

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 10448. A bill for the relief of Edward F. Shea; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 10449. A bill for the relief of Joseph P. Hegarty; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 10450. A bill admitting to citizenship and fully naturalizing Lelia M. Dodd; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 10451. A bill to provide for placing Leland Cavanah Poole on the retired list of the United States Navy as lieutenant (junior grade), United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 10452. A bill granting a pension to Inez Hays; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 10453. A bill for the relief of James M. Hays; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 10454. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WHELCHER:

H. R. 10455. A bill for the relief of certain persons whose crops were destroyed or damaged by high waters; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

9256. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Petition of Ralls County (Mo.) Post, No. 234, of the American Legion, favoring enactment of a general conscription act and other national defense measures; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9257. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of Charles M. Stewart, secretary, representing Rotary Club of Murray, Ky., asserting their support of the program to protect and defend our country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9258. By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky: Petition of Judge Frank Y. Patterson and many other prominent citizens of Bowling Green, Ky., urging the President and the Congress to sell to England 50 of our surplus destroyers for immediate delivery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9259. Also, resolution of the Kiwanis Club of Owensboro, Ky., urging the immediate passage of the Burke-Wadsworth bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9260. By the SPEAKER: Petition of John Schultz, of East St. Louis, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the case, No. 219147, *John Schultz v. Mather Stock Car Co.*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9261. Also, petition of the Allen Plan Society, Wilmington, Del., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the national-defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9262. Also, petition of Work Projects Administration Union, Local No. 1, United Federal Workers of America, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the selective compulsory military service bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9263. Also, petition of New Jersey State Association Chiefs of Police, Asbury Park, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, August 5, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. W. L. Darby, D. D., executive secretary, Washington Federation of Churches, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we come before Thee today in the shadow of a great sorrow. Stark tragedy suddenly has come upon us and we have suffered the loss of a devoted Member of this Senate in a dreadful catastrophe of the air. We thank Thee for those qualities of mind and heart which endeared him to his friends and made him so useful a servant of the country he loved. We are grateful for the virtues which he possessed and for the high ideals of public service which he displayed in so many ways.

Now that he has gone from us, stricken down in the midst of a career of such great usefulness, we feel a sense of irreparable loss. Thy Divine comfort we ask for the family circle from which he has gone to return no more. May they have the assurance of the compassion of a loving God in this hour of grief and loneliness. In the face of the death which has brought his body to the grave may they be sustained by the steadfast hope of the life immortal and the joys that are in store in that heavenly land for all believers—a place where sorrow and tears are no longer known.

May his spirit of deep consecration to his country's welfare and his concern for all humanity brood over his colleagues in this body as they meet here today and note that his seat is empty because his earthly life is ended.

May we indeed cherish his memory and endeavor to emulate his example. Grant to the Members of this august body as they mourn his loss a firm resolution that they will give their best to the service of God and country as long as their lives may be spared.

Through these troubled days may we all have a sense of Thy presence in the world and seek to know and do Thy holy will. So, whether the days which remain for each of us be few or many, let us live in the light of eternity and make faithful use of our gifts and talents until the end comes for us, as it has come for him, and we, too, fall asleep to waken in the home above, beyond the sunset glow—that place of "many mansions" prepared for those who love our Lord.

In Christ's name we ask it. Amen.

PRESIDING OFFICER

Under the designation of the President pro tempore of August 31, 1940, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, took the Chair.

DEATH OF SENATOR LUNDEEN, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, we are all saddened today by the tragic death in an airplane accident on Saturday last of our colleague, Senator ERNEST LUNDEEN, of Minnesota. At a time more suitable for eulogies of his public service and character and in testimony of the friendships which he created here in the Senate we will devote the opportunity to pay appropriate tribute to our departed colleague. At the present time, out of respect to his memory, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 306) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. ERNEST LUNDEEN, late a Senator from the State of Minnesota.

Resolved, That a committee of four Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause the Presiding Officer appointed the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. As a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, September 5, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord God, we come to Thee in the name of Him who is above every name. Let Thy morning light of promise be in our hearts for Thy goodness is infinitely in excess of our needs and Thy mercy exceeds our sins. Forgive our failures, bridge our imperfections, and pass by our limitations. Purify all motives by which our conduct may be determined, and may we ever hold fast the truth that he that dwelleth in God dwelleth in love, for God is love; urge this truth in every mind. We pray that we may enjoy life, but ever hold it on the highest plane by keeping steadfast in faith, pure in love, and bright with spiritual outlook. Come to us and to our hearthstones and be our rest when the hours seem forbidding, our help in the moments of perplexity and our balm for every wound. When earth's little while is over, permit us to pass on into the life eternal. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two editorials from the Gaelic American on the subject, Keep America Out of War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an open letter to the Honorable James A. Farley from John O'Connor, of New York, former chairman of the Rules Committee of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article on Our Nation's Defense from the Sanford Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURGIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include three separate and distinct statements from the Navy Department, one relating to the Mason board report in regard to the acquisition of Naval Reserve stations, another in reference to all contracts entered into by the Navy Department and shipbuilding companies, and another with reference to the aeronautical situation in the Bureau of Aeronautics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein editorials from the Chicago Tribune, the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE SENATOR JONATHAN BOURNE, JR.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, Jonathan Bourne, Jr., United States Senator from Oregon, 1907 to 1913, passed into the great beyond here in Washington, D. C., on September 1. Eighty-five years of age, he was of keen mind, intensely interested in public affairs, a friend and associate of public men and a participant in political affairs of his adopted State of Oregon, and of the Nation. Senator Bourne was a most remarkable man, gifted with political genius which enabled him to make his mark, not only on his own day and generation, but on our political institutions which have been permanently changed in some respects because of his thought and activity. His most distinctive achievements which will be longest remembered are the pioneer work in Oregon for the direct election of Senators, the formulation of the Oregon system of popular government, and the parcel post.

Jonathan Bourne, Jr., was the first man ever sent to the United States Senate as the result of a popular vote, and he originated the system of direct election of Senators which Oregon used for 10 years before it was adopted nationally. The Oregon system to which I have referred is an integrated system of popular government or people's government, as he liked to call it. Oregon's reputation as a political experiment station was gained because of the leadership and activity of Senator Bourne. The national achievement with which his name is most closely associated is the adoption of parcel post which became a law when he was chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. He is said to have written the bill which was enacted into law.

After leaving the Senate, Senator Bourne organized the National Progressive Republican League and the Republican Publicity Association which he personally directed and financed. He devised and coined the expression "second elective term," used throughout the country in supporting Theodore Roosevelt for reelection in 1908 and in combating the propaganda against a third term. He always believed that had Theodore Roosevelt kept his pledge made to him not to withdraw from the race, he would have been the nominee in 1908 and there would have been no World War. Senator Bourne made princely contributions to the political campaigns of the Republican Party and of the men in both parties whom he admired and trusted. His loyalty to friends knew no limit. I can testify to this because we belonged to different political parties but were firm friends for nearly half a century. I never knew a man with keener insight into the motives which actuated others. Implicitly keeping every promise to others, he demanded from them the same high standard and relentlessly severed connections with those who were faithless to pledges.

Born in Massachusetts in 1855 of the best New England stock, he early became acquainted with the whaling industry as his father was the owner of the largest private fleet of whaling ships in the United States. The town of Bourne in Massachusetts and the Bourne Whaling Museum at New Bedford, endowed by Senator Bourne's sister, Emily, perpetuate the family name and history. The young man was a member of the class of 1876 at Harvard University. Just before graduation he started on a trip around the world in one of his father's sailing ships. He was shipwrecked on the island of Formosa, finally making his way to Hong Kong in China, and from thence to Portland, Oreg., where he arrived in 1878. Attracted by the setting of the beautiful city, then a pioneer settlement of a few thousand people, he decided to make it his home. He studied law, was admitted to the bar and practiced a short time. He found the career unattractive because of confinement and devotion to tradition. His was an original and creative mind. He engaged largely in mining, making and losing fortunes in developing and prospecting mining properties. One of those fabulous mines is said to have yielded more than \$1,000 a day net for over 3 years.

A POLITICAL GENIUS

The Senator's greatest activity was always in the political field. He was interested in governmental affairs and institutions and had an unbounded faith in what he always called

the "composite citizen." On May 5, 1910, he delivered a speech in the United States Senate, "Popular Against Delegated Government," summing up his philosophy; 9,000,000 copies were distributed, reaching every State in the Union and many foreign countries. It was said to be the most widely circulated speech ever delivered in Congress. Jonathan Bourne, Jr., was truly a staunch advocate of the rights of the common man and was the father of the Oregon system which incorporated that theory into the political life of a State.

Senator Bourne always continued to fear the encroachment of bureaucracy and of excessive power in the hands of the Executive. On June 17, I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3925, his letter of June 6, this year, to the New York Herald Tribune, in which he condemned Congress for the surrender of its powers.

With his indomitable courage, great insight, and Yankee ingenuity, he penetrated the political schemes of his opponent and planned ingenious and successful campaigns for candidates who were his friends, and for measures which he originated. His only service in official positions was as a member of the Oregon Legislature, as police commissioner of Portland, and as United States Senator from Oregon. He thoroughly understood the political methods used by men who controlled elections in those days, and his devotion to popular government arose from his experience in early day politics and his revulsion against the methods of unscrupulous politicians.

ADVOCACY OF FREE COINAGE OF SILVER

Jonathan Bourne early caught the fever of the West and became an ardent advocate of free coinage of silver at a ratio of not less than 16 to 1. Though a Republican, he joined the group of Senator Teller supporting William J. Bryan in the campaign of 1896. I, too, was an ardent supporter of Bryan in that campaign, and of his money theories, and date my participation in Oregon State-wide politics from that campaign 44 years ago this summer, when I spoke throughout the State under the management of Jonathan Bourne, Jr.

DIRECT ELECTION OF SENATORS

Oregon abandoned uninstructed election of Senators by the Legislature and adopted direct election by the people 10 years before the system was adopted nationally. The Oregon experiment had resulted in the popular election, in a Republican State, of one Republican (Bourne), and two Democratic Senators (Chamberlain and Lane), and pointed the way to national legislation. The Oregon law resulted from a most picturesque campaign and a series of striking incidents. It was the direct outgrowth of Jonathan Bourne's interest in the money problem. Since the story is unique in our national political annals, I desire to relate it in some detail.

In 1896 Mr. Bourne secured from a majority of the men elected to the Oregon Legislative Assembly pledges to support the reelection of United States Senator J. H. Mitchell. After the fall election of 1896 it was rumored in Portland that Senator Mitchell would not stay true to the silver cause but, if returned to the Senate, he would stand with Mark Hanna for the single gold standard. Senator Mitchell was asked by Mr. Bourne to deny this statement. He failed to do so, and finally admitted its truth. He was then informed by the determined Oregonian that he could not be elected to the United States Senate by the Oregon Legislature, even though the votes had been pledged to him. The only method of preventing the pledged election was keeping the lower house of the Legislature from organizing. This Senator Bourne did by entertaining a majority of the lower house continuously at his own expense until the constitutional expiration date of the Legislature was reached and adjournment forced. This was, so far as I have been able to learn, the only occasion in American history on which an elected legislature has failed to organize and function, and that was in Oregon in 1897. As a result, Oregon was without a United States Senator for 2 years. The Governor appointed former Senator Henry Corbett, but he was denied admission by the Senate because the Oregon Legislature had failed to use its opportunity to elect a Senator.

Certainly, this was bold, spectacular, and most effective political strategy, unparalleled elsewhere in the history of legislative bodies.

Out of this "hold-up session" came the direct election of United States Senators by the people instead of by the legislatures. Senator Bourne said to me:

I saw plainly that the American form of government was done for if these men with their money bags could go to the legislature and buy their seats in the United States Senate. I decided that the only hope for America was to force the election of the United States Senators back to the people.

It was not only a question of corrupt control in the election of a Senator, but also the fact that State measures were so tied up with promises on senatorial votes that the whole Legislature was controlled and corrupted in all its actions. The improvement in State legislative procedure is sufficient reason for the change, admitted even by those who question the influence on the quality of the Senate of the United States.

I was elected to the Oregon State Senate in 1902, and was a member of that body when the bill was introduced providing for the famous Statement No. 1 and Statement No. 2. Statement No. 1 provided that the candidate for the Legislature agreed to vote for the people's choice for United States Senator, regardless of his personal preference. Statement No. 2 simply said that he would not be controlled by the people's choice. Public sentiment compelled every candidate for the Legislature to take Statement No. 1; therefore, they were pledged to vote for the people's choice. Then the people, by popular vote, made the selection at the election prior to the meeting of the Legislature. Senator Bourne was the first Senator elected under that pledge, in 1907. He was a Republican—the State and Legislature were strongly Republican. Two years later, Governor Chamberlain, a Democrat, was the people's choice for Senator, and under the pledge of the Legislature, he was elected in January 1909, although the legislature was strongly Republican. These events antedated the seveneenth amendment to the Federal Constitution providing for direct election of United States Senators. Oregon's experience added to the strength of the movement.

THE OREGON SYSTEM OF POPULAR GOVERNMENT

The Oregon system of popular government consists of the initiative and referendum, the recall, the direct election of Senators, the voters' pamphlet, direct primaries, and Presidential preference primary. This system was promoted with the financial backing of Senator Bourne, through an educational campaign extending over several years. The initiative gives to the people the same power exercised by the Legislature and, in addition, provides that laws enacted by the people are not subject to veto. The referendum is a provision for popular expression of opinion on any law passed by the Legislature, which does not carry an emergency clause. Oregon introduced the Presidential preference primary under which the electors of each party may indicate their party's choice for President which shall be binding upon the delegates to the national convention. At one time there were 24 States having some sort of a Presidential preference primary law. It was under the operation of this law that Theodore Roosevelt's name was placed on several State ballots as a candidate for the Presidency in 1912. It is my judgment that the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt, at the Chicago convention in 1932, at which I was a delegate, would never have been made had he not had the endorsement of the Presidential preference primary States. The recall is a powerful deterrent to corrupt action in public office.

The most excellent feature of the Oregon system, which has not yet made its way elsewhere, is the voters' pamphlet. This is a publicity pamphlet issued by the State preceding primary and general elections. Any candidate for office may carry his cause to the electors by paying for space in this official pamphlet. Proponent and opponents of initiated or referred measures are given the privilege of presenting their arguments to the people. Political parties may advocate measures or candidates. I have had some experience in presenting my platforms to the people of Oregon, and I believe the voters' pamphlet is a most potent influence in elections.

I also believe it is indispensable to any system of genuinely popular government. Naturally, there have been many attempts made to discontinue this pamphlet, thus forcing candidates into expensive advertising and denying publicity to those who cannot pay such bills nor meet the people personally.

As I bid adieu to my honored friend, I take pride in reciting his achievements, to the end that we may have more democracy and a safer political system.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an article on the march of democracy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN ZANDT?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the current issue of Collier's magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. PITTENGER?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from The Alien Menace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana, Mr. THORKELSON?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein portions of an article on alien poison, by Stanley High, in the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by J. Edgar Hoover.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter taken from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my protest to the many others that have been expressed against the act of the President in transferring to England 50 of our destroyers, an important and valuable portion of our Navy.

While the President is directly responsible for this transaction, I cannot help but feel that Congress, by its policy of granting to the Chief Executive so many of its own prerogatives, must share that responsibility.

This is an act of war and is clearly and unmistakably a violation of our own statutes. In 1917 Congress enacted the following statute:

During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war * * * with any intent or under any agreement * * * that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation * * * after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States.

Only 2 months ago Congress passed a law confirming this act, and just a month ago passed another law which provides:

No vessel, ship, or boat * * * now in the United States Navy or being built or hereafter built therefor shall be disposed of, by sale or otherwise, or be chartered or scrapped, except as now provided by law.

Also, the United States Government was a signatory to the Hague Convention of 1907, which provided—

The supply in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war material of any kind whatever, is forbidden.

I am not questioning the need of air bases involved in the transaction. I do, however, question the necessity and the wisdom of exchanging a portion of our Navy to acquire them. To say the least, it is quite incompatible with the expressed need of additional ships for our defense, and certainly involves a grave risk of dragging our Nation into the war.

If the defenses of the United States are as weak as we have been made to believe, we cannot afford to give up such a vital part of our Navy. It is my understanding that while these destroyers are of an older type they have recently been put into first-class condition. According to a report of one of today's newspapers they "were described yesterday by the Navy as good warships despite their age." There can be no question of their usefulness or England would not want them. These destroyers represent 22 percent of our total destroyers, and in case of emergency would be sorely needed.

The question that now confronts the people of this Nation is, What will be the next move of the President? Judging by this act and his often expressed belligerent attitude, is it not logical to expect him to follow this action by others which will sooner or later completely involve us in the war? Is it reasonable to suppose that our Nation can continue much longer in its present course and still remain at peace? There can be but one end, war, to the policy pursued by the present administration. "Measures short of war" are the direct and inescapable path to war. One step and then another will finally lead to an act of reprisal or an outright declaration of war.

I shall oppose with all the means within my power every act which I have reason to believe has any possibility of involving us in a total war. I feel certain our economy, finances, and Government are now so thoroughly diseased and weak that we could not possibly endure a war without losing what democracy and liberty is still left to us. I am convinced our Nation would pass into a dictatorship as completely as that of the totalitarian states of Europe.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I take exception to what the gentleman from Ohio has just said, that Congress is responsible for selling these obsolete vessels. How in the world could Congress be responsible when the President of the United States took the liberty of going against the law and trading these vessels to Great Britain? Regardless as to whether you think it right or wrong to transfer the vessels, I claim the President did this contrary to law. He assumed the role of a dictator. Why is the gentleman from Ohio accusing me of being responsible? The President did things

that were wrong, and I object to his doing them in the manner he did, without the consent of Congress. I am not responsible in any sense, and I take no responsibility for that act, and I am not responsible for the acts of the President, thanks to my record in voting not to grant him power which he has and which he assumes.

He has too much power for a good President and certainly too much power for a bad one. Those who voted for granting him such power certainly should be censured for so doing by the people of America in November.

Mr. SMITH of OHIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I made my statement on that premise. The extraordinary powers granted to the President by a strongly Democratic Congress created a condition which gave him the opportunity to act as he has. Therefore those Members who gave him that power are jointly responsible.

Mr. RICH. The New Deal administration gave the President all power, and they are the ones who are responsible. I do not accept any responsibility for it; my votes exonerate me. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the row between 2 of our Republican friends as to who is responsible for the sale of the 50 over-age destroyers to England in exchange for the air bases in this hemisphere. Both of them failed to mention that which the press carried this morning, that their recognized and chosen leader, Mr. Willkie, said it was all right and that it would be approved by the American people. Mr. Willkie is further quoted as saying that the only thing he criticized was that the President did not take the people into his confidence before making the trade, and that that was an evidence of dictatorship. Thomas Jefferson used the same method when he acquired Louisiana, and no one at that time or later has ever accused Thomas Jefferson of being a dictator. The President did what we have always done and what our Government has recognized as the right policy with reference to carrying on negotiations of that kind. The President cannot take the public into his confidence or advertise what he is doing when he is negotiating a trade with a foreign power. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rose from a sick bed to come here and vote against this so-called peacetime conscription bill. I may not have any time allotted to me to discuss the merits of the measure from my viewpoint, but I want to give a message to the American people now. If they knew what is going on behind the scenes in Washington, their Capital, they would start a revolution not to overthrow but to preserve democracy. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I do not know who is responsible—Congress, the President, the Secretary of War, or Mr. Willkie. I only say that whoever did it did a blamed good job. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in the proceedings of this debate I think it is well once in a while to refer back to the voice of wisdom which may be found in the Democratic platform adopted in 1904, at St. Louis. Let me read:

We favor the nomination and election of a President imbued with the principles of the Constitution, who will set his face sternly against executive usurpation of legislative and judicial functions, whether that usurpation be veiled under the guise of executive construction of existing laws, or whether it takes refuge in the tyrant's plea of necessity or superior wisdom.

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anyone who questions the fact that we need these air bases and I am glad to see the Government acquire them. Frankness, however, compels me to say that I fear the Attorney General, in the opinion he rendered, erected a scaffold upon which he hung his reputation as a great lawyer. [Applause.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I know that I am a youngling in the ranks here, but it does look to me that when they are aiming missiles at the Chief Executive—and remember he is the head of the Army and the Navy—they ought to at least give him credit for doing what he actually did; that is to get the opinion of the Attorney General and the legal department of the Navy before he acted, and if, after that, he stood with a chance to trade off 50 obsolete vessels for a 99-year lease—and nobody contends that these vessels will last 99 years—and made a trade like that, I think we are foolish folks to go talking about the niceties of life regarding dealings involving that man across the sea who treats folks as he did the Holland that gave to the Kaiser a haven of protection when a great part of the world wanted to get at his throat. Certainly Hitler's country could see no violation on our part in this. I think some of us are getting off wrong here. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the gentleman from Texas referred to Wendell Willkie agreeing to turning over of the 50 destroyers to the British. As a matter of fact, that is not the truth. Wendell Willkie, although he believed in acquiring air and naval bases, said that it was done without an act of Congress. This is a representative government and you ladies and gentlemen are elected to represent the people of this country and to enact laws and to preserve the Constitution of America, and I say again that the action of Roosevelt is in direct violation of the law. The President took the law into his own hands. It is Congress' privilege to change the law. If we believe that these destroyers should be turned over to the British, then we should change the law and make it possible legally to turn them over rather than having this man in the White House usurp the power of the Congress. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

CONTRACTS FOR AIRPLANES MADE SINCE JUNE 1, 1940

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I present, on behalf of the House Military Affairs Committee, a privileged resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the Secretary of War be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution and, without objection, the letter will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 585

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to transmit to the House of Representatives forthwith detailed information showing the number and types of airplanes for which contracts have been made for the use of the Army, the dates such contracts were entered into since June 1, 1940, and the names of the firms, companies, or corporations contracting to furnish such airplanes.

WAR DEPARTMENT,

Washington, September 3, 1940.

HON. ANDREW J. MAY,

Chairman, Military Affairs Committee,

House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MAY: Receipt is acknowledged of request from the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, dated August 29, 1940, for a report on House Resolution 585 introduced on August 28, 1940, proposing that the Secretary of War be directed to transmit to the House of Representatives forthwith detailed information showing the number and types of airplanes for which contracts have been made for the use of the Army, the dates such contracts were entered into since June 1, 1940, and the names of the firms, companies, or corporations contracting to furnish such airplanes.

The War Department has no objection to transmitting the information desired, and it is set forth below:

Type and model	Manufacturer	Contract date	Quantity
Bomber, heavy, 4-engine: B-24D.....	Consolidated Aircraft Corporation.	1940 Aug. 16	56
B-17E.....	Boeing Aircraft Co.....	Aug. 30	277
Bomber, light attack: A-20A.....	Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc.....	June 14	20
Pursuit, 2 engine: P-38E.....	Lockheed Aircraft.....	Aug. 30	410
Transport: C-45A.....	Beech Aircraft Corporation.....	Aug. 28	20
Trainer, primary: PT-13B.....	Stearman Aircraft Division, Boeing Airplane Co.....	Aug. 16	75
PT-17.....	do.....	do.....	225
PT-19A.....	Fairchild Aircraft Division, Fairchild Engine & Aeronautical Co.....	Aug. 28	100
PT-20A.....	Ryan Aeronautical Co.....	do.....	100
Trainer, basic: BT-13A.....	Vultee Aircraft, Inc.....	do.....	500
Trainer, advanced: 1-engine: AT-6A.....	North American Aviation, Inc.....	Aug. 14	637
2-engine: AT-7A.....	Beech Aircraft Corporation.....	Aug. 28	150
AT-7.....	do.....	Aug. 16	67
AT-8.....	Cessna Aircraft Co.....	July 16	33
Observation, short-range, liaison: 105.....	Stinson Aircraft Co.....	Aug. 24	6
Rotating wing, autogiro: XR-1.....	Platt-LePage Aircraft Corporation.....	July 19	1
Grand total.....			2,677

In view of the fact that the data requested are furnished herewith, there would seem to be no necessity for the passage of the resolution.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

ROBT. P. PATTERSON,
Acting Secretary of War.

MR. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid upon the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

MR. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include in the RECORD two newspaper articles regarding the funeral of the late Senator Lundeen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

MR. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter entitled "Campaign Analysis," appearing in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. SECCOMBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix a resolution from the annual conference of the Brethren Church.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a brief article by Mark Sullivan.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MR. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD], who is in the hospital, may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MRS. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter from Mr. Goodman, research director of the United Shoe Workers of America, regarding the activities of Mr. Bata at Belcamp, Md. The letter is written to the Solicitor General.

I have heretofore on the floor of this House brought to the attention of Congress his un-American activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INFORMATION REGARDING AIRPLANE CONTRACTS

MR. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield for a question?

MR. MAY. I yield.

MR. CASE of South Dakota. The chairman of the committee recently reported a resolution giving certain information on orders for aircraft. I wonder if the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs plans to place in the RECORD for the information of the Congress a statement of the contracts that have been awarded by the War Department, together with a statement of the fees and architectural and engineering contracts, comparably similar to that recently presented by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

MR. MAY. If the War Department makes available that information, and it is the desire of the House to have it, I can present it.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE

MR. MAY. 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. 10132) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training.

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. 10132, with Mr. WARREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MR. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS]. [Applause.]

MR. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, the ears of Berlin, Moscow, Tokyo, and Rome are tuned in on the proceedings in this Chamber this week. They are fully aware that the result of our actions will influence the future events of the world. The dictators of the world, who have their envious and greedy eyes fastened upon the riches of the New World, are sitting with their fingers crossed, holding their breath, trusting that this the greatest and almost the last of the democracies will run true to the form of democracies of the past and that we will neglect until too late to provide for our national security. God forbid. [Applause.]

Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, and the war lords of Japan are hoping against hope that partisan politics, sectionalism, class antagonism, and the work of the progeny of their Trojan studs will act to assist them to fasten the yoke of totalitarian

slavery on the necks of the peoples of the New World. They know the dangers to their aims and ambitions which rest with our state of preparedness.

As I sat in the Committee on Military Affairs for something like 3 weeks listening, most of the time, to testimony of those who appeared in opposition to this legislation, I attempted to classify the objections stated there. I find, Mr. Chairman, that the opposition to this legislation was almost identical in structure and sequence. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, one would almost be led to believe, by listening to the testimony of those in opposition to this legislation, that it has emanated from a central source. I firmly believe that, whether wittingly or unwittingly, the majority of those who appeared in opposition were using argument implanted in their minds by subversive influences.

The first argument which was generally made by those in opposition to this legislation was that it was un-American in its character. Mr. Chairman, that was most surprising, because in a great many instances the argument that this legislation was un-American in its character came from those who have desired to destroy everything which is American. It came in many cases from a class of people who have been doing everything in their power to change our American system of government. It came in many instances from a class of people who have construed Americanism and the liberties which it has conferred upon the citizens of this Nation as a license to practice here, under the guise of our principles of freedom, subversive movements. That class of people were unanimous in their opposition to this legislation because of its being un-American and undemocratic.

Now, let us take perhaps the most democratic nation in the world. That nation is Switzerland.

Switzerland has a system of compulsory military training, and I do not believe there is anyone within reach of my voice here today who is prepared to state that Switzerland's system of compulsory military training has not been her salvation now that she is surrounded by totalitarian nations with their eyes fastened upon her riches and determined by every means within their power to wipe out any vestige of democracy. Yet here is a beautiful little flower of democracy blooming in the midst of a filthy mire of totalitarianism. The little democratic nation of Switzerland is today maintaining her independence. The reason she is maintaining her independence is because she has had the wisdom, foresight, and courage to put into effect the system of military training that makes all these gigantic totalitarian nations fear her might, small though it may be. In times of peace she has prepared for war. Today that preparation is paying handsome dividends.

The second argument that has been generally advanced in opposition to this legislation is that the voluntary system is adequate. Man after man, woman after woman, and organization after organization appeared before the Committee on Military Affairs and maintained that we had not tried the volunteer system, maintained that the volunteer system would produce all of the men we need for our armies. To determine the validity of the argument that the volunteer system is adequate, let us look back into our history. At no time in the history of this Nation, when we have been confronted with an emergency, has the volunteer system proven to be adequate. It has not produced men sufficient to meet the emergencies which this Nation has had to face. Back in the days of the Revolutionary War, when it is generally believed that zeal for independence swept the Nation like wildfire, States were forced to resort to conscription in order to get men enough to fill their quotas in the Continental Army. Even under the opiate of fanatic desire for self-government, enthusiasm did not outweigh selfishness. Then, read your histories again. Read about the War of 1812. Read about the disgraceful performance of the American troops in almost every land engagement connected with that war. Read there the lesson of unpreparedness. It is shameful, disgraceful, and came very near being disastrous.

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

Mr. FADDIS. I am sorry, I do not want to yield at this point.

Mr. CELLER. I just want to state that Washington asked for a selective draft act.

Mr. FADDIS. I have just stated that conscription had to be resorted to during the Revolutionary War.

During the War of 1812 American land forces were defeated in almost every engagement in which they took part. Only the power of American seamen won what has been called our second war for independence. Our land forces were woefully inadequate both as to numbers and training to protect our national interests at that time.

In the War with Mexico we were engaged with a Nation much weaker than we, and the volunteer system at that time was adequate for the only time in our history because of the fact that in the southern part of the United States enthusiasm for that war reached such unbounded heights that volunteers flocked to the colors in unprecedented numbers.

In the Civil War both the Confederacy and the Union were forced to adopt conscription in order to obtain sufficient men for their armies.

In the Spanish-American War we did not have conscription. Neither did we have anywhere near the number of troops to provide an Army sufficient in size to carry on a war of the proportion it was first expected to be. That war was of such short duration that everybody was agreeably surprised, and for that reason and that reason alone the volunteer system proved adequate. It did not, however, raise nearly the number of troops that were calculated to be necessary.

In the World War, as everyone knows, conscription was resorted to, and we all know it was highly successful in producing one of the greatest armies the world has ever seen. By the use of this Army we did, in spite of all which has been said, preserve democracy for the world for at least 20 years.

The system of conscription is desirable for the reason that it is democratic in that it produces an army which is a cross section of the United States. It brings the burden, the obligation, the privilege, whichever you wish to term it, of military service alike on all classes and all ages capable of performing in that capacity. What could be more democratic than that all should contribute alike to preserve the rights, privileges, and liberties we all enjoy? This is the very essence of democracy.

Another argument made against the selective service proposition was that the draft would hit only those in the unemployed classes. That is exactly one of the reasons we are trying to put through a system of conscription, in order that the burden of military service will not fall upon any one class.

Another interesting thing about the argument that conscription is a class institution is that this argument comes generally from that class of people who have maintained that the Government of the United States owes them a living. They maintain on the one hand that the Government of the United States owes them a living, but refuse to recognize the fact that they in return have distinct obligations toward their Government.

Another argument that was generally advanced by those in opposition to this piece of legislation was that we were taking our advice from the wrong people. They produced as their "yes-man" Hanson Baldwin. Almost every single individual who appeared in opposition to this legislation produced an article which this Hanson Baldwin wrote for Harper's Weekly. This article was their argument that there was no necessity for conscription. I endeavored to learn from those who opposed this legislation just what sized army we should have to confront the dangers which confront us.

When they were asked as to what size this army should be, they did not have the slightest idea. They had no idea in the world as to what size of an army was needed in order to protect this Nation in time of an emergency. Therefore, we are forced to believe that those who appear with this argument were those who were unalterably opposed to this legislation regardless of the size of the army concerned. If an individual could express no judgment regarding the size of an army

necessary, certainly that individual had given the matter at hand little thought.

The Committee on Military Affairs listened to testimony from all people. We, of course, took into consideration testimony that appeared to us to have resulted from study and knowledge, not prejudice. After all, testimony to have weight must carry some degree of knowledge along with it. Testimony from anyone who admits or who is proven to be ignorant of the subject on which they are testifying certainly should carry no weight in any court or in any committee. Therefore, the Committee on Military Affairs was bound to discount the testimony of those who appeared quoting Mr. Baldwin as their "yes man," and took into consideration the testimony presented to the committee by men who have spent their lives in the United States Army, testimony given by men who have been educated for 25 or 30 years in the matter of national defense, and in the matter of providing an adequate system of national defense for the use of this Nation in time of war.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to call attention to the fact that in every instance in the hearings before the committee when these voluntary witnesses were forced to make an admission, they admitted that if they had to take an authority they would take the War Department officials.

Mr. FADDIS. That is true.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DARDEN of Virginia. Did the committee call Mr. Baldwin by any chance?

Mr. FADDIS. No; the committee did not call Mr. Baldwin, because the committee inquired into Mr. Baldwin's capabilities in the matter of being a witness and it found his record to be as follows, and I am sure that any member of this Committee who will weigh the record and capabilities of this man, as an expert on the matter of national defense against that of the present Chief of Staff of the Army will take the side of the committee. I am not saying anything against Mr. Baldwin, but I merely wish to quote to the House his record as a military man.

He was appointed to the Naval Academy in 1920; graduated in 1924 with the rank of ensign; promoted to lieutenant, junior grade, in 1927, and resigned on September 5, 1927, giving as his reason limited opportunities and personal reasons. Appointed lieutenant, junior grade, Naval Reserve, December 1927, and resigned September 21, 1934.

I will leave it to any member of this Committee if his record and his education as a military man or as an expert on these matters will stand up for 1 minute against the reputation, the knowledge, the education, training, and experience of such men as General Marshall, General Drum, General Shedd, General Andrews, and a good many other members of the War Department who appeared before the committee.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman also point out the further democracy of the system under this bill where everything is decentralized and the class and induction into service is left with civilians wholly distinguished from whatever Washington may want or whatever Washington may desire in this regard?

Mr. FADDIS. That is true. All the machinery of the draft is put in the hands of the civilians of the Nation. The military authorities have nothing whatever to do with it, which is absolutely in conformity with our traditional policy of making the military subordinate to the civil authorities.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I have heard a good deal said that the selection will be by lot, but I do not find anything in this law that shows how the draft will actually proceed. Is this because I have not been able to find it? Can the gentleman refer me to the place where that appears?

Mr. FADDIS. There is nothing in here that says it shall be done by lot. It says it shall be done in an impartial manner.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is the only reference?

Mr. FADDIS. That is the only reference.

Mr. CELLER. I have before me the old selective draft regulations, and therein provision is made for what is known as master lists, where capsules contain numbers, these numbers being equivalent to the numbers in the various draft boards.

Mr. FADDIS. We do not need that in here.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman give me some explanation to clear up the language of subsection (c)?

Mr. FADDIS. If the gentleman will wait, I will endeavor to cover that.

Mr. MILLER. Is the gentleman going to cover this by sections?

Mr. FADDIS. I want to proceed with the argument I have prepared here.

Mr. Chairman, opposition also appeared in the form of a fear that this will be fixed upon the Nation as a permanent policy. The provisions of this legislation last until 1945. Just what world conditions will be, or just what may be necessary in the matter of national defense for this Nation after 1945 I am sure no living man can stand up here and chance a guess on today.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman who occupies the chair at this time has served in this House for a number of years, and there is no other man in Congress who enjoys a larger share of the affection of all Members of Congress than he. He is about to leave us, so I would like to have order maintained to save him the responsibility of admonishing the membership too much in that regard.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, so much for the fear that this may be fastened on the Nation as a permanent policy. Fear was also expressed that the troops raised in connection with this legislation would be sent overseas.

Certainly anyone knows that it is impossible to maintain a Navy or an Army in this Nation today for any length of time without the permission of the Congress. Certainly, everyone is aware of the constitutional provision that appropriations for military matters may not be made for a longer term than 2 years. Certainly every responsible Member of this House knows that it is within the control of the Members of Congress, especially those of the House of Representatives, to prevent any undue use of the troops under the command of the President of the United States. And certainly I believe that everyone within the hearing of my voice is bound to say, whether or not they agree with the President of the United States, that he is a sincere and a patriotic man, and that he will do only what he believes is necessary in the interest of this Nation. [Applause.] I believe every reasonable-minded man will be bound to give him credit for doing just that in the action he took yesterday. I am reminded of the remark made to me at dinner by the learned gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON, when he said that action in acquiring bases in a manner of this kind was much to be preferred to the way Hitler would acquire his naval bases.

The last argument in the locker of those who appeared in opposition to this bill was the argument that it would violate the civil liberties of the people of the United States. This argument was made by those who have no conception of the real meaning of either civil liberties or civil responsibilities. It was made by those who only use the Bill of Rights of the United States as a license to follow, here under the Stars and Stripes, practices that would be condoned in no other nation in the world, practices for which they would actually have been executed in the nations which they left before they came here. They are here today and under the cloak of the Bill of Rights are trying to carry on all sorts of seditions and subversive schemes to destroy the very Government that protects them in the license which they now enjoy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in connection with other provisions of this measure. We have raised the pay of those in the Army and the Navy in an endeavor to make it conform more nearly to the civilian pay those who will be taken into the Army under the provisions of this act will have. I want it to be understood that the pay of the Army does not consist alone of the base pay. I have heard remark after remark here on the floor and made in committee, "Oh, well, what is \$30 a month?"

Thirty dollars a month is not the only pay that a man in the Army gets. In addition to this \$30 a month, he gets his food, his clothing, his medical attention, his amusements, his housing, his heat, and various other things that go with the life of a soldier.

There is every opportunity for men to rise. The opportunity for promotion will be given them. It has also been stated that there is no opportunity for promotion in the Regular Army. I call your attention to the fact that even before the passage of this measure it was quite possible for an enlisted man in the Regular Army to rise to the point where he was getting \$126 a month. Now, \$126 a month for 12 months in the year, with food, clothing, shelter, medical and dental attention is not a wage to be sneezed at in these times or in any other times. The pay ranges from \$126 a month down through the other grades to \$84 a month, then \$72 a month, then \$60, then \$54, then \$36, and then \$30 a month. The base pay of a private is \$30 a month, and it rises as he is promoted. Any man by proper behavior and application to his duties will get along in the Army. If a man goes in there with his mind made up to get along he will get along. On the other hand, of course, if he goes in there with his mind made up that he is not going to get along, that he is going to be incorrigible and disobedient, that is another question.

We have made provision to take care of conscientious objectors. I am sure the committee has had all the sympathy in the world with those who appeared claiming to have religious scruples against rendering military service in its various degrees. Some appeared who had conscientious scruples against handling lethal weapons, but who had no scruples against performing other duties which did not actually bring them into combat. Others appeared who claimed to have conscientious scruples against participating in any of the activities that would go along with the Army. The committee took all of these into consideration and has written a bill which, I believe, will take care of all the reasonable objections of this class of people.

We also took care of those students who have been entered in college during the year 1940-41, in that their call is deferred for the school year, but not in any case later than the 1st of July 1941. We have taken care of the needs of those who will have obligations of a financial nature, such as insurance, rent, and various other items. We have taken care of that so that their creditors cannot take advantage of their having been called into the service to foreclose on them or by being unnecessarily harsh in their dealings with them.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up much more time because there are others who want to speak on this measure, but I shall be pleased to answer any questions I can in my remaining time.

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

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman has just given us a very vigorous defense of the bill which his committee has sponsored. I wonder, however, after giving consideration to all the good that would result from the passage of the measure, if the gentleman does not agree with me that one of the best results we will get is that the adoption of the system will serve to disclose the identity of those who plot to overthrow our Government.

Mr. FADDIS. I believe that is true and hope it will have that result.

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

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. It seems rather a touchy subject and one that seems to be avoided here, but the gentleman who is on his feet over there has a volume relating to how these boys will be selected, but I do not think the gentleman or anyone else likes to tell us how they are going to be selected, and I am wondering if we cannot find some happier way. Why cannot the boys just get together and shoot the craps themselves?

Mr. FADDIS. Of course, the gentleman, I believe, is opposed to this legislation—

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no.

Mr. FADDIS. And whatever method would be chosen would not be acceptable to the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman is entirely wrong.

Mr. FADDIS. I am sorry if I am wrong, but I know of no other way to choose them except in an impartial manner. It is not up to the Congress to write in every detail in connection with the administration of this legislation. The gentleman himself has had long enough experience in this body to recognize that that is a total impossibility.

Mr. GIFFORD. These boys are more interested in that minute detail than in anything else.

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

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would like to ask the gentleman to give his views with respect to the committee amendment relating to the commandeering of manufacturing and munitions plants during the period of this bill.

Mr. FADDIS. I would rather let somebody else who more thoroughly understands that than I do give his opinion on it, if the gentleman please. Someone will speak shortly who will do that.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FADDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The gentleman referred to certain exemptions. How about the ministers and priests and rabbis, and those studying for such religious occupation? They are all exempted, are they not?

Mr. FADDIS. Provision has been made to exempt that class from the provisions of the legislation. Provisions will also be made to exempt those with genuine dependents.

Now, Mr. Chairman, finally I wish to state in answer to those who demand to be shown the emergency which demands this legislation that if they cannot see from the fate of Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France the trend of world affairs, then are they indeed among the blind who will not see. If they cannot read the very words of Hitler, that he intends to invade this hemisphere, then they are lost to the effect of any argument. For the sake of our national security this legislation is necessary. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RUTHERFORD.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is the most important bill that has ever come before Congress for consideration. It seeks to change our national policy of over 150 years. We may be taking the last step toward the socialization of America. Once this step is taken, it may take a lot of real effort to retrace our steps. The demand for the conscription of men brings the demand for the conscription of industry. Following that comes the demand for the conscription of wealth. When these steps are completed we have socialism, fascism, nazi-ism, or some form of totalitarian government.

The question then arises, How far can we go and still be able to turn back? As I stated before, this is the most important bill that has ever come before Congress, and the voting for or against it places a real responsibility upon every Member.

As a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs I had a part in whipping into shape the bill that is now before us. It is not a perfect bill by any means, but if we

have to have a draft bill at this time, I feel that this one is preferable to the one sent over from the other body. There are some features of this bill that I would like to change. When the matter of conscription of men was first talked about and discussed, it was said that we should make some provision for the training of the young men of our country, so that in the event of war we would have trained men to call to the colors. I believe that the people of the country in general approved of such a scheme. Now we find in the bill the words "training and service," which to my mind clearly indicates that every man drafted under the provisions of this bill will not only be trained but will be called to serve in the armed forces of the country anywhere in the Western Hemisphere should the President so decide. I believe that men called under the provisions of this bill should be trained in continental United States, and if in the future Congress decides that a sufficient emergency has arisen, then it will be time enough to send these men beyond the shores of our own country. If this is to be a training bill, let us make it a real training bill in fact.

Again, there is a question in my mind whether or not some provision should not be inserted in this bill delaying the operation of the provisions of the bill until the volunteer system has proven a failure. There is no question but that under the present conditions voluntary enlistment will fill up the Army and Navy to full war strength by January 1, 1941, and it is the belief of a great many people in this country that we can provide the necessary number of men called for in this bill by voluntary enlistment. They may be wrong, but they feel that the voluntary enlistment should be given a chance. I believe that if the War Department would put on a real campaign for voluntary enlistment for the next 4 months, and showed the people of the country that they were making an honest effort to get men by that method, that if the volunteer method did not provide the necessary number of men, then these folks would get behind the draft method. When Secretary of War Stimson was before our committee I suggested such a procedure, but he seemed to take the attitude that it could not be done, so what was the use of trying it. However, I believe that it would be well worth the effort, because if it succeeded, this bill would not be necessary, and if it did not succeed the proponents of such a procedure would be satisfied as to that, and the conscription of men would be taken with less hard feeling. So I say, let us give it a chance. It will do no harm, for as I look over the statement below, it is a part of the minority report to this bill.

	Enlisted men	Officers	Total
Navy.....	143,747	10,769	154,516
Marines.....	29,985	1,394	31,379
Navy Reserves ¹	40,336		40,336
Marine Reserves ¹	15,076		15,076
Army.....	289,000	14,000	303,000
National Guard.....	223,000	15,000	237,000
Army Reserve officers.....		120,000	120,000
Enlisted Reserves.....	17,500		17,500
Total.....	758,644	161,163	919,807

¹ Includes officers on which specific figures unavailable.

I find that we will have 919,807 men under arms and by December 1, 1940, and with enlistments increasing as they are, we will have over 1,000,000 in the peacetime forces of the country by that date. It seems to me that with the calling out of the National Guard at this time the War Department will have plenty to do in taking proper care of the requirements of this body of men and that the postponement of the provisions of this bill for 3 or 4 months will not retard national defense seriously.

Another feature of this bill that gives me considerable concern is the so-called conscription-of-industry provision. I know that it sounds good to say that if you are going to conscript human life that you should in turn conscript industry and wealth. It makes good political talk to say that those who oppose the conscripting of industry and wealth are putting "property rights above human rights." There is no such

thing as property rights. It is actually human rights in property. It is these human rights in property that has made America the greatest country in the world. Here any man with a will to do and a will to work could accumulate a home, a business, and wealth. That was his right. He had the right of free speech, the right to worship as he saw fit; the right to do most everything that he wanted to do provided that he did not harm his neighbor. These are the rights that made America great and these are the rights that I believe we are trying to defend. That is the reason why we have this bill before us today. We want to prevent Hitler et al. from doing to us what they have done in Germany, Italy, and Russia. It, therefore, behooves us to be careful that in passing this bill with the conscription-of-industry clause included that we do not bring upon this country the very thing that we do not want.

Taking over private property in the time of war is a very different thing than the taking over of private property in time of peace, no matter how great the emergency may be. It, therefore, seems to me that before we give the Government the power to condemn private property or the power to take over the operation of private plants in time of peace we look well to what we are doing. It certainly is a radical departure from anything that we have ever done before in this country.

Have you stopped to think what might happen under the provisions of the Russell amendment as adopted by the Senate? Let me read it to you:

*Provided, That whenever the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy determines that any existing manufacturing plant or facility is necessary for the national defense and is unable to arrive at an agreement with the owner of such plant or facility for its use or operation by the War Department or the Navy Department, as the case may be, the Secretary, under the direction of the President, is authorized to institute condemnation proceedings with respect to such plant or facility and to acquire it under the provisions of the act of February 26, 1931 (46 Stat. 1421), except that, upon the filing of a declaration of taking in accordance with the provisions of such act, the Secretary may take immediate possession of such plant or facility and operate it either by Government personnel or by contract with private firms pending the determination of the issues: *Provided, That nothing herein shall be deemed to render inapplicable existing State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, and employment standards of the employees in such plant or facility.**

Think of it. Whenever the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy determines that any existing manufacturing plant or facility is necessary for national defense and is unable to arrive at an agreement with the owner of such plant or facility for its use or operation, either of them, under the direction of the President, may institute condemnation proceedings and take over such plant. Under the provisions of the Russell amendment, the sole power of determining the necessity lies in the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

Under such power they could take over every industry in the country, and no one could say them nay. They could take industrial plants over immediately, and the Government would pay for them when it got good and ready. Once the plants were taken over, title to them would be in the United States forever, as there is no provision in this amendment to turn the plants back after the emergency is over. Here is the chance that a lot of new dealers have been looking for—a chance to make this Government over. If this amendment prevails, they will have made over the Government, and democracy as we have known it will have passed beyond recall.

As I interpret the term "facilities," it can be made to include most every kind of business, whether engaged in the manufacture of munitions of war or not. It could include the press and the radio. All this taking could be done by the President through his War and Navy Secretaries if he so determined. Do we under the guise of national defense wish to sovietize America? I will never vote for a bill containing such a provision.

What about the committee amendment on the same matter? I believe that it is a better provision in that it provides

simply for the operation of munition plants and not their condemnation. The title to the plants would still remain in the owners and would be turned back to them after the emergency had ceased. At least after the emergency had ceased the Government would not be in business, but probably the plants would be a little worse for the wear. The right to take over a plant in peacetime is a tremendous power, and if we use this emergency to do so and then turn back the plants after the emergency is over, we have at least created a precedent which we will have a hard time thrusting aside at some future date. This whole conscription of industry, no matter which plan is adopted, presents many serious problems. So I say that before we vote once on this matter that we should at least think twice and see just where these amendments, if adopted, will lead us.

When this matter was first discussed I was inclined to favor the selective draft as the most democratic way of securing a body of trained men to use in time of war, but it has gradually taken on so many different angles during the past weeks that I am still in a quandary what to do when the time for final vote arrives. I hope that I may get some real light as this debate proceeds.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION—FOR TRAINING OR FOR WAR?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, whether we should have peacetime conscription depends to a large extent upon the purpose we have in mind. If the thought is to train men so that we may be ready to meet any danger which may in the future confront us in a world which is undergoing one of its recurrent war epidemics while at the same time we avoid giving offense to potential enemies and make an earnest and sincere effort to avoid being involved in war, there is no reason to believe that we cannot obtain men in sufficient number to meet our need.

To assume otherwise is to subscribe to the belief that Americans have grown so soft and so unpatriotic that they will not defend their country in time of danger.

The spirit of patriotism burns as fiercely in the breast of Americans today as it did in Revolutionary days. Let our people be once convinced that the invader is at our door and few, indeed, would be those of any age who would not gladly volunteer.

If the purpose be to train men so that we may be adequately prepared to meet any danger, the record shows that the Army and the Navy have been able to obtain all the men they wanted, needed, or could train.

As late as September of 1939 the Army's General Staff limited its request for an increase from 169,000 to 227,000 for the Regular Army and asked that the National Guard be recruited from 190,000 to but 235,000.

Again passing upon the necessity of men and its ability to train them, in October the General Staff recommended that the Regulars be limited to 280,000 and the National Guard to 320,000 men. A month later and in December, the Army high command advised against a further increase in Army personnel until reorganization, training, and equipment could be welded into an effective organization.

The truth is that the Army has neither on hand, nor can it get within a year, the equipment to properly care for and train an Army of a million men and, if that number is conscripted and thrown into training camps without proper preparation, many of them will die like flies.

The present war, if it has demonstrated anything, has shown the necessity of mechanized equipment. There is no longer any room for controversy over the necessity of aircraft, tanks, and vast quantities of munitions of all kinds. The day is long past when a million or 2,000,000 men, no matter how perfect their physical condition, how high their courage, how willing to fight, "springing to arms overnight," are an adequate defense for any country.

Safety from warlike aggressors rests today upon the ability of a nation, through its manpower and its factories, to pro-

duce war equipment. Hitler has taken years and the continued labor of millions of men and women, to reach his present state of efficiency. He and his people have had but one object in view—that was preparedness for the conquest of their enemies. To it wholeheartedly they have devoted themselves unceasingly.

It is foolish and egotistical to assume that we, in a few short months or in a year or 2, by halfhearted efforts carried on by conflicting forces, can reach a like high degree of mechanical efficiency.

You have but to read the article by Davenport in Collier's of August 7, 1940, describing conditions at Detroit, Mich., to reach the conclusion that what this country now needs by way of preparedness is a unity of purpose and the training of hundreds of thousands of men to transform them from willing but unskilled workers into skilled, technical mechanics and craftsmen.

That cannot be accomplished in Army camps, under Army officers. First, because neither the Army nor the Navy has the instructors, either in sufficient number or of sufficient ability; and, second, because the Government lacks the facilities. Industrialists cannot do it overnight because the process is a slow and an arduous one.

What this country needs now, whether it is proposed to train men for preparedness or whether it is proposed to train them for war, is a course of instruction, compulsory if necessary, in all of our high schools, colleges, universities, which will give to our young men the manual, mechanical training which we must have if production is our goal.

If it be said that such a procedure will not give us sufficient trained men, then let us have additional classes, night schools if necessary, for all other citizens, regardless of age, who have the physical and the mental ability to become proficient in any line of necessary endeavor. Teach our young men and, if necessary, our middle-aged and old men, the essentials of production. Then, when it appears that we will have the equipment necessary for training, if voluntary enlistments have not given us the requisite number, let us have the draft.

CONSCRIPTION FOR WAR

If the purpose be to conscript men for war, that raises another issue and one on which the President and the Congress should be slow to act.

Our people fought one war, all to no good purpose. The cost of it still rests heavily upon our shoulders. The suffering and the misery which it brought are not yet at an end.

Before the President arbitrarily continues on his course which would involve us in this foreign war, before he sends our Army or our Navy into danger zones where he knows retaliation will follow, let the people have a chance to speak at the polls in November.

It was on August 14 of 1936 that he said:

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "no" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

Since that date and especially during the last year, he has consistently driven us toward war. He now leads the war party. If he is honest, let him so announce. Let the opposition declare for preparedness and for peace. Then let the people in November give the answer.

Repeatedly, the President has repudiated his promises. In recent weeks he has made false statements—statements which the people know to be false. He is no longer to be trusted. A man who will propose to violate the law by sending torpedo boats to a belligerent nation, a man who has no regard for the solemn international agreements of our Nation, a man who assumes the authority to send a part of our battle fleet across the seas, is not a man who can be trusted with the lives of more than a million American youths.

For the foregoing and other reasons which will occur to all, we should vote against peacetime conscription. We should insist that Congress alone has not only the authority to de-

clare war, but to shape the policy which will determine whether we remain at peace or go to war.

If the President will not confine his acts within the limitations of the Constitution, he should be impeached.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, when I was a little boy I read about the seven wonders of the world. During the past two decades it has been my privilege and good fortune as a Missourian, who has to be shown, to have traveled rather widely and to have seen for myself some of those wonders of the world, but the longer I live and the more widely I travel, the more I study men and institutions, the more am I convinced that there is only one wonder in the world today, and that is the United States of America. [Applause.]

There are other countries, sir, that are larger than ours in area, that possess more acres, that have richer mineral deposits, and more diversified agricultural products, and, perhaps, richer in natural resources; and there are also other nations that are larger than ours in population, outnumbering us three or four to one. Notwithstanding the fact that other countries are larger than ours, both in area and in population, within the brief span of a century and a half the United States has grown to be the greatest nation on God's earth, and the American people, in spite of all the vicissitudes of fortune through which they have passed, have become the happiest and freest people under the face of the shining sun.

Why is it, I ask you, sir, that we are supreme among the sovereign nations of this earth at this hour? Neither geography nor numbers is the true criterion by which to judge the greatness of a nation, and our preeminence today is due, not to accident—it did not just happen—but, rather, I should say, there are at least three distinct things that have contributed to our greatness: First, the Christian religion, because the men who founded this Nation, who wrote the bible of our freedom and our Declaration of Independence, were religious men and Christian gentlemen who placed supreme importance upon the greatness of the individual; second, our constitutional, representative form of government created a republic where the people themselves are the supreme sovereign and a government which derives all its just powers from the consent of the governed; and the third reason is our underlying economic philosophy of individual initiative and private enterprise.

Our forefathers crossed the stormy seas. They fought off the hostile forces of Nature. They combated savage tribes. They sweated and toiled and went through blood and suffering in order that we might become free and independent men. They lived under no military regimented society. Rather, they left the Old World to escape the heel of cruelty and the yoke of oppression and came to a new land where every man could walk the earth his own king, the equal of every other man, to go his own way, work out his own will, weave into the warp and the woof of the magic days the dreams of haunting doubts that inspired and urged him on.

Up until a few years ago little did I ever dream that I would live to see the time when the Chief Executive of this Nation would ask the Members of this Congress, who had taken an oath similar to his, to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution, to enact legislation, whether it was constitutional or not. Up until a few years ago I never dreamed that I would live to see the day when the President of the United States would attempt to accomplish by indirection that which he dared not accomplish by direction—to undermine and destroy the independence of a free judiciary, one of the coequal, coordinate branches of our Government. Little did any of us ever dream that we would live to see the day when the Executive would defy the sacred third-term tradition and ask the American people to return him to power as the one and only indispensable man to rule over the destinies of a mighty and great and free people. Little did we ever realize that we would live to see the hour when a President, in time of peace, when we are at peace with all the world, when no one has attacked us, when no one has assaulted us, when no one has insulted us, would ask the American people

to grant him the dictatorial and tyrannical power to conscript the young manhood of this Nation in order that they might goose-step to the commands of generals and salute brass hats.

But we have lived to see that hour. The greatest issue for us this moment is whether America shall remain a democracy or become a dictatorship. It is whether we shall maintain our liberty and freedom or whether we shall become a regimented society. It is whether we shall remain a constitutional representative republic or whether we shall become a totalitarian state.

Conscription in peacetime, sir, is an undemocratic, ignoble confession that the methods of Hitler are better and more effective than our own. He who advocates taking the young manhood of this Nation out of their homes, out of their professions and from their families in times of peace, misinterprets the spirit and genius of the men who carved the destiny of this free Republic. We are called upon now, in addition to all the extraordinary powers already voted the Executive under the cry of "emergency," to give him more power, concentrated in a single individual here in Washington. Oh, Members of this House, you cannot consider this bill before us today alone by itself. You must consider it in the light of everything that has gone before and in the light of everything that is likely to follow. Everyone in America knows that for the past 7 years the American Congress has voted the Executive enormous and vast discretionary powers, extraordinary and excessive powers, under the cry of "emergency," which were promised to be exercised only temporarily, as long as the emergency lasted. But the emergency never ends, and consequently those extraordinary powers are still exercised.

What are some of those powers? Under the Constitution the President has the right, of course, to exercise his power as Commander in Chief of the Army, the Navy, and the air force. Under the neutrality law he can single out combat areas and prohibit ships from entering belligerent waters.

The Constitution says that only the Congress has the right to coin money and regulate the value thereof. Napoleon once said, "Give me control of the purse-strings of a nation and you can have all its armies." I submit to you in all fairness as an American patriot that the President at this hour has such vast discretionary control over monetary affairs, a prerogative that justly belongs to this Congress, that he can issue United States notes at any time up to \$3,000,000,000. He can further deflate the gold content of the dollar, and by deflating it to 59.2, today he has a surplus stabilization fund of two and one-half billion dollars. He can coin silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. He can close the stock market for 30 days at any time he chooses. Because of certain specific pieces of legislation the President of the United States exercises almost complete control over agriculture, paying benefits to certain kinds of farmers in certain sections, and withholding those same benefits from other farmers.

Likewise, through certain labor legislation, he controls the industries of this Nation along with agriculture. He controls the finances. He has been voted over \$20,000,000,000 in a blank check which he can spend any way he chooses. Not satisfied with those excessive and extraordinary powers, not granted by the Constitution, we are now called upon to give him the additional power of conscripting the young manhood of this Nation when we are at peace with the world. When you conscript manpower in this Nation you are going to conscript industry, you are going to conscript labor that operates that industry, and you are going to conscript wealth, whether you like it or not. [Applause.]

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

Mr. SHORT. Let me continue, please. Of course, you are going to conscript it. The sauce that is good for the goose is good for the gander. If we are going to have a socialistic state or a communistic society—if we are going to give any man control over the lives of human beings, why should you single out a particular select class and then deny that control to apply to all of us equally without partiality and without favor? [Applause.]

Who is for this bill? Where was it born? I know that many fine patriotic Americans are for it. Much as I differ in judgment, I respect their feelings in this matter because no man is the keeper of another man's conscience. I have been implored more by Republicans than some others, prominent ones, not to make this speech today. No man is the keeper of my conscience. [Applause.]

Who is for this bill? I will tell you some people who are for this bill. Wall Street is for it, regardless of politics. International financiers are for it, regardless of politics. Foreign investors are for it, regardless of politics. They want an Army to protect investors, and when you get an Army to protect investments you will be led down the bloody path of war. History has never recorded a single instance where a country has raised a mighty army that it did not sooner or later use that army. That is an undeniable historical fact.

We are called upon to vote conscription. Why? In the name of God, why?

We are getting down to the bill. Is it necessary? I do not think so; not even after listening to my good, patriotic, brilliant, and able colleague from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]; not after listening to all the generals—and they have changed their opinions a lot in the last few weeks. I do not believe we need it.

It took the Nazis 4 weeks to get 60,000 men across 150 miles of water to Norway when they had complete control of those waters, when they already had their "fifth column" developed inside of Norway ready to take it over. It took Britain, with her mighty Navy in complete control of the North Sea, 4 weeks to get 20,000 soldiers to Norway, and then she had to withdraw them quickly. Hitler is finding it exceedingly difficult at this hour to get across the English Channel that I have crossed a dozen times—only 20 miles. I want to say to you that when this war is ended all of the belligerents engaged in it will be so utterly exhausted they will not be able to get out of their own back yards. The victor will be only 1 step ahead of the vanquished, only 1 step ahead. And when the war ends, famine, pestilence, death, and disease, the backwash of war and always more destructive than war, will take untold numbers. Europe will be a shambles and chaos. My God! Men, have you ever read history? Have you ever been out of your own back yard? What of the Austrians, the Czechs, the Poles, the Norwegians, the Danes, the Belgians, the Dutch, the French, and we will say the Britishers in the event Britain loses—Britain has not lost this war yet, not by a long shot. We read in the papers day before yesterday that these barn bombers from Germany indicated that the Germans are short of bombers or short of pilots. Britain has not lost the war. But even if Britain succumbs, do we need this bill before us today? I say "No." It will take a vast German Army, an enormous police force, to keep in subjugation those conquered, discontented, and disgruntled minorities. Hitler will have to reorganize and rehabilitate all these conquered countries—and yet you talk about his attacking us across 3,000 miles of water. Oh, I know the Atlantic has shrunk, I know modern inventions and scientific discoveries have annihilated space and conquered time. I know Lindbergh has pushed Paris up into our own front yard. I know Dr. Eckener and Howard Hughes have brought Moscow and Tokyo within hours of Washington. I am aware of these facts, but I still thank God there are 3,000 miles of deep blue water between the New and the Old Worlds, and 5,000 miles of like deep blue water between us and the Orient. Anyone who knows anything about military tactics knows that the United States is most fortunate in its geographical position.

How many men do we have in our land, naval, and air forces, active and reserve, in the United States today? Almost 1,000,000; over 900,000 at this hour, and it will be 1,000,000 within the next few weeks.

Has the volunteer system failed in this country? Are we so lacking in patriotism that we have to go out and compel men to serve? Every red-blooded American will fight for liberty, but he will never tolerate anyone to compel him to fight for it. [Applause.] Now, let us see about the volunteer

system. How can a thing fail when it has never been tried? Up until May of this year we had restrictions on enlistments in the Army. When we lifted those restrictions we found over 9,000 men enlisted during the month of May, over 23,000 enlisted during the month of June, more than 31,000 enlisted in July; and General Shedd testified before our committee that the enlistments in August will be correspondingly great. If you will reduce the term of enlistment from 3 years to 1, as the bill under consideration provides, and hike the pay of the men who shoulder rifles from \$21 to \$30 a month—and God knows a soldier should be worth as much as a boy in the C. C. C. camps—if you will do that, you will find we will get all the soldiers under this volunteer system that we can properly clothe and house and train. [Applause.] Men responsible in high authority have disclosed before our committee that we will not have complete equipment for 750,000 men until 1942. I know you do not need complete equipment, all the accessories and paraphernalia attendant on modern warfare, in order to train men; but I want to say to you gentlemen that the United States Navy is our first line of defense—and we have a navy which I think could lick any combined 2 navies on the face of the earth today. [Applause.] Our Navy does not need men. They have more volunteers than they can take care of. Secretary Knox testified there are over 7,000 on the waiting list now. You can find all kinds of young men who will volunteer for the Air Corps. What the United States needs with its two oceans, one on either side of us, is, first, an impregnable air force which is absolutely invulnerable to attack; and, second, the necessary naval and air bases. The United States does not need a large army. If there is one lesson modern warfare has taught us, if there is one thing we have learned from the Battle of France, it is that you do not need a huge army. Rather, you need a small army, well coordinated, highly equipped and mechanized, that can strike with lightning rapidity and achieve its goal. If the truth were known, I wager there were not more than a quarter of a million Germans who took France with all the millions of conscripts in her Army, the finest in the world, and in spite of the Maginot line.

Let me pause here long enough to say that our committee unanimously voted for every dollar of appropriations deemed necessary for these weapons of war. I even stretched myself and voted for mobilization of the National Guard and the Reserve officers. I have gone that far with you. We who oppose this bill are just as earnest in our desire to see that our Nation is adequately prepared as any proponent of the measure. We want to be ready to meet any eventuality. We do not want to be caught napping and asleep at the switch.

You know the President and even our General Staff—I will not confine it to them, I will say all the world—were so surprised and overwhelmed by Hitler because they had underestimated his strength that they are now inclined to go to the other extreme and overemphasize his supernatural ability. Bear that in mind. That is just hard, common sense.

No one has attacked us, no one has insulted us, yet I fear that perhaps we are already in this war. I speak out of a troubled mind and with a heavy heart today. The speech I am making is not an easy or even a pleasant one to make, but at least so far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, in the years to come and in eternity I want the RECORD to be made.

A year ago today I landed at New Castle from the little Swedish steamer *Ingeborg* after a violent and turbulent crossing of the North Sea from Goteborg to England. The *Athenia* had been sunk, and I was reported on it. After my wife, my friends, and I had spent a week in London, we finally landed in New York and much to my surprise I found the American people more excited and more wrought up and more hysterical than the people in the Germany and Britain we had just left. I thought New York had been bombed. I thought somebody had shot grandpa. I ran out and looked at the city to see if it was still standing. Well, another limited emergency had been called. Congress had been asked to meet in special session and to undo in this atmosphere of

hysteria that which we had done 2 years previously in time of peace, when there was no major war in Europe, when we could think coolly, calmly, and objectively without overemotion. We then opened the door and let down the bars.

Mr. Chairman, what many of us predicted last September, October, and November is now coming true. First, you furnish munitions. Next, you will furnish money or credit. The last step will be men. After making the little speech that I made here yesterday I read in this morning's press where, "Britain hails the United States as an ally." And the man on the street in England says, "Thank God, at last we have someone with us now." That is the reaction.

George Washington, in his Farewell Address, said:

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

But we have men today who are wiser than George Washington. George refused a kingly crown. George refused a third term, but he belonged to the "horse and buggy" days. [Applause.]

Today we must conscript men for the defense of what? Why should we whip up their emotions unless it is to create such an excitement that their minds will be detracted from the domestic failures and the problems immediately at hand? Oh, it is so much easier to solve the problems of Europe than it is to solve our own problems at home. [Applause.]

Why must we meddle in foreign affairs? There is something funny, and pathetic, too, about all this draft business. Before our Democratic friends held their ratification ceremony in Chicago, Harry and Harold drafted Roosevelt. During the convention Roosevelt drafted Henry, and poor old Jim Farley felt the draft as he drifted out. [Applause and laughter.] And the deceit and deception of that convention is equaled only by what is contained in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that perhaps this will cause more internal strife and trouble at home than anything we could do at this particular time. I do not fear any foreign power as much as I fear the internal breakdown of our democratic institutions, this drifting toward totalitarianism, and the concentration of power in the hands of a single individual. I submit to you this is more power than any good man should want or take, and God knows, it is more power than any bad man should possess.

We are going to hear a lot about Trojan horses, "fifth columnists," and attacks from within, but you know the first casualty in war is truth. When the President sets up these local draft boards all over the Nation, they call it universal conscription. It is not. You are going to set up draft boards on the recommendation of the various Governors, and they are going to take just a few particular boys out of a community. When they take Bill Smith's son and leave John Brown's son home, look out, brother; look out. There is a bug under the chip.

Edwin Markham, bless his heart, author of *The Man With the Hoe*, whom our beloved Speaker has quoted so beautifully and so effectively on this floor, and who wrote *Lincoln, the Man of the People*, when they dedicated the Lincoln Memorial, in my judgment the most beautiful monument in this city or in the world, wrote this:

I fear the vermin that shall undermine
Senate and school and citadel and shrine;
The worm of fraud, the fatted worm of ease,
And all the crawling progeny of these.
I fear the vermin that shall honeycomb
The doors and walls of state, in unsuspecting hour.

We had better stay home and put our own house in order. We cannot solve the world's ills and its problems until we first solve our own.

Britain already this year has done \$2,000,000,000 worth of business with us. The airplane industry in this country already has a vested interest in this war. The farmers are going to ask us, perhaps, to repeal the Johnson Act and extend loans to Britain, but they will not be loans, they will be

gifts. Of course, we can raise farm prices by giving food to Britain or other parts of the world, but we had better give it to the 11,000,000 Americans in our country today who are underprivileged.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I want this 1 minute to say that our committee, much as we may differ among ourselves, love each other. Our chairman has been very fair and very broadminded. Though we disagree on this proposition, thank God we live in America, where we can differ and still love each other, and may it be so always. That is the wonder of this democracy, this Republic. What I fear is that if we pass legislation like this you will not have free speech. You cannot talk back in an army. Oh, but it is wonderful. As Voltaire said—

Though I disapprove of everything you say, I will die to give you the right to say it.

This is a great country if we will only take care of it and not be swept off our feet.

It's nice to see the Old World, to travel up and down
Among the famous palaces and the cities of renown,
To see the crumbling castles and the statues of the kings,
But now I think I've had enough of antiquated things.
So it's home again, and home again, America for me!
My heart is turning home again, and there I long to be
In the land of youth and freedom beyond the ocean bars,
Where the air is full of sunshine, and the flag is full of stars.

[Applause, Members rising.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

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

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I rise to give expression to the sentiment that we thank God that there are still men in America like DEWEY SHORT, with honesty of conviction.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, the statement the gentleman makes is true, but the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] does not have a monopoly in this House on honesty or convictions. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has assigned to me a difficult task when he asks me to follow the brilliant and always entertaining gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. I agree with all he had to say in the last minute of his very eloquent speech, when he referred to the splendid feeling that prevails in the Committee on Military Affairs.

The gentleman from Missouri, DEWEY SHORT, is one of the delightful and companionable men of this House, although we seldom agree on political questions. I regret very much that he saw fit to inject so much politics into a question of this importance. I had hoped that politics had adjourned at least for this week, or until this bill is disposed of. I regard this the most important measure that has been debated on the floor of this House since the World War. Today we should talk, act, and vote as Americans and not as Democrats and Republicans.

The gentleman from Missouri did ask some very pertinent questions, and some of them are entitled to respectful answers. One of his very direct questions was that he wanted to know where this bill was born. If you will read the hearings you will find that just about exactly 20 years ago there was a distinguished man from New York who ably represented that great State in the Senate of the United States.

He happened to be the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of that great deliberative body. After the World War he began to give study to the so-called National Defense Act, which is the law today and of which he is the author. After months of laborious effort that same man, with a unanimous report of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, both Republican and Democratic, reported back

to that body the recommendation that there be incorporated in the National Defense Act, under which we live and operate today, a system of selective service and training. The cry immediately went up that there would never be another war. Sad to relate, we had not made the world safe for democracy.

That bill did not get very far and was defeated in the Senate and was opposed in this House by another man, whom I will later mention, but during these intervening 20 years, in conjunction with an organization commonly known as the Plattsburg Camp, they have been trying to figure out some plan for universal-selective training of the young men of this country, and that same man is the author of this bill. His name is JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of the State of New York (applause), and since the gentleman from Missouri has seen fit to inject so much politics into this debate it almost makes me wonder why, with the Republican Party having such a man they would not make him their standard-bearer instead of a newly converted Democrat. [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is the author and father of this bill and Senator BURKE, the author in the Senate, is one of Mr. Willkie's outstanding leaders, so it could hardly be called a Democratic measure.

The gentleman also makes another very pertinent inquiry when he wants to know who is for this bill. Well, I think one of those whom I would name first would be the Honorable Wendell L. Willkie, who is for this bill. [Applause.] I know this must be a bitter pill for the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and also the Republican leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. I would also name the great Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, and the great Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, who for many, many years have shed luster upon the Republican Party. I would go further and say that the Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, who is one of the greatest officers of the Army that this Nation has ever produced, says that it is absolutely necessary for our proper and adequate national defense, and I would go still further and say that if the Gallup poll is to be believed that 2 to 1 of the American people are for this bill.

I must confess, Mr. Chairman, that more than 2 months ago when the hearings began on this bill, I not only had an open mind upon the question, but I doubted if I would support such a measure. I was not then sure of the necessity, and I wanted to be certain we could not raise an adequate army by the volunteer method. I undertake to say that any man who has the time and the opportunity to study carefully the lengthy hearings on this bill must reach the conclusion that more defense is necessary for the United States if we are to meet the terrible situation that now prevails throughout the world, and personally I am convinced this is the only way we can do it.

I am one of those who believe that if we could get sufficient volunteers all well and good, but now for more than 2 months the House committee has had hearings on this bill, with all kinds of witnesses both for and against, including the author of the bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and various patriotic and veterans' organizations like the Veterans of Foreign Wars. We have heard those against it. We have heard the pacifists, we have heard the ministers, and the result of it has been that in my judgment a bill has come out that can stand the most careful scrutiny and one that I believe, upon due and fair consideration, you will support.

I am not going to take a lot of time going into the details of this bill, because a good many of the Members, and especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], have gone into it rather exhaustively, but you will recall that, in addition to the age limit of 21 to 31, the bill provides for a pay increase to \$30 a month. It provides for quotas to the various States by which every State will be given full credit for the men now in the service, regardless of what branch it may be. It provides that officers, legislative, judicial, and executive, shall have deferments, likewise ministers of the

gospel, also those engaged in necessary industry and agriculture, and conscientious objectors are given proper consideration. There is a moratorium for those who have debts they cannot take care of before they enter the service. There is a guaranty the draftees will have their jobs back when they come home, or at least have a fair hearing in the United States district courts of the country. The members of the local boards are all civilians and appointed, or at least recommended, by local officials.

Since the time when legislation of this kind was first suggested Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France have all fallen, and now England is in the death struggle.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] wants to know who is for it. I will also tell you who is against it. There are a lot of good men all over the country, and women, too, including a lot of fine men in this body, who are against the bill, but I will tell you an organization that is absolutely 100 percent against it, and that is the Communist Party. I refer to an editorial that I received this morning from the Daily Worker, in New York City, of Friday, August 30, 1940, the official spokesman of the Communist Party, in which they close their editorial with these words:

The draft bill comes up in the House on Tuesday. Between now and then the American people must make themselves heard as never before.

1. Wire, write, send delegations to your Congressman. Let him know that labor will vote out of office every supporter of conscription.

2. Organize meetings everywhere to protest the action of the Senate and to let the House know that the people do not intend to take this lying down.

3. Let all Labor Day rallies become anticonscription rallies.

4. Give support to the Emergency Mobilization for Peace, to be held in Chicago this week end.

The Burke-Wadsworth bill is a bill of tyranny and death. Let the voice of the people ring forth—for their democratic rights; for their right to live.

Now, let us see if it is possible to get an army such as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] says he favors, by the voluntary method. I want to give you some figures in this connection.

The present enlistments for this year by the voluntary system are approximately 170,000 men. If you will refer to the RECORD of August 7 last, I placed some figures therein that show the enlistments up to the 1st of June. The War Department today has given me the enlistments for the month of June, which amount to 22,444; for July, 31,958; for August, 33,880; making a total of approximately down to this date of near 170,000 enlistments.

Now, I think you will be interested in observing in the RECORD tomorrow morning the statistics and facts I shall put into the RECORD relative to the volunteer system. I expect to insert in the RECORD these tables down to this date. It will be observed that some of the States, notably my own State of Texas, of which I am so proud, is right near the top of the list. The States of North Carolina, Kentucky, South Carolina, and Texas lead the list. This table which I expect to put into the RECORD will show the number of enlistments per 100,000 of population. While Texas heads that list with 14,667 enlistments, or 252 per 100,000 of population, there are other States like Michigan that provide only 69 per 100,000. There are States like New Jersey that provide only 74 per 100,000.

We might take a look at Missouri, Mr. SHORT's State, which has furnished only 87 per 100,000. And yet this is the State that gave us General Pershing, who says this bill is absolutely necessary. At this rate, it would take 2 years to get the 1,200,000 that General Marshall says are absolutely necessary for an initial protective force. I do not believe we can delay longer.

Let me refer you to the record on this point. When General Marshall, Chief of Staff, was before the committee I asked him this question:

You are also convinced that, speaking for the War Department, you cannot get an adequate Army voluntarily?

General MARSHALL. We cannot secure the necessary number of men by the volunteer method, and we absolutely cannot secure

men with sufficient rapidity to meet the present situation. We must get these men very quickly. Matériel we cannot rush to meet the immediate emergency, but men we can procure. There should be no delay.

Mr. THOMASON. Will you tell us, please, so that we can have it in the record, what progress is being made in the way of enlistment for the Regular Army, and also the activities of the National Guard and the Reserves?

General MARSHALL. We are securing more men by voluntary enlistment than we expected to be able to secure, but we are still far below the number we need. In the month of June we obtained approximately 16,000 men, and we reached the quota we set for ourselves in June, 10 days ahead of time. But we needed about 80,000 to meet what I thought were our urgent needs to get the ranks filled up and the new units under way in intensive training.

So, if General Marshall, who ought to know more about this subject than any other man, is to be believed, it is absolutely impossible to get an army that will meet the present situation by the voluntary method. Surely, we can trust the Army on matters of this kind. That is their business, and they must know for they have the records.

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

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the record indicate that even if you tried to raise an army by the voluntary system, the soldiers would come in greater number from some of the Southern States?

Mr. THOMASON. Well, I was just about to say the charge has been made that this is an undemocratic measure, when in my judgment it is the most democratic thing that can be done if it is necessary to raise a million or two million men. [Applause.]

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the record also show clearly that the voluntary system in the State of Missouri has utterly failed?

Mr. THOMASON. Absolutely; and it has failed in more than half of the States.

