



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 12, 1941

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.  
Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, whose Fatherly heart opens with love in response to our many needs, we rejoice that Thou art rich toward all who call upon Thee.

We thank Thee for the gift of life with its joys that cheer us and its trials that teach us to put our trust in the Lord God Omnipotent, who is too wise to err and too kind to injure.

In these days of struggle and of challenge may we courageously declare ourselves to be the pilgrims of a larger hope, for Thou art our refuge and strength.

Help us to live by faith and to labor in faithfulness for the building of a better world when peace and prosperity shall be the blessed heritage of mankind everywhere.

Hear us in the name of Him who is the Author and Finisher of our faith. Amen.

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

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Baldrige, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 191. An act for the relief of Franklin Stencil and Domic Stencil;

H. R. 587. An act to extend the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes," approved September 2, 1937;

H. R. 1352. An act for the relief of Norman Carlin Brown, a minor;

H. R. 1354. An act for the relief of Herman R. Allen;

H. R. 1576. An act for the relief of Emily Barlow;

H. R. 1606. An act for the protection of walrus in the Territory of Alaska;

H. R. 2010. An act for the relief of Wade H. Erwin and Vonnle Erwin;

H. R. 2182. An act for the relief of John S. Small;

H. R. 2212. An act for the relief of Raymond W. Reed and Rose Reed;

H. R. 2431. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Carr China Co.;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Margaret S. Holten;

H. R. 2688. An act granting an extension of patent to the United Daughters of the Confederacy;

H. R. 2753. An act for the relief of Lewis Jones;

H. R. 3206. An act to afford greater protection to the purchaser of patent rights;

H. R. 3752. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," approved April 20, 1918, as amended November 30, 1940;

H. R. 4045. An act for the relief of Tony Crone;

H. R. 4085. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of bridges across the Monongahela River in Allegheny County, Pa.;

H. R. 4150. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence River at or near Ogdensburg, N. Y., and for other purposes;

H. R. 4231. An act granting the consent of Congress to the South Carolina State Highway Department to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Santee River at or near Leneudens Ferry, S. C.;

H. R. 4306. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Wabash River at or near Mount Vernon Posey County, Ind.;

H. R. 4315. An act to legalize the construction by the Big Creek Bridge Co., Consolidated, of a bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at Nolan, W. Va.;

H. R. 4338. An act to provide for adjustment of the inactive-duty pay of certain transferred and retired members of the Fleet Reserve;

H. R. 4582. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4660. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide aid for needy blind persons of the District of Columbia and authorizing appropriations therefor," approved August 24, 1935;

H. R. 4732. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Department of Highways, Commonwealth of Virginia, to construct, maintain, and operate two free bridges across the New River, one at Bluff City and the other at Eggleston, in the State of Virginia;

H. R. 5122. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River, between the boroughs of Elizabeth, in Elizabeth Township, and West Elizabeth, in Jefferson Township, in the county of Allegheny, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

H. R. 5339. An act granting increases in pensions to certain widows and dependents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during the War with Spain, the Boxer Rebellion, or the Philippine Insurrection.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 647. An act for the relief of Gilbert E. Jackson and Helen Jackson, individually, and as the natural guardians of Edwin Jackson, a minor;

H. R. 3484. An act to provide retirement pay and hospital benefits to certain Reserve officers, Army of the United States, disabled while on active duty;

H. R. 4100. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Louise Holcombe, a minor, George Holcombe, and Cliff Evans;

H. R. 4131. An act to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended;

H. R. 4498. An act to provide for the admission to St. Elizabeths Hospital of insane persons belonging to the Foreign Service of the United States;

H. R. 4529. An act for the relief of John Henry Hester;

H. R. 4599. An act to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to accept gifts for St. Elizabeths Hospital and to provide for the administration of such gifts;

H. R. 4769. An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks;

H. R. 4784. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4813. An act to amend section 73 of an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 377. An act to repeal sections 512, 513, 514, 515, as amended, 3744, as amended, 3745, 3746, and 3747 of the Revised Statutes;

