence can ever be required of me, I feel the influence of all the history of my State and I know what is desired and expected of me by its people. Vermont, constant to the basic principles of the Government by having transmitted through generations the heroic traits of forebears from the fields of the Revolution; faithful to the Union by sacrifice of more men in proportion to its population than any other State; loyal to the cause of human liberty in 1898 by quick response of volunteers and service of a native son whose name will live to inspire the Navy; Vermont, still true to Americanism by appropriating a million dollars for defense and calmly turning to the business of raising regiments after its legislators had sung—

My country, 'tis of thee,
Land of the noble free.

There is with me no difficulty of decision or fear of consequences. This Nation, the first permanent Republic, is now ready to maintain its principles, protect its citizens, and accept the opportunity to help liberate the last oppressed people on the earth. As the Speaker has said, "We will stay here till sun-up to complete our duty," for we believe that here begins the end of that day's business which will make true democracy a defense to our own people, an unconquerable desire in all the nations of the earth, and the first real hope of the sun-up of universal, lasting peace. When American citizens shall again feel that their lives are sacred to their Government and their flag is respected in every land and on the sea; when political and religious liberty in Russia shall have swept the Siberian prisons to their place in history with the Bastile; when all the skill and power of the German people shall have failed in tyranny and become strong in benevolence; when the hand of the Turk shall have been struck from the throat of the Armenian and the shrine of Christendom this Nation will be proud that the Stars and Stripes went anywhere with the colors of any ally to help bring this to pass. To the accomplishment of all this, and much more, we dedicate this Nation to-night, believing that from our action there will come forth a more united, heroic, and spiritual America that freely met the requirement to give of its immense resources and splendid manhood and womanhood unto the death for the sublime result to the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. PRICE] is recognized.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour I shall not take more than a minute or two of the time of the committee.

This is a solemn hour in the history of this country, and I do not feel that I should cast my vote on this resolution without saying a word.

I represent a constituency as peace-loving and as peaceful as any constituency in this Republic. And yet they do not want peace at any price. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN] when he says that 90 per cent of the American people want peace. But, my friends, there is a big difference between wanting peace and refusing to fight when we are insulted. Of course we want peace. The American people all want it. There is not a man within the sound of my voice who does not desire peace, and yet that does not feel that we should subject ourselves to insult and injury without resenting it. I just want to leave this thought with you, that to refuse to pass this resolution would be a national humiliation. To pass it with a large vote against it would be a national calamity. To pass this amendment that is offered here would be a national shame and humiliation, for to-morrow morning on the bulletin boards in Berlin and all over Germany would be standing out the news that the American people and the American Congress were divided and that they were not standing solidly behind the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of this great country. [Applause.]

Do you want to offer encouragement to the enemy? Three days ago we stood here and held up our hands to heaven and took the oath that we would defend and protect the Constitution of the United States against all foreign and domestic enemies. [Applause.] Does any man in the sound of my voice pretend that Germany is a friend of this country? Can any man read the history of her doings during these past few months and say that she is our friend? Would you say that a country which had murdered our citizens, which had sunk several of our ships without warning and in violation of all law and of the laws of humanity, was our friend? Would you say that a Government which had plotted in our country to destroy our sovereignty was our friend? I say to you, my fellow citizens and gentlemen of this House, that when you cast a vote against this resolution you are casting a vote to encourage the enemies of your country. [Applause.] And just in proportion as the vote is cast against this resolution, just so far are you encouraging the enemies of the American Nation. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, every Member here fully realizes that it is now beyond the power of argument to stay the passage of this resolution. In so far as the admittedly inevitable result of this debate is concerned it is but a painful waste of time to speak upon the question. But, Mr. Chairman, it is a vital issue of such tremendous importance that I feel it is the duty of every Member, one that he owes to himself, to the good people whom it is his honor to represent, and to his country, not to conceal but fearlessly to make known his stand upon this momentous question.

While I differ with them and shall vote for the resolution, nevertheless my heart has been stirred to its uttermost recesses, and I have been deeply and profoundly impressed with the opposing position first outlined so masterfully in this debate by the eminent gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER]. I can not agree with the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] that such position is one of disloyalty to this Nation, for in my judgment it is one born of deep, conscientious conviction, prompted by a courageous heart bravely pulsating with love for and duty to humanity. It does not require strong men to drift with the tide, and none less than the bravest of the brave can fight a losing battle, knowing beforehand its outcome and probable future personal disaster. And, Mr. Chairman, I desire to predict that after this resolution has been passed, which it will be with few dissenting votes, and war has been declared, none but a loyal, valorous patriot will be able to follow the illustrious gentleman from North Carolina, our honored, beloved, and distinguished Democratic leader of the House [Mr. KITCHIN] in his hearty support of that star-spangled flag, which in all of its history has never yet been conquered or dishonored with impunity.

I shall support the resolution, not merely because it is the President's policy, for each of us can not escape the constitutional responsibility placed upon us individually, but more because I believe that it is the policy of our peace and liberty loving, peace and liberty establishing, peace and liberty compelling Nation of American people.

The opposition does not argue that our boys are unwilling to die in defense of their country, or that a declaration of war should be withheld when the provocation is without extenuation, but practically all of the argument massed against the resolution is based upon the following: (1) That the provocation is over 3,000 miles away; (2) that England has many times violated international laws and trampled upon our rights with respect to commercial enterprises, yet during this war we have continued to extend forbearance; (3) that no ordinary situation exists in Europe, but the two great contending combatants, the entente allies and the central powers, are engaged in a life struggle, upon the termination of which depends their future existence, and that the danger zone is dangerous because just now it is a battle field of nations, which extenuates the provocation; (4) that considering the great necessities of the warring factions we might afford just now to waive and not insist upon our commercial rights and our right to travel upon the high seas; (5) that we can not afford to put our boys in one side of the scale against the protection of commercial rights upon a world's battle field in the other; and (6) that the lives of American boys are far more valuable than the privilege of traveling just now in a zone 3,000 miles from home, which has been proscribed and marked off as the battle ground of warring adversaries, which privilege we should be willing to waive, and which provocation we should be willing to forbear temporarily while lasts this great life struggle of the world.

It is a fact that no ordinary situation exists in Europe. It is a fact that half the world is fighting for its very existence. It is a fact that England during this war has many times trampled upon our rights with impunity. It is a fact that if we saw fit we could waive our right to commercial privileges in the war zone and to our privilege of traveling just now upon that portion of the high seas where goes on this struggle. If this were all, I would be willing to listen to the doctrine of extending forbearance during this crisis. And, Mr. Chairman, if it resolved itself into a question of voting my four boys and the boys of my people and my Nation into the trenches merely to protect commercial rights 3,000 miles away, in a tremendous world's crisis like Europe now faces, I would not do it; and, further, if it were merely a question of voting the splendid young manhood of my district and Nation of patriots into a cruel war, to which is known the most modern of all the barbarous and tortuous instruments of death and cruelty, merely to protect the privilege of traveling upon the high sea several thousand miles away, when the life exigencies of nations has made such privilege dangerous, right at this particular time I would not do it. But, Mr. Chairman, there are two reasons, from the compelling influence of which I can not escape, that force me to support the resolution. One is that Germany has deliberately done that which we told her emphatically the doing of which would mean war, and the other is that the crucial provocation is not 3,000 miles away, but exists upon our own soil.

No nation should ever demand of another that which it does not intend to enforce. While I have always believed that the impulsive Mayo demand upon Huerta on April 9, 1914, to salute our flag was trivial, yet when made its compliance should have been enforced. We have made requests of, and protests to, but no demands upon, England. We have made a demand upon Germany in the nature of an ultimatum, and Germany has not only ignored and disregarded it, but premeditatively has done that which she full well realized meant war. To forbear now means dishonor to our country. As the second reason I mentioned that the final provocation was here in our own land.

What means this great hegira of German reservists to Mexico? What means this wholesale drawing of gold from El Paso and American banks and accumulating it across the Rio Grande? What means that purported undisclosed part of the Zimmermann note, kept secret until recently, conveying the startling intelligence that the Imperial German Government will establish submarine bases at Mexican ports, from which will be supplied arms, ammunition, and supplies, ordering all German reservists in the United States to Mexico, with instructions to arrange attacks all along the border? What means this pouring into Mexico, not merely of German soldiers able to fight and carry a gun, but well-trained German officers able to mobilize and train the seasoned battle-field-experienced Mexicans, who not only cherish hatred of generations against us, but who are willing to fight, pillage, and murder under any banner when a small stipend of gold is the daily reward? What means the establishing and operating by skilled Germans of a plant for the manufacture of war munitions in the City of Mexico? What means the unloading by schooners on the Pacific coast within the past few days of German arms and munitions for Mexico? What means the daily organizing and drilling of Mexican soldiers, Villa and Carranza alike, by seasoned German officers? What means the infamous, inconceivable conduct of Count von Bernstorff, Capt. von Papen, Capt. Boy-Ed, and other accredited representatives of the Kaiser in the United States in violating every right recognized by civilized nations with respect to deceit and intrigue? What means the purposed scuttling and deliberate demolishing under orders of German ships interned in our harbors and the ruthless breaking of paroles by German officers and sailors interned on our soil and their escape into Mexico? In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, it unmistakably means but one thing, and that is war. Not war in the limited zone 3,000 miles away, but war by the Imperial German Government upon the Government and erstwhile peaceful and peace-loving people of the United States within our very borders and upon our own sacred soil.

