

Mr. STONE. What is the matter with men from 45 to 70 that they can not get in?

Mr. FLETCHER. The general experience is, I think, that men from 45 to 70 would not compose very efficient men for soldiers in the trenches. There may be other opportunities for gentlemen of that age in other work and in other service, and undoubtedly there will be opportunities offered them. But the point I am coming to is what Mr. Bennett, the director of this national service board in Canada, says:

The board has power to prevent men from enlisting who are needed in occupations where they have skill—for example, send them back to the farm. England had to return four divisions of shipbuilders and coal miners who enlisted in the first wasteful period of recruiting. A nation should not let the wild cry for soldiers from a thousand sources stampede irreplaceable men needed at home to make those soldiers effective. It takes six months to make a soldier; it takes six years to make a tool setter, two years to make a coal cutter, long apprenticeship and training to make an engineer or machinist. Nothing is more ruinous than the cry for wholesale indiscriminate volunteering.

That is a statement of this gentleman after the experience they had in Canada.

#### WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By direction of the Vice President the Chair announces the following Senators to serve upon the committee to investigate the street railway strike: The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, April 23, 1917, at 12 o'clock meridian.

### SENATE.

MONDAY, April 23, 1917.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of all mercies, Thy servants this day are called upon to face the solemn responsibility of making preparation for the defense of our national honor and peace. We pray that Thou wilt lend them Thy blessing and Thy guidance. We thank Thee for the unity of spirit which pervades our national life. The ideals committed to us by the toil and sacrifice of our fathers, which are so infinitely dear to us to-day, will be defended with our fortune and life. Only let us see clearly that Thou art guiding us in the way. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Vice President being absent, the President pro tempore [WILLARD SAULSBURY, a Senator from the State of Delaware] assumed the chair.

JOHN H. BANKHEAD, a Senator from the State of Alabama, and HENRY F. HOLLIS, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, appeared in their seats to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. SMOOR and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### CROW INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT. (S. DOC. NO. 12).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 12th instant, certain information relative to what land within the Crow Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, is susceptible of cultivation to cereal crops without irrigation, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2762) to authorize the issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1771. An act to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," relative to the Fleet Naval Reserve;

H. R. 2008. An act to provide for the extension of minority enlistments in the naval service;

H. R. 2338. An act to authorize the detail of additional officers to the Hydrographic Office;

H. R. 2339. An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy until September 1, 1918; and

H. R. 2340. An act to increase the age limit for persons appointed as officers in the Naval Reserve.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

\* The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 2. (By Mr. Coombs.)

To the President, to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, and to the Secretary of the Interior:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, duly assembled in its third session, respectfully and earnestly represent that—

Whereas in the Government service in the Territory of Alaska, and particularly in the service of the Alaska Engineering Commission, there are employed in clerical positions numerous aliens and persons who are not naturalized citizens of the United States: Now, therefore,

We, your memorialists, respectfully ask that legislation be enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and regulations be adopted by the various departments of the Government, prescribing as a necessary qualification for the holding of clerical positions in the Government service in the Territory of Alaska that the employees be citizens of the United States: Be it

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the President, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Delegate from Alaska, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Alaska Engineering Commission.

And your memorialists will ever pray.  
Passed by the house March 29, 1917.

LUTHER C. HESS,  
Speaker of the House.

A. H. ZIEGLER,  
Chief Clerk of the House.

Attest:

Passed the senate April 5, 1917.

FRANK A. ALDRICH,  
President pro tempore of the Senate.

Attest:

W. M. EDDY,  
Secretary of the Senate.

#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Territory of Alaska, ss:

I, Charles E. Davidson, secretary of Alaska, do hereby certify that the above is a full, true, and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 2, of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, passed at the third session thereof.

Witness my hand and the seal of the Territory of Alaska, affixed at Juneau, the capital, this 12th day of April, A. D. 1917.

[SEAL.]

CHARLES E. DAVIDSON,  
Secretary of Alaska.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Territories and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint memorial 4. (By Mr. Snow (by request).)

To the President of the United States, the United States Senate, and the United States House of Representatives:

Your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska, most respectfully represent that—

Whereas the Government of the United States is now engaged in the construction of a railroad from Seward to Fairbanks, Alaska, for the purpose of developing the resources of the territory tributary to said railroad;

Whereas several towns have been and will hereafter be established along the line of said railroad;

Whereas the act of March 12, 1914, authorizing the construction of said railroad empowers the President to withdraw and dispose of lands belonging to the United States for town-site purposes, and the said act further provides that all funds received from the sale or other disposition of town-site lands be paid into the Treasury of the United States as other miscellaneous receipts are paid;

Whereas most, if not all, of these new towns are established and located upon undeveloped land, which requires large expenditures of money to make it suitable for habitation; water supply must be furnished, streets and sidewalks constructed, as well as school-houses, municipal buildings, and other public improvements of that nature;

Whereas Congress has on many occasions, by law applicable to the disposition of town sites in other portions of the United States, provided that a certain portion of the funds received from the sale of town sites shall be devoted to making improvements within such towns: Now, therefore,

We respectfully urge that suitable legislation be passed requiring that at least 50 per cent of the funds received from the sale of town sites sold under the provisions of the said railroad act be devoted to making improvements within the respective towns; be it further

Resolved, That a copy hereof be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the chairmen of the Committees on Territories and Public Lands of the United States Senate, and the

chairmen of the Committees on the Territories and the Public Lands of the United States House of Representatives, the Hon. Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior, and the Delegate to Congress from Alaska. Passed the house March 31, 1917.

Attest:

LUTHER C. HESS,  
Speaker of the House.

Passed the Senate April 5, 1917.

A. H. ZIEGLER,  
Chief Clerk of the House.

Attest:

FRANK A. ALDRICH,  
President pro tempore of the Senate.

W. M. EDDY,  
Secretary of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Territory of Alaska, ss:

I, Charles E. Davidson, secretary of Alaska, do hereby certify that the above is a full, true, and correct copy of house joint memorial No. 4 of the Alaska Territorial Legislature, passed at the third session thereof. Witness my hand and the seal of the Territory of Alaska affixed at Juneau, the capital, this 12th day of April, A. D. 1917.

CHARLES E. DAVIDSON,  
Secretary of Alaska.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I present resolutions adopted by Sioux Falls Lodge, No. 262, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and a petition of the Commercial Club of Fort Pierre, S. Dak. I think both are very important, and I should like to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petitions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the United States of America is now engaged in war with a foreign power, the prosecution of which war demands the undivided and unqualified support of all American citizens: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That Sioux Falls Lodge No. 262 of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks hereby declares its unswerving support of whatever measures may be taken for the prosecution of said war and for the common defense by the President or by the Government of the United States of America or by the government of the State of South Dakota; be it further

*Resolved*, That this lodge will cooperate in every way with other organizations or with local or State or Federal officials for the promotion and carrying out of plans for the mobilization of the resources of the United States in men and material for the defense of the Nation and the successful prosecution of the said war; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the governor of the State of South Dakota be informed of this action by this lodge, and be given assurance of the loyal and energetic cooperation of this lodge, and of every member thereof, in any measures he may take for the discharge of the duties of the State of South Dakota to the Nation.

Introduced by the trustees at the regular meeting of the lodge April 13, 1917.

FORT PIERRE COMMERCIAL CLUB,  
Fort Pierre, S. Dak., April 18, 1917.

Hon. E. S. JOHNSON,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Inclosed you will find a copy of some resolutions adopted by the Fort Pierre Commercial Club, which I believe will be self-explanatory.

I trust and urge that you do everything in your power to have these resolutions or some of a like nature adopted.

Thanking you in advance, I beg to remain,  
Very respectfully,

GUY H. HARVEY, Secretary.

We, the undersigned, hereby petition the Congress of the United States, and each of the Senators and Congressmen of the State of South Dakota, that Congress take such action as may be necessary to prohibit as soon as possible the use of all grain and other produce suitable for food where the same is being used in the manufacture of beer and distilled liquors and spirits, and that the sale of all intoxicating liquors be prohibited throughout the United States and all its possessions during the continuance of the present war or while the United States is engaged in war.

We also urge that the dealing in futures and the buying and selling of margins and long and short options in the exchanges and boards of trade be prohibited, but that care be exercised not to interfere with the purchase and sale of commodities in the way of grain and provisions where delivery is made of the article bought or sold at the time of such transaction.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I present resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Newberry County, in my State, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWBERRY, S. C., April 20, 1917.

Hon. E. D. SMITH,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have the honor of sending you a copy of the resolutions enthusiastically and unanimously adopted at an immense mass meeting of the citizens of Newberry County, S. C., Tuesday, April 17, 1917.

Respectfully,

JNO. M. KINARD, Chairman,  
S. J. DERRICK,  
JNO. H. WICKER,  
MRS. W. H. HUNT,  
MRS. F. Z. WILSON.

Whereas by act of the Congress and President of the United States a state of war has been declared to exist between our country and the Imperial German Government; and

Whereas our Government, State and National, has called upon all citizens to assist in preparing our country to meet the manifold needs and to make the numberless sacrifices arising from our duty in this crisis and testing time of our national life; and

Whereas the people of Newberry County have always, in every time of stress and storm in our history, heroically and in unanimity rallied to the support of the Government to which they owed allegiance: Therefore be it

*Resolved*—

First. That the citizens of Newberry County in mass meeting here assembled do hereby express to the Congress and President of the United States our hearty approval of the stand they have taken to uphold the dignity, the honor, and the rights of our country, and the intelligent zeal they manifest in preparing our Government and people for the arduous tasks now before them.

Second. To our Government, State and National, we pledge our earnest and loyal support in all its efforts to strengthen to whatever extent needed the power of our Army and Navy, to increase our food supply, to curb the extravagance and careless wastefulness of our people, to throttle the greed of the avaricious eager to prey on their country's necessities, and to equip the units of mercy and charity which the patriotic and devoted women of our country are ready now to organize to the end that this horrible world war may be quickly ended and the issues involved righteously settled.

Third. To the accomplishment of these high purposes we announce to-day that Newberry County stands ready in the services of her sons on land or sea; on her farms and in her gardens; through her financial, industrial, and business enterprises; and by the ministrations of her women to do her full share whenever and wherever loyalty to country and duty to humanity points the way.

Fourth. That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States, Senators of this State, and the Representative of this district.

Mr. JAMES. I present resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the City of Bowling Green, Ky., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOWLING GREEN, KY., April 20, 1917.

"No militia (volunteers) will ever acquire the habits necessary to resist a regular force. The firmness requisite for the real business and fighting is only to be attained by a constant course of discipline and service. I have never been witness to a single instance that can justify a different opinion; it is most earnestly to be wished that the liberties of America may be no longer trusted in any material degree to so precarious a dependence." (George Washington.)

In view of the above and the fact that universal military training as set forth in the Chamberlain bill and in that drafted by the War Department involving the principle of universal liability to service, and which is being so powerfully advocated by the President: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Bowling Green, Ky., representing 386 members, mayor of city of Bowling Green, and the undersigned patriotic citizens of this city and the county of Warren, do hereby pledge to the President and to the Congress of the United States our supreme loyalty and consecration to the national cause; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we do hereby urge upon each of our Senators and Congressmen, and especially our own Representative, the Hon. ROBERT Y. THOMAS, Jr., the imperative necessity of supporting the President and by adopting an immediate system of selective universal military service along those lines for which they are best fitted; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be immediately dispatched to the President, to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House, to our two Senators, each of Congressmen, and especially to the Hon. ROBERT Y. THOMAS, Jr.

Passed this 20th day of April in assembled session.

Carl D. Herdman, President Chamber of Commerce; A. T. Patterson, Mayor City of Bowling Green; E. C. Smith, Clerk County of Warren; G. D. Milliken; P. J. Potter; T. F. Miller; Lon M. Jackson; Ervin Ray; F. F. Stovalle; S. D. Hines, Police Judge; R. W. Covington; Robert Rodes; John M. Galloway; Perrin S. Turpin; D. C. Garvin; J. E. Stewart; Frances Clarke; S. C. Lawson; J. S. Patterson.

Attest:

E. H. HYMAN,  
Secretary-Manager.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I have resolutions of a mass meeting called by the mayor and the president of the Kelso Commercial Club, held in the city of Kelso, Wash., in which they urge Congress to take immediate steps to regulate food prices through the proper Government bureau and establish maximum prices that are fair and equitable. I ask that the resolutions may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At a meeting called by the mayor and the president of the Kelso Commercial Club, held in the city of Kelso, Wash., on Monday, April 16, 1917, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas in the present war period the people of the United States are admonished by the President to forego unusual profits in the handling of all food supplies; and  
"Whereas many of the necessities of life, including all food staples, are reaching such high prices as to make it a burden for the great majority of people to subsist: Now, therefore,

"We, the citizens of Kelso, through the city officials and the Kelso Commercial Club, urge President Wilson and our duly elected representatives in Congress to take immediate steps through the proper Government bureau to regulate food prices and establish maximum prices that are fair and equitable."

J. BALLARD,  
Mayor of the City of Kelso.  
CLAUDE J. SHIPLEY,  
President of Kelso Commercial Club.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I present a joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, urging an appropriation for the construction and maintenance of a military road in that Territory, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House joint resolution 3. (By A. A. Allan.)

To the Congress of the United States of America:

The Legislature of the Territory of Alaska respectfully represents that—

Whereas the prime essential to the development of the vast resources of Alaska is transportation; and

Whereas railroad and steamship facilities are inadequate to such development unless supplemented by a system of wagon roads and trails, and Congress has recognized this fact by repeated appropriations for such purposes; and

Whereas the annual appropriation for the construction of roads and trails in Alaska was not made the last session of Congress and the failure of Congress to make appropriations at this special session will not only paralyze the efforts of the road commission for future developments, but by preventing necessary repairs and maintenance will result in the great deterioration of the roads already constructed, to the great loss of the Territory and the United States; and

Whereas the construction of an adequate road system in Alaska will not only open for development immense areas of mineral, coal, and lands suitable for farming and cattle grazing, but will afford an invaluable asset to the United States in case of war; and

Whereas the Legislature of Alaska has created Territorial road commissions to supplement the work of the United States Road Commission and will appropriate moneys to this end to the extent of its financial ability; and

Whereas the Territorial road construction to be of any considerable value must be tributary to and an extension of Government construction; and

Whereas the discontinuation of governmental policy of road construction in Alaska would result in a loss to the Territory and to the United States far greater than the sum asked by the Secretary of War for maintenance and construction, and would be, under the circumstances, utter folly: Now, therefore,

We, your memorialists, urgently call your attention to the situation as above presented and respectfully but earnestly represent that the sum of \$500,000, requested in Senate amendment, in lines 7 to 11, inclusive, on page 55 of House of Representatives bill No. 20783, for appropriation for the construction and maintenance of roads and trails in Alaska, should be allowed.

We, your memorialists, will ever pray.  
Passed the house March 30, 1917.

LUTHER C. HESS,  
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

A. H. ZIEGLER,  
Chief Clerk of the House.

Passed the senate April 2, 1917.

FRANK A. ALDRICH,  
President Pro Tempore of the Senate.

Attest:

W. M. EDDY,  
Secretary of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
TERRITORY OF ALASKA.

I, Charles E. Davidson, secretary of the Territory of Alaska, do hereby certify that the above and within is a full, true, and correct copy of the original house joint memorial No. 3 on file in my office and of which I am the proper custodian.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the Territory of Alaska at Juneau, Alaska, this 13th day of April, A. D. 1917.

CHARLES E. DAVIDSON,  
Secretary of Alaska.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire. It is a very brief one, and I ask to have it printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, 1917.

Resolved, That the Legislature of New Hampshire hereby expresses its hearty approval of the message of the President of the United States to Congress on April 2, and trusts that the high ideals therein expressed may soon be established for the welfare and peace of the entire world, and we urge upon Congress the speedy enactment of the military and naval measures submitted by the President, especially his appeal for the raising of an army upon the basis of universal liability to service, in order that there may be a vigorous prosecution of the war against the German Government.

Mr. GALLINGER presented petitions of Abigail Webster Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of Franklin, and of 250 citizens of New London, in the State of New Hampshire, praying for compulsory military service, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the New Hampshire annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Keene, N. H., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CURTIS. I present a petition signed by the president of the Western District Conference of the Mennonite Church of Newton, Kans., which I desire to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PETITION TO CONGRESS.

The Mennonites of this country are either immigrants or the descendants of immigrants from various countries in Europe which they left to avoid compulsory military service. Assurance was given them by high officials of the United States, including President Grant in 1873, that they need fear no compulsory conscription here.

In view of this our attitude regarding military service we petition the Congress of the United States to exempt us and other noncombatant Christians from all compulsory military training and service in the event of the enactment of such a law.

Our people are mostly engaged in agriculture and are in every way loyal citizens. They pray for this exemption because they try to follow the doctrine of our Lord Jesus Christ, stated in Matthew v, 44: "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you."

Our hope that this petition will be granted is based on the fact that in a democracy the conscience of the individual is duly considered, and the further fact that in Canada our brethren have been assured by the Government that the exemption for which we pray is granted them.

J. W. KIEWER,  
President of Western District Conference.

NEWTON, KANS., April 21, 1917.

Mr. CURTIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Leavenworth and Lawrence, in the State of Kansas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Osage County, Pratt County, Newton, and Parsons, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against compulsory military service, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Atchison, Kans., praying for compulsory military service, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, No. 1, Department of Kansas, praying for the protection of the Army from saloons and immoral characters locating near the camps, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MYERS. I present two brief telegrams in the nature of petitions to Congress, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD with their signatures.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONRAD, MONT., April 17, 1917.

Hon. HENRY L. MYERS,  
Washington, D. C.:

Be it resolved by the city council of the city of Conrad, That we hereby pledge our support to the President of the United States of America in the great crisis which now confronts our country, and we believe it to be the sentiment of the city and of the entire community that our Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States should stand squarely behind the President in each and every measure that he may suggest to the Congress for the prosecution of the war; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress and a copy hereof be spread on the minutes of the city council.

Passed by the city council this 16th day of April, 1917.

Approved by the mayor this 16th day of April, 1917.

J. E. RITCHEY, Mayor.

Attest:

K. L. JOHNSON, City Clerk.

BUTTE, MONT., April 19, 1917.

Senator HENRY L. MYERS,  
Washington, D. C.:

Without a dissenting vote it was resolved by the Rotary Club of Butte, that we request our Members of Congress and Senate to adhere to and support the President of the United States in all war measures. We particularly indorse universal military service with immediate conscription, if deemed necessary by the President and the War College.

BUTTE ROTARY CLUB,  
CHAS. AUSTIN, Secretary.

Mr. PHELAN. I present a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California, a communication from the governor, and another from the president and faculty of Leland Stanford Junior University, of Palo Alto, Cal., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions and communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[California Legislature, at Sacramento, 42d sess.]

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, April 2, 1917.

To the Honorable President of the United States, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, Senators and Members of Congress from California:

In compliance with the provisions of assembly joint resolution No. 14, adopted by the Legislature of the State of California at the forty-second session, I am sending you a true copy thereof, in title and words as follows:

CHAPTER 37.

Assembly joint resolution No. 14 (by Mr. William J. Martin, of forty-eighth district) relative to the establishment by the Government of the United States of a national park at Pinnacles National Monument.

Whereas there has been established by the Government of the United States a national monument known as the Pinnacles National Monument, which said monument is situated in San Benito County, State of California, in sections 33 and 34 of township 16 south and in lots 3 and 10 of township 17 south, both in range 7 east, Mount Diablo meridian, and which said monument was created January 16, 1908; and

Whereas there is contained within said monument beautiful scenery and rock formation of a peculiar and interesting sort, said rocks being the largest conglomerate boulders known; and

Whereas each year a very large number of persons visit said monument, said numbers greatly increasing each succeeding year, until said monument has become one of the most instructive and interesting nature exhibits in the State of California, so much so that the public interest requires that said monument be given the standing of a national park; and

Whereas a large amount of land surrounding said monument is now Government land and is of such a wild and rugged nature as to be unfit for agricultural purposes: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the assembly and senate, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California memorializes the Congress of the United States to enlarge said monument by adding thereto all the surrounding nonagricultural Government land, and as thus enlarged to change the same into a national park; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California be requested to use all honorable means to secure the action desired in this matter for the purpose aforesaid; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of California, including those to assume office on March 4, 1917.

C. C. YOUNG,  
Speaker of the Assembly.  
ARTHUR H. BREED,  
President Pro Tempore of the Senate.  
MARTIN C. MADSEN,  
Private Secretary to the Governor.  
FRANK C. JORDAN,  
Secretary of State.

And do hereby certify that the same was duly filed with the secretary of state on March 30, 1917.

B. O. BOOTHBY,  
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

SACRAMENTO, CAL., April 20, 1917.

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Our State council of defense advises me that there is a serious shortage of tin plate, which is restricting the supply of cans for household and for the commercial canning of foods. These facts are apparently known to the Departments of Agriculture and of Commerce. I am further advised that exports of tin plate from this country continue at the alarming rate of 500,000 boxes per month, which, if continued for 12 months, would represent the equivalent of 1,500,000,000 cans—a quantity which, if retained for domestic use, would greatly relieve this distressed situation for the conservation of food supplies. I would urge that an immediate embargo be placed upon exports of tin plate, except in so far as such exports may relate to the necessities of war, and that such embargo continue during the canning season or until such time as domestic requirements for the canning of food may be protected.

Kindly give copy this wire to each of our Representatives.  
WM. D. STEPHENS, Governor.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CAL., April 21, 1917.

Senator JAMES D. PHELAN,  
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas every American citizen shares equal rights under his Government, and therefore stands under equal obligations toward it:

We, the undersigned members of the faculty of Stanford University, heartily indorse the principle of universal service and the measures recommended by the President to Congress for selective conscription. We urge you to vote accordingly, and against any amendment favoring volunteer recruiting to the exclusion of the principle of universal obligation.

Ray Lyman Wilbur, John Maxson Stillman, Wm. D. Briggs, B. Foster, W. A. Manning, W. C. Brown, George J. Pierce, M. S. Willman, J. E. McDowell, C. H. Gilbert, H. R. Stolz, C. A. Huston, E. P. Lesley, C. B. Whittier, Jos. Bingham, D. M. Folsom, M. R. Mirkwood, G. H. Cleveland, H. W. Young, Stanley A. Smith, P. A. Martin, A. B. Clark, Bailey Willis, J. C. Branner, Chester G. Verner, A. C. Whitaker, Austin F. Rogers, R. L. Abrams, J. R. Slonaker, F. B. Garver, Fernando Sanford, G. C. Price, Edwin C. Starks, H. C. Moreno, J. H. Foss, Oliver H. Jenkins, R. L. Green, John S. Tatterick, A. M. Cathcart, Howard J. Hall, Everett W. Smith, E. D. Adams, Joseph G. Brown, C. F. Tolman, Wilfred Eldred, E. Kennedy, Albert A. Bennet, Payson J. Treat, Lewis Miterman, L. L. Burlingame, S. D. Townley, Chas. Moser, J. F. Newsom, R. E. Swain, J. Pearce Mitchell, Edward Krebbiel, R. M. Aiden.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask to have printed in the RECORD a telegram embodying a resolution adopted by a patriotic meeting at McCook, Nebr.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McCOOK, NEBR., April 19, 1917.  
HON. GILBERT M. HITCHCOCK,  
Washington, D. C.:

At a public meeting this evening 500 patriotic citizens of McCook passed the following resolution unanimously in a rising vote. We the patriotic league of Redwillow County, Nebr., desire to express to our Representatives in Congress, Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS, Hon. GILBERT M. HITCHCOCK, and Hon. A. C. SHALENBERGER—

*Resolved,* That we most heartily indorse the program of our administration in its fight against autocracy; that we pledge herewith our loyal support of his program to His Honor President Woodrow Wilson in this grave crisis; and that we request this expression to be conveyed at once to our President."

C. L. FASNESTOCK,  
G. A. BAS,  
H. C. SEIDEL,  
F. M. KIMMELL,  
H. C. CLAPP,  
Committee on Resolution.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I send to the desk and ask to have read a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Nebraska Legislature.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved,* That to defray the necessary military and naval expenses of the present crisis we favor legislation that shall call for sacrifice on the part of capital as well as human life, and that to that end we favor the raising of extraordinary revenue by Congress, by increasing the income and corporation taxes particularly upon those incomes and corporation revenues arising from the manufacture of war material. Let war, if it comes, not become the source of further increase in enormous fortunes, but let capital be content with the ordinary profits of business and join with labor in the necessary sacrifices to maintain our rights and protect our citizens.

*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the President of the United States and to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

George W. Fuller, W. J. Taylor, J. H. Reifenrath, S. M. Fries, W. F. Rieschick, J. H. Norton, Nicholas Meysenburg, A. H. Miller, W. L. Bates, B. J. Ainlay, Thomas E. Conley, D. H. Cronin, Crist Anderson.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. I present petitions of the Salisbury Lodge, Order of Elks; the Frostburg Lodge, Order of Elks; the Municipal Congress of the Eastern Shore of Maryland; and the mayor, city counsellor, and aldermen of Annapolis, all of my State, approving the President's foreign policy, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petitions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROSTBURG, MD., April 3, 1917.

HON. JOHN WALTER SMITH,  
Washington, D. C.:

Frostburg Lodge, No. 470, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, unanimously indorses the President's foreign policy.  
C. S. JEFFRIES, Secretary.

Whereas our forefathers fought and died that the inalienable principles of freedom to pursue life, liberty, and happiness without molestation might be firmly established and permanently preserved; and Whereas the Imperial German Government and its allies, by ruthless destruction of the life and property of neutrals and noncombatants, and by their avowed intention to continue such dastardly conduct, have violated those principles; and

Whereas the President of these United States of America has called upon the Congress and the American people for full authority and means to preserve our sacred rights: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the members of Salisbury Lodge, No. 817, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks—*

First. That we do hereby unequivocally indorse the course of action recommended by the Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America, in his address to the Congress made on April 2, A. D. 1917; and be it further

*Resolved—*  
Second. That we do hereby pledge our support and loyalty to the promulgation of whatever measures the Congress in the exercise of their knowledge and wisdom may adopt for the defense of the principles of American liberty against the vicious and arrogant attacks of Prussian imperialism and greed; and be it further

*Resolved—*  
Third. That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President and both Houses of the Congress of the United States, and also published in the newspapers of Wicomico County, Md.

The above resolutions were adopted by Salisbury Lodge, No. 817, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, at a special meeting thereof held on Wednesday, April 4, 1917, at 8 o'clock p. m.

ARTHUR B. WEST, Exalted Ruler.  
CHAS. W. BENNETT, Secretary.

[SEAL]

SALISBURY, MD., April 5, 1917.

Senator JOHN WALTER SMITH,  
Washington, D. C.:

Resolutions passed by the Municipal Congress of the Eastern Shore in session at Salisbury, Md., this 5th day of April, 1917:

*Resolved,* That the Municipal Congress of the Eastern Shore of Maryland indorses the patriotic action of President Wilson and the Congress of the United States in so nobly upholding the dignity and honor of the country and our national self-respect in this hour of crisis in our international relations."

J. FRANK HARPER,  
J. H. C. LEGG,  
R. GROOME PARKS,  
Committee.

Resolutions approving the action of the President and of the Congress of the United States in declaring that a state of war exists between Germany and the United States.

Whereas by repeated and brutal attacks on the high seas by the German Government upon the commerce of the United States whereby the lives of American citizens, men, women, and children alike, have been lost, and millions of the property of our people destroyed, the maritime trade of our country fundamentally injured, and the rights of Americans on the ocean denied, infringed, and ravaged; and

Whereas the Government of the American Republic, under the wise and patriotic leadership of His Excellency, President Woodrow Wilson, has borne with unparalleled patience these wrongs, injuries, and outrages, and insisted and petitioned, to the very last point of submission, the German Government to desist from their unwarranted and cruel campaign upon our shipping, and to return to the humane principles of international law, without relief from these merciless evils or abatement in their heinous excesses; and

Whereas we have accepted the gage of battle with this natural foe of liberty, and have determined, if necessary, to spend the whole force of the American Nation to check and nullify its pretensions and end its power: Now, therefore,

We, the mayor, city councillor, and aldermen of the city of Annapolis, in Maryland, deem it proper and fitting, representing as we do, the people of a town most illustrious in the patriotic annals of the country, where the first seeds of American liberty were sown; where the stamp officer in battle royal by our citizens was driven from our shore; where the *Good Intent* was sent back to our mother country with its unbroken cargo for violating the interdiction of the Maryland patriots; where the *Peggy Stewart* and her cargo of tea was burned in the open hours of daylight by our undisguised forefathers; where the Maryland line of immortal fame and unmeasured prowess was formed; together with a legion of other patriotic acts performed here in the cause of our national liberty, to hereby declare our heartfelt and unqualified approval of the action of our noble President and of our splendid Congress, and to pledge to them in all the fellowship and fraternity of our common patriotism to our beloved country, our cordial and complete support, unqualified by limitations to bring to a successful issue the cause that they and we sustain, that we may preserve our rights and may aid everywhere the people who are seeking it, a larger share of liberty and their proper and legitimate voice and vote in the government of themselves.

Resolved further, That the clerk of this body have a properly printed or engrossed copy of these resolutions, with the seal of the city on it, signed by the mayor and clerk, sent to the President of the United States and the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved April 9, 1917.

[SEAL.]

Attest:

JAMES F. STRANGE,  
Mayor of Annapolis.

PHIL. E. PORTER,  
City Clerk.

Mr. NELSON presented 17 telegrams from citizens and firms in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against volunteer enlistment, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented 27 telegrams from citizens and firms in the State of Michigan, praying for prohibition in naval and military camps, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Fergus Falls, Minn., praying for the adoption of an arrangement by the United States, Canadian, French, and English representatives for guaranteeing the prices of farm products, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the imposition of a stamp tax to increase the revenue, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Virginia, Minneapolis, Crookston, Faribault, and Gilbert, all in the State of Minnesota, praying for compulsory military service, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, this morning I received 19 telegrams from Malden, Mo. I will read three of them:

Stand by President in all war measures, especially conscription.

Another:

We are with the President, and we want conscription.

Another:

Now is the time to support the President, and we want conscription.

These 3 are samples of the 19. Malden is a very pretty, prosperous little city of 1,500 to 1,800 population, being located near the northern border of Dunklin County, Mo., which is one of the best counties in the southeastern section of the State. I personally know most of the gentlemen who signed these 19 telegrams. They are highly respectable and esteemed citizens of that town and thoroughly representative.

Mr. President, so far I have not put into the RECORD any telegrams or letters received by me respecting the war, although I have received not hundreds but I think I can safely say thousands of such communications from all over the country, representing every phase of opinion. I have taken the position, assumed generally by Senators of experience and long service, that it would be a useless and expensive encumbrance of the RECORD to put into its pages the vast number of such communications showered upon us. They would make a volume—some being one way and some another. I see no sense in putting these things into the RECORD, making pages and pages at large public expense for nothing.

But I felt a little curious this morning when I received this batch of 19 telegrams from this one town, the only ones I received to-day, to know how it happened that these good people suddenly awakened to the importance of pressing this matter upon my attention en masse. They all came in a bunch. I

wondered what influence had operated to excite this movement, and I am still curious to know. They were all delivered at once. I wish I knew how it happened. Of course I do not object to my constituents conveying their views to me; on the contrary I specially desire them to do so. I always treat the individual views of my constituents with high respect, although their views often confuse me by their wide divergence. However, that is not the point that interests me at this moment. I merely wonder how it happened that 19 good men and true in one small town suddenly felt themselves constrained to send to me such telegrams as those I have read. There must have been some influence operating to induce this concentrated action. That is the point at which my curiosity asserts itself. I can understand that sort of thing when there is a great organized movement afoot—a thoroughly well-organized movement—such as the movement which seeks to promote prohibition legislation, woman suffrage, labor movements, or something like that which has taken on the aspect of an established propaganda. I can understand that, for in such cases there are organized agencies which can be utilized to induce the people throughout the country associated with such movements to send telegrams or letters to those representing them at the Capitol. But I am curious to know why 19 gentlemen in this one small town all at once and at the same time sent me this particular bunch of telegrams. I do not know that I will ever find out about this, but I am going to send a copy of to-day's RECORD to every man who sent me one of these telegrams, with the hope that some of them will enlighten me on this mystifying subject. Just such mystifying incidents frequently occur with respect to a variety of subjects, as every Senator knows. Every Senator has similar experiences.

As to this particular matter, I will say that while telegrams of this kind, whether from the one side or the other, have weight with me, yet if I felt a deep conviction that I ought, as a matter of public duty, to oppose the conscription bill, or oppose or support any other particular bill before the Senate, I would oppose or support it as I thought duty required of me. That would not be out of any disrespect to those who communicated their personal views to me. But if I felt constrained, as a matter of public and official duty, to oppose or support a bill I would act accordingly to my best judgment. I might and probably would act regretfully because of the fact that some of my constituents, whose views I highly esteem, advised me to the contrary, but I could not shrink from the performance of a grave public duty as I saw it.

In this instance it so happens that the telegrams from Malden, to which I am referring, were unnecessary. I had already declared my purpose to support the conscription bill. On the very day the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, reported the bill I told him I intended to vote for it. Many more than 19 of my constituents have telegraphed me to oppose the conscription bill. I wish I could oblige all of them on both sides, but I can not. I must therefore act on my own judgment as to what I think is best promotive of the public welfare and according to what I think duty demands of me under my oath as a Senator. Later I will give my reasons for supporting this particular bill, and I hope these 19 esteemed constituents of mine will do me the honor of reading what I shall have to say in this behalf.

Mr. TOWNSEND. We have in Michigan, organized by the Legislature under the leadership of the governor of that State, what is known as the Michigan War Preparedness Boards and also a Food Preparedness Board. The latter board has sent to me a short resolution, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHIGAN WAR PREPAREDNESS BOARDS,  
Lansing, April 18, 1917.

HON. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TOWNSEND: Acting upon the authority and instruction of the Food Preparedness Board of Michigan, I am sending you the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted by such board at a meeting held in Lansing April 17, 1917:

By Mr. Simpson:  
"That the secretary be instructed to write the Michigan delegation in the National Congress to use every honorable influence to speed up the vote on the agricultural appropriation bill of \$25,000,000, as proposed by Secretary Houston of the Department of Agriculture."

Very respectfully,

FOOD PREPAREDNESS BOARD,  
By M. H. DEFOE, Secretary.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I present a petition signed by some 30 or more of the leading business firms of Jackson, Mich., setting forth their reasons for supporting national prohibition at this time, which I ask to have inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKSON, MICH., April 21, 1917.

HON. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We inclose herewith a petition signed by manufacturers and business men of this city.

The sentiment for national prohibition as a war measure, and especially in view of food conservation, seems to be practically unanimous, and, had time permitted, we believe almost every voter, except those directly interested in the manufacture and sale of liquors (which constitute a small minority), would have signed this request.

We have kept the original for our files.

Yours truly,

E. R. YOUNG,  
W. R. SMITH,  
L. E. LATTO,  
W. R. FOX,  
Committee.

JACKSON, MICH., April 21, 1917.

To the Hon. WOODROW WILSON, President; Hon. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND, Hon. WILLIAM ALDEN SMITH, Senators; Hon. MARK BACON, Representative:

In view of the probability of food shortage and in the interest of conservation of grains and in the interest of factory efficiency, farm production, and military efficiency, we hereby petition for national prohibition as a war measure.

Jackson Cushion Spring Co., W. R. Smith, secretary; Wilson Packing Co., W. H. Knox, vice president; Modern Machine Tool Co., H. Holton, president; Jackson Glass Works, F. C. Ransom, secretary; Walcott Lathe Co., Dean G. Kimball, vice president; Townley Shingle Co., Neal R. Townley; Colvin Dairy Co., F. E. Colvin, secretary-treasurer; O. F. Schmid Chemical Co., O. F. Schmid; Alloy Steel Spring & Axle Co., R. W. L. Smith, president; Lockwood Ash Motor Co. (Inc.), W. L. Ash, president; Fleid Brundage Engine Works, C. F. Field; Jackson Farm Produce Co., G. H. Randolph; Auto Oil Co., D. S. Fleming; Jackson Machine Tool Co., D. G. Kimball, secretary-treasurer; The Mutual Motors Co., W. T. Miller, treasurer; Fox Machine Co., W. R. Fox, president; Briscoe Motor Corporation, L. E. Latta, secretary; Jackson Automobile Co., H. A. Matthews, treasurer; The Sparks-Withington Co., Wm. Sparks; Jackson Motor Shaft Co., L. C. Bloomfield, president; Forst Gear & Forge Co., Edw. J. Frost, president; Hayes Wheel Co., C. B. Hayes, president; Pearman Rim Corporation, O. W. Mott, president; Jackson Welding Co., O. W. Mott; Walk-Over Boot Shop, T. A. Rogers; J. O. Gilbert; F. D. Bennett; Wm. J. Stiles, city commissioner; Geo. H. Curtis, attorney; F. T. Lockwood, city commissioner; W. W. McLain, commissioner of schools; Yocum & Taylor, retail leather goods; Reid & Carlton, retail seeds, hardware, and implements; Peoples National Bank, F. H. Helmer, cashier, A. C. Bloomfield, cashier; Cook & Feldner Co.

Mr. TOWNSEND. We have pending before the Senate the war bill, upon which I expect to submit some remarks at an early opportunity. In connection with that bill I ask to have read a letter comprising but one page, which I have received from a former member of the Michigan State Senate and a participant in the late Spanish-American War, which to me furnishes an argument for the proposition of raising the age limit for enlistment in the Army to 45 years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read the letter, as follows:

APRIL 19, 1917.

HON. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I like your stand upon the matter of conscription. Make the age limit 45 instead of 40. I am 42 and as fit as when 40.

Without conscription and a maximum age limit of 42 at least, men like myself could not take an active part in the war.

Should the age limit be raised above 40 thousands like myself might hesitate (unless conditions become more serious), because those nearest and dearest to us claim there is no justification for us attempting to enlist and thus sacrifice their interests.

Most men at 45 are physically fit for hard and energetic service. We have had five years more of the benefits of government than men of 40, hence owe more to our country.

My case is a sample. I realize, possibly more than most men of 40 years, the duty I owe to my country. I'm fairly, profitably, and satisfactorily employed but, being in debt, must keep at my work, else through the nonpayment of interest all I have will be lost not only to me but to my family. A private's pay would not pay my interest charges, let alone the taxes, therefore I can not enter a training camp for six months' preparation without causing my family serious want in the future. Yet I owe a duty to my country and in my present employment am not adding her directly in this her hour of need. To do so would appear cruel to those who are dependent upon me, and to others I would look foolish.

Now with conscription and a maximum age limit set by the Government at 42, service in the Army, at whatever cost, would be the natural thing for one in my position.

In order that we may be justified in asking a seat at the table when the final decisions are made, we must strike hard and quickly. We can do so only by adopting conscription and more effectively by placing the age limit at 42 at least.

With best personal regards, I beg to be,  
Faithfully yours,

J. E. BAYLISS.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Some days ago I presented a telegram from the governor of Michigan, which was printed in the RECORD, and which seems to have been misinterpreted. I did

not misunderstand it; I knew that he was expressing his individual opinion as to industrial and agricultural preparation, and that the references to conscription and the sending of American troops abroad were simply a report of the information which had come to him. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a telegram which I have received from him on that subject.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANSING, MICH., April 18, 1917.

Senator CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,  
Washington, D. C.:

I fear my letter to you has been somewhat garbled by the press and has given a wrong impression to what I meant to convey. I wanted to emphasize the fact that we needed all the labor, at least for the present, upon the farms to produce foodstuffs, as that is one of the principal things in war, and the present condition of our food products throughout the country is alarming. Never in the history of the State have the cellars and barns of the farmers been as bare as they are to-day. I merely conveyed to you those ideas as were given to me, not my individual ideas, and did not suppose they would be made public. We are with the President and Government and his military and naval authorities in whatever way they may deem for the best.

ALBERT E. SLEEPER, Governor.

Mr. FREYLINGHUYSEN presented petitions of the Madonna Council, Knights of Columbus, of Englewood, N. J.; of the Daughters of the American Revolution of New Jersey; the Lawyers' Club, of Essex County, N. J.; of the Engineers' Club, of Trenton, N. J.; of the American Society of Civil Engineers, of New York City; and of the National Committee of Patriotic and Defense Societies, of Washington, D. C., praying for compulsory military service, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Presbytery of New Jersey, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the borough council of Ruthersford, N. J., praying for an appropriation for the improvement of the Hackensack River, N. J., which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 114, Independent Order of Brith Sholom, of Camden; of Saranac Tribe, No. 128, Improved Order of Red Men, of Camden; and of the Civic Association of Haddonfield, all in the State of New Jersey, pledging support to the President, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Local Lodge No. 340, International Association of Machinists, of Newark; of the New Jersey State Sunday School Association; and of the Civic Association of Haddonfield, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the conservation of food supplies, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I have here a memorial for national prohibition, signed by a thousand of the leading scientific, business, and professional men of the United States. It is one of the most notable memorials ever presented to Congress. The signatures were secured by a committee of 60, headed by former Gov. Foss, of Massachusetts, and Dr. Irving Fisher, of Yale University.

The memorial is of such importance that I ask that the thousand signatures, without prefix or suffix, be printed in the RECORD. It will take about a page or a page and a half of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The memorial and signatures ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

#### A MEMORIAL FOR NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

In view of the scientifically proved unfavorable effects of the use of alcoholic beverages even in small quantities,

And in view, therefore, of the colossal, physical, mental, moral, economic, social, and racial evils which the manufacture and sale of alcoholic liquor entail.

And in view of the inadequateness of all methods hitherto employed to check or regulate these evils.

And in view of the great and rapid growth of public knowledge and sentiment on this subject as shown by antialcoholic agitation and legislation through most of our national area.

The undersigned believe the time has come for the Federal Government to take steps looking to the prohibition in the United States of the manufacture, sale, import, export, and transport of alcoholic liquors:

#### MINISTERS.

Bishops: Charles H. Brent, Frederick Courtney, Walter T. Sumner, and Ethelbert Talbot.  
Miscellaneous: Heber J. Grant, William Harmon Van Allen, Shailer Mathews, Percy S. Grant, and Newell Dwight Hillis.

#### INSURANCE.

Presidents of companies: Kimball C. Atwood, D. M. Ferry, Arthur Jordan, Wilmer L. Moore, Frank W. Sargent, Edson S. Lott, F. R. Bigelow, Frederick Freilinghuysen, Darwin P. Kingsley, H. V. Oiney, Edward L. Watson, and Asa S. Wing.  
Miscellaneous: H. R. Albee and John T. Stone.



Dwyer, George D. Selden, James Long, A. B. Farquhar, Eben B. Clarke, William F. Donovan, A. F. Bennett, and John A. Westman.

#### MACHINERY.

John A. Mead, E. J. Lindsay, John Carruthers, E. H. Sleight, C. B. Reed, James K. Risk, Charles H. Ingersoll, L. C. Walker, H. A. Severson, Arthur Baxter, D. D. Bowsher, Ward W. Willis, Clarence E. Bennett, A. Lincoln Bell, Edward C. Hinman, Marshall T. Reeves, L. A. Osborne, Frederick K. Copeland, B. Congor, A. C. Bent, C. R. Fitch, Joseph H. Wesson, C. Rorabeck, Daniel Seltzer, Edwin C. Nichols, Frank H. Brooks, Albert J. Thornley, James Hartness, James Russell Clarke, William Butterworth, John L. Wagner, W. T. Beatty, V. D. Moody, N. G. Williams, George A. Farrall, L. S. Starrett, J. A. Jeffrey, A. E. West, D. Robert Yarnell, Seth A. Moulton, Charles K. Haddon, Frederick Fosdick, John Fahnline, G. A. Stephens, Joseph Boyer, Clement A. Griscom, H. A. Carhart, H. T. Herr, Pliny E. Holt, J. C. Reed, William D. Baldwin, Frank O. Wells, and E. P. Bullard, jr.

#### TEXTILE.

R. J. Jones, Thomas Hand, Frederick B. Gordon, E. A. Clements, S. I. Munger, William Carter, J. J. Phoenix, Robert S. Mehan, George B. Goodall, William H. Haines, George H. Kerslake, Charles W. Masland, Oliver L. Johnson, Frank L. Chipman, J. W. Holtenback, J. E. Edgerton, Frank Hughes, Francis Winslow Poe, James P. Verdery, D. H. Campbell, John M. Geer, Arthur E. Tweedy, James E. Rankin, William G. Bassett, T. B. Kay, Fuller E. Callaway, E. M. Green, Ira Dimock, James D. Hammett, Z. F. Wright, Edward Freschl, F. A. Carter, George T. Greenhalgh, Charles Cheney, J. T. Shanahan, Robert Shapson, G. W. Hamilton, Rufus Mathewson, R. A. Schofield, G. M. Traber, James C. Seif, William L. Turner, William McCleary, H. L. Shuttlesworth, M. F. Cole, E. E. Shanahan, F. P. Peabody, Francis T. Maxwell, L. C. Mandeville, Theodore F. Thieme, Charles Sisson, Aug. W. Smith.

#### PAPER.

Charles Sumner Blvd, Maurice Hoopes, H. A. Frambach, G. E. Henry, A. W. Brown, James Rogers, George W. Sisson, jr., W. H. Foster, Frederick A. Emerick, G. A. Osborn, N. J. Smith, J. N. Henry, D. M. Bare, H. A. Moses, James Logan, B. F. Nelson, F. Wayland Ayer, H. L. Paddock, George H. Mead, R. Glendinning, Frederick M. Hodge, J. A. Kimberly, Arthur C. Hastings, Waldo E. Pratt, and William Gibson.

#### AUTOMOBILES.

R. H. Webber, B. H. Scott, A. R. Erskine, E. O. Sutton, F. E. Eckhart, H. H. Franklin, Harry G. Fisk, and E. W. Allen.

#### MINING AND OIL.

F. W. Uah, Fillmore Condit, Wm. H. Stanton, Chas. C. Stoll, W. G. Morris, Stewart K. Smith, Dwight C. Morgan, William J. Faux, Alan C. Dodson, E. B. Thornton, John Laing, R. M. Fry, Charles E. Lawrence, H. W. Varnum, C. M. Wasson, T. H. Watkins, Lyman Stewart, A. W. Calloway, Robert H. Gross, George C. Atkinson, H. H. Wilcock, J. F. Welborn, A. Gatliff, W. M. Pickett, Lewis Emery, jr., W. De L. Walbridge, and John Gibson, jr.

#### WOOD AND LUMBER.

William Decker, M. W. Waldorf, P. A. Peterson, P. C. Fuller, J. T. Cox, F. A. Seagle, Walstein R. Chester, John S. Bradley, N. J. Blagen, and W. R. Brown.

#### SHOES.

E. J. Bliss, J. P. Grosvenor, George D. Selby, C. E. Legg, John A. Affleck, W. H. Butler, and J. Franklin McElwain.

#### FOODSTUFFS.

John S. Pillsbury, A. J. Porter, James F. Bell, Isaac F. Norton, C. E. Welch, John Crosby, E. P. Wells, William Fellowes Morgan, Chas. S. Pillsbury, Harold A. Hatch, and C. C. Colt.

#### ELECTRICAL.

J. H. McGill, William L. Hooper, H. H. Noble, R. R. Benjamin, G. A. Briggs, and C. C. Chesney.

#### GENERAL MERCHANTS.

John Wanamaker, S. S. Kresge, John V. Farwell, Ralph N. Harbison, Samuel S. Childs, Charles E. Adams, Herbert S. Houston, L. S. Bixler, P. W. Litchfield, John T. Dorrance, Harry B. French, L. J. Colman, N. Musher, George S. Wright, A. D. Reynolds, James W. Johnson, Otis N. Pierce, Frank S. Washburn, George H. Raidart, P. H. Callahan, George L. Palmer, Thomas W. Stephens, Edward S. Payson, Joseph M. Steele, J. A. Sunderland, George G. Williams, James N. Gamble, Wallace J. Pierpont, H. E. Moore, Walter B. Knight, Edward E. Kerr, Edward W. Backus, Thomas B. Fitzpatrick, Albert M. Todd, C. A. Moorman, J. P. Gossett, Frank B. Clippinger, Daniel Baker, Hiram W. Steele, Charles Piez, John S. Baker, S. F. Bowser, John C. Milne, Nathaniel G. Herreshoff, George A. Driggs, John Walton, E. J. Young, Elisha J. Steele, Ernest Lister, W. A. Rogers, William A. Vawter, Harold F. Coppes, Henry S. Dulaney, W. E. Penn, Henry F. Baker, A. H. Helsey, N. T. Pulsifer, Courtenay Guild, H. J. Hayden, William S. Stearns, R. S. Kent, Sidney Blumenthal, Eugene N. Foss, and B. E. Comer.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

W. S. U'Ren, John L. Grandin, Florence Kelley, Robert E. Spear, John Graham Brooks, Carrie Chapman Catt, Arthur Copper, Luther Burbank, Gifford Pinchot, Orville Wright, William C. Sturgis, T. A. Jaggard, jr., and H. W. Wiley.

#### MISCELLANEOUS SCIENTISTS.

James G. White, E. J. Phelps, Walter A. Danforth, Robert Garrett, James Brown Scott, Joseph Walker, Charles W. Bryan, and Melvil Dewey.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Let me say, further, in reference to the memorial that I have here the autograph signatures of the signers which I will be glad to have Senators inspect during the day before I file it with the Secretary.

#### COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have a letter in the form of a petition bearing upon the subject of conscription. It is so terse and so strong and presents the argument so briefly that I ask that it may be read at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the letter.

The Secretary read as follows:

St. Louis, Mo., April 21, 1917.

Hon. PORTER J. McCUMBER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You have voted the money, now vote the men; and don't depend on volunteer service; that has always failed in the past and is bound to fail if tried again.

Anyhow, we have no time for experiments. We need soldiers, and we need them quick. And we may need many more than can reasonably be expected to volunteer.

Then, why not vote for compulsory universal service and settle the question?

It puts all on an equality. It does not ask the generous and the brave to endure banishment from wives, children, parents, and friends, to sacrifice their business or positions, and to imperil their health and lives, while the shirkers and the unworthy remain comfortably at home and continue their selfish pursuits in peace and safety.

It means coercion, yes; but of a less offensive sort than the coercion of the volunteer system—the contemptuous glances of men and, more potent still, of women, too, upon the lusty figure of the youth who hangs back from the recruiting station, with their sneers, and jeers, and epithets, and imputations, and disdain.

Conscription is the only just, fair, democratic way to raise an army. Those who oppose it are either uninformed as to what it really means or are afraid that they or theirs will be caught in the draft. You can not afford to vote just to please the uninformed, and as for the shirkers or the disloyal, they are not deserving of consideration.

You did not depend on voluntary contributions for the war fund. You knew it couldn't be raised that way. And if enough people will not voluntarily part with their money to pay the expenses of the war, is it reasonable to expect that enough of them will voluntarily give up their homes and business entirely and adopt a life worn out with toils and exposed to continued perils to create an army adequate for the emergency?

Undoubtedly some of the opposition to compulsory service comes from the same secret and subtle influences that from the beginning have sought to advance the interests of Germany. They want Germany to win. Failing in their efforts to keep us from accepting Germany's challenge, they now seek to hamper and delay our preparations for defense. They would, a few of them, deliver us into the hands of our enemies. With these, of course, you have no sympathy or concern.

But admitting there is a very considerable worthy and loyal element that is opposed from conscientious and unselfish motives to compulsory service, your practical, common sense must tell you they are wrong. Then why not use your own good judgment in the matter and depend upon your ability to establish the wisdom of your course later? You should have no trouble in convincing your constituents that from the standpoint of economy of life, of suffering, and of treasure selective conscription is the best means that can be adopted.

Senator, it is very likely that you hear from more people who oppose than who favor conscription. But that is not proof that the opposition sentiment preponderates. Those who favor it feel so strongly it is the only way that they take it for granted it will go through, and so only a few ask you to support it. Those who oppose it know that argument and reason and enlightened public sentiment are all against them, and they seek to make up by noisy demonstration and passionate protest what they lack in logic, in numbers, in intelligence and moral worth.

This is no time for Congress or its Members to consider any temporary or local political effect of its actions. It is a time to think of the future of the Nation, of the pressing needs of the situation, and to make sure that we do not by temporizing or delay invite calamity.

Yours, truly,

H. R. STRONG.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the modest communication which has just been read from a citizen of St. Louis rather amuses me. Each Senator has received a copy of that document. When Mr. Strong, whoever he may be, informs the country that those of us who have ventured to question the propriety of conscription are uninformed and are afraid that we ourselves may be drafted he goes altogether afield in his attempted criticism. I have more than a hundred communications here on the other side that I will not ask to have printed in the RECORD, but I will let the communication of the St. Louis gentleman go for what it is worth.

#### INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. BRADY. I have received from Mr. Norman Thomas, the secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, a memorandum giving his views regarding the amendment his association feels should be added to Senate bill 1871. Mr. Thomas appeared before the Military Committee, and I then suggested to him to prepare this memorandum, which gives a very clear and intelligent statement of the principles of his association, and which I think is of sufficient importance to be considered by the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask that the memorandum be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The memorandum is as follows:

In submitting the inclosed suggested amendment, in the interest of conscientious objectors, I respectfully desire to make plain the following points:

First. Conscientious objectors in general are not expressing their approval of the principle of conscription for military service, when they request exemption.

Second. Conscientious objectors of the sort whom I know personally are not cowards and are very eager to serve society. It is our hope that under a system of selective draft the great majority of conscientious objectors will be found to be giving unselfish service of recognized value to the State. The Fellowship of Reconciliation, which I represent, has sent out a letter urging its members to lose no time in engaging in constructive service. Several of its members are now engaged in dangerous forms of relief and prison-camp work in the Balkans and in Armenia.



The fellowship is seeking an opportunity to send out some of its younger men for the reconstruction of villages in those regions in Armenia where danger from disease and disordered conditions of life is very great.

Third. In urging this amendment members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation are not actuated primarily by personal motives. Few of them would be liable under the present form of the act to military service. We are primarily desirous of saving the principle of freedom of conscience, which is absolutely vital to democracy, and of securing its recognition—even in a form which may not seem to us ideal—in this law.

Respectfully submitted.

NORMAN THOMAS,  
Secretary Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Suggested amendment to Senate bill 1871 to cover the case of conscientious objectors:

First. Amend title by adding to it the following words: "and for other purposes."

Second. Section 3, strike out words "and nothing in this act contained shall be construed to require or compel any person to serve in any of the forces herein provided for who is found to be a member of any well-recognized religious sect or organization . . . in accordance with the creed or principles of said religious organizations." Substitute therefore the following: "and nothing in this act contained shall be construed to require or compel service in any of the forces herein provided for by any person who is conscientiously opposed to engage in such service."

Third. Add new section, following section 3, as follows:

"Any person who shall have been exempted from military or naval service on the grounds of conscientious objection under section 3 of this act shall be liable to be drafted and assigned by the President to any one of the following kinds of civil service under the civil branches of the Government in which he can conscientiously engage: Agriculture, forestry, reclamation of waste land, highway construction and repair, public education, prison work, social-welfare work, coast-guard life saving, and relief and reconstruction among noncombatant sufferers. Any other civil service of national or international importance.

Any person so drafted shall serve during the period of the emergency and for one year thereafter unless sooner discharged.

Fourth. Add to the bill provision for civil tribunal to pass upon exemptions in general and especially upon those urged on conscientious grounds. We suggest, in general, that the terms of the House bill will meet this point. We quote the language of the House bill suggesting that it be incorporated in the Senate bill as a separate section: "That the President is authorized and empowered to constitute and establish throughout the United States tribunals for the purpose of enforcing and carrying into effect the terms and provisions of this act, together with such regulations as he shall prescribe and determine necessary for its administration. A majority of the members of each tribunal shall be citizens of the United States not connected with the Military Establishment: *Provided further*, That upon the complaint of any person who feels himself aggrieved by his enrollment or draft as is herein provided any court of record, State or Federal, having general jurisdiction in matters pertaining to the writ of habeas corpus, according to local laws or by act of Congress, shall have jurisdiction by proceedings in the nature of the writ of habeas corpus to hear summarily and determine the rights of such person."

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, while we may not all agree as to what this section in the bill should contain, yet I feel that the amendment suggested by Mr. Thomas should receive consideration and for that reason I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and, referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

A bill (S. 2027) for the relief of The Sanford & Brooks Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2028) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the business of loaning money on security of any kind by persons, firms, and corporations other than national banks, licensed bankers, trust companies, savings banks, building and loan associations, and real estate brokers in the District of Columbia," approved February 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A bill (S. 2029) for the relief of the widow of Joseph Culley; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2030) granting a pension to Edward Keegin; and

A bill (S. 2031) granting a pension to Lillie B. Le Compte; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 2032) to prevent unfair discriminations in the sale of print paper by persons engaged in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 2033) for the relief of John Ogden;

A bill (S. 2034) to correct the military record of James H. Painter; and

A bill (S. 2035) to remove the charge of desertion against James B. Smock; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2036) granting an increase of pension to Ephriam Briggs;

A bill (S. 2037) granting an increase of pension to Zed Culver;

A bill (S. 2038) granting a pension to Thomas Jefferson Rothgeb;

A bill (S. 2039) granting an increase of pension to Thomas White;

A bill (S. 2040) granting a pension to William C. Campbell;

A bill (S. 2041) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Walters (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2042) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Wood (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2043) granting an increase of pension to Fanny Harris Howe (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2044) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Huey (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2045) granting a pension to Eliza Coe (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 2046) to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes approved February 9, 1909," as amended by an act approved January 17, 1914; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 2047) providing for the free transmission of mail of enlisted men below rank of captain; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A bill (S. 2048) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McCarty (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 2049) granting an increase of pension to Minnie Lord Henderson; and

A bill (S. 2050) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Edge; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

A bill (S. 2051) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

A bill (S. 2052) authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

A bill (S. 2053) granting to the State of Colorado sections 2 and 32 in every township of said State for educational purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WALSH:

A bill (S. 2054) granting a pension to Mamie Bridgewater (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 2055) to authorize the President to appoint Francis P. Fremont, formerly a major in the United States Army, on the active list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 2056) for the relief of Frank Pinkley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 2057) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hill;

A bill (S. 2058) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Fike;

A bill (S. 2059) granting an increase of pension to Emma E. Elliott;

A bill (S. 2060) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Bristow;

A bill (S. 2061) granting an increase of pension to James L. Mitchell;

A bill (S. 2062) granting an increase of pension to Andrew West;

A bill (S. 2063) granting an increase of pension to Gilliam L. Craven;

A bill (S. 2064) granting an increase of pension to Alvin M. Owens;

A bill (S. 2065) granting an increase of pension to William A. Bodine;

A bill (S. 2066) granting a pension to Rebecca J. Thompson;

A bill (S. 2067) granting an increase of pension to George D. Abrahams;

A bill (S. 2068) granting an increase of pension to Richard M. Clark;

A bill (S. 2069) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Davis;

A bill (S. 2070) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Schopf;

A bill (S. 2071) granting an increase of pension to James H. Knight;

A bill (S. 2072) granting an increase of pension to Jehu F. Stiffler;

A bill (S. 2073) granting an increase of pension to Jabez Smith;

A bill (S. 2074) granting an increase of pension to Uriah G. Williams; and

A bill (S. 2075) granting an increase of pension to James Alfred Mason; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE:

A bill (S. 2076) for the relief of Augustus G. Reynolds; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GALLINGER:

A bill (S. 2077) granting an increase of pension to John C. Emery; and

A bill (S. 2078) granting an increase of pension to William H. Tripp (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

#### SEIZURE OF ENEMY VESSELS.

Mr. CULBERSON. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) authorizing the President to take over for the United States the possession and title of vessels of any subject or citizen of any nation with which the United States may be at war, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the President be, and is hereby, authorized to take over for the United States the possession and title of any vessel, within the jurisdiction of the United States, of any subject or citizen of any nation with which the United States may be at war, and, through the United States Shipping Board or any department or agency of the Government, to operate, lease, charter, and equip such vessel in any service of the United States, or in any commerce, foreign or coastwise, as he may see fit.