This is not the first time the country has been confronted with the necessity for legislation of this kind. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] said, it was done in the War of 1812; it was done in the Civil War; it was done in the World War, about which no complaint has been made.

May I ask this question: If the cowboys on the plains of Texas and those from the cotton fields of the South have been patriotic enough to voluntarily enlist up to the full strength of the desired quota, tell me, if you please, why the young men of alien extraction from the sidewalks of New York and other great cities, who are spending most of their time criticizing the Government under which they live, should not be compelled to serve? [Applause.] This is the just and democratic way.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I think my colleague will agree with me that historians generally agree that because the Confederate Army inaugurated a conscription system in 1862 they lasted a year longer than they would have lasted.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not know any reason why, if my son voluntarily entered a training camp this summer, the fellow down the street who might be a bootlegger or habitué of a poolroom should not be required to prepare himself to defend his country. [Applause.]

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

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. Are we not 100,000 men behind our authorization today?

Mr. THOMASON. I know we are far behind on necessary enlistments. As I said a while ago, it would take at least 2 years under the present system to get the Army that the War Department says is necessary to meet the present situation.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I noticed with a great deal of interest that the gentleman spoke of the aliens. Will the

gentleman then support a perfecting amendment to include many millions of aliens in the draft, including late arrivals in this country who are specifically exempted?

Mr. THOMASON. I think few of us would care to have aliens, especially German aliens in our Army at this time. [Applause.] The gentleman can speak for himself. We have too many "fifth columnists" in this country now, without putting them in the Army.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I ask this question purely for information. The gentleman mentioned, and I have read it many times, an army of 1,200,000 men. I have read a number of times that the War Department says the standing army should be 375,000 or 500,000. I wish the gentleman would explain the difference.

Mr. THOMASON. The War Department says an initial protective force of 1,200,000 is necessary. That does not mean a permanent standing army of that number. When you compare our Army with the other armies of the world today you will find we have one of the smallest of any large nation in the world. We have an Army of which we are all proud when it comes to personnel and morale, but no one can say in view of what has happened in the other countries of the world in the last year that it does not behoove us to see to it that an adequate army is provided to meet any emergency, and this is the only way to do it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just want the gentleman to explain to us what the 1,200,000 will be. Are part of them to be under training?

Mr. THOMASON. They will be the Regular Army, Reserve Officers, National Guard, and the draftees under this bill. This is a uniform measure, it is a democratic measure that will require every man in this country from 21 to 45 to register; and it is absolutely up to the men in the local communities to determine who is to go. This part of our Army will be civilians and civilians will determine who in their neighborhoods will be selected.

May I not say in this connection that the testimony of General Shedd, Chief of Personnel of the Army, is to the effect that not one man who is now married will go if he claims his exemption, and not one man with dependents who claims his exemption will go.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Chairman, what would you do with men who have married since discussion of this bill began, men who very plainly married to avoid military service?

Mr. THOMASON. I am a firm believer in marriage. I think it is a fine and sacred institution. The local boards will attend to that. Perhaps a few have or will marry to evade the draft, but surely you would not stop all marriages, most of which are made in good faith and entered into because the young people are in love.

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

Mr. THOMASON. For a brief question only.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman believe that the national interest is presently imperiled by an emergency that we face?

Mr. THOMASON. Of course, I do, or I would not be for this bill. I do not see how any man who reads the newspapers, how any man who listens to the radio, or any man who goes to a picture show can fail to realize that we are facing the most critical time in the world's history. Hitler has not only made his threats. He is on the march. Read his books. I live on the Mexican border. Take a trip to Mexico or South America and find out for yourself about the subversive influences that are at work. I say it is time for America to wake up. The people of the country are already several jumps ahead of Congress. It is better to be safe than sorry. [Applause.]

Mr. KEEFE. May I add this: That I am glad the gentleman has made that observation. But I want to add this further question: In view of the fact that I interpret what the gentleman has said as a declaration that the Nation is

presently imperiled, why does not this Congress so declare, because in this—

Mr. THOMASON. I just yielded for a question.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to finish asking it—because in this very bill it is provided that whenever the Congress shall declare the national interest is imperiled these boys are in the Army indefinitely, and not for 1 year's training.

Mr. THOMASON. They are in the Army for training only for 1 year. Then they pass into the Reserves for 10 years. This is nothing in the world but a training bill. This is a preparedness bill to meet any emergency. [Applause.]

I can appreciate how the gentleman from Wisconsin feels on that, because I know how unsympathetic he is to any legislation of this sort. This is no declaration of war. This is no expeditionary force. This is a life-insurance policy.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman said he was going to insert some figures in his remarks.

Mr. THOMASON. I expect to place in the RECORD figures of enlistments by States, not only percentages but the number per 100,000. They show that in the industrial centers, particularly of the East and North, the percentage is not half what it is in the agricultural West and South.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If the gentleman will yield further—

Mr. THOMASON. Briefly.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I found from the Congressional Index that in the World War we had volunteers to the extent of 1,163,048, consisting of 545,773 Regulars and 617,275 Volunteers, as against 2,394,653 drafted. Would the gentleman have someone check those figures so we may know whether they are correct?

Mr. THOMASON. I will let the gentleman from Ohio do that himself. I think the Members will find, if they look at the RECORD in the morning, from the figures I insert, they will find the present system is unfair and undemocratic, and it is even impossible for us to raise the number of men the War Department says we must have by any volunteer method.

Mr. Chairman, this is a grave hour in the history of this country, and certainly in the history of the world. If we are to believe what our War, Navy, and State Departments tell us, we must be prepared to meet the present threat. I do not know how we can do it or how we can raise an army by any other method than this. It is an absolutely fair bill. Ours is a rich heritage. We are a free people and expect to remain such. Bombs are dropping this minute on the homes of innocent civilians in London. Little children are being shipped to our country to find adopted homes. Innocent women and children by the thousands in Europe are tramping the highways seeking food and shelter. That just cannot happen in America. I am glad we have sent them our surplus destroyers and I favor giving them all aid short of war. Thank God, ours is still a Christian country that believes in liberty and justice.

There is not a Member of this Congress who would vote to send a single boy to Europe, but I do believe that we will tax ourselves for munitions and the training of our men. The English Channel is now our first line of defense. We have much in common with the English. We speak the same language. We have the same old common law. We have the same ideals. We believe in and practice democracy. If this madman who is now running loose and wild in Europe continues his march, and especially if he should capture England and the English fleet, then we may expect anything on earth to happen here.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. I thought the British Government had guaranteed that the British Fleet would not surrender if we sent our destroyers over there?

Mr. THOMASON. I hope and pray they do not, although I do not understand that they guaranteed that they would not,

because I do not see how they are in position to do so if we can believe what we hear. With the odds they are up against, I do not know how they can guarantee anything. They are a game and determined people. In football parlance, I hope and pray they "hold that line."

Mr. ENGEL. Then why was that statement broadcast?

Mr. THOMASON. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. The English have not insured or guaranteed anything along that line.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not know how they could guarantee anything under present conditions. I will say they are doing a swell job so far.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I ask the able gentleman, who has great experience on the Military Affairs Committee, this question: When you have to raise or train a large number of troops, is it any more practical or fair to depend on the voluntary contribution of manpower than on the voluntary contribution of money, both of which are necessary to effectuate that purpose.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not think so. I thank the gentleman for his question. I know of no man in this House whose judgment is better or whose patriotism is higher.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I believe I heard the distinguished gentleman from Missouri mention certain governments which he visited when he was in Europe last year. He said the people were not "het up" at all about any danger or necessity to get busy. That when he got back to New York he found the people there much more concerned, acting as though "granddad had got shot." May I ask the gentleman what has become of those governments that were not "het up" at that time?

Mr. THOMASON. Hitler is in charge of those countries just as he will be of all the world if he succeeds in his ambition. Maps are already prepared in Berlin showing how he proposes to divide up the Western Hemisphere.

I was impressed with the testimony given before our committee by a former Member of this House, the distinguished mayor of the city of New York, Mr. LaGuardia, who was the man I referred to when I said that he opposed the bill that the gentleman from New York, Senator WADSWORTH, offered in the Senate 20 years ago.

The mayor came before the committee, urging the immediate passage of this bill, and said he realized how serious the situation is and that he would go further than the bill provides, fixing it so that every man up to 64 had to register; then you could provide home guards as well as men for military service. I subscribe to that view.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope this bill passes, as I believe it will, by a substantial majority. It is absolutely necessary for the adequate defense of this country if our military and naval experts are to be believed. Civilization is at the crossroads. Christianity and our free democratic institutions are on trial. May God bless and keep America. [Applause.]

Under leave granted me, I also include in my remarks the following for the information of the Members:

[The Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service]

Enlistments, State of residence as tabulated from enlistment papers, fiscal year 1940

State	Number of enlistments	Number of enlistments per 100,000 population (census, 1930)
Alabama	4,545	172
Arizona	642	149
Arkansas	2,532	137
California	5,695	100
Colorado	1,892	183
Connecticut	1,376	86
Delaware	205	89
District of Columbia	413	81
Florida	2,085	142
Georgia	5,906	203

Enlistments, State of residence as tabulated from enlistment papers,
fiscal year 1940—Continued

State	Number of enlistments	Number of enlistments per 100,000 population (Census, 1940)
Idaho.....	723	187
Illinois.....	6,794	89
Indiana.....	3,189	98
Iowa.....	1,994	80
Kansas.....	2,304	122
Kentucky.....	7,326	280
Louisiana.....	2,519	119
Maine.....	1,268	160
Maryland.....	1,501	92
Massachusetts.....	4,268	100
Michigan.....	3,310	69
Minnesota.....	1,762	68
Mississippi.....	2,338	116
Missouri.....	3,149	87
Montana.....	664	125
Nebraska.....	1,633	118
Nevada.....	236	1262
New Hampshire.....	497	108
New Jersey.....	3,007	74
New Mexico.....	553	131
New York.....	11,092	88
North Carolina.....	6,220	196
North Dakota.....	585	86
Ohio.....	4,326	65
Oklahoma.....	5,512	230
Oregon.....	1,574	165
Pennsylvania.....	14,586	153
Rhode Island.....	745	109
South Carolina.....	3,121	180
South Dakota.....	724	100
Tennessee.....	4,502	153
Texas.....	14,670	252
Utah.....	536	105
Vermont.....	427	122
Virginia.....	4,280	176
Washington.....	2,183	139
West Virginia.....	3,598	209
Wisconsin.....	2,973	101
Wyoming.....	451	205
Hawaii.....	122	34
Panama Canal Zone.....	25	183
Philippines.....	57	4.7
Puerto Rico.....	382	241
United States Army posts.....	2,353	166
Alaska.....	33	166
Total enlistments.....	150,403	
Average per 100,000.....		133

¹ Estimate given on basis of 100,000 population; in this case below that figure.

Source: U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; Fifteenth Census of the United States, 1930, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1933.

The War Department's plans are in far greater state of readiness than when the compulsory system of selection was initiated during the World War. Years of study and research have perfected the plan so that it is in readiness for immediate operation. Representatives of the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee state that the selective service system can procure the number of trainees needed for the first increment within not more than 45 days from the enactment of the appropriation bill.

The following schedule has been prepared by the Joint Army and Navy Selective Service Committee.

SCHEDULE OF TIME REQUIRED FROM DATE OF PASSAGE OF THE LAW UNTIL FILLING OF FIRST CALL

0 to 14th day: Registration preparation.

15th day: Registration.

16th to 21st day: Set up local board and serially number cards.

21st to 25th day: For lottery and distribution of order number.

24th to 29th day: Local board assign order number and mail questionnaire.

29th to 34th day: Return of questionnaires.

34th to 36th day: Run through questionnaires and sort out probable class I-A.

36th to 40th day: Physically examine and induct class I-A.

Consider 0 day as the day of the passage of the act.

JOINT ARMY AND NAVY SELECTIVE SERVICE COMMITTEE,
THE ARMY WAR COLLEGE,
Washington, D. C., August 31, 1940.

HON. R. E. THOMASON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. THOMASON: The committee is very glad to comply with your request and furnish you information concerning the distribution of quotas under selective service.

It is expected that when Congress authorizes a selective-service system it will adopt the quota policy which has been established by this committee. This policy provides that the quota basis of the Nation shall be the number of men available for service, including those men already in the service.

For example, a rough estimate of the number of men available for service, within the age group 21 to 30, in the United States, is

4,000,000 men. A State having 40,000 men within this age group eligible for military service would furnish 1 man out of each 100 men called, or 1 percent of the national quota. A State having 80,000 men available would furnish 2 men out of each 100 men, or 2 percent of the national quota.

Within each State the quotas would be apportioned among the various counties and local board areas in the same proportion. Let us assume that the State with 40,000 men available has one county with 400 men available. In this instance, the county would furnish 1 out of each 100 men furnished by the State, or 1 percent of the State quota.

Each State and each community is to be credited with the number of men who would voluntarily enlist in any of the armed forces. If we assume that there are two States, each with 40,000 men available, and that 2,000 men have enlisted from one State and 1,000 men from the other State, the number of men to be selected from the second State would be 1,000 larger than the number selected from the first State.

At the present time there is not sufficient information to make any exact estimates of quotas. As an example of the method in which a quota would be determined, these figures are submitted for your State of Texas. None of the figures are based on anything except estimates.

Estimated number of registrants in Texas: 510,000 white, 89,000 colored.

Estimated class I (men available):

170,000 white

29,667 colored

199,667 estimated total available

If we estimate that 40,944 residents of Texas are members of the armed forces, the quota basis for Texas then becomes 240,611.

If we estimate that 37,944 of those in the armed forces are white and 3,000 are colored, the State of Texas would then be entitled to a credit for each of these amounts. Under a call for 400,000 men, using the above figures, Texas would furnish an estimated 24,021 men.

These figures all constitute a rough estimate and are not to be regarded as final. If it appears, when the accurate figures are received, that instead of 40,944 men from Texas who have enlisted in the armed services, there are 50,000 men from Texas, the quota allotted to Texas would be that much smaller. On the other hand, if the final figures disclosed that the number of men already furnished by Texas to the armed forces is approximately 10,000 less, then the quota for Texas would be approximately 10,000 larger.

Each State and each locality within the State will have its quotas established and its credits given for the men who have gone into the armed services voluntarily, according to the proportions which exist between the State and the Nation for State quotas, and between the country and the State for the local quotas.

The first call made under selective service would necessarily be based on estimates. Since the number of registrants in each State and the number of those registrants who are available for service could not be established until the system has had time to register and classify all the men within the age group, after the first call the estimates would be corrected to comply with the actual number in each instance.

It is entirely possible for a State to satisfy its entire obligation on the first call, and by continued volunteering to eliminate furnishing any men by the compulsory system. On the other hand, the States where volunteering lags would be required to make up these deficiencies through the selective-service system.

The committee will be glad to furnish any additional information desired by you. It is expected that more accurate figures will be available before it becomes necessary to apportion any quotas.

For the committee.

Yours very truly,

BEN R. HOWELL,
Major (Specialist-Reserve), G. S.

COMPONENT PARTS OF THE SELECTIVE-SERVICE SYSTEM

Local boards: Number, 6,500; 3 members per board. Nominated by Governors, appointed by President. Will be asked to serve without pay. Determine each case on its merits.

Government appeal agents: One to each local board. May appeal from any classification.

Examining physicians: One or more per local board. Examine only class I men.

Advisory board for registrants: One or more in each county. Composed of lawyers, school teachers, etc. Assist registrants in filling out questionnaires.

Boards of Appeal: Number, approximately 250. One or more for each State. Review appeals, and may affirm, reverse, or modify ruling of local board. Five or more men on each board of appeals.

Medical advisory boards: One or more for each State. Composed of specialists. Examine and determine doubtful medical cases.

State headquarters: One in each State. Composed of National Guard officers who have been trained. Will supervise operations of system within State.

National headquarters: Will supervise operation of the system in the States. Will distribute supplies and finances. Will allocate quotas among the States. Will make inspections of the system. Will determine questions of national policy.

OPERATIONS OF THE SYSTEM

Registration: Registration will be conducted by the persons who normally conduct elections. One registration place will be established in each voting precinct. Registration does not include any information except the registrant's name and where he can be located.

Selection: After registration the cards will be delivered to the local board by the county clerk. Each local board will have not more than 3,500 cards. The local boards number the cards before the national lottery. The national lottery determines the order in which each man will be called. Questionnaires are sent by the local board to the registrants in the order fixed by the national lottery. Advisory boards assist registrants in making out questionnaires, and the registrant is classified by the local board.

Classification: Registrants are divided into four classes:

Class I: Those available for service.

Class II: Those deferred because of occupation.

Class III: Those deferred for dependency.

Class IV: Aliens, the physically unfit, etc.

These classifications are subject to change by the boards at any time. The class I men are given physical examinations and the physically fit are selected. Induction takes place when calls are made by the service, after it has facilities available to shelter and train the men called.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, it has been stated that if a number of Members want time to speak on this important issue the House would sit very late. It now appears that a great many Members do want to speak and in accordance with an agreement with the majority leader we will probably be here until 10 o'clock tonight in order to give that opportunity to Members on both sides to speak.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, since those of us who entertain grave doubts as to the wisdom or necessity of enacting this measure authorizing conscription are freely termed short-sighted, let me preface my views on this bill with a simple statement of my personal attitude toward national defense, which was formulated during my period of service in the Army during the World War, and which I have held consistently during the past 21 years. I have believed, and I believe now, that the defense of America is a sacred responsibility which rests equally upon every citizen. I have always felt that every person, man, woman, or child, who enjoys the rights, privileges, and advantages of American citizenship should and must stand ready to contribute to the fullest of his ability to the protection of the Government and the free institutions which guarantee him these benefits. For 20 years I have urged universal military training in order that we might have an adequate reserve of manpower available to meet any national emergency, and to prevent a repetition of the criminal folly of 1917 when many of our young men with less than 3 months' training were sent into battle against seasoned veterans and their lives needlessly sacrificed upon the altar of unpreparedness. The principle of universal military training is just in that it most equally distributes the burdens of national defense.

Likewise, I have urged that the principle of universal service be applied to our national resources and energies, so that our tremendous productive capacity might most efficiently be directed to the creation of an adequate defense with the least injustice to any group or individual, and with the least possible economic dislocation.

Those are still my basic views today, just as they have been for more than 20 years. For weeks I have sat with my committee and have heard many witnesses testify for and against this measure. Because of my views on military training and my desire to provide for the adequate defense of my country, I was in sympathy with the principle involved but studiously kept an open mind until the hearings were closed. Yet I cannot support the proposal which is now before the House. I cannot support this measure because I believe that it departs in many important particulars from my fundamental beliefs; because I believe it would be dangerous in the hands of the present Executive; and because, with the present state of unpreparedness in our Army and Navy, it is untimely.

After the weeks of expert testimony we have heard on the subject, it still has not been demonstrated to my satisfaction

that this proposal of peacetime conscription of manpower and industry is necessary. Despite the assertions that voluntary enlistments will not provide the manpower required in our present defense program, there is sound reason to believe that even under existing regulations, enlistments will continue for some time to run ahead of the capacity of the Army or Navy to equip and train these men in well-integrated defense units.

It was only in May of this year that the Army began to accept enlistments without restriction. We are still asking our volunteers to sign up for a 3-year service period, and we have offered no other added attractions, such as pay increases and assurances that they will not be sent to Europe to fight, to secure volunteers. Still enlistments have mounted steadily since May. With reports for the month of August still incomplete, the Army has announced that more than 42,000 men have enlisted in this single month.

Army officials have conceded that if the basic pay should be increased from \$21 to \$30 per month, with a 1-year enlistment period provided, a further sharp increase in enlistments is certain. Even under present conditions, we are assured that the Army will reach the full strength for which money has been appropriated before the 1st of December.

Furthermore, under the recent authority to call out the National Guard and the Reserves for a year of active service with the Regular Army, the President may, at his discretion, mobilize a regular force in excess of a million men, including the Navy and marines. There is every sound reason to doubt that the Army can train, equip, and coordinate a body of from 400,000 to 1,200,000 drafted men, in addition to its still unfinished job of equipping the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Reserves with modern weapons in the coming 12 to 18 months. William S. Knudsen himself confirmed this serious doubt when he recently said to a Senate committee, "It will be 1942 before there will be complete equipment for 750,000 men."

Essentially the same is true of the Navy. Secretary Knox has testified before the committee that the Navy does not need additional manpower at the present time. In fact, he stated that the Navy has a waiting list of some 7,000 applicants for enlistment, and that he did not anticipate that the Navy would have any trouble enlisting all of the men needed for another year.

Why, then, this pressure for immediate conscription? Granting that we should start at the earliest possible moment to train men for our reserve forces, why should we not first be sure that we can adequately train and modernize our Regular Army, National Guard, and Reserves? Why not first check the Army's capacity to absorb, train, and equip drafted men through this first draft of the National Guard, which has already been authorized? Certainly the first requirement is to equip and train the defense forces already available. If our Regular Army, National Guard, and Reserves are fully equipped with the modern implements of defense and thoroughly schooled in the use of these mechanized weapons, they will provide a sound nucleus around which a larger fighting force to meet any requirements can be readily built.

If we could reserve this debate to the sole problem of providing adequate manpower for our defense program, the essential factors could be examined and an effective system could be devised without undue difficulty. Unfortunately, however, the problem is by no means that simple. Conscription of manpower is merely the first step—the entering wedge in what will inevitably be a drive to total conscription. In fact, the Senate has already clearly marked the course we will inevitably be asked to follow in its amendment which authorizes the President to conscript industry. My Committee on Military Affairs has fallen in line, and has reported a conforming amendment which will become a part of this bill before us.

Because "total defense" has a more pleasing sound, and because it rings a little more inspiringly over the radio than the rather harsh term "conscription," we have already heard such frequent reference to the phrase that we are becoming used to it. The advocates of total defense are weaving a very plausible, a very inspiring picture designed to draw our

attention away from the sinister implications in this drive toward a militaristic economy.

But total defense, or total conscription, has only one possible logical end. No matter how noble the ostensible purpose, now matter how plausible the apparent need is made to appear, total conscription is totalitarianism. It is a militaristic dictatorship.

If supporters of this measure, and particularly of this industrial conscription feature which we are now considering as an essential part of the bill, call us alarmists for pointing to these inherent dangers, perhaps they will explain why such a provision appears in this legislation at all. If it is not the actual intention of the administration to exercise some form of dictatorship over American industry, perhaps the advocates of this bill will explain why the Executive should not be satisfied with the tremendous power over industry which the National Defense Act of 1916 already gives him.

Section 120 of the Defense Act imposes binding responsibilities upon all potential producers of arms, equipment, and supplies to produce defense requirements. It empowers the President to take possession of plants where management fails willingly to meet defense requirements, and it carries the clear penalty of heavy fine and imprisonment for noncompliance. This law, amended upon the basis of our World War experience, has been deemed to provide ample guaranties that our manufacturing facilities will be directed to the purposes of national defense. What has happened in recent weeks or months that can possibly justify an administration in seeking even greater power over American industry in time of peace? In the weeks of hearings before our committee not one single person has appeared to request or justify this revolutionary peacetime proposal. No official of the War or Navy Department or of the National Defense Commission has complained of a lack of cooperation on the part of industry and asked for this legislation. Why then is it being forced upon the country?

The question seems particularly pertinent in view this administration's continuing head-long drive toward intervention in Europe. Just 24 hours ago we had the most spectacular example in a whole line of startling, precedent-shattering proofs that President Roosevelt is determined to drag this country again into the quarrels of Europe.

It wastes time to argue here now whether the sale of war implements to Great Britain, directly or indirectly, is in the interest of American security. It is even futile to argue the President is guilty of direct violation of law—the violation, in fact, of a statute which bears his own signature.

What we are looking at is an accomplished fact. Planes, guns, artillery, and finally naval vessels have actually been disposed of by the President. What is particularly pertinent is the manner in which these transfers have been accomplished. The main point is to examine again the methods the President has employed in his drive toward intervention.

First, we had the thin subterfuge of the trade-in, by which the President has been stripping our own Army and Navy of planes which he has sold to Britain. Yesterday, on this floor, my colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] described the transfer in direct violation of law of important quantities of Lee-Enfield rifles and 75-millimeter field pieces, which I imagine came as a distinct surprise to most of you here, and to the Nation.

Despite the obvious evidence that this course has shocked and alarmed the Nation, the President has not been deterred. In fact, he now becomes bolder, drops the trade-in subterfuge, which was no longer fooling anyone anyway, and now moves to outright sale of naval vessels to Britain.

And all of this happens despite the clear intention of this Congress to prevent such an outright sale. You will remember the attempted sale of several units of the "mosquito fleet," or small motor torpedo vessels, which the administration undertook to transfer to Britain this past June. Thanks to an alert Member of this body, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who cited the act of June 15, 1917, chapter 30, 40 Statutes, pages 217, 222—

During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel, built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war, or converted from a private vessel into a vessel of war, with any intent or under any agreement or contract, written or oral, that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation, or to an agent, officer, or citizen of such nation, or with reasonable cause to believe that the said vessel shall or will be employed in the service of any such belligerent nation after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States—

This sale was halted and the 23 units of the "mosquito fleet" slated for delivery to Britain were saved for the time being for our own Navy.

It was on account of this incident, and this incident alone, that the Congress thereupon added to the Naval Appropriation Act, Public, 671, of June 28, 1940—

SEC. 14. (a) Notwithstanding the provision of any other law, no military or naval weapon, ship, boat, aircraft, munitions, supplies, or equipment to which the United States has title, in whole or in part, or which have been contracted for, shall hereafter be transferred, exchanged, sold, or otherwise disposed of in any manner whatsoever unless the Chief of Naval Operations, in case of naval material, and the Chief of Staff of the Army, in the case of military material, shall first certify that such material is not essential to the defense of the United States—

A specific prohibition against the sale of naval vessels. There could be no possible doubt at the White House of the intention of Congress in that instance. Now, just 2 months later, the Attorney General has tortured the meaning of this provision and, through legal sophistry and subterfuge, has issued specific directions to the Chief of Naval Operations, who has steadily opposed the transfer of these destroyers from the American Navy, to reverse his previous opinion, and thus has contrived a devious escape for the President.

By indirection, subterfuge, and sophistry and the most palpable evasion, therefore, the President and this administration continue stubbornly on their headlong course. Now, finally we have committed what cannot possibly be termed anything but an outright act of hostility. And if you should ask how this course, culminating in the outright sale or trade of these destroyers, is justified you will get no better answer than that international law is a thing of the past; that since the rules of decency have been discarded by dictator nations, we should divest ourselves of stuffy moral and ethical principles by which we have always operated as a dignified nation. In the words of Secretary of War Stimson:

It is not a question of complying with formalities like the declaration of war. You all know that nations do not declare war now; they wage it.

Implicit in our foreign relations now is the code of the dictator, whose declaration of war is delivered by guns, bombs, and torpedoes. If we have adopted the code, we should not be surprised that the code is invoked against us. If there are reprisals against us—and there doubtless will be if the enemies against whom we have declared ourselves are able to undertake reprisals successfully—the final step will have been taken.

It is not surprising, therefore, that this original question of conscription of manpower should raise such alarmed protest from the country. It is not surprising that even greater alarm should follow this sweeping proposal which would deliver American industry, and eventually the entire American economy, into the hands of an interventionist Executive.

Make no mistake about it. Industrial conscription, broadly interpreted under the loose provisions of this measure, is the straight road to total conscription.

It may sound well to the unthinking to order that a plant or an industry be commandeered for defense production. But you cannot conscript a factory or an industry without ultimately conscripting the manpower in that plant or industry. When the Army or Navy officer walks into the front office, clothed in the power and authority of the Federal Government, the hard-won rights of labor are on their way out. You simply do not argue with official orders. The man in the plant can no more dispute the authority of the Federal officer to impose conditions in the operation of the plant under his control than can the private in uniform defy the orders of his captain.

President Roosevelt himself has made unmistakably clear the principle that there is no power to strike against the Federal Government. There can be nothing more certain, therefore, than that it is not capital or wealth but labor which will ultimately suffer most under industrial conscription. Fortunately American labor leaders are fully awake to this inevitable outcome.

From labor, of course, it is a simple step to bring storekeepers, professions, and services under this control. It is only another short step to cover the farmer who feeds and clothes the defense worker or who supplies the raw materials for the factory.

It is easy to shout "conscript the wealth." In fact, this politically expedient but woefully shortsighted course is particularly tempting when you are cornered by the command from the administration to conscript American youth. But I warn you to think carefully before you undertake to do either.

Conscript manpower and you have immensely bolstered the assurance and determination of a President who, in spite of every deterring influence, has driven consistently nearer and nearer American involvement in this war. Give this President similar power over American wealth and industry and the pattern for a militaristic dictatorship is complete. There is nothing, then, to prevent him from taking us without further subterfuge or indirection into actual participation. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER].

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, all of us in this House of Representatives must appreciate our grave responsibility. We are considering a bill that will authorize a radical departure in our peacetime national-defense plans. Those of us who favor it feel that the emergency confronting the Nation today is greater than it faced after the declaration of war in 1917. We realize that nations have succumbed to physical effects which were far less terrible than those which were endured in the last World War. Loss of life has diminished in this war but decisions of far greater effect upon the fate of nations and the destiny of mankind have been made. Through strategic moves, the application of scientific and mechanized forces, resistance has been paralyzed and advantages gained as the result of which millions of men become incapable of further resistance or judge themselves incapable of continuing the fight. This has been the history of Europe since Hitler started to impose his will upon it.

We believe that the whole situation is so acute, so pregnant with dire possibilities for this country, for its future and the preservation of its institutions that we must prepare, not only in the way of material that this Congress has already authorized, but we must train our young men, so that they may be ready to wield if necessary the weapons which are being forged by a free and independent America.

Those who in good faith in this House and throughout the Nation oppose this bill are influenced by the arguments that the voluntary system of enlistments has not been given a full enough trial and that our armed forces could be amply augmented if we put on a drive for volunteers. They also believe that we are imposing upon the country a militaristic system which will be its undoing and which cannot be abandoned after it is once started.

Let us be fair and say that both sides in this historic controversy are deeply conscious of the importance of the decision and each feels that his cause is righteous. It would seem that we should be able to get a clear conception of this thing and chart a correct course from certain historical facts both of the past and the immediate present. Most of us will admit that if war should come to this country on any considerable scale, we should have to have conscription immediately. Our wars of the past have proven that the voluntary system is inadequate and that a compulsory selective service law is the only democratic, fair, and practical way in which to raise armies when the Nation is imperiled. This is more than ever true today; for, when a modern industrial nation such as the United States is attacked by a major foe, it

means the utilization of all of the resources of the country. Not only must manpower be inducted into the combat forces but industry, agriculture, scientific development and practice must not be crippled. There must be such wise selection that those who are taken into the Army do not stop the flow of supplies of the farm and of industry needed both for the armed forces and the civilian population. We must insure the continuation of our economic life and be sure that the man who will render the most valuable service in industry, agriculture, or other necessary employment remains where he can do the best job for the Nation and does not come into the military service. You cannot do this under the voluntary system, which takes men without selection and oftentimes brings into our military forces those who could best serve elsewhere. Our national requirements cannot be met by any system of voluntary service. It will take some form of selective service. Selective service is just, fair, and democratic. Through it the responsibility and burden of military service will fall fairly and equally on every class of our citizens, high and low, rich and poor alike. It insures that we will get the men we need at the time we need them. It is the only system which prevents the entire burden of military service falling upon the willing and it is the only one which provides us with the defense force we should have with a minimum of delay and with the least disruption of our economic system.

We have always managed to get along in this country in peacetimes with a very small Regular Army, citizen soldiers known as the National Guard, and the Reserve officers who have had partial training and are designed to officer any civilian army that may have to be called into being in an emergency. In the past, it has been great civilian armies that have fought the wars of America. There was a time when it might have been somewhat truthfully said that in the event of the invasion of our country a million men would spring to arms overnight to defend her. Unfortunately, such is not the situation today. Even though a million youths might wish to volunteer their services in time of the Nation's peril, it takes months and months to prepare equipment and arms for them and it takes long and tedious training and discipline to make of these raw recruits troops who are capable of functioning with the modern weapons of warfare.

Have you ever stopped to ponder the duties of a modern artilleryman, of the enlisted men who are assigned to the Signal Corps with all its highly scientific instrumentalities—the radio, sound detection, and communication devices? We could go on and enumerate other highly technical branches and services in the modern Army—the Tank Corps, and mechanized divisions, the Air Corps where months must be spent in the training of ground-school mechanics, the flying cadets who are the military pilots of tomorrow, who must take a preliminary training of 9 months and then be assigned to a tactical unit for some 9 months longer, a total of a year and a half, before they are given assignments as individuals upon the big bombers and the very fast pursuit and fighter ships.

But you say, Why should we train men at this time? Why not wait until war is declared or it is imminent? Can no democratic country in these times see the necessity for preparing itself against the worst? France hoped for the best and France is a Nazi dependency. Britain hoped for the best and Britain is in a bitter struggle for existence. And yet we postpone the day of starting compulsory military training and we argue and debate and refuse to face the realities of the situation. In my judgment, we cannot afford to gamble on the voluntary system of enlistments even for a trial period.

What are the facts with reference to the present strength of our armed forces and proposed expansion of these, as well as the possibility of obtaining the necessary manpower by the voluntary system? The existing Regular Army has a strength of approximately 280,000 men; and while the National Guard has a strength at present of approximately 242,000 officers and men, it is estimated that when it is called into active Federal service its total strength will shrink to not to exceed 170,000 men, the others being elim-

inated by resignations, dependency, and other reasons. If we are to fill up the Regular Army to its authorized strength of 375,000 men and bring up the National Guard to its authorized strength of approximately 400,000, we should have to recruit by voluntary enlistment 95,000 for the Regular Establishment and 230,000 for the National Guard, a total of 325,000 men. Remember that it will require 12,000 men each month to keep the Regular Army at its authorized strength as vacancies to that number are caused each month by termination of enlistment periods and other reasons. This maintenance figure of 12,000 monthly is based on experience with 3-year enlistments. Such a number would, of course, have to be greatly increased with the use of the 1-year enlistment period.

Can the voluntary system, operating alone, procure 400,000 trainees by the first of the year, together with the number of men required to bring the regular forces and National Guard to their respective authorized strength, together with the additional men needed to fill vacancies in the regular forces? Absolutely not; and, furthermore, the voluntary system operating alone cannot thereafter procure the 400,000 trainees who will be called up later in 1941 and those that may be called from time to time during the period that this bill would be in force. Even though we did speed up voluntary enlistments and we managed to obtain 50,000 monthly or better, which is in excess of any volunteering to date, we would have to first send 12,000 of these to the Regular Army for replacements, and at that rate of enlistment it would take us at least a year to get 400,000 men if we leave out of account making up the strength of the National Guard, which we have directed shall be called into active Federal service, this number being, as I have pointed out, 230,000.

Whose advice are you going to take upon this tremendously important subject? If you are going to accept the counsel of our military leaders—The Chief of Staff, General Marshall; General Shedd, Assistant Chief of Staff, who is the War Department expert upon enlistments and training; and other high-ranking officers of the Army—who have made studies over the years relative to our national-defense problems and needs, then there should be no hesitancy on your part in voting for the system of training and service authorized by this bill, for all of these men have given it their firm approval. They feel the dangers to this country and the present world situation are most grave. They know, as every thinking citizen does, that if England goes under our defense problems are greatly intensified.

Some of you talked yesterday that you might be willing to train some of the youth of the land if they would be held in the continental United States. This bill contemplates that we will fill up the regular forces with those who are selected and that they will get their training and experience with seasoned troops and those having the very best equipment available at this time. We are not expanding the officer personnel of the Regular Army; and by the time it reaches its authorized strength of 375,000 men practically 60 percent of its officers will be Reserve officers on extended active duty, men who will return to civilian life after the emergency is over. This should be some indication that those who head our War Department are not planning or seeking to impose upon this Nation a great military program which will be continuous from this time henceforth. They are seeking only to do this job in the American way, in the democratic way, in as efficient a way as we the Congress of the United States will let them do it.

It is inconceivable to those of us who have thoroughly considered and studied the requirements of our national defense that, when so much is at stake, anyone should even suggest a trial of the system which we know in advance is doomed to failure.

We who recognize the immediate requirements for an adequate, impregnable, and inexhaustible defense cannot and will not be parties to any program, substitute, or amendment which would in any way require the gambling with the security and integrity of this Nation.

All proposals or amendments which would prohibit entirely or even postpone for a short period of time the immediate

use of the compulsory system of selection are proposals which require the most inexcusable and foolhardy gambling.

We do not propose to gamble on what we know will be a losing proposition. To gamble and to lose when the stakes are what they are is unforgivable. The loss will not merely be proof that the voluntary system will not get the required number of men; it may be the complete annihilation of our democratic form of government, our institutions, our homes, and all those things we hold so dear to us.

Some people who would delay the passage of a compulsory selective service law, and who still insist we can obtain enough voluntary enlistments to fill the Regular Army, the National Guard, and provide sufficient trainees, brings to mind an apt comparison. Suppose any school, college, or university starts its term, its regular curriculum and course of study during the month of September, and then says that it will receive students each week through the academic year, ending next June. Do you think that institution would make much of a showing in educating those who dribbled into its portals during the next 9 months? No; colleges realize that they must get their students at fixed times, so that they may be divided and apportioned among the classes in order that the students may have the benefit of making an even start, and have advantage of the full training. In the same way, the Army will be able to do a much better job in training these young men if it can have them in regular increments at the time it is prepared to initiate their training.

There is another argument that one hears frequently advanced, but which has been thoroughly discredited by General Marshall, that we do not have modern equipment to train these men, and that they should not be called up until modern paraphernalia is available. The Chief of Staff, in his testimony, found on pages 109 and 110 of the hearings before your Military Affairs Committee, made it very clear that we had ample rifles and other weapons available, so that the trainees will have ample equipment, this being particularly true as the basic training takes quite some time.

There are two very compelling reasons that appeal to those of us who have sons who will be of an age to be subject to this training and service during this period. It is a well-known fact, demonstrated in the World War and in the present conflict in Europe, that it is trained, prepared, and disciplined divisions that suffer few casualties. The losses are far greater among those combat units that are filled with raw recruits who had have but little training, discipline, and experience. I feel very strongly that if my sons were called to service, and they could have the training provided by this bill, their chances of coming back whole or at all in case of actual warfare would be much greater. Then there is the other compelling reason why this measure should be adopted. It is the desire that this country may avoid war. All of our people share in this desire. The question before us is not one of involvement in the European war; it is the question as to whether we shall prevent European aggression from reaching across the ocean and inflicting war upon us. If we make up our minds that we are going to be in a position to protect this Nation; if we are going to provide the necessary modern weapons of warfare—and this Congress has not been niggardly in its appropriations for that purpose; if we are going to supplement such effort by training enough of our young men, so that we have an adequate reserve of disciplined, prepared citizen-soldiers, Germany, dominated as it is by one man, will hesitate to attack us. Money appropriations for equipment, mechanical and otherwise, are not sufficient. We must have an adequate supply of trained men. With them we have a state of preparedness that will go a long way toward insuring the people of this Nation that we can continue to live in peace.

Let us bear in mind that this bill contains some important terms which indicate its temporary nature and the continuing authority of the Congress over what is done under its provisions. It is a temporary measure, for by its terms the law ceases to function as of May 15, 1945, except as to the refresher training which may be hereafter established. It provides that no more than 1,000,000 men for both the land and sea forces can be in training at any one time. The training is for 1 year. Any young man between the ages of 18 and 35

may enlist and get credit for the year's training before being drafted. Many doubtless may wish to do this after graduating from high school and before entering college. No men can be inducted until Congress specifically appropriates the money for the number it deems necessary to raise. The service of these trainees is restricted to the Western Hemisphere. They are not being trained and equipped for service in Europe. Army pay is raised from \$21 to \$30 per month. Men are to be returned to their jobs in industry. The foregoing is but a statement of what the bill contains and is brought up here for the purpose of making it clear to you that there is no intent through this legislation to foist upon the country a permanent military system involving the training of huge numbers of men yearly.

We have heard again during these 2 days of debate the argument that has been advanced so frequently in the past that we are imposing upon our people a peacetime compulsory-service law. I submit that it may more accurately be called a program of emergency training and service rather than one of peacetime service. It is in no sense a proposal for the establishment of compulsory military training as a permanent and normal part of the American defense system. Anyone who fails to see an emergency as far as this country is concerned, in view of the conquest of Poland, Norway, Holland, and Belgium, the fall of France, and the attack upon the British Isles must be blind indeed. We all hope and pray that war may not be brought to us. We do not know that Hitler intends to try and dominate the world as well as all Europe. In my humble judgment, we cannot take chances on what he may do or try to do. It is far better to be over-prepared than underprepared. Let us face this emergency as men and do those things which we think are best for the future of this Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, we are now faced with one of the most serious questions ever presented to a free people. This is the hardest vote I have faced during my services in the House of Representatives, and it is only after serious thought and study that I have become firmly convinced that the enactment of this legislation will forever change America from a free, peace-loving Nation to a military dictatorship. I believe that a draft in wartimes is justified, and in case of war I favor not only a draft of the young men of this country but of industry and capital. In other words, if we are going into a war, it must be a war of every citizen and every agency.

We are now asked to adopt military conscription during peacetimes. It is a radical departure and, once adopted, will become a part of our national policy. Let us not be under any illusion. It is stated that this measure is for a 5-year period, but once we establish this European system it will be with us forever. The business of Europe is war, and now we are adopting their policy. None of us will live long enough to rid ourselves of this system. European history proves that no nation has ever rid itself of militarism except by revolution. This legislation is an ever-growing force which will keep us regimented and will continue to ever increase the restrictions on our freedom and liberty. The enactment of this legislation carries with it three vital and fundamental changes in our past and present traditions and well-being.

First, we abandon the time-honored traditions of a peace-loving, liberty-loving people and adopt a military despotism.

Second, a division of our citizens into two classes, namely, the military and ruling class and the common citizen whose freedom and future will be regimented and restricted.

Third, we place the financial burden of a military nation on our economic structure that will enslave us in the future.

It is argued by the proponents of this measure that the selective draft is the only democratic way. I do not agree with them. Enactment of this bill will permit the Federal Government to take our young men and place them in any type of service it desires. In other words, the young men of our Nation will not be privileged to choose what particular

line of service they want but will merely become a cog in a great machine. In the past the citizens of our Nation have achieved high ideals and great undertakings because of their freedom of choice. Now it is proposed that we are to turn our backs on that record of achievement and let the state act in behalf of the individual. I want the young men of this Nation to have the opportunities that our forefathers planned for them. Surely we have not forgotten that our democracy was fostered and founded by citizens who were fleeing the traditions of the Old World. Our forefathers left the militarism and regimentation of European countries in order to establish this land of the free. Is it possible that we who say we are opposed to that type of government are now going to embrace and adopt it in our own land? How can we justify our opposition to the methods of Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini when we are enacting the very legislation that has made them and their methods powerful?

The people of the United States are for peace and not for war. There are a few who are desirous of involving this country in the present European conflict. It is less than 25 years ago that we entered a European conflict in order to save the world for democracy. Certainly the experiences and lessons of that war have not been forgotten. Our foreign policy should be to quit meddling in the power politics of Europe. The European nations with their vast military machines must engage in wars if their leaders are to retain their supremacy and power. If we enter into alliances with European nations it means we will be embroiled in every war fought on European soil. Let us not forget the words of George Washington, who said, "Beware of foreign entanglements."

My second point is that we will divide our citizens into two groups socially and economically. Under these conditions it is only natural that the preference will go to the military group. Our educational system will be revamped to meet that situation. The individual initiative will give way to the precision of military discipline. The training for invention, production, and research will give way to the training for destruction. A military discharge paper from a training camp will take precedence over a college degree. This changed condition will not only affect the training of our youth, but will also affect the mind and thought of our youth. Individual thinking will give way to mass thinking and the young men of our Nation will become cogs in a great machine. Their minds will be trained to blind obedience and our Nation will become incapable of a democracy.

It is under these conditions that totalitarian governments develop and succeed. Conscript the youth of the Nation and put them in a war machine and war will inevitably follow. If we pass this measure we turn our backs upon the greatest tradition of our country and destroy the boast of a free people.

My third point is that this change of policy will place a great financial burden upon this Nation. So far no one has discussed the cost of this program. From information I have been able to gather it will cost at least \$1,400,000,000 to provide for the training now being planned in the bills pending in Congress. I believe we should carefully consider the placing of this great burden on the people of our Nation. This burden will greatly increase as this military machine grows and develops. It would mean that people who are not of military age would at all times be spending their energy in caring for millions of other men who did nothing but prepare for military service. It means that our citizens will be spending their time and energy developing a military machine that is larger than any other military machine on the face of the earth. The militaristic leaders of the Nation are not satisfied nor can the citizens of a militaristic nation feel secure until they have the most modern and largest military nation on the face of the earth. One step leads to another and eventually we are headed that way. In my opinion it means the end of America as we have known it. It means the end of the one truly democratic nation of the world. It means trading freedom and democracy for regimentation and dictatorship. Let us not do it. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have given this legislation my most careful consideration. I have listened to the arguments on both sides of the question. I have studied the committee reports and the hearings, and tried to figure out in my own mind the far-reaching consequences and effect of this legislation to the people of our country. I may be wrong in my conclusion, but I cannot support this proposal. Time alone will determine whether our action on this bill has been right or wrong. Let it be understood that I am in favor of an adequate defense program. In view of the world situation, we must increase and build our defenses just as rapidly and orderly as possible.

However, I do not believe we should yield to peacetime conscription, except as a last resort. To do so is to adopt a policy that is in direct opposition to that which has been followed by our Government throughout the years. The policy of this bill is not the American way.

I shall not take time to discuss the details of the bill, except to call your attention to the fact that we now have approximately 1,000,000 men in our armed forces—200,000 of them in the Navy. We are advised that those in the Army and Air Corps do not now have sufficient equipment. According to Mr. Knudsen, it will take until 1942 to properly equip 750,000 men. I think we ought to give our volunteer service a little better chance. Let them enlist for 1 year, and pay them at least \$30 per month. They are now enlisting at the rate of forty to fifty thousand per month.

The Honorable Harry Woodring, Secretary of War opposed the policy of military conscription, and said that voluntary enlistments should be given a fair chance. I just do not believe we have come to a place where we should immediately yield to compulsory conscription military service as demanded by this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I want now to direct your attention to two amendments that I shall expect to offer to this bill at the proper time. The first amendment provides for extending the maximum age from 45 years to 60 years as originally proposed. It is my contention that if we are going to set up a system of drafting the manpower of this country, in the name of or for the purpose of national defense—we ought to extend it so that every able-bodied man may have a chance to do his part in the defense of his country. It is not necessary that he become a member of the armed forces—but he might be called upon in many of the other services which will contribute to the carrying out of the national-defense program. In other words, if you are going to follow a policy of registering men up to the age of 45 years, then you ought to go ahead and extend that registration to include several million more men who will be just as capable of performing whatever duties may be required, and who have not passed the age of their usefulness.

The other amendment that I want to submit is to provide for striking out the exemption that is provided in this bill for Members of Congress as well as members of other legislative bodies. I think it comes with little grace for Members of Congress to specifically exempt themselves under the terms of the bill, and demand that the farmer, the mechanic, the storekeeper, and men from various walks of life, be required to take their turn under the provisions of this program. Congress exempted its membership from service in 1917. Let us not make that mistake again.

Mr. Chairman, let me say again, never before in the history of our Nation, has such far-reaching legislation been submitted to Congress in peacetime.

Whatever may be the outcome of this legislation let us do everything within our power to keep our country out of the European war. We just do not belong in that catastrophe.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

AMERICAN SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of H. R. 10132 involving a selective service for the manpower of the Nation. This bill proposes a fair, equitable, and just system of com-

pulsory selective military training and induction into service. The obligations of military service and the privileges of that service should be shared by all equally. That is exactly what the current bill prescribes, and further, the enforcement is left to local boards composed primarily of one's neighbors. Of course, hardships, inconveniences, and difficulties may accompany selection and induction into the service. That is the price one must pay for living in a republic and a democracy as grand and noble as our own.

IN TIME OF PEACE WE MUST PREPARE FOR WAR

It has been argued that this bill establishes a precedent in the sense that it provides for peacetime compulsory military training and service. Would the opponents of the bill wait until Hitler declares war upon us? It is the fashion these days not to declare war. The axis powers did not declare war on Belgium or Holland or Norway or Denmark. They attacked and conquered and then declared war. If Hitler has any designs on this country, he is not going to waste or mince words in a declaration of war. He is going to strike, and strike hard, at the first opportunity. All that stands between Hitler and us is the Atlantic Ocean and the British Navy. Once the British Navy is gone the Atlantic Ocean is a mere pond. It has always been said, "In time of peace, prepare for war." We must be prepared. A volunteer army cannot give us the proper and appropriate preparedness. Time is of the essence. We must set up a sort of conscription rotary army now.

We cannot start to prepare after the die is cast. We cannot throw raw recruits into battle as we did in the beginning of the World War. Time must be had to train them. We cannot, must not throw volunteers (with no adequate time to train or harden them) into the fray to become cannon fodder.

This bill is no sign of war. It involves us in no commitment for war. It is simply a precautionary measure. It is no pledge to Great Britain. It is purely to have an adequate force ready where necessary to defend our homes and firesides.

ENGLAND'S DIFFICULTIES NOTWITHSTANDING

It is argued that we are pulling England's chestnuts out of the fire. This argument is ridiculous. It must be understood that the bill specifically provides that those inducted into the service shall only serve on the Western Hemisphere, or in our colonial possessions. This limitation precludes our sending a single man to England. England's difficulties have nothing whatsoever to do with this draft bill. Let us hope that England wins. She and the Atlantic Ocean are our bulwarks to the east. Frankly, if we did not have these vanguards of defense, Hitler would have been at our doors long since. We must prepare against Hitler and Mussolini. We must also safeguard our commercial supremacy. We only consume in this country 90 percent of what we produce. We must export this 10-percent surplus in order to live. A good deal of that exportable surplus goes to South America. Once Hitler and Mussolini fasten their fingers into South America, the countries thereof would no longer take our surplus, and without that surplus being exported, we economically perish. Our democracy would be gone and our citizens would be reduced to the status of robots. Our mode and method of living might be reduced to that of slaves. It is to prevent these evils that we set up this rotary army called by the selective-draft method. It is to maintain our supremacy commercially and economically as well as naval and military supremacy.

THE VOLUNTEER SYSTEM IS AN UNDEMOCRATIC SYSTEM

The selective-service system is democratic in the sense that all are treated alike. The rich man and the powerful man have no more rights than the poor man or the indigent one. A great lottery determines who shall or shall not go. That same lottery determines who shall go first and who shall go last. Personalities have no part in the selection or the induction. Under the volunteer system, those without funds or without jobs, without place or position are naturally the ones to volunteer. In other words, the poor volunteers come to the support of the rich and poor alike. That is wrong. The force of economic circumstances ordinarily forces the poor man to enlist.

Furthermore, voluntary enlistments cannot fill the need of either the Army or the Navy. The Army got 16,177 3-year volunteers in June last; 23,234 in July. It could doubtlessly fill out its Regular forces to 375,000 by ballyhoo and expensive advertising. But keep this in mind—the primary objective of peacetime conscription by selective-draft method is not to create merely a standing army. We wish to assure the United States a huge rotating reserve of trained men to be called in an emergency, to be called out quickly in wartime. That is why Congress has been asked to select 400,000 draftees by October 1, and another 400,000 next April. Give these draftees a year's training. They are then to be returned to private and civil life and are to be replaced by another class of draftees. The National Guard, which has recently been called, will be used to train the draftees. We can rely upon such an army of draftees properly trained within the proper time.

The history of our previous wars indicates that reliance cannot be placed upon volunteers. Washington bitterly complained about the inadequacy of this system. He recommended that the States organize their militia for home defense, and after they were trained, they were urged to join the Continental Army. He could never get sufficient men to volunteer for enlistment in the Regular forces. Even with offers of large cash bounties, it was found that voluntary enlistment was most unsatisfactory. Washington had to call constantly upon the States for militia to assist in his operations. As a result of the insufficiency of the volunteer system, the American Army was constantly in danger of final disaster. For example, Washington reported from Morristown, N. J., on March 14, 1777, that he had but 1,000 Regulars and 2,000 militia, whose engagement expired that same month, to face over 20,000 British in and around New York. Because the Central Government lacked power to raise an effective army, the war dragged out for 7 years, during which the Americans employed a total of almost 400,000 men, while the greatest strength of the enemy in any one year was but 42,000. The conclusions that Washington drew were as follows: First, the only effective troops were those enlisted for the duration of the war; second, the method of voluntary enlistment was not able to supply adequate men. After the Revolutionary War, Washington proposed to the First Congress a true selective service. He failed to get Congress to heed.

He wanted Congress to raise an army and classify men by age and physical fitness—to segregate the fit men between 18 and 25 years of age into separate units and to give them special training by selected instructors. He thus hoped to develop an effective citizen army. We are developing such a citizen army by the current bill.

Jefferson and Madison, after Washington, made the same proposals, but to no effect.

The mistakes of the Revolutionary War were repeated in the War of 1812. We employed all told 527,000 men, while the enemy never had over 16,500 in the field against us at any one time. The war dragged out futilely for 3 years. A Regular Army of numbers adequate to win the war was authorized but could not be recruited. Even when bounties were offered, the volunteer system broke down. Conscription for the National Army was then proposed, but the old prejudice in favor of the State militia was too strong, and it was decided to rely on it again. The States accordingly turned out their levies—undisciplined mobs under untrained officers. The old weaknesses were again demonstrated. The action at Bladensburg, in defense of the National Capital, illustrates perfectly the working of the militia system. Four thousand four hundred men were drafted a day or two before from their fields and shops, and obediently answered the summons. But, they fled at the first shot. The result—the Capitol building burned and in ruins. The White House was so smeared with smoke that, after the war, it had to be repainted. It was repainted white, and ever after has been called the White House.

The same situation developed in the Mexican War. As one result of the short enlistment period for volunteers, General Scott had to send home 4,000 men, over 40 percent of his

army, when he was in the middle of his advance to Mexico City, and at a time when Santa Anna was admitting that Mexico no longer had an army. Scott then had to wait weeks for new regiments, while the enemy recovered. The mistake of not making enlistments for the duration of the war greatly prolonged hostilities.

The limited volunteer system again caused tragic results in the Civil War. For example, Union troops in the Shenandoah region refused to remain beyond their 3 months and the Confederate troops there were free to move to Manassas, where they proved to be successful against Union volunteers. Union troops in the Manassas area actually marched away to the sound of the cannon, because their time had expired. Lincoln reported that 1 year voluntary recruiting actually collapsed July 1862. In desperation the Government, under Lincoln, ordered that a draft of 300,000 militia be immediately called into the service of the United States, to serve for 9 months, unless sooner discharged. It became clear to Lincoln that previous unsound volunteer recruiting policies would cripple the northern war effort. He therefore determined upon the draft. But, it must be remembered, the draft was introduced unfortunately 2 years after the war began. It was not popular because the Federal Government alone conducted the draft machinery. Be it remembered that the instant draft bill provides local machinery by local draft boards. Also, the Civil War draft bill fell heavily on the poor and allowed the rich to escape. After being drafted a man could either hire a substitute or purchase exemption outright for \$300. These provisions favored not only the rich individual, but also the rich district. The present draft bill especially prohibits substitutions and bounties.

The Confederacy realized their mistakes quicker than the Union forces did. After 1 year of volunteer system, general conscription was employed by the South. The conclusion is inescapable—that whenever the volunteer system was tried in our previous wars, it broke down or was highly inadequate and costly, particularly in human life. We must remember these lessons. We remembered that in the World War and organized our forces as a result of the selective-draft system.

THE DEMOCRATIC METHOD

All men between the ages of 21 and 45 must register. It is expected that 24,000,000 men will appear before local draft boards. A draft board will be organized for each 30,000 population. There will be appellate or district boards co-terminous with the Federal judicial districts. Each person compelled to register will be given a serial number on a registration certificate which he will carry around with him. The first one to register will be given serial No. 1. The second will be given serial No. 2, and so forth, until all those having registered will be assigned a serial number. This practice is repeated in each local draft board. At a given date, a director of the selective service who is appointed by the President, will arrange for a lottery to determine the order in which registrants shall be drafted into and inducted into the service. Numbers will be inscribed on pieces of paper and each piece of paper will be inserted into a separate capsule. Each capsule will be sealed and placed in a huge bowl. These capsules are then well churned in the bowl. The President, or the Secretary of War, or the Director of the selective service, or someone high in authority is blindfolded and picks out the first capsule. Let us assume it bears the number 500. Every registrant in every local board whose serial number is 500 will be the first to be called. Let us assume the second capsule bears the No. 7. Every registrant having serial No. 7 in every local draft board will be the second to be called. This practice continues until all the numbers have been pulled out of the bowl. Thus, all registrants are assigned the order of their induction.

It is proposed to call about 400,000 men around about October 1, and 400,000 again next spring. Thus, chance determines who shall go first, second, third, and so forth. Nothing is left to the discretionary powers of anyone. The rich man is not privileged. The rich and the poor men are accorded the same treatment. Can anything be more democratic?

DEFERMENT BECAUSE OF DEPENDENCIES AND ESSENTIAL EMPLOYMENT

The regulations will prescribe that in class A will go the single men with no family dependencies, including those physically and mentally able. In the deferred class will go those with family obligations and those who are in essential employments, as well as those who are physically defective, together with nondeclarant aliens and conscientious objectors. This deferred class will not be called for service until Class 1 has been exhausted.

Under the House bill, it is proposed to draft no more than 1,000,000 men. The Senate bill provides for the drafting of 900,000. The Senate bill provides for the registration of all male citizens, as well as aliens, who have declared their intention of becoming citizens, who are between the ages of 21 and 31. The House bill extends the number to include persons who are between 31 and 45. The Senate bill provides for approximately 12,000,000 registrants, and the House bill provides for 24,000,000, or twice as many.

I prefer the House bill. I think we should get as wide as possible an inventory of the human power of the Nation. We must be prepared for all eventualities.

DEBT MORATORIUM

The benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors Recovery Act of 1918 are extended to all draftees. This means that all those drafted are free from harassment and injury in connection with their civil affairs during their terms of service. All court proceedings against them are stayed. All executions are stayed. There can be no evacuation against them for failure to pay rent. There can be no foreclosure of mortgages against them. All installment payments on mortgages or the purchase of real or personal property are stayed. All insurance premiums are stayed. No payments on insurance policies need be made during the term of service. There can be no lapsing or suspension of the insurance. No property can be repossessed. The statute of limitations is extended for the duration of the service. In other words, the soldier or the sailor serving under the act will have the benefit of the suspension of all legal proceedings and transactions against him.

JOBS TO BE HELD OPEN FOR DRAFTEES

All those who serve shall have the right to claim return to their jobs, if the application for such reemployment is made 40 days after the soldier is relieved from his military service. If he is in the Government employ, he is to be restored to his original position, with no loss of seniority, status, or pay. If he was in the employ of a private employer, the latter is directed to restore the soldier or sailor to such position, or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay, unless the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make it impossible or unreasonable to do so. The soldier may hail his employer into a Federal court to determine whether or not his refusal to reinstate him as indicated is reasonable or unreasonable. The Federal court can direct that the private employer reinstate the soldier or sailor. He can take such a proceeding without fees or court costs into the district courts of the United States.

The director of selective service must establish a personnel division to aid persons who have completed service under the bill in finding employment elsewhere if replacement in their former positions are impossible or unreasonable. If the person was in the employ of any State or political subdivision thereof, it is the sense of Congress that the soldier be restored to said State or municipal position, or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay.

COMPENSATION

The compensation provided for in the bill is \$30 per month. I think this sum is inadequate and should be increased to at least \$50 per month.

CONSCRIPTION OF INDUSTRY

The bill provides for the conscription of manpower. Therefore, accompanying same should be the conscription, if necessary, of industry. If, for example, a plant, factory, or entity refuses to cooperate in the manufacture or assembly of a certain product essential to our national defense, our Government cannot sit idly by and take that punishment from that

private manufacturer without protest, without remonstrance, without penalty. If the article thus made in that plant owned by that noncooperative manufacturer or recalcitrant manufacturer is necessary to our national defense, the Government should have a right to take over that plant during the national emergency and control the manufacture of the essential articles manufactured therein. However, it is essential that the act describe certain definite standards by which the officials of the Government shall judge those noncooperative or recalcitrant manufacturers. All action must be fair and judicial. The Government shall seize the plant, but compensation or rental shall be determined by the governing military authorities. If, however, the owner of the plant feels aggrieved that the amount fixed for the rental is insufficient, he shall have the right to go into court and have the court determine adequate compensation for the period that the Government shall be in possession of the plant or factory. In this way the Government shall have the right to take possession of an essential plant in the interests of national defense where the owner of such commercial entity or factory refuses to aid properly and adequately the Government.

For all the aforesaid reasons, I shall vote for the pending bill and shall be happy to do so. Were I to take any other stand, I should deem my own action unpatriotic and cowardly. I would regret such a vote for the rest of my days.

There are some in my district who will disagree. I am sorry. To those I simply say that they may be enthusiastically misguided. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, war and its connotations is the subject on every tongue, the product of every pen. In a welter of material on the subject which has reached my office, I have read with particular interest an article appearing in the Lewiston Morning Tribune, daily newspaper of Lewiston, Idaho, on August 18, 1940, and I commend it to the thoughtful attention of the members of Congress and insert copy for their convenience in the RECORD.

The article referred to was written by Mrs. Grace A. Leeper, who knows whereof she writes. She was a World War nurse in France and from her own experience as an eye witness of the horrors of war she makes competent corroboration of Sherman's assertion. After the war she specialized in history and economics at Columbia University and qualifies as a student of national and international issues. The poignancy of her observations on conscription emanates from a mother's heart. Mrs. Leeper has two sons, Donald and Robert, who are approaching conscription age. Their father was the late Col. R. D. Leeper, who served in the World War and later was Justice of the Supreme Court of Idaho.

Regarding the matter of conscription in peacetime and of what it may lead to, there are many angles to this serious question that we women who might be called upon to give the most might well consider.

At the present time we in this country are reversing many traditional policies that we have followed for more than 150 years and that were formulated to safeguard and protect our democracy from the very things which at the present time are causing us to break these traditions.

Our founding fathers were suspicious of large conscripted armies, knowing as they did that in European countries where they have always had conscription and where the people were taxed constantly for armaments and to support large standing armies that it taxed people into poverty, it conditioned the people into thinking of war instead of peace, it tended to breed hatreds which eventually lead to war, and it puts the control of power into a few hands.

By advocating conscription in peacetime, by mixing up and taking sides in foreign quarrels, we are reversing the foreign policies under which this country grew great and prosperous.

The population of our country is made up of Germans, Irish, English, Scotch, Italians, Norwegians, and many other nationalities who come to this country not only to better themselves economically and spiritually but to get away from the Old World, its quarrels, restrictions, and hatreds.

We fought the Revolutionary War to break away from England and the British Empire. But even then there were about 100,000 Tories, or loyalists, who fled to Canada from the United States, preferring to live under British rule rather than join that tattered rabble in arms who saw in democracy an ideal and something for which to live and die.

Forty years later English redcoats captured Washington, D. C., and set the White House afire. In the Civil War upper-class England had labored to destroy our union, and just as the nineteenth century was fading the United States had clashed with England over the Monroe Doctrine.

Many of us went over in the last war, as we thought, to beat the Kaiser and save democracy. Now it's "to save democracy and to beat Hitler," for which the highly paid propagandists and leaders emanating from overcrowded New York City and Wall Street would conscript our young men. Or is it to embark on an imperialistic campaign to grab the Dutch East Indies while the grabbing is good, under the guise of "protecting" them from Japan?

In approaching conscription and this mad scramble for armaments from another angle, how in the world are the small-business men, the farmers, and all the other people who find it difficult to pay their taxes now, ever going to pay them when there are dozens of new taxes added?

Then there is conscription itself. It's always very easy to make the life of a soldier sound glamorous and to make a lot of vague promises about jobs when a sordid job has to be done, or delude one's self into thinking that one's position or prestige can exempt one's darling boy from being conscripted. Our haunting, tragic memories from the World War could tell another story. And conscription? It takes your boy and your husband if the war lasts any length of time. They are taken to some training camp where long lines of tired men arrive and are herded together, more or less like cattle; the carefully nurtured only son eats, sleeps, and lives beside the city bum, the degenerate, the crook, the boy from up in the sticks.

These new recruits are crowded together, usually sent to some other section of the country, new food, harsh environment, wet slush, or burning sands, and in a few weeks the diseases begin. Long rows of hospital beds filled with sick, frightened, homesick boys, meningitis, streptococci, "flu," mumps, and the red tape of the Army before you know what has happened to your boy.

War is just what Sherman said it was, and conscription is one of the first steps toward it.

Yes; there's a lot of things for us women to think about and ponder over before we kiss that boy good-bye, possibly for the last time.

Are we willing to sacrifice him to preserve the status quo of the British Empire, which already controls a quarter of the earth's surface, together with nearly 500,000,000 people?

Are we willing to sacrifice him and other boys to go over and fight the Japanese, just to grab some new land that doesn't belong to us? It has been our policy with few exceptions, for which we paid very dearly, to purchase any new land, not to shed blood to obtain it.

Our destiny in this country calls for us to work as hard for peace as we do for war. It calls for being prepared, yes, but also for being neutral and putting our foreign policy back on a dignified basis and not standing on the White House steps and calling names to every country in the world, advising them what to do and criticizing their conduct.

It means putting our own house in order, with mortgaged homes and farms, the Negro and unemployment problems to solve, to say nothing of bettering relations in South America. We have plenty to do.

No; our destiny does not call for us to give our boys or to tax ourselves into poverty to get the British Empire out of a jam because her leaders have muffed the ball playing their power politics, because if we do it now it will have to be done again in 20 years. And possibly the time has come in the history of the world when it seems unethical or immoral for the British Empire or any empire to have control over so many peoples, to say nothing of controlling the lion's share of the world's raw materials.

Yes; there's a lot of things for us to think about, and not the least of these things is that, professing to be Christian, possibly it is up to us not merely to give lip service to that philosophy but to work for peace which was prized so highly by Him who preached "peace on earth, good will to men."

G. A. L.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY].

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am bitterly opposed to the passage of H. R. 10132, known as the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill. The argument used by the proponents of this bill is that the need of conscription of manpower is imperative in the rapid and successful execution of an adequate program of national defense.

These proponents, however, have not demonstrated satisfactorily the necessity of such conscription. Our land, sea, and air forces, active and reserve, have already reached a new peacetime total in excess of 900,000 men, itemized as follows:

Navy	154,516
Marines	31,379
Navy Reserves	40,336
Marine Reserves	15,076
Army	303,000
National Guard	237,000
Army Reserve officers	120,000
Enlisted Reserves	17,500
Total	919,807

With the enlistments anticipated to December 1, the peace-time strength of the armed forces will be approximately 1,000,000 men.

Conscription of manpower is urged as necessary to defense against imminent perils to this country. The imminence of these perils is pure assumption. But even if we were to grant that America is in real and imminent danger from without, the course the proponents of this bill propose to follow may lead to even more serious internal hazards.

Conscription of manpower will be merely a first step. Proposals for total conscription of wealth and productive facilities will follow inevitably. In fact, the ground work for a totalitarian military economy has already been largely completed. The Senate has already voted to conscript industry in time of peace. The proponents of this bill in their arguments for national defense lead to this inevitable conclusion, namely, the use of our entire manpower and our entire economy under an arbitrary, centralized control for the primary if not for the sole purpose of establishing a military machine. Under authorizations that already have been extended to the Executive, that machine will be immense.

I am opposed to this bill because the conscripting of manpower—of farmers, of industry, of labor to run industry, and of the wealth of the Nation—is not only unnecessary at this time to the adequate defense of the country, but is a distinct and dangerous departure which will lead ultimately to the destruction of the American form of government, changing it to a totalitarian military economy.

The power of conscription placed in the hands of an administration that has proved by its record to have utilized every conceivable excuse for regimenting America, overturning all tradition and changing our form of government, is nothing but an invitation to disaster.

If our country were at war, there would be no other alternative than to take this chance, but we are not at war. As a peacetime measure, the conscription bill now in Congress is being forced upon us through the efforts of an international lobby, the New Deal hierarchy, and certain hysterical Congressmen.

To grant this additional power to a President who has already indicated a desire to plunge our Nation into Europe's melee would be the final act in the collectivist program to "make America over."

Raymond J. Kelly, the national commander of the American Legion, whose loyalty and Americanism no one can question, has stated that "conscription should not be put into effect until all other avenues have been exhausted." But, all other avenues have not been exhausted. Our time-honored military volunteer system has not failed as yet. More volunteers are enlisting in the Army and Navy now than can be readily assimilated. According to a release from the War Department recently, nearly 200,000 men, who have enlisted will have to be housed in tents during the coming winter, subjecting them to great hardships and consequent dangers to their health.

Several camps are taxed to capacity and are using hundreds of pup tents to house the volunteers. In other words, we now have more men in the Army and Navy than can be taken care of. Then why draft 24,000,000 more?

Harry H. Woodring, former Secretary of War, under President Roosevelt, after serving for 7 years as Secretary of War, states:

I am an advocate of adequate defense but I will never stand for sending American boys into Europe's shambles. There is a comparatively small clique of internationalists who want the United States to declare war and get into the European mess with everything we have, including our manpower.

President William Green of the American Federation of Labor in a statement issued against the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill states:

We do not regard the Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill which provides for compulsive military service as a well-planned measure. We cannot, therefore, give it our approval and support. The American Federation of Labor will give support to compulsory military training service legislation when such action becomes necessary in order to defend, protect, and preserve America. However, in providing an adequate army for defensive purposes the American way should be followed first. A voluntary enlistment program should

be launched by the Government designed to create an army of one and one-half million men. This would be putting voluntary action before compulsion. American labor would respond to such a program wholeheartedly and enthusiastically.

The American people are vitally interested in the permanent welfare of our country. That is evidenced by the fact that thousands of letters and telegrams are sent to Congressmen and by the further fact that thousands of American citizens are visiting Washington, protesting against the passage of this conscription bill. It is unfortunate that some Congressmen resent the receiving of these letters or the visitation of citizens. To me, it is a hopeful sign. The more people that take interest in their Government, the better off our Government will be. These letter writers and visitors are not propagandists but earnest American citizens expressing their constitutional right of freedom of speech.

The overwhelming majority of the people of my district, the Sixth District of Michigan, as indicated by telegrams, letters, and personal visitations, are opposed to this conscription bill.

I cannot help but feel that this conscription bill is too drastic in its nature and un-American in its scope and is being pushed as a part of the program of the propagandists who are telling us that we should get into this war to "save the world for civilization."

I am deeply and vitally interested in my country and its constitutional form of government, and for that reason I have voted for every measure that in my judgment would best protect our national defense in the Army, Navy, and air force, and will continue to do so, but I am bitterly opposed to this un-American conscription bill now before the House and shall vote against it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, In the years that it has been my privilege to be a Member of this body I cannot recall a measure that has given me more concern than has the conscription bill now before us.

I realize fully the great need for adequate national defense and the responsibility that rests upon Congress in connection with providing such defense.

Members of the House, our leaders have whipped the American people into a frenzy of hysteria that is much more pronounced and dangerous than was a similar wave that swept over the country in 1916-17, and which resulted in our entrance into the World War. The two waves are much alike as the present one is traveling in lines closely parallel to that of the former. Again we are told that we must make the world safe for democracy; that we must take every step to preserve democracy; but I fear that while we are concerned over the destruction of democracy in Europe we are slowly but surely losing democracy at home. The President has been voted unlimited powers and sums of money so vast as to stagger the imagination. No longer do constitutional restraints or statutory prohibitions stand in the way of Presidential action. He is supreme.

On yesterday the President blandly announced to the Congress and to the country that he had entered into an agreement with Great Britain to transfer 50 destroyers to that country in exchange for certain tracts of land that we will acquire for airport purposes for a period of 99 years, providing England still retains title to them during that period. This action by the President was taken by him secretly, without consulting Congress, and was in direct violation of a law enacted by Congress in 1917, which reads:

During a war in which the United States is a neutral nation, it shall be unlawful to send out of the jurisdiction of the United States any vessel built, armed, or equipped as a vessel of war * * * with any intent or under any agreement * * * that such vessel shall be delivered to a belligerent nation * * * after its departure from the jurisdiction of the United States.

If that law was not violated by the President in his secret negotiations with Britain then I do not understand the meaning of language. True, the Attorney General has obligingly ruled that the President has the power to take this action. But the Attorney General has very obligingly before come to the rescue of the President with constructions on law that are

wholly unwarranted and in absolute contradiction to the Constitution or statute law. Clearly, the transfer of 50 destroyers to Britain is an act of war and under international law we are now at war with Germany as a result.

Now, we are asked to enact a conscription law which will require the registration of all males between the ages of 21 and 45. A month or so ago the President also proposed to register females between the ages of 21 and 45, and even proposed to assemble them in training camps, but as a result of the wave of protest that swept over the country and in view of his campaign for a third term, he very quietly gave up the idea. But he still wants conscription of men. It is proposed, under the pending measure, to conscript 2,000,000 men. What do we need such a large Army for? Whom are we going to fight? Where are we going to fight? When are we going to fight? Congress should call upon the President to furnish it with that information before we take action upon this measure. We should know what need there is for it and we should certainly be advised as to where this powerful force is to be employed. I am not afraid of conscription in time of war or threatened war. It may be that the security of America is threatened. I doubt it, although I can well understand the feeling of hostility against us in the totalitarian nations that has resulted from the name calling by the President and his advisers, and the many unneutral acts that he has committed since war broke out.

Personally I consider New Deal leaders more dangerous to the United States than are the totalitarian leaders, because of their disregard of law and their undermining of democracy in America.

I refuse to join the army of hysterics that has been formed in order to make the country safe for a third term, and those of you who do so will live to regret it to your dying day.

For nearly a decade Congress has surrendered power after power to the President, until now it is little more than a rubber stamp. You on the majority side are responsible for this lamentable, tragic, and indefensible condition, because at all times you have had an overwhelming majority in both Houses of Congress. You have repeatedly ridden roughshod over the minority when we sought to stop your wild stampede toward autocracy. Today Congress is little better than an automaton. Where are our Washingtons, Jeffersons, Websters, Clays, Blaines, Clevelands, McKinleys, Champ Clarks, Claude Kitchens, and Jim Manns? We are going to have a House cleaning this fall just as sure as the rising of tomorrow's sun. Let us pray that it may not come too late.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss briefly H. R. 10132, generally known as the Burke-Wadsworth bill, now under consideration. This bill has for its purpose two objectives: (1) Military training, and (2) conscription for military service in peacetimes.

At the outset I desire to preface my observations with the statement that as far back as June of this year, when the President was urging that the Congress adjourn within 10 days, I took the position that owing to the emergency confronting the Nation, the Congress should remain in session in order to provide for our national defense and endeavor to find a solution for our domestic problems which must be solved if we are to provide effective national defense. I believe it is clearly evident now that this course was justified. We have found it necessary to enact, since that time, much legislation which is necessary in order to go forward with our defense program. It has been done without partisanship. I have without hesitation supported the entire defense program and will continue to do so insofar as in my judgment it is necessary. I believe we should provide such defenses that we may be impregnable against attack from any foreign nation or combination of nations. I am unalterably opposed, however, to preparing armaments for intervention in foreign conflicts or to sending our forces overseas to take part in wars on foreign soil or from taking any steps which will involve us in such foreign controversies which are not concerned with our own national defense. I believe that America should keep out of Europe's wars and should keep Europe's wars out of

America. Let us prepare for peace, not war; for defense, not intervention. My vote upon the pending bill will be governed by my determination to adhere to this program.

The question now before us is whether or not it is now necessary to depart from a course we have followed for 150 years in securing our military personnel by voluntary enlistment to one of military conscription in peace times. I have followed carefully the arguments for and against this legislation, both in the House and in the Senate, and have examined the reports of the committees and the hearings, and I am firmly convinced that the proponents of this bill have not proven their case that it is necessary at this time to resort to conscription in peacetime in order to secure the enlistments necessary to provide an army necessary for our national defense. The following table shows the present strength of our forces:

	Enlisted men	Officers	Total
Navy	143,747	10,769	154,516
Marines	29,985	1,394	31,379
Navy Reserves ¹	40,336		40,336
Marine Reserves ¹	15,076		15,076
Army	289,000	14,000	303,000
National Guard	223,000	15,000	237,000
Army Reserve officers		120,000	120,000
Enlisted Reserves	17,500		17,500
Total	758,644	161,163	919,807

¹ Includes officers on which specific figures unavailable.

An examination of this tabulation discloses that our land, sea, and air forces, active and reserve, have now reached a new peacetime total in excess of 900,000 men, and by the close of the year they will approximate 1,000,000 men. It was originally intended to draft 400,000 men on October 1. It is now anticipated, however, that only 55,000 drafted men and 55,000 of the National Guard will be called by that time. The remaining units will be called periodically up to January 1, 1941, which is the earliest time when it is believed quarters will be available.