S. 807. An act for the relief of Eva Mueller;

S. 858. An act to provide for the presentation of silver medals to certain members of the Peary Polar Expedition of 1908-09;

S. 904. An act for the relief of C. D. Henderson;

S. 1207. An act to change the times for holding terms of the District Court for the Eastern Division of the Western District of Tennessee;

S. 1363. An act for the relief of Sioux Skys, Inc.;

S. 1428. An act for the relief of Walter M. Anderson;

S. 1430. An act for the relief of Ivan Richard Witcher and Nellie Witcher;

S. 1479. An act for the relief of Mary S. Gay;

S. 1581. An act for the relief of George Wells and Mamie H. Wells;

S. 1587. An act to provide rental allowances for officers without dependents on sea duty when deprived of quarters on board ship;

S. 1627. An act to provide for a quinquennial census of industry and business and for the collection of current statistics by the Bureau of the Census;

S. 1637. An act to authorize the conveyance to the State of Illinois for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 1649. An act to authorize the payment of certain claims of employees of the Bureau of Reclamation arising out of loss of tools destroyed by fire at Parker Dam, Ariz.;

S. 1650. An act for the relief of Joseph V. Brclerick;

S. 1655. An act for the relief of Victor M. Lenzer, former special disbursing agent, Department of Labor;

S. 1677. An act authorizing subsistence allowance provided for aviation cadets to be paid to messes in manner as prescribed by the act of March 14, 1940 (Public, No. 433, 76th Cong.);

S. 1678. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego for street purposes a parcel of land situated in the city of San Diego and State of California;

S. 1695. An act for the relief of Reginald H. Carter, Jr.;

S. 1698. An act to amend the act reorganizing the administration of Federal prisons;

S. 1701. An act to provide for pay and allowances and mileage or transportation for certain officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve and retired officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps;

S. 1708. An act for the relief of Susannah Sanchez;

S. 1782. An act to authorize the payment of a donation to and to provide for the travel at Government expense of persons discharged from the Army of the United States on account of fraudulent enlistment;

S. 1813. An act for the relief of Harry F. Baker; and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9, 1941, as Leif Erikson Day.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 155):

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ALBERT G. RUTHERFORD, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

*Resolved*, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

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

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now adjourn.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution, the Presiding Officer named Mr. DAVIS and Mr. GUFFEY as members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial appearing in the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal entitled "Profits Unlimited."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and include therein an article in the Times-Herald comparing the draftee system in Canada with that of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PIERCE, Mr. THILL, and Mr. PLOESER were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a recent editorial from the Deposit Times.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article written by one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial, Is the National Being Taken Down the Road to Socialism?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair prefers not to recognize anyone to address the House for 1 minute this morning, according to the announcement made yesterday.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. To revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Newton (Iowa) News of last week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an article by Bill Cunningham in the Boston Herald showing the necessity for giving our selectees equipment with which to train.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein a radio address deliv-

ered by myself over the Mutual Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin, Hon. FRANK B. KEEFE, over the Columbia Broadcasting System on the evening of August 8.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter received from a constituent of mine from Appleton, Wis., with a short article attached.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the New York Times and a letter from the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a statement and a set of tables worked out by Mr. Linder, commissioner of agriculture of the State of Georgia, on the unfair percentage of national income that the farmers have received.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a brief letter from a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech given Saturday night by Colonel Lindbergh.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### CREATING GRADE OF CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER IN THE ARMY

Mr. MAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 162) to strengthen the national defense by creating the grade of chief warrant officer in the Army, and for other purposes, for printing, under the rule.

#### REQUISITION OF PROPERTY FOR DEFENSE OF UNITED STATES

Mr. MAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1579) to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States.



# AMENDING THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

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 House Joint Resolution 222, declaring a national emergency, extending terms of enlistments, appointments, and commissions in the Army of the United States, suspending certain restrictions upon the employment of retired personnel of the Army, making further provision for restoration of civil positions to members of the Army on relief from military service, and for other purposes.