The property rights and claims to compensation, if any, of such subject or citizen shall be determined at the end of the war.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. HARDING. I send to the desk an amendment which is to be proposed by me to the Army bill (S. 1781) and which I think is of sufficient importance to have read and ordered printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The amendment was read and ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

At the end of section 1 add a new paragraph, as follows:

"Seventh. The President is further authorized to raise and maintain by voluntary enlistment, to organize and equip not to exceed four infantry divisions, the officers of which shall be selected in the manner provided by paragraph 3 of section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That the organization of said force shall be the same as that of the corresponding organization of the Regular Army: *And provided further*, That there shall be no enlistments in said force of men liable to draft under section 1 of this act: *And provided further*, That no such volunteer force shall be accepted in any unit smaller than a division."

In section 2, page 5, line 6, after the word "authorize," insert "except as provided in the seventh paragraph of section 1."

In section 8, page 11, line 18, strike out the word "and" and insert after the word "sixth" the words "and seventh."

#### REQUISITION OF VESSELS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Senate bill 1797 has been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs and is now on the calendar. I desire to offer an amendment which I intend to propose to that bill when it comes up for consideration, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed.

#### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I offer a resolution, which has reference to some hearings had before the Committee on Military Affairs, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 48) as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate, and that expenses contracted hereunder shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. There is no immediate necessity for the passage of the resolution at this time, and I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

#### RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I send to the desk a resolution and ask to have it read and lie over under the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 47), as follows:

Whereas the railroad companies have filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission schedules of rate increases amounting to 15 per cent flat, that with the increase of local rates to follow will be over half a billion of dollars annually, which will go into effect June 1 unless suspended by order of the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

Whereas the railroad companies have enjoyed an enormous increase of business during the last two years, giving them, according to the receipts for the last six months of 1916, a net income of approximately 7 per cent on the book value of their properties: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be requested to suspend said increases of rates until the same shall have been thoroughly examined in detail by the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine whether they are just and reasonable, or until such time as Congress may investigate the same to determine whether legislative action is advisable.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will lie over and be printed.

#### AFFAIRS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 49), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the authority heretofore vested in the Committee on the District of Columbia by Senate resolution of February 20, 1909, directing the said committee to examine into matters relating to the District of Columbia is hereby continued, and the said committee is hereby directed to pursue its investigation during the Sixty-fifth Congress.

#### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 50), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to send for persons and papers, and to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and the expense thereof be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

#### ADDRESS BY JOHN SKELTON WILLIAMS.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I present and desire to have referred to the Committee on Printing, with a view to have it printed as a public document, a very admirable address by Comptroller John Skelton Williams, which was delivered before the Southern Commercial Congress at its annual convention in Norfolk, Va.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The address will be referred to the Committee on Printing for action.

#### INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate; and I desire to say in this connection, Mr. President, that I believe at the time the Senate adjourned on Saturday last the request was pending that the bill be read.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1871) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee. I send to the desk an amendment to the bill which I think the chairman of the committee will, perhaps, be willing to accept, and I ask to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

On page 6, line 9, after the word "Territories," insert the following: "duly ordained ministers of religion, students preparing for the ministry in recognized theological or divinity schools."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I prefer to examine the amendment a little more carefully, and in any event I think the bill ought to be read and the amendments taken up in order.

Mr. REED. Then, let the amendment be printed and it can be taken up later. I ask the chairman of the committee, however, to kindly consider it because I think it is a matter to which he will agree.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I now ask that the Secretary read the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill. The Secretary read the bill (S. 1871) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in view of the existing emergency, which demands the raising of troops in addition to those now available, the President be, and he is hereby, authorized—

First. Immediately to raise, organize, officer, and equip all or such number of increments of the Regular Army provided by the national defense act approved June 3, 1916, or such parts thereof as he may deem necessary; to raise all organizations of the Regular Army, including those added by such increments to the maximum enlisted strength authorized by law. Vacancies in the Regular Army created or caused by the addition of increments as herein authorized which can not be filled by promotion may be filled by temporary appointment for the period of the emergency or until replaced by provisional appointments made under the provisions of section 23 of the national-defense act, and hereafter provisional appointments under said section may be terminated whenever it is determined in the manner prescribed by the President, that the officer has not the suitability and fitness requisite for permanent appointment.

Second. To draft into the military service of the United States, organize, and officer in accordance with the provisions of section 111 of said national-defense act, so far as the provisions of said section may be applicable and not inconsistent with the terms of this act, any or all members of the National Guard and of the National Guard Reserve, and said members so drafted into the military service of the United States shall serve therein for the period of the existing emergency unless sooner discharged.

Third. To raise by draft as herein provided, organize and equip an additional force of 500,000 enlisted men, or such part or parts thereof as he may at any time deem necessary, and to provide the necessary officers, line and staff, for said force and for organizations of the other forces hereby authorized, or by combining organizations of said other forces, by ordering members of the Officers' Reserve Corps to temporary duty in accordance with the provisions of section 38 of the national-defense act approved June 3, 1916; by appointment from the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, from those duly qualified and registered pursuant to section 23 of the act of Congress approved January 21, 1903 (35 Stat. L., 775), from the members of the National Guard drafted into the service of the United States, from those who have been graduated from educational institutions at which military instruction is compulsory, or from those who have had honorable service in the Regular Army, the National Guard, or in the volunteer forces, or from the country at large; by assigning retired officers of the Regular Army to active duty with such force with their rank on the retired list and the full pay and allowances of their grade; or by the appointment of retired officers and enlisted men, active or retired, of the Regular Army as commissioned officers in such forces: *Provided*, That the organization of said force shall be the same as that of the corresponding organizations of the Regular Army; *And provided further*, That officers with rank not above that of colonel shall be appointed by the President alone, and officers above that grade by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Fourth. The President is further authorized, in his discretion and at such time as he may determine, to raise and begin the training of an additional force of 500,000 men organized, officered, and equipped as provided for the force first mentioned in the preceding paragraph of this section.

Fifth. To raise by draft, organize, equip, and officer, as provided in the third paragraph of this section, in addition to and for each of the above forces, such recruit training units as he may deem necessary for the maintenance of such forces at the maximum strength.

Sixth. To raise, organize, officer, and maintain during the emergency such number of ammunition batteries and battalions, depot batteries, and battalions, and such artillery parks, with such numbers and grades of personnel as he may deem necessary. Such organizations shall be officered in the manner provided in the third paragraph of this section, and enlisted men may be assigned to said organizations from any of the forces herein provided for or raised by selective draft as by this act provided.

SEC. 2. The enlisted men required to raise and maintain the organizations of the Regular Army and to complete and maintain the organizations embodying the members of the National Guard drafted into the service of the United States, at the maximum legal strength as by this act provided, shall be raised by voluntary enlistment, or if and whenever the President decides that they can not effectually be so raised or maintained, then by selective draft; and all other forces hereby authorized shall be raised and maintained by selective draft exclusively. Such draft shall be based upon liability to military service of all male citizens, or male persons not alien enemies who have declared their intention to become citizens, between the ages of 19 and 25 years, and shall take place and be maintained under such regulations as the President may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of this act. Quotas for the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, or subdivisions thereof, shall be determined in proportion to the population thereof available for military service as shown by the registration provided for herein, and credit shall be given to any State, Territory, District, or subdivision thereof for the number of men who have entered the military service of the United States under the provisions of this act from any such State, Territory, District, or subdivision as members of any Federal force hereby authorized. All persons drafted into the service of the United States and all officers accepting commissions in the forces herein provided for shall, from the date of said draft or acceptance, be subject to the laws and regulations governing the Regular Army, except as to promotions, so far as such laws and regulations are applicable to persons whose permanent retention in the military service on the active or retired list is not contemplated by existing law, and those drafted shall be required to serve for the period of the existing emergency unless sooner discharged.

SEC. 3. The Vice President of the United States, the officers, legislative, executive, and judicial, of the United States and of the several States and Territories, and all persons in the military and naval service of the United States shall be exempt from the selective draft herein prescribed; and nothing in this act contained shall be construed to require or compel any person to serve in any of the forces herein provided for who is found to be a member of any well-organized religious sect or organization, at present organized and existing, whose creed forbids its members to participate in war in any form and whose religious convictions are against war or participation therein in accordance with the creed of said religious organization; and the President is hereby authorized to exclude or discharge from said selective draft and from the draft under the second paragraph of section 1 hereof, or to draft for partial military service only, persons of the following classes: Customhouse clerks; persons employed by the United States in the transmission of the mails; artificers and workmen em-

ployed in the armories, arsenals, and navy yards of the United States, and such other persons employed in the service of the United States as the President may designate; pilots; mariners actually employed in the sea service of any citizen or merchant within the United States; persons engaged in industries, including agriculture, found to be necessary to the maintenance of the Military Establishment or the effective operation of the military forces or the maintenance of national interest during the emergency; those in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their exclusion or discharge advisable; and those found to be physically and morally deficient. No exemption or exclusion shall continue when a cause therefor no longer exists.

SEC. 4. All persons liable to military service under the provisions of this act shall be subject to registration in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the President, and upon proclamation by the President or other public notice given by him or by his direction stating the time and place of such registration it shall be the duty of every such person liable to military service under the provisions hereof to present himself for and submit to registration under the provisions of this act; and every such person liable to military service shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this act upon the publication of said proclamation or other notice as aforesaid given by the President by his direction; and any person who shall fail or neglect to present himself for registration or to submit thereto as herein provided shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction in the proper district court of the United States, be punished by imprisonment for not less than three months nor more than one year, and shall thereupon be duly registered.

SEC. 5. The President is hereby authorized to utilize the service of any or all departments and any or all officers or agents of the United States, and of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, in the execution of this act, and all officers and agents of the United States, and of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, are hereby required to perform such duty in the execution of this act as the President shall order or direct, and the officers and agents of the several States shall hereby have full authority for all acts done by them in the execution of this act by the direction or request of the President. Any person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying into effect any of the provisions of this act or the regulations made or directions given hereunder, who shall fail or neglect to perform such duty; and any person charged with such duty or having and exercising any authority under said act, regulations, or directions, who shall knowingly make or be a party to the making of any false or incorrect registration, physical examination, exemption, enlistment, enrollment, or muster, or any false or incorrect report or return pertaining to any registration, physical examination, exemption, enlistment, enrollment, or muster; and any person who shall make or be a party to the making of any false statement or certificate as to the fitness or liability of himself or any other person for service under the provisions of this act, or regulations made by the President thereunder, or otherwise evades or aids another to evade the requirements of this act or of said regulations, shall, if not subject to military law, be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction in the proper district court of the United States, be punished by imprisonment for not less than six months nor more than one year, or, if subject to military law, shall be tried by court-martial and suffer such punishment as a court-martial may direct.

SEC. 6. That the qualifications and conditions for voluntary enlistment as herein provided shall be the same as those prescribed by existing law for enlistments in the Regular Army, except that recruits must be between the ages of 18 and 40 years at the time of their enlistment; and such enlistments shall be for the period of the emergency unless sooner discharged. All enlistments, including those in the Regular Army Reserve which are in force on the date of the approval of this act and which would terminate during the emergency, shall continue in force during the emergency unless sooner discharged, but nothing herein contained shall be construed to shorten the period of any existing enlistment.

All voluntary enlistments shall be in the Army of the United States, and those enlisted may be assigned upon enlistment to any force of said Army not required to be raised exclusively by selective draft.

The President may provide for the discharge of any or all enlisted men whose status with respect to dependents renders such discharge advisable; and he may also authorize the employment on any active duty of retired enlisted men of the Regular Army, either with their rank on the retired list or in higher enlisted grades, and such retired enlisted men shall receive the full pay and allowances of the grades in which they are actively employed.

SEC. 7. That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint for the period of the existing emergency such general officers of appropriate grades as may be necessary for duty with brigades, divisions, and higher units in which the forces provided for herein may be organized by the President, and general officers of appropriate grade for the several Coast Artillery districts. In so far as such appointments may be made from any of the forces herein provided for, the appointees may be selected irrespective of the grades held by them in such forces. Vacancies in all grades in the Regular Army resulting from the appointment of officers thereof to higher grades in the forces other than the Regular Army herein provided for, shall be filled by temporary promotions and appointments in the manner prescribed for filling temporary vacancies by section 114 of the national-defense act approved June 3, 1916; and officers appointed under the provisions of this act to higher grades in the forces other than the Regular Army herein provided for shall not vacate their permanent commissions nor be prejudiced in their relative or lineal standing in the Regular Army.

Each chief of bureau of the War Department shall, during the existing emergency, have the rank, pay, and allowances of major general.

SEC. 8. The appointments authorized and made as provided by the second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth paragraphs of section 1 and by section 7 of this act, and the temporary appointments in the Regular Army authorized by the first paragraph of section 1 of this act, shall be for the period of the emergency, unless sooner terminated by discharge or otherwise. The President is hereby authorized to discharge any officer from the office held by him under such appointment for any cause which, in the judgment of the President, would promote the public service; and the general commanding any division and higher tactical organization or territorial department is authorized to appoint from time to time military boards of not less than three nor more than five officers of the forces herein provided for to examine into and report upon the capacity, qualification, conduct, and efficiency of any commissioned officer within his command other than officers of the Regular Army holding permanent or provisional commissions therein. Each mem-

ber of such board shall be superior in rank to the officer whose qualifications are to be inquired into, and if the report of such board be adverse to the continuance of any such officer and be approved by the President, such officer shall be discharged from the service at the discretion of the President with one month's pay and allowances.

Sec. 9. That all officers and enlisted men of the forces herein provided for other than the Regular Army shall be in all respects on the same footing as to pay, allowances, and pensions as officers and enlisted men of corresponding grades and length of service in the Regular Army.

Sec. 10. All existing restrictions upon the detail, detachment, and employment of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army are hereby suspended for the period of the present emergency.

Sec. 11. All laws and parts of laws in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby suspended during the continuance of the present war.

#### ISSUANCE OF BONDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I desire to submit as a privileged matter the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H. R. 2762, being a bill to authorize an issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes.

I will say, before sending up to the desk the report of the conference committee, that the House receded from all of their disagreements except the disagreement involved in Senate amendment No. 5, and there they receded with an amendment. I will explain that so far as the difference involved in Senate amendment No. 5 is concerned, down to the second proviso the matter as it comes back from the conference committee is what the Senate did, but abbreviated, made somewhat more terse and somewhat clearer, and then there is added this proviso, which is new matter:

*Provided further*, That the provisions of section 5191 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the Federal reserve act and the amendments thereof, with reference to the reserves required to be kept by national banking associations and other member banks of the Federal Reserve System, shall not apply to deposits of public moneys by the United States in designated depositories.

It was thought that we ought to make that amendment to the Senate amendment, because the moneys received by the Treasury under this bill are secured by independent security anyhow, and it would be a useless burden upon the banks to make them increase their general reserves because of this addition to their deposits. I submit the conference report and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2762) to authorize an issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Sec. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, is hereby authorized to deposit in such banks and trust companies as he may designate the proceeds, or any part thereof, arising from the sale of the bonds and certificates of indebtedness authorized by this act, or the bonds previously authorized as described in section 4 of this act, and such deposits may bear such rate of interest and be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: *Provided*, That the amount so deposited shall not in any case exceed the amount withdrawn from any such bank or trust company and invested in such bonds or certificates of indebtedness plus the amount so invested by such bank or trust company, and such deposits shall be secured in the manner required for other deposits by section 5153, Revised Statutes, and amendments thereto: *Provided further*, That the provisions of section 5191 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the Federal reserve act and the amendments thereof, with reference to the reserves required to be kept by national banking associations and other member banks of the Federal Reserve System, shall not apply to deposits of public moneys by the United States in designated depositories."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the title, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the title inserted by said amendment insert the following: "An act to authorize an issue of bonds to meet

expenditures for the national security and defense, and for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes."

F. M. SIMMONS,  
W. J. STONE,  
JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,  
BOIES PENROSE,  
H. C. LODGE,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

CLAUDE KITCHIN,  
HENRY T. RAINY,  
LINCOLN DIXON,  
J. W. FORDNEY,  
A. P. GARDNER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for the adoption of the conference report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

#### INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1871) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, it is not my purpose at this time to discuss in detail the bill which is now before the Senate. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], has done that in the most comprehensive way, and I assume that there will be opportunity later on to discuss and rebut any arguments that may be made with reference to the provisions of the bill as presented.

When war was declared with Germany, the President was directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States to bring it to a successful conclusion, and we pledged all the resources of our country to that purpose.

The question we must now consider is How are we going to give the President what we have directed him to employ—that is, the naval and military forces of the United States? Are we to do so in a manner which has been demonstrated over and over again as ill-advised, ineffective, and disastrous, or are we to turn our attention to the results of the experience of other countries and take from their experience those lessons which will enable us to steer clear of the follies of the past? That is really the dividing line between general service and volunteer service, between efficiency and inefficiency, and between the judgment of military men everywhere and of those who, through some delusion, would make our country in its hour of greatest need ineffective, if not impotent.

Our own experience in the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, and the Spanish War, has been of one kind and has completely demonstrated, even if no other course had been adopted by other countries, the futility of sending untrained or partially trained troops—very largely officered by patriotic persons who are brave and willing, but insufficiently instructed—against thoroughly equipped and mechanized troops under the direction of trained officers. The result has always been a needless sacrifice of life and health and an enormous and unnecessary expense.

In the Revolutionary War we used 231,771 Regulars and Continental troops and 164,087 militia, a total of 393,858, against which the entire British force from first to last did not exceed 150,000; in other words, the Americans had nearly three men to their enemy's one, and they were operating in a country they knew thoroughly, in the midst of their own bases of supplies, while the enemy were operating a great distance from their base and in a country with which they were not acquainted and of which they could not have had suitable military maps.

In the War of 1812 we had 56,032 Regulars and 471,622 militia against English and Canadian forces of about 55,000 men. There is no more painful page in the history of our Republic than the results of the contests between our land forces and the enemy during this war. With the exception of two or three bright spots, notably at New Orleans, the American armies made a shameful exhibition of their capacity to wage a successful contest against a trained enemy.

Right here in the neighborhood of Washington we have had the example of an American volunteer army, quite likely made up of as brave men as ever shouldered a gun, fleeing before a British force so far inferior in numbers that the comparison is almost ludicrous and permitting, as a result of their inability

to fight as a body, the British to capture Washington and to burn the White House and the Capitol of the Nation.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WEEKS. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Would it interrupt the Senator for me to ask a question just at that point?

Mr. WEEKS. Not at all.

Mr. VARDAMAN. In the light of those disastrous mistakes which the Senator has so graphically portrayed, what explanation has the Senator to give for the failure of Congress and the American people to embark upon the plan which the Senator now proposes, or some similar plan, in order to avoid the possible repetition of those disasters? If the old way was such a bad way, I confess I can not reconcile persistence in it with my idea of the ability, patriotism, and high order of statesmanship of the men who have directed the affairs of this Republic in the past.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I expect to discuss some of those reasons; but I will say to the Senator that in my judgment very much the same reasons have been advanced in the past as will be advanced here during this debate. They are well known; they will be stated by those who have an honest belief that a volunteer system is traditionally the system which this country should follow; and yet I am going to try to demonstrate that they are wrong in the first place, and in the second place that the demonstration of their wrong has been universal, not only in this country but in other countries.

Mr. VARDAMAN. If the able Senator will pardon a further interruption, I should like to suggest to him that it is rather remarkable that the men who conceived this marvelous form of government, gave it being, and directed its growth from its infancy to the present day, when it stands out the strongest, the richest, and in many respects the most remarkable success in governmental experiment beneath the stars—I repeat, it is remarkable that these wise statesmen should have overlooked and disregarded the lesson of experiment and thrown away the wisdom which ought to have been extracted from the mistakes which the Senator has pointed out and pursued the same policy for 125 years. It remained for the wise men of the twentieth century, the heirs of the founders of the Republic, to insist upon this radical change, which to my mind is a reflection upon the capacity to govern and the noble statesmanship of those who have gone before us.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I agree that it is a reflection on their capacity; and it will be a reflection on our capacity if we do not now correct the mistakes of the past.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was interested in the statement the Senator from Massachusetts made, that a small British force defeated a larger American force of volunteer soldiers and burned the Capitol. Does the Senator think the force would have been any stronger if it had been conscripted at that time?

Mr. WEEKS. I think, Mr. President, that if we had had the wisdom to establish universal training in this country, so that we would have had trained men, we then would have been able to protect our own.

Mr. GALLINGER. But we did not have it. Now, my question is susceptible of a direct answer. Does the Senator think that if those soldiers had been conscripted, in place of having been volunteers, they would have been better able to compete with that trained force of the British Army?

Mr. WEEKS. With the same length of service, I think not; but, Mr. President, I am going to discuss the question of universal service. I hope the Military Affairs Committee will report later on a bill providing for universal training, and I am trying to point out why we have failed in the past.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am in favor of universal training, and I want to ask the Senator another question. We are constantly having it said to us that our disaster at the first Bull Run Battle was because our soldiers were untrained; and that was true. The southern army was made up to a very considerable extent of men who had had some military training. But does the Senator think that if that army had been conscripted, in place of having volunteered, they would have stood any better chance in the first Bull Run Battle?

Mr. WEEKS. Probably not, but I want to add if it had been conscripted it would have been a fair representation of the American people. As it was it was made up of an unfair representation of the American people. What we ought to do at this time is to do what is fundamentally and technically the right

thing instead of continuing a policy which is fundamentally and technically wrong.

Mr. GALLINGER. That volunteer army was made up of average good citizens.

Mr. LODGE. Above the average.

Mr. WEEKS. Yes. That is one of the peculiarities with the early volunteers.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not think so. Does the Senator think we are going to have a fair representation of the citizenship of this country if we draft men from 19 to 25?

Mr. WEEKS. I think so.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator thinks so?

Mr. WEEKS. I absolutely think so.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think it the most unfair proposition that ever could be presented.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the Senator inform me whether the troops which won the Battle of New Orleans were volunteers or conscript?

Mr. WEEKS. The men who won the Battle of New Orleans were volunteers who had had a great deal of training in connection with the Indian wars, who knew how to shoot, who were led by a determined man, who knew how to handle his men. They were behind breastworks which had been improvised for the occasion, and they won because they were protected; they were well officered, and they knew how to shoot. That is a part of the general training which we ought to give to our people.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying. I was wondering if he is going to take up in the course of his remarks the history of conscription in this country as well as voluntary service. I wish to ask the Senator if he recalls what took place when the Government instituted conscription by law in 1863?

Mr. WEEKS. Oh, yes; Mr. President, I recall just what happened, and it happened as a result of the intrigues of a lot of copperheads who were doing everything they could to prevent the Government from being successful in prosecuting the war, and there are people in this country who are coming pretty near the line of doing exactly the same thing under present conditions.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; the newspapers say those of us who do not entirely agree with the Senator ought to be put in that class.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think so.

Mr. GALLINGER. I could put in the RECORD some very important newspaper utterances not a thousand miles away from Washington which would indicate it. Now, will the Senator—

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator knows I am not responsible for newspaper utterances. I am responsible for my own.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit one further inquiry? We have had five wars, I believe.

Mr. WEEKS. More than five.

Mr. GALLINGER. Five that are worth enumerating. They were all fought by volunteer forces and we won them all.

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; and at the end of the Civil War we had the finest Army that was ever gotten together. A volunteer force in a Commonwealth which is trained makes the most effective force that can be congregated under any circumstances, infinitely better than Regulars. That has been demonstrated time and time again.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator, if that is so, why change the system that brings about such a splendid force as the Senator has described?

Mr. WEEKS. Because the delay and cost is excessive. If the Senator will give me the opportunity, I will try to demonstrate why I think we ought to change the system. There may be those who do not agree with me, and I should be glad to debate any question which develops as a result of this discussion. This is simply preliminary. I am glad to answer the question and I shall try to answer the question more fully during my discussion.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to preface my question with the statement that it seems to me the Senator's argument thus far made is a logical and correct one in favor of conscription as a permanent policy; but will the Senator claim that in raising an army for the present war we can get a trained army any quicker or a better army by conscription than we could by volunteering? In other words, taking the condition we are in now, whether

we may like it or not, taking it just as it is, will there be any advantage in raising and training an army now by conscription over the volunteer system?

Mr. WEEKS. I think I can answer that.

In the Mexican War the forces involved included 31,024 Regulars, 60,659 Volunteers and Rangers, and 12,601 militia, a total of 104,284 men, while the maximum number of Mexican troops engaged in the war was only about 46,000. In this war the Volunteers were enlisted for one year, and as the war did not end within that time many of them returned to their homes without waiting for its termination.

At the end of the Civil War our volunteers had acquired a training which made them comparable to any army that ever existed. They were without question among the best troops in the world, but the cost of their preparation and the final accomplishment was simply appalling. We employed 67,000 Regulars and at different times 2,606,341 Volunteers, while the Confederacy did not during the entire war employ more than a million and a half men, and perhaps not greatly exceeding 1,000,000. It must be remembered that in this war the Confederacy was operating in interior lines and in their own territory, with which they were entirely familiar, and that to some degree they had previously been given a better training than the men who had come from the commercial and industrial North. But the results on both sides showed lack of experience and suitable previous training.

No intelligent man can go over the battle fields of the earlier days of the war or examine the records of that period without being deeply impressed with not only the lack of experience of the officers but the futility of attempting to fight without the very best training and under the best obtainable officers. Three months after war was declared the Battle of Bull Run was fought, and it showed conclusively the result likely to come in a contest between comparatively untrained forces, and that result would have been accentuated greatly if one of the forces had been made up of trained men. The panic was indescribable, and the evidence is complete that neither side felt itself competent to engage in further actual contests without sufficient preparation, because between the 4th of July, 1861, and the last days of May, 1862, no action worth the name was fought by the Army of the Potomac and the Army of Northern Virginia. It was a period of drill and preparation and assimilation of the forces which had enlisted for long enough periods to give them sufficient training.

In the Spanish-American War we had engaged 58,688 Regulars and 223,235 militia or Volunteers, and the Spaniards did not have over 200,000 men in any part of the territory involved in the contest. In this instance we were fighting with a nation not much better prepared than ourselves, though one that had military traditions, which might have led to the belief that it would have made a better showing.

Thus in two of our foreign wars we were fighting nations incomparably inferior to ours in numbers and resources, while in the other two foreign wars fought with Great Britain we engaged in the contests at a time when that country was not free to devote its entire energies to the wars being waged with us.

The arguments and appeals for trained forces made by military men from Washington and his lieutenants down to the present day are of one tenor; indeed, it would be difficult to find a trained military man anywhere in the world not in favor of universal training and universal service. Continental Europe has been committed to this policy for many years, and the soldiers of Great Britain, like the late Lord Roberts, Earl Kitchener, and others, who have in the past and their successors who are at the present time demonstrating their efficiency, are quite as insistent along this line as their brother soldiers of the Continent. The ideas of our own trained soldiers are in entire conformity with those of the soldiers of other nations.

Great Britain failed to heed Lord Roberts and the others, and this failure resulted in the loss of a great many of the most promising and patriotic young men of Great Britain and her colonies. Her failure to be prepared nearly lost the war, and imposed upon her allies a double burden until she could prepare herself to do her part.

Not only are the trained soldiers of our Regular Army favorable to universal training and service but their opinion is shared by our citizen soldiers, as is clearly demonstrated by the replies received to a series of questions asked last year by Representative GARDNER, through Gen. Bell, while the National Guard was on duty on the border. The head of every independent National Guard organization was asked this question: "Have you formed an opinion upon the question of universal military training? If so, what are your ideas?" Five hundred and ten answers were received to this question, 500 being in favor of universal training and 10 opposed to it. The 500 men favoring universal training included 16 colonels, 250 captains, and 234 first sergeants. The

10 included one colonel, 5 captains, and 4 first sergeants. As far as I am informed these National Guard units came from every section of the country, and it would seem to be a complete indorsement of the principle of universal training from our citizen soldiers.

Whenever we have waged a great war it has been necessary to resort to draft in order to bring it to a successful conclusion. As early as 1777, within about a year of the beginning of the Revolutionary War, the then leading Colonies of Massachusetts and Virginia were forced to resort to draft, and notwithstanding the disjointed efforts of the Colonies to keep up their complements the patriot armies which in 1776 had been 89,000 men had shrunk to 29,000 in 1781. In 1812 the volunteer system was so conspicuously unsatisfactory and incompetent that even Mr. Jefferson, who was certainly not a man of the military type, was obliged to make a protest against such a system.

From 1802 to 1808 all measures, whether offensive or defensive, looked almost exclusively to the use of militia and volunteers. In 1807, when for the second time our relations with Great Britain had become strained, the President was authorized to accept 30,000 Volunteers, officered by the several States, and says Gen. Emory Upton, probably the best military expert developed by our Civil War, "more than half a century later we reaped the bitter fruit of this system at the Battle of Bull Run." Thus was the volunteer system given preference in anticipation of the War of 1812. But long before that war had been brought to a close the folly of the system had manifested itself to such a degree that Thomas Jefferson wrote:

It proves most forcibly the necessity of obliging every citizen to be a soldier. This was the case with the Greeks and Romans, and must be that of every free State. \* \* \* We must train and classify the whole of our male population. \* \* \* We can never be safe until this is done.

The volunteer system having failed before the close of the War of 1812, the Government was forced to devise various schemes for raising men, and was only able to avoid a draft by the speedy termination of the war.

In the Mexican War nearly the entire force of Volunteers was raised under one call and enlisted for a period of one year. It required almost the entire 12 months to train this volunteer force in the ways of war, and the training having been completed and the term of enlistment exhausted practically the entire volunteer force withdrew from the service, although the war was not over.

I might at this time call attention to the results during the Civil War due to a termination of the service of Volunteers. When Gen. Lee was making his invasion of Pennsylvania in 1863, when there was danger of an attack upon the Capital, the terms of service of many men ended; that is, on the 30th of June of that year. One regiment of Volunteers which was passing through the Capital was asked to remain and defend the Capital, or to remain long enough to be sure that their aid was not necessary, and of those men—loyal men, I presume, generally speaking—only about one-half consented to remain and protect their Capital.

Despite the unfortunate experiences of the Government with the volunteer system in almost every instance in which it had been put to the test, it was again resorted to at the outbreak of the Civil War. The difficulties experienced in that struggle through the use of Volunteers were occasioned, to some extent, by the fact that short enlistments were made the practice. Nevertheless, in resorting to the draft, President Lincoln in an address to the American people, which set forth some of the human traits which must forever be a weak point in the volunteer system, said in part:

At the beginning of the war, and ever since, a variety of motives, pressing some in one direction and some in the other, would be presented to the mind of each man physically fit for a soldier, upon the combined effect of which motives he would or would not voluntarily enter the service. Among these would be patriotism, political bias, ambition, personal courage, love of adventure, want of employment, and convenience, or the opposite of some of these. We already have and have had in the service, as appears, substantially all that can be obtained upon this voluntary weighing of motives. And yet we must somehow obtain more or relinquish the original object of the contest, together with all the blood and treasure already expended in the effort to secure it. To meet this necessity the law for the draft has been enacted. You who do not wish to be soldiers do not like this law.

The report of the provost marshal general of the Civil War, Gen. Fry, is eloquent of the failure of the volunteer system at the most critical period of the war. He said in part:

During the latter part of 1862 the necessity for a radical change in the method of recruiting troops in order to prosecute the war to a successful issue became more and more apparent. The demand for reinforcements from the various armies in the field steadily and largely exceeded the supply of men. The old agencies of filling the ranks proved more and more ineffective. It was evident that the efforts of the Government for the suppression of the rebellion would fall without a resort to the unpopular, but nevertheless truly republican, measure of conscription. \* \* \*

But it was not easy to convince the public mind at once of the justice and wisdom of conscription. It was a novelty, contrary to the traditional military policy of the Nation. The people had become more accustomed to the enjoyment of privileges than to the fulfillment of duties under the General Government, and hence beheld the prospect of compulsory service in the Army with an unreasonable dread. Among the laboring classes especially it produced great uneasiness. Fortunately, the loyal political leaders and press early realized the urgency of conscription, and, by judicious agitation, gradually reconciled the public to it. \* \* \* The public safety would have been risked by a longer delay in the enactment of this law. A general apathy prevailed throughout the country on the subject of volunteering.

Mr. President, I wish to demonstrate that the press of to-day is as loyal as the press of that time, so I include in my remarks the statement of a large number of newspapers throughout the country which have indorsed the act which is now pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Five hundred and one newspapers scattered over every section of the United States recognize the vital necessity for the immediate passage by Congress of a universal military training law and urge this action in their editorial columns. The advocates of universal military training include practically all the big dailies of the country. The list follows:

Maine: Portland Eastern Argus and Press, Bangor News, Rockland Opinion and Courier-Gazette.

New Hampshire: Manchester Union, Keene Sentinel, Rochester Courier, and Strafford County Record.

Vermont: Burlington News, St. Albans Messenger, and St. Johnsbury Caledonian.

Massachusetts: Boston American, Journal, Post, and Transcript, Pittsfield News, Westfield Journal, Springfield Union, Fitchburg Sentinel and News, Lowell Courier-Citizen and Sun, Amesbury News, Lynn News and Telegram, Salem News, Rockland Standard and Independent, Waltham News, Brockton Times, Worcester Post, Norwood Messenger, New Bedford Times, Mercury, and Standard, and Plymouth Old Colony Memorial.

Connecticut: Hartford Courant, Post, Times, and Globe, New London Day and Telegraph, Meriden Record, New Haven Courier, Evening Register, Times-Leader, and Union, Bridgeport Farmer, Telegram, Post, and Standard, Norwalk Hour and Sentinel, Ansonia Sentinel, Waterbury Democrat, American, and Republican, New Milford Times, Torrington Register and News.

Rhode Island: Providence Journal, Bulletin, and Tribune, Newport News, Pawtucket Times, and Westerly Sun.

New York: New York City Times, Herald and Telegram, Morning Telegraph, World and Evening World, American and Journal, Tribune, Sun and Evening Sun, Globe and Mail, Brooklyn Eagle, Standard Union, and Times, Long Island City Star, Flushing Queens Chronicle, Peekskill Times, News, Union, and Highland Democrat, Rye Chronicle, White Plains Argus, Record, Eastern State Journal, and Westchester News, Ossining Democratic Register, Citizen, and Sentinel, Middletown Argus and Orange County Times-Press, Newburgh Journal, Valatie Rough Notes, Kingston Express, Freeman, and Leader, Catskill Examiner, Recorder, and Mail, Albany Journal, Knickerbocker-Press, and Times-Union, Cohoes Republican, Glen Falls Times, Johnstown Leader-Republican, Saratoga Sun and Saratogian, Amsterdam Recorder-Democrat and Sentinel, Ogdensburg News, Watertown Standard and Times, Binghamton Press, Rome Sentinel, Utica Herald-Dispatch, Cortland Standard and Democrat, Auburn Citizen, Newark Union-Gazette, Ithaca Journal and News, Rochester Chronicle, Post-Express, and Times, Albion Orleans Republican and Orleans American and News, Niagara Falls Gazette, Buffalo Commercial Express and News, Dunkirk Grape Belt and Observer.

New Jersey: Newark Star and News, Jersey City Journal, Hoboken Hudson Observer, Ridgewood Herald and News, Perth Amboy News, Clinton Democrat, Somerville Unionist-Gazette, Democrat, and Messenger, Trenton Times, Elizabeth Journal and Times, Plainfield Courier-News and Record, Summit Herald, Rahway Record, Westfield Leader, Englewood Press, Hackensack Record, Newton Register, Passaic Herald, Paterson Guardian, and Bayonne Review and Times.

Pennsylvania: Philadelphia Bulletin, Public Ledger and Evening Ledger, Inquirer, Press, Record, and Star, Pittsburgh Gazette-Times and Press, Scranton Scrantonian, Warren Mirror and Times, Washington News, Wilkes-Barre Independent, Record, Times-Leader and News, Williamsport Sun, York Daily, Dispatch, and Gazette, Butler Citizen, Du Bois Express, Easton Free Press, Erie Herald, Franklin News and Herald, Hazleton Standard, Johnstown Tribune, Lancaster Intelligencer, New Era, Examiner, and News-Journal, Lock Haven Dispatch, Express, and Clinton Democrat, Mount Carmel Item, Carbondale Leader, Coal-dale Observer, Kane Republican and Leader, Meadville Tribune-Republican, Monessen Independent and News, Mount Pleasant Journal, New Castle News and Herald, Uniontown News-Standard, Herald-Republican, and Genius-Republican.

Maryland: Baltimore American, News, Star, and Sun, Ellicott City Times, Laurel Democrat, Cumberland News and Times, and Frostburg Mining Journal.

Virginia: Richmond Leader and Times-Dispatch, Covington Virginian, Danville Register, Petersburg Index-Appeal and Progress, Roanoke Times, and Norfolk Virginian-Pilot.

West Virginia: Clarksburg Exponent and Fairmont Times and West Virginian.

Kentucky: Paducah Democrat, Newport Kentucky Post, Lexington Herald, Ashland Independent, Maysville Bulletin, Independent, and Public Ledger, and Hopkinsville Kentucky New Era and Kentuckian.

Tennessee: Knoxville Sentinel, Nashville Banner, Memphis Appeal, Scimitar, and Press.

North Carolina: Charlotte Observer, Asheville Times, Elizabeth City Advance and News, Washington News, New Bern Sun-Journal and New Bronian, Oxford Public Ledger, Reidsville Review, Wilmington Star, and Salisbury Post.

Georgia: Athens Banner and Herald, Griffin News and Sun, Dalton North Georgia Citizen, Valdosta Times, Dublin Courier-Herald, and Laurens Citizen.

Alabama: Mobile Tribune, Item, and Register, Montgomery Advertiser, Birmingham News and Talladega Our Mountain Home, and Alabama Reporter.

Mississippi: Jackson News, Vicksburg Herald, Post, and Times-Democrat, Natchez Democrat, and Brookhaven Leader.

Florida: Lake City Citizen-Reporter and Index.

Louisiana: New Orleans American, Item, and Times-Picayune, and Shreveport Journal, Times, News, and Caucasian.

Ohio: Columbus Citizen, Cincinnati Times-Star, Inquirer, Post, and Tribune, Cleveland Leader, News, Plain-Dealer, and Press, Urbana Citizen, Gallon Inquirer and Leader, Kenton News-Republican and Democrat, Chillicothe Scioto Gazette, Akron Times and Press, Delaware Journal-Herald and Gazette, Mansfield News and Shield, Wellsville Union, Norwood Enterprise and Republican, Portsmouth Times, and St. Marys Leader.

Indiana: Terre Haute Star, Indianapolis News, Linton Citizen, Seymour Republican and Democrat, Anderson Bulletin, Valparaiso Vidette, Noblesville Ledger, Wabash Times-Star, Marion Chronicle, and Goshen Democrat and News-Times.

Illinois: Chicago American, Post, Examiner, Journal, Herald, News, and Tribune; Belvidere Republican; La Salle Post and Tribune; Rock Island Union; Galesburg Republican-Register; Peoria Star; Decatur Review and Herald; Jacksonville Journal and Courier; Belleville Advocate; Collinsville Advertiser-Press; Harrisburg Register; Cairo Bulletin; Carbondale Free Press and Southern Illinois Herald; Joliet Herald-News; Ottawa Free Trader-Journal and Republican-Times.

Wisconsin: La Crosse Leader-Press; Oshkosh Northwestern; Stevens Point Journal and Gazette; and Wausau Record-Herald, Pilot, and Wochenblatt.

Michigan: Detroit Free Press and Gateway; Kalamazoo Progressive Herald; Adrian Telegram; Battle Creek Moon-Journal, News, and Inquirer; Flint Journal; Lansing State Journal; Cadillac News; Manistee News-Advocate; Calumet News; and Houghton Gazette.

Minnesota: St. Paul Dispatch and Pioneer Press, Minneapolis Journal and Tribune, Stillwater Gazette and Messenger, Wadena Pioneer-Journal, Duluth News-Tribune, and Cloquet Pine Knot.

South Dakota: Aberdeen News and American.

Iowa: Des Moines Capital and News; Burlington Hawk-Eye; Fort Madison Democrat and Gem City; Waterloo Courier; Cedar Falls Record; Oelwein Iowan and Register; Cedar Rapids Republican, Times, and Gazette; Clarinda Herald; Creston Advertiser; and Sioux City Journal and Tribune.

Nebraska: Omaha True Voice, Ord Quiz and Kearney Hub and Times, Kansas; Wichita Eagle; Rosedale Interstate News; Coffeyville Journal, Sun, and Independent; Pittsburg Sun; and Wellington News.

Missouri: St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Post-Dispatch, Republic, and Star; Kansas City Journal, Star, and Times; St. Joseph News-Press and Gazette; Chillicothe Tribune and Constitution; Trenton Republican-Tribune and Times; Carthage Press; and Joplin Globe and News-Herald.

Arkansas: Little Rock Gazette, Pine Bluff Graphic, and Fort Smith Times-Record and Southwestern American.

Oklahoma: Battlesville Enterprise and Examiner, Guthrie Leader, and Shawnee Herald.

Texas: Corsicana Light and Sun; Fort Worth Record; San Antonio Express; Waco Times-Herald; Amarillo News; Brownwood Herald, Bulletin, and Pecan Valley News; Dallas News, Journal, Dispatch, and Times-Herald; and Temple Mirror.

New Mexico: Albuquerque Journal and Roswell Record and News.

Nevada: Reno Journal.

Colorado: Denver Rock Mountain News; Boulder News-Herald, Camera, and Miner; Cripple Creek Times; and Grand Junction News.

Montana: Helena Independent, Anaconda Standard, and Bozeman Courier and Chronicle.

Idaho: Boise Statesman and Twin Falls News and Times.

Oregon: Portland Telegram, Oregonian, and Spectator; and Astoria Astorian.

Washington: Seattle Post-Intelligencer and Times; Spokane Chronicle, Spokesman-Review, and Press; Tacoma Ledger; and Vancouver Columbian and Clarke County Sun.

Utah: Ogden Examiner and Salt Lake City Republican and Tribune.

California: San Francisco Call and Examiner; Sacramento Union and Star; Chico Enterprise; Bakersfield Echo; Fresno Republican and Herald; Santa Barbara Press; San Jose Herald; Long Beach Telegram; Los Angeles Examiner, Express, Times, and Tribune; Santa Monica Vanguard-Sun; Riverside Enterprise; San Bernardino Index; and Richmond Independent.

The Minneapolis Tribune says: "Universal training is not only the best safeguard against war, but the only scheme that puts the rich and poor on exactly the same footing in the matter of military service if war should come."

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch says: "Congress ought to pass at the earliest possible moment a measure embodying the main provisions of the Chamberlain bill. The people ought to demand it as a measure of wise and useful preparedness."

The Seattle Times says: "Compulsory military training is an urgent necessity as a means of assuring the Nation a dependable reserve of trained men for any emergency that may arise."

The New Orleans Item says: "This paper long ago exhausted its vocabulary in arguments in favor of a compulsory system of military training. It is the only democratic form of military service. It is the only practical form of preparedness."

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I am the last person to do an injustice to the National Guard. I have served in it for many years. I think I know its high purposes, its loyal membership, and its desire to be militarily useful. Moreover, in recent years, there has been a marked increase in its efficiency, somewhat due, of course, to the legislation of 1903 and other subsequent legislation. Yet, our National Guard is composed of 48 units, the officers of which are elected and, in time of war, appointed by the governors of the several States. Necessarily, the efficiency of these units vary, because the same support and encouragement is not given to the guard in each State, and very seldom is the guard enlisted to its full strength. Many men who enlist are found disqualified for various reasons and are discharged before they receive much training; many lose interest and fail to attend drills, being discharged for cause, without any resulting stigma attached to their leaving the guard; and the number of long-service and well-trained men in comparison to the total number connected with the guard is relatively small. Probably not more than 25 to 30 per cent

of the National Guards which went to the border last year had received more than a year's training, which meant, in addition to the week ordinarily spent in camp, not more than from 50 to 100 hours of drill a year.

To show how inadequate this amount of training is considered by those directing European military affairs, it is only necessary to compare this period of drill with that given European recruits before being sent to the front. At this time no recruit is considered fitted to come into contact with the enemy until he has received at least 2,400 hours of drill. When our men went to the border last year, a very considerable percentage—possibly as many as one-half—had never fired a rifle and nearly as large a proportion had never had an hour's drill.

Moreover, as I have suggested, the selection of officers, which is done under the provisions of the Constitution, presents a serious difficulty. They are elected by their men, and the election, while it produces many admirable officers, is more or less influenced by social or political reasons and almost always affected by the element of good fellowship. As a matter of fact, officers should be chosen solely on account of their military qualifications. Leadership in military affairs, as in every other walk in life, must include a knowledge greater than that possessed by others. A man who knows more than his fellow men is a leader, wherever he may be, and therefore, in fitting out military organizations, one of the first requirements is that an officer must be competent to instruct and lead his men, in which case he will have their respect and will be followed by them even though they may not have a personal liking for him.

I have heard many complaints about the hardships brought about by sending the National Guardsmen to the border last year to perform police duty. There is reason for these complaints, because men who had been patriotic enough to join the National Guard suddenly found themselves dragooned into performing a service they had not anticipated or desired, while many of their fellow citizens were at home following their civil employments. Yet, if every man had had to take his chance of performing this service there could not have been any reason for complaint.

The Commander in Chief considered it necessary that such service should be performed on the border, and the National Guard was the only available force for that purpose. The National Guard, however, through its constituted representatives, is responsible for being placed in this position. I do not mean its representatives in every State—I am glad to say that the leading officers in the State of Massachusetts were opposed to the military legislation placing the guard in this position—but the adjutants general of most of the States brought all the political pressure they could to bear on Congress last year, and, as a result, obtained the legislation they desired and which made it necessary for the National Guard to perform this police duty. However, the feeling was created that the guards sent to the border were unjustly treated, because a great many of their fellow men were exempted from such duty, and for that reason alone, in my opinion.

Those who are urging a retention of the volunteer system emphasize the fact that there is merit in retaining historical associations, such as the names of well-known State and local military organizations. There is no doubt about the validity of such a claim. The long-continued service of an organization of distinguished character attracts enrollments in its membership. Everyone can recall the names of famous military organizations in this country which have had brilliant records. This, however, is not unusual in other countries and is equally true in countries where universal service prevails. The well-known regiments like the Grenadiers and the Black Watch and other similarly prominent organizations in Great Britain are as familiar to the rest of the world as to the inhabitants of England. A similar policy is followed in Russia and in Germany. In Germany troops from the different sections of the country are usually included in organizations by themselves. We read of the Bavarians, the Württembergers, the Saxons, and the Prussians, and there is no reason why such a policy should not be followed in this country under a conscription system. It seems to me it would be particularly unfortunate to make up our organizations from groups of men coming from different sections of the country. They can serve in every way as well, and will be more willing to enlist if they are to enter organizations made up of men coming from the same general locality and who may be their personal friends.

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States makes the most ample provision for the protection of the citizen and in permitting him to exercise his rights in all matters pertaining to citizenship. He is assured of entire freedom of religion and speech and is permitted to petition the Government for a

redress of grievances. He is protected against unreasonable search of his person, house, or effects, and is assured against unjust arrest and imprisonment, and no State is permitted to deprive him of his life, liberty, or property without due process of law. The Government not only protects a person in the exercise of every conceivable liberty which does not involve a violation of law, but it goes further than that and protects him and his property abroad. It has contracted agreements with other nations assuring American citizens impartial treatment while sojourning within their territory, and our history is filled with instances in which the Government has taken drastic measures where the life or property of a citizen have been endangered in foreign lands.

We fought the Tripolitan War in 1803 because American citizens were seized and imprisoned by the Tripolitan pirates, their property sequestered, and because our commerce was constantly preyed upon and great financial tributes demanded by the Tripolitan leaders as ransom for our sailors. We fought the War of 1812 to maintain the rights of American citizens from the claim of the British Government of the right of search and seizure. It is not necessary to instance individual cases, though it will not be unreasonable to call attention to one or two to show what has been the policy of our Government in such matters.

For example, in 1852 Martin Koszta, a political refugee from Austria to the United States, made declaration under oath of his intention to become an American citizen. After remaining here nearly two years he went to Turkey on business, placing himself under the protection of the United States consul at Smyrna. While there he was seized by a band of lawless men, thrown into the sea, and immediately thereafter taken up by a boat's crew belonging to an Austrian man-of-war. Their plan, apparently, was to return Koszta to Austrian territory; but opportunely an American sloop-of-war, the *St. Louis*, under Capt. Ingraham, arrived in the harbor, and the release of the captive was demanded. Force was threatened, but unnecessary, as the Austrians finally released Koszta and he returned safely to the United States. Incidentally, I will say Congress thought that incident so important that it voted a sword to Capt. Ingraham for the prompt and effective action which he took.

On another occasion, in 1904, Ion Perdicaris, an American residing near Tangier, Morocco, was abducted by a bandit named Raisuli. The American consul immediately notified the Moroccan authorities that they would be held responsible for the safe return of Perdicaris. Long negotiations followed until finally Secretary of State Hay sent his famous message to the American consul general at Tangier that "the United States wants Perdicaris alive or Raisuli dead," and five weeks after his abduction this American citizen had regained his liberty.

Now, having all the rights of a free people and having the protection of the Government wherever the citizen may be or whatever the condition of his qualification for citizenship, it can not be an unreasonable position to say that the citizen shall respond to the just requirements of government, and we do compel him by stringent legislation to observe all laws and regulations concerning public health. We compel him, except when reasonable excuse is offered, to serve on the jury, and there are innumerable other civil examples to show the policy of the Government in requiring its citizens to support it in time of peace and to help, in proportion to their capacity and opportunity, in maintaining and executing the laws. If it is practicable to permit such action in time of peace, how much more necessary must it be to require from every citizen in time of war those things which he can best do to maintain and uphold his Government.

Unfortunately, up to the present time, this has not been the case. While our Government has been most scrupulous in its efforts to fulfill its obligations to the citizenry, it has been far too lenient, even in time of great national peril, in calling upon the citizens to reciprocate. It has said in effect: "Those of you who desire to do your duty may do so; others may do as they please," and the result has been that most of our wars have been unduly prolonged, and, before victory has been assured, it has been necessary for us to employ at least two men to every one used by our adversaries.

Mr. President, there is nothing in national compulsion repellent to democracy, provided the thing to be compelled is recognized as beneficial to the Nation. If there were, it would reject governmental regulation of the hours of labor, compulsory insurance, and compulsory education. A democracy like ours is made up of millions of units, and its success, in the final analysis, will be determined by the intelligence of these units. Therefore, we not only provide education at the public expense but compel it within reasonable limitations. If it is beneficial to the country that its citizens should be educated and educated as a result of compulsion, is it not equally desirable when the country needs



defense that we should take those citizens who have been educated at the public expense and require them to defend what the world has agreed is the best form of government extant.

Moreover, a system of compulsory training should be established. The opposition of the opponents to compulsory training is based on the theory that it is not necessary, but when we come to a national crisis we immediately discover that there is no time for the preparation we should have made. Tyranny, not democracy, has always justified itself by suppressing discussion or action as unnecessary.

It is rather a curious statement, but true, nevertheless, that men who work for very different purposes in life have, through their studies, come to an entire agreement on the question of compulsory military service. While, as I have stated, most trained military men whether citizens of an autocracy or of a republic, are in favor of it—we have not expected the most radical pacifists to support it—we have been lead to believe that there was a vast difference of opinion on the question of compulsory military training and service among the peoples of those European countries where that system obtains, and that liberals and socialists were generally opposed to it. We hear substantially nothing from any such sources in opposition to the prosecution of the war or in detraction of the policy followed by their countries in preparation for it; indeed, compulsory service seems to have practically unanimous support in continental European countries.

Such men as Vaillant and Jean Jaures, two of the most noted pacifists of France, long ago came to the conclusion that compulsory service was absolutely essential, and in his last days Jaures published a book which was a plea for compulsory military training based on the Swiss method, and advocated that it should commence as early as the age of 10. I quote the following from Jaures' book, and Jaures was one of the leading Socialists of Europe.

A government which is demonstrably and genuinely a government of national defense, which can give proof of its reverence for law and justice, is entitled to call on every available man in time of need. The resentment which men feel at being obliged to leave their families will be directed against the aggressor and will strengthen their resolve to defend the country. It will be the duty of the country, defended by all its citizens, to provide for the families of those who fall in its defense.

Switzerland in the first week of the present war mobilized a force of 200,000 men, which would be equivalent to practically 6,000,000 in the United States; and in order to bring about a result so important it is necessary to take out of the working life of the citizen only a little more than six months. The Swiss system is one we could well afford to copy as far as it would directly apply to our conditions, for it is strictly defensive and intended simply for the defense of the country and not for the purpose of waging foreign wars.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WATSON. I understand the Senator's argument to be an argument in favor of universal military training. Does the Senator make no distinction between universal military training and the selective-draft system proposed by this bill?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, universal military training is simply a forerunner of the system which we should have in force, but which we have not. Every citizen should be trained, prepared, and compelled to serve his country in the way he can serve it best. It may not be in a military way; it may be in raising potatoes or serving as a United States Senator or in some other way. I am in favor of compelling everybody to do his share as a citizen of the Republic in maintaining the Government in time of need.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely; but—

Mr. WEEKS. Now, just let me go on one moment.

Mr. WATSON. Certainly. Pardon me.

Mr. WEEKS. I admit we are not in condition to do that today because we have had no universal-training law in operation. I hope there will be one; but why I am arguing in favor of this bill which is pending before the Senate is because I believe it is the only fair system to impose; and I think, if the Senator will do me the honor to listen to me, he will obtain my reasons for thinking so before I finish my address.

Mr. WATSON. I shall be very glad, of course, to listen to the Senator, but I thought that, in my own mind, at any rate, he was confusing universal military training with the idea of the selective draft, as embodied in this measure.

Mr. WEEKS. It is impossible to divorce universal military training and universal service.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely; one follows the other.

Mr. WEEKS. One follows the other.

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

Mr. WEEKS. Now, we have not had universal training, and we want it—or most of us do—and we want universal service at this time. There ought not to be a single slacker in the United States. Either every man should be engaged in the military service or he should be engaged in some other way in supporting his Government at this time.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield, if the Senator from Indiana has concluded.

Mr. REED. I do not want to break in on the chain of inquiry of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. WATSON. I only desired to pursue the matter just one further step. I thoroughly agree with the Senator in his contention that it is entirely desirable from every standpoint that we should have universal military training, followed by universal military service; but we can not have universal service, except by the preliminary step of universal military training.

Mr. WEEKS. I disagree with the Senator in that respect entirely; and that is what we are trying to bring about now, so far as we can, by this legislation.

Mr. WATSON. I understand that this legislation simply proposes to go into each community and take out certain persons to be put in the Army, to be selected in a certain way, under a selective draft.

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Now, whether a man is drafted or volunteers, he is still a raw recruit, is he not?

Mr. WEEKS. He is, or, at least, he may be.

Mr. WATSON. Yes; and he will have to go through precisely the same military training in order to become a soldier whether he is drafted or whether he volunteers?

Mr. WEEKS. He will.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely. So that there is nothing about the draft which makes a man a soldier by the mere act of being drafted?

Mr. WEEKS. Not at all.

Mr. WATSON. And, therefore, so far as obtaining immediate results are concerned, there is nothing sacred about the draft?

Mr. WEEKS. Not at all.

Mr. WATSON. Well, I wanted to get the Senator's viewpoint.

Mr. WEEKS. More than that, there is not only nothing sacred about the draft, but there is a great deal of prejudice against a draft. Now, however, we have an opportunity to do what those who have preceded us for 125 years have failed to do. We have an opportunity to establish what the whole world says is a correct military system; and why should we throw away this opportunity simply because for the moment we do not get better results than we would by following the old system?

Mr. REED. When did the whole world say that?

Mr. WEEKS. If the Senator had been listening to me, and if he will do me that honor to listen to me until I finish, he may be able to get an answer to a question which evidently he has asked haphazard. I will say to the Senator that he can not find a single trained, competent military man in the world who is not in favor of universal training and of universal service.

Mr. REED. I can find the Senator one; I can cite him to one now, the best soldier in the United States to-day—Gen. Miles.

Mr. WATSON. Well, Mr. President, I rather agree with the Senator from Massachusetts in his contention; but that is not the selective-draft proposition which is favored in certain quarters; it is universal military training; and I think there is the greatest difference in the world, a chasm as wide as from the North Pole to the South Pole, between universal training and the selective-draft system proposed in this bill.