Under this bill it is proposed to draft 400,000 by January 1, 1941, and an additional 400,000 on April 1, 1941, which, added to the Regular Establishment and National Guard, would make a protective force of 1,200,000 men by the fall of 1941.

Congress recently authorized an increase in the strength of the Regular Army to 400,000, but appropriated sufficient funds for 375,000. General Shedd testified that at the present rate of enlistment this figure would be reached by approximately December 1. Secretary Knox testified before the committee that the Navy does not need additional manpower; in fact, the Navy has a waiting list of 700,000. It is not believed that it will ever be necessary to draft any men for the Navy. In fact, volunteers far exceed the requirements of the naval forces. Under the law we recently passed, giving authority to mobilize the National Guard for a year of active service with the Regular Army, which is now being done by Executive order, the size of our military establishment will be doubled. It is not believed by those in a position to know that the Army can properly equip, train, and coordinate this body of 400,000 drafted men within 12 to 18 months. In fact, William S. Knudsen, of the National Defense Council, recently stated:

It will be 1942 before there will be complete equipment for 750,000 men.

It is conceded that there will not be barracks, housing facilities, medical supplies, hospitals, medical and nursing staffs available to take care of the immense number of draftees that would be called into training service under the provisions of this bill. Under the voluntary system, which we have always followed, all the volunteers will be available that can be properly trained, housed, and cared for with such facilities as we will be able to provide. From information furnished by the Secretary of War, September 3, 1940, the Army recruiting program is as follows:

Early in the fiscal year 1940, due to the Panama and Air Corps expansion programs and the subsequent Executive increase issued under the limited emergency powers of the President, the author-

ized enlisted strength of the Army was increased from 165,000 to 227,000, which strength was reached by February 7, 1940. There then resulted a period when the only recruiting was to maintain the Army at its then authorized strength. On May 16, 1940, an additional 15,000 men were authorized. On June 19, before these had been secured, the strength was further increased to 280,000, the maximum then authorized by law. This figure was superseded by congressional action which fixed the enlisted strength of the Army at 375,000. During this time the recruiting service was intensifying its efforts, and the recruiting campaign gathered momentum, with resulting strengths as follows: June 30, 1940, 246,949; July 31, 1940, 270,183; August 22, 1940, 285,000 (estimated).

The following table shows the monthly enlistments in the Army from January 1, 1939, through July 31, 1940:

January 1939	3,872
February 1939	6,108
March 1939	7,328
April 1939	5,442
May 1939	6,736
June 1939	6,946
July 1939	7,162
August 1939	9,259
September 1939	14,765
October 1939	19,815
November 1939	17,286
December 1939	16,530
January 1940	17,820
February 1940	9,151
March 1940	8,374
April 1940	6,274
May 1940	9,492
June 1940	23,444
July 1940	31,958

Estimates now indicate that the voluntary enlistments for August will probably reach the all-time record of 45,000 and should reach 60,000 in September. These enlistments are made under existing regulations for 3 years' service with a base pay of \$21 per month. If the enlistments were limited to 1 year and the base pay raised to \$30, it is reasonable to believe that the enlistments would be very much increased in number. Under such a program it is logical to believe that the Army's objective of a million Reserves by February 1941 may readily be obtained under the voluntary system.

My conclusion, after a most careful consideration of all the factors entering into this problem, is that it is not necessary in order to secure sufficient personnel for our military forces to invoke the draft system while we are at peace with all the nations of the world. If the time comes when it is demonstrated that in order to provide for our national defense no other recourse is open than to draft men for military service, I am sure we all will support such a program.

I agree with one of my colleagues when he said peacetime draft is a departure from the time-honored and time-tested volunteer system for recruiting our armed forces in time of peace. It is a dangerous venture; one that will have a profound influence upon the life and future of every man conscripted, upon our free institutions, and our American way of life. Based upon the considered opinion of military experts and the undisputed facts of history and the conditions with which we are now faced, it is uncalled for at this time. The Honorable Harry H. Woodring, after 7 years as Secretary of War, upon his retirement publicly stated:

How any fair-minded Member of Congress could say that we have given the volunteer system of enlistment for the United States Army service a fair trial and that it has broken down and therefore we need the compulsory service is beyond my understanding.

This is not a peacetime measure. Such a law has never been resorted to in peacetime before in the history of this Nation. Its enactment is a step toward war. It will lead us inevitably down the road to war and to dictatorship. Every dictatorship in the world today was preceded, and is today maintained, by conscript armies.

I do not hold the belief, as some do who support this legislation, that in order to keep off totalitarian governments which may threaten us it is necessary for us to adopt totalitarian methods ourselves. It is conceded by all that the drafting of our citizens in peacetime for military service is a totalitarian plan which lies at the very foundation of the totalitarian governments of the Old World that have wrought havoc upon their neighbors by military force.

We should adopt conscription only as a last resort. It is incompatible with democracy. It is not economic, as it will

drain out of our industrial and professional life those most needed. Furthermore, it will not only forcibly remove them from their peacetime pursuits for a year, but will also hold over their heads for 10 years or more the threat that they may be inducted into service at any time for an indefinite period. While marked and awaiting call they will be unable to secure permanent employment, to establish themselves in business, professions, or other life work with any degree of security. Their education, employment, and credit opportunities will be stifled. I have in my files even now letters from men of draft age making inquiries with reference to their business commitments in case of draft.

Many supporters of this legislation are doing so with the belief it is a bill providing for military training only. If that were true, there would be little opposition to it. In truth, it lodges in the hands of the Executive most far-reaching power over the lives and destinies of our people, to forcibly remove them from their civilian pursuits in peacetime and regiment and induct them into a military machine where the processes of free men no longer exist. This is the chief foundation stone of a one-man government—a totalitarian state. The issue is, Shall we remain a democracy or become a dictatorship? Too much power is already concentrated in Washington. The Congress should not surrender this power over our military forces.

Mr. Chairman, the glory of America has been that down through the ages it has preserved and protected the freedom of the individual citizen and has refused to become a militarized regimented society. Our founding fathers fled from the Old World to escape it. I do not choose to accept the responsibility to subject the lives and destinies of 24,000,000 young Americans subject to the draft to regimentation and enforced military service in times of peace. They have no voice on this momentous question except through me and my colleagues—the Congress. They have not refused to serve their country in times of need, and I cannot vote to surrender them to regimentation until they do, which, I pray God, will never occur. I cannot deprive our young men of their American right to enlist voluntarily to protect their country. Until they refuse, I will not stigmatize them with the brand of a conscript. I believe in our American youth. I have worked with them for a quarter of a century. I believe the men of today of military age are the equals of the patriots of the yesterdays who fought to preserve America, in valor, moral fiber, and patriotic love of country. When war comes or when a great emergency requires, young America will respond to the call of our country to beat off any attack. In the meantime, the voluntary system of military enlistment will furnish all the men for training our facilities justify and our needs require. In keeping with my oath of office and the duty I owe to my people and my own conscience, I cannot support this measure in its present form, which will rob the free men of America of their heritage of freedom. I alone must live with my conscience.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the author of this bill, 30 minutes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I shall not inflict upon the members of the Committee anything approaching an oration at this time; indeed, I feel myself incompetent to do such a thing. Rather shall I attempt to explore in a somewhat informal manner the situation that confronts the country and the influences, world-wide, which affect the country. As I do so, or attempt to do so, I shall avoid hysteria or any semblance of panic, but endeavor rather to be realistic to the best of my ability.

I cannot claim infallibility of judgment. Perhaps the most I can boast of is that my mind may run along as the average

man's mind runs, as the average man witnesses events. Perhaps you will let me say what effect events of recent months have had upon my way of thinking.

War is always an exceedingly serious thing, even though it rage on the other side of the world. War in Europe, of course, is an even more serious thing to the people of the United States, for by indirection its effect is felt amongst us all; but, perhaps, because war has been so constant in greater or less degree during the last 10 or 15 years, I, and other men like me, pay not much attention to it, and I am conscious of the fact that I was not deeply stirred when the present conflict broke out on September 1, 1939. It seemed to me that it was pretty far away, although I recognized it might have its reverberations here in the United States. I think I did not begin to feel deeply concerned about it, in its effect upon the safety of the United States potentially until the British and the French forces were driven out of Belgium, and I began to realize, as many of you did, the enormous power of the military and economic force back of that expulsion of the British and French Armies from Belgium, resulting in the seizure of the Channel ports. Then I awoke to the fact, and I am sure you did too, that a new force was at large in the world and was progressing with giant steps. Then when France collapsed only a month later, it seemed to me then, and I believe it to be the fact, that the whole face of the world had changed, for with the collapse of France and the entry of Italy into the war on the side of Germany, we see the probability—indeed, it is more than a probability, it is almost a certainty—that the whole of the European continent is to be organized under one single control, Spain, France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Germany as at present constituted, and the Balkan States, plus Italy, with the backing of Russia; the whole European continent subjected to a philosophy which, to say the least, spells danger to the rest of the world. I visualize, as no doubt you do, the extent of the power which may rest in the hands of the men who rule all of Europe—military power, including air power and sea power, economic power and industrial power.

If it should turn out that one power shall dominate all of Europe, assisted by another power which shall dominate all of the Far East, we shall have a state of affairs in this world never before equalled in the history of the race. I think I can say that advisedly. Much the greater portion of the civilized world will be living under a new philosophy, a philosophy that teaches that force and force alone is entitled to prevail in the affairs of human people. So I say that when France fell on or about June 12 or June 14, I personally became deeply concerned about the safety of the United States, and on June 21 I introduced this bill.

Now, what about the safety of the United States? We read in the literature of the Nazis and the Fascists, outspoken and brutally frank, that their next field of exploitation shall be South America and Central America. This they have announced. Whether they carry out that threat or not none of us can tell, but that they have made that threat time and again cannot be denied, nor can we deny the fact that for some time past, and at this very hour, there are influences at work in South America and Central America to undermine those governments and substitute for them new governments utterly devoted to the totalitarian system. With this thought in mind, my mind ran, and I have no doubt yours did, to the Monroe Doctrine. It is the one policy of defense to which this country has adhered for 120 years. We adhere to it because we are convinced that its maintenance is essential to the safety of the United States. We cannot afford to take any chances about it—none whatsoever. If this huge collection of power dominant in Europe and in Asia is to carry out its program or to attempt to do so, we must be ready. [Applause.] And I judge that the Congress already has taken into consideration that possibility, in that by a vote which I think was nearly unanimous the Congress has provided for what is to be called a two-ocean navy. Now, obviously, Mr. Chairman, we would not have done that had we not had in mind the very menace which I have attempted to describe. A two-ocean navy, why? It is because we fear a concentration against us

from east and from west, because we realize that were the British Navy to fail, our present Navy is not strong enough to guard us in both oceans. And may I say at this point also that control of the sea is now inseparably linked with control of the air.

For the same reason Congress has already authorized the appropriation of sums to greatly increase our air forces. So, I think I am right in saying that the Congress, in action already taken, has taken into very serious consideration the possibilities of aggression against the Monroe Doctrine, and in such aggression, against the safety of the United States. We have authorized that expansion in the Navy. We have gone a long way toward authorizing that expansion in the naval aviation and in the Army Air Corps. We have not yet provided for adequate expansion in the land forces. This bill is intended to accomplish that, and to accomplish it as simply as possible, with the least disturbance possible in industry and agriculture and the professions and with the least burden placed upon the most men.

May I remind you that this is an emergency measure? It is not an attempt to establish a permanent policy in the United States. It is meant to meet, if it is possible to meet it, the immediate future and to put the country in a position to meet that situation promptly. In my humble judgment, we cannot afford to indulge in a "wait and see" policy. Others have indulged that and they have perished.

Referring to the Army and land forces, may I make these observations: What we need today is troops, not merely thousands of men, not merely students taking a military course in colleges or in military schools, but troops, and troops as soon as we can get them. Time is of the essence. When I say troops, I mean soldiers, organized and trained in units—companies, battalions, regiments, brigades, divisions, officers and men trained as units in teamwork and in coordination between the different branches of the service. Troops are the only things that count. Great numbers count next to nothing. How may we obtain troops at the earliest moment? As has been said so often, the Regular Army is the professional standing army element of our Military Establishment, and the Congress has authorized it to increase its numbers to 375,000 men. In addition to the Regular Army, the National Guard called into Federal service number 230,000 men. There will be a shrinkage in the guard shortly after they are mobilized, due to various causes, and the estimate is that after the shrinkage there will be in the neighborhood of 200,000 men.

The General Staff, for years, to my knowledge—at least 18 or 20 years—has studied the problem of the defense of continental United States and the Monroe Doctrine. As you all know, it is the duty of the General Staff to make as close and exhaustive studies as are possible, in order to be able to advise the Government and the Congress how best a certain military obligation may be carried out. It is not a secret in the War Department that for all these years their first and most important consideration has been given to the defense of the Monroe Doctrine. To my knowledge, for at least 15 years the General Staff, which is composed of officers coming in and going out, not a permanent body in personnel, but a rotating body, has adhered to the conclusion that a land force of 1,200,000 men is necessary. It has been known all these years as the initial protective force. In it, of course, are included the garrisons in the Philippines, Hawaii, Panama, and, more lately, in Puerto Rico. In it, of course, is included the entire overhead of the military system, which at times is heavy. That is the force deemed necessary throughout all these years for the proper and safe defense of the Monroe Doctrine. I believe that we need that force, and need it just as soon as we can get it. I hesitate to let a day go by in delay.

The contention has been that we can get it by voluntary enlistments. At the present rate of enlistments it would take nearly 2 years to do it. I do not believe we can afford to wait 2 years, or to wait 1 year. We cannot afford, in other words, to take any chances. We have got to be realists about this thing. It is no joking matter, and it is not a pleasant thing. I wish to heaven that the situation were such that the intro-

duction of such a bill would be utterly unjustified. We would be a happier people. The world would be a happier world. But, Mr. Chairman, we are not masters of events, unfortunately perhaps for the world at large. We are not the masters of events. Were we the master we would have seen that things would have come along very differently in the last 8 or 10 years. The thing I plead for is that we shall so fashion our defenses that we shall be the masters of our own destiny. [Applause.]

Now, again, from the military side, if you will allow me, I want to discuss the workings of this thing, should the bill pass. It has been discussed in part by others, and I shall be guilty of repetition, I fear, to a certain extent; but nevertheless, in order to attempt to put together a connected story I may have to be thus guilty.

Should this bill pass it is the announced plan of the War Department to hold the first registration day about the middle of October. The blanks and notices and regulations are all ready. Of course, the draft boards, locally organized, must be appointed before that registration day. The first registration will be of men between 21 and 31, a pool containing 12,000,000 men. The first call to service is calculated to come about the 7th to 10th of November.

At that time it is estimated that the first call will use about 75,000 men. Between that time and we will say January 1, additional increments will be called in so that the number called in between the first part of November and January 1 shall in the aggregate amount to about 400,000. The 400,000 will be taken from the pool of 12,000,000—not a very heavy drain on the manpower.

They will not be sent to great training centers as was the case in the World War, but these men will be sent to and attached to existing units of the Regular Army and the National Guard which at that time will be in the Federal service and trained with those existing units, thus training much more rapidly than they would if they were all freshmen in the same class and nothing but freshmen in the class.

On April 1, 1941, it is planned for the War Department to summon another 400,000 men and to assign most of them to the Regulars and the guard. The total in the first year under the selective draft is to be in the neighborhood of 800,000 men in 2 segments, roughly, of 400,000 each. These added to the Regular Establishment and the guard—and the men are to be soldiers of the United States while they are in training—will by the end of the summer or the early autumn of 1941 actually produce the initial protective force of 1,200,000. That is the quickest it can be done. It will take a year.

From that point on the Congress is master. The Congress will be governed by world conditions. Tentatively the War Department proposes that in October or November of 1941 another increase will be brought in through the draft, but the Congress will decide how many they shall be, for the bill provides, as most of you know, that no man shall be inducted into the service under the provisions of this bill unless the Congress shall have hereafter appropriated funds specifically for the purpose; and in no case under the provisions of this bill shall there be more than 1,000,000 men in training in any one year. Should the Congress a year and a half or 2 years from now make up its mind that the initial protective force is not sufficient, then it will have to pass authorizing legislation to increase the number of men to be selected in a given year above 1,000,000. The Congress remains master of this entire situation. The legislation is to run for only 5 years. It is to meet this emergency. I think I am not impertinent in suggesting that scarce a man upon this floor knows what will be the condition of the world a year from now. I wish I could prophesy it, and you all wish you could prophesy it. I doubt if you dare try to prophesy what the condition will be 2 years, 3 years, or 4 years from now. We put in this bill the 5-year limitation in the confident hope that by that time world conditions would have changed so that we would not have to burden ourselves in such fashion. But at any rate at that time we can take another estimate of what is going on and decide what it is

best to do for the continued defense of the United States. There in a general way is the program. The details of this measure, of course, are of tremendous interest to you all. May I speak of one detail that has not been touched upon thus far.

The Senate bill contains the provision that the registration shall be confined to men between 21 and 31 years of age and that the selection shall be taken from among men 21 to 31 years of age. The House bill provides that the registration shall include men of 21 to 45 years of age and that the selection shall be made from among men of 21 to 45. I should say at this point that after the first registration of men between 21 and 31 a subsequent registration will be taken of men between 31 and 45.

That is already planned by the War Department. I am strongly of the opinion that the House provision is the better provision, that the wider age range is not only more democratic, much more fair, but more effective in more than one sense.

The experience of the World War showed, in its selective draft, that of all the men drafted into the Army from 18 to 45, 13 per cent were between 31 and 45 years of age. True, a small percentage, but a very significant percentage. The testimony that I have heard ever since the World War has been to the effect that the 13 percent of men between 35 and 45 was a very valuable thing in the military units themselves. The presence of a somewhat older man steadied the youngster. His presence is also an evidence, a demonstration that he, the youngster, is not being required to carry the whole burden, that a man somewhat his senior is tramping alongside of him along the road carrying a rifle. There are men between the ages of 31 and 45 eminently fitted for military service.

Under the Senate restriction not a single veteran of the World War could be in the Army because obviously they are all over 31 by now. There were some men in the Army at the end of the World War between 18 and 19 years of age. Today they are 41, 42, or 43. Some of them may be perfectly fit to go, with no dependents, no heavy obligations. I have met some of them. Already they are incensed at the idea that they are not regarded as good enough to go because they are over 31.

I believe the House provision builds up morale by the mere presence of a few of those older men who, as you who have been in the military service know, make the ideal sergeants and other noncommissioned officers. This question may be tested when we come to read this bill for amendment. Someone may offer an amendment to adopt the Senate provision. I express the earnest hope that the Committee of the Whole will adhere to the wider age range. In this wider age range there are 24,000,000 men in the United States: 12,000,000 between the ages of 21 and 31, and another 12,000,000 between the ages of 31 and 45. Out of this huge pool it is proposed to take annually not more than 900,000 maximum, that is about 1 out of every 23. Truly this is not a heavy draft upon the manpower of the United States. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the manpower of the United States is so enormous that it is inconceivable that it could ever be mustered into a military force, nor could it ever be used. Our pool is so huge that by dipping into it only slightly, 1 out of 23, or under the Senate bill 1 out of 13, we can get plenty of men; and we get them in the democratic way, by selection from those who are fit to serve.

I know it has been contended, and honestly so, by many men in this debate that this thing is undemocratic. I cannot concede that. I think you will all agree with me that in a country such as ours every man owes a duty to do his best to defend his country against attack. No one will deny that. If that is true, does there not go along with that another duty that he shall prepare himself in order that he may defend his country effectively? [Applause.] As I see it, there is the whole thing in a nutshell. Those who have dependents are not to be sent. Those who are engaged in occupations deemed vital to the national interest are not to be sent.

There are other exemptions concerning conscientious objectors and members of the ministry.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the boy who is able to go and whose departure will cause scarcely a ripple, considering the number, will go and, in my judgment, will serve his country proudly. I have never agreed with those who said that the drafted soldier is inferior to the volunteer. Our experience in the World War with the draft soldier was that he was a splendid soldier. I recall, for example, the Seventy-seventh Division, recruited by the draft from the heart of the city of New York and containing in its ranks thousands of young men of foreign parentage, young men of the first or second generation in America. You remember the story of Whittlesey's Lost Battalion. It was made up of the drafted men of the Seventy-seventh Division.

These men made good—excellent—soldiers. They saw their duty. They did not regard it as undemocratic. I never heard such a suggestion from any one of them. The overwhelming majority of the youth of America today stands ready. Youth wants to be told how and when, and youth will respond. [Applause.] That is all there is to it.

I thank you for your patience. I have not orated. I am unable to do so. My heart has been in this sort of thing, since away back in 1920 when, as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, I was instructed by that committee to report the National Defense Act of 1920 and to include in it a provision for compulsory military training. That was 20 years ago. That provision was knocked out in the Senate. The rest of the act was passed and is on the statute books. The provision was knocked out in the Senate, and well do I remember, Mr. Chairman, the principal argument against it was: "Oh, well, there are not going to be any more wars." [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, despite the tragic character of the debate, I have not yet lost my sense of humor, and I fully realize the reason why I am given the floor immediately after the able and distinguished former Senator from my State. I have thereby been put under a terrific handicap when the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs places me in this position, for I believe that there are few men in this House who can be considered as honest and as able as the distinguished former Senator from the State of New York. [Applause.]

In my own limited manner, however, I shall endeavor to present certain views within the 15 minutes allotted me that are adhered to by the overwhelming majority of the American people with regard to the proposed conscription of American youth.

For despite the controlled press and the controlled polls, you must admit that the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., the churches, the youth organizations, and the Farmers Union do represent a far greater number of people in their opposition to this bill than the organs of propaganda which have been hysterically clamoring for its passage.

There has been only one argument advanced here. It is the same argument that was given us back on May 16 when the President of the United States came to this Congress and made his plea for armaments. At that time I felt, and I still adhere to the same feeling, that it was not a plea for armament for defense but that we were following the same pattern of 1916 and 1917, that we were arming, not for the defense of our shores, not for the defense of the best interests of the American people, not for the defense of the worker in the factory or the farmer in the field or the businessman, but that we were arming under the guise of a so-called national defense for offense, and we have been using that armament program as a vehicle to catapult this country into an imperialist war in which the American people

have all to lose and nothing to gain. I believe that time and events since then have demonstrated that the program has been and is armaments, conscription, and war.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following events, which sustain my contention that this program of armaments and conscription is one for war and not for peace: First of all, nobody in this House can deny that we have become a military reservoir for one side of the belligerents against the other side. I submit that history bears me out when I say that you cannot keep out of war when you become the military reservoir for one side of the belligerents against the other. The attempt to turn over the mosquito fleet, the turning over of our best dive bombers, the illegal turning over of 50 warships does not make for neutrality. These events make for war; and none of these acts, I submit, were done for the defense of our shores or for the defense of the best interests of the American people. [Applause.] They were done solely to speed the movement in the direction of war.

How is this program being put over on the American people? We have created a hysteria in this country, a hysteria of imminent invasion. This hysterical argument has been and is the basis upon which the war program is being justified. I hold in my hand here a Senate document, a unanimous report of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, published exactly one day before the President came to the Congress of the United States with his message, and if I may be permitted I now read from that document. Remember, it was issued on May 15. This is not a document built on the opinion of professional military men with their biases and antidemocratic prejudices; but it is a document which represents the unanimous opinion of the representatives of the people in the United States Senate Committee on Naval Affairs who have studied the question of defense, not for 1 day, not for 30 days, but for years and years. It states:

From the military point of view, the United States must be considered as an insular nation. We are separated from potential enemies on the east and west by broad and deep oceans. On our northern and southern borders are nations which have been friendly heretofore. Across these land frontiers could come no armies of sufficient strength to menace our security. Our situation is not similar to that of the British at the present time. Prior to the advent of air power the British Isles were insular countries. This complete insularity is now compromised in a military sense in that they are subject to damaging attacks by aircraft based on the Continent. The armies of Europe and Asia do not menace us. To be a menace, they must be transported across the seas in ships. Airplanes based on the continents of Europe and Asia do not menace us. To threaten seriously our continental security they must be conveyed across the sea and operated from bases in or near this hemisphere. The armed forces of no foreign nation or group of nations can seriously threaten our continental security if we make sure that we command the seas which separate us from all potential enemies.

This is the unanimous opinion of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, published not in 1928, not in 1939, but on May 15, 1940, contradicting every statement that was contained in the message of the President on May 16, 1940.

You also know that no bases can be established in the Western Hemisphere as long as we have a navy equal to that of any potential enemy and you well know that we have had such a sized navy for years.

Let us be honest with ourselves. There is not a person in this House who does not know deep down in his heart that you cannot have a war budget which in less than 2 years will amount to \$19,000,000,000, and keep out of war. You cannot have besides that war budget an Army built by conscription, and still keep out of war. What are we arming for? Does any man seriously believe that we are arming for defense against invasion? You are not fooling the American people. The man out on the farm, in the mills and factories, and on the sidewalks of New York, knows that you are arming for a repetition of 1917. Yes, Senator WADSWORTH, the men in the Seventy-seventh served and they died, but events are demonstrating that they died in vain, because we are repeating 1917 again in the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WARREN). The gentleman from New York will suspend.

This is the last time the Chair is going to give any admonition to the galleries. You are guests of the House, and no demonstration of approval or disapproval of any remarks made on this floor is going to be tolerated. The Chair will instruct the officers to take the offending parties out of the galleries if it happens again.

The gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I have stated that you cannot keep out of war with a war budget which will amount to almost \$19,000,000,000 in a period of less than 2 years, and I quote for my authority the President of the United States himself. During the winter of 1936 at Buenos Aires the President stated that out of his wide experience and historical study, nations which spend heavily on armaments—

inevitably face the day when their weapons of destruction must be used against their neighbor, or when an unsound economy, like a house of cards, will fall apart.

The day is not far off when these weapons of destruction and this army built by conscription will be used not for defense but for participation in an imperialist war unless the American people put a stop to this war program which we have undertaken in this Congress.

It has been contended that all this is being done to save democracy, to save our democratic way of life.

Let us see what we have been doing to that democratic way of life in America since the war program was launched. Day in and day out we have been ruthlessly tearing up our Bill of Rights in measure after measure, and now we culminate that with what? With this conscription. We are imposing on America a "nazification" of American youth; and we talk about the democratic way of life.

What happened in Germany? The economy, the social existence, and everything in Germany was based on the militarization of Germany's unemployed. The youth of Germany were put into military and labor camps, conscripted, and taught not to talk back. This is now the desire of America's brass hats as expressed by the provisions of this bill. There is no free speech in the Army and there is no free speech in anything connected with the Army. There is no Bill of Rights with regard to the Army or anything else that is military. That is the very essence of militarism; that is the very essence of this bill. The youth of Germany were put into camps and militarized, and the entire economy of Germany and her entire social structure became dependent on the militarization of the German youth. Germany had to go to war because her economy and society were based on militarism. Base our economy on militarism by conscription—and that is just what we are doing—and we march inexorably to war. [Applause.]

We are told again and again that our democratic way of life must be preserved. I am just beginning to wonder how much will be left of that democratic way of life if we continue this "blitzkrieg" against the peace and freedom of the American people. Under the guise of seeking to repel Hitler we enthrone Hitlerism in free America.

There is one argument which I cannot help but treat with disdain and contempt, and that is the argument that we are taking these boys off the streets. We are going to save these boys. We have to save them from themselves, and we must toughen them up and put them into uniforms. Is this the best treatment the greatest country in the world can give American youth, to put them in uniforms, militarize them, "nazify" them, and change them from freemen to cannon fodder? I submit that a free country and a great country can find a real solution, and that is to give American youth overalls and jobs and not uniforms and militarization. [Applause.] Sure, put them into camps and knock out of their systems every single democratic concept. Knock out of their systems every feeling for the Bill of Rights, every feeling for free speech, and then what will you have in America? The America we love or a Nazi America?

What difference will there be between the America that we love, the America that we now have, and the Hitlerism that we want to smash?

These boys would not hesitate a minute to volunteer for the United States of America if America were in danger.

They would volunteer to fight in any war which was for the best interests of our country. They hesitate, however, because they know that they will be thrown into an imperialist war, a war for spoils, a war for Wall Street, and everything that Wall Street represents. But why conscription? I will tell you why conscription. Because the American people do not want any part of this war, and since the war makers know that the American people do not want any part of this war, that is why we are resorting to compulsion to conscription to drag American boys into the Army. [Applause.] I say that it is a reflection on the patriotism of American youth when it is charged here that it is necessary to drag these boys into the Army. I know the American boys. I am young enough to know them, and you know them too. American youth is patriotic and it is precisely because it is patriotic that it does not want to fight in any unpatriotic war. Are you going to vote here and say that the American boys in your community are not patriotic enough to take arms and defend the United States if it really became necessary to defend the United States?

When you vote for this conscription bill that is just what you are doing. You are reflecting on the patriotism of American youth. American boys are ready to fight for America, but American boys do not want any part of this imperialist war. The memory of 1917 is still too vivid in the minds of the American people; they do not want this repetition, hence draft, compulsion, conscription.

It has been said here that it is democratic. Whoever conceived that compulsion was compatible with democracy? How can anything be democratic when you compel and you force, and that is what you are doing here—legislating compulsion. We are dragging these people from their homes and putting them into the Army. There is nothing democratic in this compulsory war scheme.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I simply want to say in this 1 more minute that with me this issue is not political. It is most unfortunate that both candidates for President have taken the same position, but let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that despite the conspiracy on the part of the press, despite the conspiracy on the part of those who occupy the seats of the mighty, you are not fooling the American people. Your farmers and my workers know what this is all about. They know what the program is. They know that the program is armament, conscription, war and dictatorship, and they call upon the Representatives of the people to defeat that program and to give the American people, peace, bread, freedom, and security. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I was greatly impressed by the impassioned utterance of my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], of whom I am very fond, and who had done his best to lead me astray in matters of social theory. But as he was speaking I felt that he was a little like a friend of mine who had a somewhat pugnacious dog that was badly bitten and a friend said, "Why, your dog cannot fight." The answer was, "He can fight all right, but he is an awful poor judge of a dog." [Laughter.]

Under the prevailing confusion, uncertainty, and fear now afflicting mankind, which includes the United States, it is humanly impossible to avoid mistakes in judgment when dealing, as we must here in Congress, with great new issues involving unpredictable and far-reaching social, economic, and political implications. A case in point is this selective-service bill which we are now discussing. No matter how one votes on this legislation, he may be certain that he will be wrong in important particulars; in fact, life has become so complex and difficult that any man who can guess right more than half of the time is a supreme genius. The best the wisest of us can do is to act in accordance with what he decides is best for the United States of America, regardless of personal or political considerations.

Personally, I have deferred final decision as to my vote until I could study the committee hearings, the bill in its final form, the Senate debate, the views expressed in the public press, and in the personal correspondence which has come to my desk. After this study I am in the condition of the old lady who went to church to hear the preacher prove the existence of God, and when she came out she said, "I still believe in God." [Laughter.] But as a result of this study, or perhaps in spite of it, I have decided to vote for this legislation. [Applause.] That is, unless in its final form it contains the fearful and wonderful Russell-Overton amendment. In that case I shall vote against it.

I frankly admit the validity of certain arguments against this legislation and I unreservedly respect the sincerity and the patriotism of those who sponsor these adverse views, but under present world conditions, dangerously affecting our own domestic economy every hour of the day, I am convinced that this or similar legislation is necessary for the immediate security of our country.

And I further believe that this or similar legislation is absolutely essential if, as a Nation, we are to play any worthy part in helping to rescue civilization from complete chaos and ruin after the present world-wide madness of mechanized murder and ruthless conquest has run its destructive course. It is better to prepare for any emergency and not need the preparation, than to need it and not have it.

In a world overrun by gangsters, hungry for loot, thoroughly equipped with every instrument of destruction, only the strong can be safe; and strength to resist successfully can only be achieved by a long, costly, intelligent, self-sacrificing process of preparation.

This is purely a military measure. Its primary purpose is to effect adequate preparedness for the armed defense of our country. On this ground, and on this ground alone, I am giving it my support. As I understand it, this legislation is designed to supply a sufficient force of trained and seasoned men to operate, with the maximum of efficiency and safety to themselves, the vast, complicated equipment of ships, planes, guns, and other defensive machineries for which we have appropriated billions of the taxpayers' money.

If this legislation is necessary now, as I believe it is, it was necessary a year ago, and I consider it highly unfortunate, to say the least, that the present administration which then, as now, must have been in possession of all the facts, did not act when there was time for calm and deliberate consideration, instead of waiting until now when we are in the turmoil of a Presidential election, aggravated by whipped-up war hysteria.

I sincerely hope that this House will not follow the lead of the Senate and mess up this purely military legislation by adding what purports to be a wealth-conscription section, but which is really nothing more than an unnecessary, unworkable, and un-American grant of additional dangerous dictatorial powers to the present Federal administration. Let us settle one question at a time.

We are now dealing with the problem of securing adequate, properly trained and equipped manpower for our defense on sea, land, and in the air. When this has been successfully accomplished, if the conscription of industry, agriculture, labor, and capital becomes a necessity for the safety of the Nation, let us deal with that difficult and dangerous problem by itself in a manner worthy of its tremendous importance, but let us not attempt to tack onto this military measure a hastily concocted partisan makeshift which amounts to nothing more than a demagogic vote-catching gesture. [Applause.]

Now, I want to say a word to my friends who are opposed to this bill. I concur with them in certain of their arguments. There are grounds of legitimate opposition to this legislation which, under normal world conditions, would decide the issue, but which at the present moment are outweighed by the dangers confronting our Nation.

Conscription of men and material in peacetime is absolutely un-American. But how can the present be accurately described as "peacetime", when we, along with every other free society, are openly threatened with ruthless conquest—

military, economic, and political—by the greatest, most powerful combination of despotisms the world has ever seen?

We are still in the grip of an ideal of national isolationism, which seemed perfectly rational and entirely adequate in by-gone days, but which cannot function successfully in a world age when every section of mankind is in complete and continuous contact; when strange and uncouth ideologies infect the whole world like a bubonic plague, and when the weal or woe of any one nation is immediately reflected in the domestic economy of every other nation.

Every normal American hates and fears war as the ultimate human madness and folly, and is resolutely determined, if possible, to keep our country out of war. Every normal American believes that peace is an absolutely essential condition for the successful working of free, democratic institutions. But Russia, Germany, Italy, and Japan, with a military equipment never equaled in history, are at this moment actively or passively engaged in a war whose avowed object is world conquest, including this Western Hemisphere. The only free societies left in the world who are capable of defending their freedom are the British Empire and our American Republic. And we cannot defend ourselves except by a plan of complete preparedness. A policy of "too late and too little" for us means the eclipse of liberty in the world for generations to come.

I would be lacking in both courage and candor if I did not point out what seems to be the most potent and persistent ground of opposition to this legislation on the part of many Americans, regardless of party, in and out of Congress, whose patriotism and sincerity cannot be successfully questioned. The fact is that great numbers of our people are disturbed by increasing uncertainty and fear as to the undisclosed war plans and purposes of President Roosevelt. [Applause.]

This attitude of mind has been greatly stimulated by the fact that the President has persisted in running for a third term, thus doing violence to, if not actually holding in contempt, one of the most sacred and salutary traditions in our entire history.

If the President, following the high example of his illustrious predecessors, had announced his purpose to retire at the close of his second term, and had devoted these closing months of his administration solely to wise and constructive leadership in preparing the Nation for successful and economic defense against all possible enemies and emergencies, the legislation before us today would have found much smoother sailing. Especially is this true if he had permitted the Democratic Party to nominate as his successor one of its many eminent leaders.

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

Mr. EATON. Briefly.

Mr. KNUTSON. I understand the President was drafted. He was very loath to run a third time.

Mr. KELLER. I did not get that wise remark. Will you repeat it?

Mr. EATON. For the edification of the gentleman from Illinois will the gentleman from Minnesota repeat his remark.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is beyond my poor power to give the gentleman from Illinois understanding.

Mr. KELLER. You are entirely correct.

Mr. EATON. After this interchange of courtesies I will proceed. [Laughter.]

Following 7½ years of continuous acquisition and unrestrained exercise of new Presidential powers it is not surprising that increasing numbers of citizens in and out of Congress are reluctant to place in the hands of Mr. Roosevelt, for purposes which he has not fully revealed, a great military machine such as this selective-service bill provides.

Mr. Secretary Wallace, who is an amiable and self-effacing gentleman [laughter], has told us in his acceptance speech, which received without reservation the President's apostolic benediction, that the choice of America now lies between Roosevelt and Hitler. Speaking for myself I do not want either one of them. [Laughter and applause.]

Notwithstanding my recognition of the sound reasons for much of the opposition to this legislation, some of which I have outlined, I still feel it is the duty of Congress, under

present world conditions, in the interest of our national safety and future world peace, to pass this bill.

In the entire discussion of this preparedness program—and I would ask the Members to listen to this, because it is the conclusion of the whole matter—in the entire discussion of this preparedness program it seems to me we have been dealing too exclusively with mere secondary considerations. In truth, these considerations are of themselves of vital importance, but their final solution must be found in those cosmic, spiritual, racial, and economic forces now transforming the world.

Mankind is in the grip of the most universal and fundamental revolution ever known. Two irreconcilable, all-inclusive philosophies of life confront each other in a mortal battle for mastery of the world. These two philosophies, mutually destructive of each other, can be summed up in two words: Despotism and democracy. One is the incarnation of tyranny and slavery, the other is the ultimate expression of freedom. No matter what we do or fail to do here, one of these philosophies will eventually rule this world. Before the present universal revolution ends mankind will have become either all slave or all free. [Applause.] Once we glimpse even in faintest outline this stupendous reality which now casts its fateful shadow over every human being everywhere the real issue which America and Britain, with all the other freedom-loving peoples, must help to decide is clearly revealed. This issue is summed up in one question: After the totalitarian despotisms have completed their present campaign of conquest, will it be possible for free men to re-create a free world in which they and their children can live in peace and security? The American answer to this question is "Yes."

When the World War was on and I was in it, I had charge of production in all the shipyards and in thousands of industrial plants, and we built more and worse ships than were ever built in the history of the world in the same length of time. [Laughter.] My children were in it. Five men in my family were in it, and two of them laid down their lives. When it was over I wanted to see this greatest of all young nations in the history of the world, believing in law, believing in liberty, believing in manhood and its opportunities, join and lead the other freedom-loving people of the world in some sort of organization which would insure forever that no such war again would curse mankind. [Applause.]

For of all sad words of tongue or pen,
The saddest are these: "It might have been!"

But we missed the bus. We missed our chance. We buried our head in the sand like a fat ostrich under the delusion that thus we could blot out the rest of the world. We thought we could live apart from the pain and passion of other peoples. And now mankind is suffering its second crucifixion in two decades. When this is over, for God's sake and for man's sake, men and women, let us see to it that America will demonstrate some real faith in its own principles and its own life, and give to the world in conjunction with other liberty-loving races what it longs for and needs beyond all else, spiritual leadership, moral authority, an intellectual vision which will lead mankind again, though it be by long and hard steps, out of the abyss of failure, ruin, and suffering into which it is now sunk until there breaks the dawn of a new day, when—

Man to man the world o'er
Shall brothers be for a' that.

[Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] such time as he may desire.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I am asking leave to insert in the RECORD my remarks in which are included an answer to the unfair and unjust criticism that was directed at Colonel Lindbergh during the first of last month, which I feel some person ought to answer. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, on August 8 the Senate, by a vote of 71 to 7, passed the National Guard mobilization bill, the purpose of which is to call into active military training

for a period of 12 months the 350,000 voluntary enrollees of the National Guard and Reserves. This measure is mandatory merely with respect to the mobilization of the National Guard, whose members are volunteers.

On August 12 the Senate began the consideration of the Burke-Wadsworth bill, under the terms of which all men between the ages of 21 and 31 are to be called into active military training for a period of 12 months. This is the compulsory selective training and service measure now under consideration by the body.

On July 2, a full month before this measure was reported to the Senate, I urged the passage of a selective-training measure in a speech in the House of Representatives, and although the terms of the measure now under consideration differ somewhat in detail from those I suggested at that time there is no essential difference in principle.

At that time I urged two principal reasons for the passage of some form of selective-service legislation. Those reasons were:

First. The need for a program of national defense designed to protect the Nation against potential invasion from abroad and against the activities of Communists, "fifth columnists", and other subversive forces from within; and

Second. That those who seek to profit from war might not be protected in their disloyalty by the sacrifices of the loyal, courageous, and adventurous of the Nation who, by enlistment in the Nation's armed forces, voluntarily accept the burden of national defense.

Both these principles are expressed, in substance, in the Burke-Wadsworth bill, the preamble of which reads:

To protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training.

And the declaration of policy of which asserts that—

The Congress declares that in a free society the obligations and privileges of military training and service should be shared generally in accordance with a fair and just system of selective compulsory military training and service.

I have urged the passage of a selective military training measure, and I now urge the adoption of the pending bill because I believe it to be the only fair and equitable way in which to prepare for the defense of the Nation. It is only by means of such a measure that all alike—the rich and poor of every creed, color, and race—can be made to assume the obligations of military training or be assured of the privileges which alone attach to universal service in the defense of the Nation in time of crisis. Only by means of such a system will it be impossible for any particular group to profiteer upon those whose patriotism might cause them to become the prey of those who insist upon enjoying the blessings and advantages that America has to confer but who lack the loyalty necessary to preserve and maintain those blessings and advantages.

But such a system will do even more. It will tend to disclose the identity of those who plot against the Republic, who would destroy its institutions, and who would by revolution overthrow the very Government to which they now look for profit and protection. The effectiveness of such disclosure will increase in direct proportion to the age limits of the selective groups, and it was for that reason, partly, that I urged that the age limit be extended to 40 years.

A system of compulsory military training is the only means by which the principles of democracy can be preserved. It is the most effective means by which to preserve representative democracy itself.

It is my conviction, and it appears to be the conviction of a large number of the citizens of the Republic, that there can be no valid objection to some form of compulsory selective military training measure. Certainly there should be no objection based solely upon political consideration. National defense transcends partisan politics. Yet there are some who see objection in the mandatory requirement of military training in time of peace as a breaking down of one of our traditional policies. And I acknowledge that I myself reached the conclusion to support compulsory military training reluctantly. But I have adopted the principle because I find in it

the hope of breaking down the encroachment of the group that has entered the Nation in Trojan horses, that secretly plots the overthrow of the Government, and that has entrenched itself in high place in order the more successfully to plan its combat. While I have advocated and urged compulsory selective military training as a part of a general program of national defense I have tried to do so unmoved by the hysteria of war or the threatened invasion of the United States by totalitarian victors. I already have stated my reasons in greater detail on previous occasions, and time does not permit their reiteration now.

I feel that it is now more than ever essential that America should adhere strictly to its traditional foreign policy; and I believe that the improbability of our invasion rests to some degree at least upon our remaining far from the zone of combat. Certainly we should refrain from any conduct that might be construed as an act of war or as conducive to war. Our foreign policy should regard all combatants alike. We do not fear any. We should not favor any.

Differences of opinion with respect to our conduct have arisen. This is but natural. But it is regrettable that in expressing these differences there has been a tendency at times to ignore the issues and to resort to personal invective, abuse, and denunciation; and I refer particularly to the reception accorded the statement made by Col. Charles Lindbergh on August 4.

I have no intention to defend Colonel Lindbergh. He probably does not need nor desire defense. But I do think that in defense of the principle of free speech which we intend so ardently to preserve he should not be denounced personally for his expression as an American citizen. Such weight as we attach to his opinions arises not merely from our admiration for a valor that no one will deny, or from our high regard for his heroic achievement, but as well from the more logical fact that he has the knowledge and experience with which to evaluate observations made while abroad. Those who denounce him as a member of the "fifth column" are perhaps yielding too readily to the emotionalism of party valor and the hysteria of war. Careful, critical analysis of what Colonel Lindbergh said fails to disclose apparently valid ground for personal denunciation of him. Among other things he said:

First. That there still are interests in this country and abroad who would do their utmost to draw us into war; and he warned that against those interests we must be continuously on guard. Can anyone deny the validity of that statement or reject that warning?

Second. Colonel Lindbergh said that American opinion is now definitely and overwhelmingly against involvement in this war, that the people are beginning to realize that the problems of Europe cannot be solved by the interference of America. Can anyone doubt that? Would it not be well here to recall the words of General Pershing delivered over the radio on Sunday, August 4:

I know that many sincere patriots are frightened at the thought of even the smallest act because they think such acts would lead us closer to the day when another American Expeditionary Force sets sail for Europe. It is my opinion that in this war it would be absolute folly even to consider sending another expeditionary force.

Third. Colonel Lindbergh said that we should build and plan the defense of our own continent and turn our eyes in the direction of security and peace; that if our own military forces are strong no foreign nation could invade us. Does that sound like the language of a "fifth columnist"?

Fourth. He said that if we do not interfere in the affairs of foreign nations they would not desire to invade us. Certainly, this is but a conclusion drawn from our traditional foreign policy. History has not repudiated it.

Fifth. He said that since we have decided against entering the war in Europe we should begin to consider the relationships we will have with Europe after this war is over; and that only by using the utmost intelligence in establishing and maintaining that relationship can we keep America out of war in the future.

Opposition to this statement, which appears to have aroused especial antagonism, appears to be based on the presumption that Hitler will emerge victorious and that we shall be forced

to enter into some relationship with him. To most of us any form of negotiation or relationship with Hitler appears objectionable and undesirable. Yet, the logic of Colonel Lindbergh's conclusion remains unimpeachable. Can anything be gained by denouncing him for stating the truth?

Sixth. Colonel Lindbergh regards the present European war as a war for the division of wealth and territory between nations. On October 9, almost a year ago, in a speech in the House of Representatives I said that "today, as for a thousand years, the warring armies of Europe seek the economic advantages of coal and iron, the raw materials of war, of economic progress and economic security. In the thousand-year perpetual conflict millions of men have been sacrificed to the god of war as possession of these raw materials has passed alternately into the hands of one or the other of these perennial belligerents. Does anyone doubt that these same forces prevail today? They will, in my opinion, continue to prevail until hatred, greed, racial and linguistic animosities, and economic desires, ambitions, and covetousness can be removed from the European cauldron of war. And no sacrifice that America ever may make will remove those causes until the nations of Europe themselves determine first to remove them." Although it is horrible for Americans to contemplate that war alone may be the means of their removal can anyone doubt the validity of Colonel Lindbergh's conclusion in this respect?

They who would have us believe that this is not a war for the division of wealth and territory but a war of ideologies deceive themselves and confuse the Nation. This is no war of ideologies. That war is still to come. It will come when the nations that are now destroying one another shall, exhausted and prostrate from economic disintegration and political dissolution, fall prey to the ideology that has cunningly preserved itself for the day when it may pounce down upon those nations in economic ruin and pour forth its savage strength in the victory of communism.

Seventh. Colonel Lindbergh says that we should rearm fully for the defense of America; that any peace plan should be based upon the welfare of America, and be backed by an impregnable system of defense. He said:

I have faith in an American Army, an American Navy, and an American air force—and most important of all, the American character, which in normal times, lies quietly beneath the surface of this Nation.

That is not the faith of a "fifth columnist." That is the faith of America. Let us all rededicate ourselves to that faith and reaffirm it through a system of compulsory selective military training that will make the American Army invincible, the American Navy unconquerable, the American air force supreme, and the American character unimpeachable.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I addressed the House and called attention to an amendment that I proposed to offer to the bill. I have prepared the amendment and have had the Navy Department analyze the difference between the so-called Smith amendment, the Military Affairs Committee amendment, and my amendment.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this analysis in the RECORD so the House will have the benefit of this information when the amendment is offered on the floor tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair inquire if that is extraneous matter?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, no; it is in reference to my amendment that I propose to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

A. CONDITIONS ON PLACING ORDERS

AMENDMENT OF COMMITTEE ON
MILITARY AFFAIRS

AMENDMENT OF COMMITTEE ON
HOUSE NAVAL AFFAIRS COM-
MITTEE

"The President is empowered, through the head of the War Department or the Navy De-

"That during the present emergency declared by the President on September 8, 1939,

A. CONDITIONS ON PLACING ORDERS—Continued

AMENDMENT OF COMMITTEE ON
MILITARY AFFAIRS—continued

partment of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for such product or material as may be required, and which is of the nature and kind usually produced or capable of being produced by such individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry."

AMENDMENT OF COMMITTEE ON
HOUSE NAVAL AFFAIRS COM-
MITTEE—continued

to exist, whenever the Secretaries of War and Navy, respectively, have tried and failed either—

"(a) To place or negotiate contracts, in accordance with existing law, for authorized objects, or parts thereof, for their departments, with any individual, trustee, firm, association, company, or corporation, hereinafter referred to in this bill as 'the contractor or subcontractor'; or

"(b) To place or negotiate such contracts at reasonable rates of delivery or at prices they consider to be fair and reasonable—

"they are authorized and empowered in their discretion, after consultation with the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, within the limits of the sums appropriated to their departments therefor, to place orders with such contractors or subcontractors for such authorized objects, or parts thereof, as the interests of their departments may require, which are of the nature, kind, or quantity usually produced, or capable of being produced, by such contractors or subcontractors."

COMMENT

The above paragraph of the Military Affairs Committee was taken verbatim from the act of June 3, 1916, which is now 50 United States Code 80. There is no duration time, so this would be permanent authority, and it is believed that such broad authority is warranted only in time of emergency or war. Moreover, the authority being conferred under the version of the Committee on Military Affairs is not contingent upon any failure by the contractor, whereas in the version of the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee this broad authority can be exercised only when there has been a failure to make a contract by the present authorized medium. Moreover, the authority in the version of the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee is granted only after consultation has been had with the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, which agency is supposed to coordinate and place such orders. It will be appreciated, therefore, that these two steps which the Secretaries would have to undertake under the Vinson amendment are fair to the manufacturer in that he will have a better chance to present his case, and it prevents any arbitrary action being taken without being thoroughly considered.

The general difference between the two amendments is that the amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs is a duplicate of the World War legislation, which was designed to be effective during a state of war or when a state of war was imminent, and its provisions are drastic and its powers of commandeering practically unlimited, in the exercise of which the manufacturer has no method of appeal or consideration. The Vinson amendment attempts to impose penalties only when there has been a failure to accept orders and provides a number of mediums by which the manufacturer may have a chance to present his case, and even if a plant is taken over by the Government, there is no prison sentence or fine imposed. It is believed that such a penalty would be entirely too drastic in time of peace, because the manufacturer is guaranteed certain rights under the constitution which should, if ever, be taken away only when a state of war exists.

B. COMPLIANCE AND PRECEDENCE

AMENDMENT OF COMMITTEE ON
MILITARY AFFAIRS

AMENDMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF
HOUSE NAVAL AFFAIRS COM-
MITTEE

"Compliance with all such orders for products or material shall be obligatory on any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, and shall take precedence over all other orders and contracts theretofore placed with such individual, firm, company, association, corporation,

"Compliance with all such orders shall be obligatory on any contractor or subcontractor to whom they are given, and they shall, in the discretion of the Secretary placing them, take precedence over all orders or contracts placed with such contractor or subcontractor. The Secretaries of War and Navy shall, in all such cases, where it is in the interests of the

B. COMPLIANCE AND PRECEDENCE—Continued

AMENDMENT OF COMMITTEE ON
MILITARY AFFAIRS—continued

or organized manufacturing industry, and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, owning or operating any plant equipped for the manufacture of arms or ammunition or parts of ammunition, or any necessary supplies of equipment for the Army or Navy"—

COMMENT

These two versions are the same in their intent, except that in the version of the Committee on Military Affairs compliance and precedence are mandatory, whereas in Mr. VINSON's amendment the precedence is discretionary in the Secretary, although compliance is mandatory.

C. PENALTY

AMENDMENT OF COMMITTEE ON
MILITARY AFFAIRS

"and any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, owning or operating any manufacturing plant, which, in the opinion of the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall be capable of being readily transformed into a plant for the manufacture of arms or ammunition, or parts thereof, or other necessary supplies or equipment, who shall refuse to give to the United States such preference in the matter of the execution of orders, or who shall refuse to manufacture the kind, quantity, or quality of arms or ammunition, or the parts thereof, or any necessary supplies or equipment, as ordered by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, or who shall refuse to furnish such arms, ammunition, or parts of ammunition, or other supplies or equipment, at a reasonable price as determined by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, then, and in either such case, the President, through the head of the War or Navy Departments of the Government, in addition to the present authorized methods of purchase or procurement, is hereby authorized to take immediate possession of any such plant or plants, and through the appropriate branch, bureau, or department of the Army or Navy to manufacture therein such product or material as may be required, and any individual, firm, company, association, or corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, failing to comply with the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding \$50,000."

COMMENT

The penalty under the amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs is taking possession and also makes the manufacturer guilty of a felony and subject to imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding \$50,000. Under the Vinson amendment, if a firm refuses an order, the Secretaries are first required to go to the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense and see if that Commission can induce the firm to accept the order or give satisfactory performance. If the Com-

AMENDMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF
HOUSE NAVAL AFFAIRS COM-
MITTEE—continued

United States, pool their orders or coordinate their orders, prices, and priorities."

mission is unable to do so, they advise the President, who may, on recommendation of the Secretary placing the order, if at this point the Secretary is unable to effect a satisfactory leasing arrangement, take possession of the plant. There is no other penalty than the taking of the plant. This seems to be all the penalty that should attach in time of peace, and the procedure in the Vinson amendment is much fairer to the manufacturer. Both amendments provide not only for plants which are engaged in manufacturing munitions but also those which are capable of being converted into plants for making munitions. The Vinson amendment is broader than the committee's amendment, because it covers performance failures on a broader basis than the committee's amendment to look out for negligence, indifference, or culpability by the manufacturer. Both amendments cover the question of reasonable price.

D. COMPENSATION

AMENDMENT OF COMMITTEE ON
MILITARY AFFAIRS

"The compensation to be paid to any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry for its products or material, or as rental for use of any manufacturing plant while used by the United States, shall be fair and just: *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be deemed to render inapplicable existing State or Federal laws concerning the health, safety, security, and employment standards of the employees in such plant."

AMENDMENT OF CHAIRMAN OF
HOUSE NAVAL AFFAIRS COM-
MITTEE

"The President is authorized to fix and require adequate compensation to be paid by the interested Secretary from any funds available to his Department for such use during the period the plant or factory, or necessary part thereof, is in the possession of the United States, and when its use is no longer required, the President shall return it in good condition to such contractor or subcontractor or owner. The President shall in each case, before he takes possession as indicated above, report to Congress failure to accept an order or give satisfactory performance. If Congress is not in session, such report shall be filed with the clerks of the House and Senate."

COMMENT

Both amendments cover the question of compensation by practically the same means. The Vinson amendment provides for reporting to Congress of such failures to accept orders or give satisfactory performance which the committee's amendment does not.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I have received several hundred letters for or against this bill from fine, patriotic citizens in my district. I do not expect to change any votes by my remarks, but I wish to explain my position to my constituents.

The vote on the pending selective compulsory service bill confronts Members of this Congress with one of the most difficult and momentous decisions they will ever be called upon to make. Conscription is hateful to all of us. We are a liberty-loving people and resent any governmental interference with our individual activities except that which we recognize to be necessary for the maintenance of a well-ordered society.

In thinking and worrying about the question facing us, I think it is well to bear in mind the basic purposes of our Union as expressed in the preamble to the Constitution:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

I do not believe it was pure chance that caused the framers to state the objectives of the people of the United States in that order. Without a more perfect Union, justice, domestic tranquillity, and provision for the common defense, our Government could not have promoted the general welfare or secured the blessings of liberty through all the years, and we cannot do it now.

I think it is significant also that the very first sentence of section 8 of article I, listing the powers granted to Congress, states that "The Congress shall have power * * * to provide for the common defense." This is vastly more than a delegated power; it is tremendous responsibility resting

on each one of us to see to it that our defenses are adequate to keep this country secure against any and all foreign aggressors.

The able junior Senator from Massachusetts expressed my feeling toward this legislation when he said:

It may very well be that this country will not be attacked, and I hope it will not, and I am rather inclined to believe it will not; but I have simply felt that those of us who are in a position of responsibility have got to assume the worst; and then, if the worst does not happen, so much the better.

Unpredictable events have been happening all over the world in the last year or two. It is conceivable that in the not-far-distant future we will be compelled to defend ourselves and our friendly neighbors to the north and south of us from aggression in the Atlantic, or the Pacific, or both. If that day comes and we are unprepared to meet the threat because of congressional inaction here and now, the opponents of this measure will bitterly reproach themselves as long as they live.

Not being an expert on foreign relations nor on military affairs, I cannot presume to say what we actually need for adequate preparedness. Both of the candidates for President have told us their belief that conscription is necessary to man the modern weapons we need and which are being built pursuant to almost unanimous votes of Congress. All of our high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy, as well as the other experts whose business it is to know about national defense, concur in that opinion. We are informed by responsible authorities that in the light of past history the volunteer system cannot and will not bring into the Army and Navy the numbers that will be presently needed for military and technical training. I have no special knowledge which justifies me in defying their opinion.

I do not regard compulsory service as undemocratic. On the contrary, I think it is the duty of every citizen, no matter what his station in life, to prepare himself to defend his family and his country according to his ability. If we wish to preserve the liberty of action and freedom of choice we have enjoyed in America, we must be willing to make sacrifices—all of us. Our way of life is not self-perpetuating in a world which greedy and ruthless dictators seek to dominate by force and murder. Ordinary prudence demands that precautionary measures be taken in these dangerous days.

Many worried people who have written me, take it for granted that the men selected for service are going straight to war. I think the opposite is true. Our soldiers and sailors will never be called upon to fight if we have enough of them and they are properly trained and equipped.

We are a rich Nation, blessed with enormous natural resources, and foreign rulers look upon us with covetous eyes. Weakness in our means of defense invites attack and bloody disaster.

The whole world knows that this House is now debating a selective compulsory service bill and is keenly interested in the outcome. If we should fail to pass it, the prestige and influence of the United States would drop to zero in Europe, Asia, and South America because it would be notice to all that we cannot and will not take up arms before potential enemies are at our gates. I am going to vote for this bill, if amendments do not completely destroy it, because I believe it will provide insurance against war.

I am extremely hopeful that coming events will make it unnecessary to complete the program which has been started, that we will not have to build the armada which has been authorized, or develop an army of the size contemplated.

I have complete confidence in General Marshall and I am quite sure men will not be called into the service before the necessary housing, hospitalization, equipment, and other training facilities are available. And I can assure the prospective civilian soldiers that very few of them will ever regret their year of service. They will be better men physically, they will have a truer perspective of human values, and they will have the deep satisfaction of knowing that they were ready when their country needed them.

My deepest concern regarding the immediate future is the secret program and the undisclosed commitments of the President. On yesterday he announced the most warlike step he has yet taken. Fifty of our reconditioned destroyers have been turned over to a belligerent nation, contrary to international law and the plain mandates of our own statutes. The Attorney General, obviously obeying orders, justifies the sale by legalistic legerdemain.

The people and the Congress of the United States wish fervently to avoid being drawn into any European war because they realize the terrible consequences. It is an imminent danger so long as this administration is in power. I hope for a change, but in the meantime I see no safe alternative to a program of rearmament, with modern weapons and men trained to use them. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from South Carolina [Mrs. McMILLAN].

Mrs. CLARA G. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, final action of the House on the bill which we are debating today will determine once and for all the position America will occupy in the eyes of the world. The importance of it cannot be over-emphasized; we shall be weighed in the balance by this decision.

Freedom to us is the foundation stone upon which the structure of our Government was built—freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of assembly, freedom from oppression are our inalienable rights. Our forefathers fled the countries of Europe to obtain it; they shed their lifeblood for it. Freedom and America are synonymous terms. Atop the dome of this Capitol is the symbol of our country, Mr. Chairman—a statue of Armed Freedom. Does that mean anything to us? Did not our forefathers who planned this building and its symbolic statue foresee that freedom is not for those who will not fight to maintain it? They fought, and for their sacrifice America stands today the bulwark of civilization and liberty.

The war in Europe rages on with unforeseen speed. We cannot deny that our destiny is linked with that of Europe, no matter what the outcome of that war. The crisis is upon us. We must realize this is not alone a war brought on by the greed of avaricious totalitarian states for more territory and resources; it is the battle in which the very sod of civilization is threatened. In the dictator nations human life and liberty are subjugated to the will of the rulers as the means to an end—the end being a more powerful state. Our country was founded on the belief each individual has the right for freedom of individual expression; our Government is maintained as a means to this end. It is my sincere conviction that our people wish to continue our philosophy of government.

The people of America are awake to the seriousness of the times. They have demanded that Congress enact laws to defend them against the destruction of their rights and their property; this we have done. The Congress, by almost unanimous vote, in the past few weeks has declared itself and these United States for a vast program of national defense. We have appropriated billions of dollars to build ships, airplanes, tanks. Other billions to purchase general supplies, equipment, and matériel, and still more billions to provide housing and training for an adequate Army and Navy. We have gone further than that. We have declared to the world by recent act of Congress our belief in the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and we have ruled that we shall protect and defend the countries of the Western Hemisphere against acts of aggression or invasion by any foreign power. We have declared our intentions and have set up the machinery for carrying them out; and now we come to the final decision, the need for manpower.

We need men well trained in military tactics, in gunnery and the operation of machinery, skilled airplane pilots, navigators, technicians. We need healthy, strong men, hardened and seasoned by actual service. This conscription bill is a means to provide them. The compulsory education in our country through the laws of each State equip each individual with weapons with which he wages his battle of life. In this

time of peril it is necessary that we conduct a Nation-wide program to equip our citizens with the means of protecting themselves and our country.

We as Members of the legislative body of our Government have given our word to the people to defend them; we have pledged ourselves to protect this hemisphere. We are in honor bound to fulfill this pledge. To fail now to provide men would invite the scorn of all nations.

This, my friends, is the way to peace and freedom. We must sacrifice for it.

I have five sons. The oldest will come immediately under the operation of this bill and will be subject to its provisions, as he is past 21 years old. My second son is almost 19 years old and is now taking military training in a school organized for that purpose. If and when my sons are needed for the defense of their country, I do not want them to go up against experienced soldiers untrained and unskilled.

It will be with a heavy heart but with honest conviction that I shall vote for this measure. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am rather happy that the debate on this all-important subject has progressed in such a temperate manner. It has progressed upon the theory that the Speaker himself is a gentleman and he is addressing other gentlemen, and gentlemen do not need to adopt anything but moderate tones in order to make their respective points. I shall try to conform to the precedent established in this debate and will continue without hysteria or emotion.

It has been said that we are embarking upon the road of dictatorship if we adopt this bill for compulsory military training. To have the United States Government go into a home and say, "We want your boy for a year" is not in keeping with the perfect democratic processes, but I make the point that war and democracy are incompatible. The question we are asked to determine is, "Shall we, to a little extent, and for a little time give up some of the democratic processes in order to preserve democracy, not only for ourselves later on, but permanently down through the years for our children and our children's children?"

We must determine whether or not there is an emergency. To determine that we must take cognizance of events that are going on all around us. We have seen the lights of democracy go out one by one all over the world. Today this country alone holds high the beacon light of democracy. We have seen Poland conquered by a superior force in 27 days. I know we said to ourselves then, "Of course, Poland is not a major military force. It will not happen when they come up against some major force." Then, we saw the ghastly defeat of France. We saw the German Army outflank the Maginot line on which the French relied so securely. We saw that army go into the lowlands and drive the British expeditionary force off of continental Europe and had not that British expeditionary force escaped through one of the best and most courageous evacuations in the annals of military history, England would not be contesting the fight today. It was that close and by that very narrow margin that England today stands between us and Hitler. The aggressor might have conquered England by now except for the miraculous escape of its strongest and best-trained force, the British expeditionary force.

Some people say, "Well, what is going on over in Europe is just another back-room brawl between European nations." Some people say that it was the iniquities of the Versailles Treaty that caused Hitler and this new Germany to arm and to fight. I say to them they are certainly in error, because Germany has conquered all of the territory she had before the war and much more; yet, she is continuing to fight England and attempting to conquer territory which she never had. This war would cease tomorrow if Germany would stop expanding and conquering. We have witnessed England's dogged perseverance. We do not know how much longer it

can continue. We hope they will be successful and stop this force, but can we be sure? Yet there are today men and women who still are unafraid of this force and who can say with certainty that the aggressor nations will go thus far and who predict they will go no farther. What insight have they into the future that allows them to predict this with such certainty? I do not know and I do not see how they know when and where all this terrific force which has been unleashed throughout this world will stop. But I do not wish to take the chance it will not stop, therefore, I want to have this country prepared for any eventuality.

I do not believe it is too much to ask that we have an army of 1,200,000 men in order to defend ourselves. This is a step in the direction of defense and not a step inviting war. I believe we should build our defense on such a scale and with such speed that no aggressor would dare test our fighting power. That is a form of insurance that will keep war out of the Western Hemisphere. This measure proposes to do that by conscripting 800,000 men in a year's time. It represents the considered judgment of our responsible military authorities. The War Department has certified it can receive these men and adequately handle and train them with available equipment and facilities. Virtually all competent authorities, including the Chief of Staff, certify that in their judgment the volunteer system is wholly inadequate to meet the problems now before us. Those who advocate delay in the application of selective service, contrary to the judgment of the Commander in Chief and his responsible advisers, bear a heavy burden of responsibility. I favor it without exemptions for Congressmen. All of us who are under 45 should set an example of patriotism to the rest of the country by registering and complying with the law we pass. Then if we are called, we shall go not with heavy heart but glad to serve our country.

May I say, addressing myself to another feature of this bill, that inasmuch as I favor the conscription of manpower, I find it difficult to understand the philosophy of men who also favor conscription of men but who do not favor the conscription of recalcitrant industry. To me that is placing property rights way above human rights. To say in one breath that we shall take human beings, we shall conscript human beings, and in another breath we shall not conscript business when it refuses to cooperate with the Government is certainly insulting the dignity of human beings just as much as it is being insulted by the totalitarian leaders today.

Someone said not so long ago they would vote for conscription but they would not vote for drafting industry when it balked. Inasmuch as I favor conscription as a necessary measure, may I say that I will not vote for conscription unless the Smith amendment, which I think is better than the Overton-Russell amendment, becomes a part of this bill. What we are facing is a fight to preserve democracy, not to preserve the profits of this country. It is not because we have more automobiles than all the other nations in the world; it is not because we possess more telephones, more wealth, and riches that we are great. I do not believe that any soldier ever gave up his life because of the material wealth of America. I believe that what we are guarding now is something far more precious. The American way of life, liberty, and freedom, words that are tasteless on the tongue of an orator, but nevertheless are words that are becoming increasingly precious today. The right of freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom to agitate for what you believe in, freedom of worship, freedom to agitate against existing governmental policies and to direct your forces against them, and change them, if necessary—those are some of the privileges of a free nation which we now enjoy.

In this Nation we now have the only real, democratic government on the face of God's green earth. This Nation offers to the individual a greater chance of advancement than any other nation now existing. I say we must preserve the spiritual qualities of this Nation, equality, justice to all, and respect for the individual, and preserve them permanently down through the ages. We must make democracy work,

so that when the totalitarian forces have expended themselves the distressed people of all those other nations will look with longing eyes on our democratic institutions, will learn their mistakes, and will model their own governments after ours.

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

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECCOMBE. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has always been a great supporter of organized labor and the author of many bills, for which I respect him.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. That is right.

Mr. SECCOMBE. How can the gentleman concede that the voice of organized labor in opposition to this bill should not be heard?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I have just this to say: I believe this question is so momentous that every Member in this House is trying to see the light and find the truth. I have weighed both sides. I have tried to find wherein the truth lies. I know the consequences either way are grim, but I believe the least grim consequences of all will result if we pass this bill so that we may be prepared in the event we are ever called on to defend this hemisphere. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the discussions this afternoon, as I listened to some of the committee hearings, with deep interest. I rise at this time because I believe the condition of the country is such that it is very necessary that we consider the implications involved in this bill as well as the facts that have been developed in the hearings.

It is within the last 48 hours that the President of these United States has seen fit to disregard this Congress, and on an exceedingly thin judgment rendered by the Attorney General he has turned over to Great Britain 50 of our ships, more ships than we have built or will be able to build in heaven knows how long.

This bill is presented to us as the only democratic way of raising an army. Maybe it is, if that army is going to fight for what we so loosely term a democracy. I call your attention to the fact that this Nation was created a Republic. [Applause.] I am inclined to believe, gentlemen, that you would find you would have no dearth of volunteers to fight for the Republic. Why should they want to fight for democracy again? Why, Stalin's is a democracy.

The effort of the administration and the proponents of the bill to brand as partisan and unpatriotic any criticism or opposition, certainly gives evidence that we have gone far away from fundamental American methods of thought and action. At a time when clear, calm, intelligent, discriminating criticism of both the definite proposals and the even more important implications should be the order of the day, it is truly tragic that we are as we are.

The gentlewoman from South Carolina [Mrs. McMILLAN] has indeed five splendid sons. They are all younger than mine. I have three, the oldest of whom is not fit for military service due to an accident of long ago. My other two sons are members of the Ohio National Guard and as such have already been conscripted for this country's service. [Applause.]

For over 30 years I was the wife of a man who loved the Army, who taught me much that few women outside the Army have opportunity of knowing. The need of adequate national defense has been in my consciousness these many years, as has my understanding of just how far Hitler has already gone in establishing his outposts in South America. I am not speaking from ignorance when I speak. My inability to go along with this bill is not because I do not see the need but because, try as I will, I cannot help see in it more danger than defense, more dictatorship than democracy.

How are we to determine the accuracy of contradictory testimony regarding the numbers that can be adequately

housed and clothed? In May, or thereabouts, the committee was informed that 75,000 men only could be taken care of this fall. Lo, in August they had "passed a miracle" and announced they could be ready for 400,000!

I want to bring another phase of the problem to your attention. On August 28 the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] inserted in the RECORD, on page 11088, a table of requirement of additional shelter for 230,000 men, these not including draftees. This table lists 34 units requiring construction of housing facilities. Not all of these include the actual cantonments but all of them include what is termed hospital facilities—34 units without hospital facilities.

Have you considered what the possibilities are if troops are assembled, no matter where, in winter, in any numbers without hospital facilities? Measles often is followed by pneumonia. "Sore throats" are very often "strep" infections. Green men from the farms and from the cities are soft and fertile soil for every form of infection. Dare we in what we still hopefully call peacetime risk these men in camps where medical facilities for care and hospitalization are still non-existent?

Do your minds retain as mine does the memories of those camps in the last war after the flu hit—the bodies rolled in improvised winding sheets that had to serve also as coffins? That is in my memory—as are the nurses who lived through the heart-breaking strain of epidemic, and, when the dramatic need for them was past, broke physically and even mentally, never to come back.

Members of the House, I want to adjure you that the mothers of America's youth will hold this Congress responsible if these men go into camp while there is not adequate preparation for their housing, clothing, hospitalization, and care. There is no time to build hospitals after fever, pneumonia, or other communicable diseases sweep a camp—and nothing that is "on order" will bring the men back who have died.

I am probably more aware than most of you of the splendid efforts that are being made by the Surgeon General's office and those associated with him to set up adequate base hospitals at these camps. But they are still only efforts. I know also, for it is my business to keep informed on these matters, that modern warfare has made these regular base hospitals obsolete. Before an enemy attacks us we must both streamline and camouflage our military hospital service as zealously as our air-defense guns, hangars, and machine-gun nests.

Much has been said of the constructive part that will be played by a year's military training in the lives of our young men. I had to contend with the destructive part of what military training did to our young and our older men during the war, and I want to assure you that just military training is not going to produce a clean and a free America.

The methods used by this administration in all matters of national defense are so tied up with its steady march toward national socialism—you can call it dictatorship—that it is difficult for me to see how anyone who believes in the fundamental principles of American representative government can fail to see the implication of a peacetime draft bill.

I wish I could convince myself it is only a foolish bugaboo that was discussed here yesterday—the possible betrayal of America.

Have you stopped to think that once a President has all this authority he might use it?

The promoters of the peacetime draft idea without question have convinced themselves of its justifiability. Some of us on both sides of the aisle have not, but we have the right to expect our motives to be held as patriotic as theirs.

In closing let me say very quietly and very earnestly, as an American woman serving in this Congress, because nothing in all the world means to me what America means and because I am very certain that she is in real danger. Try as I will, I cannot convince myself that this bill for peacetime conscription of our men and Government-controlled use of our industry is a true defense measure. I cannot consider it anything less than a major step toward dictatorship which, under the conditions in the world today, could be used to implement the

declaration of the President of not "total defense" but "total control." [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing new in the dictator argument by those who oppose selective service. I presume to suggest that the advocates of conscription from a deep-seated conviction, but who oppose the passage of the legislation presently, will find small comfort for their convictions when they reflect that the other and Republican candidate for the Presidency of the United States, Wendell Willkie, also advocates conscription.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would like first to make my argument.

The same arguments that are made against conscription in the existing national, unprecedented emergency in peace, threatened with war, are the same arguments that have always been made by those who oppose conscription in times of war.

When Japan has overrun much of China, and as a result of the German conquest in Europe, public opinion in the United States has been crystallized for prompt and adequate national defense, it is time for action. The time for words has passed. I shall speak briefly.

With one accord the Congress of the United States has made the largest appropriations in peacetimes for the enlargement and the mechanization of the Army, for the increase of the air force, and for the modernization of the Navy. We have authorized and appropriated billions of dollars to promote this program of national defense because all concede that we are face to face with the greatest emergency that ever confronted the Republic in times of peace. It is in vain to appropriate these billions of money for equipment unless we provide adequately for the handling of that equipment. There must be the trained soldier to handle the modernized armament; after all, machines do not think. Men are more important than guns. In our democracy we are considering legislation that will provide for the training that is needed in our program for national defense. All are treated alike; the selection is to be made by local boards, and the military is subservient to the civil authority. But it has been suggested that the volunteer system will secure the necessary recruits. Those who know best, the Chief of Staff, say it will take 2 years to secure the necessary number. We have delayed too long. It is the general consensus that the Selective Service and Training Act is the only method that will procure promptly the men needed in this program. No great war was ever fought by any country without conscription. George Washington, in Virginia, advocated it in 1777, in the Revolutionary War.

Massachusetts passed a conscription act in 1777 in that war. A conscription bill was finally proposed in the War of 1812, and only the victory of Andrew Jackson at New Orleans, with his seasoned and trained troops in the Indian Wars, in which he participated, prevented the passage and enforcement of the act.

Abraham Lincoln was called a dictator in 1863 when he advocated conscription. I am among those who believe that the splendid record of the Confederacy in the War Between the States is largely due to the fact that beginning in 1862 conscription was adopted in the Confederacy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In a moment, please. In 1917 Woodrow Wilson was called a dictator, but few now who love their country will dispute the proposition that the selective draft in 1917 was not the best and fairest way to provide for the American Army.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried the voluntary system. It has failed. The country demands preparedness and defense. All are treated alike in this bill. I favor the provisions of the House bill, particularly the age limits in the House bill. I think they are preferable to the provisions in the Senate bill. I hear the argument that our country is to provide for those who are unemployed, to feed the hungry,

and to clothe the naked, but it is my judgment that those who have been fed and those who have been employed ought to defend the Government which has supported them in the last 5 years. [Applause.]

I have little patience with the communistic opponents, respecting as I do those who honestly oppose conscription in both peace and war—I repeat, I have no patience for the communistic influence that opposes conscription, when in Russia, the birthplace of communism, there is the largest standing conscript army in all the world. [Applause.]

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

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will be glad to yield as soon as I have had an opportunity to finish my statement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the purpose is to secure trained men for the appropriations we have made. The purpose of the selective draft is to get the right man for the right place; the right man for the right job, whether he be your son or mine. There is not any more democratic way to do it.

I want to suggest in this connection that I am personally gratified that the committee has proposed an amendment as a substitute for the so-called Russell-Overton amendment adopted in the Senate, and I think the language of the committee amendment is preferable to that of the Russell-Overton amendment. It follows the language of the act of 1920.

If we are to conscript men, those men ought to have the plants and materials to provide the equipment which they need to render the service to which we have called them.

I want to say another thing. There has been much short-sighted criticism of the demands that new plants be located in the great interior of the country. I say this criticism is short-sighted. Munition factories are now located where they were located when we thought the Atlantic Ocean was a complete barrier. There is a great citadel that can be erected in the interior of our country, as were the cities of refuge in ancient times, and I think we ought to utilize existing plants and existing facilities in the present need, but in the expansion future plants should be located where they will be free from attacks. [Applause.]

We covet no land; we covet no territory. We have the men. We have the resources. We are determined to the last cent and to the last man to defend the country of our fathers. [Applause.]

I extend and revise by saying that prompt and adequate national defense will be promoted by the immediate passage of the pending bill.

SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

The totalitarian powers in the Orient and in Europe speak and recognize no language except force. Force can only be overcome by force.

Ominous and unprecedented realities confront the American people. Modern warfare is waged on military and economic fronts. Defense is imperative to preserve peace. The Nation has been aroused as never before in its history to the necessity of wise defense. Billions of dollars have been authorized and appropriated, as I have stated, to enlarge, modernize, and mechanize the Army and Navy. Arms, munitions, and implements of war without adequately equipped and trained manpower will be in vain.