Are we particularly uneasy about the Atlantic coast, fearing the landing there of German spies or armies? No! Are we anticipating danger from the 3,000 miles of Canadian border? No! Are we especially apprehensive about the invasion of our country from that portion of the Pacific coast not contiguous to Mexican possessions? No! But where is our uneasiness, if any we have? In what direction lies our first danger? Where is the mobilization ground for enemy troops, warships, submarine bases, Zeppelins, aeroplanes, munitions, invasions? There is but one answer—Mexico. It is mainly through the land of my birth that our Army is to take its first stand. It is the brave Texas boys who are to see the first active service upon native soil. It is the American citizens who live in Texas who are likely first to realize the great horrors of war, not war which before the dawn of day we are to vote upon our Nation, but grim-visaged war which by German selection has already fastened its fangs into the vitals of our country.

Let us briefly review a few recent border conditions to ascertain what may be expected of Mexico. During the years 1910, 1911, and 1912, 47 American citizens were murdered in Mexico. During the years 1913, 1914, and 1915 the lives of 76 Americans, murdered in cold blood, paid tribute to lawless conditions in Mexico, and during the last three years mentioned 20 civilian Americans and 16 American soldiers were brutally murdered on American soil by Mexicans from across the Rio Grande.

On January 10, 1916, the Santa Ysabel massacre occurred. C. R. Watson and 19 United States citizens, with accredited passports in their pockets, were taken from a train by Mexican bandits, stripped of their clothing and belongings, and then foully murdered. On March 9, 1916, in the darkness of the night, Mexican cutthroats crossed the Rio Grande and upon American soil in Columbus, N. Mex., murdered 17 Americans, and but for timely and efficient resistance would have pillaged and murdered the entire citizenship, including men, women,

and little children. On May 7, 1916, 200 Mexicans crossed the Rio Grande in their raid on Glen Springs, and, by reason of the want of a needed military highway along the border, it took our Cavalry 11 days to go out from Marathon and overtake the leader on May 18, 1916, only 135 miles from the border. Notwithstanding our expenditure of $129,000,000 on the Pershing expedition, Villa, still alive, is apparently ready to join hands with Carranza, under German organization, against us. As far back as the Gadsden treaty of December 30, 1853, Mexico agreed—

that whenever the tranquillity and interior repose of either country shall be threatened or disturbed by unlawful invasions of any of the citizens or subjects of either power against the territory of the other, respectively, they will cheerfully cooperate in their endeavors to suppress all such attempts.

Yet Carranza not only failed to suppress Villa himself but in many instances refused to cooperate with us, and in every way possible hindered and retarded the United States in its efforts to capture him.

On June 2, 1915, the President directed a communication to Mexico, which concluded as follows:

I, therefore, publicly and very solemnly call upon the leaders of factions in Mexico to act, to act together, and to act promptly for the relief and redemption of their prostrate country. I feel it to be my duty to tell them that if they can not accommodate their differences and unite for this great purpose within a short time this Government will be constrained to decide what means should be employed by the United States in order to help Mexico save herself and serve her people.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that by taking prompt and decisive steps to prevent the Imperial German Government from overwhelming Mexico and using its resources in an apparent attempt to Belgiumize the peoples of both Mexico and Texas, the time has come to help Mexico save herself and serve her people, and at the same time reestablish our long-suspended legal rights, ignored and trampled upon by said country.

Let us remember that with a population of 15,000,000, 12,000,000 are poor, ignorant peons. With 30,027,500 acres in cultivation, 43,933,200 acres of forest lands and 120,444,200 acres of pastoral lands, the great mass of Mexican peoples own not a foot of soil and are forced to daily slave for worse than masters at 10 cents a day remuneration. Mexico has 1,572 gold mines, 5,461 silver mines, 970 copper mines, 383 iron mines, 151 mercury mines, 94 lead mines, 86 sulphur mines, 49 zinc mines, 40 tin mines, 21 opal mines, and 73 other mines, yet thousands of her ignorant peoples are starving to death. Their judicial system is one in which the courts decide according to the desires of those in authority and not according to law. Americans have invested in Mexico $500,000,000 in railroads, $125,000,000 in oil, and $50,000,000 in lands, cattle, rubber, and agriculture pursuits, yet to-day the stability of American investments in Mexico is absolutely without rating. Under the newly promulgated constitution vast holdings of American citizens have been unjustly confiscated without notice or hearing.

Let me remind you that when on August 11, 1915, the United States, Brazil, Chile, Argentina, Bolivia, Uruguay, and Guatemala invited the two warring factions to meet in conference on Mexican frontier to exchange ideas and, if possible, to reach an agreement of peace, Carranza refused. It was Carranza also who refused to ratify the protocol agreed to at Atlantic City on November 24, 1916, and after four months of fruitless efforts the dissolution of the American-Mexican Joint Commission thereby resulted on January 15, 1917.

Let me remind you further that on May 31, 1916, Carranza sent to our Government a sharp note at the same time massing 40,000 troops near the American border.

I mention all of these facts in answering the question, if all of the foregoing has occurred when we were at peace with all the world, what may we not expect now from Germany and Mexico with access to all of the Mexican resources whether we should pass this resolution or not.

What is the portent of the note sent by Carranza to our Government on February 12, 1917? In the light of the chronology I have mentioned, in my judgment, it was incited by and written in the behalf of the German Government, and taken altogether it means war on American soil by the Kaiser from Mexico across the Rio Grande. In such a crisis no Texan will dodge the issue.

I intend to vote for the resolution without amendments, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the Congress, realizing full well the awful, dreadful consequences of war, for it can not be avoided honorably; and in passing subsequent legislation to provide necessary means to prosecute this war, I intend to vote to make the factories, commercial enterprises, and railroads that have profited most by this great world war stand the greatest portion of the incident expenses. And I sincerely hope that if Mexico is to be taken charge of by any outside Government it will be done by the United States and not by the Imperial German Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, at this late hour I shall not take up the time of the House. I shall vote for the resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am a new Member of this body. This is my fifth day in Congress, and it would be presumptuous, indeed, in me to address this body did I not think, did I not realize and know that I am right in supporting this resolution. [Applause.]

I come from the far Northwest of this Republic, from Puget Sound, and I bring the greeting that we have patriotism on Puget Sound, in the wonderful young State of Washington, as well as you have and as much as you have in the good old State of North Carolina or in the good old State of Pennsylvania. My people are patriotic to a fault. They will support the President of our country. I did not and do not agree with him politically, but in this controversy I stand by him and my people stand by him. [Applause.]

In his international policy my district believes in him. Last November the good men and women of my congressional district gave him over 12 000 majority; they expressed confidence in him; they emphasized their full and abiding faith in his judgment, and their overflowing confidence in his sagacity and leadership. I can do nothing else than carry out their direction as indicated by their votes. While I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams from the people of my own home city of Seattle not one person in word or suggestion has expressed a lack of faith in the good judgment of the foreign policy of the President. On the contrary over half of these people have asked me to stand by the President and in this crisis support his policy. This I shall do. I have no right, moral or legal, not to do so. My pathway is pointed out to me, my duty is made plain. Had I been left undirected by such an overwhelming expression of confidence in him, I might and perhaps should have considered many things now behind me. My vote shall therefore be in favor of this resolution, and I will take my chance in whatever destiny it may yield. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. This resolution has been under continuous debate since mid forenoon. I have heard much bitter denunciation of the conduct of Germany, of its mode of warfare, and of its ultimate purpose. In much of this I agree. There is no doubt of the commission on her part of this long list of violations of the rules of international law. She admits it and pleads military expediency and necessity.

No necessity can apologize for violations of law; no pardon or excuse can come from such sources; no justification for the killing of our people can satisfy our understanding. The President on last Monday stated the position of the American Government and its people. There is a limit to the patience of finite men, and when patience is outworn resentment and punishment are the only recourse.

This is not a war of sentiment. This is a war brought about by the repeated unlawful acts of a nation seemingly wholly reckless of its international obligations. For weeks and weeks acts of war on the part of Germany have filled our Republic with astonishment, even with horror. These must end, Mr. Chairman; no honorable, self-respecting nation can further endure them. America did not bring this war upon the world; we have not brought ourselves into it. Another's hand, not ours, is the hand covered with blood. We have not drawn the sword until after the dagger has been repeatedly thrust at our breast. We have bandaged our wounds; we have undertaken to hide our scars.

We shall bandage no longer; we shall now cease to hide; it is cut and scar in the great open field from now until such wrongs shall not only cease but the nation that brought this conflict on shall be stripped of its sword.

Mr. Chairman, our people have the right to trade with the world. We have the right, undoubted right, to send the produce of the fields and mills throughout the world. The agreed and written law of our civilization—of humanity, if you please—gives us this right.

Germany has agreed to this and has long taken advantage of the same or similar world-wide right. We have done nothing and are doing nothing but that which we have the right to do under the code of civilization—the only rule for the conduct of the world.

Because the Imperial Government of Germany finds it convenient—necessary, if you please—as a military expedient she violates these precepts that she herself has long recognized and which she assisted in having ordained. In these repeated violations she has not only destroyed the property, millions of it,

of our citizens but has taken the lives of our countrymen. No other nation in all the world would have been so patient as ours; no people so slow to utter a protest. The cold facts of events proclaim to a candid world this traditional quality, if I can call it such, of the American Nation and its people. Not only this, but my own city has repeatedly suffered, my people placed in terror. On land and sea one wrong after another have we suffered.

Tell me, Mr. Chairman, by what right, by whose code of ethics, are these things to be justified? No nation has the right to undo of its own volition, however founded in necessity, the rules of safe conduct on the high seas which our civilization was a thousand years in obtaining. No nation has the right to change at her convenience the recognized laws of humanity. I am not for war; no self-poised nor self-controlled person is; no American ever should be. But war is here; it is now and has been thundering at our gates. War long since—acts of war, "overt acts," if you please—overflowing in number, all-abounding in cruelty and wrong.