Mr. WEEKS. Now, let me make this suggestion to the Senator from Indiana: A selective-draft system is not ideal; it is going to take one man and not take another; but it is going to give every man a chance; and it is going to prevent the fellows who are standing around on the street corners down town—the slacker, who never does anything for his country—it is going to give him the same chance that the boy who is going to be a worthy citizen has to serve his country.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. WEEKS. It is not going to take your boy and mine, necessarily, who may be fit and who may be prepared to make good citizens in the future, but it is going to give them an equal chance with every sluggard, every slacker, every fellow who is standing around the street corners and wasting his time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is going to take the boys of 25 and exclude the boys of 26.

Mr. WEEKS. It is.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is not universal; that is the most arrant discrimination and injustice.

Mr. WEEKS. There are good reasons for it, because the whole history of the world has demonstrated that the men who serve and serve best are under 25 years of age. There were only 46,000 men in the northern Army during our Civil War who were over 25 years of age when enlisted out of 2,600,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Very true; but that great Army was organized of enlisted men, and was a magnificent Army.

Mr. WEEKS. It was when it came out of the war.

Mr. LODGE. They had four years' training.

Mr. GALLINGER. They could not have had four years' training before they enlisted, nor four days' training, any more than the conscripts under this bill can have.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know that the Senator has covered it, and if he has I will read it in his speech—I have only come in in the last few moments—but I am very anxious to know how this bill links in with and fits into the proposition of universal training. It seems to me this is the very antithesis of universal training. It is by its terms limited to a very few and even to only a portion of those included between 19 and 25.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I think the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee would say to the Senator that it is his purpose to try to bring out of the Military Affairs Committee, before this session of Congress is over, a bill providing for universal training. It has not been attached to this bill for the very good reason that we can not commence to recruit our armies until Congress has decided how it shall be done, and therefore it did not seem desirable to involve that question in the legislation which is now pending.

Mr. BORAH. Precisely; but what I want to get in my mind is in what respect am I indorsing universal service by voting for a bill which provides for a selective draft?

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator is indorsing it in this way—that every man stands his chance of being selected and of serving in some capacity, if we follow it by requiring certain men to work in munitions factors, certain men to work on the farm, and certain men to do other things.

Mr. BORAH. You could do that under the volunteer system. Canada has done it.

Mr. WEEKS. Well, Mr. President, I noticed this morning, that these regiments in the city of Washington, right under the shadow of the Capitol, are short 644 men, and that since the 1st day of April only 104 men have been enlisted. In other words, it will take nearly nine months to enlist the National Guard regiments in the city of Washington up to maximum requirements, if we follow the volunteer system.

Mr. WATSON. But after all—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I make a statement—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield, and to whom?

Mr. WEEKS. I have been pretty liberal in yielding. I am quite willing to yield for questions, and I am desirous of bringing out any objections to anything I have said or may say, but I do think I should yield to one Senator at a time, and just now I have yielded to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. I want to ask only one more question. I am not asking these questions to combat the Senator's position.

Mr. WEEKS. Oh, I understand.

Mr. BORAH. I have been wholly unable to reconcile this bill with the propaganda which has been going on for the last year and a half for universal training and universal military service, and I should like to have the Senator—who is not only a member of the committee but peculiarly fitted to discuss this question—enlighten some of us as to how and wherein we are in any sense aiding universal military training and universal military service by voting for a selective draft, which contemplates, in the first place, limiting it to men from 19 to 25 and, in the second place, selecting a very few of the men between those ages. Now, you might go into a neighborhood where there were 10 boys and select 1. He would get his military training, while the other 9 would be in the same position that they were before.

Mr. WEEKS. Well, Mr. President, there are practical reasons why this can not be made any more comprehensive. It is estimated that we require at this time a million men. There would be probably, between the ages of 19 and 25, 6,000,000 men.

We could not arm and equip 6,000,000 men with our present system inside of three years. What nonsense it would be to make a draft which would cover all of the men suitable for military service within those ages and have them taken away from their normal employments and not be able to arm and equip them or make any military use of them. Therefore it is necessary to take a portion of them rather than all.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think the statement was read into the RECORD on Saturday by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] that under the volunteer system of Great Britain there went from the factories and from the manufacturing enterprises of the country practically all of the available men, with the result that after they did get an army they had to bring back all of these men.

Mr. WEEKS. That undoubtedly is true, Mr. President, and it was especially true of men connected with steamships or any other water service.

Mr. BORAH. But that has not happened in Canada.

Mr. WEEKS. Men employed along the water front went into the naval reserve and became at once attached to the Government operations to such a degree that for a time it was impossible to discharge steamers which had landed at Liverpool and other British ports. We want to prevent that. We do not want to take men away from the factories that are making munitions or clothing or doing the other things which are just as necessary to the Government as the actual military service which this bill contemplates.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WEEKS. I do.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. This bill does create, does it not, a universal liability to military service between the ages of 19 and 25?

Mr. WEEKS. Absolutely so.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is, except for certain exemptions contained in the bill.

Mr. WEEKS. Now I should like to have an opportunity to go on with my remarks. I was speaking of the Swiss system when I was interrogated. This system is not only compulsory and general but it is democratic in that all promotions result from competition and all ordinary social qualifications are removed. The Swiss system has the approval of those responsible for military affairs and government in Switzerland, and it meets the approval of all classes to such an extent that the rejection of a recruit on account of physical disqualifications or other reasons is looked on as a disaster.

The attitude of Liberals and Socialists in Belgium on this question is not different from that in France and Switzerland. There, after long discussion, the Liberals took the lead in advocating universal service, and they were supported by substantially the entire Socialist Party. The opposition came from Conservatives.

We all know that in this country a man wearing the uniform of a United States soldier or sailor is tabooed in many places. This was once the condition in Europe, but since the adoption of universal service in European countries the uniform is universally respected, and many social benefits have resulted from the intercourse of men of all classes, rich and poor, during their periods of military training. One of the greatest "outs" about the English Territorials, and one which it is almost impossible to disconnect from a similar service, is the frequent distinction of birth and wealth between an officer and a private. That is impossible in a universal-service system.

Jaures said in one of his articles on the subject of universal training that a volunteer army for France was as undesirable and unthinkable as voluntary taxation. In referring to the political phase of the question, he said:

Any political party which is too cowardly to demand from the nation the sacrifices which are necessary to its life and its liberties is beneath contempt, and can not survive.

Vaillant has said that—

universal service is one natural and inevitable direction of true democratic development.

To demonstrate to the Senate that the opinions of the European workingman are no different from those of the wage-earners of this country who have given the subject consideration, I wish to read the following extract from an editorial which appeared in a recent edition of one of the New York papers:

ORGANIZED LABOR ACTED WISELY IN ENDORSING COMPULSORY UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING.

The declaration in favor of compulsory universal military training by the representatives of organized labor is a momentous event in the history of our country. It signifies the abandonment of the opposition to preparedness by the workmen of the country; or rather it signifies the victory of the workmen of the country over the opposition to improper methods of preparedness.

The workmen have always very wisely opposed that preparedness which is based upon a large standing army of professional soldiers. They knew instinctively that there was danger to the country in a large standing army of professional soldiers. And it is largely due to the weight of their wise influence that military preparedness in this country has not taken the direction of an increase in the size of our professional army. A great standing army of professional soldiers would be dangerous to our internal liberties and ineffective as a defense from danger from outside.

But universal compulsory military training is an entirely different thing. Liberty was never endangered by a citizen soldiery, but liberty has many times been preserved by a body of trained citizens called from all walks of life to render service in the hour of need for which they had been amply trained.

In the history of the world the trained citizen soldiers have made the best armies. Never have they been conquered, when thoroughly trained, by any professional soldiers. In all nations and at all times they have conquered their enemies when their enemies have been professional soldiers. Thus they have proved themselves to be the best and most efficient defense against foreign foes.

But while the professional soldier has been a weak defense against the stranger and a source of danger to the country which employed him, the citizen soldier has not only been a source of strength and security to his nation from foreign attack, but has been a great bulwark in preserving the liberties of his country from dangers from within.

In many countries the opposition to compulsory service has been under the general characterization of calling it Prussianism or militarism. Militarism can not exist in any country where the military as a class is not exalted above the civilian. The theory that teaching a man to defend himself, to shoot, and to drill with precision puts in him a desire to fight and that every man wearing a soldier's uniform has that desire is absolutely without foundation. A complete answer to such an assertion can be found by inquiry of those men who have fought in our wars. Ask any old veteran of the Civil War whether the numerous battles in which he fought created in him a desire to fight or a disgust for war. In ninety-nine out of a hundred cases it will be found that the latter was the result of his military service. It has been charged that Army and Navy officers are desirous of bringing about war because of their desire to fight. Exactly the opposite is the case. Practically all of them would be glad to avoid war, but they know the only way to fight effectively is to be prepared for it, and that is the reason they defend suitable preparation. They are not deluded by the theory that because a man is patriotic or physically strong, or any other equally specious reason, he is a prepared soldier or sailor. They know that exactly the reverse is true; hence their desire to change raw material into a finished product.

The only countries in which militarism may be said to exist are Japan and Prussia. In Japan militarism has existed from days immemorial—the samurai and his successor of the present day have been in a higher social class than the civilians engaged in professions and trade. To some extent the same condition has obtained in Prussia. Many people who have visited Germany within the last 15 or 20 years have testified that the military class has been dominating and domineering; that it has not respected civil employments or employees; that there has been no discrimination in the brutal manner in which the soldier has treated the civilian; and that he has been supported and protected by the constituted authorities in following this course.

We all agree that the one great object to be obtained in the world is peace. We all hope that the time will come when armies and navies will be superseded by an international court of arbitration. As a practical proposition, however, the prospects in this direction are not promising. There are almost insurmountable barriers between us and the realization of our dream of world-wide peace. One of the difficulties of first importance is that every strong nation prefers to depend upon its own military resources instead of placing itself at the mercy of some international tribunal. Arbitration of differences between nations means the willingness of the nations concerned to reach some agreement. When one nation refuses to agree, that is the end of arbitration. Furthermore, some time before the present war began, the great powers participating in The Hague conference decided not to arbitrate certain important questions. Until our dream of world-wide peace comes true, we must be prepared to protect ourselves.

The extreme pacifists of to-day are decrying preparedness. They claim that the mere act of preparing ourselves to properly defend our shores from an invading enemy tends to militarism. Because of their fear of militarism they prefer to let the other nations of the world prepare and the United States remain totally unprepared, trusting that we will not be attacked. His-

tory has taught me one thing: If we are going to trust anybody, I prefer to trust ourselves—even at the risk of having to cope with that terrible menace militarism which is causing the pacifists so much anxiety—rather than trust some great powerful nation to leave us alone in our weakness.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I do not believe that a country governed by the people, as is the case in the United States, need fear militarism. It is true that large standing armies are dangerous to the peace of a country where the power to use that force is vested in a few persons. A few persons can not declare war in the United States. Before war can be declared a majority of the House of Representatives and the Senate must vote in favor of it.

The first person to resent militarism, exalting the military above the civil, is the private citizen, and the Constitution places in his hands the power to decree whether or not militarism shall exist; in fact, there is no institution of our Government—military or naval—which is not dependent upon the approbation of a majority of our citizens.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I suggest to the Senator, too, that there is another shield against militarism, and that is the fact that Congress can only make an appropriation for the Army for two years, and in the meantime the Members of Congress have to go back to the people and be reelected.

Mr. WEEKS. That is quite true.

Opponents of universal military training have frequently charged that such a system is undemocratic and un-American and should not be tolerated in this country. To that charge I reply that nothing is un-American which a majority of the American people, after mature deliberation, decide is for the good of the country and desire to see enacted into law. If I correctly understand the principles which inspired the foundation of the Republic, the Congress of the United States reaches the utmost pinnacle of democracy and Americanism when it heeds the voice of the people and puts into effect such legislation as that voice demands. There is no doubt in my own mind as to what the people demand in this instance or what they would demand if they were correctly informed or given the time to study the question.

While expressions of opinion by individuals, even those in high official position, do not necessarily represent the final popular verdict, they do as nearly as any agency can express the popular will, so I wish to submit to the Senate the names of 383 mayors of cities of over 5,000 population, in all parts of the country, representing a total of 19,203,050 inhabitants, who are unqualified and enthusiastic advocates of universal training and service. I ask consent to have it inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Three hundred and eighty-three mayors of cities of over 5,000 population, in all parts of the country and representing a total of 19,203,050 inhabitants, are unqualified and enthusiastic advocates of universal military training. The list follows:

Maine: Charles P. Lemaire, Lewiston; John F. Woodman, Bangor; F. H. Nickerson, Brewer; H. Shall, Houlton; Samuel J. Mitchell, Sanford; and Frederic E. Boothby, Waterville.

New Hampshire: Fred N. Beckwith, Dover; A. A. Beaton, Franklin; and George T. Munsey, Laconia.

Vermont: Adelbert W. Braisted, Burlington; F. Mitchell, Montpelier; and James E. Timmons, Winooski.

Massachusetts: James M. Curley, Boston; W. D. Rockwood, Cambridge; Justice L. Moore, Chelmsford; Edward E. Willard, Chelsea; George D. Gibb, Dedham; Frank H. Tass, Fitchburg; John A. Stoddard, Gloucester; George H. Newhall, Lynn; Frank S. Banks, Maynard; James S. Russell, Milton; Charles S. Ashley, New Bedford; A. C. Bingham, Norwood; George M. Underwood, Orange; James A. Cody, Rockland; Henry P. Benson, Salem; Eben J. Williams, Waltham; Arthur F. Thayer, Ware; and T. F. Kennally, Whitman.

Connecticut: Clifford B. Wilson, Bridgeport; Anthony Sunderland, Danbury; A. J. Deane, Hamden; Howard I. Taylor, Manchester; Harold M. Meed, Middletown; Samuel Camper, New Haven; John Humphrey, New London; Merwin Hine, New Milford; Paul Harstrom, Norwalk; Allyn L. Brown, Norwich; A. H. Lister, Plymouth; John M. Leach, Stafford Springs; John J. Treat, Stamford; H. E. Coe, Torrington; and Martin Sculley, Waterbury.

New York: John Purroy Mitchell, New York City; Joseph W. Stevens, Albany; Schuyler Hazard, Albion; James R. Cline, Amsterdam; Mark L. Koon, Auburn; C. F. Travis, Catskill; James S. Calkins, Cohoes; G. M. Hoagland, Cortland; J. A. Taylor, Dunkirk; H. W. Hoffman, Elmira; Henry C. Drake, Fredonia; William Reed, Glens Falls; Charles S. Harvey, Hudson; Frederick E. Bates, Ithaca; Samuel A. Carlson, Jamestown; Borden E. Smith, Johnstown; Palmer Caulfield, Jr., Kingston; A. Zoller, Little Falls; A. N. Thompson, Middlefield; Charles A. Hyman, Newark; J. D. Wilson, Newburgh; George W. Whitehead, Niagara Falls; Albert W. Twigger, Ossining; Lester H. Crump, Peekskill; Hiram H. Edgerton, Rochester; John Hoag, Salamanca; W. P. Butler, Saratoga Springs; Franklin F. Burns, Troy; Isaac R. Breen, Watertown; and Farrington M. Thompson, White Plains.

New Jersey: Mark M. Fagan, Jersey City; Frederick W. Donnelly, Trenton; C. G. F. Patrick, Asbury Park; Norral F. Mountain, East Orange; Victor Maraleg, Elizabeth; Clinton H. Blake, jr., Englewood;

Thomas C. Elvins, Hammonont; W. H. Lundley, North Plainfield; Emil Diebltsch, Nutley; J. Ten Broeck, Perth Amboy; Leighton Calkins, Plainfield; Charles Browne, Princeton; Harry Simmons, Rahway; Daniel A. Garber, Ridgewood; N. A. N. Grier, Salem; William T. Steel, Somerville; Ruford Franklin, Summit; Wm. A. Brady, Union; and William F. Vosseler, West Orange.

Virginia: George Anslie, Richmond; Charles Broun, Roanoke; A. A. Moss, Newport News; Wyndham R. Mayo, Norfolk; R. Gillian, Petersburg; Julian F. Ward, Winchester; and Harry Wooding, Danville.

West Virginia: H. G. Kirk, Wheeling; G. E. Breese, Charleston; Anthony Bowen, Fairmont; and E. Schon, Huntington.

Kentucky: James C. Rogers, Lexington; W. M. Salisbury, Ashland; A. Y. Paterson, Bowling Green; W. C. Quinby, Dayton; R. T. Stowe, Hopkinsville; J. Wesley Lee, Maysville; A. J. Livingston, Newport; Frank N. Burns, Paducah; Samuel Rice, Richmond; and D. T. Matlack, Winchester.

Tennessee: R. E. Wing, Nashville; J. W. E. McMillan, Knoxville; S. E. Millen, Johnson City; and Jesse M. Littleton, Chattanooga.

Pennsylvania: Thomas B. Smith, Philadelphia; E. H. Meals, Harrisburg; Edward H. Filbert, Reading; W. S. McDowell, Chester; C. E. Rhodes, Altoona; J. G. Armstrong, Pittsburgh; Harry C. Rulon, Bloomsburg; Herman W. Worth, Bradford; Thomas Scott, Bristol; John T. Loftus, Carbondale; A. H. Swing, Coatesville; H. F. Blaney, Coaldale; A. J. Hoag, Dubois; D. W. Nevin, Easton; Jacob Evans, Forest City; Fred W. Brown, Franklin; John G. Davis, Freehold; H. M. Stokes, Hanover; James J. Wood, Kane; Willis F. Beach, Knoxville; H. L. Trout, Lancaster; G. A. Leopold, Lewistown; Chas. E. Donahue, Lock Haven; B. B. Shultz, Luzerne; John E. Reynolds, Meadville; N. G. Dunlop, Monessen; John L. Shield, Mount Pleasant; Louis P. Lincoln, Munhall; A. D. Newell, New Castle; Samuel N. Shaffer, Plymouth; F. Pierce Mortimer, Pottsville; W. Newton Porter, Scottsdale; Wm. R. Conrad, Tamaqua; E. Clay White, Tarentum; Richard Beaton, Tyrone; George M. Bailey, Uniontown; C. S. Keabb, Warren; J. R. Elree, West Chester; R. Nelson Bennett, Wilkes-Barre; E. S. Hugentugler, York; and Edmund Jermyn, Scranton.

Maryland: Thomas W. Koon, Cumberland, and S. R. Teddy, Frostburg.

Delaware: James F. Price, Wilmington.

Rhode Island: Joseph H. Gainer, Providence; Clark Bunstiek, Newport; Giles W. Easterbrooks, Pawtucket; Robert G. McMechan, East Providence; Charles D. Kimball, South Kingstown; Everett E. Whipple, Westerly; and A. Archambault, Woonsocket.

North Carolina: T. L. Kirkpatrick, Charlotte; J. E. Rankin, Asheville; P. Q. Moore, Wilmington; P. G. Sawyer, Elizabeth City; A. H. Bangert, Newbern; L. E. Tilley, Rocky Mount; Warren N. Meadson, Salisbury; and E. T. Stuart, Washington.

South Carolina: T. T. Hyde, Charleston; and L. A. Griffith, Columbia.

Georgia: A. S. Candler, Atlanta; James R. Littleton, Augusta; Bridges Smith, Macon; L. G. Council, Americus; Robert O. Arnold, Athens; W. E. Wood, Dalton; W. W. Robinson, Dublin; Drew W. Paulk, Fitzgerald; A. B. Assington, Rome; W. J. Pierpont, Savannah; T. B. Converse, Jr., Valdosta; and Scott T. Beaton, Waycross.

Alabama: George B. Ward, Birmingham; H. Fillans, Mobile; J. W. Vandever, Talladega; E. C. Payne, Albany; L. L. Scarborough, Anniston; T. T. Terry, Huntsville; and W. T. Robertson, Montgomery.

Mississippi: Walter A. Scott, Jackson; J. J. Hayes, Vicksburg; Benjamin T. Warriner, Corinth; Charles Henck, Brookhaven; and John M. Dabney, Meridian.

Florida: S. A. Anderson, Miami; J. E. T. Bowden, Jacksonville; George H. Hinrichs, Pensacola; and A. J. Moseley, Lake City.

Louisiana: Martin Behrman, New Orleans; J. McW. Ford, Shreveport; and George L. Rilling, Lake Charles.

Ohio: C. Thornton, Youngstown; Charles A. Stolberg, Canton; W. J. Lamb, Akron; James A. Cahill, Chillicothe; Arthur J. White, Delaware; George N. Leasure, Delphos; T. P. Peter, Dover; George Kinney, Fremont; F. W. Biehl, Gallion; J. C. Weaver, Greenville; George H. Lingrel, Kenton; George Tedy, Lakewood; F. H. Lowney, Mansfield; James Ralston, Martins Ferry; C. N. Anderson, Norwalk; H. E. Engelhardt, Norwood; L. A. Moore, Lorain; E. G. Huntington, Painesville; H. H. Kaps, Portsmouth; Henry J. Nailor, St. Barnard; G. M. Raudabaugh, St. Marys; Walter K. Keppell, Tiffin; C. S. Mark, Van Wert; H. Barnes, Wellsville; William Dodds, Xenia; W. H. Webster, Zanesville; and Charles M. Milroy, Toledo.

Nebraska: J. P. Dahman, Omaha; C. W. Kilber, Kearney; Charles G. Rljou, Grand Island; and William Madger, Hastings.

Indiana: M. J. Hosey, Fort Wayne; P. E. Smith, Elkhart; Samuel F. Spohn, Goshen; James S. Wales, Alexandria; Thomas Barnes, Lafayette; Joseph E. Turner, Linton; Frank V. Guthrie, Logansport; James E. Crozier, Madison; James O. Batchelor, Marion; Alonzo K. Grant, Mount Vernon; J. Ross, Seymour; Perry L. Sisson, Valparaiso; James M. House, Vincennes; and James Wilson, Wabash.

Illinois: Charles T. Baumann, Springfield; H. P. Pearsons, Evanston; W. C. Lewman, Danville; E. R. Duvall, Belleville; William W. Ray, Belvidere; E. K. Porter, Carbondale; George B. Crispin, Charleston; D. J. W. Luigel, Collinsville; Daniel Dinneen, Decatur; P. N. Joslin, DeKalb; John L. Conger, Galesburg; T. Y. Gregg, Harrisburg; G. H. Gibson, Harvey; H. J. Rogers, Jacksonville; William C. Barber, Joliet; E. F. Bradford, Ottawa; H. M. Orr, La Salle; S. B. Dawson, Macomb; F. A. Garesche, Madison; F. E. Bell, Mattoon; H. A. Murphy, Pana; Charles Schaefer, Pekin; John J. Massieon, Peru; and William McConeh, Rock Island.

Michigan: James W. Marsh, Battle Creek; R. P. Welton, Bay City; A. D. Billings, Adrian; R. H. Mullen, Cadillac; Earl F. Johnson, Flint; H. W. Nordhouse, Manistee; John L. Black, Port Huron; and C. W. Brown, Ypsilanti.

Wisconsin: J. S. Konkel, Superior; Charles H. Fleming, Kenosha; John E. Barron, Eau Claire; Mathew P. Bellow, Oconto; F. A. Walters, Stevens Point; and H. E. Marquardt, Wausau.

Minnesota: V. R. Irvin, St. Paul; J. H. Truax, Duluth; Jacob R. Kollner, Stillwater; E. E. Webber, Chisholm; H. M. Dixon, Cloquet; H. W. Misner, Crookston; Leonard Erikson, Fergus Falls; L. A. Fritscher, New Ulm; J. M. Diment, Owatonna; and John F. Merrill, Red Wing.

Iowa: John MacVicar, Des Moines; M. B. Snyder, Council Bluffs; Louis Roth, Cedar Rapids; J. B. Newman, Cedar Falls; John Berwald, Davenport; A. P. Brown, Fort Madison; A. C. Morris, Grinnell; and T. A. Potter, Mason City.

Utah: Abbot R. Heywood, Ogden, and W. Mont Ferry, Salt Lake City.

Missouri: Henry W. Kiel, St. Louis; George H. Edwards, Kansas City; E. Marshall, St. Joseph; Hugh W. Judor, Joplin; C. B. Gammone, Carthage; S. Hawkins, Chillicothe; J. G. Micis, Hannibal; Chris-

tian Ott, Independence; I. F. Harlan, Moberly; J. J. Gideon, Springfield; and M. S. Sudder, Trenton.

Kansas: C. W. Green, Kansas City; Louis N. Eminan, Atchison; George Coverdale, Coffeyville; John J. Varner, Toia; A. M. Harrington, Newton; L. E. Curfman, Pittsburgh; and George H. Hunter, Wellington.

Oklahoma: Edward Overholser, Oklahoma City; J. E. Wyand, Muskogee; O. C. Lasher, Ardmore; Millard F. Kirk, Battlesville; and T. P. Stearns, Shawnee.

Arkansas: Charles E. Taylor, Little Rock, and Henry C. Reed, Fort Smith.

Texas: Clinton G. Brown, San Antonio; Lewis Fisher, Galveston; Tom Lea, El Paso; A. P. Woyedincip, Austin; Henry D. Lindsley, Dallas; John Dolins, Waco; E. T. Tyra, Fort Worth; J. E. Brosley, Amarillo; H. C. McGown, Brownwood; J. B. Marmion, Houston Heights; William H. Kinglet, Hillsboro; Edward H. McCuiston, Paris; R. H. Dunn, Fort Arthur; George A. Bird, San Angelo; J. K. Campbell, Temple; and Benjamin Campbell, Houston.

Arizona: W. H. Timerhoff, Prescott; W. W. Adamson, Douglas; and C. D. Barclay, Globe.

New Mexico: J. H. Mullin, Roswell.

South Dakota: A. N. Aldrich, Aberdeen, and D. G. Mulberry, Huron.

Colorado: Charles L. McKesson, Colorado Springs; W. D. Armstrong, Cripple Creek; W. L. Armstrong, Boulder; and John T. West, Pueblo.

Montana: C. H. Lane, Butte; Edward O'Brien, Anaconda; H. T. Wilkinson, Missoula; and L. W. Truitt, Bozeman.

Wyoming: R. N. La Fontaine, Cheyenne, and E. S. Lauzer, Rock Springs.

Idaho: S. H. Ha7s, Boise; L. J. Perkins, Lewiston; and E. M. Sweeley, Twin Falls.

Washington: C. A. Fleming, Spokane; Milton Evans, Vancouver; A. M. Muir, Bellingham; and Jesse T. Mills, Olympia.

Oregon: F. T. Woodman, Los Angeles; C. L. Palmer, Baker; C. B. Lankin, Ashland; F. C. Harley, Astoria; and W. A. Belle, Eugene.

California: F. T. Woodman, Los Angeles; Edwin M. Capps, San Diego; Samuel C. Irving, Berkeley; Alva E. Snow, Fresno; F. H. Bartlett, Alameda; George Hay, Bakersfield; E. J. Doussel, Napa; E. J. Garrard, Richmond; Oscar Ford, Riverside; G. H. Wixom, San Bernardino; Willis M. Slasson, Santa Barbara; and S. L. Berkeley, Santa Monica.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, Switzerland is one of the best examples of the improbability that preparation involves militarism. Switzerland is completely surrounded by first-class powers; and yet, it has maintained its independence, its democratic institutions, its self-respect, and it has had universal service for more than 70 years.

Practically every Republic in South America has a compulsory military law on its statute books; yet we have heard no suggestion that universal service has developed a militarism in those countries or a desire to wage war. The Argentine system is an illustration of what is being done in those countries. In Argentina the law provides for obligatory military service between the ages of 20 and 45, and there are practically no exemptions, except for physical disability.

I have received a very large number of letters and communications in advocacy of universal training and I quote the following from the letter of a well-known citizen of New York, who expresses in strong terms his views in favor of this form of military preparation:

There is more objection to it in Congress than elsewhere. Universal training and universal but selective conscription is mighty popular among the people I talk with, because it is so universally democratic and the only fair way. Every one of these slackers and pacifists would be united in declaring for his equal rights—that is, rights equal with those of any other man, rights equal because of American laws and American institutions—but if it comes to a question of equal duties and equality of obligations, these people would, many of them, prove to be slackers and dodgers.

It is all very well to say that you interfere with individual freedom of action, but to thrust the burden-bearing of the whole country upon the shoulders of our very best—those who would come forward and volunteer—is certainly just as unjust as it would be to permit a chosen few to enjoy all the rights and privileges possible under the American flag and all it represents.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?  
Mr. WEEKS. I do.  
Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to ask the Senator, since he has made a number of references to what is popularly known as the slacker, if he considers the slacker morally deficient?  
Mr. WEEKS. Well, Mr. President, I had not thought of it in exactly that way.  
Mr. THOMAS. The Senator knows that this bill exempts the morally deficient from the operation of the law.  
Mr. WEEKS. That being the case, I do not consider him morally deficient.  
Mr. THOMAS. I presume that for the purposes of this bill the Senator would include him as an individual subject to its terms?  
Mr. WEEKS. I think so.  
Mr. THOMAS. To my mind this is a remarkable bill in that it seems to me to exempt the very class the existence of which is one of the strongest arguments that the Senator is using in favor of this bill.  
Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?  
Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not a fact, from the Senator's observation and experience, that slackers are usually more than 25 years of age?

Mr. WEEKS. Not necessarily at all. If the Senator will take the trouble to walk down Pennsylvania Avenue between 5 and 6 o'clock in the evening he can see 500 or more almost any time.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are all over 25 years, and you are going to exempt those under the terms of this bill.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator is mistaken; they are not generally over 25.

Mr. McKELLAR. Most of them are.

Mr. WEEKS. Most of them are under that age.

I wish to add one further comment, because I think it is particularly pertinent and very well said. It is one of the strongest pleas for compulsory service which I have seen. It comes from Hon. Leslie M. Shaw, formerly Secretary of the Treasury. He says:

Whatever number of men we raise I hope will be conscripted, for I want to see the ranks of the wealthy and the ranks of the poor, the ranks of the old American stock and the ranks of every shade and description of hyphenates, the ranks of the patriotic and the ranks of the pacifists, the good stuff within all ranks and the worthless stuff within each rank, to contribute proportionately.

The essence of the substance of this bill is stated there in those lines.

John Stuart Mill, in his essay on loyalty, almost every word of which could be used as an argument in favor of the principle of requiring the citizen to perform military as well as other service to the State, uses this language:

If anyone does an act hurtful to others, there is a prima facie case for punishing him by law, or, where legal penalties are not safely applicable, by general disapprobation. There are also many positive acts for the benefit of others which he may rightfully be compelled to perform, such as to give evidence in a court of justice, to bear his fair share in the common defense, or in any other joint work necessary to the interest of the society of which he enjoys the protection; \* \* \*. Though society is not founded on a contract, and though no good purpose is answered by inventing a contract in order to deduce social obligations from it, everyone who receives the protection of society owes a return for the benefit, and the fact of living in society renders it indispensable that each should be bound to observe a certain line of conduct toward the rest. This conduct consists \* \* \* in each person bearing his share (to be fixed on some equitable principle) of the labors and sacrifices incurred for defending the society or its members from injury and molestation. These conditions society is justified in enforcing at all costs to those who endeavor to withhold fulfillment.

Mr. President, the United States is at war. Let us suppose for the moment that we are face to face with this possibility: We are about to be invaded by a vast army, a highly organized and efficient body of men. We have no reserve of trained men to recruit our existing organizations, bringing them to war strength and maintaining them during war at this effective strength, and consequently additional volunteer regiments will have to be called for, for troops must somehow be provided. As in the past, the patriotic young boys will join and go to the front. In every war we have ever had these volunteers—green boys, under inexperienced officers—lose from 22 to 28 per cent of their regimental strength in their concentration camps before ever actually going into a campaign, so a regiment of 1,600 will in a short time probably have lost 400. It will then be ordered to the front and in six months will have lost 40 per cent, and thus be reduced to 720 men. As there are no trained men to supply this wastage another 1,600-strength regiment will be raised and go through the same course, incurring the same losses, while the officers and men are learning the A B C's of the soldier's profession—that of keeping themselves well, properly fed, and properly supplied.

Such was the experience of our past wars, and such will be the experience of any future war fought by these volunteer soldiers. Can mothers and fathers of this Nation appreciate that the deaths of many of their sons are due to the ignorance of their officers and to the lack of training in their boys? Many a boy has become sick and has died from preventable disease because he did not know how to take care of himself and his officers were too ignorant to show him. Many a boy has been needlessly slaughtered by bullets and exposure because led by untrained officers.

Mr. President, I believe every real American man and boy stands ready to answer the call of his country, and I believe that every real American father and mother are willing to have their sons answer this call. Can not these same American fathers and mothers appreciate the fact that if their sons have received military training and are led by competent officers their chances of returning home alive are a hundredfold better than if they had received no training and are led by incompetents? If these sons do not return home, are not their parents better fortified to bear the burden of their grief knowing that

their sons died on the field of battle, that their sacrifice was worth while, and that they rendered their country a service than if they had died in a concentration camp from some preventable disease, contracted through ignorance and lack of training? Moreover, how is the father and mother of a promising boy, one who quite likely would occupy an important place in life, to justify his sacrifice when they see the coward, the slacker, and the selfish in their midst who have made no effort to aid their country?

I have no patience with the sentiment which pervades that song, *I Did Not Raise My Boy To Be a Soldier*. I do not believe it represents American womanhood. I do not believe it represents anything but a skulking low desire to avoid responsibility. I prefer the sentiment expressed in an incident which took place in the town of Twin Falls, Idaho, recently. I happened to see an account of it in the *New York Times*. I do not propose to read it all; but a Mrs. Erwin, who had listened to some pacifist argument, made a speech which I think should be given general circulation:

I have lived in peace and quiet under the Stars and Stripes for almost 50 years. I have helped to build a home and rear my children in this great land of splendid churches, schools, and institutions, and in all this time no sacrifice for my country was ever asked of me until now. Can I do less than give my boy?

Let us send our boys with cheers and as few tears as possible. When one of our boys stands on lonely guard duty at night, thinking of home, let us be glad to have him say, as he remembers how mother cheered his going:

"Gosh! Wasn't mother a great old sport? Didn't she buck up fine?"

That is the kind of sentiment I believe that moves the American mother and what they want to demonstrate to their sons. I recall very well an incident that took place on the U. S. S. *Ranger* after she had captured the *Drake* and had taken her into a French port. She had among her crew an 11-year-old boy. His name was John Downes. A visitor to the ship, seeing this small boy, said to him, "My boy, why did your mother let you go?" His reply was, "My mother did not let me go; she sent me." That is the kind of spirit that is the opposite of "I didn't raise my boy to be a soldier." That is the kind of spirit which I believe is in the breast of the American women.

There are undoubtedly many Members of Congress and many people in civil life who favor the volunteer system—it is a time-honored method of raising an army—but how would such advocates feel about a volunteer system of war taxation? There are men who have the habit of giving; they are free spenders of their incomes, and many of them feel the responsibility of their citizenship to such a degree that they pay their taxes with the same willingness that they contribute to any other public cause; but no one believes an attempt to establish a voluntary system of taxation would result in equality or justice or even in raising anything like sufficient revenue to carry on the Government. What would the average citizen say to giving to any of the well-known rich men of the country the privilege of paying taxes to support the Government in case of war or refraining from doing so, as he might see fit? He would say that the country can not trust to disinterested patriotism in the raising of taxes. No one would be simple enough to advocate such a plan, and yet the net result of a volunteer system in obtaining men does not greatly differ. The patriotic, the adventurer, the lover of excitement, and those men having an inclination to military life will be the ones to respond, and the other classes will be glad to have them to do so, because it will relieve them of their obligations to the Government. If the Government can not obtain revenue to run it in time of war by voluntary action, the same result will be bound to follow any attempt to obtain sufficient men, and from everyone's viewpoint, except to those who wish to raise units of volunteers for some specific reason, the universal training and service system is the correct one to follow.

There is another reason why volunteering is inequitable. It has been the experience of the past, I think almost without variation, that volunteering in the country districts is much greater than in the large cities. It is much easier to bring before the people of the country districts the requirements of the Government and to develop sentiment in those sections which will bring about a volunteer movement. Almost invariably in the past the recruiting officers have come across this situation. Perhaps it is due, to some degree, to the fact that a much larger percentage of the population of cities are recent immigrants, while people living in the country are naturally agriculturists, are more likely to become property holders, and thereby more readily recognize and accept the duties of citizenship. This being true, it naturally follows that if we depend on the volunteer system there is going to be an unequal contribution from the residents of the country, a most unfair and unreasonable result in itself and extremely harmful under present conditions.

when one of our greatest requirements will be a sufficient food supply.

In the United States there are unusual reasons for the establishment of a universal training system which do not exist in many other countries or in many other democracies. During the last 25 years we have received a vast number of immigrants, largely made up of men who have had no lesson and, to some degree, no instruction in loyalty to our American institutions, and many of them have come here not to assume but escape national duty. They have lived under a system of government where compulsion meant service to a sovereign and they are unable to appreciate the difference between service of that kind and compulsion to serve a commonwealth—that the latter simply represents the deliberate voluntary choice of the people of whom they are one. Therefore, from the standpoint of the desirability of the assimilation of these citizens, it is well that they should appreciate their obligation to the country they have chosen as their home.

Alan Seeger, a native of Massachusetts and one of those spirited young Americans who has been helping to repay the debt we have owed France for 135 years for the part she took in obtaining our independence, and who lost his life "somewhere in France," witnessing the complaisance, not to say criminal neglect, with which we have followed our own affairs and in failing to prepare ourselves for what has been demonstrated to be the inevitable, wrote a message to America, a part of which I shall read:

You have the grit and the guts, I know;  
You are ready to answer blow for blow;  
You are virile, combative, stubborn, hard,  
But your honor ends with your own back yard.  
Each man intent on his private goal,  
You have no feeling for the whole.  
What singly none would tolerate  
You let unpunished hit the State,  
Unmindful that each man must share  
The stain he lets his country wear  
And (what no traveler ignores)  
That her good name is often yours.  
Not by rough tongues and ready fists  
Can you hope to tilt in the modern lists.  
The armies of a littler folk  
Shall pass you under the victor's yoke.  
So be it a nation that trains her sons  
To ride their horses and point their guns;  
So be it a people that comprehends  
The limit where private pleasure ends  
And where their public dues begin,  
A people made strong by discipline,  
Who are willing to give—what you've no mind to—  
And understand—what you are blind to—  
The things that the individual  
Must sacrifice for the good of all.

And then he made this appeal:

O friends, in your fortunate present ease  
(Yet faced by the self-same facts as these)  
If you would see how a race can soar,  
That has no love, but no fear, of war,  
How each can turn from his private rôle,  
That all may act as a perfect whole,  
How men can live up to the place they claim  
And a nation, jealous of its good name,  
Be true to its proud inheritance,  
Oh, look over here and learn from France.

Can we not take this appeal, so graphically presented, to ourselves? Are we going to be a failure as a nation, governed by prejudice rather than reason, and do the thing which for the moment may seem to be popular, but which is really contrary to every principle of our Government? Can we not rise to the occasion presented to us, convert ourselves from individuals to a whole, and demonstrate that we have all the elements of real patriotism? We should not fail to follow the example of France and every up-to-date nation in the organization of our military forces and to take advantage of this opportunity to establish what will in years to come be of immeasurable benefit to our descendants; that is, a system of military preparation and training which will adequately protect the life of the Republic.

Mr. WADSWORTH obtained the floor.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the Senator from Minnesota desires to ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts, I yield to him.

Mr. KELLOGG. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question.

Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks any amendment of this act is necessary to accomplish what he suggested, allowing in the various units the service of men from the various States and communities together.

Mr. WEEKS. I think that might be done, Mr. President. There is a question now raised about volunteers and there is a disposition on the part of some of our citizens to serve in

the way they want to serve but not in the way they should serve. We need 500,000 men in our Regular Army and National Guard. They can enlist for the duration of the war. They are going to serve under the best trained officers there are in those two services, and yet they object to volunteering in this way because they say that they want to serve their country in the way they think best. The best way is the way our military experts have indicated. Probably it is not the way the amateur would prescribe. If the men are really patriotic and wish to serve, there is an opportunity for 500,000 to enlist at once.

Mr. KELLOGG. I quite agree with the Senator. I thought he said in his speech—

Mr. WEEKS. I did say that in forming a new army the additional 500,000 men could very well be segregated so that those from a State would serve in the same organization.

Mr. KELLOGG. Does not the Senator think it is advisable to immediately supplement this legislation by a bill for universal military training?

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. KELLOGG. At once?

Mr. WEEKS. I certainly do.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator does not agree with the recommendation of the Secretary of War that we should not do it during this war?

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know what his recommendation is, but if he recommended that I do not agree with it.

Mr. KELLOGG. I think he so stated. Does the Senator know of any reason why it should be put off until after the war?

Mr. WEEKS. I am in favor of doing it at once.

Mr. KELLOGG. Is it not a fact that universal military service in this country at any time would be a mere name; that it would be only a selective service at best?

Mr. WEEKS. Universal military service in a military capacity?

Mr. KELLOGG. That is what I mean.

Mr. WEEKS. It must be selective, because there are a large number of men who for one reason and another will be employed for other useful purposes.

Mr. KELLOGG. It is not intended at any time to have all those serve of military age and qualification.

Mr. WEEKS. Of course not.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I make a suggestion to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have the floor, but I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I wish to point out just one thing, if the Senator will permit me. The bill authorizes the President to make such distribution that he may confine the men from any one State to regiments or divisions from that State. In other words, he can call them all together, and I think that has always been the policy of every administration, and it would be the policy of any President who had the best interests of the service at heart.

Mr. KENYON. I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question.

Mr. WEEKS. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. KENYON. Will the Senator from New York permit me?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly, with the understanding that I may obtain recognition.

Mr. KENYON. I heard nearly all the address of the Senator from Massachusetts, but he may have answered the question I wish to ask him. I should like to know if the Senator is entirely satisfied with the age limit prescribed.

Mr. WEEKS. I have never voted for a bill since I have been in Congress that I was entirely satisfied with. I might change many things in this bill if I were going to follow my own individual inclination. My judgment is that the boy who should be trained originally is the boy whose age is 19 years, and yet there are reasons why that should not be done, because one boy of 19 has frequently developed to a greater degree than another boy of 21. So there must be exceptions. But wars are fought by young men, and we say 19 years because that is naturally the period when the boy is passing from high school into employment or into college, and it would interfere less with his normal requirements than if he entered later.

Mr. KENYON. We will not get the slacker we hear so much about unless the age limit is raised.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator means above 25?

Mr. KENYON. Above 25.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think there is any age limit to the slacker. I think all ages contain the slacker. Even those of our age contain slackers, and I should like to put the slackers of our age out on the farm and see that they raised potatoes or something else.

Mr. KENYON. Then, the Senator believes that as to the unmarried men there should be a difference in the age?

Mr. WEEKS. Quite likely.

Mr. KENYON. Why should not the bill be modified so that the unmarried man can be taken, say, to 40 or 45 and let them go into this list of the draft? When a man reaches 40 he ought to be married, or he ought to be reconciled to war, anyhow.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not in a hurry. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. In regard to that matter, on which I have noticed there has been some question, in every army in Europe, if I am not mistaken, they take their youngest men from the first line. They are men who form the bulk of the army in active service. When the war comes the men under 25 are sent. Then up to 45 they are called in the respective lines. It is the universal practice to take the young men first. This is nothing new. It is simply following the line which, I think, has been adopted in all the systems of the world.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, an incident happened this morning during the morning hour which I believe should enable us to measure the extent and the scale of our efforts in this war. The Senate adopted a report of the conference committee having in charge the adjustment of the differences between the House and the Senate on the bill providing for the issuance of \$7,000,000,000 of bonds and certificates of indebtedness. That bill goes, of course, immediately to the President, and without any question whatsoever it will receive his signature and become a law. It is the largest authorization for expenditures in our history, and I think it is the largest single authorization in the history of all nations. It indicates, if it indicates nothing else, that America intends to wage this war in earnest and to the full extent of her power and resources.

We all know the composition, generally speaking, of the Navy. We know the nature of its organization. We know that the Navy has been kept modernized and up to a high degree of efficiency. We know that it can not be greatly expanded upon a moment's notice; that probably, for the purpose of this war, it will not be greatly expanded; that with the exception of the creation of special services the Navy of the United States is ready, and that no legislation of great and far-reaching importance is necessary with respect to the Naval Establishment.

When we come, however, to judge of the effectiveness and the adequateness of the Army of the United States we find an entirely different state of affairs, and it is in the creation of an army capable of bearing its part in this war that America will make its most gigantic efforts.

It must not be forgotten, Mr. President, that we are building for great events; and that when we set out to build an army which shall be competent to meet the supreme test of those events we must start practically de novo and build from the ground up. It will not suffice for us Americans to stand here and be content with the building of an army, or rather the hasty throwing together of an army, merely for the purpose of our continental defense. We can not afford to proceed upon the assumption that the time will not come when American troops will be needed in France or upon other European battle fields. If we are to exercise a requisite degree of prudence and foresight and incidentally maintain our self-respect we must assume, in our preparations, that the sending of an American force across the Atlantic Ocean is inevitable. If we will get that assumption thoroughly grounded in our minds and prepare ourselves mentally and spiritually in that respect, then we will be better prepared to build a real army which shall be competent to carry the heaviest burden which may be placed upon it. Events may not come to such a pass, but we must not choose the easiest way. We are not the masters of events.

In creating a great military force which shall represent the power and the spirit of the United States, naturally, we must first make use of the weapons we have. This bill provides for such use. Our thought at first turns, of course, to the Regular Establishment, which upon April 1 last in its combatant force numbered in the neighborhood of 105,000 men. Since April 1 something like 25,000 men have been enlisted in the Regular Army, and it now contains about 130,000 men.

The bill provides, however, that the five-year increment laid out in the national-defense act of June 3, 1916, shall be accomplished during this one year. Accordingly the Regular Army will be raised to a fighting strength of 270,000. This is to be done by accepting volunteers; and in the event the President makes up his mind that volunteers are not forthcoming with sufficient alacrity, he is authorized under the terms of this act

to fill the Regular Army up to the maximum war strength of 270,000 by the imposition of the draft.

When we contemplate, however, this great expansion of the Regular Army we must remember one or two phases of that expansion. In order to accomplish the five-year increase of the Army from approximately 130,000 men to double that number, it will be necessary to very considerably increase the number of units in the Regular Army. For example, I think there are to-day 37 or 38 regiments of Infantry. With the five-year increment completed and the maximum war strength accomplished, there must be, as I remember, 64 regiments of Infantry, and a like increase in the number of units must take place in all other branches, such as Cavalry, Field Artillery, Engineers, and so forth. So it will be necessary while we are expanding our most perfect instrument to split in two every existing regiment of the Regular Army, take half, or approximately half, the men and assign them to new regiments to form a nucleus of veterans around which new recruits may be clustered and receive their training, and be thereby the more rapidly trained as efficient soldiers. So within the next six months the Regular Army of the United States will pass through this phase of enlargement and expansion, and in a short time—what the period will be I can not tell—the Regular Army will be practically unrecognizable as compared with what it is to-day. It will be doubled in size; it will have a large number of additional units, half of them veterans and half of them, or approximately half of them, more or less green recruits.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GERRY in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KELLOGG. I should like to suggest to the Senator that that assumes, of course, that we are going to get the men by voluntary enlistment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We are going to get them, whether they volunteer or not.

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is determined in this bill, if it shall pass.

Mr. KELLOGG. I mean for the next three or four months.

Mr. WADSWORTH. For the next three or four months.

Mr. KELLOGG. Does the Senator know whether or not we are now getting the men by enlistment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I said a few moments ago that my understanding was that the total number of enlistments in the Regular Army since April 1—which was approximately the date of the declaration of war, or a little bit before that time—is in the neighborhood of 25,000 men.

Mr. KELLOGG. How long will it take to secure the aggregate number at that rate of enlistment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not quick at arithmetic, but it will be seen that it will take many, many months to recruit to 270,000 men at the rate of 25,000 a month. However, when the program has been finally settled by Congress and enacted into a statute, to be followed by a proclamation by the President, I look for an increase in voluntary enlistments. To-day thousands of young men do not know what the military policy of the Government is; and it is not surprising that they do not know, because the Government has none.

Mr. President, I was about to say that this expansion of the regular force will very largely increase the number of the commissioned personnel. Officers in command of companies, batteries, and troops of the Regular Army have already been requested to send to the War Department the names of enlisted men who are under their command and who, in their judgment, are qualified to receive commissions in the expanded force. We shall find at the end of a few months that many a sergeant and many a corporal will be holding commissions as second lieutenants in the expanded Regulars or in other forces.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York a question for information?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. My understanding is, though I may be mistaken, that after this bill providing for a selective draft shall have been passed, if men volunteer the township or the precinct upon which there is a draft imposed will get credit for the volunteers who have enlisted; that is, the number who so volunteer will be credited on their draft quota.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true.

Mr. NELSON. That is my understanding. So that, after we pass this bill, in a township we will say, where there are five called for under the selective draft, if five men volunteer, the township will have filled its quota, will it not?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It will.

Mr. NELSON. So that the door for volunteering is open.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The door, Mr. President, is wide open. It is wide open to men who desire—and I should think that sensible men would desire it—to join units already organized and suitably officered.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from New York says that the door is open for volunteers; but does not the Senator think there would be a wide difference in the joining of volunteers if there were a call for volunteers to serve during the war, instead of asking them to join the Regular Army or to become members of the National Guard when it is almost impossible now to get out those organizations when one once enlists?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Idaho forgets that, as already stated by the War Department, the enlistment period carried in this act for the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the selective draft is for the emergency only.

Mr. BORAH. That is true; but is it not true that one can only enlist now to become a member of the Regular Army or the National Guard?

Mr. WADSWORTH. A man may enlist now, Mr. President, and become a member of the Regular Army for the duration of the war.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And may enlist in the National Guard to become a member of that branch of the service—which, incidentally, is to be thoroughly absorbed into the United States forces—for the duration of the war. They will be on a parity with the 500,000 men who are to be raised by the selective draft. All are treated exactly alike in the enlistment contract. That, to my mind, is one of the most valuable provisions of this bill, for it will give us a homogeneous army. There will be no enlistments expiring during the period of the war, and all the men who have enlisted subsequent to April 1 last at the conclusion of the war will be entitled to return to their homes.

As I was saying, Mr. President, a large number of sergeants and corporals of the Regular Army, and I dare say many privates, before this war is over will be serving as commissioned officers. The chances for promotion which are offered to an enterprising and intelligent and industrious young man who will take this opportunity of joining a unit that is already trained are greater than have ever been offered to the young men in the United States Army.

The same thing must be said also of the National Guard, as it is to be treated under this bill, and that ought to be thoroughly understood. The existing units of the National Guard under the terms of this bill are to be raised to maximum war strength. That will provide a force of approximately 330,000 men, practically double the number of the present National Guard. Those recruits will be accepted on the volunteer principle unless and until the President makes up his mind that the total of 330,000 can not be promptly obtained under that plan. In that event the existing units of the National Guard will be filled by the operation of the selective draft. And the Guard is to receive further treatment of a military nature which, in my judgment, is a very healthy one, and which I am sure the Senator from Idaho will agree to. Under the national-defense act of June 3, 1916, an effort was made to federalize the National Guard. In my judgment the Congress went about three-quarters of the distance. I am sorry they did not go the whole distance. I would have voted to have made the National Guard completely Federal in every respect; and I hope at some future time, when the discussion of these emergency measures is over, that I shall have such an opportunity.

The President has the authority, of course, to muster into the United States service the National Guard or the Organized Militia; but there has been grave doubt as to whether or not the President has the right under the Constitution to send these men outside of the United States. In the consideration of that very question during the session of Congress last year a provision was incorporated in the national-defense act, known as section 111, which authorizes the President, when the United States is in need of greater forces than are provided for by the Regular Army and in time of war, to draft the National Guard, complete and entire, into the Federal service. This bill provides for the drafting of the National Guard. In addition to being mustered into the United States service, they are to be drafted into the United States service as a collection of individuals; but the Secretary of War assured the Committee on Military Affairs that it would be the policy, and that it was certainly the desire of the War Department, not to break up the existing units of the National Guard when they were drafted as individuals. So the operation will practically amount to this: We will say that the First Minnesota—which I will say, incidentally, is one of the finest Infantry regiments in the United States—will be mustered into the United States service.

Mr. NELSON. I think they are already mustered in.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from Minnesota tells me that they are already mustered into the United States service. The colonel of the First Minnesota Infantry will receive an order to parade his regiment. They will leave their quarters and march on parade, and the order of the President of the United States drafting the regiment, complete and entire, into the Federal service will be read to the men; the regiment will then march back to its quarters completely federalized, with all connection with the State of Minnesota severed, and in exactly the same condition, in a military sense, as is the Regular Army and as will be the 500,000 men to be raised by the selective draft.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, would that be any different than if the President should find that number of men out upon the commons somewhere and should draft them into service?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It would be much different, Mr. President.

Mr. BORAH. Except that they have had training.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They have had about eight months on the Texas border, and are a very valuable unit.

Mr. BORAH. But the President must draft them as individuals.

Mr. WADSWORTH. He must. I thought I said quite distinctly that the individuals are to be drafted, but that the units will not be broken up. The policy of the War Department recognizes that that would be a very unwise thing from a military standpoint. As a matter of fact, the muster rolls of that regiment and of every other National Guard regiment would simply show on their face that on such and such a day the men—naming them—had been drafted into the Federal service. The machinery is automatic and does not disturb the existing units.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. STERLING. The National Guard, having been completely federalized by this proposed draft, as the Senator says it would be, will it be State militia or National Guard after the war is over, or what will be its status?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, that brings up an interesting phase of the future of the Organized Militia, or the National Guard, which I did not intend to discuss; but let me say, in reply to the Senator from South Dakota, that when the National Guard regiments are drafted into the Federal service as individuals they cease entirely to have any relation whatsoever to the States, and when the war is over they are mustered out, but they do not go back to the National Guard of the States, because the Congress has not power, as I understand, to create a State force. I doubt if it is within our power to legislate in such a way as to say to the State of New York or to the State of Minnesota, "You must take back these troops when we get through with them." We might legislate in a permissive sense, and probably it will be necessary for us when this emergency has passed to deal with the question. In fact, Mr. President, I think it will be exceedingly necessary to deal with it, because it certainly should not be the policy of the National Government by the operation of the draft to deprive the States for all time to come of a military force which they have assisted in organizing. That is a question which must be taken up sooner or later.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. What the Senator states is true in respect of those who are drafted to fill up the ranks of the National Guard, but as to those troops that have already been enlisted under State law and then mustered into the Federal service, when they are mustered out of the Federal service they go back into the State service and become subject to State control. That is my idea. There is a distinction between those who were in a regiment while it was a part of the National Guard and those who are put into it after it has been mustered into the service of the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is a close legal question, Mr. President, that I am not competent to discuss, and shall not attempt to discuss upon this occasion, because it looks only toward the future, to a condition of affairs that will arise when the war is over. This bill makes no attempt to solve that question, and it really ought not to demand our attention at this moment.

So it will be seen, Mr. President, that the National Guard is to be very largely expanded, and will go through somewhat the same experience as the Regular Army during the next few months, involving the selection and promotion of a large number of men to commissioned rank. With the guard drafted



into the Federal service and placed upon exactly the same military footing as is the Regular Army, the commissioned officers of the two forces become interchangeable. The President has complete authority over the commissioned officers and over their appointment and promotion. No longer, while this war is in progress, will the governor of any State have any jurisdiction whatsoever; the two forces, Regulars and guard, are made completely homogeneous. There will be no distinction between them, and I believe that in a short time they will be equally efficient.

A good deal of stress, Mr. President, has been laid upon the desire of many men residing in the various States to create additional units in the National Guard under the provisions of law contained in the national-defense act of June 3, 1916. Senators will remember that that law authorizes the National Guard to be recruited to an aggregate number based upon a quota of 800 men to a congressional district. That will provide something like 450,000 men. To do that it would be necessary, of course, to create additional regiments, troops, and batteries of all branches of the service in the National Guard. The Judge Advocate General of the Army has ruled that the War Department has no power to prevent the governors of the States from organizing additional units of the National Guard up to that limit, but the Secretary of War, as I am informed, has urgently requested the authorities of the several States not to do so, but to confine their efforts to recruiting the existing units to full war strength. They are urged not to attempt to throw together hastily additional troops and companies and regiments in the towns of their States, and thereby incur the danger which, as the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] has pointed out, has always accompanied and always will accompany the hasty assembling of volunteer forces. So it has been the policy of the War Department during the last few weeks to discourage the creation of additional units of the National Guard; and I for one hope very much that that advice of the Secretary of War and that policy of the War Department will be followed and that the present units, which have already reached a considerable degree of efficiency, certainly far higher than the National Guard has ever before enjoyed, shall be left as they are; that our military system shall be left unhampered by the sudden creation of additional units with officers named by the governors.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SHERMAN. Under present conditions, in view of the discouragement to the creation of additional units of the National Guard of the States, it practically leaves the Federal recruiting station as the only avenue through which a person desiring to enlist can offer his services. In that event what term of years would a volunteer who enlisted in the Federal service assume, seven years?

Mr. WADSWORTH. He would enlist for the duration of the war.

Mr. SHERMAN. Is there any such limitation of the term of enlistment under the oath he takes under the present law?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under the existing law?

Mr. SHERMAN. Under existing conditions, I am not having reference to the bill pending here, but I am having reference to conditions that would attend a recruit who goes to a station now and desires to enter the Federal service. He would be required, would he not, to enlist for the regular term of seven years if he desired to become a member of the Regular Army?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can answer "yes" and "no" to that question. At the present moment, of course, he would enlist subject to the regular enlistment contract; but the assurance has been given to all those who have presented themselves for enlistment since April 1 that, whereas they sign such an enlistment contract as is provided for by law for the Regular Army, they will, in fact, be discharged at the end of the war.

Mr. SHERMAN. That, however, is merely a regulation of the War Department, and there is no authority of law, is there, to recruit forces—

Mr. WILLIAMS. There will be after this bill passes—

Mr. SHERMAN. There is no authority of law, outside of this bill, is there, to recruit forces except under the regular terms of enlistment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is what we are waiting for.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand that. I am not talking about the provisions of the bill; I am talking about the conditions attending enlistment under existing law.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator just a moment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator knows that the President can discharge any man at any time for the good of the service; and if he can discharge one man, he can discharge a unit.