The primary purpose of the pending bill is to train for service.

The selective system of compulsory military service is the fairest method of reaching the desirable objective. Individual rights must yield, in a grave national emergency, to the welfare of the Nation.

If it be said that the United States has never resorted to compulsory service or to conscription in peacetime, the sufficient answer is that the United States has never been faced with such a grave national emergency. We have recognized that emergency, as I have just stated, by appropriating in peacetime the largest amounts for the Army and Navy in the history of the Republic.

In compulsory training, all share equally in the obligations of defense. The selection is administered by a board in every county. It is composed of the friends and neighbors of those called to service. No fairer method could be devised. Those

needed will be called and they will be called when they are needed.

Conscription provides for an inventory of the Nation's manpower. The selection of those able to bear arms and those unable to bear arms can be made. I repeat that the selective service is the only way to put the right man in the right place. All are accorded equal treatment.

MORALE

Arms and munitions are not enough. There must be faith in the ideals of the American people. Every citizen is thus enabled to serve his country according to his ability and according to his country's needs.

The risks and the sacrifices in preparation for defense or war should be equitably distributed among age groups and economic groups.

The aims of democracy have not been fully realized and the hope of fruition lies in freedom from the antidemocratic ideas spread by totalitarian powers. All who stand for free institutions must unite to protect these institutions.

CONSCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

Under the act of 1916, as amended by the act of 1920, the President, in time of war or when war is imminent, is empowered to commandeer manufacturing plants and materials for national defense. Such is the purpose of the Russell-Overton amendment adopted by the Senate. The language of the Senate bill, however, might be construed to give powers that are either unnecessary or dangerous. It provides for commandeering manufacturing plants or facilities. The National Defense Act provides for commandeering manufacturing plants and war materials. The word "facilities" might include the radio, the newspaper, and it might embrace schools and churches. I believe that the amendment submitted by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, following as it does the act of 1916, as amended by the act of 1920, provides the better procedure; it will better accomplish the purpose. Among other things, it provides for commandeering for the payment of reasonable rentals during operation by the Government, and for return to the owners. If there is to be a conscription of men, there must be a conscription of the plants and materials to provide for arms, ammunition, and implements of war. If there is to be conscription of manpower in peace, there should also be power for the conscription of property.

LABOR

I am not impressed by the opposition to the conscription of manufacturing plants by the allegation that it means the conscription of labor. Personally, if men are conscripted to die for their country, in a grave emergency, they should be conscripted to work for their country. The answer, however, is that labor is fairly protected. The bill provides for protection to labor just as it provides for protection to manufacturing plants and to the men conscripted. The soldier is entitled to as much protection as the manufacturing plant, or labor.

I believe in a square deal for labor. My sympathies are with the people who work. A totalitarian government means slave labor. The rights of collective bargaining were early abolished by Hitler in Germany. The labor groups in France, as a result of the conquest by Germany, will suffer more than any other group of French citizens. Defense will protect all citizens, both employers and employees. All should share in the burdens of national defense.

VOLUNTEERS

The United States and Great Britain are the only nations that do not have compulsory military service in time of peace. Both countries have resorted to conscription in time of war.

Massachusetts and Virginia adopted conscription in 1777 during the Revolutionary War. In the War between the States, the volunteer system in the Union collapsed in 1862. Compulsory training was adopted by the Union in 1863. It must be conceded that there were unsatisfactory features and that there was much opposition. There were defects that are obviated in the pending bill. In 1863 the granting of bounties and the hiring of substitutes were provided.

The Confederacy adopted conscription in 1862, and conscription obtained thereafter in the Confederacy throughout the War between the States.

Great Britain in 1916 and the United States in 1917 adopted conscription. While we are not actually engaged at war, I repeat that we are confronted with the gravest national emergency in the history of the American people. Preparedness is imperative. There can be no preparedness without training and there can be no adequate training without selective service. No better method of the discharge of his obligation by a citizen to his country can be devised. The volunteer system in the national emergency would be neither fair nor effective. It would not be democratic. There is no instance in history of a country which has won a really great war with the volunteer system.

National defense must be supported by those who know how to vote and by those who know how to shoot. There are problems involved, but there can be no civilized existence without self-defense. The problem is to avoid the scylla of unpreparedness and to escape the Charybdis of militarism. The bill is therefore limited to the existing emergency. The objective is organization for the maximum of the defensive with the minimum of the offensive. Wars are not won by defense. Only offensive wars have been successful. We stand for peace but if war must come, we must be trained to take the offensive.

SACRIFICE

Thoughtful citizens know today that democracy is on the defensive. Selective military service is necessary; it is justifiable for national defense. Billions of appropriations mean billions of taxes. Taxes always mean sacrifice. All citizens must share this sacrifice. Congress has just begun to levy taxes. Our people have become soft. College students by the thousands watch football. Only 22 people play and are thus trained and hardened while thousands watch and remain soft. A nation that is not worth dying for is not worth living for. The United States of today must be prepared to give their all in defense of freedom as did their forefathers. There must be training, there must be discipline, there must be sacrifice. We covet no territory, but we will defend with the last penny and with the last man the country we have.

We are willing to conscript manpower. We are determined to prevent war profiteering and war millionaires as a result of the sacrifices for national defense.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Newton D. Baker, Secretary of War during the first World War, some years ago told a committee of Congress that planning for national defense would be ineffective because with the passing of the emergency preparedness would be discarded.

The National Defense Act of 1920 was passed but preparedness was neglected. Preparedness, however, while now beginning at scratch, has adequate authorization in the act of 1920. The Army and the Navy were organized upon the principle of a single authority and a single responsibility. There are joint boards for strategic purposes. The Commander in Chief has the final say, but he follows the general of the Army and the admiral of the Navy.

BOARDS

A number of boards are authorized and have been appointed by the President. There is a place for them in the picture, but a divided authority is a weak authority; it is ineffective.

Superboards are calculated to relieve the executive officials of single responsibilities. Such officers have been trained. The Army and Navy have been conducting research. They have been planning for the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

RESEARCHERS AND INVENTORS

There is always a new group of researchers and inventors in a national emergency. They do not discover in time for use. If cotton growers had waited for a mechanical picker, or if they had delayed the growing of cotton until such a

picker could have been invented, no cotton would be produced.

Many crimes will be committed in the name of national defense. Bureaucracy is on the march. Departments are claiming that their bureaus should have money for national defense. The Work Projects Administration is urging that this Administration can be used advantageously for national defense. The imperative need of the hour, however, is skilled and trained workers and not idle men. The Federal Housing Administration is most altruistic. The need is not expensive and extravagant housing, but the imperative need is cantonment for proper living quarters for trained soldiers.

Propaganda is not idle. Many projects will be urged under the guise of promoting national defense. Projects that cannot be completed until too late for use are advocated.

The need is the utilization of existing executive agencies for enlarging and modernizing the Navy, for the building of airplanes, and for the mechanization and enlargement of the Army. Agencies that have been trained through the years and are familiar with the problems should be utilized. Advisory boards generally hinder rather than help.

ESTABLISHED AGENCIES

My point is that established agencies should be utilized in national defense. The executives of the Army and Navy know our problems. Speed will be promoted. Advisory boards and planning agencies can be used in the picture but they should not be permitted to delay actual construction and enlargement.

The need of the Army is improved equipment. Private agencies should be utilized in providing this equipment as far as possible. Private incentive should be encouraged. It will be easier to return to a normal peacetime.

The equipment must be supplemented by trained men. I favor the volunteer system in ordinary peacetimes but there are exceptions to all good rules. In the face of a national emergency we need conscription now.

LEADERS AND PROPHETS

There will be hard work for the man conscripted; there will be hard work for the munition makers. What we need today are leaders that will tell the people how hard they can work and not how easy they can live. We need prophets who will preach work, courage, thrift, and self-denial. We need prophets who will preach the experiences of man since the beginning of time and who will utilize and proclaim the methods set forth in the Bible for overcoming human weaknesses. The United States can only be defended by virile men with modern equipment.

CITADELS OF DEFENSE

Citizens and spokesmen for the Midwest and South have been criticized because they have called attention to the fact that their areas have not been selected in the allocation of defense orders or plants. There must be no grab game. Such criticism, however, is shortsighted. The subject should be considered from a military and from a strategic angle. The facts should be kept in mind.

New York City and San Francisco are vulnerable to attacks, especially from the air. So are other cities along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Unfortunately, many of our arsenals, proving grounds, and military centers are located in the coastal areas. Airplane factories are located along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. There is great industrial development in the Northeast. It is now unfortunate from a military and strategic viewpoint. There is a concentration of steam-power development and of water-power development along the coast. A great deal of power production is near the northeastern boundary of the United States.

The locations have disregarded modern defense problems. In Germany, Berlin is near the center of the country. The military establishments are located around and within 25 miles of Berlin.

Our situation results from our confidence in the Atlantic Ocean. Transportation has been revolutionized. An ocean is not the protection that it formerly was. We will have to defend our coasts, and our cities, and our Military Establishments.

LXXXVI—721

FUTURE CONSTRUCTION

There must always be a citadel of defense, just as in ancient times there were cities of refuge.

A nation may have abundant men and abundant resources but it will be defeated if the enemy can capture the vital areas and vital resources by striking fast enough. Defense plans and defense establishments must be planned to prevent this contingency.

We have a vast central area between the Alleghenies and the Rockies. It is larger than the combined areas of European countries; it has sufficient natural resources to support the population of the country throughout any probable war and to produce the necessary supplies. It produces grain, cotton, oil, and minerals in abundance. It has been properly called a natural citadel of defense. Processing and manufacturing plants for munitions have not been located in this area.

Strategic plans should be made to convert the vast central area between the Appalachian and Rocky Mountains into an effective citadel of national defense. Manufacturing plants for munitions, motorized equipment, airplanes, and other military necessities should be located in this area. Ships should be built along the Gulf. There should be located in the great interior improvements to support the population. Power should be developed. The money of the United States expended for national defense should be used for developing this citadel of national defense.

The city of Washington was captured in the War of 1812, and almost captured in the War between the States. Vital industries along the coast are exposed. Expansion should be made in the great interior. The submarine and the airplane are dominating factors in modern warfare.

LONG-RANGE PROGRAM

Manufacturing plants for military supplies should be located in a zone that is free from foreign attack. Loans for factories to provide for the civil population should encourage their location in the safety zone.

FLOOD PROTECTION

Adequate national defense must give consideration to the hazards of nature. Among the greatest of these hazards are floods. Manufacturing plants are located along streams and in the long-range program these streams should be protected from floods. Plants may be destroyed by floods as well as by human enemies.

Continued appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors that are imperatively necessary for national defense should be made. Flood protection must be provided for communities in the Ohio River Basin and along other streams where munitions and implements of war are manufactured.

Power can be developed in the interior. I know of no stream that has greater power possibilities than the White River in Arkansas. Power can be supplied for manufactures and for mining in this important area.

The bread basket of the Nation must not be overlooked. Agriculture must be protected in the long-range program for national defense.

The Mississippi Valley is the largest and most fertile valley in the world. It must be protected from devastating floods. Fortunately, a good beginning has been made. The largest authorizations and appropriations for flood control in the history of the country have been made during the present administration. Flood control and river and harbor improvements should stand on their own merits, but there is no reason in refusing continued appropriations or authorizations where such works are imperatively needed for national defense.

Military and industrial expansion can well be made in the great interior of the country. National safety would thus be on a firmer basis.

MONROE DOCTRINE

For its own safety the United States is committed to the Monroe Doctrine. Conscription is limited in the pending bill to the Western Hemisphere—I oppose conscription for service in foreign wars. This means that we are determined to

stay out of Europe, but at the same time we equally determine that Europe shall stay out of America. We have no desire to master the world, but we are determined to continue to be the masters of the United States. Every citizen owes an obligation to protect his country. That obligation can best be discharged by the training provided in the pending bill.

We have the brains, we have the numbers, we have the resources. We are determined to be prepared for attack. The best way to prevent attack is to be prepared, and the best way to be prepared is to build so that in all attacks there may be a final citadel of defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] 10 minutes.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my views in connection with this legislation are well set forth in the minority report of the Committee on Military Affairs, which I signed, and it would be useless for me to repeat them here. I shall therefore devote the few minutes that have been granted to me to calling to the attention of the House the fact that one of the most efficient lobbies ever maintained in Washington has been in operation since the introduction of this Burke-Wadsworth bill on June 21 last.

Thousands and thousands of dollars have been spent by what is known as the national emergency committee of the Military Training Camps Association, of 28 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City, to influence the passage of this legislation. It would be most interesting to know who supplied the money for this most efficient lobby. It is an admitted fact that the Burke-Wadsworth bill, so-called, was written and sponsored by this national emergency committee of the Military Training Camps Association. It was introduced in good faith in the House of Representatives by the able and distinguished Representative, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], who, no doubt, is sincere in his convictions that conscription is necessary now. However, since the introduction of this conscription bill hardly a day has passed but what members of the Military Affairs Committee and other Members of Congress have not been contacted, by mail or otherwise, by Mr. Grenville Clark, the chairman of this national emergency committee of the Military Training Camps Association.

Mr. Chairman, organized labor is opposed to this bill, ministers and church people are opposed, and many other organizations are opposed to peacetime conscription. In fact, the only organization that seems to be in favor of this legislation is the national emergency committee of the Military Training Camps Association.

This organization, I am told, has maintained headquarters at one of the prominent hotels in Washington throughout the hearings and has employed high-salaried representatives, at the same time maintaining a secretarial staff.

It would be interesting to know, and I believe the Members of this Congress and the people of America are entitled to know, just what is this national emergency committee of the Military Training Camps Association? Under what authority does this committee function? What is its purpose? What is its source of revenue? Who comprise its membership? What is their source of income? How much money has this committee spent to influence the passage of this legislation? Is this committee a "front" organization for international bankers who would involve this Nation in war to protect their interests? This Congress and the people of America are entitled to know the answers to these questions before this conscription bill is enacted into law.

I am in possession of numerous letters and pieces of propaganda that have been literally showered upon Members of Congress, especially members of the Military Affairs Committee, by Mr. Grenville Clark. This propaganda includes booklets and photostatic copies of editorials, newspaper clippings, and advertising purporting to have appeared in Communist publications or traced to Communist origin, all being opposed to this conscription bill.

In these exhibits, Mr. Chairman, I detect a subtle attempt on the part of Mr. Clark and his associates to label as

Trojan horses, Communists, "fifth columnists," and what have you, all who oppose this legislation. In my opinion, the mailing of these photostatic copies of editorials and newspaper clippings is also an attempt to frighten those Members into supporting the bill. In a letter which accompanied this propaganda, however, Mr. Clark and his associates were very careful to protect themselves against criticism by stating in one paragraph, that—

We fully recognize that much of the opposition to this (Burke-Wadsworth) bill has come in good faith from persons loyal to the American system, however wrong we believe them to be in their judgment; and we do not believe that communistic agitation has influenced any Member of Congress.

This sentence in Mr. Clark's letter, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, means just the opposite. He and his associates apparently are quick to condemn anyone opposed to this legislation as Communists, and so forth.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I will gladly compare my patriotism and integrity of purpose with that of Mr. Clark and his associates at any time, at any place, and I am sure that all other Members of this Congress who are opposed to this legislation would be glad to do the same. His patriotism is demonstrated by the fact, brought out in the Senate debate, that Mr. Clark established trust funds within his own family for the purpose of avoiding the payment of \$90,000 in income taxes. This same Mr. Clark apparently is willing to sacrifice American youth, while protecting his own property.

I resent the activity of Mr. Clark and his associates in lobbying this legislation. I am convinced that they represent those who would have this Congress vote to send young men to war to protect the holdings and the investments of the bankers and financiers of Wall Street.

As I have stated before, Mr. Clark's lobby has been most efficient, probably because he has had at his command unlimited funds to spend. In both the Senate and House hearings on this bill advance copies of all testimony of witnesses favorable to the legislation were ready for distribution to newspapermen and radio organizations as soon as the witness took the stand. The newspapers and radio chains were advised in advance to watch for the appearance of certain witnesses favorable to the bill. At the same time, newspapers throughout the country were deluged with propaganda favorable to the passage of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that this Congress should make a complete investigation of the lobbying activities of this committee before the passage of this Burke-Wadsworth bill. We should ascertain the motives behind this national emergency committee and, more important, we should ascertain who has furnished the money to carry on this extensive and expensive lobby. The people of this Nation, as well as the Members of Congress, are, as I have said before, entitled to know the answers to all questions relative to this organization, its financing, and its purposes.

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

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of my committee.

Mr. MAY. I suggest to my colleague the gentleman from Michigan, in connection with his statement that the bill was prepared by the Military Training Camp Association, that the gentleman remembers that Mr. Clark testified it was in collaboration with the War Department officials; that they worked it out together for several months.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Yes, I remember Mr. Clark's statement. And that is all the more reason why it should be looked into thoroughly. It seems to me that we have come to a sad state of affairs when the War Department has to call in attorneys for international bankers to frame its legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, this bill, the title of which is "To Protect the Integrity and Institutions of the United States Through a System of Selective Compulsory Military Training and Service," is of momentous importance. No legislation considered by Congress during my service in the House has been of more vital interest to the people of the United States, providing as it does for the registration of all male citizens between the ages of 21 and 45 years, from which number will be selected an army of 1,000,000 men for a year's training for the defenses of our country.

That it will disrupt the lives of many of our citizens and affect plans which they have made, and in some instances cause hardships, no one can deny, but under conditions as they exist throughout the world today, I have reached the conclusion that it is necessary for the safety and preservation of our country, and shall support it, and believe that it should become a law.

To provide for the common defense, as expressed in the preamble of the Constitution, is one of the highest duties imposed upon the Congress of the United States, and when our military and naval experts and those familiar with world conditions all agree that the integrity and institutions of the United States are gravely menaced and such legislation is necessary, I would be recreant to my duty as a Member of this House if I did not give it my wholehearted support.

My service as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the study which I have made of world conditions, together with the first-hand information which I have had from representatives of democracies that have fallen within the past few months, supplemented by the philosophy, aims, and purposes of the would-be world dictator, Adolf Hitler, as disclosed in his own writings and sayings, convince me that those favoring this legislation are not prompted by hysteria, as opponents of the legislation charge, but that there is a real and a grave danger which must be met, and met promptly.

I would rather be prepared a year too soon than a day too late, and I would rather we would be overprepared than underprepared.

Instead of this legislation being, as its opponents claim, a step toward war, I think that it and all the other national-defense legislation which we have passed at this session of Congress, all of which I have supported, is the best insurance we can have against war.

The only thing that dictators who are dominating the world today respect is force, and if we are adequately prepared to defend our country on land and sea and air these miserable despots who are seeking the rule of the world will be less likely to commit acts of aggression against our country than they would if they thought we were unprepared to defend ourselves.

I do not share in the belief that compulsory military training is undemocratic. On the contrary, I believe that it is the most democratic method and the fairest way in which an army can be raised, for by it all men, high and low, rich and poor, in every geographic section of the country will be treated exactly alike, and no favoritism will be shown. In other words, it invokes the old democratic doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none, and I believe that the defenders of our country should be thus chosen.

I commend and congratulate our Committee on Military Affairs for the hearings which they have had upon this important measure, and the care which they have taken in the preparation of the bill which we now have under consideration. I know from my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], the ranking majority member upon that committee, of the thorough and conscientious study which they have made, in an effort to be fair, not only to the country but to its citizens.

There are two features in the House bill as reported by the committee, not in the Senate bill, which I like. The Senate bill prescribed the ages for registration of those between 21 and 31, while the House bill, I think very wisely, includes those between 21 and 45. Personally I would prefer to place the age limit much higher. In fact, it strikes me

that it might be best to include all male citizens between the ages of 21 and 66. I do not believe that the defense of our country should be altogether imposed upon the youth of our land. In this age of mechanized warfare, where marching does not play such an important part as it once did, I think there are places for older men in the Army, and I should like to see the defenders taken from all ages, and not impose the defense alone upon our young men.

The other feature of the House bill, as reported, which I prefer to the Senate bill, is contained in section 3, which provides that college and university students who have entered upon attendance for the academic year 1940-41 shall not be inducted into service prior to July 1, 1941. It strikes me that this is fair to permit those entering colleges or universities this month to complete their full year before being inducted into service; and since all of the million men are not to be called into service at once, but at various intervals, this provision will in nowise disrupt or delay the carrying out of the terms of the bill.

If we are to conscript the youth of America for national defense, industry and wealth must do its part, and I will vote for any just and reasonable amendment which will accomplish that purpose.

I am glad that the candidates for President of both major parties have declared themselves in favor of this measure. There should be no political division among our people when the defense of our country is involved. Let us promptly enact this measure into law. Let us not make the mistake which has been made by the democracies of Europe that have fallen—of delaying to get ready until it was too late. America is in danger. Let us act now. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, honor, honesty, and patriotism are not limited to the confines of any one party. I recognize fully the good faith of our Republican friends who are opposing this bill. All of us must appreciate the responsibility of this hour. Its significance should interdict partisanship and consume the dross of every unworthy motive. It is my solemn conviction that there is not a Member of this House who has not done some soul-searching on this great issue. With all due respect for differing opinions, however, it seems to me that running all through the thinking of the opposition may be traced two fundamental fallacies. The first one is that one which brings them under the condemnation of sacred writ against those who cry "Peace! Peace! When there is no peace." Just because world war No. 2 is a few miles away does not mean that the world is not on fire with war. Why talk about peacetime? This is wartime. We would be recreant to the sacred trust that the suffrage of America has imposed in us were we not to measure up to our responsibility here as guardians of the peace of America. We must prepare, not for war, but for peace, by providing for an adequate national defense. That is what this bill seeks to accomplish in part.

The world used to be a terrestrial ball of huge proportions at the time when our forefathers debated seriously whether it was round or flat. It used to be considered tremendous, but now it is about the size of an apple. The halitosis of Moscow and the "B. O." of Tokyo are too close for comfort. The world has shrunk from geometric proportions to the size of a baseball, within our memory; and yet some say because the war is not in our back yard, there is none.

Why, then, prate about conscription in peacetime? This is not peacetime; this is wartime, and it has caught us unawares.

The second great fallacy which I believe underlies the thinking of so many of our good friends of the opposition is they fail to appreciate the wide distinction between self-discipline and obedience to a despot. I want to repeat that: They fail to appreciate the significance of the tremendous difference between self-discipline and obedience to a despot. Here in America we have in times past for various and sundry reasons, too numerous to recall in this brief statement,

yielded our personal liberties. We have no more right to tonsils and adenoids if we go to the public schools. We are not immune from vaccination for the common good. I might go on multiplying illustrations of the rights we have voluntarily surrendered. And that is what this bill is—a voluntary, reasoned surrender of our right to grow soft and flabby so that we may strengthen and train ourselves. No one compels us. We do it ourselves. This is democracy in action. Representative democracy, speaking through accredited representatives of the sovereign people, is about to register the people's will. [Applause.] They and we are determined that "this Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth." The price is not too great. [Applause.] This is voluntary self-discipline. They talk about this being undemocratic and un-American, and un-this and un-that. We depend upon conscription in every other field of endeavor. We draft the baby who comes into our home from heaven. He does not come here voluntarily. His parents know the price they must pay in surrendered time and ease; yes, in heartache. From the minute he comes he drafts his parents and everything they have. He is a despot in every home, and we self-discipline ourselves to give him a better chance. This bill comes along to make him safe. Schools do not depend upon voluntary contributions, and well they do not. They depend upon taxation, which is the conscription of a portion of our wealth.

Churches do not depend on voluntary contributions. Even they have their budgets and high-pressure campaigns to meet them. As our eloquent, distinguished, and brilliant friend the gentleman from Texas, FRITZ LANHAM, so wonderfully portrays the picture of the average man in a church of voluntary contributions, he will sit back there before the usher comes to him with the contribution plate and debate as to how much of that dollar he has in his pocket ought to go for the salvation of the world, and by the time the plate gets to him he decides a nickel is an abundant contribution. So neither the church, nor the home, nor the school, nor government depends upon voluntary contributions, but each depends absolutely upon conscription for support.

I want to talk for just a minute about an old, old story. One of our troubles is that times have changed. They talk about this being new. Well, everything in the world is. Why not this? You remember that Goliath, "strutting his stuff," defied the armies of Israel. He thought that because he was equipped with sword and armor he was safe. He had a Maginot line. But David took to the air. Goliath fell. History repeats itself. Air power and new weapons, plus men trained to use them, have recently overcome Maginot lines and rendered good military equipment obsolete. New methods in modern warfare are making their eloquent plea day by day, hour by hour, for the enactment of this bill. If we are to play our part in honor and in trustworthiness, we must heed the challenge of modern history, answer the call of the people who sent us here, and give them the chance, by self-discipline, to make themselves safe.

We must, if we are to survive as a nation, and the preservation of this Union is as incumbent upon us today as it was on our fathers.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. We heard a lot today about the width of the Atlantic and the width of the Pacific and lack of danger. With reference to the gentleman's remarks relating to changed times, I would like to call his attention to the fact that when George Washington left Mount Vernon to go to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia it took him 21 days. Now, you can make the trip in about 40 minutes.

Mr. HOBBS. Yes; and in his day the Potomac River was as broad as the Atlantic Ocean is today, judged by modern criteria.

We had a distinguished gentleman from my home town who was one of the two United States Senators from Alabama for a number of years, both living there, Senator John Tyler Morgan, father of the Isthmian Canal. In the heat of debate

before the War between the States he said, "Why, we can whip those Yankees with popguns," and he meant it. He came back after the war and one of his colleagues was twitting him about that remark. He said, "I still stand by my statement. We could have done it, but the darn fellows would not fight with popguns."

That is why we need this "gun." We need it to conscript not only manpower, not only wealth, not only industry, not only everything that we need for adequate defense, but we need to conscript ideas too. I shall offer an amendment to draft the necessary patents. Another amendment I shall offer will give us the necessary information upon which to base national defense in the future.

I beg of you your support of these salutary amendments.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman referred to the Yankee army. I wonder if the gentleman knows that those volunteering after the passage of the Draft Act numbered 1,558,000 and that the number conscripted was only 255,000 in that Yankee army?

Mr. HOBBS. That is one of the benefits of conscription. It does not have to work. It serves as a spur. It extends a cordial invitation. Sometimes the mere reminder of duty is all one needs. As I have said before, there is one man in this country—there are plenty of them, but there is one I have in mind right now—that has not a thing in the world to fear from me. I am not going to bother him, because he is prepared to defend himself. His name is Joe Louis. I want Uncle Sam, not to go into the fighting business, I want him not to have to fight. He will not have to fight if he prepares himself adequately to defend himself. I want that respectful attitude toward fighting him which I maintain toward fighting Joe Louis to be the attitude of every dictator in this world, when they think about fighting Uncle Sam. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I believe in adequate preparation for defense and that is why I favor this bill. May I say to you in conclusion: "Of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are these: 'It might have been.'"

As the requiem tolled by breaking hearts, and wracked brains from one end of Europe to the other, comes that old, pathetic lament: "Too late, too late." When Hitler marched into the Rhineland he could have been stopped with a buggy whip. When he occupied the Ruhr and began to train his legions of youth with broomsticks, it could have been stopped easily. But when the world realized that his preparation was complete, it was too late. It was too late for the man with the umbrella. His umbrella was about all he had to wave them back and they would not scare at an umbrella. We need more than an umbrella and a confession of faith in his promises. Let us not fool ourselves by thinking that we can do our duty by wishful thinking. We must, if we be true to the trust of our constituents, stand up like men and be strong in this hour, not of peacetime, but of wartime.

The flames of the hell that is war must not spread to our hemisphere. It is not yet too late to fireproof our house and those of our neighbors. If we do so, and not even a spark falls over here, it will have cost some money and some self-sacrifice. But the safety is worth the price. If, however, the fireproofing be not done and our fair land becomes an inferno, then all the money of earth and all the anguish cannot make restitution nor bring back life to a single corpse.

Verily, now is the accepted time. Now is the day of salvation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-six Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, those of us who served during the World War were impressed with the great

lack of preparedness in this country at the outset of that war. At the end of the war, most of us veterans were interested in seeing to it that no future war should find America so unprepared. For that reason there was great interest in the resolutions adopted by the great convention of the American Legion at Minneapolis, Minn., in 1919. Those resolutions came as near expressing the universal opinion of all war veterans as any statement I can now recall, and, for your information and to refresh your memory, I will set out at this point the resolutions adopted at that convention bearing on the future military policy of the United States:

Resolutions adopted at the Minneapolis convention of the American Legion on the future military policy of the United States

1. That a large standing army is uneconomic and un-American; national safety with freedom from militarism is best assured by a national citizen army and navy based on the democratic and American principles of the equality of obligation and opportunity for all.

2. We favor a policy of universal military training, and that the administration of such policy shall be removed from the complete control of any exclusively military organization or caste.

3. We are strongly opposed to compulsory military service in time of peace.

4. We have had a bitter experience in the cost of unpreparedness for national defense and the lack of proper training on the part of officers and men, and we realize the necessity of an immediate revision of our military and naval system and a thorough house cleaning of the inefficient officers and methods of our entire Military Establishment.

We favor a national military and naval system based on universal military obligation, to include a relatively small Regular Army and Navy, and a citizen army and navy capable of rapid expansion sufficient to meet any national emergency, on a plan which will provide competitive and progressive training for all officers, both of the Regular Army and Navy and of the citizen forces.

We believe that such military system should be subject to civil authority. Any legislation tending toward an enlarged and stronger military and naval caste we unqualifiedly condemn.

5. The national citizen army, which should and must be the chief reliance of this country in time of war, should be officered by men from its own ranks and administered by a general staff on which citizen-soldier officers and Regular Army officers shall serve in equal number.

We recommend that military training in high schools and colleges be encouraged.

6. We favor the continuance of training camps for the training and education of officers to serve in case of national requirement.

For some 15 years from 1920, I found in my own experience a serious misunderstanding by many people of the true policy of the American Legion. The very clearly worded statement for adequate training was all too often misconstrued as an expression of war-mindedness and it has only been during the past few years that the public generally has realized that the programs of our veteran organizations have called for an adequate training program.

Such a program involves large numbers of trainees but does not call for large numbers in the armed forces of the United States. The training program should never be confused with a program advocating a large standing army whether raised by volunteer enlistment or by conscription.

Shortly after the close of the World War, Congress turned its attention to determining the future military policy of the United States. The War Department cooperated with Congress very closely and out of the study and deliberations the National Defense Act of 1920 was developed and became law. At this time it is of real interest to look behind the National Defense Act of 1920 to see what happened with reference to the matter of conscription inasmuch as conscription was not made a part of that act.

On January 23, 1920, Senator Wadsworth, who was then chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, introduced a bill, S. 3792, of the Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, which bill was brought to the floor of the Senate and debated at great length. This bill, when introduced, contained a provision for compulsory military training but the provision for compulsory military training was stricken out of the bill prior to the enactment of the bill into law. The provision is of particular interest at this time in that it reflects the recommendations of the War Department and those Members of Congress primarily interested in a training program while the memory of the World War was fresh in mind. The provision made all men subject to military or naval training when they became 18 years of age with provision that the

training might be had any time within 3 years following the trainee reaching that age. The bill provided that the trainee be inducted into the Army or the Navy of the United States for the purpose of training only and that his period of training be 4 months, plus time needed for enrollment, mobilization and demobilization.

The bill provided that training might be continued for an additional period not exceeding 2 months at the election of the trainee. At the completion of training, the trainee was to be assigned to the Organized Reserves and continue therein for 5 years. There was provision that a limited number of trainees might also be assigned to the National Guard, in which case his enlistment period would be 3 years rather than 5.

During the course of debate, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], then chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, gave the following very interesting statement (59 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 5183-5184) regarding the evolution of this particular provisions in his bill:

Mr. President, I have said that we have never had a military policy, and I think that statement is correct. I know full well that there is a suspicion and a fear in the minds of many people that the adoption of a military policy necessarily means the establishment in this country of a great militaristic machine. I would never support any such proposal, nor would the Committee on Military Affairs do so. There is, however, a kind or a type of military policy which is in sympathy with our institutions which can be maintained and operated without violating the principles of the American people or their traditions, which can be so maintained and operated as to make this country absolutely secure and at the same time avoid the creation and the favoring of a caste of any kind or description.

I think no Senator will deny that we should have learned a great deal, and undoubtedly we have learned many tremendously valuable lessons, as the result of this last Great War; and I find a disposition in the Army and in the Navy and in the Congress and among the people to take advantage of some of those lessons and to see to it that some of the handicaps that we experienced during this war shall not again be met with if we shall in the future be driven into war.

With the idea of taking advantage of the lessons of the war, the War Department prepared a bill, and to a consideration of some of its more important features I invite the attention of the Senate. The War Department bill was introduced last July in the Senate, and I think also in the House of Representatives, and was announced as representing the matured opinion of the War Department in the matter of a national defense and the establishment of a military policy. It provided for the maintenance of a Regular Army of 576,000 officers and men, at an annual cost of \$800,000,000. It provided also for a system of universal military training, under which each young man on reaching the age of 19 will go to an intensive training camp and there be trained for 3 months. * * *

At the expiration of the 3 months' period the young man was to return to his home and resume his civilian occupation. He was not to be attached to a Reserve unit of any sort; his name and number were to be kept by the War Department, and in the event of war that young man would be summoned to the colors under a draft law, and, with his associates, was to be used to fill up the units of the Regular Army. In other words, the citizen soldier as contemplated by the War Department bill was really meant to be a high private in the rear rank of the Regular Army in time of war; he was to be the "replacement" of the professional soldier; the Regular Army or professional soldier was to dominate the entire situation under such a proposal, and the citizen soldier was simply to fill in the places which could not be filled in or could not be taken care of by the Regular personnel. * * *

The Senate committee rejected the War Department's bill because the committee believed that it was in violation of the traditions and the democratic institutions of the United States, in that it attempted to make the citizen soldier subservient to the professional soldier; in that it attempted to establish in this country a very large Regular or professional Army in time of peace, and to make that Army, through its officers and its machinery, dominate completely the entire military policy and national defense of the country.

The Wadsworth bill of 1920 did not include any provision calling for conscription as the initial method for augmenting the armed forces, and there was a very definite program to establish a training program separate and distinct from the armed forces and setting the training period at a period of 4 or 6 months only. The training period was not so shortened because of prior military service of the trainee, because boys who had already passed their eighteenth birthday were not subject to training and those just reaching their eighteenth birthday were exempt from training if they had had military service equal to the length of training required.

It is true that there has been some development in arms since 1920, but it is true also that General Marshall has just

recently justified the Army's right to call out large numbers of men for service by stating that we have some 2,000,000 Lee-Enfield rifles available for their use, and I submit that it should take no longer to train a man in the use of the Lee-Enfield rifle in 1940 than it did in 1920.

So far as the infantry branch is concerned, drill regulations have been simplified somewhat since 1920, and the matériel available for training purposes remains uncomfortably similar to the matériel available in 1920. I am giving you this comparison for the purpose of emphasizing what I think is the true purpose of the bill now before us, namely, that it is not primarily a training bill but, rather, an effort to augment the armed forces of the United States for military use by conscription in peacetime. I should call your attention further to the fact that is probably well known by all of you that Great Britain and the United States have stood almost alone within recent years for the principle of voluntary service in peacetime, and most of us in America have grown up to look upon this feature of our military policy as one of our rights, privileges, and immunities, held so dear to us all in our form of government.

I think it would be well at this point to examine the military policy that has prevailed in Great Britain. On May 26, 1939, Great Britain enacted a Military Training Act providing for the conscription of men between the ages of 20 and 21 years for a period of 4 years, the first 6 months of which shall be given to active training. This act was to have been enforced for a period of 3 years with provision for its termination or extension under certain circumstances set out therein. The act provided that any man so conscripted for training may, at any time during the period for which he is so deemed to have been enlisted, enter or enlist, with the approval of the Army council, for service in the Royal Navy or the regular air force. The act provided further that the trainee may, at any time during his training period, after completing the special course of training, enter or enlist with the approval of the Army council, for service in any of His Majesty's reserve and auxiliary forces for a period which is not less than 3½ years.

Then came the European war. On September 1, 1939, Germany invaded Poland. On September 3, Britain declared war on Germany. On September 3, Britain also enacted the National Service (armed forces) act of 1939. This act provided as follows:

(1) Until the end of the present emergency, the provisions of the Military Training Act, 1939, requiring persons to register under that act shall cease to have effect, and no person shall be liable to be called up for military training under that act.

(2) Any person who at the commencement of this act was registered under the Military Training Act, 1939, or who was required to be registered at any time before the commencement of this act, shall be liable to be called for service under this act notwithstanding that he may not be so liable by virtue of any proclamation made under this act.

(3) Any person who at the commencement of this act is registered under the Military Training Act, 1939, shall be deemed, in the case of a person registered in the military training register under that act, to be registered in the military service register under this act.

It is worthy of our consideration at this time to note that Great Britain clung to her freedom from conscription for military service until the outbreak of war and that she had launched a training program separate and apart from the regular armed forces with provisions for voluntary enlistment in the armed forces by any trainee who had been conscripted for training only. It is interesting also to note that the National Service Act which provided conscription for service in the armed forces was enacted on the same day that war was declared.

It seems to me that our own legislative process should be relied upon to likewise meet any such emergency calling for the change from a training program to a program of conscription for service during wartime.

One other point should be brought to your attention at this time, and that has to do with the matter of the limitation of service of any conscripted forces, such as confining the service to the continental boundaries of the United States.

I do not know how vivid your own memory might be of the experiences we had in the World War in sending untrained troops abroad but certainly modern warfare has not convinced me that untrained troops are of greater value in expeditionary forces today than in 1918. The experience of Great Britain in sending masses of trained soldiers into France without adequate matériel and their experience at Dunkerque convinces me that even trained troops should be kept at home until they are adequately equipped. In my opinion, it is even more important to keep untrained troops in training rather than send them along with expeditionary forces. In this connection, I should call your attention to a bill that has just recently become law in Canada. This bill provides that the Governor in Council might require—

Persons to place themselves, their services, and their property at the disposal of His Majesty in the right of Canada, as may be deemed necessary or expedient for securing the public safety, the defense of Canada, the maintenance of public order, or the efficient prosecution of the war, or for maintaining supplies or services essential to the life of the community.

The bill provides further that the powers conferred as have been set out—

May not be exercised for the purpose of requiring persons to serve in the military, naval, or air forces outside of Canada and the territorial waters thereof.

With America looking with disfavor upon conscription for peacetime service following our participation in the World War; with England carefully launching conscription for training only in peacetime; and with Canada limiting the service of her conscripts to her own borders even in wartime, it seems to me that the bill here under consideration is breaking way from those cherished institutions we have commonly associated with our democracy. It is my desire and intention to submit to the House at the proper time an amendment which has for its purpose changing this bill from peacetime conscription for unlimited service as a part of the armed forces of the United States to a training program coupled with voluntary enlistments in our armed forces. I am not opposed to conscription for service in wartime, nor am I opposed to complete registration at regular intervals of all those within military-age limits, but I have not yet come to view lightly the departure from our long-established customs to the extent that I can support conscription for service in the armed forces in peacetime. I am not at all impressed with the statements of the War Department that they have exhausted their ability to enlist men voluntarily. I just recently received a letter from one of the leading businessmen of my home town, Iowa City, Iowa. The writer of this letter knows what the score is in the realm of public affairs, and this is what he writes regarding the matter of enlistments in the Army and Navy:

I am firmly convinced that the voluntary enlistment has not even been tried in the Middle West. I know nothing at all about the rest of the United States. If a young man wanted to enlist in the Army in Iowa City, I do not know, and I question if a dozen others know, how to go at it. No trial has even been attempted. I do know that last year a half dozen enlisted in the Navy, and they went to Cedar Rapids and just had a devil of a time finding out how and what to do. If a boy doesn't know what to do, how can he enlist?

I was telling my brother about the difficulty of finding out anything about it and he certainly was most surprised. If the Government would go ahead and do a little of that first World War movie, post-office, and newspaper advertising for about 3 or 4 months, I think the surprise of some will be astounding—then follow with the draft.

In view of this indictment of the efficiency of the War Department in reaching into some of the largest towns of my State, I plan to include in my proposed amendment a provision calling for polling of registrants under this act to determine whether or not they are willing to volunteer when and if the President and the War Department advise them that their services are needed. It is my hope that this polling will create for us a reservoir of manpower available for voluntary service that will take away the necessity for resorting to peacetime conscription for service in the armed forces. A similar polling might even likewise reduce the needs for peacetime conscription for training. I am certain that the

preservation of the institutions and customs that typify our American democracy is a cause sufficiently worthy to challenge us to the utmost to find ways and means for meeting our defense needs without resorting to measures that resemble the practices of totalitarian governments. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, like many others, I was inclined to be opposed to this legislation when it was first proposed. It was with this attitude that I approached the matter when the Military Affairs Committee began its hearings. Those hearings consumed some 2 months, and we heard everybody who desired to be heard either for or against the proposal. After hearing all of this evidence, I was left with the conclusion that this legislation would be justified if certain facts were proven to exist. I enumerate these facts in the order of their relative importance:

First, an imminent danger to this country, requiring the expansion of our defense forces.

Second, an inability to secure such forces by the volunteer system.

Third, the ability to house, equip, and train these forces with modern weapons and under modern conditions.

To my way of thinking, a casual look at conditions in Europe should be sufficient to warn us of an imminent danger. Last May the condition of Europe was deemed such by practically every Member of this House, on both sides of the aisle, as to justify huge appropriations for the production of modern implements of war. A little later a tax bill was passed by similar overwhelming majorities. Since that time Holland, Belgium, and France have all succumbed to the nation we then regarded as a potential danger. I fail to see anything in the situation now compared to the situation in May that would give us any assurance that the danger then existing has passed. On the other hand, I do see, and very plainly, that a powerful nation like France could withstand that aggressor only a few weeks. Not a man upon this floor thought that such a conquest of a major nation was possible in these modern times. Therefore the danger which we all recognized last May not only continues but we find that we had then underestimated its real character.

There is no occasion to quibble as to the role we are to play in the world under present conditions and under the conditions which we must face when the war in Europe is concluded. This is not a new role. We adopted our policy in 1823 when we proclaimed the Monroe Doctrine. Ever since that time we have claimed the right to prevent any European interference in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. The membership of this very House, since the present war in Europe began and after France had requested an armistice, voted for a resolution reaffirming the principles of the Monroe Doctrine and giving notice that we would not recognize the transfer of any territory within the Western Hemisphere. That resolution passed almost unanimously. We knew what we were doing, and we knew that nations already crushed by Germany owned possessions in this hemisphere. We knew that France, then suing for peace, had possessions in this country. We knew that England, the remaining nation in conflict with Germany, had most extensive possessions in the Western Hemisphere. We also know that we might be called upon to back any such resolution. Therefore I say we must have known that we would require a very material expansion of our armed forces.

I am unable to understand the position of those who say that nobody wants to attack us and that nobody will attack us. With Hitler roaming Europe almost at will, with his people keyed to the necessity and to the regimentation of war, with himself now very definitely cast in the role of a conqueror, I am impressed with the fact that he must remain

a conqueror. A conqueror must conquer or he is through. If he is successful in Europe, where will he turn? Perhaps to the Western Hemisphere. Would it not be reasonable for a swaggering conqueror to demand the possessions of the nations he has conquered? This, especially, if another nation, supposedly neutral but aiding his enemies with munitions and implements of war from its own armed forces, should take the position that he dare not. The swaggering conqueror must maintain his standing as such before his own people. What is the reaction of those people to a Presidential campaign in this country in which the principal candidates spend most of their time denouncing the conquering hero? He might find himself in the necessity of convincing his people of his power and ability. No American fears such an endeavor; provided we are prepared with men and munitions to meet it.

To my way of thinking, this is the imminent danger which this country now faces. I am perfectly willing to admit that I may be wrong and sincerely hope that I am and that this world situation will pass over without affecting our Nation. If I am wrong and we take these young men from their normal callings and place them in training for a year, perhaps we have done an injustice to some of them by interrupting their normal pursuits of life. Yet, if I should be right and those who oppose this bill wrong, it may be that we have lost all. It may be that our democratic system of government is gone and with it all of those liberties and privileges that we here enjoy. Therefore, thousands of times over would I rather be overprepared than inadequately prepared.

Much has been said about securing the men necessary for this expansion by the volunteer system. It is most interesting to note the number of men who strongly advocate that system, and yet in their own States the system has completely failed. Something was said here yesterday of the State of New York, and the record shows that one and three-tenths men per thousand of male population have enlisted in New York as compared to four and five-tenths in North Carolina, four and two-tenths in Kentucky and South Carolina, and four in my own State of Texas. Even lower than New York do we find such States as Illinois with one and two-tenths per thousand, New Jersey with one and one-tenth, Ohio with nine-tenths of one man per thousand of male population, and Michigan with eight-tenths. From this it is evident that enlistments have been available principally in the South and the Southwest and not from the other sections. A democratic army should come from all portions of the country and not from only a certain region. I trust that some of the gentlemen who have so strongly advocated the voluntary-enlistment system did not mean thereby that they wanted this Nation defended by the youth of States other than their own.

The largest number of enlistments ever received in any month has been approximately 30,000. That sounds like lots of men. However, from that number 8,000 were replacements to take the place of enlistments which had expired and to fill vacancies caused by other reasons. There is only a certain number of men who will volunteer and we cannot hope that an average of 30,000 per month could be maintained over any considerable period. If it could be for a year, we would net somewhere around 300,000 to 360,000 men. These would be in varying degrees of training from raw recruits to efficient soldiers with approximately a year's training. It would not constitute an efficient army and would be but about one-third of the men reasonably necessary for our present purposes.

Every official of the War Department has testified that it is not possible to secure the necessary men by voluntary enlistments and the record proves that assertion. This bill will provide a system by which men from every part of the country and in every walk of life will be called upon to serve this Nation in the capacity in which they will be the most valuable. It is a thoroughly democratic system as well as a necessity in our present condition.

The Chief of Staff has assured this Congress that every man called under the terms of this bill will find quarters and

proper equipment awaiting him and that none will be called until such are on hand and ready. Further, that every man called under this bill will be trained with the most modern equipment known to military science so that at the end of his year's tour of duty he will be a modern soldier, trained with modern weapons, and capable of really defending this Nation.

The Members of this House are charged by law and by their oaths with the obligation of defending this Nation against all enemies, foreign and domestic. This creates a heavy burden in these times. Those who are willing to assume the risk of failing to provide an army because we may not need it are at liberty so to do. For my part, I cannot assume that responsibility. If we fail to prepare all may be lost. I shall prepare against such danger and at the same time hope that it never comes. At present it is better to be overprepared than underprepared. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. (After counting). One hundred and twenty-seven are present, a quorum.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. VREELAND].

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Chairman, through the courtesy and generosity of my colleagues in granting me a leave of absence in the House, I had the privilege of serving 3 weeks in the United States Army during the first Army maneuvers just completed at Ogdensburg, N. Y. There has been some wonder perhaps why I should wish to take the time to attend the maneuvers. First, I considered it my patriotic duty to serve so as to prepare myself, as did others, to help protect my country should the occasion ever arise. Second, I will not expect others to do anything at my bidding that I would not do myself. And, thirdly, I wished to see our Army in action and learn from a first-hand observation how well prepared we were both from a standpoint of manpower and material.

I want to comment upon and commend the people of northern New York State and particularly those of St. Lawrence County on their patriotism in making that, the largest concentration of troops for training in peacetime in the history of the country, a success. It is well worthy of commendation when it is considered that over 1,500 landowners gave their land without cost to the Government for the use of the troops, with only 4 exceptions. The highway engineers spent considerable time in making preparations for the movement of the trucks and men and the school commissioners gave the many school buildings for use as headquarters. It was a fine gesture and a monumental example to the rest of the country of the fine patriotism of the American people when called upon. Also must be mentioned with considerable praise is the air-defense command, which functioned perfectly. The American Legion had the sole charge of organizing this group of many hundreds of residents covering a radius of 200 miles. The Legionnaires did a fine job in the World War and have shown that they are still ready and willing to do their part again.

General Drum, who directed the maneuver, proved by the smoothness of the entire movement from beginning to end that he is a most efficient and capable officer in whom the American people can place the utmost confidence, not only personally but also on his choice of assistants.

It was most discouraging to see the deplorable lack of equipment in the various organizations. In spite of the lack, however, the men went about their work and training with an admirable spirit and desire to do their bit in preparation and defense. It is hoped that industry will soon gear itself up to the necessary production so that shortly our Army will be fully equipped to meet any emergency or contingency that might arise, or at least to act as a warning to other nations that this country can cope with any situation.

One of the most generally used arguments against the pending legislation, the so-called Burke-Wadsworth bill, is that we have never had to resort to conscription in peacetime before. That is the same argument used for many years

against the necessity of national defense. The only answer I can see is that we never had "blitzkriegs" before, either. Whether the President, by his foreign policy, has deliberately maneuvered us into the present situation for personal gain or whether the situation is more grave than he will tell us is beside the point, and as it now remains we must think of our national security, since armies cannot be trained overnight for the modern mechanized and highly technical method of modern warfare. I only hope and pray that America will never again be called upon to send troops into action against an enemy without even the rudiments of training. That is slaughter, not bravery, and the price too great, especially when a little training and foresight might save millions of lives. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SCHIFFLER].

THE EVIDENCE DOES NOT WARRANT PEACETIME CONSCRIPTION

Mr. SCHIFFLER. Mr. Chairman, the efforts to conscript men and industry at this time are, in my judgment, unsupported by evidence demonstrating the necessity for such action. It is a departure from sound traditional American policies. Conscription in peacetime of either men or property is undemocratic, un-American, and a major and drastic step in the realm of totalitarianism and dictatorship. The surrender of rights of the American citizen, except in the event of war that threatens the existence of our Government and its people, is wholly without justification and in direct violation of constitutional rights, as well as fundamental Americanism. On the contrary, in the event of total war, either threatened or actual, then there is complete justification and reason for the conscription of every resource—men, materials, plants, and money. In fact, all the resources of our Nation, irrespective of ownership, should be subject to surrender to the Federal Government where necessary to preserve the Government and its people.

In addition, no individual, citizen, or alien enjoying the privileges and protection of our Government can justly withhold from the common defense anything necessary, property or service.

Not one iota of evidence has been presented to support the idea that there is imminent a threat of invasion from without. Much evidence has been presented before the Military Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives. This evidence is general and not at all specific. I have read and studied the same carefully, and nowhere have I found evidence that is clear, specific, and reasonable pointing out in clear and unequivocal language the exact nature of the so-called emergency, nor does there appear in any of the evidence thus far presented a clear and specific statement demonstrating that an invasion is either threatened or imminent. This applies not only to the United States but to the countries embraced within the protective factors of the Monroe Doctrine. Much hysteria prevails. This hysteria has led to confusion and uncertainty. It is predicated upon broad and general statements leading the people of the country to believe that we are in danger of imminent invasion. I do not want to lightly discount the efforts of the totalitarian states in Europe in their attempts to invade Great Britain. On the contrary, it has not been specifically pointed out in a logical and sensible manner just how an invasion of the United States could be accomplished. Those familiar with this problem have failed to demonstrate that it is possible for any nation, or combination of nations, to attempt or make an invasion of the countries of the Western Hemisphere. We possess by far the greatest navy in the world today. Provisions have been made for enlarging this Navy and providing 1,325,000 additional tons. This is the first line of defense. Not one single statement has been made that such defense could be penetrated by the navy or any combination of navies in the world. On the contrary, it has been stated that such navy, when completed, will be invulnerable.

I have supported all legislation to provide this navy. The air force is undoubtedly a coordinating and auxiliary factor

to the Navy. Provisions have been made, which I have completely supported, to build, equip, and maintain the largest air force in the world. A well-trained mechanized army of one-half million men can, according to the best evidence heretofore presented—such army when properly equipped in so-called streamline fashion, acting in conjunction with the Navy and air force—repulse any attempt at an invasion of the United States by any nation or combination of nations in the world. I have likewise supported every authorization and appropriation to provide such an army. In fact, I have considered it my privilege and duty to give my complete support to every necessary effort to set up every element of adequate defense for our country and the Western Hemisphere in accordance with our obligations under the Monroe Doctrine.

I am unalterably opposed to our intervening in foreign wars. I shall never consent to the sending of our American boys to foreign soil to fight in foreign wars. Our experience in the last war—tragic and costly in lives, suffering, and property as it was—should be the guiding star in our conduct at present. It should teach us that, notwithstanding all that we may endeavor to do, we cannot terminate wars nor can we permanently settle the problems of other parts of the world. It will suffice for the present if we engage ourselves in a solution of the problems of our own Nation. The major problems are yet without solution. It is our primary duty to bring peace and prosperity to our own people rather than to engage in endeavoring to meddle in the affairs of all the other nations in the world, and, I might add, if we succeed in the solution of our own perplexing problems within the next few years, we shall have an accomplishment that will stand out in history as a monument to those who have been elected to lead the people of this Nation.

To disrupt the lives of the millions of young Americans as is contemplated in the bill before us for consideration and to cause the incalculable suffering and inconvenience that will result, and without other justification than hysteria, unsupported by actual facts, is unjustifiable and unpardonable. Notwithstanding that we have had placed in all parts of the world diplomatic and other agencies to keep our Government and the Congress informed of existing conditions and tendencies, there is nothing before this body in the nature of concrete evidence to warrant the present hysteria and false war propaganda. Our future interests may require that we be partial to one side or another in the present conflicts abroad. They may also require that we take sides in the threatened insurrections in South American countries, but such as also demonstrating that we are in danger, either immediately or in the near future, of our Government or its people losing anything which they now possess, I am unable to find anything to support such theories.

I recognize that the world being an armed camp requires that we adequately prepare against a possible enemy. In my judgment, we are doing that with the legislation already passed by this Congress. Under the present plans, billions upon billions of dollars will be spent for armaments of various kinds within the next 2 or 3 years. We shall have a million men under arms in the Navy, Air Force, and the Army. Our Coast Guard has been materially strengthened. Unless it is contemplated that a part of this armed force be sent to other parts of the world to fight, according to the very best evidence of our General Staff and those who should know, these forces are adequate for national and hemispheric defenses.

In conclusion, I wish to state that when and if this Nation is threatened, when and if the life of one American has been taken or one foot of American soil or territory is threatened, it will then not only be my duty, which I shall fully perform, but I shall consider it a privilege to not only bring into the sphere of Government control every individual within the Nation as well as all its material and resources and it will be unnecessary to draft me personally to aid in defending and repelling any invasion by any nation. I do not agree that it is necessary to disrupt the lives of so many millions of Americans and to take a major step to destroy our republican form of government. In the light of all the existing evidence and of all facts as they have been presented, I believe it completely unnecessary and unjustifiable. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the Senate has already proved that it would take hours of debate to discuss the entire field covered by the provisions of this bill. If one wished also to address himself to the testimony given in the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee there would be no limit to the time required.

My purpose today is to call your attention to an amendment which I proposed, and which was adopted in the committee, for the purpose of equalizing the pay of men in the Army with men in the Navy. The amendment is contained in section 3 (e) and was adopted by the Senate. Its terms have been drawn by the War Department, after exhaustive study and with full knowledge that it is not possible to classify enlisted men in the Army on exactly the same basis as in the Navy. It is possible, however, to provide for classifications in the Army, having regard to the increased skill now required from soldiers in the management, operation, and repair of mechanized and motorized equipment. We have been told by the representatives of the War Department that a very large percentage of the men in every branch of the Army are specialists, as high as 78 percent in the Air Corps. It is only fair that they should receive some recognition for their skill and training in the way of increased monthly pay.

Witnesses have differed widely in their opinion as to the possibility of securing all men necessary for such an Army as our country needs for the defense of the Western Hemisphere through voluntary enlistment. It has been stated by a member of our General Staff before the House Military Affairs Committee last January that if we had 480,000 properly equipped men, plus the National Guard, all the nations of Europe combined, with full control of the high seas, could not land one corps of troops on American shores. This statement was quoted by Senator VANDENBERG in his speech of August 12 in the Senate. However, that statement did not take into account the defense of the Western Hemisphere, for which undoubtedly a much larger force would be required. Congress has already provided funds for the purchase of essential military items for 1,200,000 men and critical items for an additional ground force of 800,000. One of the issues raised by this bill has been whether or not sufficient enlistments could be obtained by voluntary method within the necessary time to make it possible for the needed men to operate these weapons to be obtained by enlistment, rather than by conscription. I believe that great weight should be placed on General Marshall's opinion, as Chief of our General Staff, that we should secure the necessary men as rapidly as possible, having in mind the time of delivery of the new guns, tanks, and other equipment during the next 2 years.

Secretary Woodring is authority for the statement that he attempted without success to secure the consent of the administration for an intensive voluntary enlistment drive several months before he was forced to resign. If permitted, it might have made even the consideration of this measure unnecessary. Such a drive has been undertaken, starting in the middle of May 1940, and with increasing effort from month to month. The figures are very informative. Only the records of 2 complete months can be shown. In June there were 23,400 voluntary enlistments and in July 31,400. I was told by an officer in the War Department this morning that reports have already been received showing enlistment records of 35,633 during August on incomplete returns received up to yesterday. It will be the middle of September before the figures are complete, but the War Department expects them to exceed 40,000. If this is correct, then the number of voluntary enlistments in August 1940 is higher than in any single month in the history of the United States, either in peacetime or in wartime. The War Department report for the year ending June 30, 1917, shows, on page 38 in the report of The Adjutant General to the Secretary of War, that the number of voluntary enlistments in May 1917 was 39,589, the highest previous monthly record. Of course, each month replacements for men who leave the service have to be made,

which reduces the actual increase in the size of the Army by about 7,500 monthly at the present time. However, I was assured by the War Department that the number of men in the Regular Army on September 1 was undoubtedly in excess of 300,000, and that it is now to be expected that by the middle of November the Regular Army will reach its present authorized strength of 375,000. That is a remarkable tribute to the patriotism and interest of American youth in national defense. Secretary Knox testified that for at least a year he expects that by voluntary enlistments the Navy and Marine Corps will obtain all the recruits necessary for those services. Therefore the men obtained by conscription will go solely to the Army. The fact that both the Navy and the marines are able to secure more recruits than they need indicated to me that, insofar as the Navy is concerned, it might be due to the much better pay received in the Navy at the present time as compared with the Army. For that reason I am very hopeful that the additional pay provided by this amendment, contained in section 3 (e) of the present bill, which amounts to an average increase of between \$12 and \$15 per month per soldier, will cause a considerable increase in the already remarkably fine showing in voluntary enlistments for the Army, but best of all it will provide a more adequate and a fairer standard of pay for the services and skill required of our modern soldiers. With the passing of the present grave emergency, such a fair standard of pay should be an important factor in determining the possibility of an early return to voluntary enlistments to provide the necessary personnel for our Army if this bill becomes law. If it does not pass, then I believe this new pay schedule for the Army should be adopted in a separate bill as soon as possible. I feel certain that every Member of Congress, as well as every citizen of the United States, wishes these men, upon whom we are calling in this time of need, to receive fair treatment and reasonable pay while in our Nation's service. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we have come to a pretty pass when a member of the Committee on Military Affairs has to ask for quorum call after quorum call in order that he may expound his views on this legislation.

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I cannot yield. I do not have the time.

The only reason I was not allowed to speak is that I signed the minority report of the committee of which I am proud, and the fact that I was against this legislation in committee, of which I am also proud. [Applause.]

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

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman, who is my friend.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman realize, as I am sure he does, that the American form of government recognizes the rights of a minority as well as the majority? [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. There is also something about free speech in the Constitution that the committee fails to recognize.

Mr. Chairman, can a democracy defend itself and remain a democracy? That is the greatest question of our time. The answer to it rests solely in the hands of the American people.

If events of the Old World drive our people in fear and panic to accept false counsel from those who ask us to abandon democracy for expediency in the name of national defense, then we will have contributed as much to the downfall of democracy in this country as the disguised "tourists" contributed to the defeat of Norway a few months ago.

If democracy is destroyed in the United States it will not be due to the armed might of a foreign enemy.

For months the American people have been harassed and harangued by persons so blind, so panicky, or so ignorant that they will not stop long enough to give a considerate thought to the proper defense of our country. Sanity in

considering our defense problems is long past due. If sanity, intelligence, and wisdom prevailed today we would not be embarking on a course so destructive of democracy, so totally un-American, as conscription in peacetime. This bill is not only un-American, it is unpatriotic, undemocratic, and absolutely unnecessary. [Applause.]

If the men upon whom the defense of this country depends for guidance are capable of observation, they would learn from the war in Europe that men alone mean very, very little in modern warfare. They would come forward honestly and admit that the German war machine has revolutionized the whole idea of defense. Today machines, production, and supply are decisive. France had as many trained soldiers as Germany and they were better trained and more experienced. Yet where is France today? The German soldier invading France was equipped with everything that ingenuity and science could give him. The soldier defending France had only the tools that conquered the Germans in 1918.

Can it be that our Army has failed to take notice of the lesson France holds out? Before taking hundreds of thousands of our finest young men out of the fields and factories to spend a year or more in the Army—let us pause just long enough to ask: Where are we heading? Why are we doing this? The sponsors of conscription say, "We are doing it to defend our country." Defend it against whom?

I am not one to underestimate the ability of the war machines of the dictators; neither do I put the slightest credence in any word they may utter. But I am not so panicky or so politically astute as to deceive my people into believing that Hitler or anybody else in his lifetime is going to invade this country from Europe.

In order to achieve any degree of success in an attack against us the enemy would have to land at least a million men with full equipment. Such a feat is now and for many years to come will be a practical impossibility. Do we forget the Norway campaign? There we saw Great Britain with the greatest Navy in all the world and with almost complete control of the seas right up to the coast of Norway. Yet she was never able to land an equipped Army in Norway and the campaign wound up an utter failure. How, in God's name, is anyone going to transport an army and equipment from Europe to North America and do any good against us if we have any defense at all?

At this very hour Great Britain is engaged in mortal combat. Ever since the disaster in Flanders the British have been face to face with a relentless enemy. Is Great Britain calling for more troops? Is she calling in men and more men from her vast Empire? No. England is begging and praying for planes, tanks, and antiaircraft. "Give us planes" is the prayer of the British. "Give us planes and tanks" was the unanswered prayer of the B. E. F. and the vanquished French.

Up to this point our so-called defense experts have taken their entire time promoting conscription to the almost utter neglect of the Army we already possess. The Army says it can equip the first class of conscripts by January 1. With what? Perhaps uniforms and outmoded guns. Certainly not with modern guns, tanks, and planes. It is high time for the American people to wake up to the fact that very little is being accomplished in properly equipping the Army we now have. It is treasonable to talk conscription while our troops maneuver with wooden guns and paper tanks.

We take pride in the quality of our American airplanes. We like to believe that they are the best in the world. Perhaps they are, but not many weeks ago we heard the Chief of the Air Corps admit that we had less than 50 planes as good as those being used in combat over Europe. Undoubtedly the general had reference to the "flying fortresses" when he mentioned the 50 planes. While they are among the finest planes ever produced any expert can tell you they have little or no rear defense and they are not armored nor do they have self-sealing gas tanks. What do 50 planes amount to in this world today? Twice that number are shattered to bits over England every day. The actual production of planes of all

types in this country is not exceeding 600 a month. That figure includes foreign order, commercial craft, pleasure craft, and military planes. Of the latter less than a dozen a month are actually being put into service with the Army. Yet we talk conscription. Do we intend to give these boys uniforms and old rifles and call them an army? Are we preparing to fight Indians or are we planning the defense of this country in the light of events abroad which no sane man can ignore?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is making a very fine and a very illuminative argument on this question and as the gentleman is a member of the committee that has heard all the testimony, I want to find out, if I possibly can, what the evidence before the committee showed with reference to equipment, as to how many soldiers we have equipment for today, including clothing and the necessary machinery with which they may be trained.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Missouri 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I do not know the actual figures, but I do know that we have not near the equipment that will be necessary for this conscription.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is, to meet the requirements of the enlisted men of the Regular Army and the National Guard enrollees.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is what the evidence before the gentleman's committee showed?

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. HARTER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I have not the time to yield further.

Before we conscript the youth of this country let us ask our military geniuses where are the thousands of planes we read about in the papers. Who has them? When is the Army going to get just a few of them into actual service? Where are the tanks and how many are being placed in actual service this month and next?

Every real American stands ready to fight for his country. His country does not mean merely the sand and stone and earth that lies between the Atlantic and Pacific, from Canada to Mexico, but it means freedom, liberty, and happiness. If, in the name of defense, we abandon the principle of free speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of contract, what is there to defend? What remains worth defending?

If we place the ideals and principles of constitutional government in peril as this bill does, what better are we than those we condemn for blotting out the light of democracy in Europe?

Without the liberty and freedom that is the heritage of every American we will be as the people on the continent of Europe, slaves of a dictatorship.

This Nation, unlike any other on this earth, has no common ties of blood, of race, or of religion. We are bound together and we are strong only in the devotion and faith of our people in liberty and freedom under our Constitution. While that devotion and faith lasts we will remain the strongest of all nations.

While we preserve freedom and liberty untarnished and unabridged, democracy will live in America. Any impairment of the fundamental guaranties of liberty contained in the Constitution, whether done in the name of defense or not, will prove more fatal to American democracy than any head-on clash with the legions of an invading enemy. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact: The chairman of the committee has made provisions to carry on this debate this evening as long as anyone wants to talk, and that is for the accommoda-

tion of the Members of the House. I also want to call the attention of the Members of the House to this fact: There are six other members of the committee who have not been able to speak, and they have not seen fit to conduct a filibuster in order to impede the proceedings here today.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. No one has spoken from the committee who has been against this bill, and it is nothing like a filibuster. The only filibuster I know of is the one that the gentleman from Pennsylvania made against the T. V. A. in committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, this contribution to the debate is offered with the full knowledge that there is little new which can be added; practically nothing original. The ground has been covered from all angles and, in addition to that, we of the Congress, as well as our fellow citizens, have been informed in the fullest measure by the press and by our correspondence. It does occur to me, however, that a brief review of the facts, the premises, the possibilities, and the probabilities involved in such legislation as we contemplate may be of value at this time, midway in the course of the debate. Until this time, with the report of the House Committee on Military Affairs before us, we have not been able to discuss this matter in the concrete. With this bill before us it has been discussed in the concrete, and perhaps a consideration of it from the point of view of the abstract may correlate the two positions. An analysis of the problem in the abstract, therefore, is being attempted in the hope that such an analysis and review may at least clarify the situation, if not proving of inestimable value in reaching a rational conclusion. In attacking this problem I cannot particularly sympathize with the efforts of my colleagues to introduce a purely academic consideration of the title of the bill. Accurate definitions of selective and compulsory and training and service, and acute differentiations among them, are not, in my opinion, conducive to a clear determination as to the need or necessity or merits of the bill before us.

It may save time and repetition if we hurriedly list many situations which can be taken for granted. There is a war in Europe. Nations have been ravaged and peoples massacred. The methods of Hitler are a scourge on mankind. No one may foresee the ultimate result, for such is undeterminable at the present time. However this may be, the result is certain to be of the most momentous import to us. If we stay in comparative isolation we cannot escape the inevitable disturbance of economic break-downs, territorial readjustments, and creation of new philosophies concerning those who govern and those who are governed. Extraordinary situations confront us in our deliberations—situations which not so many months ago were looked upon not only as impossible and improbable, but even incomprehensible in the light of our stage of civilization and of the determination of all peoples to go forward instead of backward have arisen. Today there are those of us who consider impossible, improbable, and incomprehensible an attack by any nation or group of nations upon our shores. Confident of no adequate answer many ask, "What nation dares make war upon us?" Are we entirely alive to the tremendous import of events if we fail to realize that tomorrow's sorrow may be because of today's trust that what is not cannot be. It is useless for any of us or anyone else to foretell the happenings of tomorrow, to prophesy accurately events that are to come. Such must change from day to day.

There is one statement in which we all probably can agree and against which argument to the contrary cannot prevail, and that is this: On this day of September 4, in the year of our Lord 1940, we are as a Nation wholly and completely unprepared, did we so desire to participate, in the war in Europe. In spite of our magnificent array of so many millions of nonmodern guns, so great a supply of '75's or 105's, with the greatest industrial potentiality in the world, we must also unanimously admit that we are wholly and totally unprepared to resist if we are attacked. The very

acceptance of this latter is proven by our action in a restatement of the Monroe Doctrine, appropriations of billions of dollars for war materials, authorization for the calling out of the National Guard, and this bill before us. We do not know what plans may be in the minds of those rulers of today who would add the remaining portions of the world to their domains. We have no way of knowing that the United States of America is not included in their general plan. In this acceptance of subjects to be granted, realization should come to us that we must face present-day facts and not future possibilities, and, incidentally, it aids us not at all to resort to ancient history to find those whom we can blame for our present condition. That solves in no way the problem and excuses us today in no way from performing a duty laid upon us in connection with the office which we hold.

Under ordinary conditions a nation finds itself in one of three situations. It is either at peace or it is at war, or it is in that midground between the two, a position imposed upon it by international relationships. Under ordinary conditions also a nation may be involved with belligerent nations. It may in itself be nonbelligerent, or it may assume a factually neutral position, but things which are true under ordinary conditions too easily become untrue under extraordinary conditions such as today encompass the world. Many European nations, now nonexistent, only a year ago declared themselves as nonbelligerent and as neutral. In my opinion we occupy the midground aforementioned, perhaps forced to an offensive or defensive war because of conditions that have not been within our control. But complete candor also compels the remark that we are heading there because of certain conditions over which we should have had control. Propagandists have been planted in our midst and by their words, apparently innocent but actually dangerous, have aroused within some of our people the urge that we should take sides with one or the other opposing forces in Europe. Consequent also upon such and influenced perhaps by beguiling words, fear and hysteria have impelled us to strike out blindly with untaped hands at possible foes with whom we are not in hostile contact. It must be said also in all sincerity that there have been in the past, and not too recent past, words and acts on the part of some of our Government leaders which would tend to turn us at least from the direction of peace. The installing in high places of certain men who have been known for their attitude of intervention has in no way quieted the situation.

If it be granted that we are in this midground and that peace is further off than war, those of us charged with the conduct of this Government must naturally ask ourselves what kind of a war is imminent. There can be no doubt that a declaration of an offensive warfare would not be our voluntary act, for we have no desire for aggression. Congress is still, at least still, in possession of the constitutional power to declare war; and this is one prerogative that this body will not surrender. Then if war comes it will have to be a war brought upon us against our will, defensive in character, and with the one purpose of a protection of ourselves, our possessions, and our neighbors whose safety is so closely tied with our own. If up to this point I have established by thesis, then the problem before us is one of national defense. This is the only rational, to say nothing of safe, step for us to take; and it is to prepare to defend this country adequately against all invasions by all people at all times by land, by sea, and by air. This step, of course, has been taken by us, and the national-defense plan is the result. The people by their expressions have approved the plan, and Congress has placed the stamp of its approval upon it by its recent actions. The reiteration of the Monroe Doctrine was a declaration to the world of the determination of this country to protect its shores, to protect its neighbors from foreign invasion, and to maintain the solidarity in freedom and in independence of the Western Hemisphere. The Congress has appropriated the hitherto unheard-of totals reaching into the tens of billions in the preparation for defense. Authorization has been given for the calling out of our National Guard. Do these steps appear to be any other than positive

proofs of the fact that the Congress and the people realize the exact situation confronting us?

There are many essentials to an adequate national defense. The first essential to my mind is the spirit of the people to defend themselves and their own against invasions from without and from within. This spirit is certainly apparent in all of our people unless there be a few who through misinformation or misunderstanding or absolute hostility to our form of government refuse to submit to the control of a patriotic privilege. Another essential is a certainty as to what we are going to defend. The Monroe Doctrine has defined that for us, and the Congress has reiterated its belief in, and its dedication to, that doctrine. National defense then means the absolute carrying out of that doctrine, and when that is carried out and successfully carried out we are nationally defended. There are two other essentials for an adequate national defense more tangible than the others mentioned. The first of these is the proper machinery of war. This we have, either present or coming. It is true that most of it is coming, and the people of this country may be thankful that it is coming from a patriotic industry—and industry means labor and capital. Our present problem, and a most pressing one, has to do with the second of these more tangible needs, and that is manpower; and in an attempt to find this we are engaged as we are today. With the reiteration of the Monroe Doctrine the assignments of our manpower as to location and the nature of their employment are not so difficult. We must have a sufficient manpower in order that a competent force may be assigned to any place in the Western Hemisphere where it is necessary to compel observance by all other nations of the Monroe Doctrine. A realization of the nature of employment of this needed manpower is necessary. The Army of today is not the Army of yesterday. The serried columns, the regular tread of marching men, the regalia and panoply of war are parts of a storied past. Our Army today in the presence of the machine age in warfare will be made up of skilled mechanics, of men dressed not for parade but clothed in the garb of a workingman, smeared with grease from hands that no longer present arms but push gears and pull levers in the modern mastodons of destruction.

As a part of our National Defense Plan the War Department presents its requirements and calls for 900,000 men by January 1, 1941. Their ultimate plan calls for one and a half million trained troops ready for immediate service. To meet this demand we have about 300,000 officers and men in the so-called Regular Army, in actuality as of July 31, 1940, 282,999 officers and men, and 220,000 men formerly in the National Guard and now mustered or to be mustered into the Army of the United States. This leaves considerable of a disparity between the men on hand and the men required. One naturally asks if this plan of the War Department calling for a certain number of men and for a determined length of service is a plan that is absolutely essential, absolutely needed, and absolutely imperative if our National Defense Plan is to be carried out. I would not know where to turn for definite statements on these points if I did not turn to those men in our armed forces to whom has been entrusted the solution of just such problems. In my own profession we have specialists whose particular skill and unusual opportunities for experience and observation have classified them as authorities in their subject. Influenced perhaps by this knowledge, I am led to believe that in the Army and Navy among our high ranking officials are likewise men possessed of the same characteristics who are qualified above all others to answer, I hope intelligently and fearlessly, such a question when propounded to them. I know very well that it is said by some that men whose profession is war are best satisfied when in control of large armies instead of mere battalions. I likewise am aware of the criticism directed against such men on the ground that, their profession being war, war is what they want. I recognize these two views. I cannot completely subscribe to them.

The disparity mentioned above, amounting to approximately 400,000 men, must be remedied if the plan submitted by the War Department is to be accepted. Where are these men coming from? There are just two sources for the acqui-

sition of manpower for our Army. One is by enlistment and the other is by a method which for convenience we call conscription. There are certain interesting facts about enlistment. We have been told that in the past few months the rate of increase in voluntary enlistment in the armed forces of our country has been unprecedented in times of peace. This is encouraging and may help us in the solution of the problem. It is expected that in this month of September the number of enlistments may reach 40,000, and in the next month 50,000. Let us take 50,000 as our average monthly increment, granting that that number of men will enlist and continue to enlist at that rate until enlistments are refused. It requires no abstruse mathematical procedures to realize that at the rate of 50,000 enlistments per month it would take 8 months to make available the 400,000 men required according to their estimates by the War Department on January 1, 1941. If this be true and if the Army plan is taken as the accepted plan and one on which dependence and confidence and faith may be placed, then voluntary enlistment will not meet our present-day need. The only other method is conscription.

Terms which are used in the heat of debate and characterizations made with more volubility than thought should be given no consideration. Personally, having complete faith and confidence in my country as I do, I discount characterizations of this method such as "totalitarian," "undemocratic," "military rule," "ruthless dictatorship," "regimentation," "civil war," "revolution." Nothing can convince me, not even the high-standing of the men who employ such nor the passionate expressions of those who profess solemnity and conviction—nothing can ever convince me that such extremes are possible in the United States of America, a nation born, nurtured, and resplendent in the "blood and tears, the toil and sweat" of the generations who have preceded us.

There can be no well-founded opposition to a registration and classification of our manpower. I presume we all mentally or actually make out our financial statements or take account of stock or make balance sheets. We want to know where we are in our private affairs. Registration and classification of our manpower will certainly tell this country where it is in this particular respect. The next step, of course, has to do with the determination of those who will actually be called. The present bill furnishes us a working model which we may accept, reject, or modify. This bill I have carefully analyzed. I have weighed its possibilities, I have considered the involvements and am satisfied that on the whole the method suggested is fair, impartial, and, most important of all, civilian. The bill before us includes nothing up to this time having to do with the confiscation of wealth, the confiscation of labor, or the confiscation of industry. I take most violent issue with all who try to persuade me that at this time the confiscation of wealth or of labor or of industry is necessary or essential. I cannot speak for the future when war may involve us nor can I agree with those who would have us believe that a conscription of the individual must be offset by a conscription of capital. The two are neither synonyms nor are they antonyms.

There are many points in this bill to which opposition can be made. I do not like the transfer of many additional powers to the President of the United States. I might under some conditions, but under present conditions, I do not. I oppose the very apparent invasion of State sovereignty as illustrated in Section 11, Subsection a, Division 4. I do not agree with apparent limitation of the responsibilities and powers of the local boards. They are the civilians in this procedure. They are the friends and neighbors of those who will be called. Their decision except in matters otherwise assigned should be final. I disapprove of compensation to most of the officials and assistants engaged in this work. I regret no provision is made for the protection of the employer and employee in altogether too many instances. But the bill before us is better than the Senate bill and meets the essential requirement in that it provides the way and the means to the accomplishment of the purpose in mind.