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 House Joint Resolution 222, declaring the existence of a national emergency, and for other purposes, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for general debate stands as follows:

The gentleman from Kentucky has 48 minutes remaining; the gentleman from New York has 45 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I prefer that the gentleman from New York yield time first.

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

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, less than a year ago a selective-service training bill was passed by the Congress. It was enacted as a defense measure. It was predicated on certain solemn assurances unreservedly made by its proponents. I supported it as a defense measure and accepted the assurances at their face value. Training for possible service in the defense of a national policy advocated and adopted by both major political parties in their national conventions was the fundamental principle upon which the arguments for its passage were based. That it had any other purpose was not divulged to the Congress or to the country. Quite the contrary. The suggestion that it might have been emphatically and categorically denied. The original plan for an 8 months' training was changed to 12 months on the recommendation of the Army. That this recommendation was based on anything other than the experience of military experts or that the opinions of these men were colored by extraneous considerations were not disclosed. In the absence of suspicion, denials on these points were not to be expected. The suggestion that the bill was a forerunner of an expeditionary force was branded as absurd.

Today we are asked to approve a drastic change—a change of such proportions that little, if any, of the original spirit of the measure would remain.

Nor can we overlook the fact that the proposed revision of the law included the suggestion that the Congress declare the existence of a national emergency. Obviously the proponents of the changes now before us were hesitant to take this step at this time. That it is in contem-

plation is evident by the report of the Committee on Military Affairs when it says that such action "may require extended debate," and proposes to "leave for future consideration by the Congress the question whether it will declare the existence of a national emergency." Taken in connection with the other proposed changes, these observations by the committee are significant.

The decision we are called upon to make, Mr. Chairman, is a momentous one. I doubt whether any more important issue or one with more far-reaching consequences will be decided by this Congress unless a resolution for war is presented to it. The course of many tomorrows with depend upon our decision today. With so much at stake, neither prejudices nor passions dare be persuasive. Only as the right of an honest, conscientious and informed judgment is permitted to show us the way can we hope to discharge our sworn duty.

When the proposed changes were first suggested, I approached the question with an open mind. If they were justified by facts submitted, I was prepared to advocate them. I have carefully studied the hearings and have followed the course of the debates in both bodies. But as yet I have failed to find a justification upon which to base a support of the measure now before us.

As I see it, Mr. Chairman, we are asked to approve the changes in the law solely on the dogmatic opinions of those who a year ago advocated the adoption of the original plan. What they recommended then, they disavow now. Have we any reason to expect that their present recommendations will not prove to be their future disavowals? To raise this question does not necessarily impugn their motives. But, if we were persuaded to accept the urgent suggestions of a year ago, and now find these suggestions repudiated, surely we should have facts and figures, rather than glib generalities, as a basis upon which to reach a decision. And what is more, Mr. Chairman, the men who are affected by our decision have a right to make a similar demand.

I confess, Mr. Chairman, that I was much disturbed as I sought factual foundation upon which to base my decision, by the information that political consideration played a part in the recommendations of a year ago. If, as it has been admitted, "a cold military proposition" became "a plain garden variety of political consideration" when the original plan was advocated, we should certainly be on our guard against a further trespass on our confidence as changes are urged. Facts, not phrases, will help prevent a similar misfortune at this time.

I believe it is regrettable that the President has not seen fit to take the Congress and the country more into his confidence in his foreign policy generally, and on the matter under consideration particularly. Movements have been furtive rather than forthright. The American people have been kept in the dark, groping blindly, urged to accept obediently, rather than approve intelligently. Ignorance breeds doubt and suspicion. Have we reached the point where the