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly; but I know equally well, if the Senator from New York will permit me, that when war exists and any private or officer is discharged for the good of the service, he will be regarded as having a dishonorable record. So, practically it leaves, does it not, the recruiting stations in a condition where the recruit must enlist, outside of this extra legal contract, for the full term of seven years? He can not enlist legally for the period of the war, can he, under the present provisions of this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true.

Mr. SHERMAN. May not that have something to do with the indisposition in many places to volunteer?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I said a few moments ago that I believed that the comparative indisposition of men to come forward and volunteer at this time is due to the fact that they do not know what the policy of the Government is going to be, and that when this act is passed we will find volunteers much more ready to come forward.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I ask further, if the Senator will permit me—because sometimes we can get a great deal of information as we go along in an informal way—if at the time the resolution declaring war passed the President did not have power to issue a proclamation calling for volunteers, in the absence of special legislation on the subject?

Mr. WADSWORTH. He did.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think he did. I believe that power has been exercised, Mr. President, a number of times in the history of this country, notably on the 15th day of April, 1861, the day following the surrender of Fort Sumter, when he called for 75,000 volunteers. The President convened Congress in extraordinary session on the 4th of July, 1861, not to pass a conscription act, but to consider legislation generally.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will conclude in a moment. The President at that time called for volunteers. Suppose the President of the United States at the time we declared war a few days ago had called for volunteers. He would possibly have had power then to limit enlistments for the period of the war. He did not do so. If such a call had been made, as it was made in 1861, would not that have completely demonstrated whether volunteers would offer in adequate numbers for the public defense?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee, with the consent of the Senator from New York.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from New York yield to me to answer the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to direct attention to the fact that the act of April 25, 1914, known as the volunteer army act, specifically provides that volunteers can only be called for by the President after the President has been authorized to do so by Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand that. The information I am trying to get is what is responsible for the apparent indisposition in certain places of men to volunteer; and I think the Senator will agree with me that the difficulty I have suggested may have something to do with it.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Illinois has referred to the first call for 75,000 men by President Lincoln. He will find if he examines the form of that call that it was a call upon the National Guard, on the militia, for that number of troops.

Mr. WADSWORTH. On the militia of the States.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have read the call. They were called for the Federal service.

Mr. NELSON. It was a call upon the militia to furnish that number of soldiers. It was a call upon the States.

Mr. SHERMAN. They were for the Federal service. I will ask further if the call of April 15, 1861, was not followed by the call of May, 1861—about the 22d of May, if my memory serves me aright—in the absence of legislation? Congress did not convene in extraordinary session until the 4th of July of that year. The second call was for 500,000 men. That tested the question of whether volunteers would offer themselves in sufficient numbers. Now, would it not have been fair, at least to the volunteer system, for the Executive to have made a call in this crisis, so that we might have some adequate information as to the response of the loyal sentiment of the country? That would have met any argument that might be offered by Senators if it had been done. There is no answer to arithmetic. All we can do now is to say what possibly would have happened if it had been done.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask this question, Mr. President, because I think the Senator from New York has a familiarity with the subject that is possessed by few of us. First, I should like to inquire, under the bill as it is now presented, how long, in the opinion of the Senator from New York, will it take the United States to have an effective fighting force?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, Mr. President, I hardly dare venture an opinion on that question. It depends upon the definition of an "effective fighting force." There are so many elements that enter into it that I hardly feel competent to answer it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The bill provides, first, for a half million men by selective draft. How long, in the Senator's opinion, will it be before that half million fighting force will be ready to engage in the present conflict?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, as was brought out in the debate on Saturday, it has been estimated that on or about August 1 those half million men produced by the selective draft will be in the mobilization camps in the 16 divisional areas, with all their equipment ready for them. We can only estimate the length of time after that which must transpire to make an effective force suitable for use in this tremendous war by having regard to the experience of other countries. It is generally understood that the British consume eight months in steady, unrelenting work teaching their men how to wage this kind of warfare. Then they are sent to France and there have a month or six weeks' additional training in conjunction with veteran troops, who, as it were, teach them the finishing touches. So that it would be 9 months or 10 months, in all probability, before we could send those 500,000 drafted men into the trenches.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the Senator will allow me to continue my answer, much will depend also upon what sort of officers are teaching those 500,000 men.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Everything will depend upon that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It would not be extravagant, then, Mr. President, to concede that, under the proposed legislation, it would take a year, substantially, to have any sort of effective fighting force in the United States?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; Mr. President, I do not concede that. My observations were directed only toward the 500,000 to be produced by the selective draft.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But, in the meantime, the expanded Regular Army will be far ahead of the selective draft army in efficiency, and so will the expanded National Guard. I think those troops, or, speaking generally, the average of them will be ready for effective field service long before the 500,000 secured under the draft.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is, if you succeed in having men volunteer substantially in those two branches of the service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; Mr. President, the success of filling those two branches is not dependent upon volunteering.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Substantially.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken, if I may say so. The bill provides that if volunteering does not produce them within a time deemed reasonable by the President, they shall be filled by the draft.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, yes; but first you undertake to obtain the requisite number by volunteering. Now, there are a very large number of our citizens, are there not, who have had military training in one form or another, who might volunteer for service under a general call for volunteers—

Mr. WILLIAMS. They all want to volunteer for commissions.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (continuing). And particularly if they believed that they were to have actual service in the military department of the Government?

The point I should like to make with the Senator is this: If, after Sumter had been fired upon, a proposed measure such as this had been presented in order that there might be an effective force in this Nation, we can let our imaginations run rife as to what might have transpired during that effective force coming together under a selective draft. But the President then resorted to the two modes of seeking volunteers. He resorted to them in an emergency, it is true. In this instance, if we are going to fight our war otherwise than by money, and if we may obtain an army by a call for volunteers more quickly than

by the proposed method, what objection is there to the call for volunteers being made in conjunction with all that is now proposed by this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not think the analogy recited by the Senator from California is an accurate one. No comparison can be made between the conditions of 1861 and the conditions here in the United States with respect to the great world war of 1917. In 1861 there was no time whatsoever to lose. Both sides rushed to arms under the volunteer system. Of course it would have been impossible for President Lincoln to ask the Congress in 1861 to take a bill such as this and build up, through the processes of a selective draft, a carefully devised and constructed army. Washington would have been captured by the Virginians while the bill was being discussed here in the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is exactly the point.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But, Mr. President, fortunately the United States is in no such peril to-day. Our own Navy and the British Navy are protecting us from invasion and giving us, thank Heaven, time to build a real army from the ground up, which shall be efficient, carefully selected in all its elements, all errors, if possible, avoided, built upon the experience of other nations, lessons learned from their mistakes and their successes; assistance from such an army. It could not be done. Our duty is to build a real army, which can compare favorably with the best armies now fighting and hold its own against any enemy that confronts it. That is the purpose of this bill. This new army is to stand the test as long as this war lasts and bear every conceivable burden that can be placed upon it in this war of trained men. The two conditions are not analogous, I say, with all respect to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, the reason I asked was because I knew the Senator was thoroughly prepared to answer any query of the sort.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not boast of that, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, well, I grant it to the Senator, and grant it to him very readily, indeed; but I am still unable to understand why, if we are going to fight in this war, we should not take every available means—the volunteer system, the draft, begin with our universal military training, and the like. I assume that the Senator from New York perhaps is not familiar with what may be the ultimate policy, but may I inquire whether the ultimate policy is that this country shall or shall not send soldiers abroad?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am not competent to announce what the policy of the administration is. I can state my personal view. My personal view and hope is that at the earliest opportunity a force of trained American troops shall appear upon the soil of France.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from New York will pardon me for the interruption, it seems to me that this bill answers the question just propounded by the Senator from California. There is no reason for the existence of this bill unless our object be to prepare an efficient army, ready to go to France or Belgium or Germany, wherever the war in Europe may call us and making ourselves fit to go when we are sent. If we were merely preparing an army to keep Germany from invading America we would not resort to this, of course, nor resort to the idea which the Senator has in his mind now. We would be making a useless waste of money. We had better turn the entire Army appropriation bill into the Navy and be done with it. The bill itself answers the question as to whether there is any intention to send troops to Europe if we ever get the troops, fit troops, equipped troops. We do not want to send boys there to be murdered—untrained, unequipped, unfit in every way.

One more word in this connection: If we had to meet conditions like those during the Civil War, of which Von Moltke said that for 12 months it was a war of armed mobs, that would be a different proposition, because the northern armed mob and the southern armed mob were equal to one another. Sending an armed mob to Europe to be shot down with machine guns and under modern conditions of trench warfare would not only be unwise but it would be brutal; and the very reason why we are undertaking here to prepare an army which shall be, individually and by companies and by regiments and by divisions, prepared to do actual service, is that we expect them to see actual service abroad. Nobody expects Germany to invade America, unless she invades the border down by Mexico, through Mexican machinations by German bribery with a few Mexican bandits.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Mississippi for a very definite answer to the query that I propounded. It is exactly in line with what I thought would be the answer to that particular query.

Let me set the mind of the Senator at rest by saying that there is no design upon my part, there is no design upon the part of any man who believes in a volunteer system, to send a mob, unprepared and unequipped, to be shot down in France or Belgium or any other place on the face of the earth. The insistence is that any army that we have shall be equipped and prepared, and the like; but the problem is whether you can not prepare and equip an army more readily and quickly under a call for volunteers than you can under the particular system that is suggested by this bill.

All of us agree, none of us disagree, that any men of our fighting force must be physically fit and must be fully equipped. There is no disagreement upon that score in the slightest degree.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield further to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I rise again for the purpose of saying that I did not misunderstand the Senator from California. I had no idea that a man of his good sense would have had the notion that we should send men unprepared to become merely food for cannon. I was merely answering the question and explaining, upon the basis of the bill, that the question answered itself, provided that the bill be passed, and that the question answered itself for the reason that I knew he would agree that we do not want to send abroad merely "food for cannon."

Now, there is one other thing. Do not make this mistake about the volunteer system: In the War between the States here were brothers quarreling in a family, and whenever brothers do quarrel, and reach the fighting point, each one is anxious to get at the other's throat, principally for the reason that he is so indignant that his own brother should be angry with him and should be fighting with him. Now, if you expect to arouse that sort of passion, which existed in the South and in the North both when the War between the States began where each man wanted to get at the other and kill him, you are not going to have that. There is no hatred of the German people in the American heart to-day, as there was hatred of Yankees in the southern heart and hatred of rebels in the northern heart at that time. You can not rely upon that spontaneous feeling that makes every fellow rush for fear the war may be over before he can get there. This is a different proposition. It is a matter of modern military machinery and mechanics, and the men have got to be taught to manage the machinery and the mechanics; and they ought to be taught it under men who at least have made a study of the science, whether they have succeeded in becoming masters of it or not, but at least men who are supposed to have some knowledge of it. My own father's regiment at the Battle of Shiloh ran over a whole brigade of Federal troops at their breakfast. Why? Because they were under the command of political general, a political brigadier, who had never known what to do with himself or his troops.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, just one word and then I am done.

I am very thankful for the remark of the Senator from Mississippi. He is quite right. I agree entirely with all that he has said. The idea that is in my mind, of the generation since the Civil War—and I may pause to say that the most charming thing in this whole debate has been to see the men of the North and the men of the South uniting for a common country—but of a generation since the Civil War, as I am, I have just this thought: If the Nation goes into war, it goes into war to fight, and there is something that is repugnant to me as an American in thinking that there is a possibility—which now happily is removed by the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi—of our fighting alone with our dollars.

We are going to fight, I see from the remarks that have been made, not alone with all of our resources, but we are going to fight with well-equipped men; and I quite agree, as well, that it is not a fight in animosity or in hatred or in bitterness at all. It is not at all a contest wherein the German people have from us anything but the kindest sentiments and the kindest feelings, and wherein we do ought else than desire to see a lasting and a just peace for that people as well as for every other people on the face of the earth. Nevertheless, we are in war, and when you are in war there is just one thing to do—to fight with every bit of force that you possess. That is why I asked the questions concerning the various modes of fighting, merely to elicit the information in that regard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope to have an opportunity to continue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One word, and I will cease to interrupt the Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a brief statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to say that one reason why I said what I said was because I agree precisely with the Senator from California that about the most contemptible thing any people on the surface of the earth can do, or has ever done, or may hereafter do, is to fight merely with dollars; and, above all people in the world, the people from my section of the country, who know how much a dollar does accomplish in war, have that feeling, because we suffered by it, and suffered a great deal.

There is no intention upon the part of this administration—and I am authorized to speak that far by my knowledge of the character of the President and of the men who are running the administration—to sink to the low level of defending American rights and avenging American lives and defending the liberty of the world and small States and defending the right of democracy to have a place to stand in under the sun with nothing but dollars. We are going to defend those American and humanitarian rights with dollars and with men and with endurance and with suffering, and with everything else of which we assert mastership. Whatsoever it shall cost, that we shall pay. Whatsoever suffering comes, that we shall endure; and whatsoever there may be of worse than suffering, that too, we shall stand to the bitter end. Whatsoever must be borne, that we shall bear. One of the beauties of the opportunity that we now have is this: We can put an end forever to the infamous lie that the American people are not a nation but are nothing but a conglomerate association of dollar hunters and of dollar makers. I am glad that the Senator from California had in his heart and has expressed the very feeling that every man south of Mason and Dixon's line has—that is, every man who has a right to live there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I had reached that point in my remarks where I had about concluded a discussion of the use of the instruments which we now have at hand, or, rather, the enlargement and perfection of them, and had not reached that part of my discussion which has to do with the selective draft as contrasted with the volunteer system. However, at this point I desire, if I may, to impress upon the Senators some of the elements of the task that we are about to embark upon if this bill or a similar bill becomes a law.

Under this bill, and even under the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], it is contemplated that 36 tactical divisions shall be organized, equipped, and trained in the continental United States. They will total a little over 1,200,000 men. It will be seen at a glance that that is the biggest single effort that the United States has ever embarked upon. It will be recognized also, I think, by every thoughtful man that there is a very dire scarcity in the United States of trained and educated soldiers who can lead us in that effort, and that whereas enthusiasm is always good and outbursts of patriotism, of course, are valuable and never should be discounted, nevertheless, when we view the size of the task ahead of us, and the scarcity of the tools with which at the beginning we must work, it ought to be apparent that we would better go slowly and build surely than to act with haste and make a complete failure of it, as we have done on former occasions when we have attempted tasks which at the outset were nowhere near as big as the one we are going to attempt under the provisions of this bill and the plans of the administration.

Thirty-six tactical divisions, 28,000 men to a division; 12,000 animals, horses and mules, and at least 1,000 wagons for each division; approximately 600 motor trucks for each division; each division containing every element that is ever seen in an army, every branch of the service being represented in proper proportions; presumably 36 divisional mobilization camps, at which will be congregated, respectively, the 28,000 men and 12,000 animals, requiring a water supply equal to and probably exceeding that of a city of 25,000 people—all must be prepared from the ground up. No mistakes must be made. It can not be done in a hurry. If it is, you will have thousands of men fill in hospitals and wasted. Mile upon mile of cantonments must be built in which the men will live—for they can not be expected to live under canvas with any degree of comfort in the northern part of the United States subsequent to December 1 next. Mountains and mountains of sacked oats and baled hay for the horses and mules, exceeding anything we have ever attempted before; medical supplies accumulated to an extent that we have never comprehended before; hundreds of physicians as commissioned surgeons to take care of these

1,200,000 men, most of whom will be green recruits. The mind can scarcely picture the extent of this effort and the enormous undertaking it represents; and no man can exaggerate the utmost importance of building carefully, conserving our resources, controlling every stage of the progress, reducing to a minimum the waste in human lives and in the materials upon which the soldiers and the animals must live.

It will not do for us, Mr. President, to say, "Let us throw together a volunteer army of 500,000 by the mere proclamation of the President." That would be but the beginning, and the vice of such a process is this: That in the hasty throwing together of an army of volunteers of 500,000 men the Government would have little control over the qualifications of the officers. It would be compelled, in the very nature of things, to take the men who present themselves in units already organized. A patriotic and popular citizen in my town or your town under such a call can organize a company or a troop, and by his personal influence and his popularity he can get them together, no doubt; but he will want to be the captain. That is the way it will work; and the chances are he will not be an efficient captain. Likewise, it is said, regiments can be organized overnight. I have heard it stated that it can be done in 48 hours in some of the communities of this country, and probably it is true; but you have got to take the colonel and the lieutenant colonel and the three majors that are offered to the War Department under those circumstances. If the War Department attempts seriously to resist that pressure for commissions in the Volunteer Army, Senators will find themselves wearing out shoe leather between the Capitol and the War Department trying to get commissions for their friends. We will all have to do it under any such system, begging for special favors for men that we happen to know back in our home States; and this great effort of ours that I have tried to picture, and have failed utterly in painting adequately, will inevitably fail, and we will be the scorn and the laughing stock of the great military nations of the world, particularly the allies, who are fighting our battles to-day. But if they see us starting in by a process of careful selection to use our wonderful material in all those channels of effort in which it can be best used, when they see that we mean to build something that shall endure, that shall not stumble or fail in this great emergency, which can carry the burden, no matter how heavy it may be, then they will know that America's assistance is a real force in bringing this war to an early conclusion. That will be the sign that will tell England, and France, and Russia, and Belgium, and Serbia that America is enlisted for the war, no matter how long it lasts. But if we take the old-fashioned, haphazard methods under which we have wasted thousands and thousands of lives in the past, and prolonged our wars instead of shortening them, our efforts will not command the respect of the Governments of the allied powers, with whom eventually, I hope, we shall be co-operating actively upon the battle fronts of Europe.

I have just as intense a desire as the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] that we shall join in the fighting at the earliest possible date, provided we do it effectively. Should we send over a body of half-trained volunteers, it is true, enthusiasm would sweep over this broad land, and we would give them a send-off that no expeditionary force leaving the shores of America ever received; and undoubtedly the devoted people of France would greet them with an enthusiasm and a heartiness that would bring the tears of gratification to our eyes; but, my friends, when they got into the trenches such a force would be a burden upon France instead of an assistance.

Mr. HARDWICK and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HARDWICK. I was just going to inquire of the Senator whether he regarded Canada's efforts—in which three-quarters of a million men were raised, or some such number as that—as of the same character as the situation which he has just described; and, if not, why we could not try for a while the same system that Canada seems to have tried with some success and without exciting the contempt of the allies? Also, I should be glad if the Senator would state how many men England raised by voluntary enlistment before she undertook to enforce conscription, and why she delayed so long in putting into effect any form of conscription there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, those very topics were discussed in a running debate here in the Senate on Saturday afternoon, and at the risk of repetition—

Mr. HARDWICK. By the Senator? I did not hear the Senator on that subject.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from New York was one of perhaps six or eight Senators who took part in a running debate on this question of the volunteers of Canada and the volunteers of England.

Mr. HARDWICK. But, really, I am seeking information about this matter to a greater extent than is perhaps apparent from the latter part of what I have said. I am thinking about these things, and I should like to have the Senator's views on these questions.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, of course it is well known that the Dominion of Canada has sent approximately 400,000 men into the army.

Mr. HARDWICK. I saw the statement made very recently that the figure now was nearly three-quarters of a million.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Seven hundred and fifty thousand?

Mr. HARDWICK. Nearly that; yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am quite certain that the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, the statement was made yesterday in the public press of the country.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The number, I am quite certain, is in the neighborhood of 400,000 men. True, that number was raised by a so-called volunteer system.

Mr. HARDWICK. Are not the Canadian troops the best the allies have had?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not denying their excellence for a moment.

Mr. HARDWICK. Why should not America have the same system under the same category?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was about to reach that. It is true, as I said, that Canada has sent in the neighborhood of 400,000 under the volunteer system. The truth of the matter is, however, that Canada in the first six months of actual fighting in France wasted the best men of Canada, who should have been carefully selected, and would have been under the provisions of a law similar to this, and been used as officer material. I mentioned a regiment Saturday afternoon as an example, two-thirds of which was well known to be of officer material, 1,600 men, the Princess Patricia Regiment. There has never been a volunteer regiment that I know of in the history of any country that had a finer and a more splendid personnel than that. In six weeks' time after reaching the trenches only 40 were left. They can never be replaced. They should have been officered the other Canadian regiments. The sacrifice of those men was infinitely more than that represented by the killing and wounding of, say, 1,500 of them, because they would have been of more service to their country in the positions for which they were best qualified. The same is true of the first troops sent by Great Britain to France in that wonderful response to the call for volunteers.

Mr. HARDWICK. May I interrupt the Senator again? Could not the selective principle be applied just as well to the volunteer system as to the conscriptive system?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not see how.

Mr. HARDWICK. Is not that exactly what Canada is doing?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If you could not fill your quota with volunteers you must resort to draft.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not know, but I have been informed by a Senator on this floor that Canada is now applying the selective principle—the main principle the Senator is lauding now—to the volunteer system and in practically three years has not yet resorted to conscription.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is another reason, however, for their failure to resort to conscription.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator state it, because I should like to have all the information I can?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The political influence in the Canadian Government of the Province of Quebec, which is largely responsible for their not having conscription.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Province of Quebec is of very small influence in the Dominion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is sufficient to have great power in the Canadian Government as now constituted, as the Senator can readily see. Of course, that is a mere expression of opinion and may or may not be well founded.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not belittling the volunteers of Canada. The Senator misunderstood me. The Senator is mistaken when he says that the Province of Quebec is exerting an influence to prevent conscription. The truth is that the Province of Quebec furnishes a very small quota to the Canadian Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true.

Mr. GALLINGER. Inasmuch as the Province of Quebec is negligible, so far as the Dominion of Canada is concerned, it would seem as though the conscription would be resorted to so

as to force those men into the army to the extent of other Provinces. I suppose the Senator knows that Australia rejected the system of conscription. So it is not universal. Yet the Senator contends that conscription is universally recognized as the best system.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In commenting on the first portion of the Senator's question or answer, as it may be termed, I do not know whether I am confusing cause and effect with respect to the Province of Quebec or whether the Senator is doing it. It is true a much lower percentage of men in the Province of Quebec volunteered in the Canadian Army than in the other provinces, and therefore it is not surprising that Quebec is not in favor of conscription.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me just one further observation. Is it not surprising, I will ask the Senator, that the Dominion of Canada with the Province of Quebec as a negligible quantity should not enforce conscription so as to make those men enter the service?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the Senator's assumption that Quebec is a negligible quantity politically is correct, to which I can not agree—

Mr. CURTIS. Would not the objection the Senator urges against the manner in which the officers are now selected from volunteers be avoided by a provision in the law that no one shall be commissioned an officer unless he has had a sufficient amount of training?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That would leave the volunteers without any officers.

Mr. CURTIS. Not necessarily. The officers now in England according to the testimony before the committee must have served so many weeks in the ranks and then they must have taken a course at a training school before they can be commissioned as officers. Congress could make a similar provision relative to officers.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think the statement of the Senator with reference to the selection of these officers of volunteers is altogether one of the strongest arguments against the volunteer system. I agree that that proposition is one of the objections to the volunteer system. But I wish to ask the Senator solely for information, how are we going to supply the officers for the different regiments when we have such a limited number of officers now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The bill makes provision for that very thing.

Mr. BORAH. Have we enough officers in the United States to supply them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have not now.

Mr. BORAH. I mean trained officers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have not.

Mr. BORAH. We must necessarily, then, resort to some extent to untrained officers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We shall have to train officers in large numbers. The first effort will be, as I understand it, to train 10,000 new officers.

Mr. BORAH. The thought occurred to me that we could train volunteers perhaps as early as we could train other officers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. With whom shall we train them?

Mr. BORAH. With whom are you going to train the men you are going to train?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The present trained officers will have to train new ones.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly. Could they not train the new officers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They could not train the volunteers for an army of 500,000 at the same time. The system would break down.

Mr. BORAH. Gen. Sherman says, in his memoirs, some of the best officers who came out of the Civil War were men who were discouraged in the first instance to become officers. If we are going to select these men in the first instance without having been trained and having their capacity developed, I do not see why we could not select them just as well from volunteers as from conscripts.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator misunderstands the provision of the bill with respect to training officers and also the policy of the administration. These officers are not to be selected before they show their fitness. They are to be trained, and then they are to be given commissions after they show their fitness. That is the whole point.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know how the officer is to show his real fitness before going to war. It took the first year of the Civil War to get rid of the blunderers of West Point.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would first prefer to answer the question of the Senator from Idaho a little more fully, because he has brought up a very important topic. The Senator says the best way to develop the fitness of an officer is in war. Certainly the Senator would not urge sending green officers to Europe in charge of troops to see how many of them would turn out to be fit.

We must give them all the instruction we can and test them out—test their ability in mobilization camps and in handling troops—and pick the best men. That is what this bill contemplates, and even then, may I say to the Senator from Idaho, the commissions that are to be given under the bill, outside of commissions already existing in the Regulars and in the National Guard, are to be temporary. They are probationary commissions. They may be withdrawn, if need be, after troops have been sent to Europe—in fact, at any time—by the President for failure to come up to the standard. So every effort is made to prevent that horrible tragedy of sending troops into battle under officers who have never been tested anywhere.

Mr. BORAH. In order that the Senator may understand me, I say frankly I have what some would call hereditary prejudices against conscription; but the Senator has done much toward causing reconsideration.

Mr. WADSWORTH. My hereditary tendency should also be against it, because every member of my family above the age of 17 was a volunteer in the Civil War, and I volunteered as a private in the Spanish War myself. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. On the question of officers, which is the most important one of all to be considered, I understand that it would take 18,538 officers to command the first increment of 500,000 men. We have about 8,000 in the Army Officers' Reserve Corps now—young men who, for the most part, have filed applications and had their names put on the list. Does not the Senator think—and that was the suggestion of the Senator from Idaho awhile ago—that officers who have seen service in the Spanish-American War, for instance, or officers who have been trained in the military schools of our country would be more competent and just as easily trained as the 8,000 young men we already have on the roll and the 10,500 others we have to put on that roll from some place or other, we know not where?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the bill on page 3 provides exactly for what the Senator from Tennessee is contending. It proposes to make use of men who have graduated from military institutions at which courses approved by the War Department are prescribed, or "from the country at large," which would include Spanish War veterans. Now, if these men want to be officers in command of troops in the service of their country, all they have to do is to present themselves at an officers' training camp within certain reasonable limits of numbers, take the course of three months which has already been outlined by the War Department, mix in with the men who are now upon the officers' reserve list, mix in with the men who are graduates of military academies, schools, and colleges, take their chance with the rest, learn something of the care and sanitation of camps, of drilling and handling troops, show their efficiency, and they will get their commissions. But what many of them want to do, Mr. President, is to organize their own companies at home and get the commissions before they are trained.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. HARDING. I wish to ask the Senator from New York if he does not think the acquirement of a sufficient force under the volunteer method is entirely dependent upon the acceptance of these unfit officers at home?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Absolutely; you can not raise 500,000 volunteers unless you let down the bars in the matter of commissions.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question for my own information. Does the Senator understand that with the bill as it is now prepared the National Guard would come under its provisions?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, Mr. President; I discussed that earlier in my remarks. The National Guard is to be drafted into

the Federal service, and will be just as surely Federal troops as the Regular Army itself. I discussed that when the Senator may not have been in the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I was not in the Chamber when that was discussed. Would not that eventually destroy the National Guard, the militia? Our law in section 11 of the national defense act reads that "all persons so drafted shall from said date of their draft stand discharged from the militia."

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I say to the Senator from South Dakota I have already discussed that. I am anxious to conclude my remarks within a reasonable time, and at the same time, of course, I do not wish to be discourteous to the Senator. That matter was discussed in a running debate while I had the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. In that case I beg the Senator's pardon for my interruption.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. The Senator discussed the point a few moments ago, to which I was attempting to direct his attention at the time before he got away from the subject of the terrible sacrifice of the few English troops Great Britain was able to send to France when the war commenced. Does not the Senator believe that that sacrifice was not only absolutely necessary but was justified, if ever a sacrifice was? In other words, is it not a fact that the flower of the English Army in France hanging on to the German right flank finally enabled the French to come out from Paris and hurl the Germans back? Had it not been for that would not Paris at that time have fallen into the hands of the German Army?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, I am not able to answer the concluding portion of the Senator's question; I do not know. But may I say in partial answer that undoubtedly the situation demanded that a terrific drain in the lives of men should be imposed upon Great Britain. In the first six months or year of the war she had to send men to France half trained. She had to take in the first few weeks the flower of the manhood of England, because always they are the first to offer themselves. But no such compulsion falls upon us, and if England had to do it over again I have not the slightest doubt but what she would have first trained, in advance of the events, a democratic army on the plan of universal compulsory service for her forces, and thus would not have wasted her best men.

Mr. FALL. I understand from the general trend of the bill it is the theory of some in this country, and evidently of the General Staff, that the United States is not to take any part in this war for a long time, not perhaps for a year or more.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is not my understanding of the bill or the purpose of the General Staff.

Mr. FALL. Well, that is mine. So Senators differ on those lines.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is not my understanding of it.

Mr. FALL. At the same time I would like to ask the Senator is it not his impression that the sacrifice of the Princess Patricia Regiment was absolutely necessary, and if it had not been made the Germans could have reached the coast of France and this war might have had a different termination?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It might be so.

Mr. FALL. Of course, if there is no emergency, I do not see any reason why we should not discuss this matter for a week or 10 days.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I say in regard to the matter of volunteers in our Army there is room for 600,000 of them, if these men desire to come forward to join units already organized and reasonably well officered. There is no room in the bill for any volunteers who are to organize themselves under officers of their own choosing, and who, according to the lessons of the past, will be 75 per cent inefficient.

This bill does not contemplate that method of recruiting an army. The bill contemplates that our new army shall be built up by a process of selecting the most available instruments, building it upon a sure foundation, and making it so strong that it will carry any burden imposed upon it, and that, furthermore, in that army all kinds and classes of Americans shall be represented.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WOLCOTT. For my own information, Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator a question. The Senator from New York has just stated that the present bill furnishes the opportunity for 600,000 men to volunteer. I desire to ask how many volunteers of the 600,000 under existing law may come

into the Regular Army and how many in the Organized Militia? How much of an increase is to be made in the Regular Army and how much in the Organized Militia?

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I said earlier in the day—I feel as if I should call it a day now—the Regulars are to be increased to 270,000 men.

Mr. WOLCOTT. How many men are in the Regular Army now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. About 130,000. The Regular Army is to be increased from 130,000 to 270,000, and the National Guard up to 330,000.

But, in addition to supplying volunteers for the existing units of the Regulars and National Guard, it is inevitable that many thousands of Regular enlisted men and of National Guard enlisted men will become officers, so that the number of men necessary to fill up those two branches of the service on the present basis must be largely increased. That is how the War Department has computed, roughly, that 600,000 Volunteers will be necessary to fill these forces up; and if they do not come forward, the President may draft them.

Mr. FALL. The Senator is now speaking of officers. Does not the Senator think that the United States has power and authority to provide absolutely the qualifications of the Volunteer officers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It has.

Mr. FALL. Then the Senator's idea is, so far as officers are concerned, that just as easily, under exactly the same conditions, officers for both the Volunteers and the drafted quota of 500,000 can be provided for.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not think it possible; politics would prevent.

Mr. President, I want to say a word with respect to the contrast between the volunteer system and the selective draft system. As the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] has so well said, when volunteers are called for the best blood of the country comes to the front. That is to be expected. Much of it should not be allowed to come. Under a volunteer system, practically speaking, there is no way of preventing that. If you are to get the requisite number of volunteers, you must take practically every able-bodied man who comes forward; and when you do that, Mr. President, you take thousands of men away from tasks at which they are of more value to their country in the waging of the war than they would be in the trenches themselves. That has happened time and time again.

The Southern Confederacy was much wiser than the North, generally speaking, in its military policy during the early part of the Civil War. They were the first to come to the conclusion that the volunteer system was inadequate. They were the first to come to conscription, and it was not solely because they lacked men. It was because the leaders of the Southern Confederacy were military men, competent to judge what the future would bring forth in the maintenance of the Confederate armies. For the first two or three years of the war the comparative success of the Confederate forces over the Union forces was due largely to the superiority of the Confederate military policy. Of course some of their advantage was due to the fact that they were on the defensive.

It was on April 16, 1862, that the Confederate Congress passed their conscription act. They had learned the lesson in just one year. It took the northern people two years to learn it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator give me the date that act went into effect?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the volume from which I am reading, unfortunately, on the pages which are before me the date on which the act went into effect is not given. I am reading from the Military Policy of the United States, by Maj. Gen. Emory D. Upton, where, on page 466, in the midst of a discussion of Confederate military legislation, he uses this language:

The next law, April 16, 1862—

Then follows the description and a copy of the conscription law itself. So it was either passed or went into effect on that date. I think the former is correct.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think that law did not go into effect until about the 1st of January following.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But, at any rate, I am correct in saying that the leaders of the Confederacy saw the wisdom of conscription at least a year in advance of the leaders of the North, and at the same time they provided in their military policy one of the most important things which we attempt to provide for in this bill, and that is the maintenance of a system of recruiting depots at home in order to keep the forces in the field filled to war strength, or approximately so, while they are doing the

fighting. It was the fact that during the Civil War the average Confederate regiment at the front was equal in numbers to the average Union brigade, with the single exception, I may say, of the Wisconsin regiments. The State of Wisconsin apparently adopted an internal State policy by which they kept sending fresh men to the old regiments who were serving at the front and discarded the practice of organizing new regiments of green men under inefficient officers. The Confederacy knew better from the beginning. We have often wondered, as we have read accounts of battles of the Civil War, how it was that Confederate regiments "stood off" Union brigades. It was because the Confederate regiments were kept at nearly war strength and the Union regiments went down to 200 and 150 men each.

We are attempting in this bill to prevent with absolute certainty that very evil. You can not keep the regiments at the front full, you can not make good the wastage, unless you are sure to get the men from the rear, and the only way you are sure is by a selective draft. If you rely upon the volunteer system to keep your regiments at the front filled, you are gambling—you can not tell from day to day how many recruits there will be in the rear ready and trained to go to the front.

That is one of the phases of this bill that I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate, because when armies are actually fighting the wastage is enormous and it must be filled.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to remind the Senator from New York that the very policy to which he so correctly refers followed in the Union Army added enormously to the expense of the maintenance of the service. There was always a colonel of the regiment to be paid a colonel's pay, a lieutenant colonel, a major, and other superior officers even with not more than a hundred men in the regiment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They generally had a full complement of officers.

Mr. GALLINGER. Would not that be so under the drafting system?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Except that the regiment would always be full.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is worth while to employ a colonel to command a regiment of 1,900 infantrymen, but it is not worth while to employ a colonel to command a regiment of 150 men. That is the command of a captain. A company of Infantry at war strength is composed of 150 men.

To come down to the basis of this whole discussion, Mr. President, we have to admit, so long as we are the devotees of a democratic system of Government, that the burdens of a great war should be distributed as evenly as may be upon all the men who are capable of bearing any share of that burden. If we are to be true to the ideals of a democracy, we must insist that every citizen owes it to his country to help in her defense. We want our defensive system so contrived that it shall not only be fair and democratic in its spirit but that it shall be employed in the most efficient way. Hence the necessity for selection, for selecting the instruments which we are going to use in waging our part in this great war.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I propounded an interrogatory to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], but the answer was not very conclusive to my mind. I am going to ask the Senator from New York the same question. When Great Britain resorted to conscription, she conscripted men from 18 to 41 years of age. Upon what theory or hypothesis has the committee restricted the age in this bill to from 19 to 25?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, Mr. President, as I understand it, there are 7,000,000 men in the United States between the ages of 19 and 25. That is a great many more than we could use for a long time to come. I suppose it was the policy of the General Staff, who have studied this matter for months and months, to select from our male population capable of bearing arms the most available material, and that material which could be drafted into the Army without inflicting unnecessary handicaps upon the industries of the country. They decided apparently—and I am disposed to agree with them—that between the ages of 19 and 25 a young man can be taken from his civil employment with less disturbance to his family or his industry than at any other age. So this bill provides that the selective draft shall apply to the men between 19 and 25. It is perfectly true that there are large numbers of men, aged 26, 28, and 30, who are fit to bear arms; but as we go up the scale in age the further we go we find the greater hardship inflicted on the country—not only on the men but on the country at large—

if you take them away from industrial pursuits and put them into the Army.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; but I am still puzzled as to the system pursued by Great Britain.

Mr. WADSWORTH. She had to do it, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not so sure about that. Great Britain called back a great many men from her army and put them into civil occupations, inasmuch as they were there needed; and yet, when she came to conscript men, she conscripted them from 18 to 41. I should think she would have needed a great many of those men in her industries, as much so as we would in the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, many of them were needed in her industries and were kept in her industries. If we wanted to apply this selective draft to all the men in the United States between the ages of 18 and 45, we should have available 20,000,000 men. It is the policy of the Government, or it should be the policy of the Government, to take the men whose departure from civil life causes the least hardship, and who at the same time will make the best soldiers. If this war should go on for 5, 6, or 10 years, we might very well find it absolutely necessary to draft men up to the age of 45.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator knows this war will not go on for 5, 6, or 10 years.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I certainly hope it will not.

Mr. GALLINGER. Still, I am puzzled to understand why Great Britain did not make similar exemptions. Now, I will ask the Senator from New York if any calculation has been made by the Senator or by the committee as to how numerous are the exemptions which are provided by this bill? The Senator from New York states the number of men who are liable to conscription. What about the exemptions? As I read the bill, there can not, under it, be conscripted a man who is useful on a farm.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is scarcely accurate, if I may call the Senator's attention to the language.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is the way I read it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are certain specific exemptions established by this bill. One of them is on the ground of religious conviction.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; applying to three or four denominations.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then, there are discretionary exemptions, which are lodged in the hands of the President. Among them are those men who, in his judgment, would be of more value in industries at home than in the ranks at the front.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I should like to conclude.

Mr. KELLOGG. I merely want to ask the Senator a question. Is it not a fact that Great Britain could not get the number of men it was necessary for her to have by taking those from 19 to 26 years of age, and that she was forced to require the service of those 40 years of age?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly; that is the fact. England had to take men who were as old as 40 years in order to get enough. She had to create an army of four and a half million men out of a population of fifty-one or fifty-two million. Mr. President, I am very anxious to conclude, if I have a chance.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I desire to suggest that he is not consistent. He is insisting on compulsory military service, and I think he ought not to object if he is compelled to occupy the floor.

Mr. POMERENE. Particularly when he is speaking so well. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Senators will kindly address the Chair.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, my great concern in this whole matter is that my country shall acquit herself creditably and in such a way as to bring this war to an early conclusion. I know that some of the ideas incorporated in this bill do not meet with the unanimous approval of the people of the United States; but, sir, I am looking toward the future, in which I hope to see our efforts, great or small—and I hope they will be great—crowned with a victory, achieved in such a way that every man in the United States will be able to say at the conclusion of this war that he has borne some part of the burden and thereby is entitled to look the rest of the world in the face and be deserving of his share of the blessings which our institutions have vouchsafed to us.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time, he said:

Mr. President, the hour of half past 5 o'clock has arrived, and I am somewhat weary. If the Senator from Oregon will consent, I should like to yield the floor until to-morrow morning.

## ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 2762) to authorize the issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

## RECESS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 24, 1917, at 12 o'clock m.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 23, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

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

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, Author of every great thought, of every high and holy aspiration, clarify our minds that we may think clearly, and fill our hearts with pure motives in the epoch-making period through which the world is passing, that we, as a people, may do our part in shaping the destiny of mankind. It is a gigantic undertaking for truth against error, righteousness against evil, liberty against oppression, democracy against autocracy, the divine right of men against "the divine right of kings." Without Thee we are impotent; with Thee we are strong, for Thou art mighty to deliver. Uphold, sustain, and guide us, and inspire every American heart with patriotic zeal, that no man, no woman, may be found wanting; that out of the great holocaust shall come a brighter day when men shall learn war no more; and liberty, justice, righteousness, and peace shall reign supreme and the old earth shall rejoice and blossom as the rose, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 19, 1917, was read and approved.

## ALLEN F. COOPER.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great personal sorrow that I announce to the House the death of former Congressman Allen F. Cooper, of Pennsylvania, who died at his home in Uniontown, Pa., on Friday, April 20. Mr. Cooper was a Member of the Fifty-eighth Congress and each succeeding Congress, including the Sixty-first, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a short summary of his services in this body.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD, as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, Allen Foster Cooper was elected to the Fifty-eighth Congress from the twenty-third Pennsylvania district, and was reelected to the Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, and Sixty-first Congresses. He was not a candidate for election to the Sixty-second Congress, and I was elected by the voters of the district to succeed him.

As a Member of Congress, Mr. Cooper was active, energetic, and always watchful of the interests of his district. He was chairman of the Committee on Printing, and gave to this work his close attention.

Mr. Cooper was a lawyer by profession, and was also identified with the large business interests of his home town and Fayette County. He was active and influential in the councils of his party, a man of high character and ideals, domestic in his tastes, and ever ready to take an active part in public affairs. His life and work have left an impress which will last, and his sudden death, which occurred at Uniontown, Pa., April 20, 1917, in the very prime of his life is a distinct loss to the splendid community in which he lived, the State, and the Nation.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STRONG, for to-morrow, Tuesday, on account of important business.

To Mr. DIES, for several days, on account of illness.

## WILLIAM H. PARRY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, with much sorrow I announce the death in the city of Washington, Saturday last, of Hon. Will H. Parry, vice chairman of the Federal Trade

Commission, a citizen of the State of Washington. I shall not take the time of the House further, except to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD concerning his life, character, and services.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1845. An act to authorize PETER GOELET GERRY to enter into a contract with the Secretary of the Navy, in behalf of the United States, for the use of the steam yacht *Owera*;

S. 995. An act to authorize the issue to States and Territories and the District of Columbia of rifles and other property for the equipment of organizations of home guards; and

S. 1006. An act authorizing the county of Morrison, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said county.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 2338. An act to authorize the detail of additional officers to the Hydrographic Office;

H. R. 2339. An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy until September 1, 1918;

H. R. 2340. An act to increase the age limit for persons appointed as officers in the Naval Reserve;

H. R. 1771. An act to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," relative to the Fleet Naval Reserve; and

H. R. 2008. An act to provide for the extension of minority enlistments in the naval service.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 1845. An act to authorize PETER GOELET GERRY to enter into a contract with the Secretary of the Navy, in behalf of the United States, for the use of the steam yacht *Owera*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 995. An act to authorize the issue to States and Territories and the District of Columbia of rifles and other property for the equipment of organizations of home guards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1006. An act authorizing the county of Morrison, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said county; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 1771. An act to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," relative to the Fleet Naval Reserve;

H. R. 2338. An act to authorize the detail of additional officers to the Hydrographic Office;

H. R. 2339. An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy until September 1, 1918;

H. R. 2340. An act to increase the age limit for persons appointed as officers in the Naval Reserve; and

H. R. 2008. An act to provide for the extension of minority enlistments in the naval service.

## REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial from the Evening Sun, of Baltimore, on "Maryland does its bit."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. DOWELL. I shall have to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa objects.

## EMERGENCY BOND ISSUE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to present the conference report and accompanying statement on the bill H. R. 2762, authorizing the bond issue.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the conference report.



The Clerk read as follows:

Conference report on the bill (H. R. 2762) to authorize an issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from North Carolina wants to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I do that, Mr. Speaker. I ask immediate consideration of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to consider this conference report, notwithstanding it has not been printed in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. What is the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. KITCHIN. To have the statement read instead of the report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement was read.

The conference report and accompanying statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 23).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2762) to authorize an issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, is hereby authorized to deposit in such banks and trust companies as he may designate the proceeds, or any part thereof, arising from the sale of the bonds and certificates of indebtedness authorized by this act, or the bonds previously authorized as described in section 4 of this act, and such deposits may bear such rate of interest and be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: *Provided*, That the amount so deposited shall not in any case exceed the amount withdrawn from any such bank or trust company and invested in such bonds or certificates of indebtedness plus the amount so invested by such bank or trust company, and such deposits shall be secured in the manner required for other deposits by section 5153, Revised Statutes, and amendments thereto: *Provided further*, That the provisions of section 5191 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the Federal reserve act and the amendments thereof, with reference to the reserves required to be kept by national banking associations and other member banks of the Federal Reserve System, shall not apply to deposits of public moneys by the United States in designated depositories."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment of the title: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the title, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the title inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"An act to authorize an issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and, for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLAUDE KITCHIN,  
HENRY T. RAINEY,  
LINCOLN DIXON,  
J. W. FORDNEY,  
A. P. GARDNER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

F. M. SIMMONS,  
W. J. STONE,  
JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS,  
BOIES PENROSE,  
H. C. LODGE,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2762) to authorize an issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

On amendments Nos. 1 and 2: These amendments make no material change in the bill and are in the interest of clearness; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 3: The bill as it passed the House limited the conversion privilege granted by this bill to December 31, 1918. The Senate changed the limitation to "the termination of the war between the United States and the Imperial German Government, the date of such termination to be fixed by a proclamation of the President of the United States"; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 4: The Senate amendment provides that the certificates of indebtedness authorized in this bill shall be exempt from all taxation, except estate or inheritance taxes. While this amendment is probably not necessary, it is thought advisable to take this precaution; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 5: The purpose of this amendment is to encourage a great many financial institutions and trust companies to join in assisting in floating this large bond issue. The Senate amendment authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to deposit in such banks and trust companies as he may designate an amount not to exceed the amount withdrawn from such bank or trust company for investment in United States bonds or certificates of indebtedness authorized and issued under the provisions of this bill. For fear that the Senate amendment might be construed to limit the amount that could be deposited in banks or trust companies to the amount withdrawn by depositors the amendment agreed to specifically states that the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may deposit in such banks and trust companies as he may designate an amount of money equivalent to the amount withdrawn from such banks and trust companies and invested in bonds or certificates of indebtedness plus the amount so invested by such bank or trust company.

The amendment agreed to further provides "that the provisions of section 5191 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the Federal reserve act and the amendments thereof, with reference to the reserves required to be kept by national banking associations and other member banks of the Federal Reserve System, shall not apply to deposits of public moneys by the United States in designated depositories."

On amendment No. 6: This amendment changes the section number; and the House recedes.

On amendment No. 7: The Senate amendment requires the Secretary of the Treasury, in addition to the reports now required by law, to make, on the first Monday in December, 1917, and annually thereafter, a report to Congress giving a detailed statement of all expenditures under this act; and the House recedes.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the title, and agrees to the same with an amendment which merely inserts a comma after the word "and" in the third line of the Senate amendment. This amendment is merely in the interest of clearness.

CLAUDE KITCHIN,  
HENRY T. RAINEY,  
LINCOLN DIXON,  
J. W. FORDNEY,  
A. P. GARDNER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from North Carolina might state what it contains.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for one hour.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, amendments Nos. 1 and 2 simply make it more clear that these bonds and certificates of indebtedness are not exempt from the payment of estate or inheritance taxes levied by the Federal Government or by the States.

Mr. MANN. My recollection is that the Senate amendment did make them subject to the estate and inheritance taxes levied by the States.

Mr. KITCHIN. No.

Mr. MANN. Not by the Federal Government?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; as the bill passed the House, it exempted estate and inheritance taxes levied either by the State or Federal Government from taxation. The Senate thought that the language was not clear enough and repeated the words, "imposed by any State or local taxing authority." The Senate amendment made the language absolutely clear, and we receded from our disagreement and agreed to that. Now it admits of no doubt but that Congress intended to exempt from taxation estate and inheritance taxes levied by the Federal Government and by the State authorities.

As to amendment No. 3, you will recall that the House—

Mr. MANN. One moment; as to this amendment No. 1, the amendment, as I understand it—I do not know whether I am right—makes these bonds subject to estate and inheritance taxes levied by the United States?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. But not subject to the estate and inheritance taxes levied by the State?

Mr. KITCHIN. We intended for these bonds to pay the estate and inheritance taxes, whether levied by the Federal Government or the State governments. The Senate amendment makes it more clear that that is the intention of Congress.

Mr. MANN. That is not the way I read it. It says, "shall be exempt."

Mr. KITCHIN. "Both as to principal and interest, from all taxation except estate and inheritance taxes, imposed by authority of the United States, or its possessions," or shall be exempt from all taxes except estate or inheritance taxes imposed by authority of any State except the estate or inheritance taxes. That is the way we had it.

Now it reads:

And shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation except estate or inheritance taxes, imposed by authority of the United States, or its possessions, or by any State of local taxing authority.

Mr. HASTINGS. That is clear.

Mr. GARNER. The way it read in the House bill was sufficient.

Mr. KITCHIN. The way it read in the House bill was sufficient, but they thought it best to repeat that—

Or by "any State or local taxing authority."

This makes it clear that these bonds must pay estate and inheritance taxes levied by State or Federal authority.

Now, amendment No. 3, to which the House agreed, makes this change: In the House bill the period of convertibility of these bonds into those bearing a higher rate of interest, if Congress should pass an act authorizing the issue of bonds at a rate in excess of 3½ per cent, was limited to December 31, 1918. The Senate struck that provision out and made the convertible period the termination of the war with the Imperial German Government. The amendment just extends the time. If the war should last only a year, the convertibility would extend only a year. If the war lasts beyond December 31, 1918, this convertibility privilege is extended beyond that time. We thought there was no objection to that.

Mr. MANN. Now, referring to the other amendments—Nos. 1 and 2—I still think that the reading of the bill excepts those bonds from estate or inheritance taxes levied by a State, but makes them subject to inheritance or estate taxes levied by the Federal Government.

Mr. KITCHIN. No. The language is—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has read it. Let me read it.

Mr. KITCHIN. All right; you read it.

Mr. MANN. It reads:

Shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation except estate or inheritance taxes, imposed by authority of the United States, or its possessions, or by any State or local taxing authority.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is, excepted from the exemption.

Mr. HASTINGS. Exactly.

Mr. KITCHIN. In other words, the Federal Government taxes these bonds with respect to estate or inheritance taxes.

Mr. MANN. I believe the gentleman is right.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think so.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. If a person of large fortune invests \$100,000 or \$500,000 in these bonds, will he be liable to any taxes of any kind to the Federal or the State Government?

Mr. KITCHIN. Not until he dies. He will pay no taxes except estate or inheritance taxes.

Mr. ADAMSON. And after he is dead he will not care.

Mr. KITCHIN. No. Now, amendment No. 4 simply makes it clear that the certificate of indebtedness shall be exempted from taxation in the same manner as the bonds.

No. 5 is entirely a new section. The statement of the managers on the part of the House fully explains the section and is as follows:

The purpose of this amendment is to encourage a great many financial institutions and trust companies to join in assisting in floating this large bond issue. The Senate amendment authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to deposit in such banks and trust companies as he may designate an amount not to exceed the amount withdrawn from such bank or trust company for investment in United States bonds or certificates of indebtedness authorized and issued under the provisions of this bill. For fear that the Senate amendment might be construed to limit the amount that could be deposited in banks or trust companies to the amount withdrawn by depositors the amendment agreed to specifically states that the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, may deposit in such banks and trust companies as he may designate an amount of money equivalent to the amount withdrawn from such banks and trust companies and invested in bonds or certificates of indebtedness plus the amount so invested by such bank or trust company.

The amendment agreed to further provides "that the provisions of section 5191 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by the Federal reserve act and the amendments thereof, with reference to the reserves required to be kept by national banking associations and other member banks of the Federal Reserve System, shall not apply to deposits of public moneys by the United States in designated depositories."

But for this provision the Secretary of the Treasury would have no power to make these deposits in trust companies or State banks and nonmember banks of the Federal Reserve System. So we enlarge his power to make deposits in trust companies and State banks as well as the banks of the Federal reserve, to the extent of not exceeding the amount of the money withdrawn by depositors from those banks to buy these bonds and to the extent of the amount which those banks may invest in the bonds. So it seems to put the trust companies and State banks, if they furnish money to buy these bonds, on the same terms as to deposits as the national banks or the member banks of the reserve system.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The Secretary of the Treasury can now deposit money in the national banks, or members of the Federal reserve.

Mr. KITCHIN. There is so much talk around me I can not hear what the gentleman says.

Mr. MANN. The Secretary now has the authority to make deposits in banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; if he names them as depositories.

Mr. MANN. This is possibly technical. The language is this:

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, is hereby authorized to deposit in such banks and trust companies as he may designate the proceeds—

And so forth. Here is a new authority covering all banks, not merely State banks and trust companies, but also by its language covering the present national banks. Well, that can do no harm, of course, except that having designated all banks in the first part of this amendment, in the proviso you say—

In no case shall an amount so deposited exceed the amount withdrawn from such bank or trust company for investment in United States bonds or certificates of indebtedness authorized and issued under the provisions of this act.

Now, that is all banks. That was not the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. KITCHIN. No; it is not all State banks or trust companies, but such as he may designate as depositories.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman inserts a word which is not in the amendment. The gentleman says "State banks."

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The language of the amendment is "banks," which covers all banks.

Mr. KITCHIN. It means State banks or trust companies, for the reason that now he has power to designate only members of the Federal reserve or national banks. Now we make it all banks. Therefore it includes the State banks and trust companies.

Mr. MANN. I understand that; but you say "banks." That covers all banks.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; all that he may designate.

Mr. MANN. Then you say below:

In no case shall an amount so deposited exceed the amount withdrawn from such bank or trust company for investment in United States bonds or certificates of indebtedness.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That was not intended to restrict the amount that he may deposit in member banks to the amount withdrawn from those member banks.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; it is this—

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; it was. That proviso was in for this purpose—

Mr. MANN. I know what the purpose is.

Mr. KITCHIN. Let us see if it does not carry out the purpose. If that proviso were not in, then we will say here is a trust company or State bank right across the street which would take \$500,000 of these bonds, and without that proviso and this section 7, the Secretary of the Treasury could take that money right out of that bank and put it in a national bank, its competitor, on the other side of the street.

Mr. MANN. That does not come from the proviso; that comes from the main part of the section.

Mr. KITCHIN. Here is what it does. Suppose the national bank right across the street had put in \$500,000 and the State bank on the other side had put in \$500,000. If you did not have that proviso the Secretary could take all of the \$500,000 from the State bank and put it over in the national bank, which would then have \$500,000 more than the national bank had paid for the bonds.

Mr. MANN. I understand the purpose of it. If money is withdrawn from the State bank, then that money may be deposited in the State bank, so that the money will not be taken out of the bank before it is used; but I am calling the attention of the gentleman to the language. The first provision in the section covers all banks, and the second provision is a proviso that he can not deposit any more in any such bank than the amount withdrawn. It was not the purpose, as I understand it, to put that restriction on the present member banks. They must have some place to deposit the money.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; it was.

Mr. MANN. It will not all be redeposited in the same banks.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is right; but if the national bank across the street to which I referred had taken only \$500,000 of the bonds, this proviso says that he shall not put more than \$500,000 in that bank. It does not say that he shall put as much as that, but not more than that. He can leave \$300,000 in that bank, but he can not put in more.

Mr. MANN. Where will he put the balance?

Mr. KITCHIN. He would put the balance if he needed the balance into the Treasury and pay it out.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; it would not be put in the Treasury. It might be half a million dollars. You do not want to remove the money from circulation.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, no; not from circulation.

Mr. MANN. Here is a State bank which the gentleman says takes \$500,000, but it may be only \$10,000. They may not desire to put up the security in order to retain this money. The money is going to be deposited in some banks, it is not going to be deposited in Washington or in a Subtreasury, because that would take it out of circulation. I am sure that it was not the intention in preparing this amendment to say that the Secretary was limited in the amount that he could deposit in the member banks, but when you say "such banks" then "such banks" refer to all banks, and I am afraid you do put that limitation on.

Mr. KITCHIN. I would say to the gentleman that that very matter was discussed, and it was the bone of contention for two days, that very point that he raises. I do not know that I ought to say anything about what took place in the conference, but some of the conferees felt that if you did not put this limitation on, the funds would go to the State or the trust bank right across the street—

Mr. MANN. I am not objecting to that limitation.

Mr. KITCHIN. Wait a moment—get this money out and put it over here in a competitor bank that is a member of the reserve, and if you can put in the Federal reserve or the member bank more money than it has paid for bonds, then you can do this, because the law does not say that you shall keep the amount in each bank which has been taken out for investment, but it says that you can not keep to exceed that. That is to protect the State banks, and I would say the Secretary of the Treasury and some of the conferees would prefer to have exactly what the gentleman claims, but the conferees could not get together on that.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. I think possibly the gentleman from North Carolina does not get quite clear the points of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I do get the points clear.

Mr. HARDY. Let me see if I understand it the way the gentleman does. As I understand it, the gentleman's objection is that under the present law the national banks, the Federal reserve banks, may receive more of these deposits than are taken from their vaults?

Mr. KITCHIN. They would have to receive all but for this section 7.

Mr. HARDY. They may receive all that they paid out and other sums invested in this money.

Mr. KITCHIN. All other sums, except for this section 7.

Mr. HARDY. This section 7 will prevent even a national bank from receiving any more sums than were paid out from that national bank.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman think that is wise?

Mr. KITCHIN. To be absolutely candid, personally I did not think that was the wisest course, but the conferees could not agree on anything else than that.

Mr. MANN. I am sure that will not be the construction in the Treasury Department, although that is what the language says.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think that is what the conferees intended, or some of them, because they would not agree to anything else, to be candid with the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell how long this money is to be left in the member banks or the banks that purchase these bonds?

Mr. KITCHIN. That is in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. He will keep it there as long as practicable, no doubt.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. When the bonds are purchased the purchasing bank pays the money to the Government or the Federal Reserve Bank. This bank is out that money. Now it reimburses itself by sales to customers and also by the deposits of money received there. It does not send it away, as I understand it.

Mr. KITCHIN. It is to keep it in the bank as long as practicable.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is equivalent simply to depositing these bonds with the member banks.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is the great inducement to the banks to help float these bonds.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is the same with the certificates, as I understand it.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, of course, section 6 is simply a renumbering of the section—

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman gets away from section 7 I wish the gentleman would advise us what was the reasoning that led the conferees to agree to the last proviso of section 7.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, now, banks outside of certain cities, such as Albany, Philadelphia, Boston, and so forth, are required to keep a certain reserve as against the amount of deposits and their circulation.