If it be agreed that my last statement is true then the only problem before us in consideration of this bill is when conscription shall take place. I want to know where the conscriptees are going immediately after their induction into the service. Only this morning I was told by The Adjutant General's Office that the Two Hundred and Forty-second Coast Artillery of Connecticut which is made up in most part of the boys in my own District will be assigned after September 16 to a section on Long Island Sound at a fort where there are no housing facilities to protect them, and where they will be under canvas from three to four months. Once again it must be asked, "Where is the War Department going to put the 400,000 conscriptees expected before January 1, 1941"? Are there uniforms for them and under uniforms I include overcoats? Is bedding provided for them? Are water, sanitary facilities, and heating plants available, and, as important as the others, is there sufficient kitchen equipment"? With their personal needs attended to the next question arises as to what they are going to do when enrolled. There is no need to bring out the fact previously hinted at that war today is not what it was yesterday. An army today to be efficient must have had actual experience with the machinery of war. This experience must not be had in battle. It must be had before the battle, and if that does not call for experience in peace, training in peace, and preparation in peace, I must confess inability to find reason to the contrary. Acquaintance with blueprints and theoretical instruction from books and lectures on intricate mechanisms will not do. The army of today must have the actual implements of war in the use of which long training is needed. Ice wagons and trucks cannot replace, in giving instruction and experience, 80-ton tanks; gas pipes and water mains have never yet been successful carriers of explosive shells—possibly tin cans used for shells, but not shells.

No one needs to tell me that I have in the last few minutes made destructive and not constructive comments. Such as I have made have been made with the idea of driving home the point. Were I consulted in the matter—which, you need not fear—I shall not be; or were I the War Department—which I am not—I should require that housing equipment and mechanization of the Regular Army and the mobilized National Guard be the first in intention and the first in accomplishment, and then from the rolls of conscriptees previously determined I would add quotas synchronously with available supplies for physical demands and with the production from industry of the machinery of war. It occurs to me that this is the practical and effective way. It occurs to me that it would cause no tremendous disruption of industry, and it also occurs to me that such a method would give to the conscriptee opportunity for financing his relationships, arranging his business, and making his social adjustments.

As many people as there are interested in this problem, so many ideas there are. It is impossible for the administration or the military departments or this Congress to satisfy all the people of this country as to the need or necessity of national defense and an increase of our land and naval forces and the conscription of men to fill their ranks. There is no one in this Chamber who hopes for war. There is no one in this Chamber who does not regret sincerely and wholeheartedly the necessity for consideration of such legislation as is today before us, but our duty is not to be led by what we hope for, is not to be led by what we may take for granted. Our duty is to face the facts before us and to do our best, as Representatives of the people, to translate those facts into a definite, successful, and final result. In the dread presence of conditions abroad we cannot appease ourselves with the thought that the apparently impossible will not become possible; that the apparently improbable will not become probable; that the apparently incomprehensible will not become comprehensible. No one of us can do other than the appreciation and realization of our duty as we see it lead us to do. If war comes we have been right. If war does not come, perhaps

what we have done is wrong; but if we are wrong—there will be no war. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill in its present form as I do not see the necessity for conscription of the manpower of this country at the present time. It authorized an Army of 1,000,000 men and only recently Mr. William S. Knudsen told the Senate committee that it will not be until 1942 that we will have sufficient equipment for 750,000 men and I am one that sincerely believes that compulsory training for all youth is more desirable. The present rate of voluntary enlistments will bring the manpower of the Army up to the strength authorized by the Congress and if the pay is increased to \$30 per month with 1-year enlistment periods the incentive will be there to serve in the Army instead of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Both the House and Senate Military Affairs Committees have held long and exhaustive hearings on this subject and the Senate debated the issue for weeks. I am in favor however of a measure that would compel the youth of this country, say from 18 to 24, to render compulsory service to our country. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on C. C. C. and N. Y. A. projects. I believe that when a boy graduates from high school he should be compelled to render a year compulsory service to our country, irrespective of his physical condition or his station in society. This should also apply to the youths who have not had the opportunity of a high-school education. The very camps that we now use or are no longer in use by the C. C. C. could be utilized for preliminary training. They could be put in these camps and hardened and given the rudiments of military training, and after 3 months be selected according to their adaptability and be trained in operating tanks, trucks, and skilled in parachuting, skiing, and obtaining mechanical knowledge of repairing the necessary equipment for modern warfare. With an additional 3 to 6 months they can be placed in military camps and taught the ins and outs of the modern mechanized units of warfare and finish out the balance of their compulsory training, drilling, and participating the maneuver of actual modern warfare similar to that of our National Guards and training they have been receiving for the past months. These youth should be then placed in the Reserves and compelled to participate in training activities for several weeks, for say, the next 3 years after they have completed their 1-year compulsory training. This method would build up a large reserve which could be called into active duty at any time necessary for the protection of our country.

My proposal will not upset the economic stability of the country, because the youth from 18 to 24 have not yet definitely established themselves, while the bill before the House provides for the conscription of men between 21 and 45 and will take them from their jobs and homes. I was glad to see that the leaders of our two great labor organizations in their Labor Day addresses oppose the principles of the bill we have before us for consideration today. I would agree to that if we have a national emergency, but that does not exist today, and in my own State of Michigan more than 900 youths joined the armed forces during the month of July, establishing a new peacetime record; that does not indicate a failure of voluntary enlistment. I submit, however, that conscription will disrupt the natural course of the future of our young men at a time when it is not needed, whereas my proposal will require them to serve their country at a period of their lives when it will least affect their future, and certainly the training they receive will be of great benefit to them at a time when they can be taught the complicated rudiments of mechanical devices which an older person cannot be taught. This bill before the House proposes to conscript not only men but industry and agriculture, and the necessity, in my opinion, does not exist today, and therefore I shall vote against the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] such time as he may desire.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, the debate on this historic measure, which has lasted 2 days, has drawn to a close, and my contribution to it will be a feeble one, but there are some things I think should be said before the bill comes to a vote and I hope the good Lord will give me strength and capacity to say them.

There are Members of this House who have grown gray in the service of our country and never before have they been called upon to pass judgment in an issue comparable with this one in importance. Generations will come and go and the children of posterity will take note of what we say and do here in the first week of September of the year of our Lord, 1940. For what we do here before the gavel adjourns us for the week end will have a historical significance far beyond our power now to visualize. The future destiny of America is involved in this week's deliberations of the House of Representatives. So it behooves us, the representatives of the people, with friendship and respect for each other and with the love of America in our hearts to sit down and reason together.

I am amazed and I never shall cease to be amazed that a bill of this kind has made its appearance in the American Congress. It is just such a bill as I would associate with the German Reichstag, the late Russian Duma, or what is left of the Mussolini-dominated Parliament at Rome, but I would never have expected it to be introduced in the Congress of the United States, a Nation whose foundation stone is the principle of human freedom. This bill is the very antithesis of freedom.

The idea of forced military service in times of peace and all that goes with it was supposedly shot to death on a hundred battlefields of the Revolution but, *mirabile dictu*, it bobs up 160 years later, with the apparent sanction of both candidates for the Presidency of the United States. It is all very strange and incomprehensible.

Let us take a glance at the whip's notice announcing the program for this week, and see how strange it looks. Here it is:

OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY WHIP,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 31, 1940.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The following is the tentative program for the House of Representatives for the week beginning September 3, 1940:
Tuesday, conscription bill.
Wednesday, conscription bill.
Thursday, conscription bill.
Friday, conscription bill.

Sincerely yours,

PATRICK J. BOLAND,
Democratic Whip.

Would anyone have dreamed a few years ago, or even a few months ago, that such a program would have been presented to the House in a time of peace? It is startling. It ought to set all of the danger signals to ringing. As one of the columnists so well said a day or so ago, no power on earth has committed against us any act of war. Not one of them has done to us anything to which we can take exception. None of them has insulted us or crossed our path in anyway. Yet with America at peace with the whole world it is proposed by forcible measures to militarize and goose-step our country. It is more than passing strange, but it is true. It shows into what dangers and pitfalls we are being led by internationalist propaganda pressures and war hysteria.

LESSONS OF THE REVOLUTION

Before we commit ourselves to the passage of this bill, let us turn our minds backward to the Revolution and reexamine the circumstances under which this Nation was born, out of the travail of Old World oppression. It was to get away from just the sort of thing this bill contemplates that our ancestors came to this country before and during the Revolution. They were sick and tired of militarism. To escape being herded and regimented and deprived of the opportunity of leading their own lives as God intended they should live, as human beings made in His image, they sought asylum on the free soil of America. Let us try as vividly as possible to recall the long years of alternate hope and despair when the fathers and mothers of the Revolution underwent every sacrifice the human mind can conceive to

erect the altar of freedom in the Western Hemisphere, and how, when they had succeeded, as they thought, in establishing a free Nation that would endure forever, they sent up their prayers in thanksgiving to the throne of God, believing that they had accomplished the grandest undertaking of all time.

Let us think long and hard before we do anything that would undermine the temple of freedom which their suffering and sacrifices established in this hemisphere.

VIEWS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

Who among the founding fathers is better qualified to express an opinion on the question here presented than Thomas Jefferson, the father of our great American Democracy, to whom we, at least on this side of the Chamber, profess to render our undying homage? On May 16, 1777, writing to John Adams, he advised that volunteering for the continental service was so successful as to make a draft unnecessary, and he added:

It ever was the most unpopular and impractical thing that could be attempted. Our people under the monarchical government had learned to consider it as the last of all oppressions.

I wonder what the father of the American Democracy would think of this proposal before us—not for wartime but for peacetime conscription and regimentation.

THE STRENGTH OF AMERICA

The strength of America is its Americanism. Throughout the world Americanism today stands for something great, noble, and inspiring. It stands for freedom—freedom from compulsion. It is recognized all around the earth that America is one country where the citizen is free. Millions of human beings who are being ground under the heels of totalitarian oppressors look wistfully toward America as the last refuge and stronghold of freedom. To them America seems like the ultimate hope of the world. They storm our consular offices abroad, hoping against hope that they may obtain visas to come to this blessed land of liberty.

Our own future safety and our opportunity for service to a stricken world depend on our remaining true to the concept of freedom on which this Nation was founded. This idea is so important in the contemplation of the problem presently before us that I take the liberty of repeating that America was brought into existence by patriots who knew from observation and bitter experience the meaning of totalitarianism—many of whom had fled to these friendly shores to escape compulsory military service in the Old World. America will remain great, America will be useful to a world in ruins only if it stays true to its original concepts of freedom.

MAY GOD KEEP AMERICA AMERICAN

I speak not irreverently but in the deepest reverence when I say that in the storm and stress we are going through I hope that God will help America to stay American. So much now depends on our ability to withstand propaganda pressures and militaristic adventurers who see an opportunity to introduce in America alien philosophies and practices utterly contrary to our traditional theory of government founded on personal liberty, which has been the backbone of American thought and purpose in 150 years of our national history and which has made America incomparably outstanding among the nations of the earth.

I have no right, and certainly no desire, to challenge the sincerity of those Members of this body who hold views different from mine on the subject of the compulsory military training bill. I respect the earnestness of their views as I hope they respect the sincerity of mine, but according to my way of thinking, it will be a tragic, mournful day when such a provision is written into our statutes, because I believe it will mark the beginning of the end of America as a free and independent Nation, dedicated to the inalienable rights of man. Notwithstanding all that may be said to the contrary, we cannot adopt peacetime conscription without surrendering a part—I think a vital part—of our democracy. A nation of conscripts is not a free nation. We cannot adopt compul-

sory military training without injecting nazi-ism into our democratic system, when all of our efforts should be directed toward keeping our democracy strong and pure. It is not essential to our national defense that we shall adopt the very things that make the dictatorships so hateful and loathsome in the eyes of all right-thinking men and women. If we graft such hybrid, parasitical growths on our American system we will have a government that is part free and part totalitarian, and that, I am afraid, would be the end of American freedom. I plead with my colleagues not to do this very dangerous thing.

If we retain and revitalize our American concept of government, our children and our children's children, down to the remotest generation, will know that they have a country worth fighting and dying for, and no one need doubt their willingness to defend it.

Everybody with the slightest sense of perception knows that we have been flying toward centralization in the United States. We have gone, I think, altogether too far in that direction, and the best interests of the public demand that the Central Government shall be stripped of some of its vast accumulation of powers and that they shall be sent back to the States. I am one of those who have viewed with the gravest concern the growing interference with, and domination of, individuals and business by the Federal Government. This bill goes one step further. It takes us to the door of the totalitarian state. Are we going to enter? That is the question we will answer when we vote on this bill Friday. Peacetime conscription will be but one step toward totalitarianism, but it will enable the camel to get its nose in. It will be so easy to amend the law later on so as to give the State authority to regiment the workers and business.

MENACE TO LABOR UNIONS

It is no wonder the labor organizations are against this bill. It would be, I believe, the beginning of the end of labor unions in the United States. It is significant that great labor organizations that usually are at each other's throats are united on this bill. They sense the danger to labor if the bill passes. It is with the deepest feelings of emotion that I say that it is my opinion if this bill passes a nation founded on individual rights dies and a totalitarian state is born.

There is one statement of the majority committee report on this measure which I think is worthy of passing notice. I have great respect for the able men who compose the Committee on Military Affairs and the highest esteem for their lovable chairman, but I wonder if the committee will not live to regret its intemperate and ridiculous assertion that those who oppose this bill are committing a crime against our country. I can readily agree that a crime is involved in this legislation, but the crime will be if the bill passes and not if it is defeated. It is being iterated and reiterated that if the bill is defeated Hitler will find great comfort and that we will be blamed for that. To this there are two answers. One is that we did not ask that this bill be introduced. Many of us hoped and prayed to God that it would never come before us, though we were determined that if it did we would do what we could to protect America at any hazard. So the blood is not on our heads. The other answer is that there will be nothing in the defeat of this measure that will give Hitler any satisfaction. On the contrary he will be given a lesson in the strength of democracies and the ability of the people in a democracy to rule that he has never yet realized.

I say "will be" because I seriously doubt that this bill is going to pass, notwithstanding the glowing prognostications that are made, and notwithstanding polls of public opinion which are so obviously and luridly inaccurate that I will never again have any faith in any national poll. The House of Representatives is the great representative body of our legislative establishment, the body that is closest to the people. Its Members know more about the wishes and aspirations of our citizens than any national poll can ever find out, and I personally know entire State delegations that are going to vote against this un-American proposition. I have faith to believe that when the roll is finally called this body will again

demonstrate that it is truly representative of the people who sent us here.

IN PEACE PREPARE FOR THE WORST

As to the wisdom of building up our national defense there is no room for argument. In a world of storm, let us prepare for the worst, even though we hope and believe the worst will never come. We should have our country so well fortified that madcap dictators will never think of attacking us.

There is no more ardent or helpful advocate of preparedness than I try to be. All of the national-defense estimates pass through a bottleneck in the form of a subcommittee of which I happen to be a member—the Subcommittee on Deficiencies—to be evaluated for inclusion in appropriation bills, and every vote I have cast in that subcommittee has been for 100-percent national defense. I have voted for all the estimates sent to us by the Army, Navy, and Coast Guard and sometimes with other members of the subcommittee I have voted to raise the estimates where a subsequent showing seemed to indicate the original amount was not sufficient.

MUST HAVE TRAINING PERSONNEL

The national-defense equipment which we are building up at such enormous cost requires that we shall provide a trained personnel to operate it. Of that there can be no doubt. It would be supreme folly to appropriate vast sums to create defense implements unless we have a personnel experienced and skilled in the use of those instruments. The only question is whether this force of trainees shall be obtained in the American way by voluntary enlistment of those who are able and willing to accommodate themselves to the requirements of the military service, or in the Hitler way, by forcibly breaking up family ties, arbitrarily reordering the lives of our young people, dislocating business arrangements, and summarily disrupting school work on a widespread scale.

CONSCRIPTION IS WHOLLY UNNECESSARY

One reason why I am opposed to forced military service in times of peace is that it is so wholly unnecessary. The infiltration of the National Guard and Reserves into the Federal service has created a large body of trainees and if, in addition to this, the enlistment period is reduced to 1 year, and the pay is made reasonably attractive there will be volunteers far beyond the capacity of our housing and training facilities to accommodate. We have, at present and in sight, only limited housing accommodations, and the American people will never stand for inadequate housing of our boys in inclement weather when there is no war emergency. The latest reports from recruiting centers show new high levels of enlistments, and this situation extends to the Coast Guard where 1,500 additional enlistees are being authorized. Admiral Waesche, Commandant of the Coast Guard, testified before our subcommittee that a compulsory law is not needed to get men for the Coast Guard. The military program we are setting up by our preparedness legislation is heralded as a program of defense. Conscription is not needed to secure defenders of our homeland. It is a gross misrepresentation of the patriotism of our people to assume that compulsion is necessary for that purposes.

WHERE I STAND

I want my own position definitely known.

First. I will continue to work, as I always have done, day and night, in season and out of season, to help to keep America out of war and at peace with the whole world.

Second. I will not vote to send our boys into the slaughter pens of foreign wars.

Third. I will not vote to sow the seeds of disintegration in our American democracy by adopting such totalitarian measures as regimentation and peacetime conscription.

Fourth. I will continue to do everything I can to build up our national defenses to the highest point of perfection so that America will be safe from attack by any nation or combination of nations.

We should not allow the siren of war hysteria to lure us away from clear, fundamental thinking on this proposition. This crucial hour calls for statesmen with heads on their shoulders and feet on the ground. We must think of what this proposal may do to America and its institutions.

This conscription bill brings us to the crossroads. We must decide whether we prefer the American way of living or the German, Italian, or Russian way of living. We must decide now before we embark on this sort of adventure whether we are willing to extend governmental control over workers and industry, for regimentation of workers and business are corollaries of conscription in the "total preparedness" program upon which it is proposed to embark. Our militarists who drafted the Burke-Wadsworth bill have become captivated by the terrific efficiency which Germany has demonstrated in the present war and have deduced therefrom that we must copy after Germany in everything. What they are leading to is a recasting of the entire American mold of thought and way of life along Hitler lines. Yielding to such an impulse would be an unwarranted surrender to fuhrer psychology. I hope and pray that in this critical period of our country's history we will remain faithful to American ideals.

Here we have presented the greatest issue in the century and a half of our national life. If America is to be saved, the America we have known and loved and cherished, it must be saved in this Chamber by the vote we cast on this bill on Friday of this week. As the fateful hour approaches, I wonder if we fully appreciate what a wonderful thing it is to live under such a government as we have, rather than under a dictatorship where the individual has no freedom and is bossed and directed and bullied at every turn. May the shades of Jefferson and Washington and Benjamin Franklin and Patrick Henry look down upon us when we vote!

My final prayer and supplication is this:

Let us prepare to defend our country against all enemies, if such there be, but in doing so let us not crucify the American form of government. Let us keep America American. On the anvil where liberty was forged, let us not forge chains to enslave the human spirit. [Applause.]

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. I have counted 43 Members on the floor, and I made the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GORE). The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order there is not a quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take all of the time that has been allotted to me on this important question. However, I think it wise to bring before the Members of the House certain points. The first is that there has been some suggestion made here that those of us who are not in favor of this bill are un-American and unpatriotic. I yield to no man in my patriotism. I yield to no man in the record that I have made in the service of my country here and on the record that my ancestors have made before me.

There have been certain derisive and contemptuous remarks about those Democrats who signed this minority report. All right, let us consider the question of a minority. When has it become un-American and undemocratic and unpatriotic to be in the minority? Let us go back in history. Less than 2,000 years ago there was a man toiling up the heights of Golgotha, bearing upon his back a cross. He was in the minority. Let us bring it down to more modern times to the man that we regard as the savior of this country, first in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen—George Washington—he, too, was in the minority. Let us go on down a little further, a man whom we all admire, whether we are Democrats or Republicans. We have a memorial to him down here just beyond the Washington Monument—a man by the name of Lincoln. He, too, was in the minority. And one of the greatest Presidents this country ever had, and from my own State of Tennessee, Andrew Johnson.

He, too, was in the minority. History proves that everyone of them was right. So I say it is no disgrace to be in the

minority. My party has been in the minority. My party has been the minority party far longer than it has been in the majority, and therefore any southern Democrat knows what it means to be in the minority, and it ill becomes any Democrat, southern or otherwise, or in fact any American to speak contemptuously of the minority because the American system of government has always recognized the rights of the minority. My ancestors ate the ashen crust of the reconstruction after the Civil War; and they were in the minority, but they did not consider themselves in disgrace, and neither do I at the present time.

Certain reference has been made to the fact that a few of us Democrats have joined with the Republicans. Well, a Republican cannot be wrong all of the time. [Applause.] The law of averages simply will not permit that. I am enough of an American to believe that a Democrat cannot be right all of the time either. [Applause.]

I am for preparedness, I am for national defense. I have voted for every measure that has come before this House for national defense, and I propose to vote for many more, but I do not propose to vote for this one unless it is radically changed. This measure is a departure from everything we have ever done in this country. To defeat totalitarianism we have taken the very heart and essence of totalitarianism.

I know the bill is going to pass—I know that. It would be a lot easier just to float along with the stream and vote for it. I took an oath of office. I came, Mr. Chairman, to this House from the State of Tennessee, the State that is known as the Volunteer State; that has proven itself such in every war we have ever had, including that unfortunate conflict between brothers known as the Civil War. We are far ahead of our quota now in volunteer enlistments. We in Tennessee do not need to be conscripted.

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

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. No; I cannot yield. We do not need to be conscripted. Others say to me they know nine Southern States whose quotas are ahead, but that they have got to conscript people in those States in order to get people from other sections of the country to carry their share of the burden. Mr. Chairman, I was elected a national Representative to the Congress of the United States, and I will not put a burden upon any part of the country that I will not put upon my own. Let me tell you, furthermore, that this bill—I make this dismal prophecy—this bill is going to get us into war, and that is what I wish to avoid. I wish to save anyone from going into the veterans' hospitals and seeing there things—that is the only word to describe them—things that once were men created in the image of God Almighty, caged like wild beasts because of the glorious thing called "a war to make the world safe for democracy" only to be followed by less democracy than the world has ever known. [Applause.] Now we are faced with "a war to end all wars." This is a war to end civilization. We have all seen pitiful pictures—my heart has bled as yours have—at the picture of a mother with her little baby there in her arms, dead, killed by a bomb. Yes; that is pitiful; but if we pass this bill, that picture may be taken in any city of the United States of America.

Ladies, gentlemen, I beg of you, think. Think before you plunge this Nation into a maelstrom of militant insanity. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman and fellow Members, this is the most important bill ever to be considered by Congress. It proposes to change our American tradition from the voluntary to a compulsory draft system of supplying the needed personnel for our armed forces. It is argued by those favoring the compulsory method that we need to enlarge our Army rapidly and that the present voluntary method will not produce the needed men fast enough. I agree with the first contention that we should have an adequate army and also that we should have trained reserves, and the best possible equipment to meet any possible aggressors. But I cannot

agree with their claim that enlistments are insufficient to supply the need for the size army Congress has said should be maintained. The Army officials have done their best to suppress reliable information which would show the number of enlistments during recent months. But because of pressure from Members of Congress, this information has been obtained a little at a time from various sources and it is now definitely shown that their claim of insufficient volunteers is not a fact. Eight members of the House Military Affairs Committee have made a minority report, which sheds a lot of light on the subject. Certainly nobody would claim that their figures and statements are not a fact. Their report shows that the United States is not as badly situated in regard to the number of our armed forces now in service as most of our people are led to believe. I am certain that the great majority of my people have been led to believe that we have only about a quarter of a million soldiers. The committee report shows the following to be a fact and I quote from the minority report:

Navy	143,747
Marines	29,985
Navy Reserves	40,336
Marine Reserves	15,076
Army	289,000
National Guard	223,000
Enlisted Reserves	17,500

To that total must be added 161,163 officers, which makes a total of 919,807 now in service or subject to call at any time. With enlistments anticipated up to December, the peacetime strength of the armed forces will be at least 1,000,000 men. The Army officials testified before the committee that originally it was intended to draft 400,000 men on October 1, it is now anticipated that only 55,000 drafted men and 55,000 National Guard will be called by that time. The remaining units will be called at about that rate until January 1, 1941, which is the earliest time in which quarters will be available. That absolutely refutes the statements that the voluntary method does not produce sufficient men for the expansion need. Even under the present 3-year enlistment period and the low pay of \$21 a month General Shedd testified that enlistments in May were only 9,492, in June they jumped to 23,442, in July they reached 31,985. He further stated that in August enlistments were running ahead of July, and it has since been proven that in August the enlistment will pass the 40,000 mark. The Army officials concede that if the pay was raised to \$30 a month, and the enlistment period changed to 1 year as this bill provides, we would have all the men that we could possibly produce supplies and equipment for.

I do not believe that the reason for this compulsory draft bill is that we cannot get all the men we need under the voluntary method. The Army men have advocated the compulsory system for many years. All preparations and arrangements have been made several years ago, long before there was any war in Europe and before Hitler became a menace to the world. But they know that now is the opportune time by playing on the emotions and hysteria of the people. It is not that I would object to training the young men; that in itself is not harmful; but I do object, and cannot see any necessity of forcing dictatorship by the military forces upon the American people in peacetime. It is inevitable that we cannot have compulsory military conscription without dictatorial powers to go with it. It is also as certain as night follows day that once we conscript men for the Army we will have to follow it by conscripting industry, which the Senate did, and I agree it should be done. Then next we follow by the conscription of agriculture and labor. Such dictatorial power may be necessary in wartime, but it is too dangerous a departure from our American system of freedom and independence to gamble in peacetime that we may ever rid ourselves of those military shackles. We are now asked to imitate the very cause that brought dictatorship to Europe and will most certainly lead to the ultimate destruction of the American form of government, and substituted by a totalitarian military autocracy. Are we willing to play into the hands of Hitler, Stalin, and the other dictators and admit that

the democratic form of government does not function and we must, therefore, institute or ape the very system we condemn most bitterly? Oh, you say that this bill does not do that. No; this bill does not go that far, but it does open the door, or is the first step toward that end. Europe did not change to a dictator by one single act. They took a step at a time until the dictators felt they were well enough organized and powerful enough to crush anybody that might disagree with them in their own country, and now they attempt to force it upon the world. There are many dangerous provisions in this bill that any President so inclined could use to get this country well on the way to dictatorship. This is in no way partisan, because both Presidential candidates are for the proposal. But the amendment to conscript industry is so broad that it does include newspapers, radio, and many other branches. In case they disagree with whomever is President, he could certainly make it very unpleasant if the amendment is not changed. There is also a provision in this bill imposing a fine of 5 years' imprisonment and \$10,000 fine, or both, if anybody gives advice or assists in any way anyone subject to the draft. It is so broad that it might even include Members of Congress that are known to be opposed to the compulsory method if he talks in opposition after it passes by explaining his reasons for opposing the bill. If the bill passes as written, I would advise my people opposing this bill to be careful what they say about this subject in the future. I have voted for all the money asked for since the President declared an emergency and will go along with any program deemed necessary for protection. But I cannot go along with this compulsory training bill in peacetime, when everybody knows that we are getting and will continue to get all the men we can use, and as fast as we can equip them not only with clothing and housing but with modern weapons and equipment for proper training. Only when that fails will I vote for this type of legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill which would register for defense purposes practically the total manpower of the United States and would pave the way for the conscription of indefinite millions of men for the Army.

I have been one of the earliest advocates of national preparedness for the United States. I want to see this Nation so strong that no other nation or combination of nations will dare attack us. I favored a two-ocean navy and I have voted for vast expenditures to build up an invincible air force and to supply the necessities of modern war for our Army.

I am willing to agree with our military leaders that defense of the United States may involve defense of any part of the American continent and that we must be prepared and able to provide that defense. As a Member of this House of Representatives, I have sought to assist our military authorities in their task of preparedness by voting for the appropriations they considered necessary.

However, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not examine carefully into every separate item of our defense program.

In an address over the radio in my Ohio district a few weeks ago, I announced that I would be willing to accept conscription only if it were shown that we could not secure sufficient manpower for our armed forces fast enough by voluntary enlistment.

At that time, I advocated making voluntary enlistments easier. I advocated shortening the term of enlistment from 3 years to 1, to conform with the proposed term for conscripted men. I advocated an increase in pay for enlisted men, and I advocated a more liberal policy of examination, so that men with slight and unimportant physical defects, who would be passed by any draft board, would not be turned down when seeking to enlist voluntarily.

I suggested a period of 3 months for voluntary enlistments under such a system before considering conscription. In this matter, my stand coincided with the published statement of National Commander Kelly, of the American Legion.

So far, no real effort has been made to increase voluntary enlistments by any of the suggested methods, although en-

listments have increased considerably with public realization of the seriousness of our national situation.

If we really need a million men for our Army, we will have a million men by voluntary enlistment.

But, serious as the situation is, we still have time to consider our acts. Nothing is gained by acting without thinking.

One advocate of conscription who is widely read and quoted, Maj. George Fielding Eliot, on September 1 wrote as an argument for conscription, and I quote:

We have learned that the great mass armies of other days, millions of men armed with rifles, machine guns, and field artillery, are almost helpless today before the highly mechanized forces of modern war—armored troops—motorized infantry, and artillery, air force welded into a striking unit coordinated in all its parts.

Inevitably the modern army must, in taking account of these things, in remembering the vastly increased industrial effort demanded to maintain it, seek quality rather than quantity in its future growth. Above all, we have learned that improvised and half-trained or half-equipped forces are worthless or worse than worthless. To use them in modern war is mass murder.

Major Eliot used that as an argument for conscription in his newspaper article of September 1. I am willing to accept his facts, but I must draw a different conclusion than his from those facts.

I see a need for a superbly equipped and trained Army, but not necessarily an immense Army.

I see a need for tanks, for airplanes, for battleships, for modern guns. I see a need for highly trained men to man these instruments of war and defense.

I see less need for millions of men in Army camps at a time when we do not have the tanks or the airplanes or the other mechanized equipment with which to train or equip them.

Our newspapers of August 28 carried an announcement that all enlistments in the Army Air Corps ground crews were stopped that day because the quota based on the amount of training facilities available had been filled. The same story said that plans were being made to reopen the recruiting soon to allow about 3,800 mechanics to enlist, but that is the total number of enlistments now planned.

If there is any difficulty in securing enough volunteers to fill available quotas for pilot training, there is no evidence of it in my district, where I know of a number of young men who are practically begging for an opportunity to attend flying schools and where a group of patriotic civilian flyers are crying unsuccessfully for equipment in order that they may train reserve pilots.

The Air Service is one service that requires by far the most training to make it effective.

I will vote for increasing the pay of our enlisted men. I will vote to reduce the period of enlistment, so that patriotic young men will feel that they can offer their services to the country without tying themselves up with an enlistment which may exceed the period of emergency. But until these things are done and until it is evident that through voluntary service we cannot supply the manpower to match the mechanical power as fast as it is produced and ready for manning, I cannot agree to conscription. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 16 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, some time ago I stated on the floor of this House that this body would soon be confronted by one of the gravest questions ever to come before the American people and the American Congress short of war itself. That question is before us today.

The question is whether we are to surrender a policy as old as the Government itself; whether we are to surrender liberty and freedom as we have known it, and establish a military despotism never before known to America in time of peace.

I desire to express my opinion on this all-important question and record some observations in regard to the pending bill now before the House, being H. R. 10132, to conscript the manpower of this country when we are not at war or even threatened with war. The entire purpose of the pending bill is to establish, for the first time in the history of this Republic, compulsory military training in time of peace. The report filed with this bill states that its adoption is urged to

protect the integrity and institutions of the United States; and that a grave emergency confronts our country, and that the enactment of this legislation would be a distinct triumph for America.

I cannot accept those views. The integrity and institutions of the United States are not threatened, and the proponents of this measure have thus far presented no case to establish that a grave emergency confronts the country. Instead of being a distinct triumph for America, I believe the enactment of this bill would be a tragic departure from everything that is American to everything that is un-American.

The whole theory of this bill is that we, as a Nation, are threatened by some transoceanic monster or aggressor with immediate invasion and attack; and that the youth, manhood, and patriotism of our people can no longer be trusted to meet that threat; whether it be real or imaginary, without resorting to force. That all voluntary methods heretofore relied upon have failed; that the spirit of '76 is dead in America; that the courage and manhood of our citizens has vanished; that love of country no longer exists; that this is no longer the home of the brave, and therefore, we can no longer remain the land of the free.

The underlying principle of this measure is that freedom among free men must die in order that a philosophy that has dominated Europe for a thousand years, and from which our ancestors fled, might be adopted in the United States. The proposal of this bill is to adopt exactly what every arrogant dictator in Europe now practices. It is a step backward to feudalism and barbarism.

The very suggestion that such is the measure of a liberty-loving people is a reflection on their devotion and patriotism in the land of free institutions. It denies the history of our Republic. The American people demand that some questions be answered before they surrender freedom of action and freedom in the pursuit of happiness for a military autocracy never before known in this refuge of a free people.

What nation threatens this country? What nation is about to invade our country? Who are we to meet in deadly combat, and why, that makes this proposal necessary?

We are not at war and no nation has even suggested or insinuated that we are to become the object of its wrath unless we provoke it by our own unneutral acts.

Peacetime conscription of American manhood is alien to everything American. A grave national emergency does not exist. Let us beware that we be not deceived and misled by a war hysteria to conscript men to save liberty, and thereby destroy liberty. Force substituted for patriotism is dictatorship for a republic. The adoption of compulsory military training in peacetime is extending the long arm of the Federal Government into every man's fireside, taking away the pride and hope of the family and overturning the economic and normal life of the Nation.

Not until every voluntary method has failed, and thus far no facts have been presented to this House that they have failed, should conscription become a part of life under the Stars and Stripes in time of peace. I am unwilling to blind myself to a century and a half of our history which looks down upon us today in silent reproach for our distrust and want of confidence in the strength, courage, and devotion of a free people to defend the integrity and institutions of the United States without a bayonet at their back.

This bill presents the gravest question ever faced by this body short of war itself. Let me here record the fact that every measure thus far presented to insure adequate national defense, including authority to the President to mobilize the National Guard, has had my wholehearted support.

War today is war with mechanism and science and not necessarily with large bodies of men. Tanks, ships, guns, trucks, and planes with only reasonable complements of men for their operation constitutes the instruments of war in 1940. I am not unmindful that every high principle upon which civilization and nations have carried on the affairs of mankind have been shattered and broken by brute force in the hands of dictators under totalitarian governments. Conscription of men and wealth is the method used under

such governments to accomplish their end. This alone should warn us not to fall into the same mistake. Conscripted armies did not save the conquered countries of Europe. Volunteer armies have preserved the great Republic of the United States for 150 years. Has the voluntary method or processes to provide the manpower required for national defense failed? Let the record and the facts speak.

According to the latest information obtainable, the armed forces of the United States now, in time of peace, number nearly 1,000,000 men.

Until very recently young men desiring to enlist in the service of the country for 1 year were refused although the law allowed them to do so. A 3-year term was not required, but it was insisted upon by our military authorities. The very nature of this policy has been to reduce the number of volunteer enlistments.

The report filed with this bill shows that not until a little more than 2 months ago were unrestricted enlistments accepted, and no effort was made to obtain large quotas of men. Since that time enlistments at \$21 per month for 3 years, to September 1, approximated nearly 100,000 men. Army officers concede that if the basic pay were increased to \$30 per month and 1-year enlistment, with assurance that they will not be required to serve in Europe, that the number of enlistments would greatly increase. The Navy has a waiting list of 7,000 men. Colonel Knox, Secretary of the Navy, in his testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs of this House, said he did not anticipate that the Navy would have any trouble enlisting all the men required for another year.

William Knudsen, adviser to the President, stated it would be 2 years before adequate equipment would be available for 750,000 men. Major Elliott stated before the Senate Military Affairs Committee that an army of 600,000 men is all that is necessary for a year or two. Maj. Gen. James K. Parsons, commander of the Third Corps Area, on August 2 of this year advised against a large Army and was of the opinion that 500,000 trainees are as many as the Nation needs and can train carefully. He also made a very significant statement when he said:

If we are going to stretch—and I think it is a long stretch—the Monroe Doctrine to include Singapore and Shanghai and South America, we will need an army of millions. If we are going to defend our own Nation, a relatively small but well-trained force will be more than adequate.

General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, informed the Military Affairs Committee of this House that with 480,000 men, fully equipped and well trained, no nation on earth could land a corps of troops on our shores, even with the command of the sea in their power.

A great War President had something to say on this subject three-quarters of a century ago, and I believe it most pertinent to the subject before the House to quote Lincoln's statement:

Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow? Never! All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chests, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years.

General Marshall seems to have the same faith in the ability of America to defend her shores and our people against a foreign invader, with a reasonable army of patriotic American soldiers.

No! Volunteer enlistments have not failed, but the Government has failed to give it a fair trial and not until a fair trial has been given should conscription be adopted in this land of freedom.

Confronted with these facts, those who support and advocate this bill face the challenge of explaining to the country the necessity for peacetime conscription. The necessity does not exist. Let us remember that if this policy is once adopted it will become rooted in this land and it will be here forever. This bill means military dictatorship and despotism. It means adding another heavy burden to an already disturbing economic load on the backs of the people of this Nation. One by one the rights and liberties of a free people are being

sacrificed for foreign conceptions of government until the destruction of our Republic will soon be an accomplished fact. One by one the branches are being severed from the "tree of liberty" until soon its trunk will stand dead and barren. This is a decided step toward that tragic end.

The conscription of wealth is a term which undoubtedly gives aid and comfort to the enemies of America, both those within and without. It is a demagogic statement intended to please the radical and the thoughtless. Government now conscripts wealth through taxation to the extent of 25 cents out of every dollar of income and it will soon take much more. Government takes what it wants, and the more it takes the less the people have to provide for themselves. The Senate has already adopted the principle of conscripting industry in peacetime. That proposal is an undeserved, unjustified, and unprovoked insult to the private enterprise and industry of this Nation. There has never been a time in our history when industry has failed to do its part toward the national defense when called upon. I cannot overlook the fact, unpleasant as it is, that the business and industrial life of this Nation, so recently the object of unfriendly governmental attitude and Executive criticism, is the first to which an appeal is directed when the Nation's defenses are to be made secure. Industry has not failed and will not fail in its duty to the Nation in spite of this unwarranted attack upon it.

Let us reason well that if the buildings, machinery, and materials of industry are to be conscripted in time of peace, then labor must, also, be conscripted and regimented at the same time, for buildings and machinery are of no value without labor to operate them. Labor understands this and has already given notice of its opposition to this proposal, which would destroy its rights. The laboring man understands clearly that if he is regimented and conscripted with industry, he will be in the Army as much as the man who carries a rifle. Labor is justly opposed to this bill, for its rights would be sacrificed to a military bureaucracy.

Not until it can be shown definitely that the volunteer system, always followed in this Nation in time of peace, has failed after a fair trial to provide the manpower necessary for national defense should legislation of this character be enacted.

It has not failed, and I present a distinguished witness who assuredly had more opportunity to know the facts than any Member of Congress. The Honorable Harry H. Woodring, until recently the Secretary of War, with 7 years of experience to his credit, spoke to the people of this Nation in no unmistakable terms in opposition to this proposal when he said:

How any fair-minded Member of Congress could say that we have given the voluntary system of enlistment for the United States Army service a fair trial and that it has broken down, and therefore we need the compulsory service, is beyond my understanding.

Canada has been at war for a year. She is an active belligerent in war. Canada at war conscripts her manpower for 30 days and then sends them back home in order not to disturb the economic welfare of the country.

The United States, not at war and determined not to become embroiled in war, proposes to conscript for 1 year. Canada conscripts for home defense only. The United States proposes to conscript her soldiers for service anywhere in the Western Hemisphere.

Not for an instant would I stand in the way or obstruct an adequate national defense. The record discloses that the voluntary military system has thus far produced that defense and not until it fails will I be swerved from my course. There I stand acquitted before my own conscience.

I oppose compulsory military training in peacetime, first, because it is unnecessary and, secondly, because it assassinates our American ideals of liberty established and maintained in this Nation since the Republic began. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I listened attentively to the entire debate of yesterday. Speech after speech came

from the Republican side of the aisle from shortly after noon until 6:30. During that entire time, in which 15 Republican Members took the floor, I did not hear a single speech in favor of the pending measure. Today, a majority of the speeches from the Republican side have been against this bill. Far be it from me to inject politics into the debate on a bill that I consider the most important yet considered by the Congress. Unless Congress passes this bill, this country cannot be adequately defended. I am for this measure and urge every Member of Congress to vote for it. But when every speaker from the left side of the aisle speaks against the measure, certainly it begins to have a political tinge. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] sounded the keynote that caution should be exercised by Members or they might suffer political consequences. In his statement of August 6 he said:

I realize that many Members of Congress are politically on the spot in regard to the conscription bill. I see no reason for those in close districts, if they do not want to, to take any side on this controversial question of conscription at the present time.

Of course, the present consideration of this bill forces the Members of the House to take a position on conscription. Thank God, we have an opportunity to make every Member come to a decision regardless of the consequences. Every Member that has spoken against this bill has pledged himself, identified himself as a friend and sponsor of preparedness. These Members have borne this out by almost unanimous votes for the appropriation of \$10,000,000,000 for defense materials. Right now I want to make one emphatic statement. We cannot purchase security for this country. Those who argue against this conscription bill should adopt for their motto, "\$10,000,000,000 for tanks, airplanes, armament, but not one man to use them." What is the alternative of this bill? The volunteer system. Is the volunteer system stopped under the provisions of this bill? No. A man can still volunteer for the Army, Navy, Air Corps, or for the Organized Reserves. And is the volunteer system the democratic method of raising a large Army, as so warmly advocated by its supporters? Of course, with radio programs, pretty girls in uniform, speeches, and bands, we can increase the number of volunteers. Those methods are being used now, but those methods appeal to two classes—those men who have been taught a love of their country and those men whose economic circumstances make enlistment in our armed forces an improvement over their present economic status. Many of the speakers who have opposed this conscription have urged a highly mechanized Army as we all do. If invasion of this hemisphere comes, as it well may before we can train mechanics, electricians, engineers, machinists, we must be able to obtain the services of men who already have a background in civilian life in these trades. With the passage of this bill every man between the specified ages—and I think it should include those up to 65—will be cataloged as to his ability. We will have taken invoice of our manpower and what that manpower is capable of doing. In time of need we can call for the services of those men whose previous training in private life makes them indispensable for our national defense. To build the same reserve of specialists by the volunteer system of training them after they are in the Army would require many years and would be absolutely impossible under the 1-year volunteer system advocated by the opponents of this measure.

I have one more argument I would like to answer, and that is a definite answer to those Members who constantly ask the question, What is the emergency? The peace and safety and continued prosperity of this Nation depends upon the freedom of this Nation and the nations of the Western Hemisphere. I cannot visualize the United States guarded by a Maginot line across the Canadian and Mexican borders. Without adequate and immediate help Canada and Mexico, as well as Central American countries, might easily fall under the absolute influence of Hitler following almost immediately the conclusion of this war. In Mexico, for instance, a very small percent of the so-called upper classes run the Government. Any party that is out might easily embrace the help of the Nazi system. The popular conception is that Mexico is a weak and

unprepared nation. In reality she has more men under arms today than we have.

All this talk about training men in peacetime harks back to outmoded methods of warfare. There is no interval between peace and modern war. There is no exchange of notes. There is no warning. The first warning that Finland had was the explosion of bombs and marching of invading troops. Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Luxemburg, Poland received no warning other than bombers overhead and the marching of invading troops. That would be our first warning; bombers overhead in Mexico and Canada with supporting troops disembarking. Certainly that will be our first warning if we are not adequately prepared to meet such a circumstance.

I have only one reservation against this bill. That is, will these men be properly trained in the use of modern warfare? The new drill adopted in the last 2 years in the Army is simple, intelligent, and readily learned in less than 30 days. As a member of the Reserves, I have just enjoyed 2 weeks' training with the Fifth Battalion of the United States Marine Corps Reserve. These men were anxious to use modern weapons. All through the year, once a week, they had listened to lectures about modern weapons. Four hundred privates in the battalion I was attached to were anxious to get their hands on Browning automatic rifles, on machine guns, on the new Garand rifles. Of course, these weapons and a range to fire them on should have been available all during the year for this Reserve unit, but even when they got to camp the only thing the majority of the men were allowed to fire was a .30 caliber rifle. Of course, there is danger in training men with modern weapons and live ammunition. Of course, some accidents are bound to occur, but every one of these recruits drafted into the service or who will go in as a volunteer must be given adequate training in the use of arms and the duty reposes itself upon this Congress after it votes this conscription bill to demand constant information as to the progress of the training of these men.

A great majority of Americans are sincerely patriotic. Certainly they are the most intelligent soldiers in the world and certainly a year's training is a small price to pay for the privilege of enjoying the luxury and freedom of living in the last stronghold of democracy in this world.

I would like to close on this note. I believe in the sincerity of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt. In this time of national emergency he appointed the best minds in the country to his Defense Council and gave them all the power they required. They are doing a good job. We are making vast strides toward getting this Nation ready for anything that may happen. Let any man disagree with the President. That is his constitutional right, but I think it sincerely a bad thing for this Nation to have Members of this House, Members of the other body, members of the press, and even a candidate for the Presidency of the United States impugning the motives, impugning every act of getting this country ready to defend itself as a selfish, political move. Until January 1 he is our Commander in Chief. We may disagree with him, but certainly in the hearts of every American there is not a question of a doubt that he is doing what he thinks best to prepare this Nation and to guide this Nation through the most-troubled times in our entire history. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MASSINGALE].

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, the House has resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 10132, being a bill to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service. I desire to discuss this matter as fully as I may in the limited time allotted to me in this debate. It is apparent that there are three essentials of national defense:

First. Money with which to buy equipment.

Second. Procurement of that equipment.

Third. Securing sufficient and adequately trained manpower to use and handle the equipment for war.

What will the House of Representatives do with this bill?

(a) Congress has appropriated about \$14,000,000,000—all the money that our military and naval advisers have recommended to be appropriated for national-defense purposes.

(b) The National Defense Board reports that our gun makers, shipbuilders, tank makers, airplane makers, makers of shells and explosives are now working full capacity in their respective fields and have either enlarged their plants or are moving to enlarge them to assure the Board that nothing in the line of adequate machinery and equipment for the armed forces of the United States shall be lacking.

(c) One branch of the Congress has already passed the compulsory military training and service law to provide the necessary manpower to handle the guns, tanks, ships, and airplanes in case war comes.

Now comes the most vital, the most important part, the very heart of the Nation's defense program. The other two essentials to such program have been met. Both the other essentials are without value unless we furnish the manpower. If we do supply this manpower, adequately trained, we then shall have done for our Government all that the best American experts and advisers have recommended for us to do.

At this point, it is well that we review the evolution of the Nation's sentiments on the national-defense program. In the language of the street, the fur is flying in and out of Congress on this bill, and all Members of Congress are deluged with protests against the enactment of the bill and letters and petitions in favor of the enactment of the bill. When the question for expanding our national defense first arose, practically every person in America stood up square-toed for making adequate defense against what might develop as a result of the European war. One of the most frequently heard arguments was that it would make business good. Another was that it is a necessary thing to do. And another was that it should have been done long ago. It was frequently asserted on the floor of the House of Representatives, and in the newspapers and periodicals of the country, that Congress had been negligent in not preparing the country for war. The President was villified because he had not taken the initiative and forced the Congress to get ready for war. They said he was playing politics and was not interested in the national defense and there were statements to the effect that Congress, having so completely failed the people in not having fully prepared this country for war, ought to resign and come home and let new men on the job, who would do it right and completely. All of these complaints were based upon the theory that complete and adequate defense was essential. Congress, as well as the people, was impatient because our national defense program had been so slowly developing that they felt for the safety of the Republic. I sometimes wonder if this jealous regard for the national defense was prompted to any extent by the personal profits that anyone thought would accrue to him as a result of the almost instant pick-up in the business situation as a result of the national-defense program when put in operation. It seems that the thought up to this time involved no sacrifice or contemplated sacrifice on the part of anyone. Of course, the picture is not complete unless we tie on to it the shadow of sacrifice. For, in national defense, there must necessarily be sacrifices, but those arguing for good business seem to have left the sacrifices for the other fellow. It is human nature to thus ruminate.

Now, since the money has been appropriated by the billions and the administration has gone forthright into the business of seeing that the Nation is adequately defended, come other classes of people. One says, "The Government has no right to draft men into military service." Another says that "this is a free country and we are now in a period of peace." And still another says, "It is un-American to pass a compulsory training bill in time of peace," and yet another says, "It is another step toward war." These expressions are protests against the passage of the bill. They are back-tracking criticisms prompted by the feeling that it is impossible to have this complete and adequate national defense if any sacrifices are to be made by them. In other words, they are expressions made after realizing that it is not all pickings and profits out of war. It is all right to take profits

that will accrue as a result of a stimulated business in getting ready for eventualities that preparedness may entail, but it is a different story when we come back to view the picture of the sacrifice that is in it. Some are strong for all the freedom, all the liberties and privileges that come from American citizenship but falter when they are face to face with the responsibilities, sacrifices, and obligations that citizenship imposes. In a democracy we cannot separate the privileges from the responsibilities, for the obligation is alike upon everyone that enjoys the liberties derived from American citizenship. If he is not willing to share his part of the responsibilities with other Americans, he is not toting square with others who are going to assume the obligations and responsibilities that go with that citizenship. All of us know that complete adequate national defense is a common responsibility in a government such as ours, and it devolves upon each and all alike. If we are not all inclined to willingly assume our fair portion of it, I can see no reason why we should not have that duty imposed upon us. Organized government cannot exist if the individual is allowed to do as he pleases, for if so anarchy would be rampant in the land.

I do not think it is necessary even to state that the volunteer system is incapable of raising an army adequate to the Nation's defense. It has failed before. In 1917 the selective service bill was enacted as a democratic way for raising an army, and the people applauded it. The bill under consideration is a fair bill. It treats everybody in America with absolute fairness and impartiality. It grants no favor to anyone. Each is taken upon his merits and fitness. He cannot hire a substitute even if he is rich, but he must do his part. He cannot buy himself out of the army. This experience was gained in the draft law during the Civil War, when men of means bid for substitutes for their service in the Army as freely and as brazenly as men will go out now to buy a bale of cotton at a public sale. This practice in the Civil War, it is said, undermined the morale of the Republic. I do not regard it as any argument against the passage of this bill that we may call out too many men or more men than we need. I think the broader the scope of the bill and the wider the range for eligibles, the more democratic the bill will be. I do think that the bill contemplates the use of more men in the service than will ever be required. It is inconceivable to me to think that we need millions of men in the Army. I am a firm believer in having all that we may need, but I am a firmer believer in not having a large surplus of men and more than we are prepared to train for service. The recent experience in this present world war in Norway is almost proof that it is impossible to land an army of any consequence by one side where the other is contending for a foothold on the same territory. It was disclosed that the main thing is to get to and occupy the territory invaded. England, with all her navy, was unable to land an army of but a few thousand men in Norway, and Germany was unable to do very much more. In the conquest of Belgium and France, a mechanized force of 200,000 Germans, on land, properly equipped and fully coordinated, overwhelmed 3,000,000 French soldiers, who were unprepared. These facts lead me to believe that the essential thing for this country to do, rather than putting millions of soldiers in the ranks, is to intensively train them in the use of the modern machines for making war. A mobile army of forty or fifty thousand men ready to go at the sound of the bugle, perfectly equipped and all its departments coordinated, is what we actually need. The selective features of this bill will enable such an army to be raised quickly, but no more of them should be kept in camps or cantonments than can be used.

Several things have occurred to me that should be incorporated in this bill, but if they are not that is not going to deter me from voting for it. I believe that it is imperative that legislation such as this be passed immediately so that the authorities can begin to build and train an army for any eventuality that may arise in this day when murderous maniacs are running at large in Europe and gloating over their ability to murder noncombatants wherever they may

be able to locate them. Of course, in case of war, every person in America will be inconvenienced and perhaps many will be greatly inconvenienced by the passage of this law whether they are to be used in the service or not. It is some slight inconvenience to have to register. I believe that every Member of this House, when he voted for the huge appropriations that have been made for the adequate defense of this country knew that money would be thrown away and wasted if we had stopped at merely buying machines and instruments of warfare. We knew that if we bought the machines and war equipment that we would have to have men to operate them. Now, why not treat all these men that we are to use just exactly alike? Many have advocated that the W. P. A. workers and their sons and the boys in the C. C. C. camps and others could furnish all the volunteers that the Army needs. I think that is somewhat of a cowardly argument. That is taking the advantage of some other boy's poverty. It is not much above the old method, in morals, of hiring a substitute. Of course, I believe that there are many thousands of boys and young men in this country who would not shirk any responsibility or duty that they owe to their country. This so-called draft bill will not hurt those within its terms. It may inconvenience some of them, but it is a type of inconvenience that they welcome because most of them want to do their duty and would not be satisfied if they should be denied the opportunity of doing it.

If we pass this bill for military training and service, we are merely following the advice of the leaders of this Nation in military affairs. We have more than an ordinary right to assume that these advisers are as patriotic and as much devoted to the Government of the United States as we Members of Congress are. They are possessed of specialized knowledge, which they began to gather in their training at the Military and Naval Academies. The Government educated them and made them fit and capable of giving advice to the Congress of the United States in such a condition as exists in the world today. I am perfectly willing to rely upon their advice and suggestions on matters that I know absolutely nothing about. They tell us plainly that we need a large Army and the way to get that Army, by experience, is by the enactment of a compulsory military training law. They further tell us that the call for this kind of legislation is now and that we should not delay its passage. They may have their estimates too high on the number of men that would be required to have registered and trained for service and if they are, we shall soon find it out. It is within the power of Congress, under the express terms of this bill, to limit the number of men that the President can call into the service to the expressed appropriation that Congress shall make for that purpose and if we have too many men called into training, we can put a stop to it. I believe that the money that we shall spend in training these men will not be spent in vain. It certainly will do no physical injury that will stunt the growth and development of their bodies, rather it ought to help them physically in a very noticeable way. If war should come, the benefit that would inure to these boys as soldiers of the Army would be incalculable, not only from the standpoint of enabling them to render an improved type of service but they will be physically stronger to withstand the strenuous work that they will be required to do.

If war comes, nobody wants it to be a war of years, and the sooner it can be ended the better it will be for the boys, the Nation, and for humanity. Naturally, there will be those, and we have already heard from many of them, that actually believe that it is a sin to participate in any kind of warfare that will oppose conscription either for training or for service in the Army, but they have been admirably taken care of in the bill.

By the passage of the bill we do not mean that we are going to make war on anybody, we simply mean to serve notice on the dictators of Europe that so far as America is concerned, we are not going to lie down and take it, and my opinion is that when we have provided such quantities of war material of the most modern and efficient kind and have trained a sufficient number of American men to man

those machines and have a sufficient number of mobile troops to dispatch to points in the Western Hemisphere outside of the United States in case of war, there will be no danger of us becoming involved in Europe. If we do not have such equipment and trained personnel, then we may just as well join those who are conscientiously opposed to war under any circumstances and let the dictators come and take it. I do not believe that there is a young man in America, outside of a comparatively few, who have been thus religiously trained, that is willing to give up this country and this form of government in order to appease any dictator. I am sure that this is not an appeasement Congress. If we know that we are not going to appease anybody and that we are going to hold and defend America, we may become involved in war but there will be no doubt about the result of such war, for an aroused and determined America backed by proper and intelligent preparedness cannot be defeated by the combination of any men who want to enforce their will and way of life upon us.

I want here to insert, as a part of my remarks, a letter that was written to me on August 23, 1940, from Tulsa, Okla., by a very warm friend of mine of better than 40 years standing. This friend of mine happens to be a Republican, politically, but if all Republicans and Democrats in the country were like him and the world knew it, there would be no danger of anybody making war against this Government. His letter is just the voluntary outpouring of a heart that knows no love for any land other than this. This letter is an allegory of a very rare sort. Here it is:

AUGUST 23, 1940.

HON. SAM MASSINGALE,

Congressman from Oklahoma, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SAM: Suppose that some outlaw would send me word that he was going to Cordell, capture your family, and burn down your property. What do you think I'd do? You are right, that is exactly what I'd do. I'd phone Clint Strong, relate the facts, and tell him that I'd be with him tonight because the outlaw is likely to be in Cordell anytime after today. I'd tell him that I knew the kind of guns and equipment the outlaw used, and that I'd bring along something superior. I'd tell him to have John Brown ready to go with us, and that I'd pick up Ed Thomas, the old sheriff of Custer County, and my brother Jack and his brother John, on my way out. We'd tell no one our plans. We'd go to Cordell, remove your family secretly, put dresses on Jack and John, place them in your house with plenty of guns and ammunition, and the rest of us would station ourselves outside in proper positions. All other men would do the same thing under like circumstances. History proves that all men are brave when they realize the presence of grave danger.

Suppose that Joe Louis would send word he was going to Washington and knock out every Congressman and Senator there. If each of you sat in his individual chair, he could do it. Not because you are not brave but because you failed to use your superior intelligence and to properly organize against a common enemy.

The foregoing is just supposition. The following is a terrible fact. You know my son U. S. I named him after this country. You know you never saw a finer specimen of physical manhood nor a better fellow. You know there is nothing the matter with him in any way. Well, he received notice from an outlaw in Europe, named Hitler, stating that he was going to make a vassal out of him, either by military force or economic pressure, just as he has of all Europeans. You know that if my son is properly trained that he can defeat the outlaw in any kind of contest. I know that this outlaw associates with some other thugs—a Russian, Japanese, and an Italian. I know that they will join him in an effort to defeat my son. None of them like my son. They are all jealous of him and want him out of their way.

You know that I am the only one who knows how to train my son for this contest. You know that my son and I have a grave fault. Neither of us will go into training unless forced to do so. We know that it will take all of his time and energy and all of my time and substance. We know that if we fail to do this my son shall lose his life, I shall lose my property and be changed from a free man into a vassal.

Therefore I am writing to ask that you kindly have a law passed giving some capable person power over my son and me and my property, as Churchill has over the people and property of England, in order that he may make us do our duty to ourselves.

Your old friend.

CHARLIE LAMB.

P. S.—His mother says that she is going to join with us. So please include her in your bill.

If there is a better argument or a more forceful assembly of words in behalf of the enactment of this bill, I have never heard them. To the young person in America, that son,

U. S., is the old, familiar Uncle Sam. To those more advanced in years, Uncle Sam becomes a close relative of the average American. To those that are "getting old," he becomes my son, U. S. So he is to my good friend, "my son, U. S."

My friend tells me that this son of his is just an average American boy, but that he had received notice from an outlaw in Europe named Hitler saying that he was going to come over here and make a vassal out of him, just as he has done to all Europeans. Confronted as he is with this threat, he feels his confidence that he can overcome that outlaw and his associate outlaws in Russia, Japan, and Italy if the son were intelligently prepared for his defense. Then he laments the fact that both he and his son have a common great fault and that is that neither relish the idea of going into training for combat and will not do so unless directed to do it, because of the time, energy, and inconvenience that it may cause them. But he realizes the failure to train for the contest will mean that the son shall lose his life and the father his property and be changed from a free man into a vassal. He suggests that I help pass a law, similar to that which they have in England, giving some capable person power to direct the proper defense of this country. This letter is joined in by the entire family—father, mother, and son. It is an unselfish type of patriotism and the reflected substance of it makes it unmistakably American in origin, for it is my opinion that such sentiments cannot be entertained by any other than those who have breathed the air of freedom in this country. Such sentiments make America great, and there can be no doubt as to the flaming devotion of this family for their Government. I believe that there are thousands of families of this type in the United States and that Congress is not going to let such people down. I hope that the compulsory military training and service law will be speedily enacted, so that the well-intentioned people of the United States will know that this Congress is going to transmit to them and to their heirs this Government, with all its institutions, so that they will carry on as long as the thought of freedom inspires the human breast.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made a while ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of conscription of the manpower of our country, and likewise of our material resources, in time of war. However, this country is at peace and there is little justification for the radical proposal which is now being debated. A report last week indicated that we have at the present time 919,000 men available in the Army, Navy, National Guard, and Reserves of our country. Evidence has been submitted to show that it will require probably 6 months to a year to train and prepare adequately these almost 1,000,000 men for the Army and Navy.

I rise with considerable trepidation to make these brief remarks because some of the learned gentlemen on the majority side, members of the Committee on Military Affairs, have stated that any Member of the House, be he a member of the majority or minority, who refuses to support this bill is a "fifth columnist" and a pro-Nazi. Yet we live in a democracy. Some Americans visiting the capital are being accused of Communistic tendencies, and being bums, because they disagree with the President. Mr. Chairman, have we reached the point in our country when standards of patriotism are set whereby it is necessary for the minority Members of the House to follow subserviently the dictates of the President of the United States in order to be patriotic Americans?

Much has been said in debate during the past few days that this is a selective-draft system, and I want to make only one brief observation in reference thereto. It is said that all the young men in our country will be treated equally and equitably.

I have here a clipping from a Pittsburgh paper of last week, and I should like to quote from it very briefly:

Essential war industries to keep many here from Army draft, leaders say.

Pittsburgh would contribute fewer men to the Army's proposed compulsory-training program than most other districts in proportion to total population, military men said here today.

This, they explained, is because great numbers of eligibles would get deferments from active service to work in essential wartime industries centered in this area.

But farming districts and areas with nonessential industries may expect to provide more recruits.

There you have the motive behind peacetime conscription. We have in our country today war industries, shipyards, factories, and industrial plants in which labor is making as much as \$30 a day. We have war contractors who were recently on a sit-down strike because they refused to cooperate in our national-defense program so long as profit restrictions existed in our law. It was necessary for the House to modify the Vinson-Trammell Act in order to make it possible for these superpatriots to make unconscionable profits.

Here we have this so-called selective draft, which is claimed to be fair to the young men of our country, whereby you propose to permit young men living in Pittsburgh and in the industrial centers of our country to retain their jobs and make as high as \$30 a day; then you go into the farming sections and the rural areas of our country and say to those young men: "Your time and your life is worthless. Your country has the right, under dictatorial peacetime conscription legislation, to demand that you forego the ordinary pleasures, security, and independence of your routine lives and submit to a service for which you will receive \$1 a day."

May I remind you, likewise, that when the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] told you about his authorship of this measure he neglected to declare that when the original draft was made it provided for payment of only \$5 per month to the young men who were to be conscripted in peacetime to serve their country.

There is no element of equity nor fairness in a peacetime conscription bill which proposes to draft men at \$5 per month—later changed to \$30—while industrial concerns are permitted to profit, with only the possibility that a part of those earnings will be recaptured through the excess-profits tax.

Industrial, business, and financial leaders of the East, regardless of party affiliation, are supporting this peacetime conscription bill. The international warmongers and Wall Street millionaires have visions of raiding the Federal Treasury as they did during the World War despite what the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee [Mr. MAY] was quoted in the Washington Post this week at stating:

Industry already has volunteered. I see no reason for drafting it. New taxes to be levied on corporation profits appear to be enough conscription in that field.

I am opposed to drafting the manpower of our country in peacetime while business and industry are profiteering. If administration spokesmen continue with their provocative statements and plunge this Nation into the European holocaust, there will be ample time to provide conscription of manpower and, likewise, to draft the material resources of our country.

During the past 8 years there have been many emergencies, most of which have been artificially created through the dissemination of fear and uncertainty. It has never been difficult to discover some emergency which might justify any contemplated administration program.

Americans recall the emergency which, supposedly, justified the proposal to pack the Supreme Court, but they were not fooled by that emergency.

Americans remember that emergency which prompted an administration purge of its own party members who refused to be satellites, but the electors were not fooled by that emergency.

During the past year there has been a persistent campaign of propaganda, duplicity, and misrepresentation, designed primarily to create fear and hysteria, justifying another emergency. Obviously it is the present plan to utilize this emer-

gency to foist upon the country a peacetime dictatorship comparable to the totalitarianism which is considered a menace to our country, but Americans will not be fooled this time.

The young men of this Nation are willing to serve their country in time of war, but they are unwilling to sacrifice their lives to satisfy the whimsical demand for power by public officials. Americans are primarily concerned in preserving their constitutional rights—not surrendering them. Totalitarianism is a curse in many European countries, and a peacetime dictatorship will, also, be a curse in our own country.

The energy, the resourcefulness, and the industry of our people should be directed toward the solution of our domestic problems. There is little justification for creating this widespread hysteria to distract their attention from 8 years of emergencies which are as real today as they were when they were perpetrated.

If peace-time conscription is enacted by Congress at this time the destiny of this Republic will be jeopardized for generations. Grave responsibility rests upon the Members of this House in casting their votes upon this revolutionary and un-American measure. I propose to keep faith with those who elected me by voting against peacetime conscription.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, for months, we on the Military Affairs Committee have been working on this military training bill. When we first started on the hearings some 2 months ago, I was at first prone to believe that our Army could be built up by use of the voluntary system of enlistment, which has been used by this Nation in times of peace since the very beginning. It has worked well in the past and the Army which we have had has been a fighting force. It has always given a good account of itself whenever brought into action.

Experts now tell us that we need a larger Army. An Army larger than has ever been heretofore needed in time of peace. I have studied the methods used by the War Department in its efforts to try and enlist voluntarily a sufficient number of men. Beauty contests, colorful poster appeals, newspaper advertisements, and radio broadcasts have been used for the purpose of pushing up enlistments and yet the number immediately necessary for the proper defense of the Nation falls far short of present requirements.

In addition to this fact, with the increase of enlistments, it has been noted that many of those who volunteer their services are men who are really needed at home in industry. The loss of skilled and trained men from certain industries at the present time when we are trying to build our defenses to the point where we are safe from attack is one that will have a far-reaching effect. Many young school and college boys are enlisting and this has reached the point where the President has had to issue a special appeal asking that men remain in school and college for the purpose of completing their education.

In spite of all of these facts, the number of men volunteering for enlistment in the Regular Army falls far short of the actual authorized strength.

Even were there sufficient volunteers to give us an Army of 1,000,000 which the experts think is necessary for our present defense, this in itself would not give the Nation some of the advantages which will be gained from a program of selective military training. The volunteer most of the time desires to reenlist and to continue in service. This produces a very small-trained Reserve even though the Army itself may be kept up to the required strength. The selective military training system on the other hand for a short period of training takes men who have no expectation of remaining permanently in the Army. They complete their period of training and then go back to civilian life. They serve to build up that great trained reservoir of civilian soldiers which in times of crisis can be depended upon to give to our defense system the fiber, character, and training necessary to a

quickly expanded Army and yet provide all of the essentials of economy and patriotism of the civilian soldier.

Mr. Chairman, I am not a militarist, and I am not one who believes that this Nation should meddle in foreign affairs. I believe that we should attend to our own business and never again send American boys 3,000 miles across the ocean to fight the battles of the Old World. I, myself, served in France, Belgium, and Germany during the last war as a soldier in the ranks. I saw war as it really is, stripped of all of its glamor and romance and in its stark and naked reality. I saw the mud and blood and grime of the trenches and I resolved years ago to work to keep this Nation safe from attack by any foe, regardless of from what direction that foe may come. I have been convinced that had we been fully prepared for the emergency in 1917 there is a great possibility that this Nation may not have been embroiled in that war.

As a member of the Military Affairs Committee I have felt very keenly the responsibility which falls upon the membership of this committee to give the richest nation in the world adequate preparedness. The decisions which I have reached in many instances have not been easily arrived at. Through days and nights I have studied the problems of national defense, not only for the effect they might have locally, but also from a broad view of properly defending the entire Nation. I have gained a wider and a broader perspective and at the same time I have felt a deeper sense of responsibility.

It is not an easy matter to frame a bill which is a radical departure from an old and established peacetime system. It is not an easy matter to work out a bill to induct 1,200,000 men into active military training. It is a duty, however, that had to be done, and I can say that the members of our committee have as a whole set themselves to this task with earnestness, sincerity, and patriotism.

We who move through events of the day often are so close to the picture that we cannot see it in its entirety. Within the last year we have seen Hitler conquer eight great nations, namely, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and France. We have seen little Finland put up a heroic battle for her very existence, and at this very hour we see Rumania giving up its own territory and struggling valiantly to maintain itself as a nation. In the Orient Japan is still aggressive and insatiable. China has been largely conquered and now her eyes look southward for action against Indochina, a colony of France. With events moving so rapidly no one can see what the future may hold.

A man is blind who cannot see the storms in the world today. It therefore behooves us as a great nation to fully prepare ourselves to take care of our own defenses regardless of what the outcome of the European struggle may be. With England whipped to her knees our defense problems become extremely grave, and we will need all of our resources of this Nation to protect our homes and our families. With this in mind I am definitely committed to the passage of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we of the Military Affairs Committee have the responsibility of protecting the lives and safety of 130,000,000 American people. We have the responsibility of protecting 3,000 miles of coast line in both the Atlantic and the Pacific, not to think of the responsibility of protecting the outlying possessions of this Nation. This in itself is an enormous job for our Army and our Navy.

But more important than this, we as a people have the responsibility of protecting the free institutions throughout the world. If we are to have freedom of speech, freedom of religion, right of trial by jury, representative form of government, and democratic institutions, which are all so dear to the hearts of the American people, and are things for which our forefathers went through centuries of untold sacrifice and deprivation in order that they might be transmitted to us for our enjoyment, we must be prepared to protect them.

The hour strikes. Will democracy survive? [Applause.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELOSON].

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday, September 3, 1940, I heard the chairman of the Military Affairs

Committee state that the President had the legal right to trade 50 of our destroyers for air bases in British possessions. He further stated that this trade improved our defenses. I have heard similar arguments raised on the Democratic side of the House, not only in regard to this unconstitutional and unwarrantable trade and weakening of our national defenses but also in regard to other matters which have been before Congress since 1938.

Let us now keep our feet on the ground and do a little thinking. How can giving away our first line of defense aid in our protection, and how can anyone with the interest of this country at heart say that in giving a part of the Navy to Great Britain can in any sense be an aid to the United States? There are no other statesmen in the world who would ever make such statements without apologizing the rest of their lives.

How can we maintain air bases in British possessions? It would be like moving in and living on the beneficence of a family. How long would anyone remain in such house? Not very long. Only until the family got tired of him. This is our position with air bases in British possessions. When the war is over we will be out, and make no mistake about that. The plan is so damnably silly that a child should be able to see through it. Yet we talk about it seriously in this Congress of the United States, the Members of which represent the people of this Nation, and who are obligated to protect the principles of this Government.

Has anyone given the slightest consideration to the cost of construction of these air bases from Nova Scotia to British Guiana? How can we, with a national debt of \$65,000,000,000, engage in the construction of air bases in a foreign country; in a country into which we must transport all material which is used in the construction of such air bases? Into a country in which we must maintain service stations and personnel to look after such bases. We will also be required to fortify, in order to protect this rented property. And when we do, we then and there become an ally of the power in which the air bases are located.

This is only one part of the picture, for the real purpose is to use the United States, as she was used in 1917, namely, as a "sucker" of the British Empire. Great Britain, in allowing us to establish air bases in her territories, is in reality treating the United States as a colony of the British Empire. We, like fools, accept this status and in addition to that borrow money at the expense of the taxpayers of the United States, in order to fortify English colonies without any expense to them or to Great Britain. Has anyone given the slightest consideration to this foolhardy venture? Of course not. Congress borrows money from the international bankers on the credit of the United States, and then charges all these loans to the American people.

What does it mean? It means national bankruptcy, poverty, suffering; and do not forget, internal strife—because the people of this Nation are not going to allow themselves to be led by the nose by the gentleman in the White House, or by any other person who leans away from the United States. I should be the last to question anyone's patriotism, yet I sometimes do question the real intention of some of those who join hands with foreign agents provocateurs to undermine and destroy the Government of this Nation. Yes; an act in which those who forget their obligated duty, become victims of their own dastardly folly.

We hear only too often that we must aid Great Britain in order to save civilization. We must aid her, so that civilization may not be destroyed. Let us again use just a little common sense. What has England given to civilization? England has given nothing but misery to the world and to her own people. The British lords chained their own people in the hold of sailing ships on the voyage to penal colonies. She tortured her own people, an atrocious act which was tolerated by the church. The Church of England and the British lords have engaged in the persecution of their own people more than any nation in the world, and while speaking of this, let us not forget the lot of the tenants under the vicious landlord system in Ireland. It was the

English Shylocks, whose god is gold and whose savior is a bribe, who introduced opium in China, and it was the British Government that forced this hellish poison on innocent Chinese who had never used opium until it was introduced by the merchants of England.

What has England done for India? Nothing, except to engaged in one massacre after another, against an innocent and defenseless people. History clearly reveals that England has done nothing for anyone, except her own damped and arrogant lords and nobles. I do not say this maliciously, but it is well for Members of Congress to realize that we are not dealing with a nation ruled by a beneficent and humane people for their acts appear to be contrary to such desirable state.

Again let us search the innermost recesses of our cerebral cells. From where has civilization come? Civilization has come from Greece, Italy, India, Egypt, Hungary, and Germany, and not at any time from England. It is therefore silly to say that these nations which I have enumerated will engage in destruction of the very ideals their people have given to the world.

Let us now investigate England's treatment of her colonies. What did she do for us in the early history of this Nation, when our people were as defenseless as many of those Great Britain has mowed down with machine guns in other countries. Why not remember some of the uncivilized acts of England toward the United States:

Remember the Stamp Act, by which immense sums were to be yearly extorted from you.

Remember the Declaratory Act, by which a power was assumed of binding you, in all cases whatsoever, without your consent.

Remember the broken promise of the Ministry, never again to attempt a tax on America.

Remember the Duty Act.

Remember the massacre at Boston by British soldiers.

Remember the ruin of that once flourishing city by their means.

Remember the massacre at Lexington.

Remember the burning of Charlestown.

Remember General Gage's infamous breach of faith with the people of Boston.

Remember the cannonading, bombarding, and burning of Falmouth.

Remember the shrieks and cries of women and children.

Remember the cannonading of Stonington and Bristol.

Remember the burning of Jamestown, R. I.

Remember the frequent insults of Newport.

Remember the broken charters.

Remember the cannonading of Hampton.

Remember England in our war with Mexico.

Remember England's attitude toward us in the Civil War and in the Spanish-American War, and do not forget England's use of us during the World War, and her interference in our elections.

Remember England's deliberate invasion of our neutral waters during the World War.

Remember the many blacklists which Great Britain has furnished to us, for no other purpose except to destroy our foreign trade.

Remember British interference with our merchant marine and delays which we suffered in deliveries of our cargoes to foreign nations.

Remember the agreement in 1921, under which we scrapped our Navy, and England scrapped her blueprints.

Do not ever forget that England has never even paid the interest on her indebtedness to us.

In recalling all these things, is there any Member of Congress who is willing to vote and sustain the Conscription Act, when in his own heart he knows that it is not in our own defense, but is instead to join in the war with Great Britain in the Far East.

With due consideration of this, can anyone who sustains this final attempt to involve us in war return home and

face his constituents with clean hands and a clear conscience? Those are questions that every Member should ask himself before he takes the next step, which is bound to lead us into a war, which will cost the United States millions of young lives and untold destruction of property.

As a final admonition, let me suggest that you read the Declaration of Independence, so that you may have a clearer understanding of how the founders of this country felt toward Great Britain when they wrote this document.

Congress unfortunately seems to be concerned with the President and not with the people who elected them to Congress, to represent the States in the Congress of the United States.

What power has the President under the Constitution? The President has no greater power under the Constitution than that granted to him in article II, and the only two full powers are the granting of reprieves and pardons. The other powers of appointment and on matters of the state, must be with the approval of the Senate. It is quite true that the President is the Chief in Command of the Army and Navy, but only as an officer; for all military bodies are under the absolute control of Congress in peace time as well as war. This is as it should be, for Congress alone is responsible to the people of this Nation for national security and public welfare. All other powers which the President now holds have been granted by Congress; and let me say at this point that all this power is an illegal grant which Congress under the Constitution has no right to transfer to the President of the United States.

Congress, therefore, is responsible for the chaotic condition in which we find our Nation today, and must in the final analysis shoulder this responsibility, as is right and proper. It should be clear that Congress is elected by the people to represent them in the National Capital and to protect all the rights which the people reserve to the States and to themselves and which are not transferable to any other branch of the Federal Government.

Congress has, in granting all of these unconstitutional powers to the Chief Executive, provided a grave for themselves and for those liberties and rights that the people once enjoyed under the Constitution of the United States. Congress has not only dug its own grave, but in their absolute disregard of the constitutional powers granted to it has provided chains which will shackle generations to come as slaves to tyrannical masters.

No one could have committed a more treasonable act than the President committed when he handed over a part of the United States Navy to a foreign power. Had an officer in the Navy been guilty of disposing of only a small, insignificant part of naval secrets to a foreign power, he would have been court-martialed; and let me say at this point that this punishment is customary in military organizations. Why should the Chief Executive be free of guilt because he is Chief in Command? Should he not, as the Commander in Chief, set an example in discipline for the others to follow? His act of September 3, in weakening our first line of defense, can only be considered an enemy act, which, if Congress had the courage to act within its constitutional rights, should be sufficient cause for his dismissal from office.