Mr. Chairman, let every American give ear to the recital by the President of these repeated acts; let every countryman of ours—East, West, North, and South—read them and write the answer in his own heart. Suppose we had been guilty of like acts to Germany and her national rights; suppose the case was reversed and the American Nation had been the guilty party and Germany the sufferer, how long would she have endured such conduct? The answer is written in the instant policy of the German Government.

America is a peaceful Nation. If there is any one great fact that fact is the nonmilitary character of our people. No time nor circumstance can change us; it is inherent in our character, molded in our institutions. We know it, the world knows it. This war is not cast upon us by the German people; it is not their work nor their war. No argument, however subtle, can convince me that the German people would have brought it upon us. The fault lies not with the people but with their Government. The acts of the German Government are not the acts of the German people, for if left to themselves, or had they been consulted, the necessity of this action of defense on our part would never have come about. 'Way back yonder my ancestors came from the valley of the beautiful Rhine. Many, many of us trace our blood to the fatherland; true it is many generations back of us, but it is there just the same. We all regret that we are compelled by the very nature of the acts committed to take this stand so at variance with our natural drift. The remedy is for the German people to direct their Government as we do, and not the Government to direct the people, as is the rule amongst them to-day.

Mr. Chairman, I stand for my country and my country's rights on the high seas, the land, under the sea, and in the air. [Applause.] I vote for this resolution only after the candid consideration of all the facts which our natural patience has endured. I am not impelled by any impulse. My desire is to harm no people, my hope is to injure no institution out of which freedom can possibly have its birth. The conduct of that offending Government alone brings us into this conflict. God grant that all this shall in His good time be changed, until the people who alone do the suffering and who alone do the dying shall rule themselves and be the full and undisputed masters of their course as nations of the earth. Our leadership in the free democracies of the earth must not be taken from us; the corner stone of our national institutions shall not fall.

Mr. Chairman, this is the solemn hour of my life, the darkest day of my existence; the heaviest heart that has ever beaten in my breast is beating now. I think I know, I think I realize, what war means. This war will test the strength of free institutions; it will test the might of our people, but we shall pass that test with every national fiber, however small, securely in its place.

We know not what the future holds for us; we know not what star shall guide us; we can not foretell our destiny; such are the plans of the Infinite. But let us all hope and pray that the Great Unseen Power who holds the fate of nations in the hollow of His hand will guide us, protect us, and bring us unto His keeping with victory and in glory. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. NORTON] is recognized.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the time for any extended discussion of the question now before the House has passed. It is as certain as that night follows day that the resolution before the House will be adopted, as it has already been adopted by the Senate. War is an abhorrent and terrible thing. Everyone who votes upon this resolution must realize that stupendous and momentous responsibility attending the hurling of this Nation of 100,000,000 people into the inferno of strife and slaughter that the many nations across the Atlantic have engaged in for the past two years. Since the beginning of the European war I have labored unceasingly in every way within my power as a citizen of this country and as a Member of this body to the purpose and to the end that this Nation might not become actively involved in this world war. But unwelcome and abhorrent as it is, war is now inevitable. With the condition that confronts us, now is no time for criticism as to whether a different policy than that which has been pursued might have avoided this war. Now is no time to cry "Peace!" Others may cry peace, but the fact is war is upon us and this fact must be met squarely.

Through no act and through no desire of the people of this country, war has been thrust upon us. We have long patiently borne the insults, the attacks, and the aggressions of the Imperial German Government. Our peaceful merchant ships have been and are being destroyed; our citizens have been and are being sent to eternity without warning and with a wanton ruthlessness such as the civilized world has never before known.

The resolution before the House is plain and explicit in its terms. It commits the country to a policy in defense of American rights and American principals. It proposes no aggression. It is a resolution wholly and entirely in defense of inalienable rights of our citizens which have been ignored and trampled upon upon by the war lords of the Imperial German Government. I shall give my full support to the resolution, because, at this time, as an American citizen, loving my country above all things, no act or action of mine shall be permitted to give aid or comfort to the common enemy. My sentiments on this occasion accord with the words of Decatur: "Our country in her intercourse with foreign nations, may she always be right; but our countrty right or wrong."

The paramount question to be kept in mind after this day until the close of this war is to see that the war is conducted by this Nation in such a way as to cause the least possible suffering and hardship to the common people of our country. The burdens of the war should be as evenly distributed among our people as in human nature it is possible to do this. I believe that the financial expense of this war should be placed for the most part upon those who are most able to bear these expenses, and that in so far as it is possible to prevent it no citizen nor group of citizens should be permitted to profit financially from this war and thereby place a heavier burden upon other citizens of the country.

The necessities of this war will require a broad, general, and much-needed adjustment of our systems of production, distribution, transportation, manufacturing, and trade. In accordance with views I hold to be for the best interests of the great mass of the American people, I shall at a proper time present to the Congress for its consideration measures for the taking over and operation by the Government of the railroads, munition plants, and other large industries of the country, and for the establishment of a more thorough nation-wide marketing system to aid in the most efficient and economic production and distribution of food products; such a system to include Federal-owned and controlled elevators, warehouses, and cold-storage plants, to the end that the distribution of all food products shall be made between the producer and consumer with a greater facility and with the least waste and cost. Only under the most efficient organization of our resources of production and our methods of distribution can we most quickly and with the least difficulty carry this war to an early and successful conclusion.

Let us all as true loyal American citizens join heart and hand in this great struggle which is upon us. Let us go forward united in this common cause for humanity and civilization. Let us pursue this war to victorious conclusion, so that a lasting peace, truer happiness and contentment, and greater liberty and freedom may come to all the people of all the nations involved. Let us conduct this war with a spirit and a purpose that will cause future generations in this free land of ours, in all the lands of the entente allies, and as well in all the fair lands of the Elbe, the Oder, and the Danube to long honor and commemorate our course here to-day. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DALLINGER] is recognized.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this resolution without amendment, and in so doing I believe I shall represent the wishes of the people of the old historic district of Massachusetts in which is included the route of the famous ride of Paul Revere.

I shall not attempt at this late hour to make a speech, but I shall send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read a letter from the town clerk of the town of Lexington, with accom-

panying resolutions passed by the town meeting of that town in which was shed the first blood in the great struggle for American independence. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEXINGTON, MASS., *April 4, 1917.*

Hon. FREDERICK W. DALLINGER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Inclosed is a copy of the resolutions which were passed by the voters of Lexington, Mass., at a town meeting held on March 26, 1917.

A copy has been sent to the President and the town officials thought you might be glad to receive a copy.

Yours, truly,

CHARLES W. SWAN, *Clerk.*

Whereas we, citizens of Lexington, Mass., in town meeting assembled, are ever mindful of the unremitting vigilance and fearless action of those who dwelt here in 1775; and

Whereas we desire to fulfill our responsibility of remaining true and loyal to their memory; and

Whereas, although bearing no malicious hatred toward any ruler, class, race, or nation, we yet determinedly and advisedly condemn the cause of a Government whose present policy is flagrantly abhorrent to American principles; and

Whereas we would not seem ungrateful to those Governments which serve our highest interests and the highest interests of mankind: Therefore be it

Resolved—

First. That we do hereby express our entire and hearty sympathy with the cause of liberty against tyranny, the cause for which the allied Governments of the entente are now fighting;

Second. That we thankfully acknowledge whatever debt we already owe to the armies and to the navies of the said Governments;

Third. That we cordially favor serving the said Governments by granting them loans of money on such favorable terms as shall show our gratitude for their help in the past and in the present;

Fourth. That we openly challenge the attention of such inhabitants of the United States of America as are not, even at this late hour, fully alive to the dangers that threaten the life of the Nation, a challenge uttered to these ends:

(a) That sleeping patriotism may everywhere awaken to an intelligent and loyal public spirit, which shall actively carry out whatever measures are most conducive to the national welfare;

(b) That the foundations of our Government, as laid by the men of old, be not shaken, but that the President and the Congress of the United States of America be consistently supported; and

(c) That the American people, who in 1775 had no difficulty in seeing across the Atlantic Ocean, may have less difficulty in determining their duty while endeavoring to serve, to the extent of their power, the righteous interests of democracy as against autocracy throughout the entire world.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] is recognized.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, from where I stand I am looking upon the emblem back of the Speaker's desk. That is the only flag unfurled to the breeze by any nation now in existence that never bowed to a conqueror. [Applause.] It is 141 years old; and during all of those years it has passed through many struggles and has never been lowered.

Our principles to-day are the same as they were when that flag was given to the world. They were expressed in two world-famous documents. The first was—

Life, liberty, and opportunity for all men.

The second was—

Justice, man to man; welfare to every citizen; and the guaranty of the fruits of freedom to our posterity.

To establish those principles, our forefathers, standing with a scattered 3,000,000 people—men, women, and children—all told, went to war with the Mistress of the Sea. It was not long after that until 10,000,000 went to war again with the Mistress of the Sea for the freedom of the sea. Later on it went through the fires of the greatest civil war that was ever known to man, and to-day it represents more than 100,000,000 of people, no less patriotic, no less courageous, no less American then were they who gave the flag to the country.

And when the challenge comes, from whatever quarter of the world, to defend the principles that that flag stands for, the Nation will be united. We will not know Democrat or Republican and we will know no Jew nor Gentile. We will not be German-Americans, French-Americans, Italian-Americans, Irish-Americans, or what not, but it will be Americans, standing for the principles of that flag. [Applause.]