Government dare not disclose to our people what its purposes are? Can stiff reliance be sustained on dogmatic opinions? Is our destiny to be dictated, or is it to be determined by the deliberative decision of an intelligent people? That there is doubt and suspicion—far too much to be lightly dismissed—cannot be denied. To attribute this disturbing situation to defeatism or to a lack of patriotism only aggravates the condition. If there is to be confidence, there must be candor; if there is to be trust, there must be trustworthiness; if there is to be faith, there must be forthrightness. No reasonable man with any sense of patriotism would urge the disclosure of plans for our own defense which are in line with national policies approved by the Congress. But, Mr. Chairman, self-government has reached a low ebb if it cannot be trusted with sufficient facts upon which an intelligent and informed opinion can be based. The administration's failure to give facts is the cause of much of our difficulty in considering the legislation before us at this time. The people have been urged to follow blindly. Is it to be wondered that there is hesitation and uncertainty? The Congress has been urged in the same way—with the same results. Candor and forthrightness have their own rich reward in trust and confidence.

Here is a field that I am afraid has not been entered, let alone explored. To me this appears to be a tragedy. What is needed, and sorely needed, today is not obedience but devotion. Self-government has no survival value unless its foundations are laid deep in the minds and hearts of an informed and an inspired people. I am persuaded, Mr. Chairman, that the proposed changes which we are considering today do not have the approval of the majority of our people. Were they to be informed—informed fully and freely and frankly—their disapproval might very readily become an enthusiastic support.

It has been argued, Mr. Chairman, that the proposed changes should be approved because of the psychological effect that such approval would have on aggressor nations. Again, an opinion, not a fact. Is it to be supposed that an ever-increasing trained service force, and an ever increasing number of men in training, in accordance with the plan which was approved originally by the Congress, would impress an aggressor as an evidence of weakness or submissiveness? I am much more concerned about the possible effect of a breach of good faith on the morale of our own men than I am of the psychological effect on a possible adversary. The most potent factor that can be brought into play for its psychological value is the competency and capacity of our gigantic industrial machine. Here is a place for psychology. Here is a possible notice which might be served on all nations with no chance that it would be misread or misunderstood. If, as it has been said, our defense program is an all-out endeavor and if the peril is such as to warrant the changes sought by this measure, the delay in putting our industrial machine into high gear should be explained. At this very

moment, differences between management and men are causing serious interruptions in production at plants which are vital to our defense effort. The same conditions have prevailed throughout the past year. I need not discuss the cause of the conditions in most instances. They are well known. But I do believe, Mr. Chairman, it is high time that the problem of production be dealt with. I am wholeheartedly in favor of showing to any aggressor that we intend to protect our rights. But the argument that the psychological factor is important as we consider this bill would be more convincing were any evidence at hand to prove that the administration intended to meet its responsibility in the field of industrial relations.

I am no recent convert to the cause of national defense. My record on this point has been established. Were I convinced—no, I shall say that were there any facts at hand which would be convincing that the requested changes in our training program were necessary for our national defense, I would make but one choice—to support the resolution. The needs of the Nation must come first. The pleasure or the privilege of the individual must be secondary, but in the absence of facts and figures upon which to base an honest and deliberative decision that a change is necessary, I have no other choice than to abide by the assurances given at the time the original plan was projected. A judgment worth having must be a judgment based on a fairly detailed knowledge of the facts. The President has felt that facts cannot be disclosed. If he is in possession of such facts as would substantiate his opinion of our peril he can take one of two courses—give them to the Congress so that the Congress may act, or exercise the power which he now has to change the term and the type of the men called for training.

No one here will deny, Mr. Chairman, that skillful strategists have been at work to edge the country closer and closer to conflict. Subtle persuasiveness has been doing its part. Propaganda of a powerful character has been doing its work. Despite these efforts the country has refused to approve a participation in the conflict, especially since the ideology of democracy against dictatorship has been dissipated by the Communist alliance. Be that as it may, however, Mr. Chairman, if, in the judgment of the President, if in the judgment of the proponents of this measure here in the House, the time has arrived when the issue of war should be met, let that issue be presented to the Congress forthrightly and frankly. If the policy of measures short of war is to be changed, one clear, positive, unavoidable duty rests on the proponents of this measure who favor a change—the duty to come from under cover, to desist from subtleties and strategy, and to permit the Congress to pass judgment on that fateful issue. To edge us closer and closer to a point where there is no turning back can hardly be counted on as a course which will challenge a devotion to duty or to a unity of purpose. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, if there is to be confidence, there must be candor; if

there is to be trust, there must be trustworthiness; if there is to be faith, there must be forthrightness. Only as confidence, trust, and faith are established can we hope to succeed.