Let me also call attention to the recent episode of the U. S. S. *American Legion*. The captain of the ship has stated that the ship was not short of provisions and water, and that there was no necessity for reprovisioning, in order to complete the voyage. He stated that he had plenty of food and that he preferred to take the great circle route, which is 446 miles shorter than the route he was ordered to take by the War Department. This is the statement which was printed in the daily press. What was done in this case? He was ordered to take the longer route, north of Scotland, through waters that were mined by Germany as well as England. What was the purpose in ordering the U. S. S. *American Legion* to take this route? It could only be for one purpose—that would be in the hope that she would strike a mine and so provide cause for arousing public sentiment, and therefore an excuse to declare war on Germany.

Has any one given the slightest consideration to the statement which the captain of the ship made? He said that a storm was raging when the ship passed through the mine field, and that if anything had happened which would have necessitated abandoning the ship, he could not have launched boats and saved the passengers or the crew. Is this a sound policy of the administration, to jeopardize the lives on this ship for no other purpose except to provide *causus belli*? The whole thing is so inhumane, so unreal, that one cannot but wonder what evil hand is directing this administration. I, therefore, advise the people of this Nation to take a whole-hearted interest in the Government, and send only such men to Congress to represent them, who will honor their obligation to preserve, to protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, and this Government, the very life and security of which rests upon the adherence to this document.

In conclusion, let me say that we should not give the slightest consideration to the leasing of air bases in any foreign possession; for after having established such bases, it is quite likely that they may be used against the United States as bases for invasion and occupation of our own country should such incident arise. If England wants to be fair, let her turn over these islands to us as our property. We may then fortify them as we please, and maintain our own forces there to protect our country and the Panama Canal from foreign enemy attack. This is the only manner in which we should consider occupation of these islands, and the expenditure that goes along with the fortification of them as bases for our protection.

Let me also restate this: We are not threatened by invasion by any foreign power, with the possible exception of Mexico and England. I have no fear of any other European invasion of the United States, for such attempt would be bound to meet with the same failure as other powers have suffered in the invasion of other countries. We should, therefore, begin to provide armaments for ourselves, and desist from arming foreign nations that have no interest in the United States.

I am, therefore, opposed to the conscription of men at this time, for we are not prepared to arm them; we are not prepared to house an army, and we will, if we place them in service, expose such troops to climatic conditions which no doubt will terminate in the loss of many lives from the usual illnesses brought about by exposure.

What is needed more than anything else today, is for Congress to wash its hands of the administration and its advisors, and instead of listening to foreign guile and advice, take charge of this Nation in the manner that the Constitution provides, in the common defense and for the general welfare of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, some of us feel that the volunteer system should be given a fair chance before we resort to conscription. Others feel that conscription should be the first step. In the interest of national defense I am convinced that the issue should be determined quickly. As a good American, I shall respect and accept the decision of the Congress.

I have taken the position that conscription should not be adopted until there is more equipment than men.

I am convinced that the young men of the Nation will volunteer to meet our every need if we make reasonable changes in existing law.

Over 4 weeks ago I introduced a bill raising the pay in the Army to \$30 per month and compelling the Army, Navy, Coast Guard and marines to accept 1 year enlistments for training. I appeared before the Military Affairs Committee urging that it be given a trial.

Conscription is the method used by every dictator in the world, and I do not want to see it adopted in America until the volunteer method is proven inadequate.

It is said that the volunteer system failed in the World War period. There is no comparison between that time and this.

The Atlantic had never been crossed by a plane and there was no threat to our national life such as we fear today. Many will volunteer for defense training today who would be unwilling to join an expeditionary force.

Furthermore, we had been furnishing supplies to all the nations of Europe and practically every man in the United States had work at high wages. Today we have millions of unemployed young men to whom \$30 per month, with room, board, and clothing, is better employment than they have ever known.

The Army has been filling every quota asked for at the present pay of \$21 and for an enlistment period of 3 years. Let the young men volunteer under reasonable changes in the present law, and I am confident we will get men as fast as we get equipment.

Here is a picture of the National Guard training with two hay-rake wheels and a plank put together to resemble a gun. Trucks were used for tanks. If we have so much equipment that conscription is needed, why was it not used by the National Guard in recent training?

It is said that conscription will get the rich and place the burden of defense on the poor. If a rich man has a son who would not volunteer, his father can get him out of conscription by placing him in the kind of position where he will be exempt. The poor man's son will still march to camp under conscription, and the rich man's son will still stay at home if he wants to.

I am further convinced that there is no constitutional way to prevent the destruction of credit for all the millions who would have to register.

Already banks are refusing to loan money to men of conscription age. Automobile dealers require cash from those of conscription age. I think it is folly to destroy the credit of millions to get 900,000 men for training this coming year. Everyone in this House would be for conscription if it were the only way to build our defenses.

Many of us believe there is another way that will achieve the same result. There will be no added danger to the country if we give the volunteer system a chance because the day we have the first piece of equipment and no men to use it we could conscript.

I fear that conscription once started will never leave us, and I cannot vote for it until the volunteer method has been given a fair trial.

My bill to shorten the enlistment period and raise the pay of volunteers was introduced a month ago. That bill could have been passed 3 weeks ago and by now we could have judged its success or failure. It is the real American way. If we adopt a policy of forcing men to serve the Nation in time of danger, voluntary patriotism will slowly die.

Let us give the voluntary system a fair and honest trial. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, although I have urged on several occasions the passage of some form of compulsory military training measure I am constrained now to renew my efforts to secure the passage of such a measure at this time.

I am constrained to do so because of my belief in the national benefits that must flow from such a measure and in order, also, to meet some of the objections which are being advanced against a program of compulsory military training in time of peace.

Fear has been expressed that the adoption of a program of compulsory military training in time of peace would break down our traditional policy of nonmilitarism, tend to create and establish a large standing army, disrupt the orderly processes of our national progress, and create a host of dependent veterans not unlike those of ancient Rome, always readily available to support any politician capable of furnishing bread and circuses.

Under our traditional nonmilitaristic policy we have successfully resisted all tendencies that might have encouraged the development of a distinctive military class—which is

really the basis of our fear—by subordinating the military to the civil authority even in time of war. We never have maintained a large standing army, depending rather upon the spirit of national loyalty which has characterized our people in the past or upon conscription or selective draft only when the exigencies have been so great as to exceed voluntary enlistment. We never have maintained large stocks of war materials, depending rather, in time of need, and under such principles of international law as once prevailed, upon purchases from neutral nations with stocks of war materials for sale. And this policy appears to have been successful in the past. It was successful because of the vigor of our national loyalty, the freedom of the seas, and the development of a system of international law sanctioned by most of the nations of the world. Its successfulness has begun to reach the vanishing point as conditions have changed in a new order of world polity.

Our traditional policy made a large Military Establishment unnecessary, and the absence of a large Military Establishment, together with our national psychology, undoubtedly contributed much toward the preservation of our peace with other nations. Having no sabers to rattle, no large armies to parade, no military pomp to maintain, we have had no desire to advance upon other nations. Without covetousness for the lands of other peoples we have had no desire to wage war upon them. The armies we have found it necessary to call into existence to defend us from attack, preserve our national ideals, or to aid the oppressed who have appealed to us in distress, have been mustered out as quickly as possible after the emergency which called them into existence had ceased to exist. Having encouraged and developed a national psychology of peace, of nonaggression, and noninterference, we have had no need for a large standing army or for the development of a militaristic class. We have discouraged a national militaristic psychology.

Although we have pursued such a policy throughout our national history it is not to be concluded that we have been entirely unprepared for our national defense. I have indicated the factors that have contributed to our potential defense. It is only a few years since we were engaged in the conquest of our physical frontiers, a conquest that brought into existence the physical power, the physical stamina, and the personal courage necessary to combat contesting forces of Nature as well as the resistance of savage tribes of primitive men who opposed our progress westward.

Many of the hardy men and women who aided in the conquest of our frontiers are still alive. Many still bear the scars of their adventurous journey into the wilderness of the West from the Cumberland Gap to the Pacific. The covered wagon is still the symbol of daring courage, progress, faith, and hope.

Until the conquest of those frontiers had ended, some of our people were engaged constantly in activities that called for personal valor, physical hardihood and endurance, well-developed bodies, and the ability to meet and overcome physical attack.

Since the conquest of the frontier there has been a gradual, yet definitely perceptible attenuation of our individual physical development reflecting the lack of a demand for physical strength and well-developed bodies. The frontiers that now engross our attention are no longer in the realm of the physical but rather in that of the mental. We are absorbed with the development of our minds rather than with the development of our muscles.

Our mental attitudes, too, reflect the change in our environment. Our pioneers were neither physically nor mentally aggressive in a militaristic sense. They did not have a militaristic spirit. Yet they had the mental determination to persist in bold and adventurous undertakings that require great physical power and physical endurance. They were mentally aggressive in the pursuit of honest endeavor. They resented both mental and physical opposition, possessing as they did, large mental and physical capacities for courage, valor, and sacrifice. The conditions, the environment, and

the necessities that confronted our pioneers and developed the generation of which they were a part have passed. We have substituted nothing for them. The requirements of our national economy have changed. And even though new frontiers develop daily they are frontiers upon our mental horizon, frontiers of adaptation, among others, to a social structure in which a spirit of rugged individualism must yield to the competitive challenge of mass organization that reflects the closing of the physical frontier of economic opportunity.

We have become mentally more pliant as we have become less robust, because we have failed to evaluate the effects of the influences that have been operative during the past half century. We have accepted mistakenly the thesis that the effects of social forces are not determinable until after their occurrence, that they are not susceptible of laboratory examination, only because we have been unable to alter our concepts of a laboratory as a confined space filled with retorts and test tubes, slide rules, and microscopes.

I do not advocate a laboratory investigation of our social economy, although we are, indeed, conducting such an investigation through the many Federal agencies and bureaus now engaged in the collection of statistics and directing the energies of our people upon a scale so great as to be beyond the purview of a single individual or even the national legislature. Except for an occasional chapter in our textbooks or in the presentation of some particular thesis there is no generalization of this vast mass of statistical information. That such a generalization would indicate definite trends I have no doubt.

I would resist as I have opposed any effort to mold our national economy to conform to any preconceived pattern. For, however great such a desire might become in an age when national planning is advocated as the cure for economic maladjustments regardless of their origin, however strong the trend of social forces, I believe that the mutability of our national characteristics under the influence of opportunity for individual development as a national objective is potentially too strong to justify predetermined patterns. But I would avail myself of every available means to resist the threat of invasion or the destruction of our civilization by external forces or their encroachment by the alien influences that now exist among us.

I admit that I have been brought reluctantly to the conclusion that we have no program that would maintain or continue that physical development of our people that characterized our hardy pioneering ancestors. We have developed no substitute for the frontier conditions that produced the physically robust men and women who settled America and carried our civilization westward to the Pacific.

As a part of our vast educational system, it would be reasonable to suppose that our schools, colleges, and universities would have introduced and maintained a system of physical education intended to develop strong and sound bodies. Yet even a casual investigation will prove the contrary to be true. We have developed a system of athletics restricted largely to the fall months and assuming during recent years constantly increasing professional characteristics.

At the greatest collegiate sport event of 1939—the football game between Tennessee and Southern California, held in the Rose Bowl Stadium at Pasadena, Calif., and attended by 90,000 spectators, only 22 young men participated in the game itself. A number not greater was held in reserve for substitution, if necessary.

That small group of players was selected, not from an entire student body of potential contestants but from a select few who because of the fortuitous circumstance of hereditary vigor and physical development had earlier been accorded opportunity for the special training required by some athletic coach or some athletic game. The selection was not based upon a general system of physical development, education, or training. In too many instances selections are made before the student enrolls. He is not selected because he has enrolled. He is enrolled in order that the team of which he becomes a part may win, that its successes will increase the

gate receipts. For the great mass of the student body there is no required athletic course and only meager opportunity, if any at all, for election. Only the select few receive the attention and training of highly paid coaches, who themselves reflect the same form of selective training.

In the baseball world series of 1939, witnessed by a total attendance of 183,849 spectators, with gate receipts amounting to \$745,329, only 18 players were actively engaged in the game at any one time. A potential reserve was probably not any more numerous. And although we may justify this upon the basis of professionalism, the same justification cannot extend to the system followed in our schools, colleges, and universities generally supported and maintained by taxation.

The physical development of our people in recent years has been restricted largely to such activities as may have commercial support or a professional status or in which these attributes are nascent. In all instances the number of active participants represents but a small ratio either of the vast multitudes that attend these exhibits or of the population generally. From the ordinary activities of our daily existence we have eliminated almost all exertion that would tend to aid in our physical development. Our ancestors walked. They walked behind the plow. They walked about the farm. They sawed and chopped wood. They pitched hay. They did a hundred and one things that gave them strength of body and of limb,

The smith, a mighty man was he,
With broad and sinewy hands,
And the muscles of his brawny arms
Were strong as iron bands.

Our mothers and our grandmothers generally walked many miles in caring for their children and their homes. All these activities have ceased to a large extent. The tractor has replaced the walking plow. Ingenious machinery of all kinds has removed to a large degree the labor of farming. Our homes have become electrical laboratories in which the pressing of a button or the moving of a switch sets to work the giant of power. Even in our remote rural areas electricity now serves home and farm to reduce the daily chores or make them less burdensome. In our cities the care of the home almost has vanished as apartments increased or ingenious electrical appliances of almost inconceivable capacity relieve us more and more of the need for physical exertion. Busses, streetcars, taxis, and private autos have reduced the need for walking. We no longer shovel coal into furnaces. We do not need to climb stairs. The world no longer needs Aladdin's lamp. It long has been superseded.

I make no complaint of this tremendous conquest by American genius. I daily avail myself of all it has to offer. I enjoy it, use it, and value it. Indeed, I have but little choice to do otherwise, for today not even a hermit could be far away from a telephone, a radio, or an auto.

But I cannot refrain from the observation that the changes which our inventive genius has produced in our daily lives have affected markedly our physical status, stature, and development. As a nation we have developed no substitute for the daily activities that made our ancestors sturdy and vigorous men and women.

The daily life and habits of our ancestors gave them abundant health. They were long-lived. I do not know whether statistics are available to establish comparative facts, but I do know that the membership of this House has witnessed during recent years the passing of many of the Nation's most outstanding figures at a time of life when many more years should have remained to them. Today men appear to die young.

We have made great progress in medical science and surgical skill. Patient men and women have toiled industriously and laboriously in laboratories in order that we may live better, happier, and healthier lives. Brave physicians have risked their own lives at the bedside of stricken humanity to save lives of others. Skilled scientists devote their lives to peering into test tubes and through microscopes, while courageous surgeons dexterously guide their scalpels into the

tissues of brain and heart. The world owes a universal debt to the contributions of these men and women.

In the realm of preventive medicine we have gone far indeed. Research has helped us to eliminate typhoid and prevented its recurrence except in sporadic cases. We have penetrated the secret of typhoid. Tuberculosis has been made to yield to medical knowledge. It can be prevented. It can be cured. It will be eliminated when a wiser generation decides that it shall be.

We have learned much about epidemics. In a general way we know the means by which they are spread. We know that the rate of their speed is accelerated by the rapidity of modern means of transportation and intercourse. But we also know that they are retarded and halted by even more rapid means of communication as the facts of their occurrence are collected and distributed by boards of health and our Federal Institute of Health.

We have reduced the rate of infant mortality by our research into the afflictions of motherhood and childhood. Our modern research in the chemistry of foods is without parallel in history. We have learned how to prevent the deaths of our mothers and how to save our children. We have learned how to prevent congenital blindness and other congenital afflictions through prenatal precaution and post-natal care. In short, we are producing a generation of well-born men and women. We are rapidly revising our laws of marriage in order to be assured against preventable or curable afflictions. Yet, despite all these things men still die young. Thousands never reach the allotted Biblical three score and 10, and year by year the Nation's best die younger. Apparently we lack the physical stamina, the physical endurance, necessary to withstand the demands of our modern life with its tremendous strain upon mind and heart and nerves.

Our modern living makes constant, intensive, demand upon a nervous system that for innumerable generations regulated more muscular than mental activity. We impose a tremendous strain of acute and constant shock upon our hearts. We drive them fiercely with chemical excitants. We force them to new and unaccustomed activity. We impose great burdens and excessive strain upon our kidneys and expect them to save us from our overindulgence in vast quantities of alcoholic liquors so great as to be almost impossible of digestion or oxidation. We live on our nerves and die of nervous exhaustion.

Our ancestors were godly people. They found time to read the Bible. They were as ruggedly honest and forthright as they were physically strong. They knew little of subterfuge or indirection. They met great issues and great crises squarely. They were reliable. They had a high concept of personal responsibility and devotion to duty. They were a serious minded people. They possessed a simple and unsophisticated belief in a Divine Being. They filled our land with beautiful churches or modest chapels as their circumstances permitted. Christian mothers took time to inculcate the simple tenets of their faith into the minds and hearts of their children. Strong moral influences exerted themselves in every community in the land. Christian men and women made Christian homes and sent forth their children with high ideals.

In my opinion we are witnessing the attenuation of the moral fiber of the Nation just as we are witnessing the attenuation of its physical fiber. A spirit of commercialism has come to mark our day. We have commercialized our sports, our art, our drama, and our education. In the mad rush to acquire wealth we have forgotten how to live. We have adopted a frenzied existence that we designate as pleasure but that leaves us exhausted and tired in body, mind, and nerves. Ours is a restless and reckless waste of nervous energy that leads us to an untimely death. We have fallen prey to the money changers and the traders whose own vicissitudes through hundreds of generations have taught them how to preserve themselves and their own institutions while they lead us on to a cynical disregard of our ancestral blessings or premature death from nervous exhaustion.

The ideals of Christian mothers perish under the inducement to live today without regard for the morrow. The simple religious beliefs of our forefathers and foremothers are ridiculed by sophisticated money-worshippers who have incarnated the golden calf. Subtly, inconspicuously, subversively they undermine our faith in God, destroy our belief in the principal virtues and leave us without mooring while they advance, steadfast in their unshakable belief of protective guidance and preservation.

In my opinion the time has come when we must reevaluate the blessings that America has inherited from the past. The challenge is upon us. Each day brings news of a world in which change is so rapid that history is made as we speak. The ancient landmarks are no more. A new philosophy of world order prevails, and a newer philosophy awaits but opportunity for expression.

Is America worth while? Were the sacrifices of the fathers in vain? Are the contributions which they made to civilization worth preserving? Gradually, for 300 years, the ideals and the virtues of our heroic ancestors have found expression in institutions that have made life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness realities. America has made men free—free to live and to think; free to pursue their own way of life. We have conquered the forces of nature. We have overcome the barriers athwart the pathway of our progress. Shall we be halted now by the insidiousness of beliefs that are foreign to our way of life or to our spiritual concepts and values?

They who would destroy us would first make us weak. They understand the power of propaganda. They know that if the youth of our land is strong—strong physically and morally—endowed with abundant health and with faith in our heritage and our institutions, America cannot perish. But they know, too, that if they can weaken our minds and our bodies, we shall fall victims to mental and bodily ills and the destruction they plot will come to pass.

Let us, then, train the young men of the Nation to be strong in body and in mind. Let us reawaken the spirit of our ancestors, let us rekindle the flame of loyalty to home and fire-side, let us reinspire the youth of the Nation with the faith of our foremothers. In this way and in this way alone shall we preserve the land we love and the institutions we revere. In this way we shall preserve America, a light unto all the peoples of the earth.

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

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have been interested in hearing the well-couched observations of the gentleman from Georgia with regard to Christian education and Christian citizenship. The gentleman, I am sure, would add that in his opinion the so-called culture of the dictator countries of Europe does not take into account Christian citizenship. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. COX. I believe the gentleman is right. [Applause.] [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] such time as he may desire.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, whatever I may say this afternoon will, in all probability, have little effect on the final vote on this vitally important legislation, but to my mind the appalling rapidity with which century-old and peace-loving nations have been subjugated and destroyed within the last 12 months, is a most compelling reason why there should not be one instant's delay in our preparing to the very limit of our ability to resist any hostile force or combination of forces, which may have aggressive designs against this Nation.

The Americas are a rich prize, and we know from public statements of the dictators that they look upon the riches of the Western Hemisphere with envious eyes. We can be certain that if we remain in such a state that we can easily be overcome by force that there will be no hesitation on the part of the dictators to attempt to subjugate us.

The American way of life, with its liberties and freedom of action, is repulsive to the forces that now seek to rule all mankind. They have announced that they intend to destroy all democracies. If we expect to defend our cher-

ished principles, and continue to live free and untrammelled as we have for the past century and a half, we must immediately begin to prepare. There should not be a waste of a single moment of time.

We have already made vast progress toward adequate preparedness in the way of matériel and munitions, but that part of the program constitutes only one-half of a complete preparedness. Of what avail will immense stores of guns, tanks, rifles, ammunition, and airplanes be, unless along with them we have the necessary number of trained personnel to effectively utilize these weapons of defense; and the surest, quickest, and most democratic way of recruiting the necessary number of men is by a system of selective and compulsory service.

The measure now before us will bring into the Military Establishment a representative cross section of the young men of the Nation. It will affect the rich and poor alike. It will spread one of the responsibilities of citizenship among all classes alike, and will not permit those who would shirk their duties to shift to the shoulders of volunteers that oldest and most commonly recognized duty of defending one's nation in time of peril.

Not because I believe in war, but because I want to keep this country from being involved in war; and because I am convinced that the best way of avoiding war is to have the Nation so prepared that no hostile force or combination of forces would dare to attack us, I cannot do other than give my wholehearted support to the pending measure; and with that also goes the hope that no amendment will be adopted which will delay, for even 1 day, the immediate operation of the selective-service features of the bill.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to the debate in the House on this very important bill, which I believe is the most important bill this House has considered since I have been here, and I suppose the most important that has been considered at any time since the World War, I have looked back on the time when we were discussing the neutrality bill. I am reminded that back in 1918, when Ireland was fighting for independence, I was sitting in the galleries of the Wisconsin Legislature one morning when an Irishman from Milwaukee introduced a resolution to free Ireland. There was not very much debate on the resolution and finally it passed almost unanimously. One of the members of the legislature who was present at that time, and who is still a member of the Legislature of Wisconsin, got up and in a serious tone said, "Mr. Speaker, do I understand that Ireland now is free?" As I reflect back, I think about the debate on the Neutrality Act and I am just wondering now, after what I have heard today, whether or not we are neutral.

Until I heard the message of the President advising Congress that he had traded 50 destroyers of our Navy to England, now at war with Germany, for some leases for air bases in the Western Hemisphere, I had an open mind on this bill. When I heard that message I knew it meant war.

I am against war, and for that reason I am against this bill. We must keep out of this war, unless we are attacked or the Monroe Doctrine violated.

The President says that he has a legal opinion giving him the right to trade these destroyers for some leases for air bases. If he has the right to trade these destroyers, then, under the same right, what is there to stop him from trading the whole Navy? It seems to me it is about time the American people awakened to what is going on in this country. This act on the part of the President ought to cause them to sit up and take notice.

Now, just what does this bill, which the people understand to be a training bill, provide? Subsection (6) of section 3, reads, in part, as follows:

The President is authorized to select for training and service in the manner herein provided, and to induct into the land and naval forces of the United States, such number of men as in his judgment, whether a state of war exists or not, is required in the national interest for such forces.

There is no exception, except in times of peace when the President cannot call more than 1,000,000 men, and the men cannot be called to serve any place except in the Western Hemisphere, from the Antarctic Circle to the Arctic Circle, including Newfoundland.

Under subsection (C) of section 1, the National Guard can find out what they are training for if they do not already know.

If you read sections 8 and 10 of the bill, and do not come to the conclusion that you are in the Army or Navy as soon as this bill becomes law, then I do not understand the English language.

Here, we are asking for a law to conscript all men between the ages of 18 and 45 years of age. On August 14, 1940, I placed in the Record a statement showing all quotas for Army, Navy, and Air Service which had been filled by voluntary enlistment from January 1, 1940, to the end of June 30, 1940.

I was interested in knowing what Canada had done about getting their quotas filled, knowing they had been at war about a year. I wrote a letter to a friend in Toronto on August 8, 1940, and on August 14, 1940, this friend wrote me in part as follows:

The situation in Canada is that, up to the present, enlistments have been on a voluntary basis.

It seems we are much more exercised about Hitler than Canada, who is at war with him. I do not know whether Canada, at war with Germany, could have done much more to provoke resentment from him than we have, who are supposed to be neutral and at peace with Germany.

This is no time for leaders in America to lose their heads. Let us try out voluntary enlistment, and at least give it a trial. We might still have some patriotic people in the United States the President does not know about. We can at least try and find out. I, personally, cannot find many people for this bill, but I can find plenty who are against it.

I do not believe many people question the sincerity of the President in his apparent great anxiety for preparedness, but a large majority of the people are forced at times to question his judgment in justification of the cause, because he lets his enthusiasm and emotions run away with sound judgment. This is very aptly illustrated in his proposal in his Chicago address in 1937 to "quarantine aggressor nations," and also his rabid speech at Charlottesville, Va. We have always been a peace-loving nation, and suddenly to try to turn the American people over to militarism is too vital a change to be brought about in a few months.

The American people should not be kept asleep as to what is going on, because the dangers from abroad are not one-tenth as much as are presented to them over the radios and by the newspapers today. The great danger of America lies right at home and it may be that the very life of democracy is at stake today if Congress passes this bill.

One who studies its provisions, and who went through the World War, realizes better than youth can possibly realize today, that as soon as it goes into effect, they will find themselves regimented, and there will be no turning back.

They will soon hear the bands playing martial music, the flags will fly everywhere, and we, once a free people, may march under the head of a totalitarian government, as much as the people of Europe are marching today.

This bill, if passed, will upset our whole economic system, and everyone knows it will not take much to do it.

With the great burden the people are now carrying, we should sit down and read some history, especially the rise and fall of Rome, and the causes of the French Revolution. I am wondering if history is going to repeat itself. Let us avoid it if we can.

Dictators like large standing armies and large navies. They are safer with them.

I cannot close these brief remarks with a more appropriate ending than to quote from a speech delivered by Abraham Lincoln at Edwardsville, Ill., on September 13, 1858, when he said:

What constitutes the bulwark of our liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, our Army

and our Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of these may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you.

[Applause.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

WHY WAR IN TIME OF PEACE?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, the history of mankind has shown the struggle of man to attain his freedoms and rights. The present domestic problem of our mankind is the struggle of the common man to preserve his personal liberties, his property, and now his life under the New Deal.

Military training for national defense is one question; conscriptive military service during peacetime is a different problem.

A vote for the Burke-Wadsworth peacetime conscription bill is in fact a vote for war. We began by lifting the embargo and by following a "path" described as everything "short of war" and we have found that this "path" has led us to the brink of war. If others are provoked sufficiently to declare war on us, we are in war just as much as if Congress went through the formality of declaring war.

Hysteria pins a totalitarian label on anyone who expresses his honest opinions in regard to peace and war; hysteria, if continued, will soon pin the label of treason on anyone who dares express his honest convictions. Even yesterday we heard the opponents of this bill called lousy bums right here on the floor of the House.

THE TOTALITARIANS

All forms of totalitarian governments are repugnant and distasteful to a free people who have enjoyed the blessings of a republic. All forms of totalitarian governments set men back centuries in their advance to freedom. An unknown number of years will be necessary for man to regain the freedoms lost to such forms of government.

Many thoughtful people cannot understand why one form of totalitarian government has been subjected to criticism and public censure by the present administration, when other forms are not subjected to the same criticisms.

Modern history records that communistic totalitarianism has killed millions of people in its rise to power; has made its people unqualifiedly the property of the state; has completely abolished religious and personal freedoms, and has recently taken a leading part as one of the most active aggressor nations. The present administration has made only weak, feeble, and evidently futile protests against this communistic totalitarianism in comparison to its attitude toward other totalitarianisms. There has been no "stab in the back" speech for Mr. Stalin. In fact, during the time he was committing some of the same foregoing deeds, this administration entered into another commercial treaty with him.

OUR PROCEDURE

Many sincere people think the present administration has erred. First, in giving encouragement to would-be belligerents to the extent that they have felt safe to declare war; second, in taking an arrogant and vindictive attitude at a time when a friendly hand would have been welcomed. No apparent effort was ever made to be neutral. Real neutrals often exert worth-while beneficial influences in matters of state. Third, in not realizing that the Monroe Doctrine means that Europe keep out of our affairs and also provides that we keep out of European affairs. Fourth, in securing huge appropriations for the defense of the United States and its possessions and then turning around and presenting the defense problem of the entire Western Hemisphere. Fifth, in trying to control the political, military, and economic life of the whole Western Hemisphere, including the 21 already

dictator countries of South America, and expecting the people of the United States to carry this enormous load. Sixth, in having playboy ambassadors who were so lacking in judgment and in common sense and whose statements were so contrary to opinions of the great bulk of the American people.

It has been well said that if all of the people of this Nation sat down to the same table at the same time they would all have an equal amount of food to eat.

It is equally true that if all men sat down to the same war table, and all people equally divided the responsibilities of war, we would have one of two results. Either there would be no war at all or, if we did have a war, each individual and each group would be carrying his share of the load. We would not find one group vociferously demanding that the second group save democracy at \$21 a month and keep, while the first group was either profiteering or being protected by the second group.

Any conscription bill that does not require each group of our society to make an equal sacrifice is not worthy of serious consideration by the representatives of the people of this great Republic. Man-created wealth must not be held more highly than God-created man.

DEDUCTIONS

First. Preparedness for the defense of our country is highly desirable. The amount of defense necessary will depend partly upon the degree of belligerency that we exhibit, or have exhibited, toward other nations.

Second. There is not sufficient evidence of an emergency to justify peacetime conscription. Why stab one dictator in the back and lie down to sleep with another. The American people are entitled to know the real object of this peacetime-conscription measure.

Third. If recent events are carefully considered, a vote for the Burke-Wadsworth peacetime-conscription bill is a vote for war.

Fourth. We must remember that the two great symbols and instruments of power are the "purse and the sword." We must consider who holds the purse. We must picture the political and economic condition of the American people when any one man acquires the military power commensurate with the financial powers now held. Let us realize that these are peacetime powers we are being asked to so flippantly give away. The "indispensable man" would, if given such powers, truly have reason to believe that he really is "indispensable." In fact, Mr. Roosevelt now has the purse in one hand and is reaching out the other hand to grasp the sword.

Fifth. The extravagance, waste, deceit, and lack of common sense and common justice exhibited by the present administration, in its conduct of our domestic affairs, should be sufficient reason to question the wisdom of extending any more powers to this leadership. Most certainly not during peacetime.

Sixth. Professional politicians for 2 years have always received a big hand from their audiences following their declaration, "I will never vote to spill one drop of American blood on foreign soil." Blind followers of the present administration have had such an impairment of memory that they have already voted to do just that. Their solemn promise to the people was not good for even 30 days.

Seventh. The sponsors of this Burke-Wadsworth peacetime conscription bill are: First, the military minded; second, the war-profit conscious; third, small group beneficiaries; fourth, a certain number of sincere people who honestly believe that an emergency justifies the enactment of this measure.

Eighth. The opponents of this Burke-Wadsworth peacetime conscription bill are: First, the clergy; second, the religious groups and organizations; third, all national, State, and local labor unions; fourth, the great mass of business and professional men; fifth, all farm organizations; and, sixth, the great bulk of the common people.

I dare say that 85 percent of the people of this country who are not personally benefited by this legislation are opposed to this un-American, war-inspiring measure, which I in heart and conscience most sincerely and emphatically oppose.

The people of Wisconsin want this Nation to remain in peace. Many of its citizens came to this country in protest of militarism—the same kind that is now being foisted upon the American people by this Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill. The table of enlistment in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5008, shows that Wisconsin has a higher percentage of enlistments than any State adjoining it.

If this Burke-Wadsworth conscription bill is enacted into law any dictatorial-minded President can conscript men, business, and labor. It should therefore be clear that in our hysterical efforts to fight certain totalitarian philosophies now rampant throughout the world we may succeed in destroying the very liberties we are seeking to preserve and acquire a new type of totalitarianism in our own country.

If anyone wishes to make political capital out of my stand on this legislation they are welcome to do so, and I assure you Members here today that I well see the political significance of this stand. At least my constituents know where I do stand and they have one more evidence that my promises to them are not empty words.

Once again, I ask, "Why war in the time of peace?" [Applause.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, less than 6 months have passed since a Presidential message was read to the Congress and to the country which warned that the war conflagration in Europe then spreading rapidly was a menace to the security of our country. The initial alarm felt by the people was augmented by the progress of invading armies in their conquering march, and immediately became greater as a vast system of propaganda was let loose as to the necessity of expansion of our own national defense. The fall of France opened the very floodgates of fear. Those who previously had been intimating that our intervention in the European conflict was essential not merely to again "make the world safe for democracy" but to prevent our own destruction became more bold in their advocacy of our involvement in the conflict.

The succeeding months have become more and more disquieting as the propaganda has spread favorable to the building America over into the most powerful militaristic force on earth. In a few short weeks those who long have been advocating a vast increase in our Army and Navy forces, regardless of expense and regardless of our domestic situation previously made acute by 10 long years of depression, have become more bold in that movement. As soon as Congress had endeavored to make sure of our national security by the adoption of one measure, then others were proposed of far broader scope. And now comes the draft bill, not as a climax to their demands but as only another step toward turning our country into an armed camp.

Millions of our people are responding to the alarms sounded, and unquestionably believe that no cost is too great to make sure that the war shall not come to us, or if it should come, that we shall be fully prepared to successfully meet and repel any invading host. The cost of war dangers so far exceeds that of rearmament that in these troubled times scant attention has as yet been given to expense. Absolute security at any cost is deemed to be and undoubtedly is cheaper than the cost of conquest.

In May, in response to the request of the President, nearly \$2,000,000,000 were authorized for armament expansion. Authority was voted to increase the Army to 375,000 men, to increase naval strength, and to provide for the planes, tanks, and mechanization of units which modern warfare, as demonstrated on the battlefields of Europe demands. That initial authorization has been followed by others until the defense program now calls for more than \$10,000,000,000. Upon the demands of the War Department, authority to call out the National Guard to supplement our Regular Army was voted. In a few months those combined forces will number more than 700,000 men, the largest peacetime force in the history of our country. Incidentally, that peacetime Army will be larger than any normal peacetime army in Europe except

that of Russia. When mobilization of the National Guard is completed, our armed forces, including the Navy, will exceed 900,000 men.

Recently there has been debate and criticism here and elsewhere as to the lack of equipment for the forces we now have. In the past few weeks the press has been fairly filled with views of the Army training camps at Plattsburg and Camp McCoy, disclosing a woeful shortage of the very necessities of modern devices for the efficiency of our forces. Army officers have appeared before House and Senate committees and testified as to this great shortage. Mr. Knudsen, of the National Defense Council, has explained that not before another year passes will it be possible to fully arm the present forces with the modern rifles and other equipment which Congress has authorized, and not until the fall of 1942 will there be a sufficient supply for our combined forces of 700,000 men. War planes and mechanization of artillery, and so forth, are now known and fully recognized from the experience in Europe to be as much of a first-line defense as the Navy has been claimed to be. Still another year will elapse before these essentials will be ready for service.

Notwithstanding the great impetus in production, months will pass before the Regular Army and National Guard will be fully equipped and ready for action.

While these various steps have been taken to insure national safety, to make our country ready for any eventuality, the proposal to draft or conscript an additional army of 1,000,000 men or more has been brought out and supported by one of the greatest waves of propaganda our people have witnessed since the days of 1916 and 1917, when hundreds of millions of foreign money were spent here to influence our participation in the World War. Over the radio and in the press has come a constant and ever-increasing volume of war alarm to convince the public that only by compulsory drafting of millions of young men can the country be made safe from possible invasion.

So comes this measure. It has passed the Senate in slightly different form. It has the endorsement of the President and the War Department and the apparent approval of the Republican standard bearer as well.

It would provide for the registration of all men between the ages of 21 and 45. From the registrants there would be some exemptions. Then, by lottery, under regulations drawn by the Army officers and promulgated by the President, 400,000 young men would be selected to enter the Army for training by December 1, another 400,000 by April 1, and another 600,000 in the fall of 1941. Annually thereafter until 1945 there would be selected another 1,200,000 young men. After the training for 1 year the drafted men would be continued in the Army Reserves for a period of 10 years, subject to the call of the President.

Time does not permit me to discuss all the sections of the bill, but I wish to call particular attention to section (c) on page 17.

Each man, after completion of his training period, shall be transferred to a Reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States, and until the expiration of 10 years after such transfer, or until he reaches the age of 45, or until he is discharged, whichever occurs first, shall be deemed a member of such Reserve component, and be subject to such additional training as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law.

The measure has been widely advertised a "system of selective compulsory military training and service," with "training" emphasized. Under that section, who can say that the year's training may not be followed by the requirement of further service for a period of years?

It seems to me that this measure is not only a radical departure from our American way but that it is wholly unnecessary to recruit our armed forces to any number which future events may make necessary. It is a peacetime application of a system which our country never resorted to except in war. It is unwarranted and unjust, as well as unnecessary.

Our young men of their own volition now are voluntarily enlisting in the Army to the number of 1,000 daily. The Army recruiting officers do not encourage enlistments for

less than the full 3-year period. The basic pay now is only \$21 per month.

The Navy, in which the basic pay is \$30 per month, has no difficulty in recruiting all the men it needs for the 3-year periods. It is said to have a waiting list of several thousand young men.

Army officers claim that only by the draft can the Army be brought to the required number, but were the basic pay of soldiers to be raised to \$30 per month and men were encouraged to enlist for 1 year instead of 3 the flow of recruits undoubtedly would be augmented immeasurably.

There is another phase to this plan of conscription which I cannot have time to enter upon, and that is the ultimate cost to the people. An Army of nearly two million men, including the Regular forces, the National Guard, and the conscripted regiments, will require expenditures of billions in addition to those already authorized for the defense program. National safety is to be sought regardless of the needed sacrifices, but our country must be strong from within as well as from without. Every factor needed to maintain that strength requires careful consideration—more consideration than is being given at present.

I shall vote against this measure as unnecessary. I do not believe that its enactment is essential to our national safety.

Along with all others here, I have received hundreds of letters and communications from those who are opposed to peacetime drafting of our young men, from not only individuals, but from church societies and memberships, farm organizations, labor unions, and other associations. Notwithstanding the well-financed propaganda sent out in support of the measure, there are millions of our people who have not been swept from their moorings of national principle and tradition and who believe, as I do, that the building of a great military machine is not essential to the safety of our country. I am pleased to take my stand with them in opposition to compulsory military service in time of peace.

Among the many communications I have received setting forth reasons why this bill should not become a law is one from the National Farmers' Union which evidences the careful attention and earnest thought of farmers upon it. By unanimous consent I shall insert that communication in the RECORD.

DENVER, COLO., August 24, 1940.

To the Honorable Members of the United States Congress:

The officers and executive board of the National Farmers Union, convened here in our regular quarterly meeting, reiterate the often-expressed opposition of the Farmers Union to compulsory military training and to the conscription of our young men in time of peace.

We favor adequate preparation for defense and stand ready to offer our lives if necessary in the service of our country and in the defense of our rights and liberties as American citizens. Because we value our liberties and our country's welfare so highly, we are opposed to any measure which we believe would tend to take from us those liberties which we are ready to defend with our lives. We and millions of our loyal American fellow citizens believe that the passage of the Burke-Wadsworth bill would be a long step toward the propagation within our country of the foreign dictatorships against the introduction of which from the outside we are appropriating billions of dollars.

The United States has attained its greatness without the use of compulsory military training or conscription in times of peace. The British Empire has reached the height of its power largely depending upon a volunteer army in times of peace and many times even during war. France, with one of the largest, and according to orthodox standards, the best-trained conscripted armies in the history of the world, lasted only a very short time against the impact of the German mechanized forces. There is no inherent advantage in introducing conscription for the military forces of this country if past history is any criterion.

Before adopting conscription we would like you to give thorough consideration to the following questions:

Why not modernize our Army and our voluntary-enlistment system?

Why not liberalize the promotion system in the Army so any recruit with ability could climb even to the top of the Army ladder?

Why not do away with the undemocratic advantages given the graduates of our military colleges?

Why not provide men in the ranks with adequate courses to qualify them for commissions and as pilots, instead of restricting commissions and pilot training so largely to that small minority fortunate enough to get 2 or 4 years of college education, on the

doubtful theory that a college education is necessary and desirable for a good officer, pilot, or ensign?

Why not increase pay for all ranks and grades to equal the best pay in industry for similar skills?

Why not require all present officers to show that they are alert to 1940 methods of warfare, and not so fossilized as to preclude the recognition of a new age and new methods?

Why reject volunteers because of slight physical defects, when we could remedy those defects at slight governmental expense and benefit both the volunteer and the country?

Why not provide in the Army auxiliary training useful in civilian life, both as a basis for better mechanized soldiers and as an incentive for enlistment equal to that which is inherent in service in the Air Corps and the Navy, whereby their quotas have always been more than filled?

We feel that our Army must be modernized, its enlistment and promotion system rationalized and made more democratic, and the existing law providing for 1-year enlistments enforced, and that if these steps are promptly carried out there would be no shortage of desirable volunteers. We repeat again, we are all agreed as to the necessity of adequate preparations for defense, but we believe that under a liberalized volunteer system, with promotions possible for all regardless of whether or not they are college (or West Point) graduates, there will be as many volunteers offer themselves for military service as it is possible for our factories to equip with 1941 implements of warfare, and more than it will be possible for the officers to properly train and for the Army to properly house. May we add that we certainly do not want our boys crowded into unsanitary and insufficient barracks with all the attendant dangers of epidemics?

We respectfully request you, Senators and Representatives, to give this proposition your most careful consideration before you take the first step toward dictatorship in this country by voting for compulsory military training and service in time of peace.

Stop, reason, consider, before you vote in favor of the Burke-Wadsworth bill.

Most respectfully yours,

Officers and Board of the National Farmers Union; by John Vesecky, president, Salina, Kans.; H. G. Keeney, vice president, Omaha, Nebr.; J. M. Graves, secretary-treasurer, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Geo. A. Nelson, chairman, board of directors, Milwaukie, Wis.; Tom W. Cheek, director, Oklahoma City, Okla.; James G. Patton, director, Denver, Colo.; Glenn J. Talbott, director, Jamestown, N. Dak.; M. F. Dickinson, director, Little Rock, Ark.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HENNING].

Mr. HENNING. Mr. Chairman, today the second day of the debate in the House of Representatives, while engaged in the consideration of the peacetime selective-service measure, I propose to discuss several phases of this legislation and its practical application to minority groups of our citizens.

We are determined as a nation, as American people, to defend democracy. Precisely what is this democracy that we believe to be worth the utmost a man, a woman, or a people have to give? It is worth more than life. Men and women have died, and are now dying, for it. It is a thing of glory and will not lastingly surrender to any arbitrary power, however armed, however fanatical. It has the power to stir the hearts of men as nothing else can stir them, and it will speak, if it must, with an unconquerable and irresistible fury.

Democracy is not a system—it is a principle of growth. It is important to realize this, with all of its implications, before embarking upon any discussion of it and its present state or its future. To defend democracy men must have experienced what it is. In 1917 men felt that the good life was within their grasp. Today they are not so sure. American historic contribution to political thought and practice has been a just compromise between the larger and lesser arrangements in society. May the origins, progress, and defense of this principle never be forgotten. It is evident to me that the destruction of the democracy of Europe occurred because they paid lip service to the great ideal while the daily life of the vast majority of the people was something else.

Total defense involves the complete and most effective mobilization of all the social, economic, and armed forces at our command. On the surface, this seems not too difficult. Today we have legislation to conscript all men within certain age limits, and assume that we have the manpower of that age group available for defense. But have we? Will those whose names and other markings indicate recent background of the Old World be really there, or will the subtle discriminations against many first and second generations be present to defeat us? It rests on the long experience of the race

that men do not grow, learn, and create except when they are free, and that nations do not grow, learn, and create except when the individuals in them are free. This freedom means freedom to achieve and freedom to sacrifice if need be.

I am calling upon the Congress today, engrossed as we are with the subject of conscription, to see to it that the American Negro, constituting about 13,000,000 of our population, is not neglected and is afforded his opportunity to give of the best that is in him in this day of his country's need.

The Negro intended to rise so he knocked at the door of our great industries only to find that he has been the last man hired and the first man fired. Today he contributes more than his apportioned share of the unemployed. Total defense means using this human energy for productive goods, those required by the armed forces as well as those to be used in the maintenance of a healthy and effective civilian population. Yet we still have a tendency to close the door. This cannot be, for what skill we have, be it black skill or white skill, must be put to work. This is the duty of those responsible for the production end of national defense.

But it is not only employment—it is also in training that these resources latent in our Negro population must be conserved. Those younger and older colored citizens who possess associated work experiences and mechanical aptitude should be integrated into the training plan for other citizens of similar background. We cannot afford to limit our existing and potential supply of trained industrial workers. Racial discrimination is a luxury to the group in power but one which in the days of storm and stress even the powerful cannot really afford.

The Negro, however, not only intends to rise, he intends to serve his native land, so the Negro press for the last 8 months has been full of stories of the fight that these citizens are making to be allowed to die for their country.

According to Dr. Raylford Logan, a Negro, speaking at the hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate, April 1940:

Of the total strength of 229,636 officers and men in the Army (now) only 4,451, or 1.5 percent, are Negroes.

Mr. Logan continues:

Of the \$165,762,162 provided for the Air Corps in line 21, page 38, of H. R. 9209, not one penny (has been) spent in developing Negro personnel, either enlisted or commissioned, for service in the Army Air Corps. Even though section 4 of Public No. 18 (76th Cong.) specifically provided that one school should be designated for the training of Negro pilots, the War Department (it seems) has refused to accept any Negro as a flying cadet on the grounds that there is no separate unit in the Air Corps.

What we need to get at is not the complete list of what we failed to do in making our democracy work, but, rather, why we have failed and how we can cease wasting resources now needed and so readily available.

Let us consider, first, why have we failed? Not because we intended to. No; in that respect we are like France. We intended to succeed. We failed because we are blind to the realities that serve our own best interests. The very essence of democracy is that every man shall have a chance to contribute his share. This is what we have forgotten, and while it may be later than we think, it is not too late to begin practicing the art of letting each man contribute his part of the load. Concretely this means two things: First, that those who administer large enterprises, be they governmental agencies or private businesses, need to send down the word that all men must have their chance according to ability and not according to race, creed, religion, or color. Second, they need to make it known that those who work, or who want to work, must know that the country today needs and wants their best.

Finally let us consider three practical ways to stop this waste:

First. The administrative personnel of the Army and Navy must relieve the Negro population of the fear that they will not be in the program. They must be in all branches and service of the armed forces in proportion to their ratio in the population. If there are to be Negro units in those States where separate institutions are maintained by law, these must

be commanded by Negro personnel. The execution of this recommendation involves a speedy and adequate training program of Negro officers, for at the moment we have an inadequate supply. If it appears that the present administrators of existing legislation cannot understand the meaning of laws passed to regulate the life of all citizens within a class, then it may be that the Congress of the United States will be forced to amend existing laws governing the armed forces to the effect that no provision of the existing acts shall be construed or administered so as to discriminate against any person.

Second. There must be immediate reexamination of the Bureau of Employment security registers and the reinterviewing of applicants who have mechanical training and are not so registered, accompanied by a redirection of vocational training so as to achieve more democratic participation by minority groups.

May I cite one example of the miscarriage of the Congress' intent in the area of vocational training? It has come to me upon reliable authority that up to 10 days ago, in Kansas City, Mo., my own State, no facilities for training Negroes for defense had been set up. This condition existed, although the office of education had set up a full program for white people. The local authority justified this condition on the basis that defense industries would not employ Negroes. The urban league made a survey and established the fact that many of such industries in Kansas City and the environs do now employ Negroes. Other industries would employ colored mechanics. Only a few felt that they could and would not. Again I say, it should not be necessary for the Congress of the United States to define what it means when it legislates for all citizens within a certain class. Must we add to the number of words now included in each law, "without discrimination on account of sex, race, creed, religion, nationality, and color"? Shall we have to reiterate in each specific piece of legislation that in those States maintaining by law separate institutions for separate minority races that there be a just and equitable distribution of funds? And then define "just and equitable," and "minority races" so that they will be understood? Precedents for such legislation are found in the second Morrill Act and more recently in the National Hospital Construction Act of 1940 passed by the Senate this spring. These precedents should indicate what the Congress intends.

Third. There must be early and continuous negotiations with industry and labor to impress upon both the need for using the available labor supply and the perfection of approaches which will break down undemocratic racial, religious, and nationality occupational patterns that impede the maximum use of available skilled workers. Political Germany took over German industry because she understood that production policies were matters that affected the general welfare. It is not the American way to rule production. It is our way for production and the Government to cooperate. Business leaders, like governmental leaders, know that total defense means jobs for the unemployed before there is any lengthening of hours or doubling of shifts. Experience in employment of all racial groups on Government projects indicates all future appropriations for defense activities can contain a provision that there be no discrimination on account of race, creed, or color in the employment of labor, and that appropriate administrative measures may be established to effect such a program. The Congress has already set the precedent for such procedure in the Hatch Act, the recent W. P. A. and C. C. C. Acts. Do we need to reiterate our intentions further?

The answer, of course, belongs to the Congress of the United States for we are responsible to the people of this country. To them we must insure their safety and security. Any plan for defense which does not do this is not only inadequate but it may spell for all of us, as it does for the least of our citizens, failure. This we cannot and will not accept.

The basis of democracy is individual freedom embodied in this country in the Bill of Rights.

In addressing the House on June 6 of this year I made a plea for tolerance of the many racial minorities in our midst in the following words:

It is . . . incumbent upon those of us of native blood to constantly keep in mind that we at one time had ancestors who came to this country from a foreign shore in search of freedom of one kind or another. When we think back on the thrifty and industrious settlers of foreign extraction that played such an important part in the development of our land, we at once grasp a picture of how well the English, Germans, French, Italians, and many others of foreign birth and ancestry adjusted themselves to the new order, and the record of recent years speaks for itself in depicting the patriotism of a high order and good citizenship exemplified by those adopted sons and daughters when the crucial moment was at hand.

It is my earnest plea that we will not permit ourselves to lose sight of the fact in our fight for the preservation of democracy that all of our citizens, whether naturalized or of native birth, are true sons of the Revolution so long as they are willing to do their part to preserve those things that are so close to the hearts of all men.

I wish it were possible to emblazon this sentiment upon the minds and hearts of all of our people, so fundamental do I believe it to be.

In the matter of total defense, there is implicitly more than just tolerance. There is involved the use of just plain, ordinary common sense. This is not an emotional problem, nor do I make this appeal upon an emotional basis. It is a practical problem with a solution which is just as practical. There is involved here today, the question of the most complete and the most effective mobilization of all our social, economic, and armed forces. Let us not delude ourselves with the assumption that just because we practice tolerance of the racial minorities within our midst, because we give lip service to the ideals of democracy that we are availing ourselves of all the potential forces at our command and that our democracy will, in some manner, be their beneficiary. We must assume that if we come to grips with totalitarianism we will need every ounce at our command, not only of patriotism, but of participation by every group, man, woman, and child within our borders. We cannot assume that the passage of this legislation by the Congress will, of itself, insure total defense and total participation. The loyalty and patriotism of the American Negro has never been questioned. There is abundant historical evidence of this, and I take it that this is conceded beyond cavil.

Let us make certain that this group, constituting as it does about one-tenth of our population, is not the Achilles' heel of our national security.

Freedom means differences of opinion. It means political experimentation. It means change, because American democracy places the highest values upon the individual and this should mean each individual. It requires in return the highest and the best in men. It requires that he be capable of self-government which is self-restraint. That he accord the same justice, respect, and tolerance to others that he asks for himself, that he use his freedom, not merely for self-advancement, but for the benefit of his fellow men.

Instead of deploring the variety of racial streams and spiritual traditions which are an inherent part of our people, we should welcome them as a token of the freedom we enjoy, and believe that the common life is enriched by what each of these groups contributes.

Here we proclaim the equal rights of all groups, racial or religious, whether they be rights of the majority or of minorities, and find our unity in a common citizenship.

The American past reveals its mixture of many people with diverse languages and cultures, fusing in time of war or peace to make American history and American stock.

Freedom means that we shall never be unanimous. We can never achieve a perfect and finished form of society. We seek for the ultimate justice. We move toward it. We never reach it. Always the new question arises, always the recurring doubt. It is only of freedom itself, of the democratic method that we dare not doubt. Let us face the problem of the Negro in our national unity without fear, without mistrust, without misgivings, and with a realistic concept that

he is here, and here to stay. He wants to participate and to achieve, to manifest his appreciation of democracy and to make his contribution to it real and vital. He wants to sacrifice and, if necessary, to suffer. He wants to discover and invent, create, to dream glorious dreams which beautify the life of man.

As we all press forward, forever on eager feet, toward the supreme adventure, let us make sure that no chains fetter any of our fellows. That no lockstep keeps us in the prison yard of arrogant authority. We take the wrong trails. We suffer. We do wrong. But the mountain passes are ahead, and the sunsets challenge us.

May we not then be humbly grateful that here on the western horizon a star once acclaimed has not set, and the strength of a hope and the shape of a vision died for, and sung for, and fought for, and worked for, is living yet? [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. Izac].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, permit me to briefly comment on the bill before us.

We are today faced with the necessity of determining how best we can retain our democratic institutions, preserve the peace and security of our people, and at the same time continue to operate in a world overrun with a new philosophy of government.

When war broke out a year ago in Europe I feared for my country because of the threat to all peace-loving countries when one among the great family of nations resorts to war. Such a nation prepares with giant strides and builds up an armament beside which the puny efforts of peaceable nations are wholly inadequate. And when such a nation becomes an outlaw amidst its neighbors, preying on them and playing at war, it reaches a degree of proficiency that makes it almost invincible. The danger I realized then is much more tangible today, and no one can view the future with equanimity.

Twenty centuries ago the old philosophy of force gave way to the teachings of Christ. No longer was it to be the strong over the weak, but rather that right should prevail over might.

At various times since then this new philosophy has been challenged, but only ineffectually and with, at best, temporary success. Now, however, we confront the gravest, the most ruthless, and the most formidable challenge since the coming of the Saviour. The old philosophy is again in the saddle directing against innocent people a campaign of pitiless devastation and death. And even worse is the denial to the victims of the liberty and freedom which make life worth living.

This modern trend of the glorification of war may well be dated from the time of Frederick the Great. It reached its previous high mark under the Kaiser. But it remained for Hitler to reach new heights never before attained in modern times. And I am so concerned over the danger to American institutions from this source that I can see nothing ahead but the most bitter, unrelenting conflict the world has ever seen.

For, in truth, my colleagues, it is Christianity versus paganism, democracy versus totalitarianism, the philosophy of liberty and justice versus the philosophy of force.

For about 20 years now we have heard this totalitarian doctrine preached abroad. First it was in Russia, where the dictator glorified the "red" army. Then in Italy Mussolini insisted on the state's priority to the child. From the blackboards of the schools the slogan stared out so all might read: "Believe, Obey, Fight!" And in the playgrounds, with wooden guns and black-shirted ranks, the youth was taught the glory of war and the immortality of military fame. In Germany Hitler carried the indoctrination still further until today no voice is law save the Fuehrer's, no rights are sacred save those he decrees.

The dictator orders the lives of the German people from the cradle to the grave. And the philosophy that governs all is that of force—force to make the German people fashion their lives, aye, even their likes and dislikes, according to the whim of Hitler, and force to bend the will of neighboring peoples to that of this same autocrat. Force, always force.

My friends, what we seem to overlook in the consideration of this present legislation is the fact of a clash of these two philosophies. We are inclined to divide along lines entirely unjustified in the opinion of those to whom we have entrusted the defense of the country.

Some say there is no danger to us, to our American institutions, or to the peace and security of our country regardless of what goes on in Europe and Asia. On the other hand, our military and naval experts are almost unanimous in warning that the danger is very real. But to me the decision must be resolved upon this truth: Totalitarianism uses the lives and properties of the people for the aggrandizement of the state which in turn denies to the people the basic rights and liberties of human beings; whereas democracy asks of its people a simple sacrifice of, not a lifetime, not a generation, but only 1 year of a youth's life to help preserve those institutions under which we have grown great and from which we have derived so much pleasure and enjoyed so many blessings.

A selective service bill of the kind under consideration would never have been necessary in peacetime in the olden days when it was our boast that a million men would spring to arms overnight. The airplane has changed all that. Now time and distance have been almost annihilated and before one man can spring to arms, an enemy can bomb to destruction a whole city.

We have been building a tremendous armament in the recent past to safeguard ourselves against the steady westward march of this ruthless force that attacks with fire and sword and leaves in its wake only death and sorrow.

Our effort to prepare has met with the approval of the American people who are not willing to exchange our American way of life for the bloody ways of other political doctrines. But I warn that ships and guns are no defense unless they are skillfully handled. To man this armament requires men of training and experience. We must have the men and we must train them. My own boy is already in service and his three younger brothers expect to serve when they are old enough.

God grant our American boys may never have to resort to the use of this armament in war, but that through the simple expedient of being well prepared they may discourage all aggressors and thus protect the lives and liberties of our citizens by preserving the peace and security of America. [Applause.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before I start making the remarks I intend to make on this bill I want to refer to some of the statements made by the preceding speaker, my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin. He quoted a part of section 3 of the bill to the effect that the President could induct into service such number of these trainees as he wished. If you stopped simply with that particular clause which the gentleman referred to, of course, you would get the impression that is true, but I call your attention to the fact that had he turned over to the next page he would have seen that in this bill there is a very specific limitation that not to exceed 1,000,000 could be in training at any one time, and the Senate bill limits that even more, providing for 900,000. Further, in the same section, on page 17, it is also stated that the trainees cannot, except in case of war, be retained longer than 12 months, and further on in the bill a specific limitation is written that not a single one can be inducted until Congress has actually appropriated the funds for it. So it seems to me that we certainly are retaining in our own hands control over this measure and over the training program that may come about as a result of it.

Mr. HARTER of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HARTER of New York. The thing that is bothering me is that as I read the bill the time is extended to May 1945, and if the money is provided under that bill then we can

have over 5,000,000 Reserves at the end of that period of time; in other words, that is possible.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If we trained a million men a year, and everyone of them went into the Reserves—that is, did not go into the land or naval forces or into the Regular forces—that would be possible after Congress appropriated the money for it.

Mr. HARTER of New York. If I may ask one further question—of course, it would not be in the law—but can the gentleman tell us what they intend to do in regard to training these Reserves and as they gradually go on the Reserve list?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is provided here that for 10 years following the completion of the training program, the trainee, when he comes out at the end of the year, will go into the Reserves during the 10 years, and during that time he may be called back once a year for a short period of training. I believe the period is perhaps 2 weeks and certainly not more than 30 days, somewhat like the National Guard and the Reserve officers have been doing in the past.

Mr. HARTER of New York. The gentleman feels, I know, from his experience that a man going into the Reserves must have annual training. Is not that so?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct, and provision is made for that.

Mr. HARTER of New York. How can we train 5,000,000 men in a year even for a short period of time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We do not have to train them every year and, of course, our policy in the past has been based on giving the Reserve officers training once every 3 years.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNS. I think the gentleman's attention must have been distracted, because in my speech I said there was a limitation of 1,000,000 men.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sorry I failed to catch that. I know the gentleman would not willingly have left that out.

Mr. JOHNS. The gentleman says that, of course, we must appropriate this money for the training of these soldiers. Is it not a fact that we have already appropriated for 1941?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not know whether that has already been appropriated for the training program or not. If so, we have done it.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. As to the question of the appropriation, it would have to be appropriated hereafter under the terms of this bill. The appropriations already made would not cover the training provided for here and would have to be appropriated specifically hereafter.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. You can only train or induct into the service through this proposed draft as many men as Congress provides money for. This is an authorization bill—

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true, yes.

Mr. STEFAN. And the money to induct these men into the service will probably come to us in the deficiency bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It must be appropriated hereafter.

Mr. STEFAN. And so far as the 5,000,000 men are concerned, you are going to train as many men as Congress provides money for through the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true.

I take it as a belief of my own that every member of an organized society enjoying the benefits of that organized society has incumbent upon him a duty to protect and defend it, even at the cost of his life, if necessary.

I believe that duty is incumbent upon every single citizen of this United States and upon every section of it. That is the reason I am supporting this conscription bill, if you want to call it such, this bill providing for a selective system of filling up the gaps in our armed forces. I suppose that if the volunteer system had given us a sufficient number of men, none of us would be arguing for this particular measure at this time. It is true we are not in war, yet there is not one of us that will dare hide his head in the sand and simply say, "We are not confronted with any danger."

Any person who reads the signs of the times must acknowledge that these are perilous times. By this action I do not believe that we are approaching any nearer to war—probably not so near as we would be if we did not enact this particular piece of legislation.

As far as pushing us into war is concerned, I do not think there is anything to that argument. It is simply preparation to defend our shores, our homes, our free institutions, and to maintain the Monroe Doctrine.

The volunteer system has not worked. A short time ago I saw this in the Washington Post, and I want to read it to you. It is dated August 6, by Associated Press from Atlanta, Ga., and is as follows:

While Congress debates conscription a record-breaking flood of volunteers from the deep South is giving the present fighting force of the United States a strong southern accent.

The Fourth Corps Area, embracing all of the Confederate States, except Virginia, Texas, and Arkansas, enrolled 2,033 volunteers in 1 week last month—a record for the United States in peacetime and a third of the national total.

Since the current recruiting campaign started May 16, enlistments in the Fourth Corps Area have averaged 1,500 a week, compared to 200 to 300 in New England and the New York area.

Next to the Fourth Corps Area most volunteers have come from the Eighth Corps Area, composed of Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Oklahoma, and Arizona. The Fifth Corps Area of Kentucky, West Virginia, Ohio, and Indiana is third.

Only today I read in my home paper, the Huntsville (Ala.) Times, the following statement, dated Decatur, Ala., September 2:

Sgt. James W. Barnes, in charge of the local Army recruiting station, located on the second floor, Post Office Building, today announced that since July 1, 220 men had been accepted for the United States Army in the Decatur office, a great portion of whom came from Madison County.

Sergeant Barnes stated that great credit was due the Reserve Officers Association at Huntsville for their fine cooperation by aiding men to enlist, and to the postmasters of the various post offices in north Alabama who have also aided a great deal in bringing before the public the facts regarding the Army. Very little, if any, drafting will be needed in north Alabama.

The requirements for enlistment are the same as always, men under 21 years old must have their parents' or guardian's consent; those under 21 should write and have their papers mailed to them, as this will save an extra trip.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman mentioned his home town, stating there were high enlistments. I would like to ask him if he knows what are the wages of the W. P. A. in his home town?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I cannot give it offhand, but I assure the lady it is much lower than in her State of Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Some States are paying \$50 or \$45 for W. P. A., as compared with the South, which is paying perhaps \$25 or \$30. I wonder if it could not be expected that in those States people will not volunteer in the Army?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly grant the lady's argument that the high enlistment parallels very largely the area of low economic opportunity. That is one of the causes; yes. I would not say it is the only cause, nor the major cause. We have a historical background. Our people have always gone into the Army. Our people have always fought the battles of this Republic, and I am sure they will continue to do so. But the very fact that a discrepancy exists is a great argument, to my mind, that this burden which equally belongs to every citizen of this Republic should be equally distributed, and these people from other areas ought to be required to do their share toward public defense.

I am sorry I cannot yield further. I must continue in order to cover the thoughts I want to present.

Several Members have argued upon the fact that we did not have sufficient equipment. Now, let me say this. Of course, we all recognize the fact that modern warfare is not the same as it was in the Civil War days or even in the World War days, nor even what it was 2 or 3 years ago.

We have learned lessons in the past 12 months, we have learned many lessons. But regardless of any changed method of warfare even today we must have in a division the same kind of troops a division has always contained. In other

words, we may have streamlined divisions, we may have mechanized divisions, we may have motorized divisions; it does not matter what you call them, they all must have the infantry, they must have the field artillery, they must have the cavalry, the engineers, and all the other forces, and they use very much the same equipment they have always used.

Recently, from the Office of the Chief of Staff came a letter to Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, in answer to this very question, and I wish to read it to you. The letter reads as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C.

HON. MORRIS SHEPPARD,

Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SHEPPARD: You have inquired whether the requirements for rifles, shelter, clothing, and training equipment for the 400,000 men to be inducted in the next few months, if the Selective Service Act is passed, can be met according to schedule.

To answer your questions intelligently it is necessary to also consider the requirements of the Regular Army and the National Guard when ordered into the Federal service. The present plan assumes that all the necessary legislation and appropriations thereunder will have been authorized by the Congress by the middle of September, and that funds in the munitions program will be available by September 1. It is proposed to order the National Guard into Federal service by increments, beginning in September, so that the entire National Guard will be in active service before the end of the year. It is also proposed to begin to induct in October those men selected for 1 year's training and service, with successive increments each few weeks, so that a total of 400,000 will have been inducted into the service before the end of January.

The strength of the Regular Army is now approximately 280,000. By the end of this year, if the present rate of recruiting continues, the Regular Army should have been increased to the total of 375,000, for which appropriations have been made. The present strength of the National Guard is approximately 230,000. By the end of January the total men in service, including the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the 400,000 to be inducted under selective service, will be close to 1,000,000 men. It is for this number that equipment must be provided.

So far as rifles are concerned, these men can be fully supplied with Garand semi-automatic rifles, or with Springfield rifles, without using any of our war-time stock of Enfields. There will therefore be no problem in arming the men with rifles.

Shelter is of two general classes—barracks and framed tents. Barracks will be provided for those men who will be trained in the Northern States, whereas those men trained in the Southern States and the Pacific coastal area where the climate permits will be partially quartered in tents. Wooden floors, side walls, and heating arrangements will be provided so that the tent camps will be similar to those occupied by the Regular Army last winter during the maneuvers in the South.

At the present time barracks are available for approximately 230,000 men. Contracts have been let for additional barracks under the appropriations provided for, an increase in the Regular Army, and contracts for additional barracks will be let when appropriations are available therefor. It requires 3 months from the time appropriations are available to complete the type of barracks being used. Under the present plans new barracks will be completed from time to time, and barracks should be available by January for approximately 500,000 men.

There are on hand today approximately 80,000 serviceable pyramidal tents, most of which are at the moment issued to the Regular Army and National Guard for use in summer maneuvers. Ten thousand tents are due for delivery on the first of each of the following months: October, November, December, and January; so that by the first of next year a total of approximately 120,000 tents should be available. On the basis of 5 men per tent, a total of approximately 600,000 men can then be accommodated in tents.

It can be seen from the foregoing that shelter will be available for each successive increase in the strength of the Army, although it will require that both barracks and tents be occupied close to full capacity.

Difficulties will undoubtedly have to be overcome in connection with furnishing clothing, particularly in the case of overcoats and blankets. It may be necessary to use substitutes for regulation overcoats, such as mackinaws, sheepskin coats, etc. Cotton comforters will be used, which are considered equally suitable for use in barracks or permanent camps. If even the substitution of non-regulation items is not sufficient to properly provide for all men inducted, the induction program will be spread out accordingly. This should necessitate no more than a few weeks' delay in the above program under any circumstances, assuming that funds in the munitions program are made available by September 1, 1940, and that funds for pay and maintenance of the National Guard and of the selectees become available shortly thereafter.

Unit equipment required for training purposes, such as artillery, machine guns, scout cars, trucks, etc., is now available in the Regular Army and National Guard organizations. While there are shortages at present in some items such as tanks, antitank guns, mortars, etc., there is ample equipment available for general train-

ing purposes. It is for this reason, among others, that the men inducted under selective service will be assigned to the Regular Army and National Guard organizations. This method of assignment will bring the organizations concerned to full strength and will permit the inducted men to be trained in organizations which have already had training and which have sufficient unit equipment for training purposes.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM BRYDEN,
Acting Chief of Staff.

We hear many complaints about shortage of matériel, and if you notice, they will always bring up an item, perhaps a 90-millimeter antiaircraft gun, and tell you that we have but one, one 90-millimeter antiaircraft gun; but they fail to tell you that that is a brand-new development and naturally we would not have them in production. The same thing is largely true of the 37-millimeter antiaircraft gun and of various other pieces of equipment. But remember, that for the basic training these men are going to get there are ample supplies and equipment to give them the 12 months' training and make them a well-trained reserve component. Recently, Fulton Lewis, over the Mutual Broadcasting System discussed this item of lack of matériel. Oh, I know we have all seen these pictures showing men drilling with broomsticks and using trucks for tanks, gas pipe for mortars, and things of that type. Nevertheless, I believe the War Department knows more about it than anybody else.

General Marshall, General Shedd, and the other officers appearing before our committee said that the equipment would be ample as these various equipments came in. Fulton Lewis, in his broadcast a few nights ago, had this to say, and he said he had received his information from General Marshall, the Chief of Staff. I certainly am willing to believe anything General Marshall tells me about the condition of the Army.

When all of the National Guard and the Organized Reserves are finally called out, and go into the Army on active duty, we will have about 600,000 men in the Army—including the regular force that already is there. Six hundred thousand men.

So far as rifles go, the Army now has on hand 2,000,000 Enfield rifles, which they say are excellent for training, and 800,000 Springfield rifles, which are considered to be the best in the world. Using just the Springfields, that means there would be one and a third rifles for every enlisted man in the Army; if you want to include the Enfields, too, it means 4½ guns for every man in the Army; but actually, according to the Army, there is only about one man in every four in an army who carries a gun; the others are in cavalry, artillery, various other branches.

On that basis, only 150,000 of these 600,000 men would carry guns, and if you'll use a little arithmetic you'll find that figures out to just exactly this:

While the pictures show these men being trained with broomsticks and iron pipes, the fact is that the Army has enough actual rifles on hand, in perfect condition, to supply every man who is supposed to carry a gun—not with 1 gun but with 19 guns.

As for using sewer pipe to imitate trench mortars, the facts are as follows:

The War Department has on hand at the present time about three thousand 3-inch trench mortars. They told me today that that is enough to supply an army—not of 600,000 men but an army of 3,000,000 men.

As for machine guns—in which there also have been some fancy publicity pictures taken—the Army has 75,000 machine guns on hand, in perfect condition, ready for service—and that does not include the machine guns that are installed in airplanes—75,000 of them. The War Department says that is enough to supply an army of 3,000,000 men.

In fact, General Marshall said today that the Army has on hand sufficient basic weapons to completely supply a full army of 3,000,000 men; that means rifles, pistols, machine guns, 75-millimeter cannons (the famous French 75's—we have 3,400 of those French 75's), and the 3-inch trench mortars.

He said there are a few lines in which we are short. There is a brand-new type of trench mortar—in two different sizes—60 and 81 millimeter. We have just started production on them, so naturally there is a shortage of them.

The same thing is true of the 37-millimeter antitank guns, which are developed from the lessons of the present war; and also a new type of antiaircraft gun, and also tanks. There is a shortage in all of those things, and to get back to the matter of rifles, there also is a shortage of the new Garand rifle, which has certain improvements over the Springfield and the Enfield. For one thing, it is semiautomatic, and so it fires more rapidly than the Springfield does; for another thing, it has a sort of shock absorber built into it to take up the recoil each time the gun is fired, which cuts down the shock on the shoulder of the man who is using it; but even so, we have 50,000 of those in use in the Army at the present time, and they're being turned out at the rate of hundreds every day. One officer said about a thousand a day.

So there are the facts, and, incidentally, by way of proof that the War Department is not putting out this movie and picture propaganda—remember that the War Department itself gave out this information.

So I feel that the Army has sufficient equipment. Any Member of this House can obtain from the War Department information as to the amount of equipment of any particular type that we have on hand.

I submit that that argument certainly is not good because we do have ample equipment, as the Chief of Staff has said, to take care of these trainees and give them the basic training they would receive in the 12-month period.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Alabama 3 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. One other thing I do want to call to your attention is that these trainees are going to be used to fill out our Regular Army and National Guard divisions. The figure 1,200,000 as our initial protective force has been bandied about here very freely today. This is not simply an arbitrary figure pulled out of the air. Our Army experts have determined the number of divisions and the various corps troops and other troops necessary to give this country adequate defense, and when these divisions are brought up to full wartime strength they total 1,200,000. This is the reason for this figure being used.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. May I not call attention to the fact that one of the large expansions of our military service is the Air Corps? The evidence before our committee discloses clearly that it requires about 13 men to keep each plane in operation, including pilot, mechanics, workmen, and operatives on the plane.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

During the short time I have been in the House, Mr. Chairman, I have never seen a measure receive more careful consideration from one of the major committees of the House than this measure has received.

We had hearings for more than a month, then we had 2 or 3 weeks of consideration in the committee, during which time every member was given full opportunity to present his views. This comes here as a studied, deliberate, careful result of the work of that committee, the members of which worked together carefully and harmoniously. I feel this is a decided improvement over the bill that has passed the Senate. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, it was not so long ago that Dr. Goebbels proclaimed to Germany, on June 23, 1934, that—

The right to criticize belongs to the National Socialist Party. I deny anybody else such right. The right to criticize is exercised by the National Socialist Party to a sufficient extent.

From the remarks on the floor of this House directed at those who are against the conscription bill, it would only be necessary to substitute the New Deal in place of the National Socialist Party. [Applause.]

I deplore the fact that the time seems to have arrived, or at least is approaching very rapidly, when we forget that this is a republic, that each of us here is sent by a constituency of free people who possess sovereign power as sovereigns, and that we are only their agents. That applies to the Executive as well as to the Congress. If the time ever comes when a Member cannot stand on this floor in time of a so-called crisis and voice his honest sentiments without being charged with being a "fifth columnist" you will know that this Republic is rapidly declining and that we will inevitably become totalitarian, both in spirit and in fact.

I am going to approach this subject not perhaps from a new angle, because the gentlewoman from Ohio today made a most telling speech along the line that I intended to discuss so far as the bill is concerned. I would remind the Members of the House that you are not dealing with frozen

beef or animal fat. You are dealing with boys. You are dealing with the basis of this Republic. You are dealing with the future of this Republic, and it is high time that we give just a little thought to these lads rather than quite so much talk about materials, what we are going to do with them and how we are going to do it.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I only have a very few minutes.

Mr. MAY. I will be glad to yield the gentleman an additional minute. I have been surprised during the evening debate here at the assertion made by certain gentlemen that someone on the Committee on Military Affairs has referred to the opposite side of the House or to some of them as "fifth columnists." I have been here during every hour of the debate and if that remark was made by anyone over here I did not hear it.

Mr. REED of New York. What inference can be drawn from what has been said by those who have taken the floor and made the statement they did about Members who apparently oppose the position you take?

Mr. MAY. I have not heard anything of that kind stated.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, we are dealing with the young men of this country. They are the choicest and the dearest possessions of the fathers and mothers of our country, and those fathers and mothers are your constituents, they are free people and they have a right to be heard through their Representatives.

I think I know something about the American boy. I have had the pleasure of working with them and training them for many, many years. It is not often that you have an opportunity to look into the heart of the average American boy, but I will give you an illustration of a red-blooded, two-fisted, outstanding athlete in a university, who fairly pictures the average American boy. He is not mere flesh alone. He has ideals, he has aspirations, and he is all that is noble, fine, and courageous.

Some years ago a young man from a university with which I am quite familiar graduated in the natural course of things. Then he entered into the service of a large company. He was poor and he started life as most people do who make a success in this Republic of ours, this Republic of opportunity. He started at the bottom of the ladder. His people could not help him; he had worked his way through the university, but still was able to be an outstanding athlete.

He died in the service of his company. A number of his fraternity brothers went up to the little hall bedroom he occupied to see if he had any possessions which should be sent back to his old parents, who lived in Pennsylvania. His fraternity brothers found only one thing, and that was a document he had written in the sanctity of his room for his own guide in life. Here is what he said, and this is the picture of the average American boy:

It was headed "My Guide."

MY GUIDE

To respect my country, my profession, and myself.
To be honest and fair with my fellow men, as I expect them to be honest and square with me.
To be a loyal citizen of the United States of America.
To speak of it with praise and act always as a trustworthy custodian of its good name.
To be a man whose name carries weight with it wherever it goes.
To remember that success lies within myself, in my own brain, my own ambition, my own courage, and determination.
To expect difficulties and to force my way through them; to turn hard experiences into capital for future struggles.
To steer clear of dissipation and guard my health of body and peace of mind as most precious stock in trade.
Finally, to take a good grip on the joys of life, to play the game like a man, to fight against nothing so hard as my own weakness, and to grow in strength a gentleman, a Christian.

There is the picture of the average American boy today, and every one of you who has a son knows that is a fair picture of the average American boy. That is the type of man that will respond to your country's call as volunteers if you give them a fair opportunity to do so. But you do not want to do that. You want to take them by the nape of the neck and say, "We are the government. We are your boss. You will do the fighting when we say you should do it."

But, Mr. Chairman, we have won our victories largely with volunteer men, just remember that. We won our independence with volunteers and we will win our future struggles, if there is going to be a struggle, with the type of boy I have described.