And I believe that while it means war—for this resolution will be passed, and I will vote for it without any amendment—the flag will still be the flag of an unconquered people, because it stands for the rights of all men and asks for wrongs against no man. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] is recognized.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, in entering into or waging a war other things are necessary besides mere sentiment and oratory. [Applause.] I represent a State which is fourth on the list of States producing wool. For this reason I ask to have read in my time a telegram which I received this evening from the Oregon Wool Growers' Association, showing the wave of patriotism sweeping over my State.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HEPPNER, OREG., *April 5, 1917.*

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Notify national defense committee that Oregon wool growers have resolved to act in conjunction with the committee in every way possible. We will urge our members to hold their wool, making the Government a preferred purchaser. We are heart and hand with everything to aid our country in this hour of crisis.

OREGON WOOL GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
W. B. BARRETT, *President.*

[Applause.]

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to refer to another patriotic incident which occurred in my State, in my home town, the town of my birth, on last Sunday. I refer to this incident in view of the fact that the newspapers report that when Ambassador Gerard was leaving Germany one of the German officials insinuatingly referred to the fact that in the United States there were 1,000,000 German citizens, and Ambassador Gerard is said to have retorted, "There are also 1,000,000 lamp-posts in the United States." The remark of the German official would not have been made with such gusto, and the retort of Ambassador Gerard would not have been necessary had the German official known what was to take place in my home town on last Sunday indicative of our German citizens' patriotism. Last Sunday, in my home town of 6,000 inhabitants, there was held a patriotic demonstration attended by 3,000 citizens. Before the demonstration there was a parade. That parade was led by the German citizens of my town, old veterans of the Franco-Prussian war, and their sons. At the head of that parade was carried an American flag, purchased for the purpose by the German citizens of my town. That flag was proudly carried at the head of the procession by a schoolmate of mine, a man born in Germany and educated in my home town.

Ah, the Imperial German Government will get no comfort when it learns the throb of patriotism that will course through the veins of our German citizens to-day. I believe every American citizen of German birth or extraction will exclaim, in the language of the poet:

Though my father's father
Felt hale German blood
Course through his veins,
A satisfying flood;
Yet as for me,
Strong limbed and free,
I'll face the war a man;
Not alien, but American.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, if my vote against this resolution would avert war I would vote against it. It would not. We are already in a state of war with the Imperial Government of Germany. I am unwilling, therefore, that my vote should be construed as comfort to the enemy that the entire Republic will face when the sun shall rise in the morning. After the adoption of this resolution by the House there will be but one sentiment from sea to sea in the mind of every citizen, whether native or foreign born, within the confines of the Republic, and that will be the prosecution of the war to a successful conclusion. Therefore, much as I deplore war, I shall record my vote in support of the resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I feel that my colleagues will be pleased to know that the messages that I get from the western and eastern slopes of the Alleghenies and from the upper valley of the Shenandoah all advise me that West Virginians want to uphold the dignity and honor of the mightiest Republic of time. [Applause.]

And, sir, that is not strange when we recall that about 10 years ago Congress made an appropriation to build a monument the purpose of which was to commemorate the first battle of the Revolution, and that monument was placed on West Virginia soil at Point Pleasant. And in this connection may I remind you that the last battle of the Revolution was fought at Wheeling, on West Virginia soil? And again may I remind you that the first battle of the Civil War was at Philippi, W. Va., where the guns of the Union answered the challenge of Fort Sumter? More than three hundred battles and skirmishes took place on the soil of my native State, and soldiers from the same territory have been on every battle field in defense of human liberty since American independence was proclaimed.

A distinguished gentleman has just referred to that dramatic occasion when the sailors and marines of the several nations

left their battleships and marched to the ancient capital of China to rescue the legations from the Boxer madness. Ah, that was a great procession, with the American marines marching at the head of the column; and it makes the blood course faster in my veins, as I remember, and as history records, that when the rescuers neared Peking, that ancient, walled capital of China, there rushed ahead of the naval forces of the world, Cal Titus, a West Virginia boy, with his mother's Bible in his pocket, who climbed the old wall and was the first to plant Old Glory on the top, a harbinger of hope, an apotheosis of liberty and victory to all the world. [Applause.] I am sure you would expect West Virginia to be loyal in the future as she has been in the past.

The most forceful appeal made by the President's friends in my district in the last campaign was that the election of a Democrat was necessary to back up the President's peace propaganda. As a Republican Member of this House I am now asked to stand by him in a war which he says has already commenced. This I shall do. The people I represent do not want war. God knows I do not want it; but the President says "We are clearly forced into it because there are no other means of defending our rights." He has presented facts and evidence to sustain his position. Under our form of government to which we acknowledge allegiance the people, every four years, select a President, who is also, under our Constitution, Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. However much we may differ from him on matters relating to our fiscal or internal affairs, it is our duty as Americans to stand loyally by the President in his efforts to protect our country against her enemies wherever they may be found. Our fight, as the President suggests, is not against the great mass of the German people, but against the most conscienceless, cruel, unrelenting form of militarism and despotism known on the face of the earth.

War in any form has always been hideous enough, but language fails us in describing the methods of the Kaiser. He sends demons in human form up into the azure blue of heaven to nullify all of Heaven's precepts and drop missiles of death and destruction upon hospitals that shelter the sick and helpless and upon schoolhouses where little children are singing songs of peace. He crushes Belgium, a friendly little neutral country against which he had no possible grievance, and then sends to the bottom of the sea the food and hospital ships destined to relieve the awful suffering of that brave people. He fills America with spies and sends his hellish emissaries here to stalk through our land with torch and bomb and plan sinister intrigues with Mexico and Japan.

No longer shall we refer to the inquisition and the dark ages as prefiguring the heights and depths of human cruelty and depravity. The Kaiser has shifted the wretched scene to the twentieth century.

I have taken some pains to glean from what I consider reliable sources a few of the public declarations of the Kaiser, made several years prior to this war.

In March, 1905, in a speech at Bremen, the German Emperor declared the aim of the Hohenzollerns to be "a world-wide dominion." In speech after speech, says his biographer, he proclaimed the world-mission of Germany, of which he himself was the divinely appointed instrument; and at Poland, in August, 1905, he said in a public speech, "Germanism, like the spirit of imperial Rome, must expand and impose itself."

America welcomes the advance of German science and German art, even to a "world dominion," provided such expansion promotes the world's progress and happiness without encroaching upon its liberties.

It is difficult to understand why the Imperial German Government should at this time seek by her atrocious acts to draw the United States into this conflict on the side of the allies. The German Emperor may be basing his hopes upon some recent events that do not constitute a very luminous page of our history. It has gone out to the world that we were hopelessly unprepared; that in our recent efforts to capture a lone bandit our Treasury was depleted, our military strategists baffled, and our diplomacy wearied, while the bandit laughed at our vexations and experienced no loss of health or liberty. But if any think that undertaking measures our strength they are grievously mistaken. A job of the kind usually turned over to a detective agency may not deeply stir the patriotic impulses of the American people; but mark my prediction, an issue in which the perpetuity of free government is involved will transform them into the most aggressive defenders of liberty the world has ever known.

The tremendous task of quick mobilization of men and munitions, the hurry to pass emergency legislation to facilitate our giving aid to those now at war with Germany, and for the protection of life and property at home and abroad bring us face to face with the problem of future preparedness. I believe in preparedness by universal military training, not that I look for wars in the future, but because the best thought of the day is that it will be the surest guaranty of peace.

No nation in Christendom will want to attack a country as rich in resources and men as the United States if they know we are prepared. The bringing together of our young men from the homes of the rich and poor, training them side by side, without reference to rank or station in life, ought to promote a better understanding among all classes and strengthen and unify the spirit of democracy in our land.

I believe this preparedness can be attained without the accompanying spirit of "militarism" that has been in evidence in Europe, and which is so repugnant to our own people. I abhor anything that smacks of a military aristocracy or snobbery among that element that happens to be favored with official positions in the Army or Navy, and I hope this sentiment will be kept at the forefront in putting into operation any laws that may be enacted relating to training and preparedness. It is a serious, an awful thing, Mr. Chairman, to send the boys from American firesides to the slaughter trenches of the Old World. And while we must take no chances and should in the shortest possible time train and equip the most formidable army ever recruited on American soil, I am nevertheless consoled by the thought that it may not be necessary to send our troops to the Old World. I am informed by the military experts that no army recruited for the war could be adequately trained under a year, and that it would be at least 16 months before such troops could be placed on the firing line of the allies. My hope is that before 16 months have passed the war will be ended, and instead of the call for American troops it will be the call for an American commission to sit with the victors around the council table of nations when the civilization of Europe is reconstructed along lines that will dethrone the god of war forever.

Some will say I am visionary; others will doubt our ability to prepare for this fight. I can not, it is true, pierce the veil of the future. I do not know what waits in the antechamber of time, but I have not forgotten the faith of the fathers of the Republic. May I here quote the eloquent words of Patrick Henry in 1775, when he was told that America would fail—words that I presume everyone here has declaimed in his boyhood: "We shall not fight our battles alone. There is a just God who presides over the destinies of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight our battles for us."

The friends were provided and the patriots were successful. Who will say, Mr. Chairman, that the Nation which was handed the torch of liberty in the eighteenth century has been found so recreant to the trust that the God of nations will desert it in the twentieth century?

America has engaged in several wars which cost much and sacrificed many lives. They were wars waged to maintain principles that were just. They are a part of the Nation's glory, and who says we were wrong? Who would blot any of these struggles and the victories achieved from our wondrous history?