Now, that is simply a security for its deposits. When the Government makes deposits of public money it requires gilt-edge security for them. We thought it was nothing but right to release those reserves and not have further security for Government moneys than the security they must put up in order to get those moneys, and that that would release the reserves and get them in circulation and in use by the people.

Mr. WINGO. I do not agree that the only function of reserves is security for deposits; but that does not meet the question that occurred to my mind. As a matter of fact, the practical operation of this act will be this: That the banks will purchase these bonds offered on their own account or for their customers, and under the deposit feature there will be no money paid out by them, but the deposit account will be altered so that instead of it being that of their customers it will be that of the United States Government. In other words, these banks will not be out a single dollar.

Mr. KITCHIN. Wait a minute. Why will they not be out a single dollar?

Mr. WINGO. I do not think they will be. I think that the object of this very deposit provision is to enable the Government to procure credits to the extent of the bonds sold without disturbing the finances of the country, and with that we all agree. The very object of this deposit provision is to prevent a financial stringency that would be produced by withdrawing this great, enormous amount of money.

Mr. KITCHIN. The object of this is to do exactly what I said, to release the reserve that under the present law is required to be kept as security for public moneys deposited. Now, when that public money is deposited ample security must be given. No man on the conference committee questioned that at all. We all thought it was right and proper.

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will permit me to conclude, I was making a statement; and he is thinking about one thing, and I am discussing another. At the time I was talking about the deposit proposition and now—

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman referred to the last proviso, and I thought he was discussing that.

Mr. WINGO. I was discussing the deposit of the proceeds of bonds, and I was getting down to the effect of this reserve provision—

Mr. KITCHIN. I thought that was what the gentleman was discussing.

Mr. WINGO. No; I think the gentleman did not pay attention to what I was discussing, or he would have seen that I was discussing what is in the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. But the gentleman referred to the last proviso.

Mr. WINGO. There is no use discussing the effect of a thing unless you get at the cause of it and what you are doing; and I was leading up to my question, which was this: The object of this deposit provision is to prevent a disturbance by withdrawing from the vaults of the banks this enormous sum of money, and I approve that. Now, against these funds at the present time they are required to maintain a reserve. Now, under the deposit provision these funds will not be withdrawn immediately. It is intended that this loan shall be a credit to the allies, and consequently the only effect of this whole bond issue will be a transference of the credit in the banks of the country. That is the reason it will be easy to float the bond issue. You will not change the status of the banks so far as the funds are concerned, and yet you are creating a greater inflation at this time of inflation by taking off the reserve requirements of the law, which all agree are low enough.

You have not placed any burden upon the banks, because with this deposit provision you have removed the burden, the danger you wanted to avoid, and in addition to that you go further and say, "We will free you from the reserve requirements so far as these deposits are concerned."

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman does not state it right. We remove them from requirements of reserves against the proceeds of these bonds which will be deposited in banks.

Mr. WINGO. And the funds will still be there and still be used for financial purposes, and the release of that much of their funds from reserve requirements will enable them to extend their credit much more.

Mr. KITCHIN. And enable the people to have much more money to use.

Mr. WINGO. And result in additional inflation.

Mr. KITCHIN. I do not know whether you would call it inflation or not. It releases so much more money for the use of the people. It does not create any new currency. It may permit a transfer of credits.

Mr. MANN. Suppose a bank or its depositors subscribe for a million of dollars of these bonds. That money is in the bank. The bank is to keep \$120,000 of it, say, as reserve. The moment it subscribes a million dollars that reserve is wiped out, and it does not have to keep any reserve on account of that million dollars. That is inflation. Then when the Government draws the money out and it gets back into the bank through depositors then they have to keep the reserve of \$120,000. That is contraction. One of the two is sure to make trouble.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will say to the gentleman that if a bank in Washington has \$100,000 now, and if I go there and borrow that money, according to the view of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. Wingo], and I pay it out for building, and so forth, the currency is inflated. When I pay it back it will be contracted. It will be that kind of contraction and inflation, and that is the only kind of inflation and contraction that will take place. It matters not whether you call it contraction or inflation if the Government puts in a bank \$1,000,000 of deposits, the Government would require that bank to keep in there under the present law \$120,000 of reserve. It could not loan it out, but it would be tied up in their security for this \$1,000,000 of Government deposits. Now, as the law requires the Government to give gilt-edged security, Government bonds, or State bonds, or other gilt-edged security, in that bank and requires the bank to put up this security for that \$1,000,000 of deposits, we thought it was only right that this \$120,000 of reserve required should be turned loose to be loaned to the people, because the Government does not need that additional security, for the reason that it has got security from the banks in the form of United States bonds, or State bonds, or other gilt-edged securities.

Mr. MANN. Now, to-day, if they buy \$5,000,000 of bonds under existing circumstances with that \$1,000,000 in the bank, they can only loan \$880,000. To-morrow, if they buy bonds, they can loan the whole \$1,000,000 of it. The next day, if it comes back to private deposits, they can loan only \$880,000 of it.

Mr. KITCHIN. You have that kind of contraction and inflation. You can not prevent that. I think the people will need

all these reserves when they begin to borrow this money or begin to pay it out.

Mr. MANN. That is the only reason we have the high cost of living. They reduce reserves and inflate the currency.

Mr. WINGO. We have never been asked to do this before. We considered this matter when we lowered the reserves by the Federal reserve act, and we lowered them to a dangerous point. And it is one of the elements of the high cost of living now, and the issuance of this large volume of bonds is going to increase the cost of living sufficiently without taking off the reserve on \$5,000,000,000 at one fell swoop. This is not a mere bugaboo that I have raised, but it is a dangerous proposition, and the banks that demand this have no right to demand it. It is not necessary. You can float these bonds without giving them this additional privilege.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think there is something in what you say. Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Was the question of the disposal of these bonds considered by the committee? Can the chairman tell us what becomes of them, how the bonds will be disposed of, whether by the Federal reserve banks or by the United States Treasury or by these large banks, and where they will be placed for sale?

Mr. KITCHIN. That will be left to the Secretary of the Treasury. He will dispose of them in the way that he thinks he will get the most for them. I think the banks will take a large portion of them and sell them to their depositors.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will they be sent to these banks to be disposed of?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; they will just subscribe for them and advertise them.

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

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. McFADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina how the banks will ascertain what these withdrawals will be used for?

Mr. KITCHIN. It does not say what they are to be withdrawn for, but it would be an actual investment.

Mr. McFADDEN. This will be only for actual investment?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. If a depositor withdraws \$100,000 from your bank and puts that \$100,000 into a bond, the bank of course will know that, and the Secretary of the Treasury can deposit that amount of money in the bank.

Mr. McFADDEN. The question I wish to propound is this: In many instances there will be withdrawals by individuals who do not care to have anybody know about them.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then the bank will not get those deposits.

Mr. McFADDEN. I would like to ask just one more question.

Mr. KITCHIN. Very well.

Mr. McFADDEN. Under this authorization it gives the Secretary of the Treasury the discretion to deposit bonds in any bank?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. McFADDEN. This applies to the 27,000 banks in the United States. Do I understand that the Secretary of the Treasury will distribute these deposits equitably to all the banks?

Mr. KITCHIN. Only equitably so far as practicable to those banks that subscribe or whose depositors subscribe and take bonds.

Mr. McFADDEN. One more question. There is in hiding, it has been stated frequently on the floor of the House, about \$800,000,000 or \$900,000,000. Suppose this should draw out \$600,000,000 of that money. Where is that money to be deposited—idle funds in people's stockings and in hiding?

Mr. KITCHIN. That will be deposited in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. McFADDEN. We are limited to the amount that is withdrawn from these banks?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; you can not exceed that amount withdrawn from the banks. I imagine that will be deposited in the regional banks or the Treasury.

Mr. McFADDEN. In the 12 regional banks?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; either in the 12 regional banks or in the Treasury Department.

Mr. McFADDEN. And the surplus can be deposited in any one of the 12 regional banks?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; or in the Treasury. That will be paid up.

Mr. McFADDEN. You mean the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, just a word further regarding the deposit of the proceeds of this big bond issue by the Secretary of the Treasury

in national and State banks of the country. So far as the national banks or member banks of the Federal Reserve System are concerned, the per cent of reserve is fixed for all of them by the Federal reserve law, but for State banks the required reserves differ in the many States, the legal requirements being fixed by the States themselves. These State banks and trust companies, if they are to receive these deposits, should be made to keep a reserve against these deposits the same as the national banks; and a good plan to cover this would be that the Secretary of the Treasury make a ruling that all State banks receiving deposits from the proceeds of this loan be required to keep the same reserve as do the national or member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and, further, the Secretary of the Treasury should leave or deposit these funds in the banks in the localities in which the subscription originates until the United States uses the same instead of transferring or consolidating the same in the few large city banks, thus to preserve the even tranquillity of our financial institutions the country over.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; they could keep it in that, or the Secretary of the Treasury could put it in the regional reserve.

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

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. This does not interfere with the present arrangements for deposits?

Mr. KITCHIN. No. It gives an additional right to others.

Mr. PLATT. So that if money comes out of hiding it can come out under the present arrangements?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. This section here refers only to the proceeds of those bonds and not withdrawals from the banks.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. What will be the security? Will the bonds be the security of the Secretary of the Treasury for these deposits?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think under the law he will have the right to do that.

Mr. WINGO. Does not the gentleman anticipate that these bonds will be the security that will be placed there?

Mr. KITCHIN. Some of it.

Mr. WINGO. Where else will you get sufficient?

Mr. KITCHIN. We have a law now with reference to the security required by law.

Mr. WINGO. He naturally would give the preference to the bonds.

Mr. KITCHIN. Suppose a bank in my town, for example, has no United States bonds and no State bonds or any of these securities, and say a \$40,000 depositor would take these bonds. My bank could not get any of that money, for the reason it would not have any of the security to put up, unless it would go and rent this depositor's bonds, so to speak; and if he turned those bonds over to it, it would get security.

Mr. WINGO. I am not objecting.

Mr. KITCHIN. I know that. I know the gentleman is only asking for information. There are a great many of these bonds that will not be deposited for security.

Mr. WINGO. There will be many that will be, though.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have in mind parties that have money in savings banks and in local banks who will take that money out and buy these bonds and put the bonds in their pockets. They will not put them back into the banks, and the banks have not the securities to get the deposits. There are many banks in that situation.

Now, the seventh amendment requires the Secretary of the Treasury to make a report as to all expenditures under this act.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman give me five minutes before he does that?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes; I will do that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WINGO. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree to the conference report on this important matter, because I recognize the fact that we do not want a delay. But, understanding this reserve question as I do, and knowing the dangers of this very provision, I can not conscientiously agree to the conference report, and I shall vote against it, even though I am the only man to do so. I want briefly, in the five minutes allotted to me, to call your attention to what the effect of this provision is.

If you will refer to section 5191 of the Revised Statutes, you will find the provisions with reference to reserves, as amended by the Federal reserve act.

We are voting under this bill \$5,000,000,000 of bonds. The President of the United States, in his address that he delivered here a few days ago suggesting this issue, very wisely called attention to the danger of such a large bond issue, and the President was not unnecessarily alarmed. It was not an imaginary danger that confronted the country, but it was of such importance that the President felt it necessary to warn this Congress.

What do you do gentlemen? This \$5,000,000,000 of bonds, reduced to a mathematical proposition under this last proviso of section 7, means a possible inflation of credit in this country of exactly \$3,000,000,000. Do you want that additional inflation at this time? It is admitted by all that one cause of our present high prices in this country is the inflation of the currency and of our credits. Yet at one fell swoop you propose to swell the credits of this country \$3,000,000,000. It is bad enough to issue \$5,000,000,000 of bonds. That may well make men hesitate at the danger that would come from such a great bond issue. It made the President hesitate, and for that reason he called the attention of Congress to the danger. We can obviate a part of that danger by not waiving the reserve requirements on deposits of the proceeds of these bonds, as is done under this last proviso. What is the necessity for it? Do you mean to tell me that the banks of this country and their depositors and customers will not buy these bonds unless you grant this privilege? The wise bankers of this country do not ask for this provision. The wise bankers of this country for the past two years have been warning their associate bankers throughout the country against the dangers of inflation, caused by the extraordinary conditions which exist in this country.

The gentleman says the proceeds of these bonds will be deposited in the banks, and that in the course of a few months they will come back as deposits, against which there must be maintained the legal reserves. But you will immediately inflate the credit of the country to a possible \$3,000,000,000, and soon thereafter—within the course of six or eight months—you will contract the credit of the country to an equal extent. Does any sane or sensible man think that is not going to have an effect upon prices and upon financial conditions in this country? Do you think you are at the end of your needs when you issue these \$5,000,000,000 of bonds? Do you not know that when you meet next December you will be faced with the necessity for another issue if this war goes on? Do you want to have unsettled the financial conditions in this country when next year you want to issue additional bonds? There will be but one answer, and that will be that the unsettled conditions produced by this cause and other causes that will exist will compel you to pay a higher rate of interest for the next issue that comes on and automatically reconvert the present issue into a higher rate of interest.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman does not mean to convey the idea that we will inflate credit to the extent of \$3,000,000,000, but he means only to the extent of 15 per cent of \$3,000,000,000.

Mr. WINGO. To the extent of \$3,000,000,000. There will be \$5,000,000,000 of bonds issued.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. And 12 per cent of that will be \$600,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. And on the basis of 5 to 1, the usual credit basis, that will be \$3,000,000,000—five times \$600,000,000.

Mr. MADDEN. That is the loaning power.

Mr. WINGO. I am talking about the inflation of credit. I am not inveighing against the banks. The wisest bankers in this country have been warning this Congress of this very condition during the last two years, and whenever they have spoken in their association meetings they have warned the country bankers and have warned Congress of the dangers of inflation. That is one of the causes of the high prices right now. Through this provision you can enter upon this policy, and having once taken the step, the next act for issue of bonds will carry this same provision, and the people of this country, through increased prices, will pay these bonds over the counter when they purchase supplies and food and clothing, and still the next generation will have these bonds to pay.

Mr. PLATT. Does the gentleman think there would really be an expansion in loans of 5 to 1?

Mr. WINGO. I do not think there is any question about it.

Mr. PLATT. I think it is very unlikely.

Mr. WINGO. Of course, it will not go to the maximum. There are a great many wise bankers in the country who see the danger, and they are now guarding against it as best they can, but the history of every war tells you what the effect is on business.

These older men who sit here know the history of the expansion of credit in the Civil War, in the purchase of great volumes of supplies, and they know what is in danger of happening in this country in the course of a few months when the \$5,000,000,000 are going to be spent by the allies. They know what is going to happen. They know what is going to happen to credits.

Mr. PLATT. But \$3,000,000,000 of this are to be exchanged for bonds of the allies. Does the gentleman think that would make any such inflation?

Mr. WINGO. I do not think that will have anything at all to do with it, because the \$3,000,000,000 of bonds of the allies will simply be security for the money that our Government is going to loan to the allies. Our Government is going to loan this money for the purpose of providing credits in this country. They are going to spend that money in the purchase of supplies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield me five minutes?

Mr. KITCHIN. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think there is something in the statement made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO], but here is the situation. We expect to have national banks—under which term I include members of the Federal reserve as a matter of convenience—and State banks also subscribing for these bonds and getting their depositors to subscribe for the bonds. If a national bank subscribes for the bonds and the money is redeposited in the national bank, the national bank would be required to keep, say, 12 per cent of those deposits as reserves under existing law, while the State bank would only be required to keep that portion as reserves that is redeposited, which the State law requires, and in most cases, or in many cases, that is a negligible amount. Of course, we can not change the requirements of the State laws concerning reserves in State banks.

I assume that the purpose of the proviso referred to eliminating reserves entirely as to redeposits made by the Government in banks which have subscribed for the bonds is an effort to put the national banks on at least as good terms as the State bank. I doubt very much, however, the propriety of eliminating reserves on account of any deposits made by the General Government. How long this money will stay in the banks no one knows. If it stays long and the reserves as to those deposits are wiped out, that will mean a considerable increase in the loaning power of the banks and probably a large increase in the amount of loans of the banks. That is expansion, inflation. When, however, the money is paid out by the Government and put back into the banks by private depositors, then the banks will have to keep their reserves, and that means contraction. I doubt the advisability of the inflation in the first place, and, if it occurs, everyone knows that there will be trouble when it comes to the contraction.

Mr. MADDEN. That would require the banks, then, to call their loans in many cases.

Mr. MANN. Undoubtedly.

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

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. All of these deposits will have to be backed by security.

Mr. MANN. The security has nothing to do with the question of reserves.

Mr. PLATT. It has this to do: According to the theorists on this matter, every bond or security has a potential credit and can be put up and borrowed upon somewhere else. The banks have got these securities, which they can borrow on somewhere else. If they pledge them, then that much currency is taken out of circulation.

Mr. MANN. A bank is supposed to have security for all of its deposits upon which it can obtain money. It is supposed to have securities for all of its deposits, and whether in the hands of the bank or in the hands of the General Government does not cut any figure at all, except as to the security to the General Government, and the General Government in addition to the security claims a first lien upon the deposits of the bank. In the national banks I do not think the question of security has anything whatever to do with the question of reserves or with inflation or contraction.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Take this example. A bank in Chicago buys \$1,000,000 worth of these bonds of the Government of the United States. The Government of the United States pays that million dollars back into the bank in Chicago. The Chicago bank sells those bonds to the member banks or national banks throughout the country. How can the Government put

that money that the national banks pay to the Chicago banks back in the member national bank?

Mr. MANN. It leaves it there, of course.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. You could not get the bonds without disturbing all of the finances of the country, if you take the money out when they buy the bonds. They have to leave the money in circulation, or you would have a cataclysm.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The money would be put in the Chicago bank instead of in the member bank, because the United States could not take that money out of the Chicago bank.

Mr. MANN. The member bank will buy its own bonds.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; and the Government will not put any money back into that member bank.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] seems to think that the sale of those bonds to the people of the country is going to inflate values. Did anyone ever hear tell of a war in any country on the face of the earth the result of which was not to inflate values? If so, I would like to have him tell me what war it was and when it happened. My good friends, the sale of those bonds among the people of the country is going to cause a more stringent money market. It is going to divert the funds of the banks of the country into channels other than those used now, and it is going to cause money borrowers of this country to pay more interest for the money they get. There is no question about that. That is going to have a tendency to inflate values. The more interest you must pay for money to carry on your business the more you must get in value for the product of your institution, and the consumer in the end must pay that increased cost. I do not know that I grasped the real point the gentleman made about the reserves in the Federal banks. Under the law there is a certain amount of money required to be held as reserves in national banks.

A certain amount of that money must be put into Federal banks by any bank that becomes a member bank. This proposition permits that money to be used as collateral security for the money deposited in local banks by the Government, which money went for the purchase of those bonds, and if you do not permit that reserve to be used as collateral security, it means that the banks of the country must put up that much more money for security and divert it from the natural channels of business in local territories. Which of the two is the most likely to inflate values?

Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will yield, he misunderstood me. I did not discuss the matter that he is discussing. I agree with the gentleman, and I think if the gentleman had listened, he would have understood. I called attention to the fact that wars cause inflation in prices. Does the gentleman want to further inflate the credit in this country by removing the reserve requirements of banks by legislation? I think the gentleman will agree with me when he sees what I am driving at.

Mr. FORDNEY. Perhaps I did not understand the gentleman. I do not want to do anything by an act of legislation that will inflate the values beyond what they are naturally going to be inflated because of the war.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman will admit that the decreasing of the reserve inflates the credit.

Mr. FORDNEY. The question is whether you use it as collateral security or put up another like amount as security and thereby double the amount in the Federal bank. Which of the two is most likely to cause a tight money market and increase value of interest, and consequently inflating values?

Mr. WINGO. I may not understand, but I think both will, and for that reason I am opposed to either.

Mr. FORDNEY. Of course both will; but the two together will make it double.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman and I agree; I do not want any more inflation.

Mr. FORDNEY. This bill does not do anything of the kind. Mr. WINGO. If the gentleman will yield further, will not the decrease of the reserves inflate credit?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know that I fully understand the real sense of the gentleman's question. Here is a certain amount of money in the reserve bank to-day, put up for membership. Is not that true?

Mr. WINGO. There is so much confusion in the Hall I did not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. FORDNEY. Does not the national bank to-day which becomes a member of the Federal banking system put up a certain amount of reserve in that bank?

Mr. WINGO. Yes; for a certain purpose, but that is not the reserve that I am talking about.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. FORDNEY. That money is now in the banks, and the bill permits it to be used as collateral security for Government money deposited in the banks or invested in the bonds. Does the gentleman want to double it?

Mr. WINGO. That is not the proposition.

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes, it is.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman is talking about the reserve required to be maintained by the member bank with the Federal reserve bank. He is talking about another reserve.

Mr. FORDNEY. Do you not, as a member bank, have to put up money to become a member of the Federal bank?

Mr. WINGO. Every bank whether or not it goes into the Federal Reserve System must maintain lawful reserves.

Mr. FORDNEY. What has that got to do with this bill?

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to me for a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. I think the gentleman from Arkansas refers to that clause in the conference amendment by which we exempt from reserve requirement the deposits from sales of these bonds. That is what the gentleman has referred to, is it not?

Mr. WINGO. That is one of the undisputed facts.

Mr. GARDNER. Will not the gentleman admit that the issuance of this great amount of bonds will of necessity force up the rate of return on money unless there is something else done to offset it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

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

Mr. FORDNEY. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GLASS. I have not heard the reason given by the members of the conference committee for this provision in the bill, but I assume that one of the reasons is—and I ask the gentleman from Michigan if it is not true—that the Treasury Department apprehends that it will have to invoke the aid of thousands of nonmember State banks and trust companies in placing this loan?

Mr. FORDNEY. I wish the gentleman would be brief, as I have only two minutes.

Mr. GLASS. Very well, I have not the time to ask the question.

Mr. FORDNEY. I want to say that the Government must, in the sale of these bonds, appeal to other banks in the country to buy the bonds aside from those that are member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and must go to banks operating under State laws that are not now members of the Federal Reserve Bank System. Their reserve is not affected at all by the security put up as collateral for deposit in their banks. It is only the national banks that are member banks that have a deposit put up that is required under the law in order for them to become a member bank.

The real point and gist of the law is that the Secretary of the Treasury must permit to remain in the bank all the money which is invested in these bonds, or practically so—a very large amount of money so invested—because if the State banks invest heavily in bonds the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the withdrawal of that money from the State banks and deposit it in a national bank—take all the money invested in these bonds from all the banks of the country and send it to New York or anywhere else and deposit it in one of the national banks—it would immediately cause a contraction of the currency all over the country, would it not?

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has six minutes remaining.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I will yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York—I will yield three minutes.

Mr. PLATT. Two minutes, I think, will be sufficient. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there is something in what the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] said, but I do not think there is very much in it as a practical matter. It must be remembered that very few other countries have any reserve requirements for their banks at all, and reserves are kept as a necessity of good banking practice and not generally because of the requirements of the law. The banks that may have these

moneys redeposited in them, after having invested their own funds or the funds of their customers in these bonds, would never dare to loan that money out down to 12 per cent. They will keep, in my opinion, more than a 12 per cent reserve anyway whether they are required to do so or not, and as a matter of fact the law does not now require a full reserve to be kept against Government deposits in banks of the Federal Reserve system, when secured by collateral. This provision, I have no doubt, was put in to equalize the National banks or member banks and State banks. Personally I do not believe that it makes any real difference as far as inflation is concerned whether it is in there or not.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. I will.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman does not believe in requiring a reserve at all?

Mr. PLATT. That is not quite true as a general statement. In a system like ours with so many small banks I believe a reserve requirement is essential, but without a reserve requirement for any deposits most of the banks would act just as they do now, and would keep about the same reserve or larger.

Mr. WINGO. But it is an indisputable fact that a decrease of reserve increases credits, does it not?

Mr. PLATT. Potentially and theoretically it does.

Mr. WINGO. And makes it possible—

Mr. PLATT. Now, the gentleman knows this: That according to the last statement of the Comptroller of the Currency the national banks of the United States are holding way above their reserve requirements to-day in spite of the great demand for money. I think it was something over \$1,000,000,000 on the date of the last call, that of March 5. Now, why are they doing that? Simply because good banking demands that they shall, and the same thing will apply whether you put in this exemption or take it out.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Is it not known there are a great many bankers of this country who recognize that the present reserve requirements are too low and they keep a higher reserve than they are required to keep, and that is the reason—

Mr. PLATT. I think that is part of it, but the gentleman knows there is before the Committee on Banking and Currency now, or will be shortly, a proposition coming from the Federal Reserve Board to still further lower the requirements of the reserve.

Mr. WINGO. That may be true, but that does not change the fact that as you decrease the reserves you make it possible to increase credits.

Mr. PLATT. Potentially, yes; but the banks know what they have to do, and they generally keep their reserves about right, anyway. What I mean to say is this: The gentleman from Arkansas can not say with any confidence that the waiving of the reserve requirements as to these special Government deposits will actually result in any inflation at all.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. KITCHIN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

#### INCREASE OF THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. DENT. 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 the bill H. R. 3545, and pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be continued during to-day, one half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and the other half by myself, and that the committee rise at 6 o'clock.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not mean that general debate will close to-day?

Mr. DENT. Oh, no; not at all; that general debate shall continue to-day and the time to be controlled one half by the gentleman from California and the other half by myself and that the committee rise at 6 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3545, and pending that he asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill shall run to-day, one half of the time to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], and that the committee rise at 6 o'clock.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman a question to see if I am mistaken in my impression. It is not the purpose of the chairman of the committee to close general debate on the bill after the debate to-day, but that debate to-day shall extend until 6 o'clock.

Mr. DENT. It is the purpose not to close general debate.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And as to its conclusion there will be an agreement?

Mr. DENT. In other words, there will be an agreement later.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I desired to know that so there might be no misunderstanding.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Is that the way the Speaker understands it, that part of the unanimous-consent request that general debate continue to-day, but is not to be concluded to-day?

The SPEAKER. Why, of course, this simply provides for to-day, and sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. [Applause.] So that everybody will know what the request of the gentleman from Alabama is the Chair will state again. That this simply provides for to-day, and there is no attempt to shut off debate when we adjourn to-day, but that will be another matter. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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 the bill H. R. 3545, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia 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 the bill H. R. 3545, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3545) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill may be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I think I may fairly state at the outset that there has been more misrepresentation of the attitude of the Committee on Military Affairs, or a majority of that committee, on the pending proposition than has ever heretofore occurred in the history of this Republic. [Applause.] There is no question that the Congress of the United States, after having declared war, stands ready and willing to back the President of the United States in order to make that declaration effective. [Applause.] The only feature that hurts me in all of this program is that there should be a feeling that the method by which this declaration should be carried into effect should not even be considered by Members of Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, if we are willing to say that we will adopt a resolution authorizing the President to draft or to call for volunteers, authorizing the President to call for all the resources of the country in his own good way, without any other action on the part of Congress, then we might as well adopt that resolution and adjourn to-day. [Applause.] This has been a most embarrassing situation to me. I hope the committee will pardon me for this personal reference, but I wish to say that I have been to the President and I have been to the Secretary of War with every proposition of compromise, upon the theory that I think unity of action at this particular time is more important than the method of raising an army. And I think so yet. I think that it ought to be known to the country that we will do what is necessary. But the method of getting the army should be one that is worked out by the proper legislative process.

Now, let us see what this bill actually does according to the majority report. In the first place, it authorizes the increase of the Regular Army up to war strength, which will produce an army of about 287,000 to 290,000 men. That increase to the Regular Army is authorized, first, by voluntary enlistment, and in the event that fails the President is authorized to fill up the gap by conscription. In the next place, this bill authorizes the increase in the National Guard up to war strength, first, by voluntary enlistment, and if that fails, then by conscription. If that is increased to war strength as authorized by the national defense act, which provides for 800 men for every Member of Congress, you will have a National Guard composed of about 625,000 men. That gives you an army, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, of over 900,000 men—practically a million. So that this bill, first, by utilizing the voluntary enlistment system, and, second, by using the draft, if necessary, gives to the President an army of practically a million men,

an army of the size that he is asking us to appropriate for. He is not asking us to appropriate for more than a million men as it is. Now, the only difference, the only real difference, between the majority of the committee and the President and the War Department is this: They want authority to conscript a half million more. Then they want additional authority to conscript still a half million more if necessary, so that the army will eventually amount to about 2,000,000 men. I say, then, the only real difference between the majority of the committee and the President is this: That the majority of the committee of the House believes that while the President is proceeding with his census of the men between the military ages, and that while he is finding out by registration who will be liable and the class from which he can draft this half a million men, an opportunity shall be given to the country to volunteer that number of men. [Applause.]

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

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not there also a very important and fundamental difference between the two propositions in regard to the range of the ages of those whom it is proposed to enroll, the War Department asking that the entire burden of the war be placed upon boys and men from 19 to 25, and the committee proposing that the burden shall be spread on all the mature men of the country from 21 to 40?

Mr. DENT. The gentleman is entirely accurate and exact in his statement of the proposition. I had not reached that. I was simply speaking of the method of raising the army first and will refer later to the details of those who will compose it.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman inform us whether or not the War Department is opposed to the age limit being fixed at 40?

Mr. DENT. The Secretary is.

Mr. POU. Mr. Chairman, a great many of us are interested in this matter, and I suggest that the gentleman be allowed to finish his statement before he is interrupted further. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. I would like, Mr. Chairman, to finish the statement I am going to make, and then I am willing to answer any question I can answer, if any gentleman wishes to ask.

Now, I stated, Mr. Chairman, that I thought the most important consideration at this time was unity of action on the part of Congress in backing up the declaration of war and not the method of selecting an Army, because I believe there will be no difficulty in getting an Army of 2,000,000 men in this country in order to carry on a war if necessary, by either the voluntary process or by the draft system. I have not the slightest doubt about that. But the misconception that exists among many people and the misrepresentation that has been deliberately indulged in by a certain portion of the press of this country, and especially those of them that have been on every side of every important question in recent years and not loyal to any [applause], has resulted in the charge that a majority of the committee was opposing the President in allowing him to have a bill that would give universal liability to military service.

There never was in all the history of this country a greater misrepresentation of the facts. As the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] suggested a little while ago, there is a suggestion of universal service and universal liability to service. Let us see what the bill drafted by the War Department and sent to the committee proposes to do. It proposes to select from the male citizenship of this country every person between the ages of 19 and 25. Is it universal liability for service to take a selected class between the ages of 19 and 25, and then to exempt certain members of that class, those that are physically defective, those that have religious scruples against war, and so forth, and so on? The statement is made that the male population of this country between those ages is 7,000,000; that of that 7,000,000 about 42 per cent will be exempt from one cause or another, so that there will be left about 4,000,000 people between that age from which to select an Army of 500,000 men. And yet that is called universal service and universal liability to service. It is one of the most arbitrary systems of stating who shall go into the Army and who shall serve in the Army that could possibly be conceived of. [Applause.]

Now, as to the military committee: As I understand it, there is no difference between us so far as that feature is concerned. I have no authority, however, to speak for them; but, I repeat, there is no difference between us upon this point. The Committee on Military Affairs, or the majority of us, decided that we would never vote for a bill that would authorize the Government of the United States to conscript a boy 19 or 20 years of age and who did not have the right to vote. [Applause.]

As I have touched upon this age-limit proposition, I may say here that while the committee changed the age limit in the bill proposed by the War Department from 19 to 25 to 21 to 40, the



Secretary told me on yesterday that he thought that that limit was too large. They do not approve of going that high. The committee adopted that program because of the recommendation that had been made by the Secretary of War to change the enlisted age in the Regular Army and in the National Guard in this bill. Under the present law the enlistment in the Regular Army is from 18 to 30 and in the National Guard it is from 18 to 45, and the Secretary of War recommended that should be changed to from 18 to 40 in both branches of the service. That is the reason why the committee finally agreed upon the maximum age limit of 40 in the bill that was presented by the majority.

Mr. Chairman, that proposition, as I understand, is practically unanimous in the committee. The minority report certainly does not say anything in regard to it and does not offer any proposition changing the age limit as fixed by the majority of the committee in this bill.

And I may say another thing while I am on this proposition: The minority does not offer as a substitute for the majority bill the bill that was proposed by the War Department. There stands to-day before this House no one who sponsors that bill. [Applause.] There is no proposition pending before this House, as a substitute for the majority report, to enact just exactly the bill that was drafted down at the War Department and submitted to the committee. The minority report simply criticizes the proposition of the majority—that we want to recognize the traditional history of the Anglo-Saxon race and give every patriotic and loyal American citizen the right at least to tender his services to the Government. [Applause.]

That is the only criticism that is made; and I assume from that minority report that all that will be done is that, when we come to section 3 of the bill, a proposition will be made to strike out of the bill the provision authorizing the President to call for volunteers while he is taking a census of the people between the prescribed military ages.

Now, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that states in substance the bill, except I wish to make this statement, which, I think, ought to be known to the House and to the country: The majority report does not delay the President in getting an Army. If the bill as reported by the majority of the committee is adopted, the President is still authorized to proceed with a registration of all the male persons between the prescribed military ages for the purpose of determining who is on the list from which the draft is to be made. It does not stop the President from proceeding with that plan. He has ample and absolute authority to do it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. TILSON, and Mr. STAFFORD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain the provision as to the increased number in addition to the increased force in the Regular Army and the National Guard?

Mr. DENT. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain the provision made in the bill for an additional increment of force of half a million men for the Regular Army and the National Guard?

Mr. DENT. I thought I had done so.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. DENT. I thought I had, but I will state to the gentleman that it means this: Under the bill as reported by the majority of the committee this increase of half a million in the first instance and an additional increase of half a million in the next instance, if necessary, shall be resorted to by the voluntary system while they are taking the census of the people if the President wishes to resort to it. But if, after the completion of the registration, after every male citizen between the prescribed military ages has been registered, the President decides he can not raise the army by the volunteer system, then he has the right to draft these 500,000 men in the first instance and an additional 500,000 men afterwards.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TILSON. In order that the debate may center about the one point that is really in controversy between the majority of the committee and the minority, will the gentleman permit me to say that, so far as I understand the minority's intention, it is that when we reach section 3, at the top of page 3, of the gentleman's bill, we will move to strike out all of page 3 and page 4 down to the word "authorized," in line 6, and on page 5 strike out the words "volunteers or." That is all the difference, so that we may bring all the debate upon that point that is really at issue. Now that leaves the matter of age, referred

to by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and brings it down to the matter of volunteers, paragraph 3 of section 1, beginning at the top of page 3 and going down to the word "authorized," on page 4, in line 6. The word "authorized" is the last word to be stricken out; and on page 5, paragraph 5 of section 1, in line 19, strike out the words "volunteers or."

Mr. DENT. I will state, Mr. Chairman—

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

Mr. DENT. I should like to make a statement in response to what the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] said, and then I will yield to the gentleman. I thought I had stated—not specifically, as the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] says—exactly what the proposition was, but that was the substance of what I had already stated, that that was the only real issue between us; that the majority of the committee recognized that the old volunteer system should be resorted to while they were trying to get ready for the draft, and leave it to the President finally to decide that question; and the minority say that it should not be recognized at all. Now I will yield, first, to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. KAHN. My colleague from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON] stated the major proposition, but it was understood in the committee that if further amendments were desired by any members of the minority they should have leave to do so. The majority in their report thought it best to center their fight on selective conscription, but the minority reserved the right to offer such other amendments as they saw fit.

Mr. DENT. In connection with what the gentleman from California states I want to say that I understood that both the majority and the minority reserved the right to offer amendments that would go to the details of the bill, but nobody reserved the right to change the policy or the principles of the bill.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to my colleague on the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I wish to have the gentleman make a little more plain, if he will, the opinion of the majority of the committee and our reason for authorizing the President to call for volunteers, that in no way will it result in a delay in securing the Army, but, on the contrary, it is a matter of record that when volunteers were called for in England and Canada and Australia they presented themselves so rapidly that the Government could not take them all. Millions of men presented themselves for service before the time when they could be accepted, and before the time we were told that it would take to install the conscription system in this country.

Mr. DENT. That is absolutely true, and I will go further and make this statement: That we were told by the Secretary of War and his advisers that they did not have sufficient equipment right now to muster in the National Guard up to its war strength.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to inquire whether the gentleman is at liberty to state the position of the President upon the bill that we have presented here?

Mr. DENT. I can not state the position of the President.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I understood the gentleman to say that he had been to the President and had talked with him.

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And also had talked with the Secretary of War.

Mr. DENT. I did; but I would not like to undertake to say what is the reason which inspires the President to say that the bill should be adopted just in the form in which it is submitted.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BRITTEN. The gentleman referred to certain exemptions in the bill. I do not know the bill thoroughly. I should like to inquire if there is anything in the bill that would exempt from the service those Americans who still have fresh or warm blood ties applying to their relatives in Germany or Austria or Hungary? That was done in Australia and in Canada.

Mr. DENT. I will answer the gentleman's question. The only exception in the bill on that subject is the exception of alien enemies.

Mr. BRITTEN. Then there is no exemption in the bill of persons having relatives in Germany or Austria?

Mr. DENT. The only exception is "alien enemies."

Mr. BRITTEN. Did the gentleman's committee consider that point at all?

Mr. DENT. Yes; that point was presented to the committee.

Mr. BRITTEN. And it was decided not to make those exemptions?

Mr. DENT. The only exception in the exemption in the bill is as to alien enemies.

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SIMS. In order that we may get a clear conception of the issue or the difference, is it not a question between the volunteer system as a preferential system for raising armies in this country in the first instance, or the conscriptive or draft system in exchange for it as the preferential system? Is not the real fight between those two systems, more than it is over mere details in working out the respective systems?

Mr. DENT. That is absolutely true.

Mr. SIMS. And I understand the volunteer system has always been the established system in this country, and conscription has been resorted to only as exceptional, unusual, and to meet an emergency that could not be covered in the regular way.

Mr. DENT. As I understand the history of the country, conscription has been used only once, and that was two years after the beginning of the Civil War. It never has been used in the beginning of any war.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP].

Mr. CRISP. I should like to ask the gentleman to explain to the committee how the selection will be made, or the first increment, or any additional increment provided for under the conscription plan?

Mr. DENT. Under the conscription plan?

Mr. CRISP. Under the conscription plan, and how this selection will be made? The bill does not deal with that, except to say under departmental regulations; but from reading the hearings I think the chairman and the committee have some idea as to how that selection is to be made, and I would like to have the gentleman explain that.

Mr. DENT. Perhaps I did not go into details upon this point. It is proposed to take a census in the first place of all the male citizens between the ages that the bill may provide for, 19 and 25, according to the War Department bill, or 21 and 40, according to the bill reported by the committee. The first thing that must be done, of course, is to take this census. Then it is proposed to put the names in a box and draw them just as you would draw a jury. Of course, the right is reserved to determine who are physically unfit and to reject them, just as a juror whose name was drawn from the box if he was found to be incompetent or disqualified for any reason would be rejected. Finally, the 500,000 men are selected by lot out of the names drawn from the box.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. I have frequently heard that the conscriptive plan is the only one that would be sure of not taking the ones who ought to be at home engaged in something else.

Mr. DENT. Yes; that idea is expressly incorporated in the volunteer plan by an amendment to the act of April 25, 1914, providing for the call of volunteers. That act is amended by this bill so as to preserve exactly the same exemption features as the bill of the War Department under the draft scheme.

Mr. FESS. Then the voluntary system would not necessarily rob the country of the munition makers?

Mr. DENT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. If we adopt the volunteer system under the provisions of the bill the President can refuse to accept any volunteer whose services are more important in some industrial enterprise. [Applause.]

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to ask whether I am right in believing that the enlistment law has been changed so that enlistments both in the Regular Army and in the National Guard are for the period of the war? Has there been such a change in the period of enlistment?

Mr. DENT. There has been in this bill.

Mr. BORLAND. I understood the gentleman to say that the Regular Army could be enlisted up to 287,000 and the National Guard to 625,000 under existing law?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Does not that furnish all the opportunities for voluntary enlistment that is likely to take place in the immediate future?

Mr. DENT. I am sure that it does.

Mr. BORLAND. Then why is it necessary to create a third branch into which voluntary enlistment may be had?

Mr. DENT. Does the gentleman mean to ask me if the additional 500,000 men are necessary why they should not be given an opportunity to volunteer?

Mr. BORLAND. Assuming that we need all the men that the President thinks we need, why are we not testing the enlistment of the 925,000 already provided for?

Mr. DENT. If I understand the gentleman's position or his question, it is this—that in the Regular Army and in the National Guard the volunteer system is recognized, but when you come to the additional force it ought not to be recognized.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is not quite accurate; he has not quite hit the mark. The question is—the law already provides two branches of the service in which the voluntary enlistment is provided for by law, embracing nearly a million men. If it is desirable to raise an additional force than that already provided for, why should not the additional force be raised by the same method?

Mr. DENT. I thought I stated that a little while ago, but perhaps I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. BATHRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATHRICK. The gentleman has explained very plainly the method of selecting the men who will be considered under the conscription method, but he has not explained who the authorities are that will make that selection—that will carry on the process of selection. I would like to have him do so.

Mr. DENT. I am glad the gentleman asked me that question.

Mr. BATHRICK. And I will ask the gentleman two questions in one. After he explains how the selective conscription will be carried on and by what authority, I would like to have him explain how the selection can be carried on by the volunteer system?

Mr. DENT. I will try to answer the gentleman. I will answer the first part of his question first. This process of raising 500,000 men from 7,000,000 men in the country will be conducted primarily through the War Department. The bill authorizes the President to use all agencies of the United States and all of the States in order to carry it into effect. But the bill goes further and provides that there shall be a tribunal to pass upon the question of exemption and pass upon the question of the rights of every man under this law, a majority of whom shall be civilians. Now, what was the gentleman's other question?

Mr. BATHRICK. The other question is: The question of selection is most important; and how are you going to do it with the volunteer system?

Mr. DENT. The same proposition would apply to the volunteer system that applies to the draft system, so far as excluding men that are not fitted for the service but are more suitable elsewhere.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. FIELDS. Is it a fact that whether we operate under the volunteer system or the draft system they are safeguarded in the same way?

Mr. DENT. The same way; exactly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the question put by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] to the chairman of the committee, and I thought that the chairman failed to catch the significance of the question. If I understood the gentleman from Missouri correctly, it was why the volunteer system is not tested by the opportunity now to go into the Regular Army or into the National Guard.

Mr. BORLAND. That is it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Now, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he does not believe that the cases are not alike for this reason: That under common American understanding of the volunteer system boys of the same neighborhood can organize, or have themselves organized, into companies, where when they go to war they will touch elbows with the man from the same shop or from the next farm, whereas if they go into the Regular Army some may be sent to California and some to New York and some to Panama or to any service in the Army or any branch that the authorities at Washington may determine that they should go. Concerning the wisdom of that I have nothing to say, but is not that it?

Mr. DENT. That is unquestionably true. As the bill was originally drafted by the War Department and sent to the Military Committee it provided that all enlistments hereafter should be in the Army of the United States. I asked the Secretary of War when he was before the committee what that meant. He said it meant the destruction of the present establishment of the Regular Army and the National Guard, and the creation

of an entirely new Army; so that he could wherever a man enlisted in the service send him anywhere he wanted to, with any branch of the service he desired, and separate him from his neighbors, and the committee repudiated that proposition. [Applause.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman one additional question. Was not that a confession on the part of the Secretary of War that the new Army, volunteer Army, would be too popular; that the young men would go to that instead of to the Regular Army? [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. I would not say what the Secretary had in his mind.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Alabama, of course, in all fairness to the Secretary of War, states that subsequently—

Mr. DENT. He yielded on that.

Mr. KAHN. He sent an amendment to the committee that all units coming from certain States should be enlisted as far as possible as State units?

Mr. DENT. He did yield on that, and sent me a letter to that effect.

Mr. CANNON. And will the gentleman allow me to sandwich in two words right there?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] makes a distinction without a difference. [Laughter.]

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I want to call the chairman's attention, replying to the question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], to the fact that one of the essential matters about this contest is whether or not a real call for volunteers has been made in this country. The bill as reported by the majority of the committee authorizes the President to call for volunteers, and let the country know that we want a volunteer army, and, further, in this bill it is provided that the army shall be raised in regimental units. In other words, it provides that in the call for volunteers regiments and companies shall be permitted to be organized and brought into the Army just the same as is the National Guard. Those of us who believe in a volunteer army feel that is the only way you can raise a volunteer army—that is, to raise it in units, as is provided in this bill. That is the difference between the plan of enlisting men, as they now are, in regimental recruiting stations scattered all over the country and enlisting them as volunteers in units, as we do now in the National Guard.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. DENT. I would rather not yield for a question now.

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

Mr. DENT. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that the Judge Advocate General has recently ruled that the States have the power now, by their own initiative, to create additional units of the National Guard up to the full authorized limit?

Mr. DENT. He has.

Mr. BORLAND. Under that system is it not possible to organize these very neighborhood companies or battalions or regiments that both these gentlemen have spoken of?

Mr. DENT. That is very true.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. FERRIS. I wanted to inquire of the gentleman from Alabama if the War Department offered any proof positive of their inability to get an army by a proper call under the volunteer system before proceeding with this?

Mr. DENT. They did not. The only argument that was made was that we ought to learn from the experience of England. We had an English Army officer before us, and I asked him the question, "How many men did you raise in your army under the volunteer system?" and he answered, "5,000,000." I said, "What is the total strength of the British Army," and he said, "Six and a half million"; so that five million of the six and a half million were raised under the volunteer system.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. As bearing upon the question as to whether sufficient opportunity for volunteering is given by enlistment in the Regular Establishment and the National Guard, is it not true that until very recently the War Department held there was no authority for raising additional units of the National Guard, and only recently, and with reluctance, ad-

mitted there was such authority, and even now the War Department is not encouraging, aiding, or assisting in the organization of such units?

Mr. DENT. I can not say that. I will state to the gentleman that I think there has been a change in the opinion as to the authority to organize the additional units provided for in the national-defense act, and now they admit that the entire war strength of the National Guard can be had.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], if the selective conscription be adopted whereby you fix the age, as your bill provides, from 21 to 40, I understood the chairman to say that those of that eligible list would have their names put in a box, and that they would be drawn out by lots?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. KINCHELOE. If that is done, and you are trying to fill up an increment of 500,000, and there are 10,000,000 names in the lot, and 500,000 are drawn out, what discretion, if any, under this bill is given to those officers as to whom they shall select and whom they shall not select, and if any discretion is given, where will that authority eventually lodge?

Mr. DENT. Well, they have no discretion, I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky, except to pass upon the question of their eligibility under section 3 of this act, which is the exemption clause and which eliminates those who are physically and morally unfit. In the first instance, as I said, that would be done through the instrumentality of the War Department, but there is a provision that a tribunal shall be created that shall have a majority of civilians to pass upon this question.

Mr. KINCHELOE. One more question: If the volunteer system is adopted and there is a call issued for, say, 500,000 men and there were a million men who responded to that call, will they be selected in the same way through being drawn out of this box?

Mr. DENT. No.

Mr. KINCHELOE. How would they be selected?

Mr. DENT. They would not be put in a box at all. If they call for volunteers, the call would come under the act of April 25, 1914, with such exceptions as we have made by way of amendments authorizing the exemption features of this draft system to be applied to the volunteer system.

Mr. KINCHELOE. How would you select 500,000 men out of a million men who volunteered?

Mr. DENT. The President would do as he has always heretofore done, call for a certain number for each State.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Where is this tribunal of civilians to be located?

Mr. DENT. There are to be a number of them; they are innumerable.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. That is exactly what I wanted to get at.

Mr. DENT. They are innumerable; just such number as may be necessary.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. So as to be within easy reach?

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. With reference to the question propounded by the gentleman from Missouri as to the opportunities of every State for the creation of additional units. I want to inquire if it is not true that when the Secretary of War Saturday a week ago informed the States that under the different construction placed upon the national defense act they could now raise additional units, but accompanied that statement with a letter to the governor of each State urging them not to do it?

Mr. DENT. It is a fact, as I understand.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. MASON. Upon the question of encouraging volunteers, is it not true that a former Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of this country, a man who has served in the field, Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, has offered to furnish to this Government and this administration volunteers in a large amount to serve his country abroad if necessary, and that that offer has been declined?

Mr. DENT. I know the offer has been made, but I have no authority to answer that it was declined.

Mr. MASON. Then I ask if the gentleman does not believe a resolution of inquiry should be sent to the Secretary of War, if it be consistent with public propriety, safety, and welfare, that he may answer to the Congress of the United States and the people whether he declined Col. Roosevelt's offer; and if so, why? [Applause.]

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. DENT. I yield to my colleague from Alabama.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, referring to the recruiting of the National Guard up to the full war strength, which will give 641,000, is it not a fact that the War Department has not supplies for these new units—has no guns, uniforms, machine guns, or anything else for them to use, and it has no desire to bring them in the field at this time?

Mr. DENT. Well, I will say to my colleague from Alabama that I think the War Department has a sufficient number of rifles to supply an army of about a million and a half men but not the other necessary supplies.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to the statement of the Secretary of War recently made before the gentleman's committee that they have only 690,000 Springfield rifles all told, both in reserve and in the hands of the troops, and that they have only three or four hundred thousand of the old Krag guns, which are not suitable for service but are merely suitable for training purposes, and they have no large cannon—no cannon suitable to equip an army of 500,000 men—no cannon of as large as 9-inch caliber and could not get them inside of seven months and would not be in a position to put 500,000 additional men in the field until after the 1st of July; that they could not get the necessary supplies.

Mr. DENT. That is substantially the statement of the Secretary of War, as I recall.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOCHT. I desire to ask the gentleman whether there was any expression of doubt on the part of the President, as the gentleman understood it, or by the Secretary of War as to the ability of the country to raise 2,000,000 men by the volunteer system, in the presence of the fact that more than that number were raised during the Civil War on both sides, the North and South, when brother was fighting against brother? Now, is it possible that anybody would doubt our ability in this country, a land of intense, consuming patriotism, to raise 2,000,000 to fight a foreign foe? [Applause.] During the Civil War we had a population of about 30,000,000, and we now have a population three times as great. It seems to me that, whatever merit selective conscription may have, the suggestion that we can not readily raise two or ten million volunteers is an absurdity and a poor tribute to American loyalty. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. I will state to the gentleman in order to be perfectly fair to the President and to the Secretary of War they have not contended in any conference that I have had with them or in any hearing before the committee that you could not raise these men by the volunteer system, but they said they thought the other system the better.

Mr. WALSH. Can the gentleman state what the difference would be in the time required under the two system to raise this number of men? Under which system could it be done the quickest?

Mr. DENT. Under the volunteer system, of course. [Applause.]

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state a little more elaborately his reasons for making that statement?

Mr. DENT. I will, and I am very glad to do it. I am pleased that the gentleman asks the question. We have not had a census of the people of this country since 1910. We must take a new one. It will require, according to the statement made by the Secretary of War before the committee, at least 3 months to take that census and at least 30 days longer in order to go through the list and weed out those that are unfit and exempt, so that it will take, according to the Secretary of War's own statement before the committee at least four months before you would get the names from which you are going to draft the men. In my humble judgment, it is going to take from 8 to 12 months, because you can not take a census of 7,000,000 to 15,000,000 people in this country in any short time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Permit me to suggest that it has taken longer than that heretofore.

Mr. DENT. Under the volunteer system all the President would have to do would be to say how many men he wanted from Alabama or Massachusetts or from any other State in the Union, notify the governor of the State, and in less than 48 hours you would have the men. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. I do not think the gentleman caught my statement a moment ago, and that is—and I know what I am talking about, because I was connected with the Census Bureau—it has taken a much longer time than the gentleman has suggested to take every census that has been taken.

Mr. DENT. That is true. It has taken several years to take a complete census of the country, and I am sure it can not be taken in three months.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman states that under the volunteer system the required number of men could be raised in 48 hours. I want to ask him whether he thinks that food production is just as necessary to win this war as fighting men?

Mr. DENT. I certainly do.

Mr. LENROOT. Then I want to ask him whether under the terms of this bill, whether the enlistment be voluntary or by conscription, the President will be authorized to exempt all those engaged in agriculture, if he sees fit?

Mr. DENT. He will.

Mr. LENROOT. Or those in any other industry whom he thinks should be exempt?

Mr. DENT. Under the volunteer plan or draft plan the President has the right absolutely to refuse to accept into the service or to discharge from the service any person who is needed in any industrial pursuit.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, if the gentleman exempts from volunteering all those engaged in agriculture, all those engaged in industries that he thinks necessary for the welfare of this country at this time, how many months does the gentleman think it would take to get 500,000 volunteers from the nonexempt classes?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, if you would exempt everybody you would never get an army. [Laughter.]

Mr. DENT. Now, Mr. Chairman—

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

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended 10 minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama be allowed to conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] asks unanimous consent that his colleague be permitted to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I understood that we agreed the time should be controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and myself during the general debate to-day.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARNER. Was there not a unanimous-consent agreement that the time on each side should be controlled by the gentleman from Alabama and the gentleman from California?

Mr. DENT. That is the understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. If that was the fact, the Chair has not been so informed.

Mr. DENT. That was the understanding.

Mr. MANN. That was the request made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT]. I am not sure whether the Speaker stated it, but I think everybody so understood it.

Mr. DENT. He stated it, and it was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is true, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] is in control of his own time without further motion. The Chair had not been advised to that effect.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. FERRIS. A few moments ago I made an inquiry of the chairman of the committee to know what proof, if any, was presented to the committee showing we could not get a volunteer army?

Mr. DENT. None in the world.

Mr. FERRIS. He supplemented that by saying that the statement had been made that it was shown that in the past it was a failure. Who presented this to the committee and said that it was a failure in 1776, in 1812, in 1861, or in the Spanish-American War? Who advocated that?

Mr. DENT. Nobody.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. In answer to the gentleman I wish to say that the statement was made that the Civil War was the only exception in which the conscription plan had been used.

Mr. GORDON. By Congress.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. If I remember the figures correctly, from first to last the United States called out approximately 2,800,000 men and the Confederate States, from first to last, approximately 600,000 men. Can the gentleman tell me what proportion of those figures were conscripts?

Mr. DENT. My recollection is that the statement was made before the committee that in the Union Army during the Civil War not over 60,000 of the 2,000,000 and more they had were conscripts.

Mr. KING. Two and one-half per cent.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. I saw in a statement that was sent out to the effect that they were 2½ per cent.

Mr. DENT. It was approximately 60,000 men, according to the statement made to the committee.

Mr. GARDNER. As a matter of fact, there were 2,200,000 and odd men, different individuals, enlisted in the Union Army. Counting reenlistments there were about 2,900,000 different enlistments in the Union Army. Forty-six thousand men were raised by draft and 73,000 drafted men sent substitutes. In the Confederate Congress the conscription law was passed April 16, 1862. After that time no law was passed by the Confederacy raising troops by volunteering from those liable to military service. From that time down to February, 1865, 82,000 conscripts were enrolled and sent to the Army from instruction camps. To this number must be added more than 76,000 men subject to conscription who anticipated it by joining the Army without compulsion. (See report of Brig. Gen. John S. Preston, C. S. A., Official Records of War of the Rebellion, serial No. 129, p. 1099.)

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Alabama concluded?

Mr. DENT. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Unless some gentleman has a specific question to ask, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman closes will he yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama yields to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CRISP. The Chairman stated that the machinery of a board was to be appointed to pass upon the exemption of anyone if the conscription feature of this bill becomes operative, which it will. Does the bill allow an appeal to the courts from the decisions of that board?

Mr. DENT. Yes; by means of a writ of habeas corpus.

Mr. CRISP. From the hearings I understood that the bill made the findings of this board conclusive as to questions of fact, and that the court could not go beyond the findings of the board as to questions of fact. Does this bill do that, or leave the matter open to the courts?

Mr. DENT. It leaves the matter open to the courts. It repudiates that other proposition.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. Under the provisions of the bill as reported by the committee could the volunteer system act necessarily as a bar to hastily mobilizing the Army under personal conscription?

Mr. DENT. Not at all. On the contrary, it permits the President to proceed immediately with the registration, so that he can get his conscript army, if that is required.

Mr. BARNHART. Under the provisions of the bill, is there any means whereby it might happen that one State furnishes its full allotment, and the conscription might fall in a State where the volunteer quota had not been made up, whereas in a State that had furnished its full quota of volunteers it would not be subject to conscription?

Mr. DENT. The only feature along that line in the bill is this: The bill provides that in drafting this army of half a million men in the first instance, and an additional half million afterwards, if necessary, each State shall be given credit for the number of men that have enlisted therein since the 1st day of April in either the Regular Army or the National Guard.

Mr. BARNHART. Now, will the gentleman state to the committee in what respect the bill proposed by the majority of the committee would hasten the mobilization of a large army over and above the conscription plan?

Mr. DENT. Would hasten it?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. DENT. I think I answered that a little while ago by stating that if you adopted the volunteer plan and the President called for volunteers, you could get them more quickly than you could take a census of 15,000,000 people, from which you have to get your 500,000 men.

Mr. RAGSDALE rose.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield, and to whom?

Mr. DENT. I yield first to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RAGSDALE].

Mr. RAGSDALE. As I understand the situation now, the Secretary of War and his military advisers and his experts and the President have worked out a plan and submitted it to Congress, in which they desire to secure as soon as possible a large and efficient army. Now, does the gentleman believe that those who are advising the President and cooperating with him, and the President himself, have reached a conclusion that will bring about a greater delay in securing that army?

Mr. DENT. In securing the additional army?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. DENT. I really think you can get a volunteer army quicker than a conscript army. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Of course, the gentleman has discussed that with the Secretary of War. May I ask the gentleman what was the answer of the Secretary of War to that proposition?

Mr. DENT. Well, I would not like to state what the Secretary of War's reasons for his position are, because he has printed them in the hearings. He has been before the committee, and the hearings are printed. But I may say in brief that the final argument that they make to me is this: "Remember the experience of England, that England started out with a volunteer system and soon had to adopt the conscripting system." My answer is this: "If you are asking for an army of five or seven millions, that England needed because she was close to the firing line, instead of an army of only a half million, I might agree that your system is the better one." [Applause.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Now, does the gentleman think that with the facts that are now known to the State Department and the President of the United States they would at this time embark on a system that they feel would in any way impair the service and the quickness in raising the men that they believe we are going to need in addition to those under the first call?