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

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, 11 months ago the Congress enacted and the President approved the Selective Training and Service Act. It provided, among other things, that each man inducted for military training and service should—

serve for a period of 12 consecutive months, unless sooner discharged, except that whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled such 12 months' period may be extended by the President for such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense.

The Selective Training and Service Act also provided that at the expiration of his 12 months' period the selectee should be released from active service with the Army and transferred to a reserve component for a period of 10 years. He could be recalled for active duty in event of war or a national emergency declared by Congress. The act also provided that not more than 900,000 selectees should be in training and service at any one time, that they should be inducted in monthly quotas and discharged in monthly quotas, so that there would be a continuous rotation which would provide at all times an active Army in being of between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000 men, and at the same time build up a trained reserve from which the active Army could be supplied and augmented in time of war.

You will notice, Mr. Chairman, that in writing this legislation the Congress did two things. First, it provided that the selectees should not be kept in active service for a longer period than 12 consecutive months unless the Congress itself, by affirmative action, declared the national interests to be imperiled, in which event it could authorize the President to extend the period for such time as the Congress might deem necessary in the interests of national defense. And secondly, it placed a limit on the number of selectees which could be inducted annually. Both of these measures were taken for the purpose of keeping the policy-making power within the control of the Congress, where admittedly such power belongs, and for the purpose of insuring itself and the country that the selective-service program would be carried out in the way the Congress planned it. All of this was done after careful and detailed consultation with the Chief of Staff, in lengthy and exhaustive open hearings, and after he had endorsed and urged the passage of the act in the manner and form in which it was reported from committee and enacted by the Congress.

Now, after 11 months of operation of this act under his exclusive jurisdiction and supervision, General Marshall comes to us and tells us that the Selective Training and Service Act is all wrong. It is wrong, the General contends, not merely in its detailed provisions, such as the provision fixing the active service of selectees at 12 consecutive months, instead

of a longer specified period, and limiting the number of selectees in training at any one time to 900,000. It is also wrong in principle, according to the General. It is wrong in principle because in the present opinion of the Chief of Staff no legal restrictions of any kind should have been written into the act. General Marshall now says that all selectees should serve for an indefinite term, that they should be released from active duty not in accordance with any law on the subject but solely in accordance with his judgment as to when they ought to be released. He says also that the number of selectees to be trained each year should be left entirely to his discretion, as well as the number to be transferred to the reserve component. He says that although he has no present intention of asking for the induction of not more than 300,000 new selectees during the coming year, the legal limitation of 900,000 per year should be removed entirely. He says he wants no legal restrictions of any kind, either as to selectees, National Guard men, Reserve officers, or enlisted men in the Regular Army. He asks that the Congress amend the act by eliminating the language by which the Congress retains control over the policy of selective service. He asks the Congress simply to declare an emergency and to give to the President the authority to raise, train, and retain in service a conscript Army without any legal restrictions whatever as to size or term of service. With such unlimited authority the Chief of Staff now says he can function. Without it he now says he cannot.

Without reviewing in detail the testimony given by General Marshall, the Chief of Staff, when he was called upon last year by the Military Affairs Committee of the House to give his views and offer his suggestions on the Selective Training and Service bill then pending, I simply want to call your attention to the fact that General Marshall endorsed and approved the bill, not only as to the principle of the basic congressional control involved in it, but also as to its detailed powers. He said the bill would enable him to create, train, and perfect the kind of an army and the kind of a Reserve he wanted. And he also said that with that army, so created, trained, and perfected, under the plan provided in the bill, he could defend the Western Hemisphere against any contingency which he could foresee. At that time he said he wanted to build up an army of about 1,700,000, which is precisely the size of the army he says he now requires, and which is the size that the army, created and trained under his supervision, will be before the end of this year. From the record, therefore, it would appear that General Marshall got exactly what he asked for in the present selective training and service bill.