Just what did we do during the World War? We went through this same hysteria you are trying to fan into flame. You are trying to excite the people prematurely. Now, as sensible men, if we have any regard for the boys of this country, and we know they will come to the rescue if we get into trouble, the thing for us to do is to realize our responsibility and see that everything is in shape for their protection before they come into the Army to be trained.

Just read the history of the hearings in the last war and see what happened. You know they were rushed into these rotten, frail, windswept barracks without blankets and without clothes. You know that; you do not dare deny it. There are men on this floor who know it, for some of them went through it. Then the flu epidemic broke out. Where were the nurses, where were the doctors, where were the hospitals at these camps, with the steam-pipes connected? Read the hearings. A special committee was set up to investigate the camps, cantonments, hospitals, and after they brought their findings on the floor of this House, the House, 274 to 4, as I recall the figures, voted the resolution through to call upon the Attorney General to prosecute those who had defrauded the people of this country and sacrificed the lives of soldiers in camp.

These boys had died like flies. I have before me the testimony showing that there was one camp where even the Medical Corps testified that these boys were shivering and blue, their nails blue, their lips blue from lack of heat in the camp hospital. There is plenty of evidence that the lads in these camps were lifted off the floor when they were sick and put in the places of the men who had died, without changing the sheets, and in many instances they did not even have the laundry to supply these sick boys. Fathers and mothers went to the camps searching for their boys and found them corded up like frozen beef, with not a box to put them in. They would try to find their boy and find that he was not even identified. How many of them went down in the camps of this country? Have the figures ever been published? No; they have not been published. However, I have talked with the officer who had charge of that work, and he said that somewhere between 125,000 and 140,000 of them died in our camps.

I say the thing to do is for this Congress first to see that we have the camps, hospital facilities, doctors, laundry, and everything that will make the boys safe, and then if the necessity requires it, after giving the volunteer system a fair chance, and if it fails and necessity requires, then pass the conscription bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]. Before I say anything that may be construed to be a contradiction or even a questioning of his statements I wish to say that I have a very sincere regard for the gentleman from New York, and I do not believe there is a more sincere, honorable, or square-shooting gentleman on this floor. [Applause.]

I believe the gentleman is sincerely of the opinion that this bill should not be enacted into law, yet he made one of the strongest arguments for preparedness that I have heard today. He stated that boys died like flies during the last war, and in the beginning of the war. Yes; he is right. I saw them. I was with them. I saw them loaded on trucks and I saw many a one loaded on a truck who probably would not have been there had the Congress of the United States made sufficient provision for preparedness far enough ahead so that the boys would not have been herded into camp and rushed to battlefields unprepared and untrained as they were.

Mr. Chairman, I am not making preparation for war. I do not have any idea of this country going to war. But if the unexpected were to happen, I should like to be placed on an even keel with the aggressor who wants to tender the challenge. I do not know the minds of others in this House. But my every effort has been and will be in the future directed toward keeping this Nation out of all wars.

I remember very distinctly that I volunteered for the last war, I was a junior in college at that time, and had just come home from college, and I remember when I went to my father and told him that I had decided the right thing for me to do was go and volunteer, he said, "Son, I had hoped that one of my boys over there would be enough, but if you feel that way about it, all right." He then dropped his head and walked off.

I never had any idea of the feeling that was running through his mind and heart until I began to think about my own boy. I have a boy just about the right age that if trouble were to break out he would be eligible—and God knows I do not want him in any battle line—but if that terrible hour were to come, I should like for him to be prepared to defend himself and to be man enough to walk up and say, "Give me my share of the burden. I will take it." I do not want him to pass it over to someone else and duck.

This is a practical proposition to me. I believe there is a very distinct responsibility resting upon the shoulders of every citizen in America to do his or her proportionate share toward properly defending this country, toward making preparation for the necessary and adequate defense of this Nation in the light of present-day facts, circumstances, and conditions. We simply cannot be unmindful of the fact that wars are raging on every side of us and the aggressors strike without warning.

Individuals differ on the degree of preparedness necessary, but I want somebody to define for me here what is the interim between peace and war in the present-day practice? How long is it? A democracy is not normally geared to war. It does not function with the speed of present-day war machines. I want to know something about what the interim is between peace and war. Then we can perhaps begin to figure on how long we would have to prepare. Were it to come unexpectedly, we might have but one shake at the dice. We simply cannot afford to take the chance. I am one who believes that the aggressors will jump on and attack a weak, unprepared nation quicker than he or they will one that is prepared.

Our paid advisers, our experts, our departments that have been charged with the responsibility of defending and making preparation for the defense of this Nation, have all advised that the indications are that we had better be prepared. I am not willing to call in an expert or group of expert physicians and doctors to the bedside of one who is near and dear to me and then, when the doctors recommend a course, assume the responsibility of saying to them, "No, do not do it. There is too much at stake." I oppose war and all of its hideous and terrible results. Adequate preparedness, in my opinion, is a further guaranty of peace.

If this bill operates as it has been defined, described, and explained to us, I do not see any serious invasion of democratic principles. I do see a democratic system of defense.

Now, there is no argument to this, and we might just as well face it squarely. The rural areas of this country have provided and have been furnishing the volunteers. Now, somebody deny that. I will pause for anybody to deny the statement that up to this moment the rural areas, the agricultural people or the rural people, have furnished the volunteers for the standing Army; and I pause for anybody to deny it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot quite see the fairness in that. If this Government is worth defending, if there is a responsibility to defend this Government and this country, it rests on all areas alike, urban and rural, agricultural and industrial, East, West, South, and North. So I see no serious invasion of any democratic principle.

We naturally do not like to be made to do things. I did not like to be made to do things when I was in the service, but

I knew that it was necessary to do them, and we know that it is necessary.

Mr. SECCOMBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Yes; I believe I will, although I had not intended to.

Mr. SECCOMBE. When the gentleman said that the voluntary enlistments come from the rural areas, did he mean during the World War or did he mean during peacetime?

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. I do not have the statistics on the World War, but I can say to the gentleman this, that from January 1 until June 30 there were just slightly over 70,000 volunteers—

Mr. SECCOMBE. This year, the gentleman means?

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Yes, this year; and over 30,000 of them came from the 13 Southern States alone.

Mr. SECCOMBE. The gentleman would not say then that the men in the city districts or out in the other communities were unpatriotic because they did not enlist?

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. The gentleman is fantastic in his conclusion. Certainly, I do not say that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. I think that conclusion sounds rather unfair. Although I am sure he did not so intend.

Mr. SECCOMBE. I want to say that I did not want to reflect on the gentleman, but I merely wanted to point out it is merely a wage question in peacetime or an economic question.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Then I will just turn the mule and cart around and back it over you and say this. If it is a wage question, has it reached the point that poor folks are to do all the fighting?

Mr. SECCOMBE. Well, that is unfair.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Certainly. [Laughter.]

Mr. SECCOMBE. Absolutely unfair and I want to be fair about the question. The gentleman raised the point of voluntary enlistments in peacetimes and now be fair and raise the question of voluntary enlistments in wartime and then compare the cities with the rural districts.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Without extending this exchange, for I am sure both the gentleman and myself want to be fair to each other as well as to the subject, I will just close the debate by saying, please again define the interim between peace and war. How long is it between peace and war?

Mr. SECCOMBE. We are at peace now and you want to conscript.

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. I ask the gentleman how long is it between peace and war in present-day practices?

Mr. SECCOMBE. You ask the President of the United States that question, and not me. [Applause.]

Mr. BARDEN of North Carolina. Well, I will admit that the President would be able to give me more information. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], such time as he may desire.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, it is now 8:30 at night. The House has been in continuous session since 12 o'clock noon. For 2 days we have been debating the Burke-Wadsworth bill. This time has not been wasted. This bill will make American history.

I have had more difficulty in reaching a decision as to the right course to pursue in this matter than on any other legislative proposal coming before the Congress during my service. The implications of a peacetime conscription law are momentous. We are being asked to change a fundamental principle upon which our institutions rest.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BARDEN], who just preceded me, said:

I am not making preparation for war. I do not have any idea of this country going to war.

I cannot feel that the distinguished gentleman fully appreciates the import of this legislation. Possibly he has not followed the debate in the Senate. Possibly he has not read the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee of the House. Possibly he is not familiar with all that has transpired in connection with our foreign relations during the last year. Possibly he does not sense the war propaganda abroad in the land. For my part, after most conscientious study, I cannot reach the conclusion suggested by my distinguished colleague. It is difficult to translate this bill as training for peace rather than service for war.

War is loose in the world. The totalitarian nations are on the war march. True, we are separated from those countries by the two oceans, yet in this day of rapid transportation, and when time and space have been almost obliterated, this country is called upon to confront a condition which would not have been recognized even as a theory a few years ago. I have pondered well all of this. I have hoped and prayed that this world war might not be our war. I am definitely opposed to the United States becoming involved in any European or Asiatic war at this time. I am satisfied that the burning necessity of the hour is strong, adequate, and impregnable defense. During the last few months, at the demand of the American people, the Congress has voted billions for this national defense. Hitler has taught the world that there can be no national security today except through mechanized national defense. The day of the minuteman, rushing to the defense of the homeland, equipped with the family shotgun or the hunting rifle, is gone. In short, war has become a highly technical science, and any nation that does not recognize that fact is eventually lost. If we cannot do away with war, then we must be prepared for war.

The country is woefully unprepared so far as the implements of war are concerned. The money, however, has been provided by the Congress, and ample mechanism is now "on order." It is just a question of time until we have the tanks, the airplanes, the rifles, the destroyers, the battleships, and the other essentials; that is, the mechanized part of the Army has been provided for, and that brings us up to the purpose of this bill—to provide the men.

It matters not how well our Army and our Navy are equipped. Equipment is of no value unless there are trained men to operate it. These men can be secured in two ways only: First, by the traditional American way; that is, by voluntary enlistment. Second, by some kind of a conscription or draft law.

Understand me, I have supported all this legislation providing for the equipment, and it follows that I shall support necessary legislation to provide the manpower.

Ever since the World War I have urged the enactment by Congress of a draft law to become operative automatically when this country is at war, nothing left to be done but to call the draftees. If we are to draft the young manhood of the Nation, provision should also be made to compel industry, agriculture, labor, and all the rest to bear their just share of the war burden.

The War Department has been working on such a measure ever since the World War. The truth is, however, that a vast majority of the American people have always rebelled against any kind of a draft or conscription law before war actually makes it necessary. The "blitzkrieg" in Europe has awakened our people to the necessity of preparation, yet we must not become jittery. We must not surrender up our liberties and our freedom except as absolutely demanded by the necessities of the hour. Every American boy has the birthright to plan his own life. This is an inalienable right and war alone should be allowed to disturb it.

The bill before us today differs in many important respects from the original Burke-Wadsworth bill and from the bill passed by the Senate. This is the place and now is the time for thought and deliberation. This bill deals with the lives,

the hopes, and future of our young manhood. Hysteria has no place here. The Congress should not pass a law authorizing the long arm of the Government to reach out into every home in the land, and change the economy and the manner of life and the American way, except such drastic procedure be necessary to preserve our Nation. Propaganda should not supplant debate and, under administration pressure, reason should not yield to fear.

An amendment will be offered, which has already received considerable publicity, and which has been given some consideration in the debate, known as the Fish amendment. Some of the newspapers, some of those who would get into the war at once if they had their way, and many other well-meaning people, are objecting to this amendment, claiming that it is a political amendment, the purpose of which is to delay inducting the men into the service until after the election on November 5. Now anyone cognizant of the facts knows that this is not the case. I have given much study to this proposed Fish amendment, and have conferred with Army officials and those who are qualified to speak as to the details of this proposed conscription law. In 1939 a pamphlet called American Selective Service was prepared under the supervision of the joint Army and Navy service committee. Of course it was never thought by the Army that our liberty-loving people would tolerate peacetime conscription, and the proposal was prepared on the basis that a law might be enacted, effective immediately upon a declaration of war. The pertinent part in this discussion is that this pamphlet recognized the fact that it would be at least 60 days before drafted men would start coming into camp after the application of the draft law. The procedure laid down in that pamphlet is almost exactly like the procedure contemplated in the Fish amendment. Certainly those preparing this pamphlet had no election or delay in mind. They were dealing with facts and not propaganda.

It seems to me that this is pretty conclusive evidence. Going a step further, however, on August 17, I received a letter from Maj. Philip C. Pack, judge advocate general's department, State of Michigan, who favors a conscription law and who at that time, together with a group of prospective State administrators of this proposed law, was working out the details of administration at Camp Grant, Rockford, Ill. Major Pack recommended that the voluntary system be given a chance and suggested that—

Registration and classification take place without delay and that the act of induction be stayed until the results of the volunteer recruiting campaign can be determined. Selective service cannot produce recruits (inductees) until 60 days after it becomes effective, that much time being needed for registration and classification. If, then, these first two steps were taken right away, men could be inducted without any further delay should an intensive campaign for volunteers fail. The 60 days would not be lost.

There will be no better evidence offered in favor of this Fish amendment. This amendment in no way attempts to delay, or will delay, the operation of this draft law. It simply gives the voluntary system a chance to function. If this bill does become a law without the Fish amendment, no conscripts will be inducted into the service before the middle of November at the earliest, and that will be more than 60 days from the date this law is approved. If that happens, then the justice of the Fish amendment will be fully established. If men are inducted into the service in less than 60 days after conscription is the law, then I am wrong. Time will tell.

No effort has been made by the Army to secure the required volunteers. The Navy already has a long waiting list and there is no contention that men will be conscripted for the purpose of furnishing manpower to the Navy at this time.

I do not like to criticize, yet I do condemn the attitude of the War Department so far as voluntary enlistments are concerned. The act of June 4, 1920, authorized the original enlistments in the Regular Army for a period of 1 or 3 years at the option of the soldier. I call particular attention to the words "at the option of the soldier." That is the plain, specific, and mandatory direction of the Congress.

Yet, notwithstanding, the War Department, pursuing the course so often adopted by the Federal departments and bureaus, has absolutely disregarded the law and has refused

to accept 1-year voluntary enlistments in the Regular Army. In this connection I call your attention to my remarks found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 12, wherein I include correspondence with the Adjutant General of the Army showing the position of the War Department against 1-year enlistments.

Now, the advocates of this measure tell us that it is a "selective compulsory military-training and service" bill. The people have been led to believe that this is intended, and will be, merely a training period for the conscripts. As I see it, this is a service law and the training is only important as it is incidental to the service. I have received correspondence from constituents who fully believe that this is a universal military-training bill. It is nothing of the kind. There is nothing universal about it other than bringing together the group from which reservoir the conscripts will be drawn. If this were a universal military-training bill, providing that all youth in the land were to receive 1 year's training in the military forces of the United States at some period provided in the law, that would be universal military training. All young men would receive discipline and training under this bill but 1 in 10 will do service, not for 1 year but possibly for 10 years.

The law will work like this: First, the mobilization day will be named, which will probably be about the middle of October. On that day all the young men in the country, between the ages provided in the law, will register. The local draft boards will then classify the registrants and the list of those eligible for immediate draft will be sent to Washington. Here, by some form of lottery, the conscripts will be selected. It is estimated that about 1 out of 10 of the eligibles will be conscripted. Supposing that 10 men eligible to the draft live in your home town. When the wheel turns or the lottery operates, one of those men will be drawn. He will then be inducted into the service for at least 12 consecutive months, and as much longer as the Congress may feel he is needed.

If there is no emergency at the end of his year's service, he will be returned home. However, he will be bound for a period of 10 years; that is, the hand of the Government has been placed upon him and he owes 10 years of military service to the Government if and when the Government calls him. During this 10-year period he can make no definite plans. However, the bill generously provides that after he has served 1 year he may enlist for a period of 3 additional years in the Regular Army, and if that service is satisfactory he will then be discharged and relieved from the rest of the 10-year period. As I am advised, it will not be possible for this conscript after his year's service to marry, thereby placing himself in the exempt class. He is given notice that he must respond to service at any time during the 10-year period. Now, the other nine boys are never interfered with unless by later law or regulation they are compelled to compete in another draft. It just does not seem democratic or even fair to me that this one boy should be singled out for 1 year's actual service and possibly 10 years' actual service, while the other nine boys go free. This is certainly not universal training and places an uneven burden on the one boy. In time of war we do not view these matters in quite the same light. But, remember, this is peacetime conscription.

Again, if this were simply a training bill, of course, the men could be best trained in continental United States. However, inasmuch as this is a service bill, this service in the Army will be performed in connection with the National Guard called to Federal service and the Regular Army, anywhere in the Western Hemisphere, in the Philippines, and in the possessions of the United States; that is, these conscripts are to be assigned as replacements in component parts of the Regular Army and the National Guard. The boys coming from a given locality, for instance, will not go to camp as a unit. Some of them will be detailed to the Artillery, some to the Air Service, possibly some to Alaska, some to the Philippines, and to the various forts and camps throughout the Western Hemisphere. If I read the future correctly, our troops are to be garrisoned at strategic positions throughout the Western Hemisphere from Nova Scotia to Cape Horn, as well as in the Pacific. If I am correct in this conclusion, then

it must be agreed that this is a service bill and not a training bill. If this conscription is for war service, why not say so?

If this service is necessary and if we are in the world war or contemplate getting into that war, then I think that the people should be taken into the confidence of the administration. You can always trust the American people when they are fully advised. They do not like subterfuge. They surely will rebel against being led into a war blindfolded. The people elected Wilson in 1916 because he kept us out of war. They no more want war in 1940 than they did in 1916.

I will gladly vote to place a most stringent but equitable democratic draft law upon the statute books for wartime service. We must have sufficient men for our national defense and if we cannot get those men by the voluntary system, then the draft should automatically come into play. But in the name of our boasted freedom and liberty, we should not abandon traditions and ideals of 150 years except as a last expedient. The voluntary method should be given a chance before the compulsory method is invoked. A proclamation by the President and a genuine campaign by the War Department will, I believe, get the required men for peacetime defense.

This bill sets up the machinery making conscription possible. It leaves the functional procedure to the President and the experts in the Army and Navy Departments. It opens the door for promulgation of rules, regulations, and policies which vitally affect the welfare of all of our people. It lodges in the President power that this Government would never heretofore tolerate in peacetimes. In the name of emergency, we have lost many of the rights of a free people during the last few years. In the name of national defense, we must sacrifice no more of our liberties and rights than is essential.

It is unfair to draft men into the service in peacetimes until there is sufficient equipment for their use and until there is sufficient housing and clothing to provide for them. It is generally conceded that we do not have adequate equipment for the men now in the service. The National Guard has already been called to duty, and these units are certainly unequipped. Indeed, in the recent maneuvers participated in by the Regular Army, the National Guard, and a part of our Reserve officers, it was necessary to use trucks for make-believe tanks, stovepipe for make-believe cannon, broomsticks for make-believe guns, and the men were "in the field" in tents and not in winter quarters. The Army is not equipped to take care of these new increments into the service at this time and, if the facts are carefully considered, we must conclude that it will be January or April 1941 before the first 400,000 men can be accommodated.

Why, then, should we provide for immediate conscription when we know that there will be no equipment and no housing for the conscripts? The answer is that under the whip and the spur of momentary hysteria an unwise and unnecessary law may be placed upon the statute books.

Of course, there is no unity of thought as to the advisability of this action. The major part of organized labor, organized agriculture, and the organized churches are protesting against peacetime conscription. With these groups this is a matter of fundamental Americanism. I am convinced that a vast majority of the American people, if they were given the opportunity, would vote against peacetime conscription. We are their representatives in the Congress. Our people are not cowards. They will defend our rights and, when they are convinced that our country is in danger, they will respond to a call for voluntary enlistments. Again I say, let the administration take the people into its confidence and lay the blueprints on the table. If this country has made any pledges to any other country concerning our entry into the present war, let the people have this information. If no secret understandings or pledges have been made, let the people understand this also.

The Army has always favored conscription in season and out of season, yet it has realized that this is a democracy and that the people rule. Many of our ancestors came to this land

of the free to escape military conscription in peacetime in the European countries. Every one of the totalitarian countries has conscription today. Only the democracies have escaped. Canada was at war for a year before it even thought of imposing conscription on its people, yet our country, the greatest democracy of them all, is going to enact an immediate draft-service law, and we are told we are not at war.

It is true that this bill has the support of President Roosevelt and many other leading citizens. It is also true that the bill does not go as far as President Roosevelt would go if he could have his way entirely. This is no new idea on the part of the President. During the last World War, when Mr. Roosevelt was Assistant Secretary of the Navy, he made a speech which is reported in the book, *Country Squire in the White House*. In that speech he said, in part:

Is it not time that the people of the United States should adopt definitely the principle of national government service by every man and woman at some time in their lives? I hope to see the time when national government service is not only an established fact but also one of the most highly prized privileges of all Americans. * * * This means service in times of peace as well as in times of war and means service in the civilian branches as well as the military branches. The day will soon be at hand when the Army and the Navy of this great Republic will be looked upon by its citizens as a normal part of their own Government and their own activities.

My understanding is that the above quotation expresses the President's views today. He would provide a regimentation and a training for all the men and the women and the boys and the girls in the land. Personally, I cannot subscribe to any such doctrine, and I hope that the bill now before us is not the opening wedge to the broader field.

It has been asserted in this debate that enactment of this bill will put this country into the dictatorship class. I think that is a little far-fetched. Colossal power, however, is given to the President. Listen to this:

The President is authorized from time to time, whether or not a state of war exists, to select and induct into the land and naval forces of the United States for training and service, in the manner provided in this act, such number of men as in his judgment is required for such forces in the national interest.

In short, the President is given plenary power whether or not a state of war exists to select and induct such number of men as in his judgment is required for such forces in the national interest. I am opposed to lodging within the discretion of a President the size of our Army and Navy during peacetimes. While this authority would not in itself create dictatorship, yet it would be a powerful help in case there was a desire on the part of a Chief Executive to assume dictatorial control of the Government.

There is no place for the superpacifist in this country. He who would not defend his country and its rights and liberties when necessary is an impotent patriot. Conversely, militarism is not only the foe of the people but the enemy of democracy. Militaristic nations and dictatorships are exactly the antithesis of our form of government. Too much power placed in the hands of one man, call him President or what you will, at once becomes a menace to all of our liberties. This is especially so when that individual is already the Commander in Chief of the military forces of the country.

This country must never see the day that great standing armies become the controlling power in our Nation. We are all viewing this matter from the patriotic standpoint. We have no right, therefore, to impugn each other's motives. We must not be swept along on a rising tide of war jitters to such an extent that we lose our capacity for critical consideration of what laws should be enacted. We have a splendid Army and must rely much upon it, yet the powers that be in our Army have made mistakes. Had the late Gen. William Mitchell, the head of the air force during the World War, been listened to by the Army, we would today have an adequate air force. Those in power were so sure of their ground that General Mitchell was forced out of the service. They were wrong then, and the world knows now that General Mitchell spoke the truth.

In conclusion, we must remember that the Congress is the forum where the duly constituted representatives of the

people are permitted to speak freely and to express what they believe to be the views of their constituents. This is a vast country and there are necessarily divergent opinions. We may not think alike, yet we can all agree alike to think. In this instance, we are all aiming at the same objective. We want immediate and adequate national defense. In the Congress a majority controls, and, after that majority has spoken, it is the people's law. If this bill becomes the law, we must all unite and see to it that it accomplishes the purpose for which it is intended. To this end, together with all other Members of Congress, I shall bend every effort.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. KERR.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I beg your indulgence at this late hour for a few minutes to discuss this important bill. I take this time because in my long service in the House I consider this probably the most important measure that has been before this House in 20 years. I am satisfied that every Member of the House is well acquainted with the purposes of this bill. The able committee that has considered it has written a synopsis of the bill in its report which is as comprehensive as any report that has ever been submitted to the House, in my opinion. Every one who reads that analysis embodied in the majority report can well understand what is the real purpose of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion there is only one issue involved in this matter and in the discussion of the matter. The proponents of the bill insist that the paramount purpose of this measure is to keep our Nation out of war.

I think I share the feeling of most men in this country that that is what we want to do. If I did not think that was the overshadowing purpose of this bill, and that its enactment would keep us out of war and its complications and avoid destruction of our property and the lives of our people, I would not dare support it. I would not dare support it if I thought that it would send an American Army into Europe. The opponents of the measure say that it is going to get us into war and in the last analysis this is the only fundamental difference between those who oppose and those who favor the measure. The opponents of this measure say that we should not conscript the manhood of this country in order to protect it. That an Army sufficient for all purposes can be organized through voluntary enlistment. Certainly it is needless for me to remind you that in each war in which this Nation participated we attempted to organize an Army through voluntary enlistment and that it failed and we had to resort to a selective draft or conscription. This is no time to be experimenting with failures.

So, in order to keep us out of war, this bill is a selective-draft bill or a conscription bill which, in my opinion and in the opinion of the proponents of this bill, will enable us to secure the fine manhood of this Nation and equip and train them in such a way that no nation in the world would dare molest us or dare interfere with our affairs and that philosophy of government that we cherish and love in this democracy.

It is well known now by almost everybody in the United States that when we selected our Army in the last World War, it was very crudely done, and on account of this want of equipment and the neglect of training of those fine fellows who were then inducted into service by this Government and who were called upon to serve in Europe, about 50 percent of those soldiers who lost their lives or who were wounded or their health destroyed can charge it to our hasty attempt to organize an army and get it into action, and this country is being penalized now because of the want of care and the want of training of these men who undertook to uphold the flag and the destiny of this Nation in the last World War.

I will not criticize the boys who volunteered to make the Army of their country. I should like to pay them a tribute. They deserve a tribute. Some of them were as fine men as ever followed a general or ever carried an arm into war, and their valor will ever contribute to the glory of this Nation. But that method of defending a Republic like ours is not the correct way. If it be done that way satisfactorily, all right, but there is a solemn duty of every citizen of this Republic

to protect his country when it is necessary to do so, and we ought not to leave this obligation upon only those who volunteer to perform this duty. It is not the democratic way and no good citizen will ever want some other to perform that obligation for him and assume the dangers incident thereto.

Therefore, this conscription plan, in my opinion, is the proper way for us to get an army to protect our Nation. This way calls upon the manhood of this country to do its duty. And you may be sure that they have always done it when they were called upon. It is the democratic way of doing it. It is the duty of every citizen of this country to bear arms when necessary in the defense of this Nation, and I am certain tonight that more than 66 2/3 percent of the people of this country know that this measure is the proper way to keep us out of war and are fully in accord with the purpose and intent thereof.

They tell us that no emergency is apparent. In my opinion, if you will turn back the pages of history, the greatest emergency that ever existed in this world is now facing the nations of this earth. For 1,000 years or more the European peoples have fought each other in bitter wars over religion, over territory, and over political circumstances which they thought involved their rights, but the revolution that is now extant in this world will not be confined to Europe, because the instigators of that revolution and those who believe in the philosophy of government that now dominates more than half the people of Europe are not going to be content, in my opinion, with confining that revolution to the European countries. It is an insidious situation, and this Nation would be a great prize for a selfish people or to a selfish man. This Nation has done half the business of the world for 20 years. This Nation is rich in natural resources. If we think that we can sit here complacently in this great Republic of ours and let a revolution go on over all the world and be satisfied that it will not affect us and that the slimy hands of those who hate a democracy and human freedom will not strike out to destroy this citadel of human rights, we will find, too soon, I fear, that we will be involved in a situation most serious.

This is an emergency era in the life of this Nation, in my opinion, and it is necessary for us to arm ourselves and equip ourselves so that we can stay away from this revolution, and so that the revolution can stay away from us.

You ask me how and why is this emergency apparent. I believe that it is so apparent that anyone can see it. Certainly, it is so apparent that this Congress, for more than a session, has been going down into the pockets of the people of this country and providing billions of dollars to be expended so that we may equip and defend ourselves in the event that any nation or group of nations should threaten or attack us or interfere with our rights, and those principles and that philosophy of government we hold dear.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I think people realize that there is an emergency overshadowing this Nation, and the world realizes it. This is why we are spending this vast sum of money for the purpose of our protection, and for the purpose of so equipping the defense of the United States and its provinces—we would not do it unless we well knew that our destiny was involved.

Mr. Chairman, this matter has been thought out well by the great leadership of this country. This is no time for political demagogism and abuse of the officials of this country and to say that they are not sincere and are not trying to keep us out of war. That ought not to be done. We ought not to impeach the men who have been given the right of leadership in this country on every occasion when they do not exactly agree with us. I do not consider men who disagree with me and my party and the principles it espouses as enemies of this Nation—I accord to most of them the utmost sincerity in respect to their political activities and for most of the men on both sides of this aisle I have profound respect and deep affection and I shall cherish this

throughout life—we all love and should love this Nation and should do nothing which would imperil its destiny.

As far as I am concerned I shall follow in this matter the President of the United States and his official advisers and I prefer to follow the great chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in the Senate—and there are few men in this country more sincere and more genuine—and I prefer to follow the committee of this House and its able chairman. I prefer to follow the 66⅔ percent of the fine men and women of this country who have expressed their opinion on this legislation, rather than to follow any Socialist or Communist or Nazi bund or any other "ism" which has for its purpose the destruction of our form of government and its overthrow. As far as I am concerned, I should like to see some law passed by this Congress that would outlaw those agencies in this country of ours which are attempting to destroy our Government directly or indirectly, and substitute some other form. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, if Congress should pass this bill we will have undertaken a step without precedent in our history. Let us hope it will not be a tragic one. Thus far we have never experienced the necessity for resorting to peacetime conscription of men or property. We are asked to authorize it now solely upon the assumption that the axis powers may soon conquer Great Britain and will then attempt to conquer this country or to violate the Monroe Doctrine.

In the matter of military preparedness it is proper, as well as necessary, that we deal in assumptions. To wait for an event to happen before preparing to meet it would be the height of absurdity. Many persons question the likelihood of Great Britain's defeat. A still greater number, including military experts, doubt the ability of Germany to invade this Nation even if she were inclined to do so. These are all matters of speculation. Who may be right, history alone can tell. In reaching our conclusions upon this bill we must assume that the worst may happen, however remote the chances may be. In reaching the views stated in the minority report filed with this bill, and in opposing this measure, I at no time have departed from this assumption.

We have heard repeatedly the contention that the huge quantities of military equipment and implements of war for which we have appropriated billions of dollars will be wasted if we do not have the men to use them. This is too obvious for comment. This fact has likewise been taken into consideration in reaching the conclusion that conscription of the manpower of the Nation at this time, when we are not at war, is unnecessary. In passing upon this phase of the question, let us dispassionately consider the facts, uninfluenced by partisan politics or propaganda.

Let us go back 3 months. You will recall that we were assembled on May 16 to hear an address by the President. It was on this occasion that he spoke of grave dangers throughout the Western Hemisphere. It was in this address that he called the attention of Congress to the flying distances between the fiords of Greenland and Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, and New England; from Bermuda to our shores, the coast of Florida from the West Indies, from the West Coast of Africa to Brazil, and from there to Venezuela, to Cuba and the Canal Zone, Mexico, St. Louis, Kansas City, and Omaha; and on the other side of the continent, from Alaska to Vancouver, Seattle, Tacoma, and Portland. These statements needed no analysis. The President was attempting to make the point that invasion of this country from points in the Western Hemisphere was not improbable. His plea at that time was for funds adequate to meet the situation.

Thereafter, a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee conducted hearings on the supplemental national-defense appropriation bill for 1941. Among other witnesses called was the able Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. George C. Marshall. At that time the authorized maximum strength of our Army was 280,000. General Marshall requested appropri-

tions sufficient for an increase to 375,000, consisting of 55,000 additional ground troops and 40,000 enlisted men for the Air Corps. His testimony, which was given on June 4, 1940 (just 17 days before the introduction of this bill), appears on pages 69 to 72 of the hearings. It is particularly significant in the light of what is now demanded. Let me quote the following:

Mr. WOODRUM. General, how much additional money, and what legislative authority, do you need for doing what you say should be done in the matter of personnel? What are the figures?

General MARSHALL. Fifty-five thousand men should be added to the ground forces of the Army, over and above those included in the present amended 1941 appropriation bill, which provides for an increase up to 280,000.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is 55,000 above 280,000?

General MARSHALL. Above 280,000.

Mr. WOODRUM. Three hundred and thirty-five thousand?

General MARSHALL. Three hundred and thirty-five thousand, which would involve expenditure for pay, rations, clothing, travel, and maintenance and essential equipment such as trucks, etc., for the new units created, of \$148,000,000.

Mr. WOODRUM. Fifty-five thousand men for the ground forces and \$148,000,000 of funds?

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM. You want 40,000 for the Air Corps, too, in addition to that?

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir. I have kept these two requirements separate.

Mr. WOODRUM. General, what are we building this force on—on what general policy? What are we going to defend?

General MARSHALL. This plan is entirely devoted to the problems as we visualize them in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. WOODRUM. The whole Western Hemisphere; not the continental United States?

General MARSHALL. Not the continental United States. We do not visualize any invasion of this country. An air raid or something of that sort is possible, but, frankly, at the present moment we do not see it in the offing. But we see all manner of possibilities in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. WOODRUM. And it is with that idea in view that we are building the forces for the defense of the Western Hemisphere?

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODRUM. For any eventualities?

General MARSHALL. For any eventualities.

Mr. WOODRUM. And this bill will carry that defense forward as rapidly as you think it can be carried forward under existing industrial conditions?

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. That is as far as you think we should go at this time?

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir. . . .

Mr. SNYDER. As I understand you, General, the 55,000 men would not be taken on for a 3-year enlistment.

General MARSHALL. No, sir; not for a 3-year enlistment. In other words, we are requesting a purely volunteer force for a short term only.

Mr. SNYDER. Since we have so many young men, why would it not be a good idea to have them enlist for 3 years?

General MARSHALL. Because it is much harder to get them, sir. We can again take stock of ourselves next winter or next spring.

Mr. TABER. You are not taking any enlistments now except for the winter and spring?

General MARSHALL. Our present enlistments are for 3 years. We wish to enlist the additional 95,000, however, on the basis of a purely temporary force for the emergency.

Although General Marshall requested that the authorized strength of the Army be increased from 280,000 to 375,000, Congress authorized an increase to 400,000, and appropriated the money to take care of the increase to 375,000. At that time the strength of the Regular Army amounted to about 230,000 men. Today it is almost 300,000. In his testimony before the Military Affairs Committee, General William E. Shedd, Assistant Chief of Staff, predicted that the full strength of the Regular Army would be reached by December 1, 1940, at which time, if this bill passes, further enlistments would cease. In other words, by December 1 we will have everything General Marshall said would be necessary to meet "any eventualities" in the defense of the Western Hemisphere without resorting to conscription.

Many who oppose this bill do so under the belief that we should not depart from a policy which has prevailed during the entire period of our existence until we have made an earnest effort to obtain needed manpower by the voluntary method. You may recall that it was not until sometime in May of this year that the Army accepted unrestricted enlistments. Before that time definite quotas were fixed each month, such quotas being limited by the money available.

During the month of May, with partial restrictions, 9,492 men were enlisted. In the month of June they amounted to 23,442, and in the month of July reached 31,985. The War Department advises that the incomplete figure for the month of August has already reached 33,880, but it is estimated that when all of the enlistments have come in and been counted, the total for that month will be over 40,000. These are 3-year enlistments, at basic pay of \$21 per month. It goes without saying, and Army officials admit it, that if the pay should be increased to \$30 per month, for a 1-year enlistment, with a guarantee of no overseas service, enlistments will materially increase. It is significant that Secretary Knox, in testifying before the Military Affairs Committee, stated that the Navy has a waiting list of 7,000 men. The estimated enlisted strength of the Navy today is approximately 143,000. Secretary Knox testified that he expected by the end of the year "with ships going into commission that we are probably going to need 275,000 men." In response to a question "Are you apprehensive you could not get those men by the voluntary system during the next year?" Secretary Knox replied, "No; to be honest, I am not." Enlistments in the Navy are for a 6-year period.

Land, sea, and air forces, active and reserve, have reached a peacetime total in excess of 900,000 men. In less than 3 months, even at the present rate of enlistment, it will exceed 1,000,000 men. When hearings began upon this bill it was anticipated by the War Department that the 400,000 draftees comprising the first unit would be called out October 1. Before the hearings were concluded it was recognized that no more than 55,000 draftees and 55,000 members of the National Guard could be taken care of by the 1st of October. Present plans provide for calling up the remaining units by January 1, 1941, when it is believed quarters will be available. It has never been contemplated that more than 400,000 would be drafted before April 1941. The whole matter, therefore, resolves itself into the question, Shall we change our traditional policy of 150 years and resort to peacetime conscription of men in order to obtain 400,000 men within the next 6 months without even attempting to obtain them by the voluntary method? Within that 6-month period we will find out if it is possible to obtain needed manpower through voluntary enlistment. If we succeed we will have the men, plus the satisfaction of having adhered to a time-honored policy. If we fail after an honest trial and the need for men is admitted, we will have lost nothing, as it is conceded by any who know the facts that production of essential items of equipment will not have outpaced the enlistment of men. In the interim there would be no objection to registration. With a knowledge that voluntary enlistment had failed, the opposition of the American people to conscription would quickly turn. I am convinced that opposition to conscription would be negligible upon proof of its necessity. By the time the necessity would become apparent, we would have armed forces well in excess of 1,000,000 men. In this connection let us bear in mind the statement of Mr. William S. Knudsen made recently before a Senate committee that "it will be 1942 before there will be complete equipment for 750,000 men."

Perhaps no proposed legislation within our experience has been more the object of propaganda than the bill now under consideration. The familiar cry has been that those in high authority are in possession of information not known to the public, that such secret information requires the scrapping of tradition and a resort to the policies and practices of the dictator nations. When the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy testified before the Military Affairs Committee they were specifically asked if any information was in the possession of government officials not known to Congress, the press, and the public. They answered in the negative.

For more than a year Canada has been at war, yet she has not been compelled to resort to conscription. Within the past few days she began the registration of persons for home-defense service only, leaving overseas service still a voluntary matter. We are not at war, yet we are told that

we cannot defer conscription for Western Hemisphere service long enough to give the voluntary method a fair trial.

In passing upon this measure let us look beyond the horizon and consider its far-reaching implications. Conscription of manpower is but the first step. It perhaps was not intended that conscription of industry should become a part of this bill, but the Senate embodied it in the Senate bill at the eleventh hour with but scant consideration. Too late to be made a part of the House bill, the same subject will be before us in the form of a committee amendment. Conscription of wealth will inevitably follow conscription of men and conscription of industry, and in their wake will follow conscription of labor, conscription of the farmers, conscription of everything. And all of this may happen although we are not at war. When it does happen, liberty will have departed from America, and we will have attained the form of government against which we are preparing to defend ourselves.

We need only refer to the RECORD to find that these are not idle statements. The "draft the wealth" bill has been introduced in the Senate. It is known as the Lee bill. Not only has it been introduced but it has been reported favorably by a majority of the Senate Military Affairs Committee. In fact, an effort was made to attach it as an amendment to the Senate version of the Burke-Wadsworth bill. It was a little too much to take at one time, but do not forget that it is still pending.

If we turn back the pages of the RECORD a little further, we will find that a majority of the House Military Affairs Committee on March 2, 1938, reported out a bill known as the May bill. At that time we were not at war; at that time the European war was a year and a half away. It may shock some of you to know of the provisions of that bill. It literally took all of the democracy out of America upon a declaration of war. It provided for the conscription of manpower; it clothed the President with power to proclaim it to be unlawful to buy, sell, lease, or otherwise contract for any article, service, or right or interest in property enumerated in the President's proclamation at a higher rate, rent, price, commission, compensation, or reward than determined by him in such proclamation. It authorized the President to determine and fix prices and raise and lower them as he saw fit. It authorized the President to exercise control over material, resources, industrial organizations, public services, and security or commodity exchanges. It authorized the President to draft into the military service the manpower of the Nation in such numbers as he deemed necessary and subject to such conditions, exemptions, rules, and regulations as the President might prescribe. It authorized him to require, under his own rules and regulations, the registration of any or all individuals engaged in the management or control of any industrial establishment designated by him, and provided that individuals so registered might be required to enter into the service of the Government under such rules and regulations as the President prescribed.

It authorized him to determine what classes of public service, real and personal property, or rights of interest therein, and what classes of owners, dealers, exporters, importers, manufacturers, or producers of any article or commodity should be required to operate under a license. The conditions of the license, of course, were to be fixed by the President. In plain language, this section empowered the President to license and completely control all forms of human life and endeavor, and to fix the terms of his license at his own whim. There was but one exception—newspapers, periodicals, and books. Radio, however, was not exempt. Further than that, it authorized the President to determine the order or priority in which any owner, manufacturer, dealer, producer, exporter, importer, or public service, should fill orders or transport or deliver anything, or furnish power or service of any kind. Of course, it authorized the President to create such agencies, boards, or commissions as he might deem necessary and proper to accomplish the purpose of the act and, of course, there was the penalty section for any who might dare to violate the edict of the dictator, which pro-

vided for the mere fine of \$100,000, or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both. The preamble of the act set forth that one of its objectives was to promote peace.

I know it will be contended that this act is not a part of the bill under consideration. It will likewise be pointed out that this bill died with the Seventy-fifth Congress, but the fact remains that it was introduced, and received a favorable committee report a little more than 2 years ago. Who can say that the idea has been abandoned? If we did not have the record it would be difficult to believe the provisions of this bill could even be thought of in America. The legislative clerks of Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin could scarcely have done a better job.

For a number of years Congress has been delegating extraordinary powers to the Executive. Virtually all of such powers were delegated on the theory that a great emergency required it. But can anyone recall that any of these powers were ever returned? Now we are asked to delegate further extraordinary power, power heretofore never granted in peacetime. Examine closely the provisions of this bill, almost every part of which confers great power on the President—the power to determine the number of men to be inducted, limited only by the appropriations power of Congress—the power to issue regulations as to deferment of service, in fact, power to issue all regulations necessary to carry the law into effect, the violation of which regulations shall constitute a felony punishable by a maximum fine of \$10,000, or imprisonment for 5 years, or both; the power to create the entire selective-service system, make appointments of personnel and fix their salaries. An appeal board is provided for but it is to be created in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President may prescribe, and its members shall be his appointees.

It is an invariable rule that the delegation of power is followed by a demand for more power. Let us halt before it is too late. Our strength is bound to be measured by our ability to preserve democracy and not by our ability to create another totalitarian state in the world. [Applause.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have been here for 8 months and I have heard uttered on the floor of the House the word "emergency" more times than I ever heard it used in all my previous life. It reminds me of the old doctor to whom a party went on one occasion and said, "Doctor, I want you to treat me for a cold." The doctor said, "I cannot treat you for a cold, but I am hell on fits." [Laughter.] He said, "Doctor, what do you do for a man who comes to you for treatment who has not got fits?" He said, "I throw him into the fits and then treat him for the fits." [Laughter.] And so it is that in the name of an emergency, this conscription bill is brought before the Congress.

It is proposed by this unprecedented, drastic, and far-reaching measure to conscript for military purposes the manpower of the Nation in peacetime. Are there any facts which justify the enactment of this measure? This is a question that must be answered under the oath, upon the conscience of each Member of this House, in the light of the facts as each of us knows and understands them. It has been said that "the law is but a shadow cast by the facts." To enact into law such a measure as this, when the Nation is at peace, cannot, in my opinion, be justified in the light of our history, nor in the light of the facts as they now exist.

I cannot conscientiously bring myself to vote in favor of this measure.

First. It is a departure from the time-honored and time-tested volunteer system for recruiting our armed forces in time of peace. It is a dangerous venture, one that will have a profound influence upon the lives and future of every man conscripted, upon our free institutions, and our American way of life.

Second. Based upon the considered opinion of military experts and the undisputed facts of history and the conditions with which we are now faced, it is uncalled for at this time.

The Honorable Harry H. Woodring, after 7 years as Secretary of War, upon his retirement publicly stated:

How any fair-minded Member of Congress could say that we have given the volunteer system of enlistment for the United States Army service a fair trial and that it has broken down and therefore we need the compulsory service is beyond my understanding.

Third. This is not a peacetime measure. Such a law has never been resorted to in peacetime before in the history of this Nation. Its enactment is a step toward war. It will lead us inevitably down the road to war and to dictatorship. Every dictatorship in the world today was preceded, and is today maintained, by conscript armies.

Fourth. This is an election year, but the consideration of this measure should be disassociated from political expediency. The membership of this House and 98 percent of the people of this country are united on the questions of national unity, national preparedness, and national defense. It ill becomes any man to arrogate to himself a superior brand of patriotism or to disparage and question the sincerity and patriotism of those who may differ with him. And yet the fear that has been sought to be engendered in the minds and hearts of our people, the hysteria that has been bred and fomented by many in this country, bears all the earmarks of political expediency. What nation of the earth has committed an overt act against this country? What direct threat has been made by any ruler against us? What invasion of our rights or trespass upon our liberties has been made by any foreign power? None whatever.

The supreme issue before this Congress and before this Nation is: Peace or war? On the common ground of national defense we all can unite. Arm to defend America. Stay out of this war unless this hemisphere is attacked or threatened with imminent attack. This we have done and are doing. This Congress, without any division along party lines, has voted more than \$10,000,000,000 for national defense.

Fifth. I have repeatedly promised the people of the great district whom I have the honor to represent that I would never vote to make a European policeman out of Uncle Sam, and that I would not vote to send American boys to fight or die in the endless brawls and wars of Europe. I intend to keep that pledge and cannot support this measure without violating it.

This measure is contrary to the spirit and genius of American institutions. It is provided by the Constitution of this Nation that only Congress has the right to declare war. In the teeth of the fact that the President of the United States has no power to declare war, on yesterday we were informed of the act of the President in authorizing the transfer to Great Britain, which is now at war, of 50 over-age World War destroyers. These vessels have recently been reconditioned and presumably are fit for naval service. If they are fit for naval service, then they are needed by this Nation for our own defense.

If they are unfit for use in war, then their transfer to the British Empire can only be for the purpose of involving this Nation in the present World War. This unauthorized action on the part of this Government is in violation of the plain provisions of the law of the land as enacted by the Congress, is in violation of international law, and is in violation of compacts to which we are a party. It is in violation of the foreign policy of this Nation from its beginning. Equal friendliness toward all nations, and no meddling in the political affairs of other nations and no alliances, has been the settled policy of this Nation from its beginning. But we have singled out one aggressor above all others, and the prediction is made that the war in which he is at present engaged is a war against this country, and that ultimately he will attack this Nation. This is but a prediction, and not the statement of a fact.

This Nation is a party to an agreement governing its conduct with respect to a war to which we are not a party. Article IV of the Hague Convention binds us to an acceptance of the following doctrine:

The supply, in any manner, directly or indirectly, by a neutral power, to a belligerent power, of warships, ammunition, or war materials of any kind whatever is forbidden.

In addition to this, by repeated recent enactments of the Congress, the transfer of these destroyers to the British Government, which is now at war with a nation with which we are not at war, is forbidden.

In a press conference, reported in the newspapers of the country of May 17 of this year, the President said that the 35 remaining decommissioned World War destroyers will have to be recommissioned for national defense, at a cost approximating \$6,000,000. Conferences are in progress on the recommissioning work, he disclosed.

Now, if the President can sell or trade to England, which is the same thing as selling, 50 reconditioned destroyers from the American naval forces, then he can sell or trade to Great Britain any submarine, cruiser, or battleship, or all our Navy for that matter. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that on June 15, 1940, the columnist, Westbrook Pegler, used the following language in his article of that date:

It is taken for granted that President Roosevelt will be the Democratic nominee for a third term, and I think it will have to be assumed that if he is elected he will be a war President—if, indeed, the country doesn't enter the war during the present administration.

Certain it is that the action taken by the President in turning over to Great Britain 50 destroyers, without the sanction of Congress, to be used by a belligerent power in a war to which we are not a party, is unprecedented in American history. Every thoughtful man and woman in the Nation knows that for a human being to engage in mortal combat, where he may lose his life or take the life of his adversary, is a fateful and tragic enterprise. Much more is it a tragic and fateful thing to plunge a whole nation into war.

What moral or legal right has any one man, in or out of office, to determine the awful question of whether or not this Nation shall become involved in the present world war? Is history to repeat itself? Is foreign propaganda, is the preaching of the doctrine of fear, the frightening of the American people, to plunge us, unprepared, into the hell of the present war? We went into the last World War, they said, "to make the world safe for democracy—to end all wars." At the cost of more than 250,000 lives of the flower of America's young manhood, at the expenditure and loss of uncounted billions of dollars, this Nation made England and France the absolute masters of Europe. We put the ball across the goal line and then moved the goal line back down the field, and left the ball in the possession of England and France. We marshaled an army of 4,000,000 men, we put 2,000,000 men in France. Our armed forces on the sea, in the air, and on the land, covered themselves with glory. For this contribution to an Allied victory we received no thanks. Our efforts were derided, scoffed at, and we were not even repaid the loans we made to our European Allies, with the exception of repayments made by little Finland.

In this connection, let us remember another fact: England and France each obtained approximately 1,000,000 square miles of the earth's surface and the dominion of millions of subject races. England and France are colonial empires, engaged in the exploitation of conquered lands and subject races. So were Holland and Belgium. Jointly counting their own populations, that of their colonies and their dependencies, these four Nations, at the outbreak of the present world war, ruled more than 625,000,000 people. In the profits derived from their exploitations we received no part.

We exercised no control over these enterprises of empire and exploitation. There are only 130,000,000 people in the United States. Shall this free, great, powerful Nation, protected by more than 3,000 miles of ocean to our east, and more than 5,000 miles of ocean to our west, become the tail to any nation's kite? Is our security, our national defense, our welfare, the fortunes, the lives and liberties of our people, so intertwined with, so dependent upon, that of the British Empire, that we must go to war every 25 years to maintain the balance of European power?

We did not start this war. England and France declared war when they were wholly unprepared for it. Shall we commit their fatal blunder and go in when we are less prepared

than either one of them was for war? What man among you is there, if your neighbor came to you and said: "I am about to engage in a dangerous enterprise which I believe will be profitable to me, but over which you are to exercise no control, and in the success of which you are to have no part or profit; yet, if I get into trouble and am about to lose my life and get the members of my family killed and suffer the loss of all my property, I want you to get your gun and become a party to my dangerous venture and run the risk of getting killed yourself, getting your family killed, and having all your possessions destroyed," would agree to become a party to such an adventure? No man with any sense, any regard for his own life, that of his loved ones, or for his possessions, would accept such an insane proposition. But they say we should go in and fight while we can have England as an ally; the transfer by this Nation to England of 50 destroyers is justified because they can be operated by English sailors, rather than by American sailors. They say that we should go in now, rather than to wait to be invaded, that we should raise and send an army to help win this war. We cannot be both neutral and at war, we cannot go in and at the same time stay out.

I address this inquiry to any lawyer in this House: Suppose a person should come to you and say: "I have been informed that such and such a man—naming him—is a man of bad character, he is a bold, violent, dangerous man, heavily armed and dexterous and deadly in the use of weapons, he has taken human life, he has assaulted others; I have been told that there is a probability that he may assault me. Now, on the basis of his reputation, what he has done and what I have been told about him, do I have the legal right to arm myself and engage in mortal combat with him, and, if possible, take his life?" What lawyer would advise such person so inquiring that he had a right, under those circumstances, to seek a quarrel with and take the life of this reputed bad man? If he did, and the reputed bad man was killed by the person so inquiring, the lawyer himself would be a party to the killing.

Who, among you, if he saw two individuals engaged in voluntary combat, would walk up and give to the one or to the other a deadly weapon with which to take his adversary's life? If you did, you would be a party to the affray and guilty, as a principal, for the act of him who received at your hands the deadly weapon and used it in such an affray.

But they say that we have appropriated billions of dollars for defense, and that we must have men to man the ships, to fly the airplanes, to use the cannon, the machine guns, and the rifles, which we propose to build and manufacture. The two-ocean Navy cannot be built in less time than 5 years. In the recent field training of our Regular Army and National Guard, many of them used ice-cream trucks in lieu of tanks, stove-pipe imitations of machine guns, wooden trench mortars. Do we need men to use implements of warfare that, as yet, exist only on order and on blueprints and in the files of the War Department? Let us bear in mind the facts and the realities of this situation.

What is the history of our defense legislation? On May 16, 1940, after Holland and Belgium had been overthrown, and when France was known to be doomed, the President read his first extraordinary defense message to Congress. He alarmed the people by stating that New England is only 6 hours from Greenland, Florida only 20 minutes from the West Indies, and that St. Louis, Kansas City, and Omaha were in easy reach of foreign bombing planes. He asked for \$1,182,000,000 additional for the Army and Navy, spoke of hemisphere defense, and 50,000 planes a year. It soon became apparent that the above sum was wholly inadequate to build, equip, and man the 50,000 planes. To allay the fears engendered by his message of May 16, on May 26 the President delivered a fireside chat. He assured the people that our defenses are not so weak as he had previously stated, and placed the blame for any deficiency in national defense on the doorstep of the Republican Party. On May 28, at a White House conference, he coined the word "dis-comboomerated," and stated, in effect, that all was well with

the country, and that he was in the White House. On May 31 he asked for an additional billion dollars, to be spent in the training of youth and skilled workmen for national defense. On June 1 the Chief of Staff of the United States Army advocated that the President be given power to call out the National Guard, and suggested that Congress authorize an increase of the Regular Army from 280,000 to 435,000 men. This apparently completed the President's plan for national defense, and on June 4, at a White House press conference, the President stated that he saw no reason why "Congress should continue to sit except for the laudable goal of delivering speeches." There was a Nation-wide protest against the President sending Congress home, and it stayed on the job.

On June 22 the House of Representatives voted a 2-ocean navy, to cost \$4,000,000,000, and to build which required 6 years. On July 10, the President sends his third extraordinary defense message to Congress. He called for "total defense," asked for approximately \$5,000,000,000 more for a 2-ocean navy, for an army of 1,200,000 men and equipment for an army of 2,000,000 men, and for universal conscription.

As the campaign waxes warmer and the day of election nears, we may expect more and more warlike utterances, more and more dire predictions, more and more steps toward war and toward dictatorship. More and more, if the American people but open their eyes, they will realize that these steps, crowned with the attempt to conscript the manpower and the industry of the Nation, are steps to a third term, to unlimited tenure in office by the President, and to dictatorship.

Is there an effort on foot to convince the American people that war is inevitable, that the volunteer system has failed, that the American people have become so flabby, so soft, so reduced to the status of a jellyfish, that it is now necessary that they shall suddenly become tough and warlike? That after having marched up and down lines of conflict for the past 3 years, with a chip on our shoulder, waving a wooden gun, that we must now plunge into the awful vortex and destructive cataclysm of war? Heretofore this Nation has gone to war only to gain and maintain its independence, to preserve its existence, and as a result of foreign attack involving the lives and liberty of our people. This was true in the Revolution; it was true of the War of 1812; it was true of the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, the last World War.

The Declaration of Independence was the recognition of the existence of a state of war and an indictment against the sovereign power against which it was waged. Each and every one of our wars subsequent to the Revolution was declared not by the President but by the Congress. The manner in which we are being catapulted into this struggle is unprecedented. The demand for conscription at this time is a change in our traditional American military system. It will lead inevitably down the road to dictatorship and to war. What has been the success of the volunteer system in this country? It has not only been successful in the past, but is successful today. Even though there has been no Presidential call for volunteers, voluntary enlistment throughout the Nation for the last 2 months has been unprecedented.

I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point, as a part of this address, a press dispatch under the date of August 22, from Morley, Tenn., a little village in the mountains of Campbell County, one of the counties of my district. From this little village of 20 families, all their sons, 24 in number, who are eligible are in the Army. The last to volunteer was 22-year-old Roy Branan, a broad-shouldered 175-pound boy towering 6 feet 2 inches in height. The same report comes from all parts of the country. Thousands of young men are on the waiting list, seeking to join the colors.

The article referred to is as follows:

DRAFT MAY CATCH MILLIONS BUT NOT MORLEY'S MEN—THEY'VE VOLUNTEERED!

(By Don Whitehead)

MORLEY, TENN., Aug. 22.—By the eternal, old Andy Jackson would have been proud of the men of Morley!

LXXXVI—724

They are the same breed of lean, tough mountaineers who followed him at New Orleans against the British, into Florida against the Spaniards, and against the Indians more than a century ago.

Conscription?

Not for them.

They just up and joined the Army when the word got around that soldiers were needed to pack a rifle.

And maybe some day the War Department will put a bronze tablet in this mountain hamlet with raised letters reading:

"This is the town of Morley, Tenn., where every able-bodied, eligible man volunteered his services to his country in the year 1940."

There are about twoscore families in this village in the shadow of the Cumberland and all their sons who are eligible are in the Army. Letters come back to the little post office with strange postmarks of far-away places such as Panama and the Philippines.

Out of Morley have gone 24 youths to don soldiers' garb. The last was 22-year-old Roy Branan, a wide-shouldered, 175-pound hill lad towering 6 feet and 2 inches.

WOMAN CHAMPION RECRUITER

Roy rode down the big road with the recruiting officer early this month to leave behind the cluster of cottages, the general store, and the post office that comprise the village.

Most of the youths found their way into the Army through the one-room post office where Mrs. Carrie Witt, a middle-aged, motherly woman, gave them counsel and advice.

"I love every one of them," she said, "I urged them to join the Army because I thought they would be better off there than working in the coal mines part time or doing nothing. And, too, the country needs them."

Sgt. John B. LaPlante, recruiting officer from Knoxville, is convinced Mrs. Witt has done the outstanding recruiting jobs in the country.

"She's undoubtedly the star recruiter in the United States," the sergeant says proudly. And so it is that Morley typifies the spirit of the Volunteer State.

WON TITLE IN '47

It was in 1847 that Tennesseans won the fighting title of "Volunteers." Trouble flared with Mexico over the boundary and Governor Brown called for 3 volunteer regiments, about 3,000 men, as the State quota.

Thirty thousand answered the call!

In the World War Tennesseans flocked to the recruiting offices to volunteer, and now in peacetime the story is being repeated.

The Knoxville recruiting office in east Tennessee led the entire Fourth Corps Area of 8 Southern States in July with 290 enlistments. Memphis was second with 258.

The area had 6,769 enlistments last month, which was a record for the United States in peacetime and third of the national total.

In 1 week this section enrolled 2,033 recruits, while the First Corps Area in industrial New England had 175 and the Second Corps Area of New York and New Jersey had 275.

But none can top the record of Morley, where the youngsters are counting their birthdays until they will be old enough to "join the Army."

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, in view of recent events, is the voting of this conscript law to be used as a mandate for war? I, for one, am opposed to the conscription of the industries of this country, including the press and the radio, which will result in the suppression of free speech, and which will inevitably lead to the conscription of labor, and I am opposed to the conscription of the young manhood of the Nation in time of peace. I refuse to be a party to making a pawn out of the lives of American boys in such a game. We all know that this Nation is exhausted financially, that we are now unprepared for war. But it is said we should get in quickly. When it is suggested that we do not have equipment for this proposed conscript army they reply, "Oh, let's put them to digging ditches, let's make them hard and tough, let them drill with broomsticks." The great majority of those who would be drafted, taken from their homes, their jobs, their life's work are now engaged in callings that make and keep them physically fit. Certainly they would not fight with broomsticks, and there is but one way to learn to use a tank, to fly an airplane, to use a rifle, a machine gun or cannon, and that is by using the instrumentality itself.

The claim that Hitler may come over here overnight is an utter absurdity. In the first place, he has bitten off more than he can chew in Europe. In the second place, it would take him not less than 5 years, even were he the victor of Europe, to organize an expeditionary force to this country. By that time we will have a two-ocean navy. We now have the best Navy in the world.

Just what do we propose to do with this conscript army, this vast reservoir of millions of manpower? If this Government has indulged for the past 3 years in provocative acts while

our Army was small and ill-equipped, just what will it do when it gets in control of the lives and destinies of millions of our men and boys? The most drastic, the most arbitrary power of a government is that which enables it to build its manpower into a living wall of defense or into an offensive army. I am for complete defense, for adequate preparation, and have voted for every defense measure up to this time, but I deem this a wartime measure, not justified in time of peace. This Nation is no more threatened today than it was in May, when an Army of 435,000 men was deemed adequate. When the Regular Army and the National Guard shall have been filled to their full quotas we will have an armed force of more than 750,000 men. In the opinion of military experts, oft expressed, this force, when properly mechanized, is amply adequate for the defense of this Nation if we are to fight only a defensive warfare.

An effort is being made to ballyhoo, frighten, stampede, and bluff the American people and the Congress into war. And even should we go in, after the fearful loss of life that such a venture would entail, after the expenditure of uncounted billions of dollars had been made, after our whole future had been mortgaged, after the powers incident to a wartime Government had been surrendered by the people, we would still have to live in a world with the Germans, the Italians, the Japanese, and the Russians, and the futility and the madness of our engaging in a European war would again be demonstrated.

Then there is not only the loss of life, the wasting of natural resources, but there is the inevitable havoc wrought with moral and spiritual values. The American people want no dictator from abroad or at home, and yet war means dictatorship. It means loss of liberty, the destruction of our way of life.

And I do not mean by what I have said that I do not believe in the right and duty of the people and the Government to defend our national existence, to protect our rights, to maintain the Monroe Doctrine. But these objectives can be best attained, and our greatest victory for our people and for the world can be won, by adequate preparation and by remaining at peace unless we are attacked.

Are there those in our midst who are undertaking to distract the people's attention and minds from the comedy of domestic errors that has been staged in this country for the last 7 years and that has piled up a national debt of well-nigh \$60,000,000,000, that has on its hands an army of 10,000,000 unemployed, a stagnant industry, a crippled agriculture? Are there those among us who wish to forsake the home stage upon which they have been performing and distract the people's attention from their failure to achieve a national unity, a revitalized industry and agriculture, an adequate preparation for defense? Do they now wish to assume the role of world tragedians and enter mortal combat with a foreign power?

History tells us that there was great enmity between Phillip of Macedon and his son, Alexander. Phillip was preparing his armies for an invasion of Asia. In the course of the preparation, he and his son, Alexander, both attended a banquet. Phillip became intoxicated, and in attempting to pass from one table to another, fell to the floor, whereupon Alexander said to the assembled guests: "See there the man who would cross from Europe to Asia, unable to pass from one table to another."

Our first line of defense is not on the Rhine. It is not in Europe. It is here in America. And it is altogether unseemly for those who have been unable to solve our domestic problems to undertake in such hot haste to cross from America to Europe.

Again I ask: What right have you and I to draft the boys and men of this Nation in a time of peace and push them into battle in an international poker game? What right, in the midst of a political campaign, have you to tear them from their homes, from their jobs, from their mothers, and send them out to fight or die in other people's wars? Such an action can be based upon but one just ground, and that is for the supreme purpose of saving this Nation. When

that hour comes it will be time enough to pass a conscription law. We have no right to do it for the preservation of empires in whose exploits and efforts at world dominion we have no part.

Let us answer these questions to our own consciences, as we must fully answer them to our constituents. And remember this: A conscript militaristic policy once engrafted upon this Nation will never be abandoned. The history of man has been that of his struggles against his own government, rather than with that of a foreign power. What do they want with this huge reservoir of manpower? How many billions would it cost to draft and arm and maintain this conscript army? Overnight those who sponsor this law seek to set up a dictatorship, to make of this Nation an armed camp. Remember that in this preparedness program we are delegating, and have delegated, to the Government and those clothed with authority, the two mightiest instrumentalities of human power: the purse and the sword. The Government has the purse, billions of dollars in blank checks. Are we ready to give it, in the light of the facts which have just been recited, an unlimited check to be paid in the blood, the suffering, the sacrifice, and the lives of American boys and men, in a war not yet declared, in a war that we did not start, in a war that is 3,000 miles away, in a war that is the inevitable aftermath of the former World War, and but a repetition of the hundreds that have gone before it? I pray God that we shall not commit this crime, and still greater blunder, against the lives, the liberties of our people, and the perpetuity of our free institutions.

War is a monster of so frightful mien
That is to be hated needs but to be seen,
But seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

The people of this Nation have as their heritage the grim reminders of their participation in the last war, four cemeteries in France, the loved and lost who paid the last full measure of devotion, the thousands whose lives were wrecked by exposure, wounds, and disease, the staggering burden of debt, and billions yet to pay, the bitter, ghastly memories of its error and futility.

Let us be fair with the people. This is the last, fatal step toward participation in this war. Many powerful influences, domestic and foreign, are combining, are working day and night, to drag and push this Nation into this war. By rash words we have long been a party to it, through the sale by this Government of rifles, cannon, and naval vessels to a nation at war we have become a party to it.

And thus, by Executive action, and not by any act of Congress, we are being edged and bootlegged in. First, warlike words, then war materials, furnished in violation of our laws, passed to keep us out of war; and then, the boys.

England has declared, through her Prime Minister, that she intends to restore France, Holland, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Poland and Norway. To do this she must wage war on the continent. She cannot do this without the aid of a conscript army of American boys.

Napoleon said: "You cannot make an omelet without breaking eggs." Nor can we restore these European nations without pouring out the treasure of this Nation like sand, and spilling the blood of our youth like water.

As the Representative of the 420,000 people of my district and as a Member of this Congress, I hold a sacred trust and am under a solemn duty. In the performance of that trust, and in the discharge of that duty I must act for my people.

Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the British Empire, Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador to this country, are serving with great ability their country. They might have transferred to this Nation naval bases as a payment on the billions of dollars their country owes us. They chose instead to "lease" us naval bases in exchange for our war vessels. By this latter course they have involved us in the war, and they make our occupancy and defense of these "leased" naval bases a joint occupancy with Great Britain. Now, if these able and experienced British statesmen, who are serving their country with such zeal and ability, will employ their great talents in

raising a British army from the more than 450,000,000 people of that Empire, it will not be necessary by this draft bill to conscript and make liable to conscription 25,000,000 of our men and boys. [Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult to describe the emotional experience of an American liberal who is confronted with the unhappy conviction that conscription of the manhood of America is essential for the national defense.

In common with other philosophical liberals I have throughout my thinking life hated the idea of war. I have feared and distrusted the intrusion of military institutions into the fabric of democratic society, because it has seemed to me that the two things were fundamentally incompatible and that if they were forced to endure side by side the military influence might destroy the processes of democracy. In my earlier life—and indeed, up to this moment—I have opposed and denounced every suggestion that compulsory military training—outside of wartime—should ever be permitted to exist in my beloved America. I used to imagine fondly that peace on earth could be achieved by a resolute application of the doctrines of disarmament and universal friendship to our national and international policies. I was persuaded that the psychology of peace could overwhelm the forces of war in world relationships. The idea that the young manhood of America could or should be transformed into warriors was utterly abhorrent to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have no apology to offer for the idealism of my earlier life, nor do I intend now to abandon any of it save only that part which stark realism in the rest of this bloodshot world has convinced me is temporarily untenable. The dearest thing in life to me is the freedom of the American way of life. My forefathers and yours fought and died to create the Magna Carta of personal liberties which is the Bill of Rights in the American Constitution. In my humble way, I have always struggled to protect civil liberties in America against every threat of impairment or destruction. Sometimes my devotion to the Bill of Rights has made me a target for bitter criticism and denunciation. There have been occasions when the ugly eye of suspicion was directed at me because I would not submit to outbursts of mass hysteria which sought to set aside some of our constitutional guarantees of the rights of individuals. But I shall continue, so long as I live, to fight for the rights of the individual, for civil liberties, and for the preservation of the American way of life.

It is precisely because I hold these things so dear that I am now persuaded to relinquish for a while my objections to compulsory military training in America. I am convinced that today America is in danger, perhaps even greater danger than in the days when Lincoln made the world resound with his heroic resolution that the American way of life should not perish from this earth.

If Lincoln were alive now to observe the transformation of the nations of the Old World into total machines of war, if he could hear the dictator rulers of those nations boast that they have made their governments the embodiment of the modern machine age and that their immediate aim is the destruction of democracy throughout the world—if he could look across the oceans and see what has occurred so recently and so suddenly in Norway and Holland and Belgium and France—can there be any doubt what his advice to America would be? I am confident that he would not advise us to equip armies and send them abroad to fight in the hopeless wars of Europe. To such a program I feel certain he would not consent and neither will I. But I am sure that he would exhort us immediately to mobilize all of our resources, material and human, to protect the America he loved so well against threats of attack by the foes of democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened at great length to the debate upon this issue, here and in the Senate. It has seemed to me that the opposing arguments finally simmered down to the bare question whether America really needs complete prepara-

tion for national defense now, or whether the asserted necessity for such preparation is a mere fiction born of war hysteria.

So far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, the necessity is very real, and I have regretfully reached the conclusion that an adequate national-defense program involves the participation of all citizens who are able to serve. Of course, I shall support also the amendments to the pending bill which will be offered to make conscription applicable to wealth and industry.

The dictators of the European and Asiatic war machines have no respect for anything except military power. Their individual ambitions and their philosophy of national expansion prompt them to attack all territories which they believe they can conquer. They will take whatever they can get. America's safety lies in convincing them that they cannot take anything in the Western Hemisphere. That is why we have undertaken this gigantic national-defense program, and why we are now proposing a call by law, without discrimination or favoritism, to the men of America to make this program effective.

The academic arguments against conscription in a democratic society, which in the past have been so convincing, lose force today because the world has entered an era of terrible efficiency—this era which is called the machine age. The astounding fate of France has demonstrated that an efficient mechanized military force, on land and in the air, is irresistible if opposed by a force less efficient, even if the opposing force be numerically much greater. The dictators of the machine nations have converted their entire populations into reservoirs of trained individuals from which they select the most efficient for their military adventures. They have done this with peoples who have never known real democracy and they have dedicated their military machines to the destruction of democracy elsewhere on the earth.

America, the great exponent of peace in the modern world, finds herself compelled to adopt much of the military technique of these war machines in order to protect herself against their threats. But America adopts this technique not for the destruction of democracy, but for its preservation and perpetuation. Surely, in such a cause, the end will justify the means. This truth is the more compelling because at this time no one has discovered any means of competing with the modern war machines in a contest of strength save in kind.

The war machines of Europe and Asia are based on a slave economy. They have abolished free labor organizations. Here in America our program for the national defense is dedicated to the maintenance of free labor. I say to my friends in the ranks of organized labor, who hate the idea of a military state as much as I do, that they can find convincing proof that universal service in America during the present emergency is essential to their cause, if they will but consider the fate of labor in the totalitarian states.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not support this bill with any idea that it may lead this Nation into war. Indeed my controlling reason for supporting it is that I am convinced that it offers America's greatest hope of staying out of war. I want no part of the endless quarrels of Europe. I do not subscribe to the doctrine that America can no longer adhere to the advice of its founder, George Washington, and keep aloof from foreign wars. But I am deeply impressed with the logic of President Theodore Roosevelt when he urged that our Nation should "speak softly and carry a big stick." It is because I hate war and the forms of government which live on war, because I love peace and freedom and the kind of government which will preserve them, that I am willing to vote for this measure and to dedicate my life to the cause of democracy. [Applause.]

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOODWIN].

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Chairman, before I come directly to the subject before the House, I want to review briefly the situation and the conditions which have brought this issue to America as well as the situation and the conditions that have brought the issue to this House this week.

For the past 7 years America has been floundering through the morass of domestic economic experimentation with little regard for what was going on in the outside world. During the last 3 years we have become vaguely aware of the fact that we used to enjoy a good foreign trade with the rest of the world. In this interval, while we were preoccupied with domestic difficulties, things were happening elsewhere. The balance of power was shifting; new trade relationships were being formed; two wars were started over the national resources of Asia and the rich China trade; certain industrial powers in Central Europe, starving for natural resources, forcibly took these resources in Spain and in Africa. Then things suddenly began to come to a head in Europe. Nations that we had hitherto regarded as weak or as only second-class powers struck for a new accounting of the balance of power. Still we did not awaken. Those charged with the security of our domestic economy continued vainly with their program of panaceas to decrease unemployment and bring general prosperity and a good standard of living to our whole people. They primed the pump of public works; they loaned money and encouraged the building up of huge surpluses of both gold and goods. All of this did not seem to help much; in desperation they turned to foreign trade for a way out. Then, those in charge woke up. The foreign trade was not there. Long-neglected markets were gone. Where? To those who had been industrious while we let the lush grass of Government subsidy and unbalanced budgets grow under our feet. But just then, for reasons of political expediency, our leaders could not tell us to "get tough" and pay our way.

War was threatening in Europe. Germany and Italy said they would fight to get their markets, but we did not believe them. They had no army or air force of any consequence, so we thought. Anyway, did not France have the world's finest army? Trained, conscripted reserves. War was far away. We could go on living in luxury, pursuing our pseudo-social reforms, at the expense of a mortgage on our children and our children's children, and at the further expense of the weakening of our national moral fiber. Why should we "get tough" and pay our own way?

And then war came. The British Navy controlled the sea. France's magnificent army stood guard from Switzerland to Belgium. We had our industrial mystic M-day. All was serene, or was it? France had more men under arms last fall and winter than were needed for military operations, so she sent her conscripts to man the factories and harvest the crops.

This spring the tempo of the war quickened. Still we were undisturbed. A billion or more to be borrowed for relief. Why, it was nothing, and it was to be spent before the November election. We could waste it; war was not near to us. And then what happened? All hell broke out abroad. We awoke and rubbed our eyes. Where were the fruits of congressional military appropriations of the last 6 years? And where were our foreign markets?

This Congress has listened to and consistently voted the requests of the administration for more funds, and for our armed forces. All to provide for their utmost efficiency. Permit me here to remind all that are within the sound of my voice that I have joined with my colleagues on both sides of the House in consistently supporting all measures for an adequate national defense.

Now we come to the selective-service bill—a measure designed to conscript for Army service our Nation's manpower. On this subject I have some questions to raise and some comments to make. First, permit me to point out that I believe a year of properly guided physical training and Army discipline would do most of us a lot of good. We American men—factory workers, executives, common laborers, clerks, craftsmen, tradesmen, professional men, and farmers—would all be benefited one way or another by hard physical work and rigorous discipline. Plenty of healthy outdoor exercise with good food and regular living never hurt anyone.

Secondly, I believe that our American heritage, its principles and its guaranties, are such that all Americans are willing to endure the utmost sacrifice that their painfully bought

but rich heritage will endure. Is our Military Establishment adequate to protect our people and our ideals from the dangers of an aggressive outside force? Congress and the people believe not.

That our Navy was only half what it should be is shown by the action of Congress in voting funds to double its size. We have also seen fit to vote all funds necessary to build up a highly specialized, easily maneuverable, efficient, hard-hitting Army. In addition to this, funds have been provided for the most efficient and effective air force in our history. Yet we are advised by responsible leaders in the administration that new equipment, for which Congress has appropriated funds, will not be completely forthcoming for over a year.

In this connection I wish to point out that it has been repeatedly stated on the floor of the House that the present armed forces of the United States—the Army in its present size—are far from being adequately supplied with the necessary war materials. Meanwhile, voluntary enlistments are going forward at a rapid pace. As a matter of fact, there are over 8,000 young men seeking service in the Navy—8,000 more than the Navy can train and accommodate. It has also been said from the floor of the House by men whose word and integrity are above question that we have not only failed to carry on a campaign for voluntary Army enlistments but have actually disregarded some enlistment laws. It has been brought out in debate that, in spite of this, enlistments in the Army have been going forward at a rapid pace, despite the low pay and comparative unattractiveness of that branch of the service. It is therefore evident that if Army pay is raised and the service thereby made more attractive there will be no dearth of enlistments. I believe the unemployed youth of this country, of which there is a great number, would welcome this opportunity to get ahead and save some of their income. Let us give the volunteer system a chance before we shackle American youth to a military dictatorship. Furthermore, the temperament of the American people is such that if we are actually threatened with invasion or the loss of our liberties there will be a flood of voluntary enlistments in the Army and Navy service. Also, it should be pointed out in this connection that a large army of trained reserves, trained by conscription, lacks the zeal and the will to fight of a similar army of volunteers—men who have volunteered to fight; men who have volunteered and who are in the Army because they believe it is their duty to be there; men who have the crusader's spirit in their eyes.

But if this country does resort to conscription for military service, I believe that all the consequences of such an act will not be immediately felt. There are too many ramifications for that.

The age group from 21 to 31—what about that? Who are these young men? Well, many of them are seeking a higher education. Many of them are learning trades and crafts. This education will be rudely broken into, and in the majority of cases it will never be finished. These are the young men who in 10 and 15 years from now will be the leaders of our Nation. Secondly, many of them in the older half of this age group are actively engaged in business for themselves, or have a trade of their own, are actively engaged in the professions, and most of them have a nice little practice started—what is the consequence of this? It simply means that these careers will be broken off, and they will be forced to start all over again. If we go to war, this group, which represents the flower of America's young manhood, the hope of tomorrow in the reconstruction days that are sure to come, will be badly crippled. I believe it is unwise to pick on this particular group or to draft them for sacrifice. If we are to have a universal system of conscription, let us take all men from 21 to 55 and from that group select those most competent to do the work that is necessary for the defense of our Nation. By so doing the future of our Nation will not be so badly jeopardized.