Mr. DENT. Of course, I do not think any such thing. The gentleman knew that before he asked the question.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I am quite sure of that. The point that I wished to make, Mr. Chairman, is this: Does not the gentleman think that the conditions that now confront this country with regard to securing men to go abroad are so different from the conditions that we faced in other wars that we are going to find a very material difference in the voluntary service of the people who will come forward?

Mr. DENT. No; I do not think so.

Mr. RAGSDALE. You think the men will come forward as rapidly for this war abroad?

Mr. DENT. I do not think there is any question in the world but that you can get 500,000 men to volunteer in this country in 48 hours. [Applause.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. How about the balance of the Army?

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LITTLE. I want to ask the question suggested by the gentleman's question who inquired whether it will be more difficult to get troops to send abroad than at home. Was not that demonstrated in the Philippine War, where they all wanted to go to the Philippines instead of to Cuba? They raised thousands of volunteers to go to the Philippines, which is farther away than Cuba.

I am informed that the bill to be presented by the minority of the committee is supported by some military experts. Does the chairman feel at liberty to inform the committee just who those military experts were, and just how expert they were, and as to what their experience had been in battle? For instance, if the gentleman would bring us the facts and tell us the names of the experts, and what battles they fought in, and what troops they commanded in action, it would assist me greatly in coming to a conclusion as to their expertness. Can the gentleman give us that? I ask this question in good faith, because I would like to have those facts. I do not expect the gentleman to answer them immediately, but later on he can disclose those facts.

Mr. DENT. I can answer that question now. That question was asked the Secretary of War when he was before the committee, and he said he had consulted with the members of the General Staff and the Army War College, and they worked it out by joint consultation with those people. I do not recall the military history of anybody in there right now except Gen. Scott, Chief of Staff, and the gentleman is familiar with his military history.

Mr. LITTLE. I anticipated the gentleman's answer, but if I am to be confronted with an array of experts, I want to know just how expert they are and whether they got their expertness by precedence or by practice. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. That is the only answer I can give the gentleman.

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KAHN. I think it is only fair that the gentleman from Alabama should state that the Chief of Staff, Gen. Scott, has fought many battles.

Mr. LITTLE. Give me their names.

Mr. KAHN. I can give the gentleman their names.

Mr. LITTLE. Name one.

Mr. KAHN. We can insert the names of the battles in the RECORD.

Mr. LITTLE. I want them now.

Mr. KAHN. And Gen. Bliss has been a warrior who has fought many battles.

Mr. LITTLE. Name one.

Mr. KAHN. And there are others who have fought for the Republic.

Mr. LITTLE. Name them. [Laughter.]

Mr. DENT. I want to say in my own time that there was nothing that I said here that was intended as any reflection on anybody in the General Staff. I admire Gen. Scott. I simply stated that his war record was known to everybody.

Mr. LITTLE. I meant no reflection on anybody. His war record is not known to me. If it had been I would not have asked the question. You are here presenting a bill which you say he indorses. I do not know of any battles he ever fought. If you know, name them. I do not intend any reflection on anyone, but when you make that assertion and do not name any battle that he was in, you make the reflection. Now, produce your battle list. [Laughter.]

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PLATT. I want to say, for the information of the gentleman behind me [Mr. LITTLE], that Gen. Kuhn has been in Europe during a good part of this war. He is the president of the War College. I also want to ask the gentleman from Alabama whether there is anything in the volunteer section of the bill that prevents the payment of bounties to obtain volunteers?

Mr. DENT. There is nothing on that subject at all.

Mr. PLATT. Has not that been a tremendous abuse of the volunteer system which ought to be stopped?

Mr. DENT. Does the gentleman think the Government could pay bounties unless they were especially authorized in the act of April 25, 1914? You see this call is made under the volunteer act that we passed here in April, 1914, and there is nothing in that which authorizes bounties. So how can they get any?

Mr. PLATT. There is nothing that prevents any city, town, or neighborhood that is richer than others offering bounties.

Mr. DENT. No; there is nothing to prevent any individual from supplying his means if he sees fit.

Mr. PLATT. And that is the trouble with the whole system. One neighborhood richer than another will offer bounties, and so will draw volunteers to itself.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. At the present time we have a large number of members of the National Guard who have families dependent upon them. I would like to know whether there is any provision by which those having families dependent upon them can be excused from service.

Mr. DENT. There is an express provision in section 3 of the act authorizing the discharge from the service of any person whose status is such that he has a dependent family to support, whether we adopt the volunteer or the draft system.

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AYRES. I understood the gentleman to say a few minutes ago that there was an English officer who appeared before the committee who said there had been about 5,000,000 men who volunteered in the English Army. Is it not a fact that thousands and thousands of those men had to be taken out of the British Army and returned to civil life in order to help restore the paralyzed industries of Great Britain?

Mr. DENT. That is very true, and that is taken care of in this bill, whether under the volunteer or the draft system.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Saltzgaber, the Commissioner of Pensions, gives the number of 2,213,365 different individuals in the Union Army and 2,898,304 as the total Union enlistments, of whom 1,722,690 got United States bounties. That does not reckon the bounties paid by States and towns prior to 1863. Now, as to the number who were the result of the Union draft, there were 46,347 held for service and 73,607 drafted men sent substitutes.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. I accept the correction, as far as the Federal enlistments were concerned. Now, I will ask the gentleman if he has the enlistments in the Confederate States from first to last?

Mr. GARDNER. That has always been a subject of dispute, but according to Livermore's "Number and Losses in the Civil War," the lowest Confederate estimate was about 600,000, and the highest estimate runs up to somewhat over 1,000,000.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. What is the gentleman's authority for that?

Mr. GARDNER. I was quoting Livermore from my own memoranda. The Commissioner of Pensions, Mr. Saltzgaber, furnished his figures to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Cannon]. They appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21, 1916.

Mr. DENT. I must decline to yield except for questions.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a statement in one sentence?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGLEY. More than a dozen men in my district have indicated their desire to get up military units, and men have been promised, and, as indicating their desire to fight, the most of them say they want to volunteer under Col. Roosevelt.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. ROGERS. Will the gentleman inform the House the total amount of bounties paid during the Civil War?

Mr. DENT. I can not.

Mr. ROGERS. Can the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GARDNER. The United States Government paid \$300,223,500 in national bounties. That does not include the State and local bounties—see page 4698, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 23, 1916.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Conscription seems to have been sugar-coated to a great many people by calling it selective, and therefore we are all interested to know what selective conscription is going to be like. I understood the chairman to say that the War Department and some officials had suggested that there might be a selection by drawing, and that the bill would allow that kind of a selection; is it not possible that this so-called selective conscription might be and would be likely to become a mere roulette wheel or lottery selection?

Mr. DENT. Out of the number of those between the military ages that is unquestionably true. There may be one boy in a family in one house and across the street three boys in another house, and the one boy may be drawn and the three other boys absolutely eliminated.

Mr. GOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. GOOD. The President's message stated that in case of war at least 500,000 men should be chosen on the principle of universal liability to service. What I want to direct the gentleman's attention to is this: Is there any real and substantial agreement in the Committee on Military Affairs as to what persons are liable for military service on the principle of universal liability to service, and also what ages?

Mr. DENT. The bill fixes the age limit from 21 to 40, and I understand that the committee is practically unanimous on that.

Mr. GOOD. How about the War Department? Does the War Department concede that only those persons who are between 21 and 40 are liable for military service under this principle of universal liability to service?

Mr. DENT. The War Department bill selects male citizens between the ages of 19 and 25.

Mr. GOOD. Under the War Department bill a man 26 years old, a citizen of the United States, is not liable for universal military service in the United States?

Mr. DENT. That is absolutely true.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. If the present volunteer system has failed to give the required number, will the gentleman explain what there is in this bill that will facilitate enlistment and bring in the required number?

Mr. DENT. I did not quite catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. The volunteer system has failed to recruit sufficient men up to date. Is that correct?

Mr. DENT. No; that is not correct.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Will the gentleman explain what there is in this bill which differs from the present system and which the gentleman thinks will bring a greater number of men to the colors?

Mr. DENT. I have endeavored to state that, and if I have failed to make it clear, I am sure it is my fault. I have stated that the raising of the Regular Army and the National Guard by volunteers up to the maximum war strength will give us 912,000 men, and if necessary then resort to the draft.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But having passed that stage, the War Department must resort to the selective system to get the required men.

Mr. DENT. I do not think we have passed that stage.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HILL. The chairman says we propose to raise the Regular Army and the Volunteer Militia to its maximum strength by volunteers. I have been studying the bill to find out whether the provisions of the bill for the additional force are operative from the passage of the bill, so that the formation of that army goes on concurrently with the increase of the Regular Army and the National Guard.

Mr. DENT. Perhaps my statement was to some extent misleading. The law will go into operation immediately on its passage, but the idea is that we have a system for raising the Regular Army and the National Guard to the war strength, but we can not get the 500,000 additional force by draft until a census of the people is taken in accordance with the provisions of the bill. The census will go on before we have any chance to get the men.

Mr. HILL. There is nothing in the bill to prevent the immediate organization of the additional army?

Mr. DENT. No; but you have to await the taking of the census.

Mr. HILL. But there is nothing in the bill itself that would prevent it?

Mr. DENT. Nothing in the bill but that.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. KING. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of War said to the committee that even if he got 500,000 men overnight, it would take four or five months to equip them, and that he could not use them?

Mr. DENT. That is true.

Mr. MASON. Then what is the hurry?

Mr. WISE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WISE. With reference to the ages fixed upon—21 to 40—that all between those ages would be liable to draft, did not the Secretary of War expressly state, in answer to a question that he would object to raising the ages from 25 to 40 unless he had authority to make regulations to group them and have authority to call the first group first, and did he not say we never would get out of the first group?

Mr. DENT. That is what he stated, as I recall.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the present plan there are two chances to volunteer, one in the Regular Army and one in the National Guard. Can they at this time volunteer for service during the war?

Mr. DENT. That is what the bill provides.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; but can they do it before the bill passes?

Mr. DENT. No; they can not. If this bill is passed it operates on all the enlistments in the Army and the National Guard since the 1st day of April.

Mr. RUSSELL. Until the bill is passed they can not volunteer for service during the war?

Mr. DENT. No; under neither organization.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some statement has been made that they are not volunteering fast enough. When this bill is passed limiting men to the war, will not that facilitate enlistments of volunteers?

Mr. DENT. I think so, very decidedly.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the gentleman three questions. In the first place, why were the particular ages fixed in the conscription bill between 19 and 25; why not 22 and 27?

Mr. DENT. The reason given to the committee was that it would take out of the industrial life of the country a less number of people than any other age limits.

Mr. KING. Are there any being conscripted in Canada or Australia?

Mr. DENT. No; no conscription in Canada or Australia.

Mr. MASON. Or in New Zealand?

Mr. DENT. No; none in New Zealand.

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman know of a single instance in history where a nation was going out to conquer the earth and set up democracies throughout the world where they did not exist where the leader went forth trailed by a conscript army?

Mr. DENT. I do not recall any.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. As I understand this bill, there are certain absolute exemptions?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. Then there is a large element of discretion permitted the authorities with reference to other discharges or refusals to conscript.

Mr. DENT. That is true.

Mr. REAVIS. Has there been anything before the committee as to how that discretion is likely to be exercised? I mean by that this: I have seen in the newspapers and elsewhere articles to the effect that men working in steel mills or in shipyards, in munition works, who are so skilled as to take them out might stop the work, would be exempt, while they could take the boy on the farm and easily supply his place with those under or over military age, or those having minor defects which would make them ineligible to service. Have there been expressions of that kind?

Mr. DENT. That question was put to the Secretary of War when he was before the committee, and he stated that he would not, in advance of the enactment of the act, announce any positive program or plan by which it will be administered.

Mr. REAVIS. Has there been anything in the hearings before the committee to justify the statement recently in the press that the Department of Agriculture was contemplating taking a census of boys between the ages of 16 and 18 for the purpose of putting them on the farm to take the place of farm boys who were conscripted?

Mr. DENT. Nothing of that kind has been presented to the Military Committee.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Has the committee any information as to what the regulations would be with respect to the exempt classes? I understand that the regulations are being drawn or are drawn, and that they cover all of the elements of exception.

Mr. DENT. I have no information as to what regulations would be adopted.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman think that such information as that ought to be in the possession of the Military Committee, so that it might be able to present the full details of the information to the House?

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Will the gentleman permit me to answer that?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. We asked for that information.

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. And they told us it had not been prepared.

Mr. MADDEN. It seems to me that every Member of the House ought to have that information.

Mr. DENT. The committee asked that question. I stated a little while ago, in answer to a question by the gentleman from Nebraska, that we asked the Secretary of War about that and he said that he had not promulgated regulations and would not do it in advance of the passage of the act; that that would be an administrative matter to be decided upon later.

Mr. MASON. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the selective part of the draft is to be purely executive, and not a legislative function. In other words, the President has the power to formulate any rules to make the selective draft; that is, the President and his representatives decide who shall be exempt?

Mr. DENT. Subject, of course, to the express provisions of this act upon that subject.

Mr. KAHN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] has stated repeatedly that he will also have the right to make the same regulations for the volunteers.

Mr. DENT. That is true.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. I wish to state to the gentleman from Alabama that I was 9 years old when the Civil War began, and lived in both Hardin and Wayne Counties, Tenn., during the war. Conscription or the draft came first from the Confederate Government. A majority of the men within military age in my neighborhood were what were called Union men, opposed to the war, but on account of not wanting to go out and fight their neighbors they remained at home. When the Confederate conscription act was passed, almost in a body they went over to and volunteered into the Federal Army. That was the first fruits of the Confederate conscription in my section. It was a material increase of the Federal Army from that section. A few Southern sympathizers were conscripted, and nearly every one of them deserted the first opportunity he had. I saw that, and I know what I am talking about.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question. The general exemption outside of those stated in the bill is to those persons engaged in industries found to be necessary to the maintenance of the Military Establishment or the effective operation of the military forces during the emergency. In the opinion of the gentleman and the committee, would that include the boys under any circumstances who are working on the farm?

Mr. DENT. Undoubtedly.

Mr. TOWNER. It is the opinion that it would do so?

Mr. DENT. Yes; undoubtedly; and I think I can state that that is the opinion of the Secretary of War.

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

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. As I understand, under the committee bill absolutely no provision is made for compelling the men to serve who ought to serve, but who is unwilling to serve, and when I say ought to serve I mean the man who has no valid objection to raise why he should not serve provided there are enough volunteers to fill up the units. Now, I would be very glad to have a statement of any of the reasons which the chairman entertains, or which were advanced by the committee, why the men who ought to serve and are unwilling to serve should not be compelled to serve?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I have already stated the position and reasons on which the committee acted, without going into an elaborate discussion on that question again.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. ESCH. The cost of carrying out this bill has not been considered to any extent since the debate opened, and yet this bill appropriates \$3,000,000,000 to carry it out for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and I want to ask whether there were any estimates furnished the Committee on Military Affairs constituting a basis for the amount?

Mr. DENT. Yes; it is shown in the hearings and the report that I filed along with this bill calls attention to the pages of the hearing where these estimates are given.

Mr. ESCH. And the various arms of the service were estimated for in considerable detail?

Mr. DENT. No; I can not say that; that is impossible.

Mr. ESCH. It was left entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of War?

Mr. DENT. It is left entirely to the discretion of the Secretary of War. The committee reached the conclusion that we had to rely on somebody to carry out this act, whichever form was adopted, and as long as we were making a new law we could not go into minute details as to each feature of this new legislation which was proposed. We had to trust somebody, so we provided a lump sum and trust its administration to the Secretary of War.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. EMERSON. I understood the chairman to make a statement that the majority of his committee would oppose conscription under any circumstances?

Mr. DENT. Oh, no; I did not; the bill itself authorizes conscription if the President, after taking a census, reaches the conclusion himself that he can get a better Army by conscription than by the use of the volunteers.

Mr. EMERSON. Suppose the House passes this bill and suppose that the Senate passes the conscription bill and it goes to conference, what will be the result then?

Mr. DENT. Well, I can not tell the gentleman what will be the result of the conference; I do not know.

Mr. EMERSON. The gentleman will be on the conference committee. What will the gentleman do?

Mr. DENT. I can not say in advance what I will do. In other words, the gentleman wants me to state right now that I am going to get what I am asking for and not yield anything that other people may want. That is not my attitude.

Mr. OSBORNE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee, referring to the age limit fixed in the bill, whether it is not a fact that the record of The Adjutant General's Office of the United States Army shows that of the 2,800,000 enlisted in the Civil War there were 1,151,438 of 18 years of age and under?

Mr. DENT. I do not know as to that record.

Mr. OSBORNE. Do not the records of The Adjutant General's Office show that there were 2,159,798 men enlisted of 21 years of age and under?

Mr. DENT. I am not familiar with that record.

Mr. OSBORNE. That is the fact.

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

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. What provision in the minority bill or the majority bill is there, if any, in regard to substitutes?

Mr. DENT. None at all in either one.

Mr. MASON. Then, as a matter of fact, is it, in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the committee, a matter which can be controlled by regulation by the War Department?

Mr. DENT. I do not know what is the opinion of the Secretary of War about that, but I would imagine not unless authorized by law. It is not authorized.

Mr. MASON. In neither bill?

Mr. DENT. In neither bill.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I do.

Mr. MEEKER. What does the gentleman think of the policy of permitting voluntary subscriptions to the \$3,000,000,000 instead of forcing the people to pay it?

Mr. DENT. I did not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. MEEKER. What about the policy of adopting this same haphazard scheme of letting people subscribe to this \$3,000,000,000 instead of forcing them to pay it, or the penitentiary if they do not?

Mr. DENT. The gentleman knows those two questions are not at all similar in any manner, shape, or form.

Mr. LITTLE. Does the gentleman know of anyone who wants to give a million or two?

Mr. DENT. I do not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Undoubtedly the chairman has answered the question which I would like to ask for information: Is there anything to prevent anyone enlisting, who is within the required age limit, providing the conscription bill is passed?

Mr. DENT. Anyone offering to enlist between 18 and 40?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Anything to prevent those who desired to enlist as volunteers even after the conscription bill is passed?

Mr. DENT. Oh, there is nothing to prevent anyone enlisting in the Regular Army and National Guard now.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That would be true even though the other bill was passed?

Mr. DENT. Yes. Now, Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is recognized.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to close the debate for the minority. I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE].

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, inasmuch as my time is limited I ask the Members to not interrupt me until I have at least made a short statement.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I believe that we all approach the consideration of this measure with a full knowledge of the solemn responsibility resting upon us. There never has been a time in the history of our country, at least in the lifetime of the Members of this House, when we were called upon to take action on a bill of such far-reaching importance as the one before us to-day. It deals with the life and death of our fellow citizens. Yes; and it may be the very life of our country. More than that, it changes the policy that has been in vogue in our country from the days that our Revolutionary fathers gave us our liberty until the present time. It is a short bill, and I regret that the members of the committee could not all agree upon it.

The chairman of the committee has given you an idea of what it contains. It provides for raising the Regular Army to war strength, for the raising of the National Guard to war strength, by voluntary enlistment of American citizens between the ages of 18 and 40 years. And in the event that they do not come voluntarily, then they may be drafted to fill up these organizations. The bill reported by the committee proposes that then the President of the United States shall call for 500,000 volunteers, and on that proposition the committee divided. There were some of us in the committee who were firm in our belief and have an abiding conviction that in this country we have come to the place where all men should recognize their liability to serve their country not only in time of peace but in time of war. [Applause.] On that one great proposition we divide here to-day. The men of this House will find themselves influenced by their emotions, their consciences, and their judgment, but I hope before this bill is finally passed the better judgment of the men of this body will prevail.

There are beautiful sentiments connected with the volunteer system. It is wreathed about with sentiments that we all love. Is there a man in this House that would break down the spirit that has animated the volunteers from the days of the Revolu-



tion to the present time? Surely not. I have the good fortune to come from that section of our country known as the great Middle West. We have sometimes been charged with dereliction so far as the preparedness of our Nation is concerned. It may be true that living out there on the almost boundless prairies of our section, breathing the fresh air that is wafted over those great plains, and viewing our fertile soil and the great potential power of our country we may feel more secure than the men who live along the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts of our country. But, my fellow colleagues from the East and from the West, we are not provincial. Oh, no. Bunker Hill and Yorktown, Fort Moultrie and New Orleans, San Jacinto and the Alamo, are as dear to us as they are to men who live in other sections. Moreover, at no time in our Nation's history when the Nation was in danger have the sons of the great Middle West failed to respond to the call. But in talking about volunteers, and we will hear much of it here in this House, when in 1861 the civil strife broke, did the boys come when Lincoln called? Surely, from Illinois, my dear old State, from all over the great West, they came singing, as one has said, "We are coming, Father Abraham, 300,000 strong." [Applause.] Yes, they came, led by such immortal volunteers as "Black Jack" Logan, gallant "Dick" Oglesby, and Isaac R. Sherwood [applause], going forth to meet in mortal combat the volunteers of Mississippi and Alabama and Virginia, and to die together on the slopes of Donelson, in the woods of Shiloh, around the precipitous bluffs of Vicksburg, and before Atlanta. Yes; it is a glorious heritage, and we are proud of it.

Is that spirit dead to-day in our country? Ah, methinks not, when the greatest living American citizen, ex-President Roosevelt, stands ready to lead his band of volunteers even to distant France. And that is not all. I picked up the paper from my little home village yesterday, and I read a story there that thrilled my heart. A young boy, whose mother died when he was an infant, and whom I have seen grow up to young manhood, and being educated in the high school, where he would soon have graduated, got on the train the other day and rode 140 miles to the city of Chicago and enlisted in the Navy. Do I love that boy? Why, we all love him. We love that spirit of the American youth. And in order that it may be an inspiration to other young men I want his name to go into the RECORD of this House. He is Frank Moist, a plain American boy, who never knew the love of a mother, but he had learned to love our flag.

Ah, friends, in the days of the Civil War they came by thousands and hundreds of thousands, but finally the patriotic orators grew weary. And so eventually in that great war we had to resort to conscription, and the men who were taken and put into the ranks were looked upon as poltroons and cowards, and from that day to this the word "draft" has borne a wrong meaning. Those on the other side of this proposition say, "Can not we get the volunteers?" Perhaps we can. Perhaps there are enough men in this country that would volunteer to make up an army of 500,000 men. But are you willing to let them do it? Are you here to-day standing for a proposition that means that only the heroes of your community shall fight the battles of your country? [Applause.] Is it fair, is it just, is it right to ask only the brave to go forward and engage in the conflict? Ah, there is not a "slacker," there is not a coward in the whole length and breadth of this land that does not fear conscription. I know that you men are standing for the volunteer system because of the sentiment that appeals to us and because of the fear that there may be wrath in your community if conscription is put into effect. But what is conscription? Let us see. In this bill as it is written, striking out some of the things that the Secretary of War wanted, we say that all men between the ages of 21 and 40 shall be subject to this draft who are physically fit for soldiers in the Army of the United States and that their names shall be put into a box and the wheel turned and the names of those coming out shall be selected as the men to go forward to fight our battles. Is it fair, is it just, is it right when in this same proposition we provide that the boy who has an unfortunate mother that needs his help may be exempt, when the man who has a family dependent upon him may be exempt, when the man who has religious scruples and can not fight is exempt to put these men's names into the box and let them stand up as Americans and take their chances in this great conflict that is now upon us?

Another thing. If we had the system of volunteering abolished, if we were on the basis of conscription absolutely, let us see how it would work. Suppose our Government to-day wanted a million men and the names were put in, all of them, for selection and it was to be determined by fate and chance which of our citizens would wear the laurels on their brows as soldiers, do not you think that a man who was so chosen to

carry the colors of his country would be looked upon as a hero? In every age of the world, in every country, the soldier has been the man who has been looked upon with reverence and respect, and that is as it should be, because it is through the sword of the soldier that we enjoy every blessing that we now possess. Every privilege that we have, every liberty that we boast of, was secured by the men who drew the sword and died for the same. Then let us enact a policy in this country, not because the Secretary of War advocates it, not because the President of the United States stands for it, but because it is right and fair and just to every American citizen. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, that is what I stand for here to-day. Surely you would not say that I am controlled by the views of the President of the United States. Far from it; but I stand for this proposition because I feel in my very soul that it is the only fair, just, and equitable thing for our people.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman care to yield there?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I will yield to the gentleman for just one question.

Mr. BORLAND. I want to ask the gentleman whether if conscription is put in force at first there would be any distinction as to who would be volunteers and who would be drafted?

Mr. MCKENZIE. No. That is it. It would take away that distinction.

Mr. BORLAND. If volunteers are first called for and then conscription is enacted into law later, it puts a brand on the man who did not volunteer?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes. It brands every man who did not volunteer as a poltroon.

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

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. The same thing exists anyway. Men are volunteering in the Regular Army now. They may be fighting side by side before the war is over. Yet, if conscription is exercised, here is one who is conscripted and another man who has volunteered under the plan of the War Department.

Mr. MCKENZIE. That is true; but look at this bill as it stands. What does it provide? It provides that if these men do not volunteer, then the President of the United States shall assume the responsibility of putting conscription in force. My colleagues, I ask you to have the courage to vote conscription into this bill from the beginning or else make it a volunteer proposition. If you believe you can get the necessary men by the volunteer system, have the courage to stand upon it, but do not put a lever in here that will pry every man loose between the time this bill goes into effect and the conscription is put into force, compelling every such man to think that he must enlist. In such a case, what will be the feeling in this country? Every man who is physically fit to be a soldier will think there is an obligation upon him to enlist, otherwise he will be conscripted. But if you say that everybody must be conscripted in the first instance, things will move on in this country evenly and regularly. The impassioned speeches that are made to arouse our people against Germany by a recital of wrongs committed by her, the pleas of ambitious politicians trying to get up regiments will all be done away with, and the business of the country will move along quietly, serenely, and undisturbed. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for a question?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. If this bill for a conscription becomes the order of the day it will require every State in the Union to furnish its quota of men in proportion to its population?

Mr. MCKENZIE. Absolutely.

Mr. MADDEN. Will there be any power vested in the President to exempt any State from doing that?

Mr. MCKENZIE. No.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the President have the power to make a regulation that will enable him to do it?

Mr. MCKENZIE. He will not. The law will specifically provide that each State shall furnish its quota. That is the only fair way. That is the reason why I am pleading for fairness and justice.

Mr. MADDEN. If I thought that would be carried out to the letter, nobody would be more enthusiastically in favor of it than I.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Let me say to the gentleman that the power of impeachment has not been done away with in this country, and a President who would undertake to play favoritism between the States in that respect certainly would be made amenable to the law.

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

Mr. MCKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. McCORMICK. Will the gentleman point to that part of the bill which covers exemptions and explain how it is duly provided that even if the exemptions within a given State be numerous, nevertheless a quota from that State shall still be proportionate to the quotas from the other States?

Mr. MCKENZIE. I can only explain that by saying this to my colleague from Illinois, that in my judgment the President of the United States would not have the power to exempt down to a point beyond the limit provided which the State should furnish.

Now, in closing, gentlemen, I do not want to take up the time in this general debate, but I do just want to say a few words in conclusion. To-day we have started in to summon 2,000,000 American citizens to arms, many of them to die of sickness in hospitals here, at home, and abroad, and perchance some of them to die on the battle fields of Europe. I know not. But it does not take much imagination to look back into the homes all over this country and see these 2,000,000 American boys coming forth to put on the uniform of the United States, either voluntarily or by conscription, to uphold the flag of our country. We passed the resolution declaring war with sad hearts on the 5th of April. Why did we declare war? Why do we now call for 2,000,000 American citizens to uphold that declaration? Was it because our President said it was desirable? No. While elevated to the highest position in the gift of our people, he is but a citizen. Thank God for that.

Was it for the purpose of driving from power one monarch across the sea in order that the throne of another monarch might be made more secure? God forbid! Was it for the purpose of overturning one branch of a royal family in order that those who represent another branch of royalty might be supreme in the countries of Europe? No; that was not the reason. Was it for conquest? I think not. If it were conquest and if we coveted the lands of other nations, the great wheat fields to the north of us, and the iron mines and the oil wells of Mexico to the south of us are much more inviting than any spot in Europe. Was it for that? It was not. Was it because we had a grievance or a hatred toward the common people of Germany? Oh, no. For I take it there is not a man here who has a particle of malice in his heart toward the great toiling masses of the German Empire.

When I voted for that war resolution, was it to put the Union Jack and the Tri-color alongside of the American flag? Was it to protect the American Eagle by calling the British Lion and the Russian Bear to its side to reenforce it? Was it in order that we might form an alliance with Russia and Japan and France and England, so that we might be secure in our isolation? Oh, no; I am sure no American was influenced by any such motive, for we know that we stood alone for 140 years; and God being our helper as Americans, let us hope that the day may never come when the representatives of our Government will entangle us in any alliance with the nations of European, Asiatic, or South American countries that will conflict with the true American doctrine.

Then why did we vote for war against the Imperial German Government? I will tell you, my fellow colleagues, why I voted for the proposition. The reason that moved me to cast the vote that I had prayed God I might forever be permitted to escape was this, and this alone, to serve notice once more on the people of the world, aye, to write it across the heavens if necessary with the blood of our patriot sons, so that the people who toil in the vineyards of Italy, the shepherds on the Caledonian hills of Scotland, the poor, unfortunate peasants in the Carpathian Mountains in the Empire of Austria, the great population of Slavs on the broad plains of Russia, and even the industrious peasants of Germany along the banks of the Rhine might read it and remember it for all time, that in this great, free Republic the rights of the citizen, even of a poor sailor, are secure, and that every son of this land will come to the defense of those rights when interfered with, and that he is secure in being a freeman in a country where he can stand up in his manhood and look up to his Creator as his Supreme Ruler and say, "My country," instead of "My lord"! We did it to serve notice that he is just as secure here as in a land that is controlled and dominated by a king, a kaiser, or an emperor, and that the poor and common masses of this world may take courage and feel that the time is coming when the world will be democratized, not by the force of American arms, but by the example of its heroic sons standing for the right, the security, and the protection of even its humblest citizens. [Applause.] Yes, my countrymen, this was the reason that impelled me to vote for a declaration that should turn the energy of this great,

mighty, and peaceful people from the pathways of peace to those of war.

Now, my friends, we are in this war. We have antagonized the greatest military power in the world. Shall we ask only the brave? Shall we ask only the few boys who will go forward and volunteer to fight our battles, or shall we lay that burden where it belongs, on the shoulders of every American citizen, and go forth to battle serving notice on that mighty military leader that he has at last aroused the people of this great, free Nation, and that he will not have to combat a small army of volunteers, but the entire military strength of our country? My colleagues, it is for us to say. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN]. [Applause.]

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, the question before us seems to me to be the most important that we have had since our declaration of war, and it is, of course, intimately connected with it; and unless I fail, I shall hope to make it clear that either we declared war on a wrong basis, or we are committed to the democratic principle of universal liability to service.

We were impelled to that war decision, so we told ourselves, on the basis of our devotion to the principles of democracy. We agreed with the President that the principles on which a just Government is founded were tragically threatened, and we agreed with the President that the world must be made safe for democracy if this Nation and every other nation believing in those principles were long to endure. Either that position is logical and sound to-day or it was not logical and sound on April 6.

Many of our citizens believed that we ought to have entered the war at the time that Belgium was ruthlessly invaded by a nation that contemptuously disregarded every sacred right of small peoples. There were others who believed that we should have gone to war when the *Lusitania* was sunk, and a hundred American lives were lost by reason of the barbarism of the Imperial German Government. But the President was patient in spite of these terrible provocations. And I want to say that they were terrible, and I am glad that I had not the responsibility to decide when it was up to him to decide, for I fear I could not have been as patient as he was though I recognize the wisdom of his patience. He delayed that momentous step, and by delaying it proved that the die was finally cast for reasons far more weighty than any one set of facts such as the invasion of Belgium or the sinking of the *Lusitania*. The Imperial German Government prosecuted a ruthless war, proving by innumerable acts that she utterly and contemptuously disregarded the rights of international law as well as the more fundamental and sacred rights of humanity itself.

The time arrived when this Nation was convinced that Germany's one purpose was to exalt autocracy based on militarism and to destroy, if within her power, the last vestiges of democracy. The world was no longer safe for a free people, so Congress was called upon basely to submit to the tyrannical force of an autocratic monarch, or to take up arms in defense of those principles which we claim are worth living for and worth dying for.

The President's decision, given to Congress in a message that will forever live as one of the greatest state documents, was overwhelmingly sustained by this body. We pledged to the President all the power and resources of this mighty Nation. In that decision I voted affirmatively and was not unmindful of the tremendous consequences of our act. To my mind it involved the complete and unequivocal support of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. [Applause.] In my remarks on the war resolution I reserved the right to oppose, by the strength of one vote, at least, any proposition which did not carry with it my own conviction. No man can compromise on a question involving his deepest conviction. That would be cowardly [applause]; but every man can compromise on a mere question of opinion. That would be courageous. To my mind there is a distinct difference between a man's conviction and a man's opinion. I make this reference for I am sure that we are all prone to confuse a genuine conviction with a mere opinion. We hold opinions when it comes to a matter of method. We are swayed by convictions when we face a matter of principle.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe intensely that the question before us resolves itself to this: Are we to raise an Army based on the democratic principle of universal liability to service on the part of every male citizen, or are we to raise an Army on the undemocratic principle of asking those who will to defend their Nation? I recognize that the majority report of the Committee on Military Affairs provides that in case of failure to secure volunteers we will then resort to the democratic prin-

principle of conscription. It seems to me that the majority of the committee are simply contending for what, in their opinion, might prove a wise measure. It is not a conviction with them, else they would commit themselves to the volunteer system without equivocation and without fear. Is the majority of the committee so convinced as to the desirability of the volunteer system that they are willing to stake the fate of this Nation on that system? Their report answers this question. They are absolutely deterred from standing fearlessly for the volunteer system by reason of their fear that it might fail again as it always has failed. Their report, therefore, is not based on the principle of raising an army along democratic lines.

Mr. Chairman, if the volunteer system were what its advocates claim for it, surely history would come to reinforce their arguments. But history in the past, as well as history being made at the present time, reveals the awful blunders that would be committed if we should tolerate, again, a system that we know to be unscientific, inefficient, and most undemocratic. Our committee has carefully studied the facts regarding the volunteer system in those countries now at war. We found that England's surrender to the volunteer principle at the beginning of the war constituted one of the tragedies of English history. After losing the flower of her young manhood she finally had to resort to conscription as a national necessity. Why should America, in the light of her own experience, in the light of the experience of England in the present war—why should America tolerate for a moment a system that is based on the very denial of democracy? The volunteer system is not democratic. Universal liability to service is democratic. The principles of democracy on which this Nation is based should be defended, not simply by those who are willing to defend her, but should be defended by every citizen, whether they are willing to recognize universal liability to service or not. We must not commit this Nation to the policies that all our citizens should be protected in their rights, but only those who are desirous shall perform their duties.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman define what he means by universal military service?

Mr. LUNN. I referred to universal liability to service.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Taking young men between the ages of 19 and 25—is that the gentleman's conception of universal military service?

Mr. LUNN. The gentleman is mistaken if he thinks there is before this House any measure calling for the conscription of young men between the ages of 19 and 25.

Mr. ALEXANDER. The War Department measure takes men between the ages of 19 and 25, and that is the administration measure.

Mr. LUNN. I would answer at once that that is not universal military service, but it provides for universal service. There are more arms in this great struggle that we must use than the military arm, and, while I do not agree, I could agree with them if they would take the boys from 19 to 20 and train them. That was their object. Anyone who asserts that the President or the War Department intended to put boys of 19 on the firing line is interpreting the bill erroneously. They did want this training, and I think it would have been a good thing, but you must understand, and the country must understand, that that is not the question involved, since this bill calls for men between the ages of 21 and 40.

Mr. ALEXANDER. If the gentleman will yield, John Temple Graves, the Washington correspondent, after sounding out the War Department, wrote his paper that it was the purpose that the first 500,000 men would be men of 19 years of age; that they were the first class to be trained and go to the firing line in Europe. I do not know whether he is right or not, but that is not my notion of universal military service.

Mr. KAHN. Will my colleague yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LUNN. I gladly yield to my colleague.

Mr. KAHN. The gentlemen who favor the volunteer system seem to forget that boys of 18 can volunteer and go to the firing line now, and there is nothing in this bill to prevent them from doing it. [Applause.]

Mr. LUNN. I would like to call the attention of the House to the remarks just made by the gentleman from California [Mr. OSBORNE] as to the ages of those involved in the Civil War. You may not know, but the gentleman volunteered for the Civil War at 16 years of age; but that is aside from the point.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNN. I will.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I understood the gentleman to state that the majority compromised because they permitted both the volunteer and conscription. How do you avoid the same conclu-

sion when you provide for the national army and the National Guard shall be filled by volunteers?

Mr. LUNN. If the bill passes as the minority hopes that it will pass, on the basis of universal liability to service and not simply on the willingness to serve, immediately the machinery can and will be placed in operation filling the Army up to the full strength. They can enlist under a former law that you made for enlisting in the National Guard and in the Regular Army. But we are dealing here now with a problem of a new army, and we are departing from an old tradition, and I think the sooner we get away from that tradition the better.

May I add a personal word as to the volunteer system? I was a volunteer in the Spanish-American War. I was a personal sufferer and I know of the excessive costs, the unpardonable waste, and the tragic inefficiency of the volunteer system as revealed during that war. We had one of the best of men at the head of our regiment, Col. W. J. Bryan. A more conscientious leader we could not have had, but, with all our love for our colonel, we prayed daily that in case of actual combat we should be led into battle by an experienced soldier. I mention this for I believe I saw the volunteer system under favorable conditions.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNN. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. The gentleman is aware of the fact that if he had gone into action he would have been led by somebody else.

Mr. LUNN. Oh, no; I am not at all convinced of that.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNN. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to say that my experience is that those who followed the volunteer captains and commanders in the Confederate War came back swearing by those captains.

Mr. LUNN. Let me say in reference to the Civil War that we are not fighting in a war that can be compared with the Civil War. At that time it was a question of soldiers more than anything else although, of course, foodstuffs entered into it. To-day, gentlemen, we are associated with other nations and we must help them to the limit with foodstuffs and munitions, or they will be defeated and we will be defeated in spite of all our bravado as to what we can do. None of us want to see the allies defeated. None of us want to see a draw. Consequently we must supply our associates with food and with munitions and at the same time raise as strong an army for ourselves as possible; and the only way we can do that is to plan conscientiously and with the best possible expert advice and keep all of these armies of our defense strong and effective, the military Army, the agricultural contingent, the manufacturing establishments, our civic bodies—in fact, mobilize all our forces—and I do not see how that can possibly be done under the majority's bill.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. LUNN. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The gentleman raised a question as to his colonel in the Spanish-American War. Does he know that he is one of the few men who have volunteered to serve as a private in this war, and he is not under 25 years of age either. [Applause.]

Mr. LUNN. I do know that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Would the gentleman volunteer as a private?

Mr. LUNN. I have already volunteered. I will go anywhere and do anything that the War Department wants me to do—even resign from the House and go out and fight as a private. [Applause.] And I intend to do all in my power to overcome a great deal of the damage that has been done by a misunderstanding of this conscription system.

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

Mr. LUNN. Yes.

Mr. EMERSON. Could I ask the gentleman from Nebraska were Col. Bryan volunteered—what place he volunteered except in the newspapers?

Mr. LUNN. Oh, no, no; just a minute. Let me say to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] that I will be one absolutely opposed to putting Col. Bryan in the ranks as a private, because the country can not afford to let a man of his type go there. We admire his splendid spirit, but we must also consider his age and his healthy avoirdupois, which would interfere with his efficiency as a private. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNN. I will yield just one minute.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Unfortunately I came into the Hall after the gentleman had spoken for some time. In

describing the difference in the agricultural and industrial conditions of the country in the Civil War and at the present time the gentleman seems to think that the plan proposed by the majority would strangle our agricultural development and hinder us. Will the gentleman tell me how?

Mr. LUNN. I am not going to take the time to explain it to the gentleman, except to say that the voluntary system by which men can rush out of industry at once, in a day, needs no explanation as to the fact that it would disorganize industry.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman wants to be fair about the bill?

Mr. LUNN. I certainly do.

Mr. FIELDS. Is it not a fact that whether we operate under the draft or the voluntary system in this bill we will have the same safeguards? The department can reject a man under the voluntary system because he is indispensable to industry just the same as if he was selected.

Mr. LUNN. With this difference, that under the voluntary system they call for volunteers and they rush forth to the place of rendezvous, individuals or by the thousands, and under the draft system they are not called away from their industry until the particular ones are wanted, and that is a very much more scientific way of doing it. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. And the question of their usefulness is passed upon by the board before they are taken in either instance.

Mr. LUNN. I can not bring myself to the position to believe that defense of the Nation is a question of will. I say that it is a question of obligation upon the part of every citizen. [Applause.] I do not want to see the flower of our young manhood, as in the case of England—and they did lose tremendously by their blunders—unnecessarily sacrificed. I do not want to raise the slackers of the country up to take the place of the flower that is to be sacrificed, if it is to be sacrificed. [Applause.] I would take every slacker and put him in the ranks, whether he wanted to go or not, exactly as you take every man and make him pay his debts, if he is able, whether he wants to or not. If you believe in the voluntary system and it is a conviction with you that it is based on democracy, then I suggest that there be an amendment in this bill stating that in case we are face to face in battle with the foe, before a regiment goes forward to fight, the officer in command again ask them whether they want to volunteer that day or wait until the next day, and make it thoroughly a volunteer system. [Applause and laughter.]

My friends, in closing, God only knows how long this war may last. No one can tell what new alignments may take place. There is only one road to safety for this great country and that is to use all of our resources, as have already been pledged to the President, in prosecuting this war until democracy is safe and militarism and monarchy are crushed forever under foot. Not only must we prepare the military army, but the industrial army, the agricultural contingent, the educational forces, the civic bodies, yea, every possible force must be mobilized to the end that the rights of humanity shall no longer be threatened by a ruthless militarism that recognizes no power but brute force.

I want to speak as dispassionately as I can of internal conditions, but you know, as we all do, that we have certain threatening internal conditions. If I were a pro-German—and I am not casting any insinuations against any Member of the House—but if I were a pro-German, if I were a hater of America, and I wanted to put America before the world weak, I would stand for the voluntary system without the right of conscription at all. I would absolutely stand on that principle, because I believe that it would weaken our defense and make us the laughing stock not only of our enemy but of every potential enemy.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. LUNN. Yes.

Mr. EAGLE. I desire in this presence to bear testimony that during the period of the last two years and a half I have received signatures to the extent of thousands in number written upon post cards and form post cards, on letters and form letters, on petitions, and on resolutions of either real or imaginary mass meetings throughout, first, my own district; and second, throughout the entire country, each and every one of them asking me to do those things here in the Congress of the United States which would embarrass this Government's foreign diplomacy, or which would help Germany or violate neutrality or which would hurt the allies; and that, since we have recognized by formal resolution on the 6th instant that a state of war exists by virtue of the brutality of the Prussian military oligarchy, those same names, traced in my office, are generally attached to the telegrams, post cards, letters, and resolutions I have received in favor of the volunteer system, asking me thereby to cripple the efficiency of the President and the Nation in this war by

providing an inefficient volunteer army; and I desire to say to the gentleman that I will not do so. [Applause.]

Mr. LUNN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been very generous in yielding to questions. Permit me now to complete my remarks. I want to paint a picture. One day while I was a volunteer during the Spanish-American War I went to the hospital tent, and there found about 50 young men ill with typhoid fever. There were about 50 of these boys, and 6 or 8 of them were dying. There was one man in attendance, a private. As I went in I saw these poor fellows, and I said to the attendant, "For God's sake, where are the nurses in charge?" He said, "I am the only one this morning." I went over and saw one especially pathetic case. He was a boy belonging to the Second Mississippi Regiment. I asked the attendant, "Is this boy dying?" His answer was, "Yes." I said, "How long will he live?" "Perhaps two hours." "Have they notified his parents?"—for that provision is made to give the name of the nearest of kin, so that notification can be made. He said, "No one knows about him." I went down to the tent of the boy's captain, and found them playing cards. They were light-hearted American boys, like other boys from Nebraska or New York, playing cards and enjoying themselves. I said, "There is a boy over in the hospital tent dying with typhoid who belongs to your company; will not you notify his parents?" They were not at all concerned, remarking, "Well, when we finish the game of cards, if he is still alive we will notify them that he is still alive, and if he is dead they can be notified of his death." I do not think that could ever happen in any organized army equipped efficiently and carried on scientifically.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNN. No.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman permit an interruption? I want to ask the gentleman—

Mr. LUNN. No; I will not yield. I have been very generous, and I desire to finish in these few minutes remaining.

Mr. STEVENSON. Just one question. Was it not the inefficiency of the War Department, which has charge of the administration of those affairs, that caused the great suffering in the Army in the Spanish-American War, and is not that the same department that now asks us to take a bill without even looking at it? [Applause.]

Mr. LUNN. My friend, I do not know whether the gentleman is aware of the fact that the War Department is not under the same management as it was in 1898.

Mr. STEVENSON. I am glad it is not; but I do not assume that it is perfect yet.

Mr. LOBECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNN. We hope we will not have any rotten meat or embalmed beef to pass over to our soldiers.

Mr. LOBECK. Dr. McRae, of Council Bluffs, surgeon, Fourth Iowa, told me they did not have enough surgical instruments or medicine when they came to the Texas border last summer.

Mr. LUNN. There was a reason for that.

Mr. LOBECK. And that is the present War Department.

Mr. LUNN. Now, the question raised by my friend from Nebraska is a good one, that there was not a sufficient amount of surgical instruments at the border, but we must remember that those instruments can hardly be bought for love or money, and we want the administration free to organize an Army so that they can plan when there is a firm making necessary surgical instruments which we need to leave that firm unhampered.

Mr. LOBECK. I hope that is true for the good of the boys, whether they enlist or are conscripted.

Mr. LUNN. My friends, I want to say this in the few minutes at my disposal that remain.

For the first time in history a great and mighty Nation has entered a war with no other object than that of upholding the sacred rights of humanity. No secret plan of conquest has engineered this war; no desire for indemnifying ourselves for the cost has entered the thought of this Government. We enter with the distinct understanding that we want no territory; we want no indemnities, but we do want justice; we do want decent consideration for international rights; we do want the acknowledgment that the small nations were never organized to be unwillingly transferred at the will of some powerful potentates.

If we ever had reason to be proud of America that reason exists to-day; if ever there stirred in our hearts a love of country, nothing but the deepening of that love can result from this war. If we ever believed that America was worth living for and worth dying for, then I say that in this day, with the recent history of the world to instruct us, we have reason for being inspired by what our Nation is trying to do and to have our devotion to country multiplied a million fold.

The Stars and Stripes go forth to conquer not for selfish gain but for implanting in the soil of the world the blessed seeds of a democracy that believes that human rights ever tower above material gains. We go forth to join hands with England, with Russia, with Italy, and with dauntless France for the preservation of principles that are dearer to us than life itself.

You and I are responsible for supporting the President as Commander in Chief of the Army. He says to us that he can more adequately and effectively carry on the great responsibilities of this war with selective conscription than by the old and vicious volunteer system of chance, and I trust we will stand by him on that proposition. Members on both sides of the House! I do not know what the result will be, but how strange if the vote, which I am confident is going to go against the volunteer system, should be recorded and show a larger number of Republicans than Democrats supporting; Republicans willing to trust the President on that question and some on our side unwilling. I hope it does not result that way. I plead as one who has had some little experience and as one who knows of the poisonous, treacherous agitation and propaganda that will go on under this particular volunteer measure. It is not countenanced by our friends I know absolutely, but let us stand unequivocally by the President for universal military service under this selective conscription bill, and it will constitute the most effective blow that we can this day give the Imperial German Government. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FOSTER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2762) to authorize an issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense and to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes.

#### INCREASE OF THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. NICHOLLS].

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, before going into my argument I wish to make a statement. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN] a few moments ago and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. EAGLE] stated that in their opinion the best way to help the German Government was to vote for the volunteer system, and insinuated that those of us who favored the volunteer system might be in sympathy with the German Imperial Government. If you will pardon me for a personal allusion, I wish to say that that can not be charged to me, for the only brother I had, two years before this Government saw that Germany was wrong, lost his life on the battle fields of France fighting with the British Army. [Applause.]

So, Mr. Chairman, I certainly have no love for Germany.

I want to say that I for the first time am in a very strange position. I think my record will bear me out that since I have been in Congress I have stood by the President as long as I could. I am standing by him now as I see it. I want to say for the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I have served on it for some time, that I believe every member of that committee, both for the volunteer idea and for the conscription idea, is absolutely conscientious in his views. If my conscience would let me I would follow the course of least resistance and vote for this conscription act from the beginning. My conscience will not let me, and therefore I propose to vote for the volunteer amendment.

Now, why do I say that we are to stand behind the President? Because, gentlemen of the committee, there is no difference in the bill which the President suggests and the bill which the committee suggests, except that in the one bill—the committee bill—we give men the right to enlist inside of the three months spoken of by the Secretary of War, while the President is perfecting his plans for conscription, and if at the end of that time or the time necessary he has not enough volunteers, he has a perfect right to put conscription into effect and put it in as strongly as he can.

A great mistaken idea has gone out over this country, and it has gone out through the newspapers, through the mails, and through the telegraph companies, that the men who voted against the use of the conscription bill from the start are opposing and hindering the administration. It is no such thing, and the men who wrote those letters and the newspapers who published those articles had never seen the committee bill, as is shown by an

article in the Washington Post of Sunday. They had roasted us, called the members of the committee traitors, and said that we were not true to the country, because we were supporting the Dent bill, and then this same paper came out Sunday morning and said that Col. Roosevelt would have a perfect right to raise volunteers while conscription was being put into effect, and take them into France. If Col. Roosevelt has that right, why has not anybody the same right? And that is all we are contending for.

There are a great many reasons why I am opposed to the bill, and there are a great many things in which our bill improves it. In the first place, they say that boys from the age of 19 to 25 shall be called into the service of this country, and they say further that out of the something over 6,000,000 available men possibly 42 per cent of them will be put aside for physical or other reasons, and that out of a balance of approximately 4,000,000 men the first 500,000 troops will be drawn. How do they propose to draw them? They say, "We are going to have the selective draft." What sort of a selective draft are we going to have? The committee has not been able to find out. You do not know what it is. Why did not they cause the exemptions as they are proposed to be put in to be published, as were the British orders when the war started there? We do not know what sort of an exemption they are going to give us, but we do know this: That under the volunteer system we can use the exact exemption that can be used under the conscription system. And I say that we can use it to better advantage, and why? Because, gentlemen of the committee, all that the Government has got to do is to instruct the enlisting officers when men are coming to enlist to question them, to find out what their avocation is, to find out what business they are engaged in, and if they can better be used at home than at the front, refuse to accept them, and give them a button to signify they have offered their services to their country.

Now, why from 19 to 25 years of age? I never heard of as unfair a proposition.

Mr. LUNN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. No; I can not. When I get through I will let you have all day.

Why, gentlemen of the committee, do they limit it from 19 to 25 years? Who voted for this war? Did the boys who are not even entitled to a vote have anything to do with it? You men voted war, and if you vote to make this 19 to 25 I hope some widowed mother will come to you when you go home and say, "Why do you represent me in Congress? Why do you take my boy and fix a law for him that keeps you at home?" That is what you deserve, and there is no way to get around it. Our bill raises that limit from 21 to 40 years, and all of you who are so bloodthirsty and hate Germany so much can get an opportunity to fight for your country. [Applause.]

I am getting tired of newspaper editors sending out these reports, because can you tell me anything that they are going to do to make the war go on after it has started?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I want to suggest that it is not civilized to use noxious gases.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Now, to pass on, my friends, there is another opposition to this bill of the department, and that is this: They say to us, "We have a right to run one recruiting station in your town. When a man comes there to enlist he can be either placed by the enlisting officer in the National Guard or in the Regular Army. He has no right to designate which he will take. We will put him in where we see fit to use him. In other words, he belongs to the Government from that time on." Now, let me tell you, we do not know anything about war. I do not think any of us know any too much, including the War College and the General Staff. [Applause.] But we do know this, that when a man goes out to fight for his country he would rather fight side by side with his neighbor than with a foreigner; that there is a great incentive for him to fight for his country when he knows if he is wounded there is somebody there to take care of him and send word home that he is wounded. And for that reason I am in favor of keeping the State units together. You take a boy from Mississippi—I do not think the Government would do this, but under this bill they would have the right to do it—you take a white boy from South Carolina and put him in a negro regiment from Massachusetts or anywhere else, and you would not have to go to Germany to have war, for you would get war right at home. [Laughter.] That is another reason why I am opposed to the proposition from start to finish.

Now, gentlemen, let me tell you something else. The War College is not always right. I can recall some little history for some of you gentlemen. Last year when the Hay bill was introduced it was opposed absolutely by the War College and the

General Staff. The original bill had the backing of the President. The President agreed finally, however, to accept the Hay bill instead of the Continental Army. At that time the papers called us all traitors, including my friend from West Virginia and myself. They said we were traitors for not accepting the General Staff proposition.

Now, what would have happened if we had accepted the General Staff bill? The National Guard would have been dismissed, and the Continental Army would not have been constructed; and when the Mexican trouble came up whom in the world would we have had to send to the border to protect the Regular Army and to keep Villa from stealing their horses? [Laughter and applause.] When this trouble came up, where is our national defense? It is the National Guard. The very organization that is kicked around is the Army that they want to defend themselves with.

Now, the only word that I have heard that appeals to me as practical from the standpoint of those gentlemen who favor the conscription bill is this: They say they wish the President had come over and that we could have gotten together. God knows, we all wish that. But they say, "We believe in standing by the President, because if we do not and it goes out to Germany that we have not stood by the President it will have a bad effect." I grant you that, absolutely. But there is another view to take of that. This country heretofore has always fought its wars with volunteers to start with. This country has had as brave and as patriotic men as ever went to the front in an army. Suppose that Germany is informed that after war has been declared the President is forced to compel men to fight. Will they then think that the sentiment of this country is behind the President? [Applause.] Which is the worse of the two evils, my friends?

"Oh," they say, "England has conscription." Of course England has conscription after 5,000,000 volunteers went to the front, just like the Union Army and the armies of the South were conscripted in the War between the States after years of fighting. But it was five years before they had to conscript. Canada, which has had to do most of the fighting, or as much of it as any one branch of the British Army, has never yet resorted to conscription. Australia, than whose troops there are no better in the world, has not yet resorted to conscription, and the Australians are doing their part in this war.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman does not overlook the fact that Canada pays \$33 a month to each of its soldiers and \$20 for separate allowance?

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina. Oh, I had not overlooked that fact; but I hope the people of Canada do not fight for money, but for love of country, as our people do. [Great applause and cheers.]

Now, gentlemen of the committee, they can not tell me that the citizens of this country are any more disloyal to their flag than are the citizens of Australia and Canada. They make one other point that, possibly, I think, should be answered: They say, my friends, that we will lose time; that if we do not put the conscription act into effect at once we will not be able to raise this Army. What do they base that on? Is there a man of any practical sense that can convince you that, if we start out to get men under a conscript act and other men come in and voluntarily offer to fight while the others are being prepared to be conscripted, we will not have more men than we started with? It is purely a question of figures.

They say that the boy from 19 to 25 ought to do the fighting for this country, and they say that the reason why we should not have a volunteer system and a conscript system united is because the boys—as one officer gave me as a reason—would be jibing each other and making fun of each other and quarreling in the ranks about it. Now, who ever heard of such an army? [Laughter.] Do you mean to tell me that the officers of the American Army off at the front, on the battle line, are going to allow their men to fight about who was conscripted and who volunteered? They are not going to do it. Our bill is merely giving a chance to men over the age of 25 to have the opportunity to fight for their country. There are hundreds of them who want to do it in my own State. I know they want to do it; and in my State they have the feeling that a conscript is a slave. And I want to ask you this question: Would not this be a great Government to go to Germany to free slaves with an army of slaves to do it with? [Applause.]

Now, gentlemen of the committee, there are other things that I would like to talk about, but my time is about up. In this matter, either way it turns, in my judgment, on both sides of

this controversy, we are trying to give the President everything he asked for. We did give him every dollar he asked for, and we are giving him every man he has asked for, and under our system we will give him a few more if he will just accept them. [Applause.]

I do not love the German people. I hate their methods. I admire the English nation. But, gentlemen of the committee, I do love America and her boys, and I do not propose to see the men of this country who are responsible for declaring war sit back and require those boys to do their fighting for them without raising my voice in protest against it. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAIG].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAIG] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, we are now considering the legislation under which we shall form an army to meet the present emergency. In the discussion of this bill I think it not amiss to call attention for a few moments to the conditions existing in this country and to the points of view from which our citizens have heretofore considered our military forces.

The change of sentiment and interest which has taken place among our people within the past two years concerning a proper military policy for the United States is truly typical of a democracy, and is, to my mind, a healthy expression of a deep concern for the safety of our Nation.

In the midst of a commercialized age, with civilization seemingly run mad fighting for nonessentials, when men were confusing the blessings which flow from a strong, stable Government with the source of the Government's strength, when we were dreaming that our peculiar advance in civilization had rendered us safe from the dangers which have threatened nations in former centuries, our dreams of universal peace and security were rudely shattered by the call to arms of the nations in Europe.

Prior to this great conflict the right and duty of maintaining our national honor, whatever the cost, was never questioned, but the horrors of the great sacrifice which the unprepared nations drawn into that war were compelled to make, instead of arousing us to a sense of our own unpreparedness, seemed to chloroform our people into a senseless disregard of our national responsibility, and only when the country began to hear from men who are not willing to sell principles for which our fathers died in order that we may enjoy ease and material comfort did our people awaken from this stupor to a realization of the fact of our unpreparedness to maintain our rights and defend our national honor.

During this period many of us have been weighing arguments, studying the military history of our country, comparing it with that of other nations, attempting to lay aside all prejudice, or even our preconceived ideas as to what might be considered as constituting an adequate line of defense, and we can not escape the conclusion that in a democracy such as ours universal military training and service is the only fair, the only democratic, the only efficient means of attaining our purpose to place ourselves as a nation in a position where we can reasonably believe ourselves free from attack either from within or from without.