A majority of the members of the Military Affairs Committee, after listening to the testimony of the Chief of Staff on the pending extension bill, apparently were convinced the general is now right, and conversely, they were convinced that the general was wrong when he offered his testimony and opinion on the original draft bill 11 months ago and when



he urged the committee to report the bill substantially in the way they did report it and with substantially all of the restrictions which he then agreed were proper. The bill now before us, which was drafted under General Marshall's supervision, and which embodies the whole of General Marshall's conception of what a conscript army ought to be, contains only one provision different in language than that which the Chief of Staff wanted. He recommended to the committee the outright declaration by Congress of a national emergency, which would give the President full wartime powers. Instead of this, the committee followed the formula prescribed in the original act and declared simply that the national interests were imperiled. The actual authority given the President under this bill, however, is virtually as broad as it would be under a congressional declaration of national emergency, and it is, as I have said, entirely unlimited insofar as legal restrictions are concerned. With the enactment of this bill the Congress authorizes the President to create and retain a conscript army of unlimited size in which the conscript serves for an unlimited term, and at the same time the Congress, through this bill, surrenders to the President every vestige of authority which it now has over the selective service except the doubtful authority to repeal the law by concurrent resolution.

It would be difficult to imagine any more drastic change of policy or any more complete abdication by the Congress of its policy-making power, than this bill proposes. It is pertinent to inquire, therefore, the real reason for the proposed change before we consider the granting of any such powers to the President. General Marshall, echoing the views of the President in his recent broadcast to the people of the Nation on the subject—a transcript of which, you will remember, the President sent up to the Congress with the statement that it was "a message to the Congress"—says that there are two principal reasons which make this far-reaching change in the law imperative. In the first place, he says, the Nation is imperiled and that the situation which now confronts us is much more serious than that which obtained when he endorsed and urged the passage of the Selective Training and Service Act. In the second place, he says he has tried hard to operate under the provisions of that act and that he has found it will not work. He says he cannot begin to release the selectees gradually, month by month, as they reach the end of their 12 months' service, as required by the act, because to do so would disrupt the Army. He says this is so even though the first contingent will not be transferred to the Reserve until November, and even though the number to be released at that time will amount to only 13,106 men, out of an army of 1,500,000. The largest number of soldiers who will be released from active service in any one month up to July 1942, will be 153,159, or about 10 percent of the Army, and the average monthly number will be about 50,000, or approximately 3 percent of the whole Army. This monthly release, the Chief of Staff declares, will disrupt and disintegrate the Army, even

though under the law new selectees may be inducted each month as replacements in numbers equal to or exceeding the number of selectees released.

To a layman the general's statement that it is impossible to rotate this small number of selectees monthly in accordance with existing law, without disrupting an army of 1,500,000 men, would seem to be mathematically untenable. We must remember, however, that the general's opinion on this matter is the opinion of an expert and not that of a layman, and that its soundness or unsoundness must be examined and tested accordingly.

There is a proper and well-established method of doing this and I shall undertake to do so in the proper place in this discussion. But before doing this, however, we should examine the first reason given by the Chief of Staff to justify this proposed change in the law, namely, that the national interests are imperiled to the extent he says they are. For unless that can be established as a fact, then the Congress, under the provisions of the Selective Service Act itself, would have no authority to authorize the President to extend the period of service of selectees beyond the period of 12 months. Unless that is established, then unquestionably the Congress would be breaking faith with the selectees if it extended the period of their service beyond the 12 months now provided by law.

The question whether the national interests are imperiled can be answered, in my opinion, in only one way. I believe the national interests are imperiled. They were imperiled when the present Selective Training and Service Act was passed. They have been imperiled ever since. They will continue to be imperiled as long as the present wars continue to rage in Europe, Africa, and Asia. Whether the national interests are imperiled now to a greater extent than they were when the first conscription bill was passed is another question. It is a speculative question on which the opinion of an informed layman may be as good as that of a military expert.