Man has always been a fighting animal. Human history opens with a tragedy. There was a murderer in the earth's first family. Christ had to endure the agony of Gethsemane and the torture of the cross in order that humanity might find the way of everlasting life. All the shrines of progress have been drenched with tears or stained with blood. But always there have been serious sentinels along the picket lines of civilization anxiously watching the horizon for gleams of the dawning of the day of "universal peace."

We believe in our country and its destiny. We believe the American Republic, enriched by contributions from all the past, is the highest forum in which the genius of man for self-government has found expression. We have gathered men from the ends of the earth and builded a temple of civilization grander than any ever before "touched by human hands or conceived by human intellect." But thinkers of renown tell us that "government of the people by the people" is still an experiment. Give sufficient time, they say, and no government has yet been established that has been immune from a recrudescence of barbarism. Our hope has been that America would be the exception to this rule. The decision we make to-day may be for weal or woe. Shall we be "heirs of all the ages" or laggards in the vanguard of civilization?

There are those among us who are prone to look for guidance to the sayings and teachings of the founders of our Government. I do not impugn their wisdom as applied to the conditions that existed then, but we know it is not the world of Washington and Jefferson that furnishes the momentous problems of this hour.

Nations have been brought into one great neighborhood. The pulsing waves of ether sending messages and warnings around the globe have made the earth a vast whispering gallery. The ocean depths and the circumambient cloudland are both utilized

to-day to meet the exigencies of war and commerce. The North Pole and the South Pole have divulged their secrets. Where is there an unexplored continent or an unvisited land? The world is no longer divided into two hemispheres. Its limits are reached and its depths are fathomed.

Figuratively speaking, science has created a new heaven and a new earth. And just when all the wonderful forces of material and social invention are playing upon our bewildered senses with titanic energy over half of Christendom becomes a seething, furious, flame-swept area of agony, hate, and murder.

Is it too much to believe that the present saturnalia of war and destruction is a necessary prelude to a new harmony which is to follow? Out of it all may we hope there will come eventually the swelling rythm of a grand march, to which all the peoples of the earth by common impulses will step forward to a common destiny characterized by democracy, freedom, and light?

In the light of the President's message, this is no time for negative, easy-going, complacent pacifism. It is no time for laying that flattering unction to our souls that some way, some time all will be well. If we remain inactive now and the German Emperor acquires dominion over Europe, would not our turn come next? We would then have to fight alone.

What shall America do? Play a dirge? No. Give utterance to a jeremiad? No. The old timepiece of the centuries has struck the hour for a charge.

Some one has said "great tasks create and challenge great folks," and the task before the American people this day is to make the world's crisis the world's opportunity.

Ah, my friends, there is something more to this war now than securing indemnity for a few American merchantmen that have been sunk. Something more than dollars, something more than the profits of munition makers and greater than keeping unobstructed the pathway of the seas. It is a momentous question. It is grander than the things we have spent most time in discussing to-day. Victor Hugo once said that in the sweep of the ages there come times when events constitute the hinges upon which the centuries swing. Such a hinge is being made to-day. America is getting ready to help inaugurate a new era in which the insiduous doctrine of the "divine right of kings" shall be taken from the book of civilization and written on the page of retrogression. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, as I said in the beginning, the people of West Virginia will be loyal in this crisis, and her legions will be ready to go forward, if needed, to help carry the Old Flag to every land and float it on every breeze, the unchallenged symbol of "man's humanity to man." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair has overlooked anyone, he will be glad to recognize him now.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

The question being taken, the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BRITTEN].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SLOAN: Strike out all of the resolution, beginning on page 1, line 1, and substitute therefor the following:

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the said state of war between the United States and certain citizens on the one hand and the Imperial German Government, brought about by the Imperial German Government, is hereby formally declared; and that the President be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to take immediate steps to place the country in a thorough state of defense and enforce American rights both as to citizens and ships on land and on the high seas, and especially within the zones where said rights have heretofore been interfered with, and to that end the President is authorized to use the military and naval forces of the United States, together with all the immediately available resources of the Government."

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I will not use all the time that is allotted to me, but there are two propositions: First, in the resolution before the House there is no provision for placing this country in a state of defense, which, in my opinion, will, during the next six months, be found to be of more importance than the prosecution of a foreign war.

The second proposition is that the war to be prosecuted is restricted to meeting the injuries or attacks which we have suffered. With these propositions I simply ask for a vote on the amendment. I think it expresses more fairly the wish of the American people than the prosecution of a foreign war for the regulation of European affairs; that is, the redress of our own grievances and the preparation for a defense of the United States against attacks which we may have within the next few months.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MEEKER] is confined to his bed in a hospital by illness. He has sent word to me asking to be paired in favor of the resolution, which, I think, can not be done; but he desires me to announce that if it were possible for him to be here and vote he would vote for the resolution. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Chairman, my colleague [Mr. FIELDS] received a telegram announcing the serious illness of his wife——

Mr. MANN. He made that announcement here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] made that announcement.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the resolution to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FITZGERALD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration Senate joint resolution 1 declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial German Government and the Government and people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same, had directed him to report the resolution back with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the preamble to its final passage.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the preamble and the resolution.

The resolution and preamble was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BRITTEN moves to recommit the resolution back to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

On page 2, after line 16, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"*Provided, however,* That no part of the military forces of the United States shall be ordered to do land duty in any part of Europe, Asia, or Africa until so directed by act of Congress, excepting those troops who specifically volunteer for such foreign service."

Mr. FLOOD. On that, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands the yeas and nays. All those in favor of taking the vote by yeas and nays will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Thirty-three gentlemen have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken and the motion to recommit was refused.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the resolution.

Mr. FLOOD. Upon that, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 373, nays 50, not voting 9, as follows:

YEAS—373.

Adamson	Brumbaugh	Connally, Tex.	Doolittle
Alexander	Buchanan	Cooper, Ohio	Doremus
Anderson	Butler	Cooper, W. Va.	Doughton
Anthony	Byrnes, S. C.	Copley	Dowell
Ashbrook	Byrns, Tenn.	Costello	Drane
Aswell	Caldwell	Cox	Drukker
Austin	Campbell, Kans.	Crago	Dunn
Ayres	Campbell, Pa.	Cramton	Dupré
Bacharach	Candler, Miss.	Crisp	Dyer
Bankhead	Cannon	Crosser	Eagan
Barkley	Cantrill	Currie, Mich.	Eagle
Barnhart	Caraway	Curry, Cal.	Edmonds
Bathrick	Carew	Dale, N. Y.	Ellsworth
Bell	Carlin	Dale, Vt.	Elston
Black	Carter, Mass.	Dallinger	Emerson
Blackmon	Carter, Okla.	Darrow	Estopinal
Bland	Chandler, N. Y.	Dempsey	Evans
Blanton	Chandler, Okla.	Denison	Fairchild, B. L.
Booher	Clark, Fla.	Dent	Fairchild, G. W.
Borland	Clark, Pa.	Denton	Fairfield
Bowers	Classon	Dewalt	Farr
Brand	Claypool	Dickinson	Ferris
Brodbeck	Coady	Dies	Fess
Browning	Collier	Dixon	Fisher
Bruckner	Comstock	Dooling	Fitzgerald

Flood	Jacoway	Nolan	Smith, N. Y.
Flynn	James	Norton	Snell
Focht	Johnson, Ky.	Oldfield	Snook
Fordney	Johnson, Wash.	Oliver, Ala.	Snyder
Foss	Jones, Tex.	Oliver, N. Y.	Steagall
Foster	Jones, Va.	Olney	Stedman
Francis	Juul	Osborne	Steele
Freeman	Kahn	O'Shaunessy	Steenerson
French	Kearns	Overmyer	Stephens, Miss.
Fuller, Mass.	Kehoe	Overstreet	Stephens, Nebr.
Gallagher	Kelley, Mich.	Padgett	Sterling, Ill.
Gallivan	Kelly, Pa.	Paige	Sterling, Pa.
Gandy	Kennedy, Iowa	Park	Stevenson
Gard	Kennedy, R. I.	Parker, N. J.	Stiness
Gardner	Kettner	Parker, N. Y.	Strong
Garland	Key, Ohio	Peters	Sullivan
Garner	Kiess, Pa.	Phelan	Sumners
Garrett, Tenn.	Kincheloe	Platt	Sweet
Garrett, Tex.	Kraus	Polk	Swift
Gillett	Kreider	Porter	Switzer
Glass	La Guardia	Pou	Tague
Glynn	Langley	Pratt	Talbott
Godwin, N. C.	Larsen	Price	Taylor, Ark.
Good	Lazaro	Purnell	Taylor, Colo.
Goodall	Lea, Cal.	Quin	Temple
Goodwin, Ark.	Lehlbach	Ragsdale	Templeton
Gordon	Lenroot	Rainey	Thomas
Gould	Lesher	Raker	Thompson
Graham, Ill.	Lever	Ramsey	Tillman
Graham, Pa.	Linthicum	Ramseyer	Tilson
Gray, Ala.	Littlepage	Rayburn	Timberlake
Gray, N. J.	Lobeck	Reed	Tinkham
Green, Iowa	Lonergan	Riordan	Towner
Greene, Mass.	Longworth	Robbins	Treadway
Greene, Vt.	Lunn	Robinson	Vare
Gregg	McAndrews	Rogers	Venable
Griest	McArthur	Romjue	Vestal
Griffin	McClintic	Rose	Vinson
Hadley	McCormick	Rouse	Volstead
Hamill	McCulloch	Rowe	Waldow
Hamilton, Mich.	McFadden	Rowland	Walker
Hamilton, N. Y.	McKenzie	Rubey	Walsh
Hamlin	McKeown	Rucker	Walton
Hardy	McKinley	Russell	Ward
Harrison, Miss.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sabath	Wason
Harrison, Va.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sanders, Ind.	Watkins
Haskell	Madden	Sanders, La.	Watson, Pa.
Hastings	Magee	Sanders, N. Y.	Watson, Va.
Hawley	Maher	Sanford	Weaver
Hayden	Mann	Saunders, Va.	Welling
Heaton	Mansfield	Schall	Welty
Heflin	Mapes	Scott, Iowa	Whaley
Heintz	Martin, Ill.	Scott, Mich.	White, Me.
Helm	Martin, La.	Scott, Pa.	White, Ohio
Helvering	Mays	Scully	Williams
Hersey	Miller, Minn.	Sears	Wilson, Ill.
Hicks	Miller, Wash.	Sells	Wilson, La.
Holland	Mondell	Shallenberger	Wilson, Tex.
Hollingsworth	Montague	Sherley	Wingo
Hood	Moon	Shouse	Winslow
Houston	Moore, Pa.	Siegel	Wise
Howard	Moores, Ind.	Sims	Wood, Ind.
Huddleston	Morgan	Sinnott	Woodyard
Hulbert	Morin	Sisson	Young, N. Dak.
Hull, Tenn.	Mott	Slayden	Young, Tex.
Humphreys	Mudd	Slemp	Zihlman
Husted	Neely	Small	
Hutchinson	Nicholls, S. C.	Smith, Idaho	
Ireland	Nichols, Mich.	Smith, Mich.	