The first fundamental duty of government is the protection of life and property; if it does not do this it has no right to be called a government. We may also consider as a fact that inefficiency is a part of the price we must pay for a democracy, and we are not willing to admit that individual freedom and personal liberty are not worth the price. It is our plain duty, however, as citizens of a democracy to make the price as small as possible.

Admitting the truth of these propositions, it naturally follows: First, the Government must have some armed force at its disposal, one which is instantly available and capable of enforcing our demands of other nations. Second, this armed force, other than our Regular Army, should be contributed not merely by a part of our citizens whose patriotism prompts service, but every citizen, rich or poor, high or low, who participates in the blessings which come to us by reason of our Government should do his proportionate share of this duty.

When this agitation for a more adequate Army first began to gain force the average business man, when shown our situation, would unhesitatingly say, "Why, yes; let's have a strong Regular Army, fully trained and equipped to meet any emergency." This appealed to him as a business proposition, a businesslike way of paying an insurance against war; but a careful analysis of this plan, and the knowledge gained from the conflict in Europe, where millions of men are necessary, when we had thought in terms of thousands, convinced thinking people of the impracticability of such a solution of our defense problem.

In the first place, you can not get the men; second, such an army would be too expensive; and third, this Nation should never wage war with a purely professional army.

In other words, we should not enter any war unless the heart of the Nation is in it; and it can not be in it unless the best blood of the Nation is fighting the battles.

Admitting, then, that some force other than our Regular Army may be necessary, how can we escape the conclusion that it is only a question as to whether we shall send our young men forth trained, equipped, able to meet at least with equal vantage any foe with which they may contend, or whether we shall send them forth to certain death against a foe better armed, trained, and equipped. Shall this Nation have said of it, as Kipling said of England?—

You pushed them raw to the battle,  
As you plucked them raw from the street.

How to train our citizens and how to have available for instant use a proper number of those who have received training are, to my mind, important problems which should have been solved by Congress long before this emergency, and we are now paying a part of the penalty for this neglect.

And I want to call the attention of the members of this committee to the fact which has been alluded to here by the gentleman from Texas: When we made our first little step in preparedness a little over a year ago we had these same people from all over this country protesting against even that meager preparedness, and many men answered with demagogic answers, when as a matter of fact we should have taken stronger measures than we did. [Applause.] These same people are to-day protesting against any change from our old, archaic system of former years.

If we had read intelligently the military history of our country, we should be convinced that we should never again enter a war depending on untrained volunteers. When we consider the technical skill, the scientific methods employed in modern warfare, we realize how helpless an army would be composed of men lacking in these essentials. When we realize that any change in our present policy of training and service must come with the approval of the great body of our citizens and that such system as is devised must be one which will appeal to them as in harmony with our institutions, we must recognize the fact that we can not hope for 100 per cent efficiency in an armed force in time of peace; so we must content ourselves with whatever plan will best organize our physical forces so as to reach efficiency most quickly in time of war.

We have now reached the stage when our future military policy is no longer an academic question, and we are face to face not with the proposition of what we might wish to do, but what, in the light of previous experience, will enable us most quickly to mobilize our physical forces into shape for effective use.

We have passed the stage when patriotic oratory, waving of flags, and hearts swelling with emotion when we hear the music of our national airs will suffice.

Here, in the very shadow of war and all its cost, we must agree to give of ourselves that supreme sacrifice which at times becomes necessary for any people to make who proclaim themselves a nation. It is very well to say that all should stand ready to volunteer their service, if necessary, but these words do not and can not make armies. We might as well recognize at once the fact that the duty of defending this Nation rests equally upon all citizens capable of service, and we should establish a democratic system of defense based upon this universal liability to service.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, this is a most interesting exposition that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is making. I hope we can have order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will again ask the Members of the committee to preserve order, and the Chair desires to ask the occupants of the galleries kindly to cease conversation. A little noise when multiplied by so many makes a great deal of noise in the House.

Mr. CRAGO. The first duty of a citizen is to the Nation. The duty of the Nation is to protect life and property. When we legislate so as to establish organized relations between the citizen and the Nation, for purposes of defense, you may call it conscription or draft, I call it the command of the highest sovereign to the citizen. No more a draft than the command of a father to a dependent child to perform a duty necessary to protect the family.

It is well for us to realize now that our President, in asking us to declare war on the Imperial German Government, knew he was asking us to take part in an undertaking which involved great sacrifice. He has asked us, as Members of the Congress, to take the first step to place at his disposal an armed force with which to maintain our rights.

The bill which we are now considering provides that our existing military forces, the Regular Army and the National Guard, shall both be increased to war strength, by volunteers if possible; but if not, by invoking the principle of universal liability to service. In my opinion the call for more than a half million men to fill up these existing organizations will absorb practically all the men who at present have any thought of volunteering their services. Especially is this true when you take into consideration the men already in these organizations who will be discharged on account of dependents, and the others who will be available and who will be used to officer the organizations which will be afterwards formed.

These citizens who are asked to volunteer to fill these existing organizations are to volunteer for the emergency only, and at the termination of the emergency they will be automatically released from the service.

Mr. HASTINGS. I wish to ask the gentleman why the word "emergency" was used instead of the words "present war."

Mr. CRAGO. It was thought that "emergency" was the better term and, in the opinion of the Judge Advocate General, might save us the necessity of organizing new forces in case, after a treaty of peace had been signed, there was still use for a large army.

Now, I have called attention to the fact that this plan has the approval of the Commander in Chief. Would any man have thought 60 days ago that it was possible to put on 12 pages of printed matter a declaration of principles which would have met the unanimous approval of William Howard Taft, Theodore Roosevelt, and Woodrow Wilson? But that is what you have in the bill of the administration here to-day, gentlemen. Representing every shade of view on political questions, they are a unit as to the system advocated by the administration by which to form this new army.

Either plan which we are considering is infinitely better than that adopted at the beginning of any of our former wars; we have gotten away from the old vicious system of calling men for any fixed term of service other than during the emergency, and we thus have made it impossible to repeat our sad experience in former wars of having enlistments expiring at a critical time and battles brought on without proper preparation, because delay would mean the loss of men by expiration of enlistments made for so many months or so many years.

Mr. MASON. Could Col. Roosevelt volunteer his services under this bill? As I understand it, Col. Roosevelt would like to raise a division.

Mr. CRAGO. I believe he is too big a man to insist on changing the policy that is laid down here because of any personal desire he might have to serve under the old system.

Mr. MASON. Can he enlist under your system?

Mr. CRAGO. He can.

Mr. MASON. Under this bill?

Mr. CRAGO. He can.

Mr. MASON. And raise an army of his own?

Mr. CRAGO. No. His services can be utilized as the Government wishes, but not as he wishes.

I am convinced that the plan urged by the War Department, and which has the approval of the Commander in Chief, is the better and safer plan for the following reasons:

First. It recognizes the principle of universal liability for service in the beginning and does not delay until the other system has failed to put it into effect.

Second. It will insure the enlistment in the Regular Army and National Guard, the organizations which should be brought to war strength immediately, of the men needed, who would otherwise wait to join some new force if volunteer organizations are to be accepted.

Third. It makes the supply of men certain and allows the Government to judge where and when the service of the citizen is most necessary.

Fourth. The sad experience of England in delaying this system cost them many precious lives and millions of money.

Fifth. If all enter the service under the same law, there will be no distinction as to class of service.

Sixth. This is the only really democratic plan, and will let the man who has not been called attend to his civilian duties without being disturbed by an inner consciousness that his country needs him at the front, and without any undue persuasion which might call him to enlist when he is more valuable in his usual occupation.

Seventh. War is now the most scientific, the most technical clash of machines and trained men which human ingenuity can devise, and in the formation of an army we must follow expert advice rather than trust to spontaneous impulse, if we are to succeed in our purpose.

I shall therefore support an amendment to the present bill which will carry out the idea of the War Department in regard to raising the troops for the new organizations, at the same time favoring the amendments already made to the bill providing for territorial recruitment, and extending the minimum age limit, which amendments, I understand, are acceptable to the Secretary of War.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to have the gentleman explain, if he can, why any one man was lost in the English service who would not have been lost if he had been conscripted instead of having volunteered?

Mr. CRAGO. Because had they gone forth with a system, instead pouring in on the Government and insisting on doing something and being in the army, the Government would have been ready to take care of them. The Government was not prepared to take care of them. It could not count on them when it needed them. There was no constant supply. They went in voluntarily and at haphazard. And men went in who should have been back attending to their duties at home, supplying the army with munitions and food and medicine and surgical instruments, and all the articles necessary to keep the army well equipped and healthy.

Mr. GORDON. Why could they not do that with volunteers as well as with conscription?

Mr. CRAGO. Because under the volunteer system you have no control of the supply. You must take men as they come or you do not get them at all.

Mr. GORDON. You can under the volunteer system proposed in this bill, can you not?

Mr. CRAGO. Not at all. You must take them as they come or not at all. But some one will say there are thousands of men who have already been formed into tentative organizations who want to volunteer their services and be taken into the service of the United States as organizations. I am not unmindful of the patriotism of these men, many of them would undoubtedly serve with great distinction; many of them have seen previous service as officers of such organizations. These organizations are, in many cases, to my own personal knowledge, composed of men of the highest character and ability. But the inauguration of this system opens up the old volunteer plan which has been so costly in former wars, and which has broken down and driven us to extreme measures in order to maintain an army.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MEEKER. Will the gentleman state whether he favors the age limit of 21 to 40 years, and if so why?

Mr. CRAGO. I am coming to that.

Our sad experience in the Civil War of having organizations, after they had been seasoned for service and had lost many men, utterly disbanded because of a lack of recruits for these veteran organizations, while new untrained and undisciplined regiments were accepted by the Government as they were offered, should make us hesitate to repeat this costly error now.

I want to say that if anyone will read the military history of our country it will be found that in the Revolutionary War, in the War of 1812, and in the War of 1861, there never was a time when the number of men who were really needed and asked for by the Government were forthcoming at the time they were needed.

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

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. In all the history of the present war have there been any finer soldiers than the Canadian volunteers?

Mr. CRAGO. I think not, and I want to say that I think the means used in Canada were more drastic, more compelling than any draft that we can adopt. Why, when you give to a little child in the school a badge or button saying, "My father is at the front. Is yours?" and that boy shows it to a neighbor's boy, and that neighbor's boy goes home to his father who is trying to feed a little family and says, "Daddy, why can't I have one of those buttons?" do you think that is not more compelling—more humiliating—than a draft?

Mr. HARDY. Then, why did Canada and Australia popularly vote against conscription?

Mr. CRAGO. Because Australia had given practically 90 per cent of her military strength before she was asked, and the men at the front objected to conscription. And they also had a universal training system in Australia. That is the answer to that question.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. Did they have that in Canada also?

Mr. CRAGO. No, sir; they did not; but they used other methods.

Mr. GARDNER. They have compulsory service for home service in Australia.

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. The gentleman speaks about the breaking down of the volunteer service. Were there more than 61,000 conscripts who helped out the volunteers in the Civil War?

Mr. CRAGO. Unfortunately, we did not resort to that until nearly all the able-bodied men were at the front.

Mr. LITTLE. Why unfortunately? Unfortunate for your argument. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAGO. All honor to the brave men who in our former wars voluntarily offered their service. All honor to the splendid men who eventually equipped themselves as officers of volunteers. The pages of our histories are full of the well-deserved praise of these men, who, in spite of the weakness of the system, learned the lessons of war and emerged from these great campaigns capable, courageous officers.

Notwithstanding this fact, however, you will not, I believe, hear anyone who knows, either by experience or study, the military necessities which the last 50 years have demonstrated offer any defense to the old volunteer system of raising armies.

We can not hope to appeal to an intelligence so lacking as not to know that military operations have been completely revolutionized in the past few years, and that war now is as much dependent for success on the proper mobilization of the forces to supply the battle line as it is on the bravery of the men on the line.

The principal opposition to the plan of the President and the Secretary of War is centered on the idea of raising our additional force by means of a selective draft of our citizens of a certain age; in other words, calling to the colors a sufficient number of our young men to form a force which is to be organized, trained, and equipped as an efficient army. In my opinion, the course proposed is the only democratic, the only effective, the only fair plan which can accomplish our purpose. It is proposed to take men at a time in life when few of them have assumed family obligations or are so identified with our industries that their presence is more needed at home.

These young men, rich or poor, high or low, educated or uneducated, are to be organized, and in all human probability will remain in training camps for at least a year, and will at the end of that time be able to meet a foe with equal vantage.

If, on the other hand, we attempt to form this new force by a call for volunteers, we will fail, and at the same time we will have men volunteering, men of patriotic impulses, who should remain at home. You will make the patriotically inclined men bear the burden and let the slackers go free. You will take from our communities the very best patriotic men and leave the slacker and the shirker at home to mold public opinion, and in some cases create a sentiment opposed to the Government, while the real men of these communities will be offering their lives on the altar of their country.

There was a time in warfare when armies practically lived off of the country. This is not true to-day, and this fact only adds to the necessity of having our industrial forces mobilized and kept efficient as well as our armies.

Who would think of going back to the old plan of having voluntary contributions made to feed and supply an army in the field? This could not succeed, yet the volunteering of men is on exactly the same principle. One month you might get the number necessary, at another time you would not get them, and you could never tell at any given time, no matter how critical it might be, whether your men would be forthcoming or not.

Under the selective system you could know exactly the number of men who would respond. The Government could estimate for the supplies and equipment of an army of whatever size may be needed, knowing that when we were ready for the men they would be forthcoming.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAGO. I have only a few minutes, but I will yield.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I want to know if the majority report fixing the age limit between 21 and 40 has the gentleman's approval.

Mr. CRAGO. It has. There is a sentiment in this country that we are taking them too young. They would only be in training, but if they will put it between 21 and 40 and let the President classify them, I am for it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. That obviates a very large part of my objection.



Mr. CRAGO. We have to guide us in adopting our military policy for the present emergency the experience of other countries; and from the testimony we have concerning forces raised in England, in Canada, and in Australia we are convinced that the volunteer system, as it has been used in these countries, has been more cruel, more drastic than any plan which we are now considering.

The testimony is to the effect that by means of social ostracism, pinning of yellow badges and white feathers on all men of military age who were not at the front, was the cause of many of the enlistments which have been made under the volunteer system in these countries. And the people of England now know that they unnecessarily wasted millions of money and thousands of precious human lives because they failed to realize in the beginning what they realize now, that the selective conscription of troops as the Government needs them is the more efficient plan to follow.

I believe it is our duty and I believe our constituents expect us to bring to this question our very best judgment.

Any one of us, no doubt, would gladly give his life rather than make it necessary to expose to the perils of war the young men of our Nation, but this is not the question before us. We are at war, and our people are looking to us to do our duty as we see it without any fear of how the performance of our duty may effect our political future.

What we want and what the country wants is a real effective army. I believe the citizens of this country are demanding this of us; and I believe the great mass of the thinking people have come to see the weakness of our volunteer system, and to recognize the fact that the plan proposed by the administration is the only just one.

Let us forget and lay aside all demagogic appeals, appeals uttered in the hope that we may retain our places in Congress, and let us stand for what we know will give this Nation that which it needs now—a real army.

We have made our choice in this great conflict from the highest motives, let us not now weaken the arm which must fight this the greatest of all conflicts for democracy and for humanity.

The issue in this conflict is so great, so far-reaching, that many little minds fail to see the real contest, but with fear and trembling and with an utter disregard of present facts and of history, they have preferred to play the craven part, under the guise of sympathy for the men who must fight that the Nation may live.

Since in this great drama of war which now occupies the amazed attention of the civilized world we have elected to again answer the call to arms, I have an abiding faith that the descendants of the men who have paid the full price for our liberties will proudly, gladly dedicate themselves to the task of protecting and defending our precious heritage. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER].

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I have brought into the House here, for the information of the committee, since the discussion arose a plan for the exercise of the power of selective volunteering. This is a chart prepared by the Canadian Government, and it classifies the volunteers exactly as we propose to classify the conscript and shows you who care to look at it how they worked it out in that country, where they are fighting a war for democracy and humanity under this volunteer selective system.

Stated in a nutshell, the War Department plan for raising an army for this war is to enlist a volunteer army of Regulars, a volunteer army of National Guards, and a conscript army of 500,000 men all at one and the same time, with this proviso: That whenever the President determines men are not enlisting in the two volunteer systems as rapidly as the safety of the Nation requires, then all units shall be filled by selective draft. The Military Committee bill provides that all the units of the National Guard, the Regular Army, and the 500,000 additional troops may be filled by volunteers, and whenever the President determines that the call for volunteers is not filling up the ranks of the 500,000 additional troops as rapidly and effectually as the safety of the country demands, then all shall be filled by selective draft.

The committee plan places all armies upon exactly the same footing and recognizes the right of a free-born American to go as a volunteer, if he desires, into any army that fights for his country. Its plan prevents the United States from being the first great democracy to hoist the flag of conscription before ever a shot is fired in a world-wide war for the principles of democratic freedom and against military autocracy founded upon the power of conscription. [Applause.]

This is the real issue in this contest. The majority of the Military Committee declares its faith in the loyalty, the patriotism, and the courage of the American volunteer. [Applause.] The minority repudiates him and stands for the Prussian plan of the unwilling conscript, who goes to the battle line, since death awaits him with certainty in the rear, and there may be a chance with the enemy at the front. [Applause.]

The minority has conceded the many important amendments which the majority has made to the bill as drawn and presented by the War Department. Nothing further need, therefore, be said in defense of these amendments.

The argument for the War Department plan to raise an army of 500,000 men by immediate conscription, as advanced by the Secretary of War, is based primarily upon the principle of universal liability of the citizen to military service in defense of his country. Conceding this liability, the bill as drawn by the War Department is a direct repudiation of this basic principle of universal liability. The War Department bill would by express statute make every citizen above 25 years of age as safe from liability to service as though he were a citizen of another planet. [Applause.]

The information furnished the committee was that there are about 22,000,000 men of military age in the United States; that is, from the age of 18 to 40, inclusive. The War Department bill proposed to draft only between the ages of 19 and 25. These classes include between six and seven million men. Therefore, under the War Department bill as submitted to the committee more than 15,000,000 men of military age, owing the same military service to their country as do the boys and young men of the ages proposed to be conscripted, were relieved of all danger of ever being compelled to go to the trenches in Europe.

The reason advanced for exempting all men above 25 years of age is that industry must not be disturbed. Men who are making money in vast enterprises because of the profits growing out of this war are loud in their demands and keeping up a constant correspondence with Congressmen asking that this war shall not disturb their business. Well, men are going to have to die in this war that this Nation may live, and it may be necessary that some profits shall be curtailed and even some industries suffer death as well.

I have had 18 letters from manufacturers in one town in New York, all of them engaged in industries not essential to the conduct of the war, and they all urged me to vote for conscription so that their industries will not be disturbed, although the plan they urge me to support sends only boys to death.

Mr. SLOAN. Was one of the persons who wrote those letters between the ages of 19 and 25?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. No; I think they are all over that.

Two millions of the men subject to conscription under the War Department bill would not be old enough to vote, and the remainder, because of their youth, could have but little voice or influence in the determination of their rights and interests in the matter. The plan made it possible for those who are of age to dominate the affairs and mold the legislation of the Nation, to decree that other men should die on foreign battle fields, while 15,000,000 men, equally obligated to military service by every rule of justice were allowed to go free. We are told that these men are to be used in the industrial army or an agricultural army and serve their country here at home. There will be no conscientious objectors against being conscripted for the industrial and agricultural armies, for they will be the highest-paid armies in the world. The service is sure to be safe and profitable, and therefore very popular. It is time that we quit talking so much about this second line of defense and set out to get some real soldiers to fight this war. [Applause.]

The problem of every war is to secure men for the ranks. Just plain common men. There will be no trouble to get men to serve on horseback with epaulettes on their shoulders, eager for rank and thirsty for glory. The problem is to get men who are ready to march upon the ground in the mud and the mire with guns upon their shoulders and ready to die in the ditch if need be. [Applause.]

I have heard of men who are willing to serve as major generals. I have had numerous requests for commissions as officers and for service in the Hospital, Quartermaster, Medical, and other noncombatant Corps. Everyone who writes to me seems to be willing to serve his country in every way except to fight or pay increased taxes.

The War Department bill was drafted so that every man above the age of 25 could claim that he wanted to be a hero, but the Nation denied him the right to be a hero. There used to be a saying that one would rather be a live coward than a dead hero, but the bill that limited the danger of conscription to those below the age of 25 made by law 15,000,000 living heroes who could stay at

home and enjoy all the profits and opportunities that come because of war, with no possibility of encountering any of its dangers. If the majority of the Military Committee are to be drummed out of Congress, as some of the great newspapers would have done, I take some satisfaction that before I have to go I was able to cast my vote so that 15,000,000 of exempted heroes will have the possibility of a chance of demonstrating their valor upon the battle fields of Europe. [Applause.]

The minority bases the weight of its argument upon the proposition that the War Department is not to be questioned in any matter of this kind. Let me read you the argument of the minority.

The minority report, embodying the arguments in favor of the administration's selective-draft measure, puts forward in brief form two major ideas: One is that conscription had to be resorted to in the Civil War, and the other is that England went through a series of terrible blunders in endeavoring to raise a proper army by the volunteer system.

The report contains a copy of the letter from Secretary Baker to Representative KAHN, who will take up the administration's fight on the House floor, and also contains an excerpt from the testimony before the committee of Capt. Benson, of the Somerset Yeomanry, an English regiment. Capt. Benson details some of the mistakes that the United States should avoid, his statement being based on his experiences in English recruiting.

The report contains the following:

The bill as originally forwarded to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs was drafted in the War Department and has the approval of the Commander in Chief of the Army, his civilian representative, the Secretary of War, and the officers of the General Staff and the Staff Corps. The military officers are the experts of the Government in military matters. It is to them the Nation will look for the organization and conduct in the field of our armies in the present war. The study of military plans and problems constitutes their life work. On the other hand, the members of the Committee on Military Affairs are laymen. They are not military men.

They should be silent.

The War Department is omniscient, and right or wrong we must accept its decrees and follow out its mandates as to legislation. We are told the same thing by the metropolitan press. Chambers of commerce, without any knowledge of the subject and having had no opportunity to have read the bills, wire Members of Congress to accept War Department plan, affecting the very life of the Nation. To question these policies or exercise our legislative judgment is akin to treason. I accept as my motto for this war, "My country always and eternally right," but I respectfully submit that the motto, "Government departments never wrong," is not the last nor truest expression of American democracy. [Applause.]

The idea that we must accept all mandates from the military department and abrogate our function as representatives of the people as advanced by the minority as their chief argument for their plan of immediate conscription is the first flower of the principle of Prussianism which is beginning to bud in this country. No one must dare question the wisdom of any plan proposed by a department of Government or a so-called military expert. Well, they seem to have a different view about this matter in the democracies of France and England, where those Governments are fighting a real war. The Republic of France has twice changed its entire cabinet during this war because bureau action was not satisfactory to the representatives of the people. In England at the outset of the war she had for secretary of war the greatest military figure of the Empire, a peer of the realm, a belted earl, victor on many a battle field, the idol of England and her armies. In a little more than a year this military chieftain had to leave that high office and surrender it to Lloyd George, a civilian who had been the butt of ridicule of the military aristocracy of England during the Boer War. To-day the Executive Council of the Empire, the council of five that directs and shapes the destinies of the armies and navies of Great Britain, is composed entirely of civilians, and the master mind of this world war is this same David Lloyd George, who was told by the military experts of Great Britain that it was presumptuous for a civilian to dare to express an opinion as to the advisability of any military policies. [Applause.]

The constant cry is why should a lawyer, a business man, or, at the worst, a farmer, presume to express an opinion or raise his voice as a Representative in Congress upon a matter which the military experts, who are of course entirely disinterested, have already determined.

Well, I, for one, confess that I am a farmer, but I also am temporarily a Representative in Congress of a small portion of the American democracy. My father was born a farmer, and for a hundred and fifty years my people were farmers in the mountains of Pennsylvania, and for 2,000 years prior to that they were farmers amid the mountains of Switzerland. Poor?

Yes, as poor as the rocks to which they clung. And though I can boast no titled lineage nor heraldic glory, there is one fact that I have always been prouder of than though I could trace my blood to a line of kings, and that is that for more than 2,000 years, so far back as the record of history runs, my people have always been free, free as the wind that blew around their mountain homes, and for more than 10 centuries, while all the rest of Europe knelt down in servitude to feudal monarchs, that peasant people embattled upon the snow-clad summit of the European Alps upheld aloft the banner of civil and religious liberty, the right of a people to rule and govern themselves and worship God as they pleased and yielding no allegiance to any power save that on high, refused to bow the head or crook the knee to any prince or potentate on earth. [Applause.]

I admit that my race heritage makes it difficult for me to accept the argument of the gentleman from California, the leader of the advocates of conscription, that Members of Congress are to accept the mandates of the military department without question.

I do not believe that a Member can excuse himself when he supports conscription upon the plea that we are raising an army of home guards or that the war will soon be over or any other hope that the Army shall not be used for the only purpose that it can possibly serve in this war, and that is to fight where the fighting must be done.

We must face the fact that when we conscript men for this army we are drafting them for no other purpose than to fit them to take part with those nations who are fighting our war on the battle fields of France this day and every day. The President has declared that the object of the war is to defeat our enemy, and to find him we must go to the Hindenberg line, where sons of France and England and Australia and Belgium are dying that democracy may yet be triumphant throughout the world. There are those who think that we can some way escape this responsibility, hoping that this army that we shall raise shall not be sent to Europe. That is the wish of one who does not want to do his part in this war; that is the wish of the conscript; that is not the hope of the volunteer. Can anyone conceive that safe behind the guns of the British fleet, behind the bulwark of the armies of France, England, Italy, and Russia, we are going to draft an army only to drill and march around upon American soil, 3,000 miles from the seat of war, 3,000 miles from the place where our enemy is fighting like a caged tiger to get at us if he can, only defeated by the protecting armies of our friends? I trust that this is not the part that anyone expects us to play in this war.

I was interested in the eloquent speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE] when he proclaimed that he opposed any alliance with anyone else in this war. I would like to ask the chairman of the minority, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], if he, too, agrees that we are to make no alliance in this war with any other nation, and is he willing that we should make a separate peace with Germany whenever the United States can make a peace satisfactory to ourselves. He speaks for the administration, I understand, upon this floor. [After a pause.] He declines to speak.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman from Nebraska that the gentleman from California will speak in his own time and not in his.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Very well. I thought it was important, right at the very time when these other nations who are fighting our battles over there, who are giving of their best blood and dying upon the battle fields fighting for us, and just as their representatives are here to meet in council with us, that it be known definitely whether we are to proclaim, through the floor leader of the minority and the supporter of the administration, that we are not to support those men, and are to make peace with the enemy whenever we are ready to make it with advantage to ourselves.

I realize that it is a tremendous responsibility to send an army to the trenches of Europe to battle with the greatest military nation in the world. We should, therefore, send the best army that America can raise. No nation in the history of the world, so far as I can discover, has ever sent a conscript army to fight a war upon another continent. It is true the English sent a small force of conscripted Hessians to fight our forefathers when we were battling for the freedom of this Nation, but it is also a matter of history that this army of conscripted Hessians surrendered to Washington one morning before breakfast without the loss of a single American soldier. [Applause.] The soldiers of continental Europe are the product of compulsory service, not drafted by a selective system to be administered we know not how, but every man of military age declared physically fit is required to go to the colors when called. The men of Europe did not have to be conscripted to make them fight in

this war. Every one of the warring nations of Europe is fighting with its back to the wall. Every soldier believes he is fighting for the very life and existence of his country. They are fighting at the very doors of their own homes. Compulsory military service to these men was only the means whereby they were fitted and trained to fight. For a generation the nations of continental Europe have been getting ready for this war under systems of compulsory military service. [Applause.]

But there is no element of compulsion entering into their service in this war. The same men would fight with entirely different courage and spirit if they were drafted to fight on another continent. There is no question but that the military nations of Europe brought on this war because of their struggles to dominate and control the trade of the world. The military machines which they built up by compulsory service were designed to back up their claims for commercial supremacy. The Kaiser of Germany himself declared at the commencement of the war that the two principal causes of this conflict that is destroying the civilization of Europe is race hatred and commercial rivalry among nations. Prussianism is the full flower of the baleful power to conscript the manhood of a nation exercised by an autocratic ruler. It is the weapon the German autocracy forged with which to win commercial supremacy throughout the world. It is the club with which that autocracy has sought to beat democracy to death. If Prussianism wins, it means that the greatest power in this world is a 42-centimeter gun. It is against Prussian autocracy that the President tells us we wage this war. That autocracy is based on nothing else but the power of conscription combined with a military caste and dies only when this power is denied to it. Many good men who see the world on fire in this war because of the damning effects of the Prussian system insist that if we would defeat it we must make use of the system upon which it feeds to accomplish its overthrow. If we must fight the devil with his own fire, let us be very careful we do not consume the institutions of free democracy in our own land with that same blasting flame. [Applause.]

Article 2 of the German constitution declares the Emperor has full power to declare war if the nation is attacked or about to be attacked. Article 62 of the same constitution provides that the entire Prussian military system shall be introduced without delay throughout the Empire. Article 63 provides that the Emperor is the sole commander in chief of the armies of the Empire in peace or war.

These three articles contain the essentials of the German autocratic power. But the Kaiser would be as weak as water were it not for the Prussian military system of conscription, which has produced the fiercest and most merciless army known to modern warfare. It is a power that the whole world is in arms against. Every English-speaking people is in arms against that power, and every English-speaking race has refused to resort to the draft, which is the foundation of Prussianism, except as a last resort. In little England herself 5,000,000 of the best soldiers in the world volunteered in this war for democracy. Canada, Australia, and New Zealand have sent almost a million of as brave troops as ever fought upon a battle field, every man a product of the system that is now sought to be discredited in this country. Six million and more of our brothers in language, now comrades in arms, have answered to the call of democracy and put guns upon their shoulders and gone voluntarily to fight her battles. England herself had less than a million men of military age left in the British Isles when they obligated the entire nation that remained at home to military service. We have more than 20,000,000 men of fighting age. If we were to go to the draft after we have sent 15,000,000 willing men to the battle line in Europe, that would be following the example of England in this matter.

Every advocate of conscription shouts "Look at England! Her record proves that the volunteer system is a failure." Yes; look at England. She is winning the war, if the allies win; she is the backbone of the opposition to Prussian militarism throughout the world; she rules the seven seas of earth; and if Germany is brought to her knees it is the navy of England that brings her to them. England rules the seven seas, and every man who treads the decks of her mighty fleet and fights beneath the union jack is a volunteer free-born Englishman. If anyone in America thinks that England has been in any sense a failure in this war, they can apply to Germany, and I think the Kaiser will tell them a different story. "God punish England" is the cry that shows the world that Germany knows whom her most dangerous adversary is. John Bull may have been a little slow at the start of this war in getting into the fight upon the land. Democracy has never deemed it necessary to be ready to strike a death blow at a neighbor nation at an hour's notice. But John Bull has his coat off now, and the

Kaiser is learning that he can fight on land as effectively as upon the sea. Does anyone think the little army of a few hundred thousand men England conscripted from the residue remaining from her great mass of fighting volunteers makes the might of England invincible to-day on every battle field of Europe or of Asia where men fight beneath the banner of St. George? On every fighting front in this great war men who speak the English language and believe in the democracy which the English race has given to the world are proving that the volunteer soldier is the best soldier and the soldier that will fight until this war is won. English-speaking nations have never been quick to quarrel, but when once engaged have never yet failed to voluntarily fight the issue through to a successful finish. A great many people, including some of those high in our Military Establishment, are worried as to how we shall start in this war. They criticize and constantly refer to the slowness with which Great Britain and all her democratic daughters started in this race of death with military autocracy, but I have never seen prizes paid nor results decided at the start of any race. If the race is long and hard, as this race was bound to be, since its course ran round the world, the race was sure to go not to the swiftest at the start, but to the racer that could run true in the stretch, that could stand the whip and the spur when the pace was heart-breaking, and the spurs are driven deep into the heaving flanks and the cruel whip beats upon the struggling shoulders of the racers.

In that sort of a race the volunteer soldier has never failed to run true to the finish and be in at the death. When the Prussian autocracy shall finally be no more and democracy and enduring peace shall reign throughout this earth, the verdict of history shall be that the soldier that finally triumphed over military autocracy in this Armageddon of the world was the English-speaking volunteer. [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. OLNEY.

Mr. OLNEY. Mr. Chairman, our minority leader has told me that there are practically 50 men who desire to be heard upon the minority report, and I am going to yield back 10 minutes of my time so that anyone who desires to be heard upon the question may have an opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, a state of war exists between Germany and the United States, and it is necessary that in the creation of an army we look to the Commander in Chief of the Army, the Chief Executive of the War Department, and competent and responsible Army officers for advice. Two methods of raising an army are under consideration by the House, one by the volunteer system and the other by selective conscription.

As a conservative business man I am willing to heed the advice of the Commander in Chief, a civilian; the Secretary of War, a civilian, and competent Army officers as to the best and wisest means to pursue in creating a trained force of men. Such witnesses came before the Military Affairs Committee, and in the terms of Caesar, they came, some of the committee saw and were conquered. To illustrate further, if you are going to build a house you would naturally consult an architect and a carpenter, would you not, the one as the experienced, guiding hand and the other to build a strong foundation, frame the dwelling, drive in the nails, and roof the building. So when the architect of the War Department appeared before our committee with his skilled artisans or carpenters, if you will, and recommended that a certain method be adopted in the raising, equipping, and training of an army I felt that these men knew what they were talking about.

As one of the original proponents of universal military training and service in the House my action is absolutely consistent.

I advocated universal training and service as an arm of the Military Establishment of the United States more than a year ago, and hope and trust after this great war is over the great military heads of the Government will get together and frame and advocate such legislation.

Would that the Government had begun such a system a year ago and we would now have training 1,000,000 men. A member of the English Parliament told me at my home in Washington three months ago that the United States would not adopt universal training and service until a crisis arrived. The crisis has arrived and conscription should be the opening wedge for a permanent policy after the war of universal liability to service where the burden of military responsibility will be equally distributed to all citizens of military age and which is the only democratic and consistent method of raising and training an army.

Capt. Benson, seven years in the English Army and an officer in the Somerset Yeomanry, doing service in and about Jerusalem, on leave of absence from his country on account of dis-

ability, was in Washington 10 days ago and I conscripted him to appear before the Military Committee.

A summing up of his testimony strongly indicated a decided preference for the conscription over the volunteer system, and if England was beginning the war she would start with conscription. Among other things, Capt. Benson pointed out that under the volunteer act about twice as many married men volunteered as single men, and, furthermore, that the volunteer system took many of the most useful men out of the country, and frequently coal miners, skilled mechanics, and agriculturalists were compelled to return to England since their services were considered more useful at home in the prosecution of the war. Actually 200,000 under the volunteer act were recalled from the front for duty in England.

Capt. Benson made a strong point on the question of economy in conscription as against extravagance and waste in the volunteer method. I quote from his testimony:

Very often A and B, who enlisted, were married men with large families, while C and D were single men. While those men were on service the State had to pay separation allowances and dependent allowances for A's and B's wives and children and dependents, and these allowances were a very serious factor. In fact, it was laughingly said that if a man only had enough children his pay would be as much as the pay of a general, and that was a factor that had great weight.

Another point which Capt. Benson drove home with force related to equal distribution of effort and obligation under conscription.

Under the volunteer act where a certain district was bombarded by Zeppelins heavy enlistment would ensue from that section, while there was practically no volunteering from sections untouched by balloon warfare. In other words, the distribution of effort and obligation under the volunteer system was not equitable.

Several weeks ago the emergency peace committee of Massachusetts took a straw vote on war and conscription and about 2,200 responded in the entire Commonwealth. The percentage against war was 62.4 and against conscription 59.9. The peace committee further states that the percentages in the congressional districts vary from high votes, such as in the Hon. RICHARD OLNEY'S—fourteenth—where there was a vote against war of 80.1 per cent and against conscription of 77.7 per cent, to an adverse vote in Hon. W. H. CARTER'S—thirteenth—of 53.5 per cent for war and 53.8 for conscription. In reading this statement to the House I reveal that the almost overwhelming sentiment in my district is against conscription, and yet I fearlessly go on record to-day in favor of such a policy as a Representative of the Nation and not as a Congressman from a particular section of the country. My people are a heterogeneous people, composed of boot and shoe operatives, skilled mechanics, farmers, business men, and granite workers, the finest constituency in the United States, and a strong bond of sympathy and friendship exists between them and their Congressman.

If my constituents could have listened to all the evidence before our committee, I am sure that there would be a reversal in the vote on conscription, for they are reasonable, intelligent, and open to conviction.

In this great war in which we have embarked there is work for all.

Men should be conscripted to stay at home to work in the fields or the shops, and most of the operatives in boot and shoe factories, the granite quarries, the shipbuilding yards will be needed at home to supply the Army and the civilians with necessities of life.

If the plan of conscription is adopted, those men will be taken who can best be spared from society.

At this point I beg to submit to the House the following letter from a constituent:

HYDE PARK, April 16, 1917.

Congressman OLNEY.

DEAR SIR: As one of your constituents I should like to express my views to you on the universal service bill which will come before you shortly. I am an ex-militiaman, having served in Company K, First Heavy Artillery.

After my own experience, and seeing the time they had in getting volunteers in England for this war, I believe the universal training bill is the only just and proper way to raise the forces we need, and I hope you will find yourself able to give it your hearty support.

Some of my reasons for supporting it are: That the volunteer force at present consists principally of the laboring class; and as it has been used mainly for intimidation in strikes it has lost favor with that class of people. Result: For years it has not been able to muster at peace strength.

Again, why should our bright, manly boys, a credit to our towns and villages, go to the front while the poolroom fiends, etc., stay at home. They should be made to go and do their part.

With the rich and poor in the ranks, there will be more respect shown for the uniform than there is at the present time.

Again hoping that you will give this bill your hearty support, I am, respectfully, yours,

ROLAND S. WARDE,  
681 Metropolitan Avenue, Hyde Park, Mass.

Granting that half a million are ready to offer their services to-morrow as volunteers the War Department is not equipped according to the Secretary of War, to properly train and equip such a force at the present time, and he added that it would take at least three months before the machinery could be actually in operation to effectively provide for 500,000, on account of a deficiency in trained officers, tentage, uniforms, and other supplies.

Plenty of opportunity is afforded to those imbued with the volunteer spirit to enlist in the National Guard and Regular Army, since according to a summary furnished by the Secretary of War the number of men that may be provided by voluntary enlistment under the War Department plan amounts to 724,718. In Massachusetts about 60 men a day are enlisting under this plan, and at this rate it would take nearly two years for Massachusetts to furnish its quota; and I understand that enlistment all over the country is proportionately similar.

To a question by one of the committeemen as to what he would do if the volunteer act were adopted, the Secretary, without hesitation, substantially said that he would give his most earnest attention and his very best effort to make the system as successful and effective as possible.

About 50,000 Americans are fighting in France to-day in one capacity or another under the flags of France and Great Britain, but in the interest of one common cause—the subjection of militarism and the substitution of democracy for bureaucracy.

If in the course of events the European war lasts into next year, this Nation may send transports to France laden with soldiers, and it would be feasible and practicable to enlist there under the Stars and Stripes the 50,000 already enlisted in foreign service.

If we desire to pay our debt to France and to help the allied nations in their great struggle, how better can we render assistance than through a system of conscription which will be expeditious, businesslike, efficient, and which has the approval of the President, the War Department, and Army officers of high rank. While I respect the opinions and honest convictions of those members of the Military Committee who have presented the majority report, I am very happy in the stand I have taken and am proud to be enrolled with the minority members, the so-called conscript fathers.

In comparison to the committee as a whole, the minority are few in numbers, but, oh, how strong in faith. Who are the minority men? KAHN of California, representing the far West, heading the committee, MCKENZIE of Illinois, CRAGO of Pennsylvania, TILSON of Connecticut, GREENE of Vermont, HARRISON of Virginia, LUNN of New York, and OLNEY of Massachusetts. Three members hail from the three largest States in the Union in point of population; about half of the thirteen original States are represented on the committee, and Virginia and Massachusetts are again found clasping hands in a common cause. Four members are Spanish-American War veterans and, confessing the weakness of the volunteer system, enthusiastically indorse conscription. The Nation, yea, the world, is watching the United States during this period. Germany would welcome our adoption of a military policy such as the voluntary system, which has broken down in all the great wars of this Nation and which has been a failure in all other countries wherever attempted. The United States is engaged in this war as an ally of the entente, is it not, and we should present a united, a solid, front.

When the House acts, may it speak in no uncertain terms in favor of conscription, carrying a message of hope and gladness to the allies and guaranteeing a speedy termination of the great European conflict. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3545, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 2762. An act to authorize an issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, and for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend credit to foreign Governments, and for other purposes.

#### INCREASE OF THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. FIELDS. 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 bill H. R. 3545.

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 further consideration of the bill H. R. 3545, with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman from Massachusetts consume?

The CHAIRMAN. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. QUIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, let no man misunderstand the gravity of the question before the House. The Congress, at the request of the President, several days ago passed the resolution boldly declaring the existence of a state of war between the United States of America and the Imperial Government of Germany. Our country is now at war with that powerful military nation. All discussion has been closed as to the relative merits or demerits of the war. The time for discussion has passed. Every citizen of this great Republic of freemen should now stand firmly and patriotically by the flag and do everything in his power to bring victory to our country.

The Congress has turned over \$7,000,000,000 to the President, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, to lend to the allies and expend for the United States in prosecuting the war. Everything requested has been unanimously granted. Your Committee on Military Affairs had the responsibility of reporting a bill to raise, equip, and maintain the Army to begin the prosecution of the war.

The President desires the authorization for 1,000,000 men by selective draft, or conscription, in two increments of 500,000 each. All of your committee agreed to give the million men, but the majority of the committee thought it wise to authorize the President to call for the first half million as volunteers in units of companies and regiments from the several States, and when he desired the next half million the President should call them in the same manner.

The majority of the committee also provided the machinery for the inauguration of the draft system desired by the President and the Secretary of War, with the authority vested in the President to initiate the selective conscription system if the proper number of available men failed to respond under the call for volunteers.

The committee was careful to safeguard the Commander in Chief against any semblance of failure on the part of the citizens to promptly respond to the call to arms.

Mr. Chairman, the objection to the selective conscription plan is fundamental. We owe it to the President and the country to provide an army sufficient to prosecute this war to a successful conclusion.

Your committee has granted every man and every dollar requested. We give in our bill the lump sum of \$3,000,000,000, and authorize the President and Secretary of War to spend it as they see proper in preparing and in conducting the war. We could not agree to the selective conscription plan as presented to us.

Mr. Chairman, that plan required us to place the burden on the youth between the ages of 19 and 25 years—to be forced to do all the fighting—the only portion of our citizens, except those in the Regular Army and the National Guard, who would be called on to die for the United States, perhaps in the trenches of Europe. We were called upon to limit the men to that specific class and allow the agencies of the War Department to select which ones they would take.

I could not agree to that plan. We all know, if this war lasts long enough, these soldiers will be marched into the trenches and on the firing lines against the enemy in Europe. It is my conviction, sir, that the burden to do the fighting in this war rests on the shoulders of the men from 21 years up to perhaps 50. The stock argument of the advocates of this selective conscription plan is, that it is universal, democratic, and the only fair way to get the soldiers to do the fighting.

How universal is it, when every man above 25 years of age is excluded from the draft, and can pursue the even tenor of his way during the mighty conflict, when a few of those who are between 19 and 25 years of age will be fighting and dying for the entire Nation?

How democratic is it, when the agencies of the War Department are to select from among the physically and mentally sound ones those names that come out of the box or jury wheel which ones are to go into the Army to do the fighting and which ones are to be left at home? I ask if this is fair; to whom is it fair? Is it fair to the man who is conscripted into the Army, while his neighbor of the same age and same physical and

mental ability is left at home to enjoy life or make money? Is it fair to all of that class between 19 and 25 years that a select portion of them be forced to do that Army service and perhaps get slain on the field of battle, while every man who happens to be above 25 years of age is excluded from the service?

Mr. Chairman, I could not vote to conscript the boys who are not old enough to vote and force them to do the fighting for the men of this Nation.

If Congress adopts the plan of the War Department, the first draft will mean about 1,100 young men from each congressional district, and the second draft will be about December for 1,100 more young men from each congressional district.

The Secretary of War stated before our committee that it would take three months from the passage of the bill to organize the machinery and register all of the male citizens between 19 and 25 years of age, and that it would take about six weeks after that to perform the select drafting and have them in camp ready for the Army. Of course, it would take several months of intensive training before they would be prepared to enter the trenches or march on the lines against the enemy on European soil. Every one of them will be in the Army for the period of the war or the existing emergency.

You understand they will be kept in the Army until the President of the United States issues a peace proclamation.

The metropolitan papers and a few leagues have endeavored to mislead the public and make them believe this is a mere proposition for universal compulsory military training. There is no such idea as that in this bill. The measure is for the conscription of 1,000,000 men between 19 and 25 years by selection through the War Department for actual service in the Army against the enemy. They are to be sent to any place or any battle field which the President may deem expedient.

Gentlemen, the President is Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, and after we turn this Army over to him I am in favor of his using his own judgment without consulting Congress as to when and where that Army is to be used.

I know, if the war continues long enough, he will be compelled to send the forces to fight the enemy in Europe. We can not be mealy-mouthed about not wanting our soldiers to be sent to foreign soil to fight. If the President says they should go there, it is up to Congress to say nothing, but aid him in every way possible to bring victory and honor to our country in this awful contest.

Since we know in reason that this Army we propose to raise under this act will be sent to Europe to engage in that mad carnage, do you want to conscript a few of a certain age, or let the call be answered by all of military age to voluntarily offer themselves as a sacrifice to the country? Do you want to follow the system and method of autocracy, or do you desire to follow the plan of democracy?

Gentlemen, the great body of the plain people, the inarticulate mass which constitutes the real sovereignty of our Government, can not be heard in the chamber of diplomats. Shall they cease to be heard in the committee rooms of the American Congress?

Shall their voice be stifled on the floor of this House?

Shall we resort to the same system created and perfected by the Prussian military autocracy, which we are seeking to overthrow?

My fellow Members, do you know that with all of the autocratic power vested in the Kaiser and his military autocracy, that he can not conscript a single soldier to go beyond the borders of the Empire? The German soldier volunteers for the service beyond his own country. The Kaiser with all his power could not conscript or draft his armies to come to America to fight. The soldiers of His Majesty could not be compelled to come until they had volunteered to do so.

If that idea prevails under an autocracy, am I to be criticized for thinking it should continue in a democracy? I love the people and adore all of the tenets of real democracy. If this be a weakness, I trust it is a pardonable one as the real cause why I can not follow our President and accept this doctrine of conscripting the young men of America to fight in Europe until after all men of military age shall have had an opportunity to answer the call of the President through authority of Congress to volunteer for such service. If they were to fail to respond to such a call in the proper number and the proper time, then no one could complain at the conscription of men from 21 to 40 years of age.

The advocates of this autocratically and erroneously denominated democratic and fair plan of selective draft or conscription say it is the ideal system of raising an army. Admitting for the sake of argument that their conclusion is true, does that make it just and right? I admit it is a perfect system by which

to gather up the American youths and stand them in front of the asphyxiating gas bombs, the machine guns, the heavy artillery, and infantry rifle bullets of the Germany army, to be swept into eternity without their desire or volition; but does that make it fair, just, and right to those young men of America? Would it harmonize with our ideals, institutions, and traditions?

I could formulate what many people would deem an ideal tax system, but to my mind it would be an outrage.

Suppose a law were suggested by which all of the taxes to support the Government should be paid by men between the ages of 25 and 40 years, and that no other persons were required to pay any taxes; and further that some agency of the Government be vested with full power at will to select a certain number of men between those ages to pay all of the taxes required of all the people of the United States, and not only the great majority of the men between 25 and 40 years would have no tax burden on them, but all other persons of all other ages in the Republic would be free from taxation. No doubt there are many people in the Nation who would call that plan "universal, democratic, and fair."

Does any man on this floor pretend to say that would be a "universal, democratic, and fair plan" to raise revenue to support and maintain the Federal Government?

Would it be a democratic and fair method of raising revenue to support the municipality, the county, or the State?

No Member of this Congress, nay, no intelligent man outside of Congress, could so becloud his powers of ratiocination as to reach a conclusion that such an abortive system of raising revenue could be universal, democratic, fair, just, and right.

Then why will not the same process of reasoning apply to the proposed selective draft, or conscription act, to draft whatever young men of the limited class the War Department's agents select to do the fighting for all the people of the United States?

Still we are told this is universal, democratic, and fair.

Is it really possible that a Member of this House could so prostitute his intellect as to in truth and fact reach such a preposterous conclusion?

Gentlemen, what is the matter with the Dent bill reported to this House by a majority of your committee?

Twelve of us believe that is the proper bill for our great country at the beginning of this impending emergency.

The minority of eight of our committee believe in the selective conscription plan, though agreeing with us on other features of the bill. A careful analysis of our measure will indicate to any mind that our country is safe in every regard in so far as the raising, equipping, concentrating, and maintaining an Army for the war is concerned.

Each member of that committee is actuated by the same high, noble, and patriotic impulses. The majority of us patriotically believe the volunteer system should be given a trial, and we have breathed our earnest and patriotic conceptions into the bill.

Why not give our citizens a chance to volunteer in units of companies and regiments, the officers to be examined and appointed by the President under the new laws?

Does any man believe that patriotism is dead in our country? Do you believe that the American citizenry would fail to respond to the stirring appeal of our great President if our volunteer provision is adopted by Congress?

Mr. Chairman, it is the passion of my soul that every real American should be ready at all times to lay down his life for his country. What nobler impulse can there be in the soul of Americans than to immolate themselves on the altar of their country? America, the proud heritage of Bunker Hill, Brandywine, and Valley Forge!

Our freedom, liberty, institutions, ideals, tradition, and rights of man and property, safeguarded by the Constitution, the sacred palladium of liberty, constitute a noble heritage won by the sacrifice of blood and life of the fathers before us.

Fellow Americans, do you mean to tell me there is no patriotism in the United States, the giant of the west?

Gentlemen on this floor argue that citizens would not volunteer, because they do not rush by the tens of thousands to fill up the Regular Army and the National Guard. Do not you know that is not a fair nor legitimate comparison?

More than a regiment a day since the declaration of war is being accepted into the Regular Army, which fills the hope of even the most optimistic observer.

Do not you know our citizens have never responded to any extent to the Regular Army? They did not do it in the War with Mexico in 1845 and 1848. They did not volunteer into the Regular Army in the Civil War from 1861 to 1865. During the whole time of the Civil War not more than 1 per cent of the volunteers enlisted in the Regular Army. Why should it be different to-day?

The first call of 400,000 by President Lincoln was responded to promptly, and they even came too fast. The Secretary of War, Mr. Cameron, made this pertinent observation:

I can not forbear to speak favorably of the volunteer system \* \* \*. A Government whose every citizen stands ready to march to its defense can never be overthrown, for none is so strong as that whose foundations rest immovably in the hearts of the people.

You hear men say conscription was resorted to by President Lincoln in the last years of the war. Do you know that the records show that 1,356,000 volunteers were enrolled and only about 60,000 were conscripted soldiers?

You say the Confederate Government had to resort to conscription. Do you know that the records show that the Confederate Government was formed in 1861, in February, and that on the 6th of March President Davis issued a call for 100,000 volunteers, and by the middle of April he had 35,000 already equipped and ready for the field. He only had a small population to draw from, and yet he got every man called for in a very short time.

Of course, he had to conscript soldiers when their wives and children were at home suffering for something to eat and wear.

What is the truth about our present condition? We have about 150,000 trained men in the National Guard who have been in training since the summer of 1916, and we have about 150,000 in the Regular Army. We have a goodly number trained in the Officers' Reserve Corps.

A call for 500,000 volunteers by company and regimental units from the States and Territories would mean what? It would mean a great upheaval of patriotism all over this mighty Republic, and before 30 days the half million men would be in training, ready and anxious for the day to come when they could go to alien soil, bear the flag of the United States, and demonstrate American valor and prowess in driving the Kaiser's warriors back toward Berlin.

All of the enterprise of this great Nation is in process of mobilization to equip the Army. The rifles are already in store for the first 500,000.

Our marvelous resources guarantee the statement they would be speedily uniformed.

Gentlemen argue that it might cripple industry. That is impossible, because the volunteer provision gives the President the same right to select them as he would have under his conscript provision. Anyway, what is a little unit of one-half a million men out of our hundred millions of people? We have 35,000,000 men of military age in this country. No one could seriously contend that 1,000,000 being taken according to the legal quotas from all the States and Territories, could cut any material figure in any business or industry, even if the President or Secretary of War did not exercise the power to say which should be refused by the Government.

Why, in the beginning of the war, depart from the traditional method of this Nation and all other democracies? It was the Volunteer Army that placed the flag of the United States on the ramparts of Monterey.

It was the volunteer regiments which brought honor and victory to our flag at Buena Vista.

It was the American Volunteers who carried the Stars and Stripes into Mexico City.

It was the Union's Volunteers who overcame the Stars and Bars and overthrew the Government of the Confederate States of America.

It was the American Volunteers who drove the flag of Spain from the Pearl of the Antilles.

It was the American Volunteers who drove the Spanish oppressor from the green isles inhabited by the swarthy Filipino in the far distant Pacific.

Is it possible that at this glorious period of our national history, when we surpass the world in wealth, resources, and inventive genius, we can not at the beginning of a war, trust the American men of military age to respond to the Nation's call to fight her battles any time and everywhere?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes additional to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIN. It was American genius that gave the world the fatal submarine. It was American genius which gave the world the flying machine, now the eyes of the modern armies engaged in the greatest war in the world's history.

Must we now, under the shadow of all past achievements, bow our heads in ignominy and exclaim, "Americans no longer breathe the patriotic spirit of 'Old Glory'?"

Shall we at the very outset of this conflict brand the American soldier with the word conscript, so that in future years his

posterity can, in accord with the citizen of old Rome, exclaim, "Conscript Fathers"?

Many newspapers of the country say the volunteer system is a failure.

Gentlemen, England, with a population of only 40,000,000 people, raised a volunteer army of 5,000,000 soldiers before resorting to the draft plan, and since adopting this plan she allows 30 days for the men to enlist in the army, and under that system she has added only 1,350,000 soldiers to her army.

Just think of it, with the war going on in her back yard, the Kingdom of England has not yet adopted any such strenuous law as is proposed here.

The Dominion of Canada and Australia, colonial dependencies or possessions of Great Britain, still have the volunteer system, and the war has been in progress nearly three years.

Each one of these countries supplies its quota of soldiers through the volunteer plan and gets them across the ocean for the mother country to put on the firing line against the enemy. No one will contend that any of the industries of Canada or Australia have been injured or hampered by this system of volunteers.

Gentlemen, who is to be selected?

The last evening the Secretary of War appeared before the committee I submitted this question to him: "Mr. Secretary, the population of my district is about 75 per cent agricultural and 25 per cent urban or town. What ratio will be selected under your draft system?" The Secretary said he could not, of course, be accurate; he would estimate about 3 to 1. That is, every time one was selected from the towns three would be selected from the country.

He said the transportation operatives of trains would not be drafted. It is plain that when they take 1,200 men out of my district 900 of them will be farmers and 300 of them town men.

Under the draft system the agencies of the War Department would, of course, determine which farmers should be put into the Army.

Gentlemen, do not pay attention to all this rot in the newspapers in reference to saying farmers will not be drafted into the Army. Every one of these men in the New England factories, these men who are making nine, twelve, and fifteen dollars a day on the coast here in the munitions factories, will stay there and say, "Yes; conscript these fellows between 19 and 25 all over the country and send them over yonder to bare their breasts to the German bullets." That is what is going to happen.

I am standing by the President in all of his war measures, but I can not support this selective conscription. It is a matter too vital and fundamental for any of us to treat lightly. I can not surrender my convictions when I am convinced that the plan is not for the best interest of our Nation. It is likely to breed internal troubles and ill feeling against the Government.

Now is the time when every citizen should love the Government. I can not conscript the boys into the Army. If they should go to the trenches and many be killed and others maimed and wounded, I could not face them, one-armed, one-legged, and with disfigured faces, and see some with sightless eyeballs rolling at me. If they go voluntarily, no reproach could come against anyone. To conscript the boys and ill fortune overtake them, pangs of conscience would disturb me as long as I live.

In the name of humanity, I ask you if you vote for the conscript bill please give us our amendment to exempt the boys.

This is a man's war, and if it is to be fought by conscript soldiers these soldiers should be above 21 years of age.

I am doing what my heart and mind lead me to think is right and for the best interest of our country now and for the future.

I ask you further to accept our amendment exempting ministers of the Gospel. Surely it would be humiliating to have the agents of the War Department drag the minister of God away from his congregation and conscript him into the Army.

May the God of hosts guard and protect America. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIN. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman know any reason why a minister of the Gospel should be excepted any more than a lawyer or a banker or a farmer?

Mr. QUIN. Oh, yes; a minister of the Gospel ministers to the people. We need somebody, while we are following this war-mad cry, while we are resorting to every endeavor to break down Prussianism, we need somebody inspired by God on high to preach to our women and children and those men above 25

years of age who are left at home to enjoy their usual pursuits. [Laughter]. Do not take the ministers of the Gospel from them. Leave a semblance of the followers of the lowly Nazarene back at home to preach to the people, to bury the dead, and marry the youth of the land. Gentlemen, I thank you. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON].

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, in order that I may not abuse the confidence of my distinguished friend from California and may yield back such time as possible for the use of others, I ask the Chair to notify me at the end of 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is with great reluctance and regret that I find myself reduced to the painful necessity of parting company on a great question from my friend from Alabama [Mr. DENT], the great chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. I have admired him; we have all admired him. He is able; he is true; he is one of the best men we ever had; he is one of the best chairmen that great committee ever had, and if anybody would say they are going into mourning because he has made this mistake I wish to console them by reminding them that as one swallow does not make a summer so one error can not damn a great man. [Applause.] There is yet time for him to retrieve his reputation and do right on this question.