As to whether the national interests were imperiled at the time of the passage of the present conscription bill, we must agree that they were. That is the reason we passed the bill. Had it been otherwise we would not have been justified in passing it. Most of us here today were Members of the Congress then. We attended the hearings before the House Committee on Military Affairs. We studied the testimony of the witnesses given at the hearings. We took part in the debate. We were familiar with all the phases of the international crisis which impelled us for the first time in our history to consider conscription in peacetime as a proper means of acquiring a military establishment which could successfully defend this nation and the Western Hemisphere in event of any contingency. You will recall that we all considered that contingency to be approaching us with lightning speed. We were right in so considering it, for with the year preceding the introduction of the conscription bill the Hitler juggernaut had swept through Europe destroying everything before it and crushing and annihilating the most powerful

armies of Europe. First Poland, then Belgium and Holland, then Norway, then France. Not only was the French Army, which was rated as the finest on earth, completely obliterated in a matter of a few weeks, but the entire British Army was driven off the Continent and all of its equipment was captured or destroyed. Britain lay apparently helpless under the bombing of an air force greater than that of all other nations combined, and in the opinion of many of our military experts Britain was as good as finished. The time she could hold out was reckoned in months, and it was feared further that with the fall of Britain might also go the British Fleet, perhaps to be used against us by Hitler.

But, Mr. Chairman, there was another grave reason which impelled us to resort to conscription in a time of technical peace. The peril which confronted the United States in so positive a way from abroad was no more serious than that which in a negative way confronted us at home, for the hearings on the conscription bill disclosed that so far as actual effectiveness was concerned, we virtually had no Army. We had a pitifully small Regular Establishment, which had apparently remained static since the World War and, particularly, in the face of a new world-shaking war which had already been in progress for more than a year. The Army was not only too small to be of use; it was obsolete. It had not kept up with the needs or the methods of modern warfare. It lacked modern guns, tanks, and other equipment with which to fight a modern war, and if it had been faced at that moment with the task of defending the Nation against what many believed to be an inevitable attack, we hesitate to think of what the consequences may have been. We also had a small National Guard and a Reserve Officers component. But the whole establishment was too small to be effective. It had not been trained to fight modern mechanized armies and it had no adequate equipment with which to fight them.

I do not wish to criticize. This is not the time for criticism. But I have never been able to understand what the responsible heads of the Army, from the Commander in Chief down, were doing all that time or what they intended to do during the 12 months preceding the introduction of the conscription bill, which as you know, was not an administration measure and which was never asked for either by the Commander in Chief or by the Chief of Staff, so far as the record shows, until after the bill was introduced. I say I have never been able to understand it and I say no satisfactory explanation has ever been given for this delinquency by any of our military experts, particularly by the Commander in Chief and the Chief of Staff, upon whose expert advice and opinion we are now asked to place implicit faith and credit in our consideration of this unprecedented proposal—a proposal to turn the entire jurisdiction of the Congress over to them, and a proposal which they now say at this belated date is the only thing which will give us an adequate army.

I do not understand it. I am not a member of the Military Affairs Committee.

I have been hoping during the course of this debate that some member of that committee would step forth and give some plausible explanation as to why the Army was in the condition it was when the Conscription Act was passed. They have not done so. I do not criticize the Military Affairs Committee, but as a member of the Naval Affairs Committee I say to you that such a situation could never have happened in the Navy, a situation wherein the United States Navy was impotent to act in the face of a year-old world conflagration by reason of lack of men, lack of training, or lack of the most modern fighting equipment. And I humbly believe, Mr. Chairman, that when the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee on the conscription bill disclosed this utter lack of readiness on the part of the responsible heads of the Army, the people of the United States reverently thanked God that at least they had a Navy—a Navy which had not been asleep—a Navy which then was and now is, and which always will be, the best, the most modern, and the most powerful in the world—a Navy which is always fully manned, fully trained, and completely prepared to fight whenever and wherever the occasion may demand it, and incidentally, Mr. Chairman, a Navy which never in all of its 150 years of continuous existence has had to resort to conscription—either in peace or war.