Assuming that we are to have a large armed military force, raised either by conscription or by voluntary enlistment, I think it is highly proper and pertinent that we have the neces-

sary housing facilities and training equipment for the Army when it is organized. Then, after the fundamental training period has been completed, we must have the necessary war materials at hand—materials that are used in this new method of warfare so that this vast new army can be effectively trained in the use of this equipment. Where are these facilities for housing and clothing and for training and equipping? Frankly, and sadly, I may say that we do not have them. Neither have we had plans until lately for the manufacture and construction of these facilities and equipment. True, most of the equipment is on order or is in the process of being manufactured. But we are assured that the orders for these materials will not be completed for from 14 to 16 months from the present moment. Housing facilities yet have to be constructed from funds already appropriated by Congress. The people whom we represent should know these things.

Thanks to the fact that the President called into service men completely familiar with procurement and manufacture of these much-needed supplies, we are now enjoying fairly satisfactory progress along this line, but there is already an evident need for skilled craftsmen in various lines of national-defense manufacture.

And this brings me to another point—that of the stand taken by Wendell Willkie upon this very matter. Mr. Willkie has come out in favor of conscription if it is necessary, but he has not urged Congress to adopt the law at this time. He has come out against the conscription of industry because he understands the very far-reaching consequences that are involved. He understands, assuming we have conscription and that our manpower is very generally drafted and because of the press of the national emergency our factories are drafted, that men may be taken from the ranks of the Army and placed in these factories to perform there the skilled trades and crafts that they had been following previous to their inductment into the Army. What will be the wages of these conscripted men in these conscripted plants? Will they be the wages of free American workmen? Wages that support the customary high American standard of living that is the envy of labor the world over? Or will they receive regular Army pay plus a small additional compensation for their specialist rating? I believe these were the thoughts in Mr. Willkie's mind when he said he could not be for complete conscription of industry. He was not referring to capital and management alone. He was referring to the labor of the plants as well. He was disturbed immeasurably by the threat to the American standard of living. He was disturbed immeasurably by the thought that free American workmen, skilled in their crafts by long experience, would be forced to work for their own Government and for factory management at wages far below the customary standard. He realizes that this is the totalitarian way. He could also see that this might even mean regimentation of farm labor on the same basis. Now, remember, this is just the step that France took when she found she had taken her skilled labor from the factories and the farms and when she had more men in her Army than she needed; more men in her Army than she had equipment for. The President speaks of retaining all of our social progress. Mr. Willkie is concerned not with the academic aspects of the situation but the real consequences.

Suppose this Burke-Wadsworth bill passes. The way it actually operates is this: Of all the registrants found fit for service, 1 out of 10 is drafted for induction into the Army. He will go into the service for 1 year of training. After that he automatically becomes a member of the Organized Reserves of the United States and is subject to call for any national emergency for any time within the period of the next 10 years. The President, then, and the military authorities have close control over this young man all during that time. After his 1 year of service in the training section of the program he is permitted, if quotas and vacancies exist, to enlist in the Regular Army; but if those quotas are purposely kept down, of course, he will have to remain on call for the next 10 years of his life. The consequences of such action are obvious. One man in 10 is inducted into the service. What

happens to the other 9? I wonder what each tenth one will think of this opportunity that the other 9 are missing. Is this democracy or is it servitude?

Why do not the executives of our country give our people—the people who have elected and hired them—all the facts in the problems involved? You know, my colleagues, the American people are entitled to know what is going on in their Government. That is our way.

There is one fundamental lesson in national defense that is apparent from the present struggle in Europe. It is that large masses of reserves, immobile for many reasons, are not an effective guiding force as compared with highly mechanized, well-supplied, highly trained, efficient armies of extreme mobility. It has been repeatedly stated here and in committee hearings that this would be our fundamental plan of operation. The General Staff has revised its plans in an attempt to bring about such conditions. I commend those in charge of our military affairs for adapting themselves to changing times and changing conditions.

In conclusion, I believe we should give the American system a chance. I believe we should not endanger inalienable rights of Americans to live as a free people and to think and act as they please. I believe if there is a definite crisis and the American people feel there is one they will enlist in an army in such numbers as to be more effective than a great mass of involuntary conscripts. Let us go after this problem the American way.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] 5 minutes.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, the issue on this conscription bill is, Are we creating an army to defend and preserve our American freedom or are we creating a dictatorship which of itself will destroy that freedom whether we are ever attacked or not?

The very arguments used in defense of this measure are so flimsy as to lead to the conclusion that we are being propagandized into something.

Gentlemen say this must not be called a conscription bill; it is only a selective-service bill. This in the face of the fact that the bill provides a \$10,000 fine or 5 years in prison for any person who evades registration or service under the act.

Gentlemen say we do not want our boys and men, if war should come, to go without proper training and be slaughtered like many of our volunteers in the World War. The simple answer to this is whether as conscripts or as volunteers they are not being called for war, not even for defense, but to train for defense. This will certainly act alike on volunteers and conscripts.

Another argument is that conscription is the only democratic way to raise an army. If the question was not so serious, this argument would be humorous. To say that the herding together of an army by the whip of military conscription is more democratic than the military strength which springs from the moral strength of free men willing and ready to defend their freedom is too propagandish to be swallowed by the most gullible.

Mr. PATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. PATRICK. Does the gentleman feel that conscription would not more properly distribute the additions to the Army than the present system?

Mr. JONKMAN. It has been explained on the floor that this conscription bill is nine-tenths lopsided.

Mr. PATRICK. What is the gentleman's answer?

Mr. JONKMAN. I have answered the gentleman's question. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

The main argument is that we could not raise a sufficient Army by voluntary enlistment. In other words, the administration, administration leaders, and spokesmen are selling the American people short. They say, in effect, that democracy is outmoded and belongs to the "horse and buggy" age because it will no longer defend itself even from attack and destruction. They say, in effect, that the American people no longer possess sufficient patriotism, love of country, and love of freedom to even defend their lives and liberties

against foreign invasion. Remember, members of the Committee, this is mobilization, not for an aggressive war on some other nation but for defense of our free institutions in case of attack. Does any sane-thinking patriotic American believe that even after 7 years of the New Deal our national morale has fallen to such low levels? Then, may God preserve us. But, members of the Committee, this premise is just as false as the others. If the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, and the Army Staff, could at any time in the last 5 months, and ever since May 16 last, have made up their minds whether they needed a half million or 5,000,000 men for defense, they could, by a call for volunteers and selection for service, have had all they needed and could train before today.

This is not the first time the New Deal has indulged in such propaganda against American institutions and traditions. The New Deal has constantly sought to unload and throw overboard American free institutions and traditions.

First in 1933 they threw the Democratic platform, the Democratic Party, the Carter Glasses, and Al Smiths overboard. Then they loaded up with braintrusts, the Tugwells, Cohens, and Corcorans with their socialistic ideals.

Then in 1933 the New Deal sold American industry and business short and tried to throw it overboard. American industry, the New Deal said, could not run and did not know its business. So, under the N. R. A. they tried to form a great collectivist state with everybody's business under a planned economy directed from Washington. But the people would have none of it and now after 7 years of belittling and attacking big business, the New Deal is in the abject humiliation of asking the Knudsens and the Stetinnuses of big business to run the Government, while the New Deal is running all over the country seeking third-term votes.

In 1934 and 1935 the New Deal sought to sell the Constitution short and throw it overboard. It said the Constitution was outmoded and belonged to the "horse and buggy" age.

At the same time, the New Deal sold an independent Congress short and threw it overboard. With the juggernaut of a dictator it reduced the Congress to a rubber stamp and instructed it to pass "must" legislation regardless of its constitutionality. But today we have again an independent Congress and the Constitution is still the supreme law of the land.

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

Mr. JONKMAN. I do not yield. My time has been cut in half already.

Mr. GREEN. I was just wondering—

The regular order was demanded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman refuses to yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. In 1937 the New Deal sold the Supreme Court short and tried to dump overboard that independent branch of the Government. It tried to browbeat the Supreme Court into regarding the Constitution as a mere scrap of paper and take its orders from a dictator as the Congress was doing. When this failed the New Deal sought to unload the independent Supreme Court by the court-packing scheme. But again the people of the United States refused to be misled and came to the rescue of the foundation stone of a free government.

The New Deal administration has thrown the anti-third-term tradition overboard, which has always been considered a step toward dictatorship. It is therefore entirely consistent if in one final effort it tries to throw all our free institutions and traditions overboard by a peacetime totalitarian conscription.

That is the science and psychology of a dictatorship. Keep battering and hammering away at democratic institutions and traditions until the people lose their grip on them.

The Burke-Wadsworth bill is unnecessary. It would in peacetime abolish the civil government and set up a totalitarian military dictatorship although there is nobody to fight with and nobody against whom we have to defend ourselves. And yet administration leaders predicted immediately upon its appearance that it would pass both Houses in a week.

The conscription bill purports to be drawn in New York. But the people may well ask themselves whether it is not just as spurious as the Chicago draft for a third term. Before the people cash this New York draft they may well inquire whether it is not a forgery drawn in Washington by those who drew the Chicago draft and are selling America into the slavery of a dictatorship.

It is well for us to remember the scriptural admonitions: "By their fruits shall ye know them." The New Deal tree has brought forth little but dictator buds. Fortunately they could not stand our democracy's climate. But it is still true that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

It seems certain that for the next 25 or 50 years we will need a much stronger Army and Navy than in the past. Until these totalitarian creeds and trends have burned themselves out we will have to be prepared to defend ourselves against them. This program calls for a highly mechanized army immediately and continuously.

To say that we will meet this situation with a call for a half million volunteers, to train for 1 year at \$30 a month, with some well-grounded and well-considered plan for 1 year, military training for our young men each year thereafter, would be preparing a sound, practical, democratic defense.

To say that we must meet this situation by immediate resort to a totalitarian military dictatorship by universal conscription is quite another thing. In addition to the Regular Army and the National Guard we could not house, clothe, and equip a million men; no, not even a half million men within a year. This plan is entirely consistent with the spirit of the acceptance speech of the New Deal candidate for Vice President, Mr. Wallace. With the President's apparent approval he apparently is not only for getting into the war, but to out-Hitler Adolph Hitler in doing so.

It must be borne in mind that our objective is to preserve and maintain our freedom and our free institutions; that these would be destroyed more swiftly and certainly by the establishment of a dictatorship than by the attack of any foreign foe if we had only a reasonable defense. Our concern should therefore be to provide an adequate defense against foreign attack without endangering or destroying our freedom from within.

Let me close with a quotation from Abraham Lincoln's speech at Edwardsville, Ill., on September 13, 1858, which is just as good gospel today as it was in his day.

What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, our Army, and our Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of these may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourselves with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you.

[Applause.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] 1 minute.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat amused at the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN], who has just spoken. I wanted to ask him a question, but he did not have time to yield, and so the gentleman from Kentucky has yielded to me. I would like to know, if the New Deal has been such a failure, has the increase of bank deposits from \$38,000,000,000 to \$56,000,000,000 benefited your people? If no banks closed to speak of under the New Deal administration, as against about 10,000 under the Hoover administration; if the checks which have been mailed to your farmers have been of any benefit? How about the Reconstruction Finance Corporation? How about the income of the American people which under Mr. Hoover was \$38,000,000,000 and during the last year is about \$70,000,000,000 and probably will go to \$80,000,000,000 during the next 12 months? [Applause and laughter.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER]. [Applause.]

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, in relation to the transfer of the 50 destroyers, I was reminded to go and look again at the Farewell Address of our first President, George Washington, who said in one paragraph as follows:

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

I believe the people of the country may be interested to review that address in the light of recent events.

Mr. Chairman, much caustic criticism has been hurled at the volunteer system of enlistment, and it has been charged that such a system is totally inadequate as a means of supplying the necessary quota demanded by the militarists. This criticism with its wise cracking suggestion that it is merely an opportunity for the slacker to "let George do it" is an insult to the young manhood of this great Republic. The 563,000 volunteers who were recruited during the first 5 months of the last World War are the answer to that unwarranted charge.

If Army officials had observed the spirit of the law and permitted 1-year enlistments the necessary quota would have been obtained without the blare of band music and billboard propaganda.

During the World War the American doughboys proved themselves quite equal if not superior to the highly trained personnel who opposed them. They were advised that their duty was to make the world safe for democracy. Twenty-two years have passed since the signing of the armistice and now a new generation of American manhood is to be conscripted to make America safe for democracy.

The repeal of the embargo contained in the so-called Neutrality Act was the first serious mistake.

The transfer of the 50 destroyers was the second mistake and is recognized by authorities in international law as an act of war.

This compulsory conscription bill follows in sequence and will be the third tragic error.

Our first line of defense is on the sea and our second line is in the air. With these two lines of defense perfected and sufficiently powerful, we have with the Regular Army and National Guard as now constituted a fully adequate land force which can be gradually enlarged by volunteer recruits if future developments warrant.

I have a keen sense of my responsibility in this tremendously important decision. I have told my people that I would never vote to send an American soldier to fight in a European war. If I supported this bill I should consider that promise as half broken. I shall vote against conscription. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the Burke-Wadsworth bill much has been said on volunteer recruiting for both the Army and the Navy.

For the information of my colleagues, there is herewith presented up-to-the-minute information on the subject as furnished by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy as of September 3, 1940.

According to the Secretary of War, the Army recruiting program is as follows:

Early in the fiscal year 1940, due to the Panama and Air Corps expansion programs and the subsequent Executive increase issued

under the limited emergency powers of the President, the authorized enlisted strength of the Army was increased from 165,000 to 227,000, which strength was reached by February 7, 1940. There then resulted a period when the only recruiting was to maintain the Army at its then authorized strength. On May 16, 1940, an additional 15,000 men were authorized. On June 19, before these had been secured, the strength was further increased to 280,000, the maximum then authorized by law. This figure was superseded by congressional action which fixed the enlisted strength of the Army at 375,000. During this time the recruiting service was intensifying its efforts, and the recruiting campaign gathered momentum, with resulting strengths as follows: June 30, 1940, 246,949; July 31, 1940, 270,183; August 22, 1940, 285,000 (estimated).

The following table shows the monthly enlistments in the Army from Jan. 1, 1939, through July 31, 1940:

January 1939	3, 872
February 1939	6, 108
March 1939	7, 328
April 1939	5, 442
May 1939	6, 736
June 1939	6, 946
July 1939	7, 162
August 1939	9, 259
September 1939	14, 765
October 1939	19, 815
November 1939	17, 286
December 1939	16, 530
January 1940	17, 820
February 1940	9, 151
March 1940	8, 374
April 1940	6, 274
May 1940	9, 492
June 1940	23, 444
July 1940	31, 958

Mr. Chairman, since receipt of the above information the War Department is authority for the statement that the enlistments for the month of August have already reached 38,333 men, and by the time final reports for August are received the number will reach an all-time record of 45,000.

These enlistments are for 3 years with a base pay of \$21 monthly. It is apparent that if the Army's recruiting campaign can produce 45,000 recruits for the month of August, they should reach 60,000 in September and continuing at such a pace it is a matter of time until the Regular Army plus Reserves now totaling approximately 686,000 will be increased to the Army's objective of 1,000,000 men by February 1941.

This can be accomplished on a voluntary basis for 3-year enlistments, and with a modified plan of 1-year enlistments it is certain that an even greater enrollment will result, thus proving that the so-called failure of the volunteer system is a myth.

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman served in the Navy, not the Army, did he not?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes; I served in the United States Navy.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman must know that a 1-year enlistment army is no good.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. But you have a 1-year enlistment army under your conscription plan.

Mr. ANDREWS. No; that is for trainees.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The bill, as I read it, states "for training and for service," which means they can keep them for 12 months, or a longer period, if necessary.

Mr. ANDREWS. The Regular Army is based on a 3-year enlistment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct, but in an emergency it will be necessary to keep the selectees for a longer period.

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman was in the Navy. I suspect had he been in the Army he would know that an army cannot be based upon a 1-year enlistment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not a fact that the World War army was made up of men who had less than 1 year's service? [Applause.]

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Does the gentleman know of any particular reason why a man who would voluntarily enlist and be placed in the Reserve Corps would be any less a soldier than a man who was drafted?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. My service, of course, was in the Navy, but I associate daily with many men who were officers in the Army, and I have yet to encounter one officer who would not

rather have enlisted men on the voluntary basis than a draftee or a conscript. [Applause.]

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. The gentleman is a past national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and is very familiar with the attitude of the vets because of his travel through the country. Does the gentleman believe there would be adequate volunteers if those young men and those veterans believed the country in imminent danger of attack?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Absolutely; yes.

Mr. CORBETT. That has been admitted on both sides of the aisle today. The very fact, therefore, that we are attempting to secure these men is proof of the fact that there must be some other reason than the danger of immediate or imminent attack. Does the gentleman agree?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I will appreciate my good friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] allowing me to discuss Navy recruiting figures, my branch of the service.

Mr. MAY. May I say to the gentleman he is in error, unintentionally, of course, about the authorized strength of the United States Army. The Regular Establishment is authorized for 400,000 instead of 375,000 men. The limitation by appropriation, however, is 375,000.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In reply to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] I wish to say that I quoted from a letter received from the Secretary of War, dated August 30. Apparently he is not up to the minute on the strength of the Army.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman has given some very interesting figures on enlistment. Does the gentleman not know that before the Committee on Military Affairs representatives of the colored race appeared and entered a very vigorous protest because the Army was permitting only a certain limited number of colored men to enlist and that at the present time there are a great many of the colored race in this country who are asking for the privilege and opportunity to enlist, which has been denied them?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman is right. I recall reading that testimony from the printed hearings.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. Since the adoption of the National Defense Act, I may say that in conference agreed to by the House and Senate, the proportion of enlistment in the Regular Army today granted to all races—white and colored—has been exactly the same, a ratio of 1 to 10, the same as the population of the United States.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was interested in the statement the gentleman made to the effect that he never saw an officer who did not prefer a volunteer to a draftee. The gentleman has come in contact with a great many ex-service men and he himself was in the World War. He certainly does not intend to leave the impression that during the World War the volunteer made a better soldier than the draftee?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. During my service in the World War, I did not know whether a man was a draftee or volunteer. As a matter of fact, my statement a few moments ago was based on the opinion of officers, and not my own. Many of my good veteran friends were drafted and served honorably and with distinction.

Mr. Chairman, according to the Navy Department, there is no problem involved in securing recruits. In fact, every month has found a waiting list of eager young Americans, the majority of whom are high-school boys and college men.

The following information furnished by the Navy Department is inserted herewith and reveals facts and figures concerning the recruiting records of the United States Navy:

	Quota	First enlistments	Waiting list
1939:			
January.....	1,450	1,455	7,567
February.....	1,225	1,206	7,401
March.....	875	1,025	7,623
April.....	800	852	7,811
May.....	1,150	1,124	6,792
June.....	1,815	1,758	5,302
July.....	1,050	1,099	5,190
August.....	1,700	1,645	4,320
September.....	3,565	3,419	3,276
October.....	3,715	3,634	4,028
November.....	4,015	3,825	3,263
December.....	4,415	4,404	1,899
1940:			
January.....	3,300	3,588	2,340
February.....	3,100	2,819	2,375
March.....	3,300	3,401	1,666
April.....	3,615	3,572	1,276
May.....	2,565	2,716	2,001
June.....	4,415	4,110	2,822
July.....	5,840	5,002	3,409
August.....	5,368	5,478	8,119

¹ Estimated.

Mr. Chairman, it is well to mention that during the World War not one drafted man was inducted into the United States Navy. The same will be true during this period of limited emergency or in the future because the monthly quota of the United States Navy is based on the completion of new ships. In other words, as fast as the ships are completed the men are recruited from the Navy's monthly waiting list.

A close analysis of the information furnished by the War Department and Navy Department is proof of the statement that volunteer recruiting is a success and is capable of furnishing the needed manpower in both the Army and Navy if put to a fair test. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in the very able and learned discussion on this so-called Burke-Wadsworth bill, not only in the House but likewise in the Senate for the past several weeks. I have the most profound respect and admiration for our very able colleague and my very good friend, one of the coauthors of this bill, the Representative from New York, JIM WADSWORTH. I admire him, and I respect him. I know of no Member of either body of this Congress who is more sincere in his service to our Nation nor who is a more conscientious servant of the people, no one who is more patriotic in his intentions. I am very certain, Mr. Chairman, that in whatever measure he may have participated in drafting this legislation, he was inspired by the most lofty of motives. To err is but human. We all make mistakes, and in my humble opinion, in this instance, I deeply regret, honest as his intentions unquestionably are, that I find the gentleman from New York, JIM WADSWORTH, advocating peacetime conscription of this Nation. I am unalterably opposed to this measure in principle and in spirit.

Mr. Chairman, I have just returned from an all too brief trip among my constituents back in the district which I have the honor to represent. I was amazed to find how little the folks back home appreciate the vicious possibilities in this conscription legislation. I found that people had given a great deal of consideration to as much of it, and as much of the implications of it, as they had gleaned from the information given to them through our regularly constituted sources of information—the press, radio, and motion pictures. From talking with these people, I became justly alarmed at the fact that they have not been given the true picture of the situation with which we are faced today; and when they do grasp the implications, they are justly alarmed, and I must say rightly and greatly incensed.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have the right to be taken into the confidence of the Government of the United States. They should be told the truth, and if they are told the truth, they will voluntarily arise to meet any and all dangers with which this Nation may be faced. But it is our

responsibility, as servants of the people, to see that they are not being made the dupes of international bankers, of international investors, and above all, of self-seeking political bureaucrats endeavoring by a wave of war hysteria to perpetuate themselves in office.

To illustrate: Some time ago a gentleman sat down beside me on a plane in Cleveland en route to Detroit. Upon learning that I had come through from Washington, he was quite interested in the latest developments in Washington; and among other things he said there was one action the President had just taken of which he heartily approved—that of the transfer of obsolete American Army airplanes to the allies. I asked him how he thought that planes, which were obsolete to us, might be of value to the allies at that time when they were being overrun by the German air force. And when I told him that, instead of being obsolete planes, they were the latest dive bombers with which our naval air force and Marine Corps air force had become possessed, not one of which was a year old, his indignation was actually unspeakable. He questioned my integrity, but I assured him that occasionally even a Congressman did find out the truth about some things, about which unquestionably misinformation had been handed to the press for release.

Illustrating again, Mr. Chairman, I find that a great many people—probably with considerable justification—feel that some sort of a training program for the youth of this Nation is, perhaps, justifiable in the light of world events. But these people had been led to believe that these boys whom we are talking about taking away from their homes and from their jobs and from the farms—yes; and from the sidewalks of New York, if you please—are going to be sent to a training camp as they were in the World War, where they will learn discipline, where they will learn the manual of arms, where they will learn how to handle a rifle, where they will do calisthenics to toughen themselves. But, on the other hand, when you tell them that this program calls for those boys to be inducted into the Regular Army and the National Guard and the Navy and to be assigned to regular units wherever they may be stationed—anywhere in the Western Hemisphere or in the Philippines—not actually going into training, if you please, but going into the Regular armed forces of this Nation; indeed, on an inferior status to the regular voluntary enrollees of those armed forces. Then, Mr. Chairman, they do indeed become indignant because of the fact that they have not been told that this is the present program. And they have not been told that if, in the opinion of Congress, the "emergency" still exists at the end of their 1-year enlistment period, they can be kept in the Army for as long as the emergency exists, not 1 but 10 years or even 20 years, unless they become 45 years old in the meantime. On top of that, in any event the enrollee shall be kept in the Reserve Army for 10 years.

And so I find my constituents asking me a number of questions, seeking information which they should have been given by this administration, which is inspiring this measure at this time in order to continue to promote a war hysteria aimed at a third term—yes, a draft of a one and only "indispensable man" to lead us on to what—bigger and better wars, with the inescapable aftermath.

Yes; they want to know where these boys are going to be trained; they want to know with what they are going to be trained; they want to know where and under what conditions they will be housed, clothed, and fed; they want to know what hospitalization will be offered if another "flu" epidemic should strike; they want to know just what commitments have been made actually to actively involve them in this European war within the next few months. These people want to know, Mr. Chairman, honestly and frankly, just what are the dangers of invasion of this Nation or of this hemisphere; they want to know just what investments in Latin America those same boys will be called on to police.

The American people want to know what commitments our Government has made to the English people. They are entitled to know. Mr. Chairman, Adolf Hitler has been re-arming his country for the past 7 years. Russia has been arming longer than that—with the blessing of the White

House inspiring American financial aid and American equipment. Mussolini has followed suit. The whole world has been arming. England and France have long since ceased to pay us interest or principal on their war debts contracted in 1914-18. They have begged off on the grounds that they needed that money for their rearmament program. America has constantly sought to disarm the world. A few years ago, when the world was at peace—albeit the rearmament race in progress—we served notice on the world that we would no longer become the arsenal for warring nations.

We saw Mussolini ruthlessly invade Ethiopia. There was no call for conscription then. During the Spanish trouble, which the whole world recognized was a proving ground for implements of death and destruction for this present conflict, we held ourselves aloof. There was then no hysteria created to rearm America. No voice was raised for conscription. When Japan overran China, did we call for conscription? We did not. But we did indulge in supplying arms and ammunition and implements of war to both sides of that struggle. You recall, Mr. Chairman, that when Russia invaded Finland, our sympathies were, naturally, with the Finnish people. And we loaned them money and shipped them matériel of which, incidentally, our Army and Navy have not yet become repossessed in kind. But there was no voice raised for conscription. Instead of that, you will recall that we had a neutrality law on the books. Did the President or the State Department officially declare that a war was going on in Finland or in China? They did not. I remind you that when questioned about it, the State Department replied that the neutrality law was not made operative in Finland because American interests were not in jeopardy, it was not made operative in China because our financial interests would be further jeopardized.

When Germany overran Poland, when she overran Norway and the Lowlands, there was no call for conscription and no request from this administration for any greatly increased armaments. But, Mr. Chairman, when conscripted France capitulated, and Britain was left alone, then, and not until then—in an election year—do we hear the call raised for conscription. Then, and not until then, do we hear the old familiar cry of 1916 that the Americas will come next.

Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that our Federal Bureau of Investigation is permitted to give to the press the facts and figures on the numbers of foreign propaganda agents operating in this country from Russia, Germany, Italy, France, Japan, China, and others, but is not permitted to disclose the facts and figures on the British agents running loose in this Nation? Why is it, Mr. Chairman, that when questioned about it at a press conference some time ago the President of this Nation emphatically denied that there was any truth in the rumor that we were offering to trade some 50 old destroyers to Great Britain in exchange for 99-year leases on air and naval bases in British possessions in this hemisphere? And why is it that just 24 hours later the President announced the negotiation on British bases but still refused to comment on the trading of American destroyers? Why is it that the President recently endeavored to transfer to England the mosquito fleet built by American dollars on British plans? Why is it that he now, upon what many attorneys of note claim is the thinnest possible shred of legal opinion, announce the completion of negotiations to transfer 50 World War destroyers to England? Mr. Chairman, we are told we need a 2-ocean navy. I voted for it. If these destroyers are of value to England, why are they not to us? Oh, I was in Panama this winter when some of these same boats were being recommissioned and put into our own patrol duty. Why are they now suddenly become obsolete? They were good enough for patrol then, and, so far as I know, we are still committed to carry on that same patrol. And just what more are we committed to supply? Why is it the British Ambassador, Lord Lothian, mentions that the exchange is to be "for naval and military equipment and matériel"?

Just how much more military equipment and matériel are we supposed to supply England? Is it our air force and pilots next? Why is it that our local newspapers today carry the story that the British man of the street at last feels

that they have one ally on their side? Why is it that Winston Churchill can state that Anglo-American relations are going "to roll on like the Mississippi," and "let it roll on full flood, inexorable, irresistible to broader lands and better days"? Why is it that former War Minister Hore-Belisha spoke of a possible common citizenship between the people of Britain and the United States? Churchill has stated that this war will go on until Hitler is exterminated. Mr. Chairman, the American people demand, and they are entitled to know, whether or not this conscription bill means that American boys are again going over to Europe. Oh, you can say that it takes an act of Congress to declare war. You can say that the Congress of the United States controls the destiny of this bill and the destiny of these millions of American youth in the future. Mr. Chairman, just what has Congress controlled over the past 8 years? Where is our time-honored triumvirate form of government with the executive, judicial, and legislative branches of this Government acting as a team? The American people want to know whether we are sacrificing our American republican form of government for a totalitarian form of Hitler's national socialism in America in order to defend ourselves from the European national socialism of Hitler? Where are all you patriots who in 1938 campaigned on the slogan that "you would never vote to send another boy to fight on foreign soil"? Oh, since when has the Argentine, Brazil, Bolivia, Mexico become our own native soil—our own native soil?

Mr. Chairman, the American people want the answer to this one question. There is no question about our sympathies. They are overwhelmingly anti-Hitler, his methods, aims, and ambitions, but if you have committed us to enter this war on the side of England, why have you not the courage to come out and say so and stop beating around the bush? America will tolerate no American Hitler. Your oft-quoted and politically expedient "short of war" is becoming as outmoded as your aid to the forgotten man. You should change your tune. You have forgotten the American people. The American people, Mr. President, demand that you come clean right now. If we are in real imminent danger, you should be the first to throw political expediency out of the window. You have not done that yet in 8 years of your administration.

Mr. Chairman, when the day comes that this Congress votes in peacetime to conscript the youth of this Nation, the industry of this Nation, the labor of this Nation, and the wealth of this Nation you will have established a military dictatorship that will spell the doom for our republican form of government. [Applause.]

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, one hesitates to take up the time of the Committee at this late hour. I have waited all day to get recognition despite the fact that my great friend the gentleman from Kentucky, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, announced on the floor of this House a few moments ago that he had no further requests for time. I forgive him, although I made no less than six requests to speak during the day.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SWEENEY. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky. This is the Congress of the American people, the legislative branch of the Government. I am grateful, up to now, that the right of free speech has not been suppressed. Hence, I make bold to say I am opposed to peacetime conscription because I believe it to be the very negation of democracy. It is the beginning of the end, as the previous speaker who just left the floor well said. It is the beginning of the conscription of labor, the beginning of the conscription of capital. I am not for the conscription of capital or men in a democracy, but if we are going to conscript flesh and blood, we dare not refuse to conscript industry and wealth. I believe we can get a voluntary military system in this country, without resorting to a draft of American youth, and I am not afraid of the hysteria that is going throughout the country—well organized by warmongers—that some bogeyman is coming to invade America within the next few days or weeks. Based upon that hypothesis, I do not go along with the advocates of this meas-

ure any more than I would go along if somebody rose in the well of this House and said, "We had better cover up the dome of the Capitol tonight, a meteor is going to fall and crush this building."

Mr. Chairman, the same propaganda was used in 1916 and 1917, preceding our entrance into the last World War. Then they told us that the Kaiser was the "beast of Berlin." He had the undersea power to reach America by submarine warfare. They quoted what he said, that he was going to impose upon the entire world the Germanic philosophy, and said we had to be prepared. Great Britain built up a great propaganda agency and spent \$75,000,000 in the United States to subsidize the American press. Have we forgotten the activities of Lord Northcliffe? They did not use the radio then as it is being used now, nor the motion-picture screen, as we know through recent developments, the propaganda war films. But they finally got us in. The sum total of our participation in the World War was approximately 100,000 dead American boys, fifteen or twenty billions of war debts still unpaid, and approximately 345,000 boys in hospitals today, or receiving medical treatment; and the world got out of it, as some speaker said tonight, a Hitler, a Mussolini, and a Stalin, offsprings of British imperialism.

Thank God, there is no stain on our escutcheon. The Government of the United States refused to ratify the treaty of Versailles that brought about this second world war. We were present at the treaty-making conference through our representatives, but the country said, "No," when the United States Senate refused to ratify such an infamous document.

Back in the days of the first World War they did things in reverse from what they do these days. They declared war first—they had the courage to do that back in 1917—and conscripted manpower later. A new system is invoked today—conscript manpower first; war comes along without a declaration. We are starting to imitate the dictator nations of Europe and Asia. They do not declare wars any more; they are all undeclared wars; and so we, in reverse, put in conscription first. I am here now to say, in my humble opinion, that it will not need a war declaration to send our boys across the ocean. The Congress may just as well go home in the light of events taking place daily in official Washington. There is no mistake about it. We are no longer neutral. War is just around the corner. This conscription bill is step No. 4 toward war.

I was bold enough in May of 1939 to make the statement on the floor of the House when I protested the official visit of the British King and Queen that only imperialistic Britain could get us into another world war. I know that some of my colleagues facetiously said at that, "Because of his ancestors or because of his lineage, he is twisting the lion's tail." My home and my birthplace is the United States of America. I am concerned with the welfare of my country over that of any other nation on earth. I was fearful of Great Britain, more than any other nation in the world, because Great Britain did bring us into the last World War. The perfidy of our British Ambassador, Walter Hines Page, and the propaganda of Lord Northcliffe brought us into that bloody holocaust to make the world safe for democracy. That is what I was thinking about when I warned against official visits of foreign rulers. I did not want to see a repetition of 1917 and 1918 in my lifetime.

I said that the first step toward war would be when you received officially the British King and Queen in June of 1939. Oh, many of you innocently went over there under the Capitol dome graciously to shake the hand of His Majesty and Her Majesty, not knowing that you were then stepping into the war, making the first step.

You took the second step when we were called into special session last fall, when our neutrality laws went out the window and you lifted the arms embargo to aid the synthetic democracies of Britain and France.

The third step was taken yesterday by the President of the United States without your consent, you the people, you the representatives of the people, when he traded 50 of our destroyers for some leaseholds in the Western Hemisphere. The last step will be when you conscript American boys in peace-

time, and then it will be boys, boys, American boys, to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for imperialistic Britain.

Oh, sugar-coat this pill if you will. Say we are going to see that these young men get their jobs back when they come back. You told them that in the last World War, at least the industrialists told them that. The 23,000 new millionaires of the last World War told them that. When they came back they could not get their jobs. They had gone away with confetti and flowers strewn in their path and bands playing, with promises never to forget them when they came back. They kissed their loved ones farewell and took their stand in the filth and blood of the war trenches of Europe. When they did come back—those that did come back—they walked in idleness, thousands of them, through the industrial cities and on the farms looking for work when there was no work. In large part, the promises made were soon forgotten.

Then there came a time, in 1932, when I was here in Congress, when 15,000 World War veterans squatted in the mud flats of Anacostia, across the river from the Nation's Capital. Men who wore the Distinguished Service Cross and the Congressional Medal of Honor, who came to lobby for the acceleration of a payment the Government promised them, the bonus, if you will, only to be shot at, only to have the machine guns turned on them by the order of a President of the United States and driven from the Nation's Capital. I lived to see that. I went down in my pockets, like many who were here then, and gave these men, these idle, starving war veterans, money to buy clothes and food and blankets when they were denied blankets, food, and shelter by their Government, despite the fact that blankets by the thousands were rotting in warehouses over in Fort Myer just across the Potomac River.

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

Mr. SWEENEY. I cannot yield; I am sorry. I only have a few minutes. If the gentleman will give me some more time, I will yield.

Mr. MAY. I will give the gentleman a minute; and now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SWEENEY. Yes; sure.

Mr. MAY. I would like to say to the gentleman that the present President of the United States, who is being suspected of being a dictator, treated the veterans when they came here in 1933 in a different way, by feeding them and clothing them.

Mr. SWEENEY. I appreciate that contribution. However, I make this statement as a fact that one President of the United States, President Hoover, turned the machine guns on the war veterans, and another, President Roosevelt, came down here and at this rostrum called the Congress in joint session and said he was opposed to the payment of the soldiers' bonus, indicating that he would veto the bill, which he did.

All this is history, and yet you say you are going to protect the rights of drafted men and make promises that will never be kept. We passed the bonus bill over the veto of the President of the United States because the people of the country demanded it.

Why do you not declare a moratorium on debts in this bill and protect the losses these young men will sustain while in the military service? We all know that certain industries refuse to accept defense orders until they know how much profit they can make. Suppose these boys who are drafted stop to make inquiry about their welfare. What happens? Well—

Theirs not to reason why;
Theirs but to do and die.

Up in the gallery I have watched women with black veils sitting around; sober-minded, serious mothers, thinking of what is going to come; and as I observe them I can visualize thousands of mothers in black veils throughout this land in the very near future if we do not stop this insanity of war involvement, in mourning for their boys that they nursed at their breasts, and who will die on foreign battlefields. All these mothers here and elsewhere tonight are watching this Congress. They are going to read in the newspapers tomorrow, if they have not heard it already, that a Member of

Congress took this floor yesterday and said about those who came here to exercise their constitutional right in protesting against this bill that they are to be characterized as Communists, lousy bums, bohunks, and ill-advised persons, and this from a so-called spokesman for the administration, an advocate of peacetime conscription.

Mr. Chairman, are we going to ignore the voice of labor who are against this conscription bill and know it means regimentation of labor, the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations? Are we going to ignore the voice of the great Roman Catholic Church of the United States, through its spokesman, Msgr. Michael J. Ready, who spoke for the bishops of this country in opposition to the bill? Are we going to ignore the voice of Charles Boss, who spoke for the 8,000,000 Methodists in this country in opposition to the bill? Are we going to ignore the voice of Bishop William Lawrence, who spoke for the Episcopal Church and the Federal Council of Churches in opposition to the bill? Are we going to ignore the voice of the powerful railroad brotherhoods, who know that this is a step toward the regimentation of labor and who oppose the bill? Are we going to ignore the voice of the Farmers' Union, the war veterans' organizations, and the many Jewish rabbis, including, in Cleveland, Ohio, Rabbi Abba Silver, one of the distinguished rabbis of America? All of these are opposed to this measure, or are we going to take orders from the Harvard Club of New York City, who, as Congressman SAM MASSINGALE said a little while ago—

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes. [Applause.]

Mr. SWEENEY. I thank the gentleman very much.

I was talking about my friend from Oklahoma, SAM MASSINGALE, who unconsciously when he was speaking here a few hours ago said this, if I recall correctly his words:

I was for some type of law like this long before this measure was sprung on us.

He used a good word; "sprung" is right, Sam—it was sprung on us. It sprung from the Harvard Club of New York City on May 22, 1940, at a meeting up there where Gen. John F. O'Ryan and others were present. General O'Ryan, in the last war, said this in favor of conscription:

The recruit does not know how to carry out orders. His mental state differs from that of a trained soldier who obeys mechanically. We must get our men so they are machines.

And get this:

We have to have our men trained so that the influence of fear is overpowered by the peril of an uncompromising military system often backed up by a pistol in the hands of an officer.

I presume he holds the same opinions today.

General O'Ryan was there and our War Secretary, Henry L. Stimson, well-known interventionist, was there. Judge Patterson, now the Assistant Secretary of War, was there, before he got promoted, and Elihu Root, Jr., a member of a corporation law firm dealing in war orders, was there. Julius Ochs Adler, the manager of the New York Times, who is reputed to hold stocks in corporations in countries now at war, was there. Mr. K. P. Budd, a director of the North British & Mercantile Insurance Co., with headquarters in London, was there, Mr. J. B. Taylor, Jr., was there, and Mr. B. M. Wells, of the Baldwin Locomotive Works, was there, all of whom expect to profit by war. They met and they drew your law there for you Members of Congress who are supposed to be the lawmaking body of the United States, and they sprung it on you, and I use SAM MASSINGALE's word "sprung." It is significant that no representation of labor, the farmer, the war veterans, the church, the mothers of the country, or any individual of draft age was present in the legislative halls of the Harvard Club of New York City on May 22, the year of our Lord 1940. The Harvard Club now becomes the Halls of Congress for the purpose of war legislation.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I want the RECORD to show—and I make this statement on my responsibility as a Member of this House—that Gen. John O'Ryan is today in the pay of

the Japanese Government and has been a representative for the Japanese Government, and this is the type of patriot who wants to conscript the youth of America. [Applause.]

Mr. SWEENEY. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

I want to make this further observation, that I shall support the so-called Hayden-Fish amendment when it is offered. That amendment failed by 2 votes in the other body. It provides that Congress shall authorize the President to issue a proclamation calling for 400,000 voluntary enlistments for 1 year, with the pay at \$30 a month, and suspend the operation of the so-called Selective Service Act for 60 days, to see if that can be accomplished.

I am not ready to say now that we have to put a bayonet behind these men to force them into the Army. Is the country worth fighting for when you have to use force on soldiers to make them fight or defend? I am not willing to say now that you cannot get volunteers. You have not given it a trial. You ought to give it a trial. The last terrible catastrophe we spoke about, the great World War, must never happen again if we are going to retain our democracy. Have we forgotten the political slogan in the campaign of 1916, "He kept us out of war; he kept us out of war; he kept us out of war." The people believed in that slogan and they returned the individual who stood behind it to the White House. The people were brought to their senses 5 months later when the President of that day put us in war. Then when the soldier boys came back in 1920 they joined with the majority of the people and put the Democratic Party out of business for 12 years. I am not a prophet, but conscription may be the real issue next November in every congressional district. It may be our action today or tomorrow in passing this bill will be the signal for the people of the country to get out and work, in an orderly way—I do not mean in a revolutionary way—to secure a referendum on the subject. I said today in a short message which I delivered on the floor of this House that if the American people knew what was going on behind the scenes in Washington they would start a revolution, not to destroy, but to preserve democracy. It can always be preserved at the ballot box. And I mean that, because that is our American system. America ought to be on the march now. Congress ought to stay in session every minute of the day and night after what happened yesterday [applause] when we traded part of our Navy to a belligerent nation without the consent of Congress. If that act yesterday was not an overt act that would justify any nation going to war against us, I do not know what an overt act is. [Applause.] I have voted for every appropriation for national defense since I came to this legislative branch of our Government. I am convinced that given a decent wage sufficient volunteers can be secured to defend our Nation against any foreign power. I shall vote against peacetime conscription, as I said before, because it is the negation of democracy and I do not believe the time has yet arrived when we want to employ the methods of a Hitler in these free United States.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, with permission of the committee chairman I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, the hour is late. This is a very important bill and it is only natural that feeling should run somewhat high. I had not intended to say anything tonight, but I cannot resist the charge that has been made on the floor by the last speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY], to whom I yielded time. I want to say something about the authorship of this bill, and nothing else.

I enlisted in the National Guard in 1916 to serve a year on the Mexican border. I served in France and I feel that I know the spirit which prompts this bill. As to the authorship of this bill, untrue statements have been made. I think I am correct in saying that the conception, the gradual development, the general idea of this bill has been in the War Department and within the General Staff for 12 or 14 or 16 years. It is true that there have been meetings in a great many places on the provisions of this bill, not only in New

York, but in the gentleman's own State of Ohio, among representatives in that State of the Military Training Camp Association. It is also true that two Members of the Congress, one a distinguished Member of this House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and another a distinguished Member of the Senate [Mr. BURKE] introduced the bill in the two Houses. I want to say, in addition to that, the bill as introduced has been very largely revised.

I think that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] today would admit that the measure he originally introduced has been corrected and improved by the Military Affairs Committee of the House, and as I see it, considerably and wisely, with the exception of one or two provisions. I believe I am correct when I say to the House—and I say this partially to the Republican side—this bill is not the foster child of the President of the United States. But for the attitude of the President this bill could have been before the Congress 3 months ago. He is as susceptible to political influence as any Member of Congress.

I am for this bill. I do not think it is the proper time, particularly at this hour of the evening, to incite feeling or to enter into violent discussion. I want to say for myself and for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], the chairman of the committee, we have attempted to control the time for debate fairly and our desire has been to give everyone his or her opportunity to speak.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is entitled to his views. Does he have any objection to the rest of us who are opposed to the bill being against it?

Mr. ANDREWS. Not at all.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to make this further observation, that practically all legislation which comes to the Congress of the United States is the result of conditions that exist in the country or that affect the country. Farm legislation largely originates with the farm organizations of the country based on need; and I think I can join my colleagues, the gentleman who now has the floor, the ranking member on the minority side of the House Military Affairs Committee, in saying this one additional thing, that there has been no partisanship of any kind or character in the consideration of this bill during the more than 6 weeks of hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 1 minute? I wish to make a statement.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I may be unduly alarmed, I do not know. I claim no superior vision of the future than that which may be attributed to the average man. Nevertheless, I am at least greatly concerned as to what may happen if the unbridled, unruly, and ungodly forces now a loose in Europe should continue in their success to overcome and destroy England and her possessions as they have the half-dozen other countries of Europe within less than 12 months.

The leadership of these forces do not hesitate to say that when they have overrun and destroyed the democratic forms of government in Europe they plan to cross to the Western Hemisphere, gathering strength by their continued success, take over South America, Central America, Mexico, the United States, and Canada. Is there any truth in these plans or designs? There are a number of witnesses who testify and say they are true. Men and women of unimpeachable character and integrity who have been to Europe say from what they see and hear the report is true. The newspapers of both Europe and the United States say it is true, the radio says it is true. I am unable to prove that any of these sources of information is incorrect, and nobody here has been able to show that the reports are false.

Of course, I am like many others when they say they are unable to understand how it is reasonably possible for this announced enemy to cross the Atlantic and successfully attack and defeat us. This thought has frequently occurred to me but when I see what has really happened, not only to the great surprise of France and England but to the surprise and astonishment of the entire world, then I become bewildered and, upon reflection, have to confess that it may be an easy matter, especially when we take into account the revolutionized and the almost unbelievable mechanized methods of warfare now being used by this relentless enemy of democratic systems of government. The average American did not believe 12 months ago that France, Belgium, Holland, and other countries could be overrun or destroyed by army tanks and airplanes within 1 year. No; France and her neighbors did not believe it themselves, but it was done. They never dreamed of the underground factories and storage plants in Germany that had been in operation and use for the past 7 or 8 years. They did not contemplate the modern mechanized system of war and were unprepared to meet it. Mr. Hitler is saying today that he has not yet disclosed his most deadly and effective weapons of war. He is telling this to England. Who knows whether he has such weapons or not? I do not know; but we were informed a few months ago by military experts of our Army and naval forces that if we were attacked by the enemy forces overnight our defense at that time would be as chaff before a wind, because we did not have implements of war that could successfully compete with Germany and her captured forces; and the experts are saying now that if there is an attack it will not be by Germany alone but by the combined forces of Germany, Russia, Italy, Japan, and the other totalitarian governments of the world.

The question, therefore, that confronts us is what are we going to do about it? All are saying that we must prepare and prepare at once in order that we might be able to meet the enemy when he arrives, but how and to what extent are we going to prepare? We proceeded a few months ago to make appropriations to enlarge our air forces and our Navy, to increase our weapons of defense, and now it becomes necessary to train men to use these implements of defense in case of attack or invasion. No one questions the necessity for it. It is only a question of procedure. Some say we should secure trainees by adopting the volunteer system. Others say we should use the selective-draft system. There seems to be a wide difference of opinion. I shall try to discuss the matter from an impartial standpoint with the hope of arriving at a proper conclusion.

The question of compulsory military training in time of war or in case of an extreme emergency is a matter that may be settled without much debate, but as a permanent Government policy in time of peace it is one that cannot be brushed aside with a wave of the hand or determined without due and thoughtful deliberation. Everybody agrees that we should have a program of defense sufficient to protect and defend our Government, its people and its institutions against foes of every type, but many of us have different ideas as to what constitutes a proper defense program, as well as the best method for executing it.

I have heard of four different but definite plans submitted from time to time for consideration. Some suggest we should have compulsory military training for all able-bodied men and such training and service should cover a period of 3 years and the program should continue for all time hereafter, saying that such a program will insure adequate defense from the standpoint of manpower.

Others say there should be compulsory training and service but it should be for 1 year only instead of three, that to be followed by volunteer training. Another suggestion is that we should certainly have ample military training but that it should be solely voluntary, and there is a fourth class who insist there should be no military training of any kind, saying we would then certainly stay out of war.

My thought is that whatever we do should be done in the light of history and in keeping with the theory of our own Government, and in doing this we cannot overlook the fact

that the permanency of a democratic form of government must, in the last analysis, be determined by the voluntary devotion and loyalty of the people, for they in reality constitute the Government. This is a government by the people and the establishment of any permanent policy that would relieve the people of their personal responsibility should be one which grows out of a response to the well-advised action of the people.

It is my further thought that before adopting a permanent compulsory policy of military training it may be well to delay the permanent feature of the legislation until after the people have had an opportunity to give expression to their will on the matter, for it must be remembered that the real strength of defense has never been found in the mere number of soldiers or the quantity of weapons used in battle. It is in the devotion of the individual and the spirit that prompts him to action.

Therefore, we should obviously call upon experience in the light of history and let that decide whether a permanent policy of compulsory military training and service will insure a stronger and better defense program than one based upon voluntary training after having made ample provision for such training in every section and locality of our country. Such a decision cannot be reached hastily. I know that some of us under what appears to be an emergency may hastily conclude that compulsory training is the only means of providing ample and effective defense, but we should know that permanent policies of government created and established in a seeming emergency may finally prove to be an unfortunate one. My thought again is that all permanent policies of government should be established only under normal conditions when people are capable of registering their unbiased, unprejudiced, and undisturbed will or deliberate judgment.

The present emergency no doubt is sufficient to warrant temporary compulsory military training; but in view of the reasons already announced, I have serious doubts whether it is advisable under the circumstances to make and establish it as a permanent policy, for I can see that, instead of increasing the spirit of personal responsibility in the life of all the people, it may have the effect of destroying the spirit of devotion and loyalty. Creating in the minds of the people the idea that the Government itself will always dictate to them what their civic duties will be and thereby relieve them of their personal and conscious responsibility will certainly mean that we will no longer have a government by the people but a totalitarian government instead.

As I have just stated, the present emergency appears to be sufficiently great to warrant or justify compulsory military training; but if there is such an emergency, it will demonstrate itself within a period of a year or so. If the actual necessity for it does not arise within that time, then the emergency does not exist. Therefore, my suggestion is that provision be made for such training for a period of 1 year now, as provided in the bill before us, and, at the same time make provision for voluntary military training thereafter, unless the people say by their action in the meantime that the fairest and most equitable way for adequate defense is to have universal military training.

If the people had a clean, clear-cut opportunity to say whether we should have the purely volunteer or the universal training system, their decision would be final, and it would be thoroughly democratic. There could be no charge of dictatorship if the people should decide there should be universal military training. It might sound harsh, but it would be a democracy speaking. It is not dictatorship when the people speak. The passage of the bill here suggested will not, as I understand, establish a permanent policy of compulsory military training, but it will take care of the present emergency and provide an experience that will enable us to then establish a permanent policy that will be more in keeping with the spirit and history of our democratic form of government.

I have thought for a number of years that provision for military training in our high schools and colleges might prove to be an added value to our system of education. Lessons in discipline, respect and devotion to the flag, obedience to salutary rules, well developed bodies, a high regard for

the rights of others, jealousy of one's own rights and duties, conscious responsibility of citizenship, and many other civic virtues may grow out of a proper system of military training. Such a training would not develop the spirit and ambition for war as predicted by some, because the many thousands of men in this country now who have received military training are no more anxious for war than those of us who have not received it.

There can be no valid argument against being prepared for any emergency and I am ready to vote any legislation that will provide adequate defense for such emergency, but I do not want to be charged with taking advantage of what appears to be an emergency for the purpose of establishing a permanent policy for training, particularly if such a policy is contrary to the principles of democracy and contrary to every well-established institution under our democratic form of government. We can easily meet any existing emergency by providing for compulsory military training now, and at the same time provide a permanent plan for voluntary military training and insure our country with military preparedness in case of any future emergency that may arise and such a plan will not destroy but will promote the principles upon which our Government was founded and has been maintained for more than a century and a half.

The Committee now considering the bill has found that there is an emergency sufficiently great to justify compulsory military training. It has found also there should be a provision requiring compulsory enlistment of industry and capital. I am thoroughly in accord with this provision. I have always had great respect for the business acumen and business integrity of many of our great industrialists, but there are press reports to the effect that some of them have recently gone on a sit-down strike simply because the Government wants to put a limit on the profits they will be allowed to make on the manufacture of the implements of war. Some of them are saying in effect that if they are not guaranteed a certain profit on the manufacture of machine guns or other implements of war they will refuse to make them. That is, their action is equivalent to a sit-down strike, as we have already suggested. If we are going to make provision for drafting men for training, provision should be made also for drafting implements of war and the industrial agencies by which they are made. Of course, I understand that the theory behind this whole defense program is that it will prevent war and it is my judgment that sufficient and timely preparation will prevent it, but in addition to trained men you must also have both efficient and sufficient implements for them to use. If men are to be drafted then industry and capital should also be drafted.

It is my further opinion that if the emergency is sufficient to justify compulsory training there should be a provision giving men an opportunity to volunteer. The bill contains such a provision. It provides further that if there is a sufficient number of volunteers in a State to meet its quota there will be no need for the selective draft to secure a sufficient number of trainees, but if not the law will then apply and it will apply to all States alike.

One who has listened to the speeches in opposition to this bill cannot but be impressed that a very large part of such opposition comes from the highly industrialized centers or from sections of the country where the population is made up largely of people of foreign extraction. The noticeable inconsistency of the opposition is that representatives from these sections have within the last 2 months voted almost unanimously for appropriations to increase the manufacture of airplanes, the construction of battleships, the manufacture of Army tanks, machine guns, and so forth, but now when it comes to requiring each State to contribute its quota to man these implements of war they seem to object. They say there should be no selective draft by States and counties. Apparently they do not want their people to be involved in this way. They are willing for someone else to take training to operate these implements of war if it becomes necessary, but they demur when it is suggested that enlistment should be uniform. That is, so long as the Government is appropriating

money to increase the Nation's mechanized defense and their localities are to be afforded increased employment, increased investments of capital, and increased money profits, they are willing to subscribe to the defense program but when it comes to obtaining or selecting men to man these implements of war they seem to be willing to let other sections of the country furnish the volunteers while they enjoy the economic benefits arising out of this emergency.

I come from a section of country that is poor in the number of plants for manufacturing implements of war, but I am glad to say it is a section relatively rich in patriotism and in devotion to our democratic institutions.

Mr. Chairman, I do not say this in a spirit of criticism of others or to boast unduly of the loyalty and devotion of the people of my State but only for the purpose of showing that the spirit of patriotism does not seem to be evenly distributed through the political fabric of our Nation. In order that I may not be misunderstood or criticized for these observations and in order to substantiate them, I am taking the liberty to include in my remarks a table showing the percentage of enlistments by States during the first 6 months of this year. The table to which I refer is as follows:

Percentage of enlistments, by States, for the months of January to June, 1940, calculated on the basis of the male population over 21 years of age (1930 census)

State	Percent	Men per 1,000
North Carolina.....	0.0045	4.5
Kentucky.....	.00422	4.2
South Carolina.....	.0042	4.2
Texas.....	.004	4.0
Georgia.....	.00386	3.8
Tennessee.....	.0037	3.7
West Virginia.....	.0034	3.3
Wyoming.....	.0033	3.3
Virginia.....	.0033	3.3
Oklahoma.....	.0033	3.3
Alabama.....	.00325	3.2
Colorado.....	.003	3.0
Pennsylvania.....	.0026	2.6
New Mexico.....	.0026	2.6
Florida.....	.00256	2.5
Idaho.....	.00248	2.5
Oregon.....	.0024	2.4
Maine.....	.00238	2.3
Mississippi.....	.00224	2.2
Arkansas.....	.00216	2.1
Vermont.....	.0021	2.1
Arizona.....	.00203	2.0
Louisiana.....	.00191	1.9
Washington.....	.0019	1.9
Utah.....	.0018	1.8
Kansas.....	.00176	1.7
Rhode Island.....	.0017	1.7
New Hampshire.....	.0017	1.7
Montana.....	.00163	1.6
Nebraska.....	.00162	1.6
Massachusetts.....	.00153	1.5
South Dakota.....	.0015	1.5
Indiana.....	.00144	1.5
Delaware.....	.00142	1.4
California.....	.0014	1.4
Maryland.....	.0014	1.4
Wisconsin.....	.0013	1.3
Connecticut.....	.0013	1.3
New York.....	.0013	1.3
District of Columbia.....	.00114	1.1
Illinois.....	.0012	1.2
Nevada.....	.00119	1.1
Missouri.....	.0011	1.1
North Dakota.....	.0011	1.1
New Jersey.....	.0011	1.1
Iowa.....	.00094	.9
Minnesota.....	.00084	.8
Michigan.....	.0008	.8

Examine the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and see what States the opponents of this bill come from, and then see where their States stand on this list showing how their constituents have responded to the call for volunteers during the past year, and you will be able to reach your own conclusions as to their underlying reasons for opposing this bill. You will find the greatest opposition coming from men whose States stand at or near the bottom of the list. I would not be placed in the position of personally questioning the patriotism and sincerity of any Member of the House but I do not see how it is possible for some men to stand here, as they have for the past 2 days, and oppose practically every provision of this bill and then praise in the most eulogistic language they can command the volunteer system when we see from the records

how their districts and States have failed to respond to the request for volunteers during the past 12 months.

As I have already stated, I do not believe it is consistent with our policy of government to insist upon conscription in peacetime in order to secure an adequate army, and I am not supporting this bill for this particular purpose because I believe we can get an army under the volunteer system, but I am supporting the bill primarily for the purpose of securing an equal and fair distribution of trainees from the various States and for other reasons I will not be able to go into at this time. Although the eloquent and silver-tongued theologian from Missouri, in support of his argument for the volunteer system this morning gave what I consider a very strong argument in favor of the selective draft when he said there were 7,000 men today who are ready and clamoring for an opportunity to volunteer in the Navy. I think he is correct, but the impression I received from listening to and reading the testimony for the past 2 months is that there are a great many more than 7,000 men of military age in this country who would like to volunteer in the Navy, Air Corps, or the Army.

But many of them do not want to volunteer primarily for the purpose of defending our Government and its institutions. They would not volunteer for the purpose of defending our homes, churches, schools, our right to religious liberty, our right of free speech, and the many other privileges we enjoy under the Bill of Rights, but they would like to be in a position in case our country is besieged by the existing threatening enemy to play the Benedict Arnold act, or do the "fifth column" stunt by placing the destiny of this Nation at the feet of the enemy upon the first opportunity. It is my opinion that the selective-draft policy will, or should, mean a great deal more than finding out the age of a man, and taking a measurement of his physical qualifications.

It is argued further in objecting to the proposed legislation that a large Army is not necessary. Personally, I do not know how large the Army should be, but I would rather have it a little too large than to have one a little too small. In support of the small Army idea, I am glad reference has been made to Biblical history where Gideon's band of 300 engaged in battle with the Midianites. This was a most remarkable battle, and I am a firm believer in the power of those who fight on the Lord's side, but I am not unmindful that as a rule the Lord helps those who help themselves. But I think the illustration cited as an argument against that part of the bill providing for a million drafted trainees per year clearly demonstrates the wisdom of two of the outstanding principles involved in the bill. First, it cannot be denied that Gideon's 300 were selected men. They were carefully selected. If my memory serves me correctly, the 300 were selected out of about 25,000 registrants, and, so far as I know that was the beginning of the selective-draft system. It was divinely instituted. It established a precedent.

The men were chosen or selected because of their loyalty, devotion, patriotism, and vigilance. Some of these virtues will be the outstanding requirements if this law is enacted and properly administered. Those charged with the responsibility of selecting and classifying those who register will look further than their physical fitness. This suggests to us the other reason that may be assigned in favor of the selective-service idea and it may also be found in this battle with the Midianites. It will be recalled that Gideon's 300 were armed only with a lighted candle in one hand, a pitcher in the other, and a sword by their side. On the other hand, it should be remembered that the soldiers of the Midianite army were as numerous and thick as grasshoppers and that the number of camels were too numerous to mention. But what did they do when faced by the 300 men with a lighted candle in one hand and a broken pitcher in the other? They all fled or surrendered. Why? They seem to have been filled with what we know today as the spirit of the "fifth column." That is the other principle involved in this legislation. We are anxious to see that we do not have a front-line army filled with men who are afraid or who would welcome an opportunity to play the Midianite act, or who would be glad to play the Benedict Arnold act and betray this country and its people into the hands of the

enemy at the first opportunity. The selective-draft system should be able to take care of this situation.

There may be some objectionable features to the bill now before us but on the whole it appears to be fair and not exceedingly drastic. As I understand, it only undertakes to give military training to those of military age and without dependents and this training is to cover a period of not more than 1 year. There will, of course, be some hardships, but they will be nothing in comparison to those which may follow if we do not inaugurate a plan that would prepare us for adequate defense. It offers ample opportunity for anyone qualified to volunteer and if there are a sufficient number who volunteer to meet a State's quota then the selective feature will not be necessary. However, the selective draft policy is in no way a reflection upon the voluntary plans, nor is it indicative of a fear there would not be a sufficient number of volunteers to meet the emergency; it is in no way a reflection upon the patriotism, the love of country, or loyalty to the flag of those of military age. It is primarily for the purpose of seeing that the responsibility of citizenship may be equitably distributed throughout the Nation. Or to put it another way, it is for the purpose of equally distributing the honor of preparing to uphold and defend the institutions of our Republic against the invasion of a foreign foe in case an attempt is made.

The other outstanding reason for supporting this bill is that it provides for immediate action. We all say there is an emergency. If so, it should be met with emergency action. We should not procrastinate and forget that—

The race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong, but * * * time and chance happeneth to them all.

Napoleon once said: "Every hour lost now is a chance of future misfortune," and I do not know of a man in history better qualified to recognize the value of the thought I am trying to convey than Napoleon, because it was the unwarranted delay of Grouchy, one of his trusted leaders, in carrying out the plans of his chief that lost the Battle of Waterloo, sent the greatest military genius of all history into exile, destroyed a mighty empire, and rearranged the map of Europe. But the tragedy of this picture is that it was recently reenacted after a period of a century and a quarter when France delayed in preparing for the approach of the enemy. Mr. Chairman, it is only another illustration of, "He who hesitates is lost."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this very brief statement. I have endeavored to be liberal on the question of granting time. The few words that were said by the gentleman from Ohio a while ago were not critical of me. He had asked me for time, and when I said that I had no further requests I had merely forgotten that I had promised him 2 minutes' additional time. I was happy to grant him 3 and then 5, and I wish to say now, Mr. Chairman, that I have been requested by the leadership to say that when the Committee rises this evening there will be a unanimous-consent request that we meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

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

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. I understand that is in accordance with an agreement reached between the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], and the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS. That we will meet at 11 o'clock to take up a conference report on an appropriation bill that may take an hour or more to complete.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his motion a minute, please?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER, Speaker pro tempore, having resumed the chair, Mr. GORE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under

consideration the bill (H. R. 10132) to protect the integrity and institutions of the United States through a system of selective compulsory military training and service, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOOR OF MEETING

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, another request was to be coupled with this request.

Mr. MAY. I intend to make that request immediately after this one is agreed to, or I will make them both together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 10263) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the gentleman from Kentucky a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, the agreement was that if the House met tomorrow at 11 o'clock the conference report on the supplemental national-defense appropriation bill (H. R. 10263) would be taken up, and that it would possibly take 1 or 2 hours. Am I correct?

Mr. MAY. It was stated to me by the majority leader that they would probably want to take up the conference report, or would take it up at 11 o'clock, and that it might last until about 1 o'clock, covering 2 hours. This was agreed to, as I understood it, by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the minority leader. I think that will be the first order of business.

Mr. MICHENER. That is what we want to know. May I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], a member of the Appropriations Committee, what he knows about it? I see that the chairman of the subcommittee is not present.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the Speaker talked it over this afternoon and we were told that the conference report on the supplemental national-defense appropriation bill would come up the first thing tomorrow morning. This involves the conference on the approximately \$5,000,000,000 appropriation bill that was passed about a month ago.

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

Mr. MICHENER. Certainly.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] asked me to make the request that he have until midnight tonight to file the report and stated that he expected to take it up at 11 o'clock.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to quote in those remarks a resolution of the National Farmers' Union in opposition to the present bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to

include an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star of today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the House today and to include some brief quotations from records and publications.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHAFER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States since December 1931 and this is the first time in all my career that I have ever encountered or have been in an altercation with any Member of Congress on this floor such as you witnessed tonight.

Perhaps I should tell you what took place and let you be the judge. As I resumed my seat, the gentleman with whom I had the difficulty, called me a traitor. He repeated it again and you know what happened.

I am sorry I brought any confusion to the House and if you think I am guilty in any way at all, I apologize to you and the Nation. [Applause, the Members rising.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINCENT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I served in the World War, and the World War, as I understood it then and as I understand it now, was fought because we were being attacked by submarines and women and children were being murdered on the high seas. For the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY] to say that President Wilson brought on that war was untrue and the whole statement the gentleman made I resented very much.

When he finished his speech he started to sit down by me. I got up and moved. I shall continue to refuse to sit by him as long as I am a Member of the Congress and he is a Member. When he sat down by me I got up and moved. I said I did not want to sit by a traitor to my country. Then he attacked me and you know what happened.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand recognition on a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words of the gentleman who just left the floor be taken down, because they violate the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words complained of.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the last sentence of my statement.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to withdraw the statement. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I object, Mr. Speaker.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include therein an article from the Knoxville News-Sentinel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include in the remarks I made today a printed statement of Grace Leeper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial that appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of yesterday and was reprinted in today's New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLAHERTY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made during the debate in Committee of the Whole today and include therein certain quotations referred to therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain editorial comment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article from the Tyrone Herald.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made this afternoon on the bill a letter I have received concerning this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein exhibit 125, Memorandum for the Director, Navy Department, Naval Intelligence, signed by A. S. Merrill, and I also ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein excerpts from magazines.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein a letter I have received.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement from the Farmers' Union in opposition to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the New York Sun of today's date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order and a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a moment ago certain words were uttered by the gentleman on the floor of the House which I demanded be taken down. No report was made of those words. I demand the regular order—the

LXXXVI—725

taking down of the words, the report of the words, and the reading by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Subsequently, unanimous consent was granted for the words to be withdrawn.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no, Mr. Speaker; three Members were on their feet. I was one of them, and objecting to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That was the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is not a ruling, it is just an answer to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; I am appealing from the ruling awhile ago.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio transcription broadcast from the Fourth Congressional District in Washington.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDOWELL] is entitled to recognition for 15 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, owing to the lateness of the hour, I do not propose to use all the time.

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

Mr. McDOWELL. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire whether or not, under the rules of the House, when a demand has been made that words be taken down, any further business can be transacted before the words are reported?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. By unanimous consent.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this has been a long and wearying day of writing letters, interviewing lobbyists, reading mail, and finally the historic debate on this infamous draft bill; and I am inclined to lay this manuscript down and go to my room for a deserved rest after an exciting day as a Congressman. However, there are some duties that cannot be shunted aside, there are some responsibilities that cannot be evaded, and there are some charges that cannot go unanswered and unbuked; and my purpose here this evening is to defend that which each of us cherishes most in life—his home.

My home has been assailed, my people have been accused, my State has been defamed, and no Pennsylvanian, and particularly no Pittsburgher worth his salt serving in the Halls of the Congress of the United States, will permit any loose-talking, uninformed, and what appears to be jealous, defamers attack us without at least being answered.

In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5241, appears a speech by our esteemed colleague the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable CLYDE T. ELLIS, which, after a careful perusal, is so astonishing in its lack of logic, in its wrong inferences, and in its obvious desire for something that belongs to somebody else, that I am convinced that Mr. ELLIS, much as I regard and esteem him, did not read his speech very carefully before he delivered it.

The whole gist of Mr. ELLIS' contention appears to be that Pittsburgh is a rich and busy city, turning out the metals and the hardware and the millions of other objects that are used by people all over the world; and we Pittsburghers confess to the truth of that, but Mr. ELLIS also appears to want to tear down our factories, throw out of work our workingmen, close up our mines, and our mills, and remove them to the wild hills of the Ozarks where the business and the prosperity will redound to the everlasting glory of the Ozark hillbillies.

The gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. ELLIS, is 1 of those 63 Members of this body who have announced in determined tones that of the new war orders to be placed all over the United States 9 Western and Southwestern States are not going to be overlooked. In a meeting in Kansas City—whether they have had it or not yet, I do not know—but the meeting

is called purely for the purpose of proclaiming to the entire United States that the political pork is to be brought into their country by any methods available.

My gifted colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, DEWEY SHORT, in his magnificent address this afternoon against the draft bill, pointed out with rare perspicacity that the first sacrifice in time of war is truth. He spoke with the vision of a prophet.

The war hysteria is abroad in the land, and there is no one here that can gainsay that of all the lurid examples as to how it affects men's minds, the remarks made by my beloved friend from Arkansas stand out in bold relief.

The gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. ELLIS, in his amazing speech, challenged Charles E. Robinson, manager of the Pittsburgh Commission for Industrial Expansion, because Mr. Robinson has recently declared that political pressure was being used to obtain Government defense plants for Midwestern States unsuited for industry.

Congressman ELLIS says in his speech, "Shame on you Mr. Robinson and your commission; fortunately the good people of Pittsburgh, through their esteemed Members of the Congress, do not act that way." In this respect the gentleman from Arkansas has made a grave error. I know not what my four other colleagues from Allegheny County may think, but I wish to state here and now that I thoroughly agree with Manager Robinson, and I shall here make the statement that the people of Pittsburgh agree with Manager Robinson, and I shall even venture to make the prediction that the Government of the United States will agree with Manager Robinson in placing badly needed war orders in the spot where they can get them the cheapest and the quickest and the best. What manner of reasoning is it that would break up the highly geared mechanical circumstance of the greatest industrial city in the world when industry is just now being given the greatest responsibility in its career in order to add to the income of States whose officers have obviously not been a howling success at solving their own social and industrial problems?

I know very little about Arkansas and I know a great deal about Pennsylvania. I know that when President Madison wanted guns in the War of 1812 we made them for him in Pittsburgh. I know when President Polk needed supplies for his armies in the Mexican War we furnished the supplies. Government arsenals at Pittsburgh during the Civil War were the biggest and the busiest in the world. The ships that drove the Spanish Fleet from the seas in the War with Spain were equipped with countless products of our great western Pennsylvania metropolis. During the World War every American, and particularly every German soldier, appreciated fully Pittsburgh's part in that conflict.

The trend of the present administration to break up established and substantial and historic concentrations of industry and labor and skill has been growing more and more pronounced since 1932. The President and the Congress have spread the back hills of Tennessee and northern Mississippi and Alabama with power lines and power dams, and every other expensive contrivance, for a population so thin and so backward that the economic returns from that venture to the whole people of the United States, who are paying for it, are many generations away.

The gentleman from Arkansas said in his speech, and I quote:

We love you, Pittsburgh, marvel at your undeterminable industry; and we are proud of these nine States constituting one-sixth of your domestic market.

The gentleman's reference there is to the fact that the value of manufactured goods produced in western Pennsylvania is greater than six of these nine States the gentleman is pleading for; and as referring to the fact that the Pittsburgh district has more employees than seven of these nine States, and he is also referring to the fact that Pittsburgh has a greater pay roll per week than all but one of these States combined. I will admit that is a mark to shoot for, and even though the gentleman from Arkansas assures the Pittsburghers that he loves us and is proud of us—and we

accept his affections with pleasure and pride—but also do we look at him with jaundiced eye, as his eyes scale the heights of our buildings and the width of our plants and the steamboats on our rivers.

It was my impression, up until I read his speech, that the defense program of America meant that we are preparing to defend ourselves against enemies foreign and domestic, as are all of we Congressmen charged in our oaths, but the speech of the gentleman from Arkansas, who apparently is the spokesman for the 63 Members of the Congress, indicates that we in Pittsburgh will have two fronts to fight if war comes—one against the enemy from without, and one against the 63 Members of the Congress trying to move the things we have in Pennsylvania out along the buffalo trails.

Personally, I have a great admiration for Arkansas; it is a beautiful State to visit in, and their accomplishments of boiling the delirium tremens out of alcoholics in Arkansas' hot springs is probably not equaled in any other State in the Union. I have a great admiration for Nebraska and Iowa and Kansas and Missouri, and the rest of those States who buy Pittsburgh's products as we buy their grain and foodstuffs, but the Union of the United States, it has been my impression, is to be a mutual bond of association, protection, and cooperation. The founding fathers never considered the jealousy between States; it occurred once, sadly enough, and the terrible Civil War has taught us that never again should one State covet those things that another has.

I have no doubt that Arkansas will render to the Nation its full share of cooperation in the grave days that lie ahead of us, and I can assure the gentleman from Arkansas that Pennsylvania will do the same. We want our factories, we want our workingmen, we want all of our people of Pennsylvania, even the Mellons to whom he refers as having made a vast fortune at the expense of the people of the Middle West. The Mellon fortune was gained in many ways, and I am not familiar with it, but the statement that it was gained at the expense of the people of the Middle West is laughable. We in Pittsburgh understood that Samuel Insull took care of all the money that was lying around loose in that section of the country some time ago.

The statement that Pittsburgh would be a prize catch to a foreign enemy is very, very true; there can be no question about that, but a city almost 400 miles from the eastern coast is just as safe from being bombed or destroyed by European enemies as is a city in Arkansas; and indeed, if we are to believe the statements of the President of the United States, who is also the head of the party to which the gentleman's political philosophy leans, the hills of Arkansas are in more danger from flying fortifications than is Pittsburgh, because it was the President himself who pointed out the short distance from Mexico to Omaha in a public address not very long ago.

I will agree with the gentleman that the President's calculations were so farfetched as to be almost ridiculous, but, nevertheless, he made the statement, and I know the gentleman from Arkansas is too good a Democrat to contradict the head of his party.

The gentleman closes his argument with the words, "Better pitch in, Pittsburgh, and help us pull. What is good for us is good for you, for we are your market."

Well, my colleagues, Pittsburgh and its 122 sister communities within the county of Allegheny are once again pitching in, and the great black clouds of smoke are hanging high over our city as we are turning out the things that the Nation needs to defend itself against its foreign enemies. We are pitching in back there in Pittsburgh, and we are making guns and we are rolling ship sides and we are casting shells and we are making plane parts.

Ten days ago we broke all records for enlistments, hundreds of refugee children are being housed by the generous-hearted people of our Nation, thousands of dollars for relief are being sent from Pittsburgh to alleviate the sufferings of the anguished in the war areas, and as the war increases its tempo, so the armory of the Nation—Pittsburgh—increases its output, and I wish to tell the gentleman from

Arkansas and his 62 colleagues, that when the war is over and peace and tranquillity have once again blessed the world, if America still stands, Pittsburgh will still be there—dirty perhaps, but still America's Pittsburgh. [Applause.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KEFAUVER, for today, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER and Mr. SHANLEY asked and were given permission to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, at 11 o'clock a. m., on tomorrow, Thursday, September 5, 1940.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

The Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will meet at 10 a. m., Thursday, September 5, in room 128, House Office Building, to continue the hearing on H. R. 10122.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, September 5, 1940, at 10 a. m., on the following bill: H. R. 10380, a bill to expedite national defense by suspending, during the national emergency, provisions of law that prohibit more than 8 hours' labor in any 1 day of persons engaged upon work covered by contracts of the United States Maritime Commission, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TAYLOR: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two houses. H. R. 10263. An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2916). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. House Resolution 585. Resolution requesting the Secretary of War to transmit information on airplane contracts (Rept. No. 2915). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 10456. A bill to provide for the orderly financing of the national defense, to maintain an even flow of purchasing power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee:

H. R. 10457 (by request). A bill for the protection of Government law-enforcement officers or agents, by providing pensions to those injured and compensation to the dependents of those killed in the discharge of duty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 10458. A bill relating to the citizenship of foreign-born children of a naturalized or repatriated citizen where the application for such naturalization or repatriation is filed while such child is a minor; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MOSER:

H. R. 10459. A bill to prohibit the advocacy of changes in the Government of the United States otherwise than as provided by the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 10460. A bill to amend Public, No. 497, Seventy-first Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. J. Res. 602. Joint resolution to authorize Jesse H. Jones, Federal Loan Administrator, to be appointed to, and to perform the duties of, the office of Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 10461. A bill for the relief of Antonino Cappello; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 10462. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial-board conviction of Policeman William F. Fey and his resultant dismissal and to reinstate William F. Fey to his former position as a member of the Metropolitan Police Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 10463. A bill for the relief of Charles Geyer; 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:

9264. By Mr. GREGORY: Petition of Mrs. J. Eli Adams and others, of Hopkinsville, Ky., requesting all material aid for Great Britain short of sending manpower; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9265. By Mr. HART: Petition of the executive committee of the West New York (N. J.) Taxpayers and Rentpayers Association, Inc., protesting against conscription; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9266. Also, petition of the board of directors of the Newark, N. J., Chamber of Commerce, favoring the immediate adoption of such legislation as may be necessary for prompt and adequate national defense, including, if essential in the opinion of the properly constituted military and naval authorities, compulsory military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9267. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of New Brunswick, N. J., endorsing the establishment of an adequate national defense, resolving that compulsory military training is a necessary step, that no armed force be sent beyond our geographical area of defense, and that such supplies or equipment not necessary to our national defense and training be made available for purchase by Great Britain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1940

(Legislative day of Monday, August 5, 1940)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. W. L. Darby, D. D., executive secretary, Washington Federation of Churches, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Thou God of men and nations, ruler of earth and sea and sky, to Thee we come with grateful hearts for the multitude of Thy mercies so richly vouchsafed to us in this day and generation. May we recognize Thee in all that we receive and seek to honor Thee in our lives.

Cleanse our hearts of selfishness and self-seeking, of unworthy pride and ambition. Grant us willingness gladly to serve our fellow men in a spirit of humility and with a sense of our common brotherhood. In this day of tragic need for so many of our citizens, let us have genuine sympathy for them in their trials and hardships and a readiness to help