NAYS—50.

Almon	Dillon	King	Reavis
Bacon	Dominick	Kinkaid	Roberts
Britten	Esch	Kitchin	Rodenberg
Browne	Frear	Knutson	Shackleford
Burnett	Fuller, Ill.	La Follette	Sherwood
Cary	Haugen	Little	Sloan
Church	Hayes	London	Stafford
Connelly, Kans.	Hensley	Lundeen	Van Dyke
Cooper, Wis.	Hilliard	McLemore	Voigt
Davidson	Hull, Iowa	Mason	Wheeler
Davis	Igoe	Nelson	Woods, Iowa
Decker	Johnson, S. Dak.	Randall	
Dill	Keating	Rankin	

NOT VOTING—9.

Bleakley	Helgesen	Lee, Ga.	Powers
Capstick	Hill	Meeker	Webb
Fields			

So the Senate joint resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. HILL with Mr. WEBB.

Mr. FIELDS with Mr. MEEKER.

Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement. My colleague, Mr. LEE, as the membership of the House knows, is sick, just recovering from pneumonia. I have talked to him over the phone to-night. He was anxious to be present, but could not be. If he could have been present, he would have voted "yea."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent, I desire to make a statement also. The gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. HILL, as we all know, is ill, though he is here part of the time. He came here to-night thinking that he would be able to vote, but on account of his health I sent him home. If he had been here, he would have voted for the resolution.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. FLOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 1) declaring that a state of war exists between the Imperial German Government and the Government and the people of the United States and making provision to prosecute the same.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. FIELDS, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely on account of the sickness of his wife.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS—LYMAN F. GRAY.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted, at the request of Mr. PETERS, to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Lyman F. Gray (H. R. 20526), Sixty-fourth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 14 minutes a. m., Friday, April 6, 1917) the House adjourned until Monday, April 9, 1917, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the president of the United States Civil Service Commission submitting an urgent estimate of appropriation for necessary additional employees, printing, stationery, travel, contingent, and other necessary expenses for the United States Civil Service Commission (H. Doc. No. 2); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the superintendent of the State, War, and Navy Department Building submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required for additional watchmen for the State, War, and Navy Department Building from April 1, 1917, to June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 3); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, not heretofore submitted, for additional force for the Patent Office, fiscal year 1918 (H. Doc. No. 4); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of Commerce submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations required by the Department of Commerce, the same to be made immediately available and to remain available until expended (H. Doc. No. 5); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Attorney General submitting supplemental and deficiency estimates required by the Department of Justice for the service of the fiscal years 1917 and 1918 (H. Doc. No. 6); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation required to provide for an increase in the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps to 150,000 men and 30,000 men, respectively (H. Doc. No. 7); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation immediately required to defray extraordinary expenses of the Naval Establishment and the Navy Department (H. Doc. No. 8); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of War submitting a special estimate of appropriation for national defense, War Department, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended (H. Doc. No. 9); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation to enable the Coast Guard to bring its present teleghone system of coastal communication to a high state of efficiency, to extend such system to include all Coast Guard stations not now connected, and to include the most important light stations which have at present no means for rapid communication (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the national security and defense, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, to be expended at the discretion of the President, and to be made immediately available and to remain available until December 31, 1917, $100,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 1998) for the purpose of limiting the activities of certain officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FIELDS: A bill (H. R. 1999) to create a commission on illiteracy, to be known as the American Illiteracy Commission; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2000) providing for the purchase of certain inventions and designs of aircraft parts of Edwin Fairfax Naulty; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 2001) to increase the quartermaster's depot at Jeffersonville, Ind., making appropriation for the erection thereon of a building; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 2002) providing for a memorial to Clara Barton in the building occupied by the American National Red Cross; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 2003) for the improvement of the East River, N. Y., including Hell Gate, Diamond Reef, and Buttermilk Channels, that will best provide adequate facilities for operations of the fleet for defense of New York Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 2004) to enlarge, extend, and make additions to, fireproof, and further improve the postoffice building at Shenandoah, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEVENSON: A bill (H. R. 2005) to create two divisions in the western judicial district of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 2006) for the relief of settlers within the limits of the grant to the New Orleans, Baton Rouge & Vicksburg Railroad Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. WALTON: A bill (H. R. 2007) to provide for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a public building thereon at Silver City, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 2008) to provide for the extension of minority enlistments in the naval service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 2009) for continuing work on the Indian highway extending from the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo., to Gallup, N. Mex., on the Navajo Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 2010) granting public lands to certain soldiers and sailors and their widows and minor children; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 2295) to pay letter carriers the amounts deducted from their salaries through an order of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWE: A bill (H. R. 2296) to authorize the appointment in the Army, and the immediate retirement, with the rank of captain, of Robert Armour, who was a captain in the Civil War, an employee of the War Department for 50 years, and 75 years of age; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 2297) providing for pensions for all American citizens who have reached the age of 65 years, and who are incapable of manual labor, and whose incomes are less than $200 per annum; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 2298) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2299) extending benefits of care and treatment by the Public Health Service to seamen on vessels used in the service of the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 2300) providing a building for post-office and other purposes at San Bernardino, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2301) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Redlands, San Bernardino County, Cal.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 2302) for the erection of a public building at Dodge City, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 2308) to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquor within 20 miles of any camp, barracks, fort, post, navy yard, school, or station of the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 2309) to regulate promotion in the Regular Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 6) authorizing the printing of certain military regulations; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALMON: A bill (H. R. 2011) granting a pension to Mary Elizabeth Presnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2012) for the relief of Mrs. W. E. Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2013) to reimburse J. B. Patterson, postmaster of Lacon, Morgan County, Ala., for certain postage stamps stolen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 2014) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Butts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2015) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 2016) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Thurston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2017) to remove the charge of desertion from John Lyons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2018) granting an increase of pension to Pary McNair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2019) granting a pension to Isaac D. Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2020) granting a pension to M. M. Sayers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2021) granting a pension to William C. Shaffer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2022) granting a pension to A. J. Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 2023) to reinstate Elwin Carlton Taylor as a passed assistant surgeon in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 2024) for the relief of the estate of Antonio Sousa, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2025) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Alice E. Davis, heir at law of John C. Davis, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2026) to appoint Allen M. Sumner a captain on the active list of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2027) to execute the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the heirs of William Pollock, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 2028) granting a pension to George F. Kratz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2029) granting a pension to William J. Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2030) granting a pension to John C. Finck; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2031) granting a pension to Henry P. McElroy, alias Patrick McElroy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2032) granting a pension to Edward G. Dalton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2033) granting a pension to William McClaskey; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2034) granting a pension to Joseph W. Connolly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2035) granting a pension to Ida L. Carter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2036) granting a pension to Robert B. Bowie; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2037) granting a pension to Margaret J. Gissel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2038) granting a pension to Isabella C. Waddell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2039) granting a pension to William L. Buck; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2040) granting an increase of pension to Henry Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2041) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Rarick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2042) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Nossek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2043) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Shipley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2044) granting an increase of pension to Francis C. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2045) granting an increase of pension to Albert M. Butts, alias Albert J. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2046) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Erdman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2047) granting an increase of pension to Louis Irons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2048) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2049) granting a pension to Marmaduke R. Goodman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2050) granting a pension to Mary J. Wilbur; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2051) granting a pension to Eva E. Schildgen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2052) granting a pension to Sophia Everett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 2053) granting an increase of pension to William L. Tate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: A bill (H. R. 2054) for the relief of James Duffy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRENCH: A bill (H. R. 2055) granting an increase of pension to Greenbury Vickery; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2056) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin N. Trout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 2057) granting a pension to Thomas E. Eagan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2058) granting a pension to Nancy C. Mays; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2059) granting a pension to Elizabeth Dickens; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2060) granting a pension to Lewis J. Moore; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2061) granting a pension to Amanda L. Dodson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2062) granting a pension to Martha Hoover; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2063) granting a pension to Christiana Oetting; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2064) granting a pension to Conrad F. Korthanke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2065) granting a pension to Frank C. Barron; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2066) granting a pension to Stella Griffitts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2067) granting a pension to Martha E. A. Ackerman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2068) granting a pension to Joseph T. Kerby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2069) granting a pension to James T. Calvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2070) granting a pension to John W. Lightfoot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2071) granting a pension to S. C. Gold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2072) granting a pension to Mary A. Manuel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2073) granting a pension to Hannah Seward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2074) granting a pension to Ellen S. Bradley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2075) granting an increase of pension to Columbus L. Reese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2076) granting an increase of pension to John G. Monroe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2077) granting a pension to Thomas Stephenson; to the Committe on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2078) granting a pension to Lydia Elliott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2079) granting a pension to M. F. Allyn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2080) granting a pension to Maria C. Vance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2081) granting a pension to James L. Coffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2082) granting a pension to James G. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2083) granting a pension to John R. Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2084) granting a pension to John Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2085) granting a pension to Samuel Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2086) granting a pension to A. A. McAlister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2087) granting a pension to James G. Munday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2088) granting a pension to John Gerdts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2089) granting a pension to John I. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2090) granting a pension to Mary U. Isenberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2091) granting a pension to James McCabe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2092) granting a pension to Carrie Hollenbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2093) granting a pension to Thomas B. Maberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2094) granting a pension to John M. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2095) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Haesemeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2096) granting a pension to Lida Beal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2097) granting a pension to Thomas F. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2098) granting a pension to William England; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2099) granting a pension to J. B. Ashbrooke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2100) granting a pension to Maria Lohmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2101) granting a pension to Tim Clifford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2102) granting a pension to James J. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2103) granting a pension to Austin Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2104) granting a pension to August Brockman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2105) granting a pension to John B. Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2106) granting a pension to James W. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2107) granting a pension to J. J. Gilliland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2108) granting a pension to Sarah F. Preston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2109) granting a pension to Alonzo C. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2110) granting a pension to Joseph Caton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2111) granting a pension to Claus Henning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2112) granting a pension to Easter Henson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2113) granting a pension to Samuel Moser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2114) granting a pension to George W. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2115) granting a pension to Henry B. Meyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2116) granting a pension to Minnie D. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2117) granting a pension to Mrs. M. C. Bixby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2118) granting a pension to Samuel M. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2119) granting a pension to Joseph L. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2120) granting a pension to Henry Otting; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2121) granting a pension to Louis Legune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2122) granting a pension to Ozias Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2123) granting a pension to W. K. Whittaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2124) granting a pension to James Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2125) granting a pension to Matilda J. Sweaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2126) granting a pension to B. F. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2127) granting a pension to Mary E. Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2128) granting a pension to Louise Bredehoft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2129) granting a pension to James W. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2130) granting a pension to Thomas Payne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2131) granting a pension to Hannah P. Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2132) granting a pension to Louisa K. Holbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2133) granting a pension to Solomon Coan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2134) granting a pension to William W. Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2135) granting a pension to Emma J. Fitzwater; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2136) granting a pension to Tazwell T. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2137) granting a pension to Peter Z. T. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2138) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2139) granting a pension to James M. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2140) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2141) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2142) granting and increase of pension to John W. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2143) granting an increase of pension to David W. Bachelder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2144) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Routh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2145) granting an increase of pension to Cassius M. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2146) granting an increase of pension to Alphonso G. Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2147) granting an increase of pension to Robert N. Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2148) granting an increase of pension to Ananias B. Reeser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2149) granting an increase of pension to Luther Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2150) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2151) granting an increase of pension to William W. Hendricks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2152) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Mawhinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2153) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Harlan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2154) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Wriston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2155) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Wilkerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2156) granting an increase of pension to James C. Haden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2157) granting an increase of pension to Oscar M. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2158) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2159) granting an increase of pension to Logan Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2160) granting an increase of pension to W. R. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2161) granting an increase of pension to Nancy C. McCurdy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2162) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Sheridan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2163) granting an increase of pension to James D. Ramey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2164) granting an increase of pension to John F. Mahnken; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2165) granting an increase of pension to R. H. Askew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2166) granting an increase of pension to John T. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2167) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Hoag; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2168) granting an increase of pension to Charles Van Buren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2169) granting an increase of pension to Louis F. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2170) granting an increase of pension to William B. Gist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2171) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bedwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2172) granting an increase of pension to George Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2173) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2174) granting an increase of pension to John Echoff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2175) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Saylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2176) to correct the military record of Andrew Ballon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2177) for the relief of T. M. Marsh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2178) for the relief of John Beverly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2179) for the relief of R. D. Shackleford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2180) for the relief of Joseph W. Hawkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2181) for the relief of John Thomas; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2182) for the relief of Dennis Sullivan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2183) for the relief of the estate of William Morrison; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2184) for the relief of Harriett A. Randle, John W. Randle, and James C. Randle, heirs at law of Spencer C. Randle, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2185) for the relief of J. H. Alexander; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2186) for the relief of A. P. Holcomb and the heirs of Samuel Thompson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2187) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Thomas A. Wakefield; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2188) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the city of Glasgow, Mo.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 2189) granting a pension to James H. Daniel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2190) granting a pension to Lewis J. Crider; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2191) granting a pension to Samuel E. Spencer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2192) granting a pension to Christopher C. Hamilton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2193) granting a pension to Charles W. Gunter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2194) granting a pension to W. W. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2195) granting an increase of pension to David R. Trotten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2196) granting an increase of pension to James H. Mayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2197) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kinzley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2198) granting an increase of pension to Willis G. Craddock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2199) for the relief of Pleasant M. Heath; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2200) for the relief of John T. Warden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2201) for the relief of Franklin Nix; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2202) for the relief of Charles T. Jackson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 2203) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Jurin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2204) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Bates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 2205) to transfer Frederick W. Cobb from the retired list of chief machinists, United States Navy, to the list of chief pay clerks, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 2206) authorizing the payment of salary due J. A. McCreary, of Forestville, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2207) for the relief of Arthur Wendle Englert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 2208) granting a pension to Pickens C. Cullum; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2209) granting a pension to Joseph M. Caughman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2210) granting a pension to Andrew E. Younginer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2211) granting a pension to Jesse H. Hutto; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2212) granting a pension to John B. McCravy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2213) granting a pension to Annie I. Rembert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2214) granting a pension to Lucy T. Read; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2215) granting a pension to Mary Kinder; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McANDREWS: A bill (H. R. 2216) granting a pension to P. H. Dennison; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 2217) granting an increase of pension to Adaline L. Black; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 2218) granting a pension to Mollie W. Springer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2219) granting a pension to Katharine Schellschmidt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2220) granting an increase of pension to William D. Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2221) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Wilkinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Buchanan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2223) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Vest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2224) granting an increase of pension to Mary Pickens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2225) granting an increase of pension to Upton J. Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2226) granting an increase of pension to Daniel H. Wise; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2227) granting an increase of pension to George A. Rubush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2228) for the relief of Americus A. Gordon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OLDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 2229) granting an increase of pension to Margaret McHenley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2230) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Frizzell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2231) granting an increase of pension to A. N. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2232) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Crews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2233) granting an increase of pension to Minerva J. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2234) granting an increase of pension to Henry E. Garber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2235) granting an increase of pension to Alfred M. Wheeler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2236) granting a pension to Bertha Oglesby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2237) granting a pension to George H. McCauley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2238) granting a pension to John P. Kirby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2239) granting a pension to George W. Douthitt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2240) granting a pension to Tilman L. Crafton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2241) granting a pension to C. B. Chamness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2242) granting a pension to George Bostater, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2243) granting a pension to Charles C. Abernathy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2244) granting a pension to Thomas E. Tanner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2245) granting a pension to James W. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2246) granting a pension to Leslie G. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2247) to correct the military record of Joseph R. (Riley) McVey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 2248) for the relief of the legal representative of Nathaniel F. Chears, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RUCKER: A bill (H. R. 2249) granting an increase of pension to Henry Eby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 2250) granting an increase of pension to Nicholi L. Nelson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2251) granting an increase of pension to Valentine B. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2252) granting an increase on pension to William Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2253) granting an increase of pension to William W. Barney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2254) granting an increase of pension to Hiram M. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2255) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Carrigg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2256) granting an increase of pension to Rufus G. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2257) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Chamness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2258) granting an increase of pension to John W. Craig; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2259) granting an increase of pension to Levi G. Hake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2260) granting an increase of pension to Anderson Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2261) granting an increase of pension to John M. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2262) granting an increase of pension to Abijah E. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2263) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson W. Lewelling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2264) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. McClintick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2265) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus C. Marston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2266) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2267) granting an increase of pension to George F. Minturn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2268) granting an increase of pension to John M. Prouty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2269) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Plotner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2270) granting an increase of pension to Enos Pearce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2271) granting an increase of pension to Wiltsey E. Sivers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2272) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah R. Sencenich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2273) granting an increase of pension to Edwin A. Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2274) granting an increase of pension to John P. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2275) granting an honorable discharge to Edwin Wallace Coberly; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 2276) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Freed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2277) granting a pension to George Zederbaum; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 2278) granting an increase of pension to John Pool; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2279) granting a pension to Margaret Seery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 2280) granting a pension to James A. Annas; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2281) granting a pension to Carl B. Traver; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2282) granting a pension to Inger Nass; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2283) granting a pension to Nellie L. Benton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2284) granting a pension to Abner L. Tuttle; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2285) granting an increase of pension to Emily M. Furber; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2286) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Cuddigan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2287) granting an increase of pension to Eli House; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2288) granting an increase of pension to James H. Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2289) granting an increase of pension to John Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2290) granting an increase of pension to Girard C. Geisse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2291) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2292) for the relief of Michael Carter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2293) for the relief of John M. Green; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 2294) to correct the military record of Alfred J. Henry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 2303) for the relief of the legal representatives of James H. Holladay, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 2504) granting an honorable discharge to Andrew Jackson Hendrickson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2305) granting an honorable discharge to James Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2306) for the relief of Frank Andress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2307) for the relief of P. C. Trump; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of D. Weber, of Washington, Mo., against United States in war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Eastern Division Conference Delta Tau Delta, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of pupils of schools of Olean, N. Y., pledging their loyalty to the President and Congressmen in the great crisis which confronts the Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of business men of New York City, representing many churches, pledging their honor to the cause of the Republic, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), petitions of sundry American citizens in Washington, D. C.; citizens of Morgantown, W. Va.; Wise & Lichtenstein, of New York; students and faculty of West Virginia University; mass meeting in Madison Square Garden, N. Y.; Harvard Club, of Boston; Union Club, of Boston; board of trustees of George Washington University, Washington, D. C.; Princeton Alumni Association, of Montclair and vicinity, N. J.; District of Columbia Christian Endeavor Union; mass meeting of citizens of Denver, Colo.; Rotary Clubs of Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, pledging support to the President of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Hamilton Club, of Chicago, Ill., and governors of States of New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland, favoring preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Highland Park Methodist Episcopal Church Brotherhood, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also (by request), petitions of Federation of Missouri Commercial Clubs, of St. Louis, Mo., and the Philadelphia Maritime Exchange, favoring passage of a rivers and harbors bill similar to one that failed last session; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorial of Richland County (Ohio) Bar Association, indorsing the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany and the declaration of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BACON: Memorial of mass meeting of citizens of Ann Arbor, Mich., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial of Eastern Division Conference of Delta Tau, pledging support to the President and country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of board of trustees of the College of the City of New York, pledging support to the President of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial adopted by St. Botolph Club, Boston, Mass., pledging support to the Government of the United States in all measures it may take for the protection of our citizens, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Eastern Division Conference Delta Tau Delta, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of mass meeting at Madison Square, New York, in re foreign situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FARR: Memorial of members of the Harvard Club, of New York City, approving of the action of the President in severing diplomatic relations with Germany, etc., and urging adequate preparations for the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of W. S. Stevens, secretary, and W. I. Tauer, president, and other members of the Yale Alumni Association, of Scranton, Pa., favoring the utmost preparation for our Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: Petition of citizens of Centralia, Keensbury, Breese, Hoffman, and Germantown, all in the State of Illinois, and 16 members of Southern Illinois Mill Producers' Association, against war with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of New Hampshire Committee of Public Safety, pledging loyalty and support in present crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Somerset Club, of Boston, pledging loyal support to the President of the United States in all measures which he shall take in the defense of our country's honor and protection of rights of citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition from St. John's Lutheran Church and Zion's Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Reno, Pa., opposing war with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Urbana, Ill., favoring war against Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of Philadelphia Maritime Exchange and Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring passage of a rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Petition of more than 5,000 citizens of Indianapolis, for passage of resolution declaring a state of war with the German Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of 62 citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the council of the borough of Duquesne, Pa., supporting the President of the United States in all matters pertaining to the welfare of our country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of John Kiesel, of Pittsburgh, Pa., supporting the President, although favoring peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 200 members of the Gateway Club, of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging in the name of suffering humanity that we be kept out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 800 members of the Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Pittsburgh, Pa., Rev. William Lochner, pastor, protesting against plunging this country into war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 600 members of the Second St. Paul's Lutheran Church, insisting that some way can be found out of the present crisis without loss of honor, and urging that the