I should have no objection, Mr. Chairman, to humoring the pride and preserving the face of every man who wants to volunteer if they would only offer to volunteer, but they do not all offer. If they did, the administration would be flooded with hundreds of thousands of telegrams saying they wanted to volunteer as quickly as possible, instead of hundreds of thousands of applications for clerkships and commissions. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is all right to talk about punctilio and pride and humiliating our young men by drafting them. This is no time for theorizing nor for sentimentality. The stern fact faces us that we have a job on our hands probably not realized by the great mass of our people nor even by all the Congressmen themselves. War has been forced upon us by the most reckless, unscrupulous, and warlike Government the world has seen for generations. The gentleman from Pennsylvania just now in describing the situation was in error when he said the President urged us to declare war against Germany. We have been for two years led by the wisest man who ever sat in the White House or presided over any other country trying to avoid having to recognize that Germany was making war on us. Finally, when patience ceased to be a virtue, when forbearance could no longer forbear, when our lives and our property and our rights, individual and national, were disregarded ruthlessly and recklessly, then, as watchmen on watchtowers, true to our trust, true to our people, we proclaimed and recognized that ruthless war was being waged upon us and recognized the necessity of preparing for it.

Now, shall we stand here and spin theories and talk about pride and punctilio and ask Germany to wait two years until we can make experiments to see whether we can organize a volunteer army, when Hohenzollern militarism may have broken down the eastern line and made it necessary—a necessity which might not arise if we took prompt action—for us to send a million men to Europe, in order that the descendants of Sheridan and Sherman and of Lee and Jackson shall cut through those phalanxes, pierce those lines, and secure liberty and freedom for us and for civilization from further ruthless aggression? [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, a thousand recruits a day would give us 750,000 men in two years. Our prompt recognition of the situation, unanimously extending credit, unanimously declaring we would resist the war, have been marvelous in their moral effects upon the war, and if we promptly follow that by recognizing the necessity to do all things necessary to raise an army as quickly as possible we would increase the moral effect, and we may by prompt action succeed in helping to end the war before the worst comes upon us. If we dally along and let our good men volunteer and let the "slackers" stay at home to disgrace themselves and probably rob their neighbors, we may be reduced to the extremity of not only sending an army abroad, but also leaving one equally as large at home to protect ourselves against other things that might happen just as bad, if we left our shores unprotected.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am unwilling that the flower, the youth, the chivalry, the bravery, the honesty of the country shall volunteer and go ahead and risk their lives in fighting for the balance of them, while their neighbors, less patriotic, are allowed to slack and shirk and stay at home. It is not discrimination. It is democracy, it is equity, both of which are equality

before the law. All of our people are subject to military duty unless specifically excepted for good reason. Then, it is simply obedience to law for everybody to recognize that, and no brave man can claim advantage over another and say, "I rushed in and volunteered ahead of you." And no "slacker" can be shamed by saying, "I was drafted when you were not." The thing to do when we have a man's job on our hands and where there may be a real war is to prepare for it and quit talking about these trifling sentimentalities that men talk about.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not trespass longer upon the time of the House, but I will ask that the Clerk read a letter, which is one of many thousands received from the district which I have the honor to represent, and which I am proud to say realizes the gravity of the situation. While many of their men stand ready to volunteer, they all recognize the liability of all to serve their country, and they are all standing by the administration in demanding the exertion of every means and the use of every resource and every recourse equally and justly to raise an army as quickly as possible and end this war as soon as possible.

I will ask the Clerk to read the letter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LAGRANGE, GA., April 19, 1917.

Hon. W. C. ADAMSON,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ADAMSON: To begin with, I do not think it is right to save all the flowers for the casket, so I am going to tell you how glad I am to see you standing for selective conscription. You are proving again your "level head," and in this instance your sense of justice as well. When I read what Representatives had to say—that "conscription would mean their political death"; "that they had promised the mothers of their States to keep their sons out of war"—I wondered whose sons would do their fighting for them. God grant it may never come to fighting; but just now, if all mothers' sons are to be spared all risks and possibilities, who will answer our country's call? No mother ever had two finer, dearer boys than mine. For years we have been trying to prepare them for lives of usefulness and praying each day that they might grow up to be a comfort to their parents and an honor to their country. We have worked and sacrificed that they might have every advantage from the public schools on through the State university and then their degrees at the Johns Hopkins and Harvard, and studying in Germany and France. Harry has spent four years of hard work on the house staff at the Hopkins, and last October he leased and equipped his own office in the city and has been doing so well this winter, and it seems the time isn't so far off now when he can begin to think of having a home of his own and some one to keep it. Searcy has been building up the "good roads and bridges" for his State, working unceasingly, going into every county in Georgia, from Rabun Gap to the sea, and, as you may know, the University of Michigan had him come up and spend one summer showing them what Georgia was doing. These are the boys who have been taught never to shirk a duty; and are such boys as these to be thrown into the breach and save Representatives from political death and their mothers' sons from every personal sacrifice and danger?

These boys of mine volunteered last year when the trouble came with Mexico, and when the war cloud appeared above the horizon again in February I went flying to Baltimore to have a little love feast with Harry before he was sent—I knew not where. While in Baltimore I was talking to some doctors about what a pity it was for Harry to have to stop his work just as he had started off. They said they had absolutely no patience with Harry; that "a fellow who had things right in his hands was a fool to risk the loss of such a grand work." These very doctors were spending the greater part of their days waiting for work to come their way, and going into the Army would be their salvation, and a burden off their parents.

We are sadly in need of conscription—boys and men, great, strong, sturdy men all over the country, some of them having been captains in athletics at college—they never have done any work worth while, and they surely need Uncle Sam to get behind them and make them work for once in their lives. I can't understand why people can't see that it would be the best thing the country ever did to take up all loafers and put them to work. Think of what it would mean to have several hundred thousand of them farming this summer.

You know how bravely and cheerfully Dr. Slack has worked all these years, despite his increasing deafness; he has looked to the future when these boys would be the stay and comfort of his later years, and now when it seems that his country needs them, he does not think of himself at all. I am not so brave and unselfish. When I was with Harry he tried to brace me up by telling me that "now was the time to put into practice my good old Presbyterian doctrines."

I am writing all this in a spirit of indignation over the effort of Congressmen to use our noble volunteers to save their shirkers, and to show that my boys are just as much to this mother—and Heaven knows no mother could ever recoil from the horror and dangers of this barbarous war more than I—yet I know that my fathers never shirked in the days of the persecution of the Covenanters; they fought for liberty in the days of the Revolution; they were loyal to the flag that "went down in defeat but in glory" in the sixties, and now I am thankful these boys are the "brave sons of noble sires." They will not have to be conscripted. It is a shame that conscription has to come, yet it is the only just course. The only safe one.

Yours, very sincerely,

RUTH B. SLACK.

During the reading of the letter the following occurred:

Mr. DECKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMSON. I will ask the Clerk to finish the letter.

Mr. DECKER. How old are these boys?

Mr. ADAMSON. They have already volunteered, both of them. The mother thinks the sons of other mothers ought to be taken, too.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman spoke feelingly and eloquently, as he always does, on the subject of universal responsibility, of universal liability to service. Does the gentleman think that those splendid principles which we all approve are exemplified by the administration, the War Department's proposition, to lay the entire burden of this great war on boys from 19 to 25, and draft them, and then alone?

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not undertake to discuss the details of this bill. [Laughter.] I do not hesitate to say that the young men are best suited, and first to be called on for service—"old men for counsel, young men for war." I trust the military experts who have studied the military history of this and other ages to advise us as to the details, and the Military Committee has studied that out. I am simply discussing the difference between the administration proposition and the proposition to insist on the volunteer experiment to delay the organization of an army needed as soon as possible. And I want to say further, Mr. Chairman, that if gentlemen will analyze the pressure upon them closely they will find that the pressure for the volunteer system comes more largely from those who do not want to go to the war than from those who would volunteer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia to print the balance of the letter in the Record? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ADAMSON. I thank the gentleman from California for his courtesy and the committee for its consideration and attention.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, as I am one of the eight men, members of the Committee on Military Affairs, who joined in the minority report, I feel that, whatever may have been the traditions of ancient days that qualified men for such an honor in old Rome, I, too, in this twentieth century have become one of the "Conscript Fathers." I suggest that, not for the apparent flippancy of the remark, but for the opportunity it gives me to remind our friends who are laying so much stress upon the opprobrium that is supposed to be attached to the old word "conscript," that that word in its ancient, pure estate was a title of respect and dignity.

Every man in old Rome qualified to bear arms was under the universal obligation to military service, and every man qualified to serve the State in any other capacity of great usefulness was under equal obligation to perform that service when the State demanded it. And it was deemed among the Romans in those days to be a distinction beyond price to have the State reach down upon any man, deeming him to be qualified for exceeding great usefulness, and conscript him to his post of duty.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. What happened to Rome? [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I will remind the gentleman that several centuries of freedom and greatness happened to Rome between that day and the day when she fell from her high estate. The gentleman also will remember that in part of that lesson we learned of those centuries that, instead of great devotion to military standards, corruption, vice, elegance, ease, frivolity, loose pastimes, luxury, and sluggishness swept over Rome, and—

Mr. GORDON. Rome lost her conscripted army in the German forests. That is what happened to her. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Then we had better go against them there and find them and see what we can get. [Applause.]

I realize that approaching the subject at this time, after having given it much detailed attention, as men on the committee in charge of this work must do, it is useless to come here on the floor in general debate and in a few minutes attempt to do justice to the opinions and convictions by which one may have endeavored to fortify his position. We all know how much we would like to prepare something like a lawyer's brief, anticipating every move that the opposition might make, and trying to close up the door against it; but we all know, at least those of us who have had much experience on this floor, that it would not be long before the patience of the Members would cease to be a virtue. And I may add, by way of parenthesis, that few men who have been on this floor many years ever expect to convince many of their colleagues or to win many votes in general debate. So I am only going to try, as briefly as I may, to sketch, as I may say in the passing phrase of the day,



some of the "high places" that have induced me to come to the position where I now expect to stand to the end.

I am opposed to the proposition of the majority of the committee to substitute for the general plan of selective conscription for the main body of what we may well call the citizen's war army one more resort to the old time-worn trial of the volunteer plan, and I call your attention to the fact that this really is the crux of our debate to-day and this week on this bill. There are details that must be established in the administration of any law whether we decide now to adopt the conscriptive system from the start or whether we intend to use the substitution that has been proposed as the first makeshift by our friends on the majority side. But whichever way we decide, whatever principle we adopt, those details will have to be shaped afterwards in the bill in order that the law may be safely and satisfactorily administered. So I will not, I hope, offend your own sense of what are your own duties, and I will not seem to underrate your own experience in these matters, if I suggest that throughout this debate this afternoon many of our friends have been dwelling with particular emphasis, sometimes with extravagant emphasis, upon details, and details only, very carefully avoiding that main principle which is at issue before the Committee of the Whole. And inasmuch as this is a military bill I may suggest to you in military phrase that perhaps those friends of ours, beneath this scrupulous attention, this religious devotion to detail, are only masking the artillery that they hope to bring to bear against the main principle which is at stake. [Applause.]

You know it is an old, old proposition in our experience, and it has been introduced into something like a colloquial axiom that many men—perhaps we ourselves on occasion—are so troubled with what might be called an astigmatism of the imagination that they are able to discern with almost microscopic clearness the fly on a barn door, but they never see the door that the poor old fly rests on, never. So that perhaps some of the emphasis that has been laid upon some of these details as to who shall be exempted and how old these soldier boys may be, and all that sort of thing, are things that are perhaps not at all in dispute between this minority report and the majority report and do not affect the principle which has been raised here.

You will notice that our friends on the majority, in bringing out this bill, propose this substitution of the volunteering principle as far as it will work, and are very careful to guard their bill so that if it fails to work, or in the judgment of the President shows signs of failing to work, then shall there be brought into effect the last power of this conscriptive authority of the Government. I want to say—and I appeal to your own sense of logic as to whether I may be justified in saying it or not—that I am opposed to going into a war in this great emergency on the proposition of raising half of our Army conditioned on the failure to raise the other half. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Certainly.

Mr. DENT. Then is the gentleman opposed to that feature of the bill which authorizes the volunteer system in the Regular Army and the National Guard in order to build them up to war strength?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Absolutely not; and for reasons which I think are equally logical. The Regular Army and the National Guard are existing institutions. They have been with us for over a hundred years, and the law and the policy of the country have always been that with regard to those institutions men are at liberty to choose whether they will go into them or not, and this bill does not grant any extra authority in regard to that. On the contrary, this bill simply recognizes existing law. In the case of the Regular Army, the service in its ranks is looked upon as a life work, an occupation, a profession, and the law allows a man in civil life to elect whether he will adopt the Regular Army for his profession or occupation; and he does that voluntarily, as he goes into any other occupation or profession. In the National Guard, which, through the process of years and by the operation of statutes, has come to have something like a quasi professional status in the military world, we still employ exactly that same policy. If in the days of peace a young man wants to devote a part of his lifetime to special military studies and experience, then he may do so voluntarily in established units which this Government provides for that purpose.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Is not the volunteer system just as old as the National Guard?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly. It is probably a great deal older, but I do not see what that proves.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. The gentleman wants the National Guard to retain its volunteer feature because it is an old organization.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No; I said the National Guard was recognized by our Government, and has been in existence ever since its inception as a part of what we may call the established military force of the Government, in peace as well as war.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. So has the volunteer system.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Oh, no; the volunteer system only springs into existence in war emergency.

I realize, as you all do, that I must dwell briefly on what I hope to suggest to you, even if I do not persuade you by the suggestion of it. I think the fundamental proposition involved here is the very same fundamental upon which depends the continuity of our Government. Its philosophy, its form of operation, and the theory under which it is administered are so simple that all of us must get in agreement upon it. It is that the relation of the citizen to the State is that of a party to a bilateral contract. If he enjoys from his Government protection and security in his life, limb, and property, and his liberty, as he goes about every day in his ordinary peaceful employments, he is under the reciprocal obligation of maintaining the power that so protects him. We all agree to that. We agree that that is the larger part perhaps of our theory of a republican democracy. Therefore if we all start out, as we do by common consent, on the theory that every man owes to his Government the sacrifice of his life if need be to preserve and maintain in peace or in war the very power that preserves and maintains him, why should not every man in time of national stress and emergency be liable to come into the Army and defend his country? And if he is unwilling to perform his part of that obligation, why should he not be compelled by that Government to come in? [Applause.] Where does the logic lie that a man who rests upon the Government's obligation in this bilateral contract may have his option to volunteer whether he will perform his part of the contract when his Government is assailed in war? What is the logic of such a situation? How can it be defended? It seems to me—and it is for this reason that I am willing to support the idea of what in the terms of this bill is called selective conscription—it seems to me that the only truly democratic way to raise an army for the defense of the country in time of war is by such form of law and its administration as most nearly distributes equally the burden of military duty and of sacrifice upon the greatest number of people who are to benefit by the victory.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I will if the gentleman will have regard for my time.

Mr. MONDELL. I very greatly approve the patriotic sentiment the gentleman has just expressed, but I would suggest that that patriotic sentiment is not carried out in the plan which I understand the gentleman supports, the plan of the War Department to lay the burden of this entire war on boys from 19 to 25 years old.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman permit me to make one statement?

Mr. MONDELL. Is not that the War Department's plan?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Let me make just one answer—

Mr. MONDELL. Is not that the plan approved by the President?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Let me make one suggestion, and let me also keep my part of the floor. I realize what it means to get into a colloquy with the gentleman from Wyoming, and I do want to save the last 15 minutes of my time if I can. I say that in no disrespectful way; but when one engages in colloquy with the nimble-minded gentleman from Wyoming one must be ever on the alert to maintain both the floor and his head at the same time. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Vermont is very nimble minded—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I would rather have the time than the bouquets. [Laughter.] Now, let me suggest to the gentleman that the principle of universal obligation to military duty is not prejudiced because only a part of the men so liable are taken for some occasions. They may be taken in any number of groups, in any number of ways. It is obvious to any practical man that if there are, for instance, in this country, say, 10,000,000 upon whom rests this obligation to military duty, we would not take all of the 10,000,000 at once, and each one of the different groups of men who were excluded might equally say, as the gentleman from Wyoming does, by inference at least, "This is not universal military service."

Mr. MONDELL. But the gentleman predicates his argument on the proposition of general obligation to service and spreading the obligation among the people, but what he proposes—

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not appear to be having the opportunity to make any argument at all just at present.

Mr. MONDELL. What the gentleman proposes to do is to put the obligation and the burden entirely upon boys and very young men. The voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If the gentleman were as well informed on this bill as he is on Scripture, he would find that the ages of 19 to 25 are not in this bill. The ages in this bill are from 21 to 40.

Mr. MONDELL. Are not the ages from 19 to 25 in the administration bill?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is not before us for consideration, and the gentleman is out of order. The gentleman's amendment is not germane. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I can not yield further. I hope the gentleman will realize how fast the sands of my time are running out.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if the obligation does not rest upon boys between 19 and 25, what are the limitations his colleagues have in mind?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I know of no limit except that all men that receive the benefit of Government shall maintain and defend their country in time of war.

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if he is in favor of that.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I am in favor of that.

Now, it seems to me that if we are to stand by what we call democratic principles in time of peace, the general philosophy of distributing all the obligations that the Government imposes upon its citizens shall also prevail in time of war when the very structure of our Government may be ruined and may perish. Why is not the obligation to serve the country then as it is now? If we are to go into a world war on the idea that may be in the minds of some of us, that we are thereby to make it safe for democracy to exist, why ought not we to go in with our full strength of a truly democratic army? Why do we only ask those who are willing to sacrifice for democracy to go in and win for the slacker and the shirker the fruits and benefits of democracy? Is that distributing the burden equally and fairly among all men?

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman recognize that all of our citizens can not be put in the Army; that it is different from taxes? We can all pay taxes, but we can not all be in the Army, so the argument of everybody serving falls to the ground.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. No; it does not fall to the ground. The power and forces of maintaining an army are not all in the field. There are others quite as important to the success of the Army as the men in the trenches with rifles.

I want to suggest one thing more about the volunteer system. There has been so much said on this subject that I realize I am touching no new chord and can not bring any new suggestions to your minds. But the volunteer system, as has been said over and again, makes its first appeal to and only brings out those men—to use an elegant term about it—of the finer spirit, these men with the chivalrous temperament, these men inspired by a little bit more of the devotion of self-sacrifice, men who are willing to acknowledge their duty and go to war without compulsion.

Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I would like to get in one or two of my thoughts on the floor. [Laughter.] I regret that I can not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD. I wanted to bring out one of the gentleman's thoughts.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not wish to be discourteous, but I have already yielded too much.

It is argued that the volunteer system calls out the finer and braver spirits and has a moral effect. If we start out with the volunteer system, it may bring out the moral effect, but when we start conscription the very fact that the volunteer system had the moral effect stamps the conscripts by way of contrast as an army of skulkers and cowards. The very act that separates these men by giving the volunteers the first chance means that the men who do not take the first chance will therefore be grouped as "conscripts."

Now, there are some other thoughts that I had sketched out as some points to dwell upon, but those have been touched upon or dwelt upon by those who preceded me, and it is equally apparent to my hearers that I have been somewhat sidetracked from an attempt to cover them all.

There is one phase of the so-called conscript army that has a tremendous moral effect, apart from the suggestion that has been made, and that is that, while the volunteer system brings

out the finer spirit, men who make some sacrifice, it brings out the venturesome spirit. It is not fair to say that every man who volunteers goes from a disinterested motive. It is true also that the venturesome and reckless, daring soldier comes in. But it is not fair to say that every man who does not volunteer in the first instance is a slacker or a shirker. There are men who are deliberate, who are not without courage, splendid men with good intentions, and they may only be waiting for a second call; they may think that the country does not need them so soon; they may have duties at home that are more compelling. But when these men are swept into a conscript army they have no chance to stand in any such attitude before the country.

Whereas, if all men are brought together in this democratic equality of a selective conscription, a citizen war army, then the man who is chivalrous enough to volunteer for any motive, then the man who may have hesitated somewhat from good conscientious motives before he volunteers, will be in there side by side upon equal terms.

And then there is another man. There is the man to be found in every army in this country through every generation of our history who, before he went in, may not have been quite as high spirited, quite as fine tempered, keen, up to what you and I think the higher standards of life and living and its outlook, but a man who, after a career in the ranks, the Army has absolutely made over. Many a man would be drawn into the conscript army, reluctantly, going with some timidity, perhaps with a little resentment, who would find himself shoulder to shoulder and side by side in the service with some of the bravest and best in the land, and who would find that he, too, had begun perhaps for the first time to recognize and realize his own self-respect. That is an accomplishment in the democratic army which you can not hope to get in any other way in the service.

It is said the patriot who is willing to volunteer is the man who will be humiliated by being put into a conscript army. My answer to that is that such a proposition does not do justice to his patriotic good intentions. If a man is such a patriot, if he is willing to risk his life for his country, if he is willing to sacrifice his life for his country, then he is a good enough patriot to serve in any army that his country raises for him to serve in and do his best for his country in any army where his country thinks he can do his best. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped, if I had not been interrupted, to dwell with some particularity upon one phase of this question, which now I can only barely suggest to you. If we start upon the plan of general volunteering we are going to be met face to face at the very outset, as we are now, by insidious and sometimes open and avowed influences that are determined to hinder, embarrass, and perhaps stop that enlistment or volunteering on every possible occasion, and you and I know it. I have roughly grouped them for the purposes of this suggestion into these five classes: People who are opposed to all wars; people who are opposed to this war; people who prefer to finance our allies rather than send men to fight—and those are the people whose souls are bound between the calfskin ledgers of the counting house; those are the people who think that if we can delay and fritter with this thing long enough to send a few dollars over across the water the war will be over before we get into it, and they are willing to risk the money rather than men in expectation of securing greater gains at home. Then there are the timid folks, who hope the war will be over before we have a chance to send their boys across the water—honestly timid, honestly conservative, struggling a little with conscience, perhaps, but meaning well; and they hope Providence will intervene with some miracle that will bring the war to a close before their boys will have to go, and they will help Providence all they can, even with their prayers. Then there is the fifth group, who are the out-and-out alien enemies.

I know it is urged that people of German birth or descent may be under some suspicion of disloyalty in this great crisis. I do not believe it. I know that they have a right to cherish affectionate sentiments for the fatherland, but I prefer to believe that every one of them, of the old settled stock, the men and women whom you and I know, are devoted to the flag of the new country where they have made their home, and that they will not be with the elements of disloyalty. But it is also urged right in this connection that we ought not to compel the man of German blood to fight against his fatherland, we ought to respect his tender sentiment and affectionate remembrance of the land across the Rhine.

I will remind such people when they say those things that hardly had this little British colony of ours, more than a hundred years ago, got out of its swaddling clothes before men and women of British blood, in order to make this the land of the free and the home of the brave, looked their own

fathers and brothers in the eye as they came over in red coats from the old homeland of England and pulled the triggers of their old flintlocks in their faces. And this in two wars—that of 1776 and 1812. All of the affectionate remembrances of the old land were with them, to be sure; but they were first, last, and all the time Americans. What men in America have done in the days past to make this a land of the free and a home of the brave I believe the men of America are willing to do to-day.

I had hoped to spend some time—

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield "here?"

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I should prefer not to yield to my comrade unless the gentleman from California can give me about three minutes more.

Mr. KAHN. I will yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DYER. I heartily agree with the gentleman's address, but I wanted to ask the gentleman if he was going to argue the question whether or not he would differentiate between German blood going to Europe and fighting and the colonists fighting the British when they invaded this country?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Oh, no; I do not think the principle of national loyalty is circumscribed by any compass on the map. I do not determine men's loyalty by the place they occupy on the map, and I do not in this instance.

I think there are philosophic propositions—to us: a much abused word—involved in this war which enter more into the spirit of reasoning than that of technical details, because, while we men here must contrive these practical things without which war can not be waged to any conclusion at all except one of disaster, still underneath this duty which falls to us we must consider the spirit in which the people behind us are apt to look at this thing.

If they do not see it in all its fullness now, they certainly will as the years gather and history is written, and men know what that history means. I think we have arrived at a crisis in this country, a very serious one, besides that of bloodshed and battle fields. Our participation in this world war is not to be so much a test of our American institutions as it will be a test of the character of American citizenship and democratic fellowship that has been developed under them. And that is a serious proposition. We want to remember that the habits of a lifetime of American ease of living, the ambitions and spirit of a liberty-loving people who like to debate just exactly what liberty means and how they were going to stand for it and how they were going to accomplish it and what they were going to do with it; people who for generations have passed their time in most elegant, fine, high inspiring, uplifting, academic discussions of what those principles were—are now thrust for the first time in half a century to a test of all the ideals, of all the theories, of all the academic opinions that this half a century has brought out. We find that, notwithstanding that for the last many years a propaganda has been afloat in this country of ours that war was a thing that was done and passed, nations would beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks—we find that all at once we are face to face with the most terrible war in history. Now is the time when we again must stand sponsors for the civilization that we have been boasting about so much, and must prepare in a most practical, thorough, and realistic way for the preservation of that civilization. The first thing for us to do, we who have been so accustomed to the use of words and fine uplifting phrases and hairsplitting debate, is to see that the day has gone by for discussion and argument and that the time has come for action. Civilization has come to a place where, as it does in these dreadful epochs every now and then in the history of the world, it seems that no further progress can be made. It is time for us to find out who among us are Americans, and when we have done that we have settled one great problem. If we have any easy dreams about the objective of this world war, if we have any idealistic principles, if we have been swept off our feet by any conjectures or what-not, there is at least one practical thing we can agree upon and it is this: That, if by bringing the men and women of America together in this crisis in support of one great democratic army to fight for our principles and our dignity we do actually nationalize all us Americans, this war will be worth all it costs. [Applause.]

The Civil War, terrible struggle that it was, settled for all time the principle of the indissolubility of this Union of the States. But it did not make a Nation of us in the last sense, in the sense that we were thenceforth to be a homogeneous people with one altogether distinctive national idealism and one in our manner of making that idealism reflected as much as might be in practical everyday life and living.

Now, for the first time in about 20 years men will be assembled in a great war army of the United States, men of all kinds of nursery and cradle inheritances, because, as you know, my friends, there has been a wonderful impouring of all the races and tribes of men to this land since the Civil War. For the first time in such a democratic army as we should raise from selective conscription these men will be assembled in the ranks together. They will learn that mystic fellowship that is embraced in the word "comrade," and when they are mustered out those men will go down through all the walks of peace to the end of the days of their generation as American citizens beyond a doubt. [Applause.]

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

Mr. KAHN. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, I would like to borrow just one doctrine from the Turk. Wherever the man of Moslem faith may go, once in every 24 hours he spreads his prayer rug and turns his face toward Mecca and breathes a prayer for the faith that is in him. I would like to see every boy in America brought up to emulate that Moslem doctrine in this one particular—that every day, once in every 24 hours, every boy in America in fancy, in his mind's chapel, would spread his prayer rug, turn his eyes toward Old Glory, and rededicate himself to the principles for which it stands. [Applause.]

In conclusion, let me suggest that now to us here to-day down through more than a century come the words of Nelson, which during that century have been readapted to suit American ears, words that have wonderful significance at this time, and words that are directly applicable to the issue before this House to-day: "America expects not merely volunteers but every man to do his duty." [Applause.]

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL].

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Chairman, I come from a State where the people love France with a passionate love. One-half our male population would gladly help France in her struggle. War to me is abhorrent. The thought of war is repulsive. I have deep and earnest convictions against war. So earnestly do I hold these convictions that for nearly three years I have done everything in my power to keep our country at peace. I have delivered public addresses from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific in the interest of peace and in opposition to war. I have believed that the battles of the Christian civilizations of this century would be fought not with shot and shell but by higher and more Christ-like forces—by living rightly and dealing justly but courageously with our fellow man. I have believed sincerely that no country in the world was our enemy or wanted war with us. I craved the opportunity for my country to rise above other peoples of earth and become the mightiest factor in all the world in bringing into realization the peace on earth and good will toward men that would endure forever. I believed this opportunity was real and promised to be realized.

There came a day, however, when war was inevitable. There was no honorable escape; and I now believe that even if it were possible for Americans to consider the idea, that dishonorable escape was impossible. I for one have been forced to believe that the German Kaiser—thank God, not the German people—has his avaricious eye upon the vast stores of wealth in the United States and that he has expected to make this country pay the cost of his barbarous war—a war of monarchical greed, waged senselessly and relentlessly upon the democracies of the world. [Applause.]

The entrance of the United States into this world war was a momentous hour. It has had a powerful moral effect upon the side of democracy, but that effect is lost if there be wavering, doubt, or delay on the part of this Congress. The United States must now strike the blow to end the war. We must act with a man's courage in doing a man's part. We must convince Germany and her associates that the United States Government will brook no delay in preparing this Government for defense against aggression and to hurl her powerful forces against tyranny and barbarism.

In times of peace I am opposed to centralized governments; but two generals can not direct a war. There must be one head, and under our form of government that head is the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, the President of the United States. I have loyally supported him in peace, and regardless of my personal fortunes I shall support him now. The hour has come when petty matters must be forgotten, when personal and political fortunes must be put aside, when men of world-sized caliber are needed to handle this world war—men who pray, think, and act only for America. [Applause.]

I have always been and am now opposed to militarism, but country's honor and the future liberty of our people that delay is too dangerous to be considered. The time is at hand for America to stand erect and strike down her foe. Sentimentality, personal politics, and individual quibbling must be subordinated to the larger duty we owe our country. [Applause.]

Under existing law the President is authorized to raise, under the volunteer system, the Regular Army to the maximum war strength of 293,000 men. He is also authorized to raise, under the volunteer system, the National Guard to its full strength of 329,954 men, making a total of 622,954 men raised under the volunteer system, the largest Volunteer Army ever before raised by this Nation.

Both the Regular Army and the National Guard are at present far below their war strength. The National Guard at present offers opportunity for 206,349 men to volunteer. The Regular Army gives additional opportunity for 161,519 men to volunteer. Under existing law the way is open for 367,868 men to volunteer in the Regular Army and the National Guard. When the President's plan is enacted into law the opportunity will be offered for 724,718 men to volunteer. The above does not include the demand for additional volunteers in the Navy and Marine Corps.

To supplement the organizations of the Regular Army and the National Guard, the President proposes, through the Senate bill, to raise by selective draft an additional force of 500,000 men. The House bill proposes to extend the volunteer system for a limited time, for experiment, to this additional force of 500,000 men. It is estimated by Army experts that to raise 500,000 men by the volunteer system would require that at least 2,000,000 men must volunteer. It must be obvious that the emergency is too great and imperative to permit of such delay, in view of the fact that large opportunities are already offered for volunteers in the National Guard and the Regular Army.

The idea of the House bill was born in politics, that of the Senate bill was conceived in statesmanship. The one stands for petty politics, the other for national service. In the one armies are officered for personal and political ends, in the other for efficiency. [Great applause.]

The House bill proposes to give a short time for men to volunteer. When the time passes, as it undoubtedly would, without the required additional 500,000 men, then for a man to have had the opportunity to volunteer and later to be drafted will be considered a dishonorable conscription, whereas, if the President's recommendations are immediately enacted into law, this army of 500,000 men will be scientifically organized from the beginning, and there is no dishonor or humiliation attached to enlistment. [Applause.]

The House bill is a mere pretense. It is not sincere. It undertakes to shift the responsibility from the Congress to the President. To vote for this preliminary sham, knowing at the time that it is not possible to be effective, and knowing, too, that this is exactly what the German Kaiser would have us do, and then say we did the best we could for a volunteer army will not fool the American people. Let us not go before the world with a divided front. Let us act, without quibble or delay, in support of our Commander in Chief, not only because he is our leader but because he is right. Let the world now know that the Congress and the American people are standing solidly behind the President with a courage that makes failure impossible.

The House bill offers a system unscientific and undemocratic, tried and found ineffective in our Civil War, tested and found useless by the warring nations of Europe, a system that in all great emergencies has led the soldiers, though brave and patriotic but untrained, only to certain slaughter and disaster. [Applause.]

No one honors the brave and heroic volunteer soldier more than I. The most glorious achievements in all the world have been accomplished by the volunteer soldier. He is and always will be the best and bravest soldier. No one on this side would take one wreath from his noble brow. It requires dauntless courage and heroism for the volunteer soldier to meet the usual hunger, hardships, danger, disease, and death in camp life, march, and battle, made necessary by the unscientific and conglomerate organization of his army. To relieve the soldier from these hardships and sufferings, by organizing his army scientifically and by maintaining our productive industries at home, is the purpose of the selective draft system. War a half century ago was vastly different from the scientific organizations, use of modern machinery, and operations of battle lines to-day. To meet the new conditions is the object of the President's plan. It is not to discredit the volunteer soldier, but to save him from needless sacrifice.

The Senate bill will make for the right kind of democracy. It will apply to all races, to all nationalities, to all sections, and equally to rich and poor. No longer can the rich bring on war, then have others do the fighting. Equal service will be demanded.

No boy should be sent to the Army until he passes the age of 21 years. It is morally and economically wrong to send our boys to war before they are permitted to receive proper educational advantages.

Under the House bill, if the war continues several years, whole communities would be depopulated of men, while other communities less responsive would be undisturbed. Under the selective-draft method no community and no industry will be prostrated by taking all the men away. The President is authorized to preserve our industries, to exempt those who have dependent families and the men who are really doing the needed work of the country. The farmers who are actively engaged in producing the necessary food products and other raw materials to sustain our people, under the provisions of the selective-draft bill, may be exempt; while the loafers, the hangers-on, around the street corners in our towns and cities will either be sent to wholesome productive labor or will be sent to the front. No longer will the flower of our young manhood who are inspired by noble and patriotic motives and who have consciences that move them to respond to their country's call be forced to bear alone the brunt of battle, while many of the irresponsible, unreliable, and less useful, though physically able, remain at home. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is not a local skirmish. It is a world war on a world scale. In this perilous hour and in defense of this Nation's honor, in the cause of real democracy and in behalf of common justice, I shall support the President's plan and I am ready to give my life, my all, to my country, God, and humanity. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3545) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow and that general debate on the bill pending before the House to-day be continued under the same agreement, the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] to control one half of the time and I to control the other half.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow and that general debate continue under the same conditions as to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the gentleman from Alabama as far as possible to aid us in having separate yea-and-nay votes on these two propositions?

Mr. DENT. On the two propositions?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; that is, on the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

Mr. DENT. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts I do not see how that can be prevented.

Mr. GARDNER. It can be very well prevented, if defeated in the Committee of the Whole, by a motion to recommit being made by somebody hostile to the whole bill.

Mr. DENT. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to a separate yea-and-nay vote on those propositions.

Mr. GARDNER. I felt sure the gentleman would support the idea; but I wanted to call the gentleman's attention to the fact, that if, for instance, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] or some other gentleman should claim the right to make the motion to recommit and on that move the previous question, the test vote would come on the previous question, which is not so strong as on the main question itself. I know the gentleman's motives are the fairest in the world, but I do not think everybody in the House had thought of that fact, and I thought it would be well to bear it in mind.

Mr. DENT. I am glad the gentleman has called my attention to that, I had not thought of it at all. So far as I am concerned, I have no disposition in the world to do anything of the kind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that under the circumstances of the case it might be proper to ask for a general leave to print. A number of gentlemen have spoken of that.

Mr. DENT. Then I ask for that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to its going over until to-morrow. Several gentlemen who have spoken to-day desire leave to extend their remarks. That is the reason why I mentioned it.

Mr. DENT. I ask unanimous consent, then, Mr. Speaker, that each Member who has addressed himself to this subject—

Mr. MANN. Make it all Members.

Mr. LANGLEY. Yes; make it universal for 10 days.

Mr. DENT. That every Member may have the right to extend his remarks within 10 legislative days after the conclusion of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all Members shall have leave to print remarks on this bill within 10 legislative days after the conclusion of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. EMERSON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. EMERSON. I rise to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article concerning an ex-Member of the House, Mr. Ricketts, of Ohio.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the conference report on the emergency bond issue.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the conference report on the bond-issue bill. Is there objection?

Mr. DENT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I did not understand that request.

Mr. MANN. It is on the conference report on the emergency-bond bill.

Mr. DENT. Very well.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the location of the Government armor-plate plant.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGLEY. Reserving the right to object, the site has already been selected, has it not? The gentleman does not want to change the location, does he? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Michigan rise?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a patriotic resolution passed by citizens at a mass meeting at Kalamazoo, Mich.

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

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 1771. An act to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," relative to the Fleet Naval Reserve;

H. R. 2008. An act to provide for the extension of minority enlistments in the naval service;

H. R. 2338. An act to authorize the detail of additional officers to the Hydrographic Office;

H. R. 2339. An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy until September 1, 1918;

H. R. 2340. An act to increase the age limit for persons appointed as officers in the Naval Reserve; and

H. R. 2762. An act to authorize an issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense and for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, pursuant to the order previously made, until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 24, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

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 communication of the chief of the Division of Public Moneys, Office of Secretary of the Treasury, submitting proposed clause of legislation for incorporation in a deficiency bill (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of the Interior submitting estimates of appropriations for salaries, mechanical labor, char and watch forces, for the new Interior Department Building from April 15 to June 30, 1917, inclusive (H. Doc. No. 49); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for repairs to buildings, etc. (H. Doc. No. 50); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication of the Public Printer submitting additional estimates of appropriations for salaries and general expenses, office of the superintendent of documents, for the fiscal year 1918, and deficiencies for the fiscal year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 51); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation under "Ordnance and ordnance stores," special naval appropriation bill (H. Doc. No. 52); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Indian River Inlet, Del. (H. Doc. No. 53); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and plan and estimate of cost of improvement of Seattle Harbor, Wash., with a view to the maintenance of the east and west waterways and deepening and straightening the lower Duwanish River (H. Doc. No. 54); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, resubmitting certain estimates of appropriation for the service of the Department of Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 55); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of proposed joint resolution relative to suspension of provision of section 355 of the Revised Statutes requiring cession of jurisdiction by a State over lands acquired therein by the United States (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3545) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 17), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ESCH, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 328) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," as amended, in

respect of car service, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 18), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 3634) appropriating money for the improvement of the Connecticut River between Long Island Sound and Hartford, Conn.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 3635) fixing the rate of pay of compositors and bookbinders in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 3636) to authorize the President of the United States to draft into the agricultural service of the Nation persons not liable to military service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 3637) to establish a standard of weights for various commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3638) to secure cooperation between the Interstate Commerce Commission and the State railway boards and commissions of the several States in correlating, changing, and establishing of intrastate rates, charges, and fares which indirectly affect interstate commerce in the transportation of passengers and property by public carriers, and providing for procedure relative thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 3639) to return to the South certain of the "cotton tax" collected from 1863 to 1868 by paying to each living Confederate soldier and each living widow of a Confederate soldier, as proper representative of the South, the sum of \$500, and a further sum of \$25 per month during the remainder of their lives, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3640) for the erection of a public building in the city of Ballinger, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 3641) to authorize the county of Cass, in the State of Indiana, to construct a bridge across the Wabash River east of the city of Logansport, at a point known as Cedar or Rock Island, in said Wabash River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 3642) for the erection of a public building in the city of Cisco, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3643) authorizing and providing for the construction of a military highway paralleling the Rio Grande border of that portion of the United States between Texas and Mexico, and along the entire border, or certain sections thereof, of that portion of the United States between Mexico and the States of New Mexico, Arizona, and California, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3644) for the erection of a public building in the city of Anson, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3645) for the erection of an addition to and completion of the public building in the city of Abilene, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3646) for the erection of a public building in the city of Sweetwater, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 3647) permitting the repatriation of certain former American citizens who have hitherto served or who shall hereafter serve in the armed forces of any foreign state engaged in war with a country with which the United States is at war; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 3648) for the erection of a public building in the city of Haskell, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 3649) to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 3650) to amend the act to regulate commerce, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 3651) providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a Federal building thereon and authority to sell the present Federal building in the city of Lima, Ohio; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 3652) for the erection of a public building in the city of Eastland, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3653) for the erection of a public building in the city of Paint Rock, the county seat of Concho County, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3654) for the erection of a public building in the city of Breckinridge, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3655) for the erection of a public building in the city of Palo Pinto, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3656) for the erection of a public building in the city of Baird, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3657) for the erection of a public building in the city of Albany, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3658) for the erection of a public building in the city of Winters, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3659) for the erection of a public building in the city of Merkel, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3660) for the erection of a public building in the city of Midland, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3661) for the erection of a public building in the city of Colorado, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 3662) to establish the metric system as the standard for weights and measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 3663) providing for the counting of service in the Army or Navy of the United States as equivalent to residence and cultivation upon homestead entries, and in the event of the soldier's death in such service providing for the issuance of patent for such land to his widow or minor children; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BLANTON: A bill (H. R. 3664) for the erection of a public building in the city of Big Springs, Howard County, in the State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 3665) to regulate and control prices of food, wearing apparel, and fuel in the United States during the war with Germany, and for one year thereafter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARKLEY: A bill (H. R. 3666) to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation in interstate commerce of misbranded articles, to regulate the traffic therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 3667) for the purpose of limiting the activities of certain officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 3668) for the improvement of the narrows of Lake Champlain, N. Y. and Vt.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 3669) fixing the rate of pay of compositors, bookbinders, and folding and gathering machine operators in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. WALTON: A bill (H. R. 3670) to acquire and preserve the battle ground of the battle variously known as the battle of Apache Canyon, Pigeons Ranch, and Glorieta, in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 3671) to authorize the Supreme Court to prescribe forms and rules and generally to regulate

pleading, procedure, and practice on the common-law side of the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3672) for the relief of homestead entrymen and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 3673) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the acts of August 4, 1914; August 15, 1914; March 3, 1915; and September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 3674) to punish the deliberate fabrication of false reports, rumors, or stories concerning affairs that might affect the international affairs of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 3768) to suspend the rights granted under reissue No. 13848 of patent No. 1053300; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3769) to suspend the rights granted under certain trade-marks; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3770) to suspend the rights granted under patent No. 1053300; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3771) to suspend the rights granted under patent No. 986148; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 67) authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to make inquiry relative to certain inducements offered by the Canadian Government to American emigrants; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolution (H. Res. 68) to appropriate \$50,000,000 to buy seeds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 69) requesting the Secretary of War to give to Congress and the people the facts relative to the proposal of Col. Theodore Roosevelt to enlist and command an army for service in France in the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEBB: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 62) authorizing the President to take over for the United States the possession and title of vessels of any subject or citizen of any nation with which the United States may be at war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 63) relative to an international trade agreement congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 64) to permit the naturalization of aliens of German, Austro-Hungarian, Turkish, and Bulgarian birth, resident within the United States on the 6th day of April, 1917, who had before that day made a declaration, according to law, of their intention to become citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 65) providing for expenses of the commission for relief in Belgium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MADDEN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 66) to authorize and provide for a joint assembly and meeting of representatives of the parliaments and national legislative bodies of the nations of the world in the United States, and to extend an invitation to said parliaments and legislative bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Memorial of the Legislature of Alaska, protesting against the employment of aliens by the United States in positions of responsibility in Alaska; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 3675) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Shisler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 3676) granting an increase of pension to Charles N. Bryant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3677) granting an increase of pension to Albert Helms; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3678) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3679) granting an increase of pension to Noah Lehman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 3680) granting a pension to John H. Wyatt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 3681) to amend the military record of Harrison P. Wiltze; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 3682) for the relief of Asbury Scrivener; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLAYPOOL: A bill (H. R. 3683) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Santee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3684) granting an increase of pension to James Knighton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 3685) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Loucks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 3686) granting a pension to J. P. Boland; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3687) granting a pension to Frederick E. Bogart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3688) granting a pension to John G. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3689) granting a pension to C. W. Lakin; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3690) granting a pension to W. A. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3691) granting a pension to Arthur Rose; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3692) granting a pension to W. R. Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3693) granting an increase of pension to Howard A. Littlejohn; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3694) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Hester Jane Padgett; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3695) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Sarah M. Gibbins; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3696) granting an increase of pension to George Bannar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3697) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3698) granting an increase of pension to L. H. Prather; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3699) granting an increase of pension to James Hampton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3700) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Anna M. Coder, wife of the late Curtis L. Coder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3701) for the relief of John G. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3702) for the relief of Andrew J. Maxwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3703) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Rev. H. A. Luckenbach, Spokane, Wash., to the position of chaplain in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 3704) granting an increase of pension to Irene Gillespie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 3705) granting a pension to Theresa De Villeneuve; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3706) granting a pension to Julius Ohswaldt; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3707) granting a pension to David Brass; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3708) granting an increase of pension to George Oberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 3709) granting a pension to Elizabeth Gouldrick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3710) granting a pension to Mrs. Helen A. Lamont; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3711) granting a pension to Mrs. William Teal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3712) granting a pension to Charles V. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3713) granting a pension to Harriet P. Shuman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3714) granting a pension to William H. Kipp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3715) granting a pension to Albert C. Schuman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3716) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Counsell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3717) granting an increase of pension to George Proudft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3718) granting an increase of pension to James West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3719) granting an increase of pension to Edward P. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3720) granting an increase of pension to George W. Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3721) granting an increase of pension to George Gunnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3722) granting an increase of pension to Edward Gridley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3723) granting an increase of pension to John W. Whitbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3724) granting an increase of pension to Alpheus Demond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3725) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Knox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3726) granting an increase of pension to Gottfried Czerny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3727) granting an increase of pension to Cyrenus F. Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 3728) granting an increase of pension to Hadley S. Horth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3729) granting an increase of pension to Eaton Kinney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3730) granting an increase of pension to James Little; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3731) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McNeight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3732) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Wilcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3733) granting an increase of pension to Chauncey A. Cronk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3734) granting an increase of pension to Stillman P. Daily; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3735) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Covell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3736) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Eells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASKELL: A bill (H. R. 3737) for the relief of Mrs. H. O'Neill; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3738) for the relief of Catherine Burns, widow of Patrick Burns; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HULBERT: A bill (H. R. 3739) for the relief of William H. Egan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 3740) granting a pension to Melissa A. Hawley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3741) granting an increase of pension to Noah W. Tryon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3742) for the relief of the Buffalo River Zinc Mining Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 3743) granting a pension to Joseph B. DeLangevin, alias Joseph Louis Lansberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3744) for the relief of Nelson D. Dillon, executor of Harriet A. Dillon, deceased, widow of Robert Dillon; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 3745) granting an increase of pension to Perry Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McARTHUR: A bill (H. R. 3746) granting a pension to Thomas E. Read; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 3747) granting an increase of pension to De Forest Rutman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MEEKER: A bill (H. R. 3748) for the relief of the heirs at law of Jacques Clamorgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROWLAND: A bill (H. R. 3749) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Sinzig; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 3750) granting a pension to Mary A. Dancy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 3751) granting an increase of pension to John W. Swanson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3752) granting an increase of pension to William A. McClarren; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 3753) for the relief of the estate of J. P. Dieter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 3754) granting a pension to Josephine Timerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3755) granting an increase of pension to Wilson J. Parker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STRONG: A bill (H. R. 3756) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Fritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3757) granting an increase of pension to John A. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3758) granting an increase of pension to Alfred T. Hawk; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3759) granting an increase of pension to Caleb Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 3760) granting a pension to Minnie M. Polk; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3761) granting an increase of pension to Alice E. Holland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3762) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3763) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Franklin S. Trufant, alias Frank Trufant; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3764) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Frank Cooper; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 3765) granting an increase of pension to Lewis J. McHaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3766) granting an increase of pension to Robert Osborn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 3767) to correct the military record of Solomon Beck; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### 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): Petitions of the Japanese American Citizens' Association, of Hawaii; the Telephone Society of the Mountain States; and the Telephone Society of Denver, Colo., pledging support to the President of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of Union Veteran Legion, offering services to country at present time; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorials of Railroad Club of St. Joseph, Mo.; Rochester Chapter, Sons of the American Revolution; faculty of the University of Virginia; Lawyers' Club of Washington; the Women's City Club of Kansas City, Mo.; and the Riding Club of New York, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), memorial of American Economists, favoring taxation instead of bond issue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Petition of 74 citizens of Roebing, N. J., favoring selective conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Lawyers' Club of Essex County, Newark, N. J., and American Society of Civil Engineers of New York, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARNHART: Petition of 51 citizens of Elkhart, Ind., for a Christian amendment to the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWNING: Memorial of Haddonfield (N. J.) Civic Association, urging suspension of manufacture of malt or spirituous liquors; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, memorial of Saranac Tribe, No. 128, Improved Order of Red Men, of Camden, N. J., pledging support to United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Presbytery of West New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Daughters of American Revolution of New Jersey and Haddonfield (N. J.) Civic Association, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association, the Automobile Club of America, and the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: Memorial of Milwaukee Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Memorial of Prof. Arthur E. Sutton and other teachers of economics at Beloit College, Wis., urging that Congress adopt the policy of taxation rather than that of bond issues as the principal means of financing the expenditures of our own country in the war upon which it has embarked; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the Lawyers' Club of New York City and Illinois Society, Sons of the Revolution, favoring raising an army by conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, against tax on perfumeries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



Also, memorial of the committee on engineering cooperation, Foreign Commerce Club, of New York, and board of directors of the American Society of Civil Engineers, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of H. Planten & Son, of Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to stamp tax along the lines of the Canadian stamp tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Memorial of First Parish Church of Cambridge, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Boston Lodge of Elks, indorsing the foreign policy of President Wilson and favoring a committee of public safety to cooperate with the States and Nation in the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Memorial of the Illinois Society of the Sons of the Revolution, favoring conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, the Lawyers' Club of Washington, a committee of 100 citizens of Trenton, and the Rochester (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring universal military service and selective draft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, in re war-revenue legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, for woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, pledging support to the President; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of Berkeley, Cal., relative to water-front advantages for Federal ship construction; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of the Rotary Club of Milwaukee, board of directors of the American Society of Civil Engineers, committee on engineering cooperation, and Milwaukee Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Southern Hardwood Traffic Association, relative to increase in freight rates and to investigation of car shortage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of mass meeting of citizens of Boone County, Ill., favoring food conservation and selective draft, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of American Society of Civil Engineers, favoring universal military training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Association of College Alumnae, favoring a Federal suffrage amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, favoring immediate legislation for universal military training and service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: Memorials of Boston Lodge, No. 10, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks; Tennis and Racquet Club, of Boston, Mass.; and citizens of Newburyport, Mass., pledging support to the Government in present crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorials of board of directors of the American Institute of Mining Engineers, board of directors of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and Tavern Club, of Boston, Mass., favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: Memorial of Edward Wries and George G. Groat, of first congressional district of Vermont, favoring certain forms of taxation to meet present war situation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULBERT: Memorials of the Westchester County (N. Y.) Commission of General Safety, the Merchants' Association of New York, and the Central Mercantile Association of New York, favoring universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of military engineering committee of New York, in re methods employed in war preparations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Business Men's National Service League, relative to the establishment of a Federal rifle range in northern New Jersey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the executive committee of the National Arts Club, in re industrial preparedness; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorials of the Automobile Club of America, the Foreign Commerce Club of New York, and the Wataga Democratic Club, of New York, pledging loyalty to the President in all possible ways; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of the American Label Manufacturing Co., of Baltimore, Md., indorsing House bill 3216; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorials of John T. Stone, of Baltimore; A. W. Calloway, president of Davis Coal & Coke Co.; Richard K. Edmonds, editor of Manufacturers' Record, Baltimore, Md.; and the First Baptist Church, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the discontinuation of manufacturing alcoholic liquors during period of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of A. C. Meyer & Co.; S. Kahn & Co.; Kohler Manufacturing Co.; R. E. L. Williamson, president of the Baltimore Retail Druggists' Association; and the Harrison Whitehurst Co., all of Baltimore, Md., opposing stamp tax on medicine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of William Silver & Co., of Aberdeen, Md., and William Numsen & Sons and Torsch Packing Co., of Baltimore, Md., favoring legislation to conserve supply of tin plate; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McANDREWS: Memorial of Chicago Association of Commerce, in relation to safeguarding against espionage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of the Republican Club of Oregon, Portland, Ore., pledging support to the President; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: Memorial of the Central Labor Union, of Brooklyn and Queens, in re method of raising revenue for war purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Lawyers' Club, of New York, and the American Society of Civil Engineers, favoring universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of military engineering committee in re method of raising engineer troops; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of St. Louis, Mo., favoring adequate appropriations for river and harbor improvements; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of St. Louis (Mo.) Medical Society, favoring suspending the patents on salvarsan and other products related to salvarsan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of St. Louis Association of Congregational Ministers and Churches of St. Louis, Mo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of five citizens of St. Louis, Mo., relative to placing war tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONDELL: Memorial of Sheridan Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, No. 520, of Sheridan, Wyo., pledging support to the President; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of committee on engineering cooperation, favoring compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States, regarding the taxation of their products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of national legislative conference, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of American Society of Civil Engineers, favoring universal military service and training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Lawyers' Club of New York City, favoring a selective draft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of faculty of social and political science of Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., relative to war taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Illinois Society, Sons of the Revolution, favoring a selective draft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of economists, relative to war taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Melvin D. Spencer, William A. Fullwood, Charles D. Emery, Donald S. Burdett, Clayton Kesterton, G. F. Manchart, and F. L. Keeler, all rural carriers out of Hornell, N. Y., opposing an extension of rural routes without a corresponding increase in the pay for serving such routes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Andrew D. White, former ambassador to England; Jacob Gould Schurman, president of Cornell University; and the following professors of Cornell University: E. Albee, C. E. Bennett, C. K. Burdick, J. E. Creighton, H. E. Dann, C. L. Durham, G. F. Atkinson, D. S. Kimball, A. R. Mann, W. F. Wilcox, E. Blaker, A. A. Young, and William A. Hammond, all of Ithaca, N. Y., earnestly advocating selective conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of F. E. Bates, E. G. Wycoff, H. S. Wright, R. B. Williams, Harry G. Stutz, W. H. Storms, C. E. Cornell, R. G. H. Speed, R. L. Post, J. T. Newman, F. L. Morse, P. S. Livermore, W. O. Kerr, J. R. Robinson, S. L. Howell, Edwin Gillette, W. D. Funkhouser, B. S. Cushman, F. C. Cornell, H. A. Clarke, C. E. Treman, and L. D. Hayes, all of Ithaca, N. Y., strongly favoring selective conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Telegram from A. A. Hibbard, in regard to the movie picture "Patria"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, letter of the United States Land Farm Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., urging raising of army by the system of conscription and universal liability to service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, letter and two resolutions of Lyon Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Oakland, Cal., urging the acquisition of Lower California and universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, letter from W. W. Donham, patriotic instructor, Lyon Post, No. 8, Grand Army of the Republic, urging military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, telegram from the American League of California, by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilber, chairman, urging the raising of troops upon the principle of universal liability to service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, pledging loyal support to the President and Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of military engineering committee of New York, favoring organization of new units of engineer troops by War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorials of Rotary Club of Brooklyn, Philadelphia Board of Trade, and Westchester County (N. Y.) Commission of General Safety, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: Memorial of New Jersey State Board of Agriculture, in re food conservation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Town Club, Atlantic Highlands, N. J., favoring compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Essex Trades Council, of Newark, N. J., in re food conservation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Alumni Association of Stevens Institute of Technology, the Lawyers' Club of Washington, a committee of 100 citizens of Trenton, and the Lawyers' Association of New York, favoring universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of 40 citizens of McCarthy, Alaska, praying for the construction by the United States Government or authorization for the construction of a railroad line from some point in the Copper River Valley to Katalla oil fields and the Bering River coal fields, to the end that these sections be opened for development; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Memorial of citizens of Loveland, Colo., favoring absolute prohibition of liquor traffic as a war measure; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of Tennis and Racquet Club, of Boston, Mass., pledging support to Nation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Boston Chamber of Commerce for universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorials of the Manufacturing Perfumers' Association of the United States pledging loyalty to the President and favoring universal military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the United States, favoring taxation instead of bond issue for war costs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Billy Olin's gang, veterans of the Civil War, and board of directors of the American Society of Civil Engineers, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of Prof. R. Whitney, professor of economics, and 12 other professors of State University of Iowa, recommending a tax on special war profits, lowering income-tax exemption, increasing rates income tax, and high consumption taxes on luxuries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Memorial of West Virginia Society of the District of Columbia, pledging the honor and lives of its membership in defense of the American flag and further pledg-

ing their support to the President and the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Memorial of First Baptist Church of Baltimore, to prohibit the waste of grain and other foodstuffs for the manufacture of alcoholic drinks, and, as a war measure, to prohibit during the war the whole liquor traffic of the country; to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, memorial of the preparedness and survey commission and the county agents' advisory committee, joint committee in Maryland, urging selective draft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Lawyers' Club of Washington, for selective draft and universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of John U. Redwood and 33 others, for selective draft; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Department of Maryland, Grand Army of the Republic, and Confederate veterans, at a meeting in Baltimore, April 19, for conscription of physically qualified citizens for military or naval service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 24, 1917.

(Legislative day of Monday, April 23, 1917.)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock m., on the expiration of the recess.

### INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1871) to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the following communication:

The Secretary read as follows:

AUSTIN, TEX., April 23, 1917.

HON. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,

Vice President United States, Washington, D. C.:

The Texas Senate has to-day adopted simple resolution No. 12, introduced by Senators Robbins and Lattimore, the text of which follows:

"Whereas the National Congress is to-day considering the best plan of meeting the needs of this world crisis as it calls upon America: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we, the Texas Senate, heartily indorse the President's plan of selective universal military service and urge our Representatives to vote for the same and that a copy of this resolution be wired by the secretary of the Texas Senate to the President of the National Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives at Washington."

It is the request of the Texas Senate that this resolution be presented to the United States Senate.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN D. McCALL,  
Secretary of Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Hitchcock	McLean	Simmons
Beckham	Hollis	Martin	Smith, Ariz.
Brady	Husting	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Calder	James	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Chamberlain	Johnson, Cal.	New	Smoot
Coft	Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Swanson
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Page	Thomas
Curtis	Kellogg	Penrose	Trammell
Fernald	King	Pittman	Vardaman
Fletcher	Kirby	Polndexter	Walsh
France	Knox	Pomerene	Warren
Frelinghuysen	La Follette	Ransdell	Watson
Gallinger	Lodge	Saulsbury	Williams
Hale	McCumber	Sheppard	Wolcott
Hardwick	McKellar	Sherman	

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. LANE] is detained from the Senate by illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to state that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] are detained on official business in connection with the work of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I wish also to state that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] is detained by illness in his family.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I desire to announce the absence of my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GORR], who is detained on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.