country be kept out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of Andrew J. Hanmer, E. B. Crosby, R. C. Dewey, A. P. Bero, C. T. Young, F. E. Bailey, Isaac Friedman, Joseph Stone, G. W. Ball, Allan P. Sill, W. A. Taylor, J. J. Taylor, F. E. Horton, J. H. Holliday, M. J. Stearns, E. C. Hubbard, J. C. Crapser, R. A. Newton, P. F. Churchill, B. S. O'Neill, J. F. McCarthy, F. B. Hawley, E. W. Kinney, J. F. Lantry, Thomas E. Shean, H. A. Little, C. F. Fuller, B. Carroll, George H. Russell, A. J. Westcott, D. Carbun, James H. Warren, F. L. Babcock, C. H. Everett, Franklin Delain, J. L. Dishaw, W. G. Smith, A. B. Cook, Charles A. Ross, E. F. McDonald, and W. L. Smith, citizens of Massena, N. Y., for national enfranchisement of women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Memorial of Little Falls (N. Y.) Lodge, No. 42, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, affirming its loyalty and support in the present international situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of patriotic rallies of the villages of Waterville and Mohawk and the Retail Grocers' Association of Utica, N. Y., pledging support and loyalty to the country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of board of assistants of the Society of *Mayflower* Descendants, relative to the invasion of Belgium, indorsing the severance of diplomatic relations with Germany, in favor of preparedness, and urging a compulsory military training law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of City Council of Providence, R. I., urging passage of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorials of Somerset Club, of Boston; Union Club, of Boston; Tavern Club, of Boston; and German Civic Association of Roxbury, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALDOW: Petition of sundry citizens and organizations of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring passage of war resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens and organizations of Buffalo, N. Y., opposing war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WASON: Memorial of the Committee of Public Safety of the State of New Hampshire, urging the National Government to recognize that a state of war exists and to take immediate action in maintaining our honor and safeguarding our interests, and pledging to the Government full loyalty and support; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Harvard Club, of Keene, N. H., favoring the immediate passage of a bill for universal military training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Concord (N. H.) Branch of the National Security League, resenting the un-American propaganda circulation by the Emergency Peace Federation and pledging its support to defend the national honor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Preparedness Day Committee of the City of Portsmouth, N. H., favoring action to uphold and support the dignity of our country and flag, and assuring hearty support in the effort to uphold the honor of our country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the executive committee of the New Hampshire State Grange, taking a strong stand for preparedness and tendering its good offices to the State and Nation for any service which it can render in the present situation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the faculty of Dartmouth College, of New Hampshire, recording their emphatic conviction that a state of war exists by repeated acts of Germany, and that a declaration to this effect be made at once, to be followed by immediate and whole-hearted support of the allied cause on both land and sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire, favoring universal military and naval training and service under the direction of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of Richard H. Lansdale, of Sandy Springs, Md., and 61 other citizens, opposed to a declaration of war with Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Emmanuel Lutheran Church, Bittinger, Md., by the pastor, to prevent this country being plunged into European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of bishop and 10 ministers and deacons of the Washington-Franklin County (Md.) Mennonite Conference, protesting against war and universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Maryland Branch of the Woman's Peace Party, protesting that a state of war exists between the United States and Germany, and urging the appointment of a joint high commission to attempt settlement of issues involved; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, declaration signed by 252 members of the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce, pledging their earnest support in protecting the rights of Americans and upholding the honor of this country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of 50 citizens of Rock Ridge, Frederick County, Md., urging Congress to keep the United States out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of Allegany Trades Council, Cumberland, Md., offering their services to the country in every field of activity to defend and safeguard the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution by the Society of Colonial Wars of the State of Maryland, urging Congress to immediately enact a universal military training service law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Hess Carriage Co. and its 35 employees, urging Congress "to use every honorable means possible to preserve peace and save the country from war"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *April 6, 1917.*

Rev. J. L. Kibler, of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, our heavenly Father, unworthy though we be, we still lift our eyes unto the hills from whence cometh our help. In this time of appalling war, and our entrance into the awful struggle, we realize our need of Thee, O God, more than ever before. Our country needs Thee; our President, our Congress, our governors, our soldiers, and all our people scattered over our vast territory need Thy overruling providence, Thy wisdom, and grace, and power.

Thou hast sustained us in the past and blessed us with great progress because we trusted in Thee and built our foundation upon Thy principles. Surely Thou hast not dealt thus with any nation. We have stood before the world as a God-fearing people, and, therefore, we have been a God-honored people.

O God, may we not forget Thy mercies, which have been ever of old. May we remember that Thou hast pronounced Thy blessing upon that nation whose God is the Lord. Wherever our people and our soldiers may go may the world still read our shining motto upon our coin, "In God we trust."

May we not lose sight of our dependence upon Thee, O God. If we must go forth to war, oh grant that we may receive our orders from the skies and look confidently to Thee as our great leader. As Thou didst divide the sea and saved Thy people Israel from their enemies, so do Thou remove our difficulties and deliver us from all our foes. O Thou great Jehovah, be with us still and guide us safely through every peril, and if it be Thy way to bring peace and liberty to the world, we pray Thee give speedy triumph to our arms. We ask it in the name of Him who is strong to save and mighty to deliver, Jesus Christ the Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday last was read and approved.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Public Utilities Commission, which will be inserted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The communication is as follows:

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, April 5, 1917.

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: In accordance with paragraph 14 of section 8 of "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913, which reads as follows: "That the accounts shall be closed annually on the 31st day of December, and a balance sheet of that date promptly taken therefrom. On or about the 1st day of February following such balance sheet, together with such other information as the commission shall prescribe, verified by an owner or officer of the public utility, shall be filed with the commission and a copy thereof transmitted to Congress." I have the honor to inform you that the balance sheet for the year ended December 31, 1916, and other information required by the Public Utilities Commission of the various utilities under its jurisdiction, which have been received since March 3, 1917, have been submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Very respectfully, C. W. KUTZ, *Chairman.*