These observations, Mr. Chairman, are by no means relevant to the issue before us because they have a direct bearing on the question as to how far we are now justified in accepting at face value the present opinions of the experts who at this late date begin to tell us what kind of an army we ought to have and who dogmatically insist that the only way to obtain that army is to give them blanket authority to create it in their own way without any legal restrictions whatever, either as to its size or as to the length of service of the selectees.

I contend, for this reason, that it is pertinent to inquire why those in responsible charge of the Army, who now advise a wholly unprecedented departure from our established tradition and custom, did not advise the Congress of the real needs of the Army long before the original conscription bill was introduced. It is pertinent, since we are now asked to accept their opinion without question, to inquire why these military experts allowed the Army to remain static through a long period of admitted danger, why they did not begin an obviously necessary program of expansion of the Army and the building up of an effective Reserve at least as early as the Navy began its expansion program. The experts say now that peacetime conscription was the solution to the problem which confronted them then. In this I agree with them. I voted for the original conscription bill.

But, if this is so, I think it is pertinent to inquire of the experts, who now ask us to follow them blindly in their new proposal, why they stood mute on the proposal for more than a year and why they waited for the Congress to propose conscription in the first place. The military experts are supposed to be the advisers of the Congress in matters of this kind.

Why did they stand mute until the Congress called them? And, finally, in endeavoring to evaluate the soundness of their opinion on the proposal they now make, it is pertinent to inquire of them, who now say the existing law is wrong, why, less than a year ago, they accepted and endorsed every feature of the present conscription bill, both as to principle and detail and vigorously urged its passage in its existing form. Under the well-established rules of evidence, it is proper to bear these things in mind and to give due weight to them in examining the experts upon their proposal, which presently I shall undertake to do insofar as their expert opinion affects the real issue involved in this bill.

I have already stated that in my opinion the national interests are imperiled. For the purpose of this argument, therefore, it is not necessary to go into the question of whether they are imperiled now to a greater extent than they were when the Congress proposed and introduced the selective training and service bill last year. It is General Marshall's contention that they are, and I am inclined to agree with him, not so much by reason of anything he said before the committee, as by reason of certain well-known facts and information which are possessed by everyone who reads the newspapers and which are by no means in the exclusive possession of the Chief of Staff or of any other military expert.

General Marshall's statements in support of his contention that the situation is worse now than it was a year ago were for the most part rather vague, as will be apparent to anyone who reads his testimony in the printed hearings, and his testimony given in executive session of the Military Affairs Committee, which does not appear in the record but to which I had the privilege of listening, was, in my opinion, but slightly more definite. He did say that he had some information which he could not give even in executive session, and I am willing, of course, to accept his statement in that regard at its full face value. On the other hand, it must be remembered that one of General Marshall's supporting witnesses, Mr. Grenville Clark, who has perhaps studied this question for a longer period of time than any other man in the United States; and who vigorously supports the general's proposal in toto, stated to the committee that all of the information there is upon this subject has been published from time to time in the public press and that everyone who is sufficiently interested has had the opportunity of being fully informed.

However that may be, we all know in a general way what the situation is now and why the national interests are imperiled today. We know that since the passage of the present act the Japanese factor has entered more strongly into the picture, and so have the Russian and African factors. There can be no question that the national interests are still imperiled, and that fact alone is sufficient under the provisions of existing law to warrant the Congress in extending the term of service of selectees if, but only if, in the judgment of the Congress it is necessary in the interests of the

national defense to do so. The whole question, therefore, is whether it is necessary.

From the very beginning of my study of this bill I have said that the argument for some short and definitely limited extension, for example, an extension of 6 months, is not without merit. But after the most careful study that I have been able to make—and that study has included the reading and the close examination of every word of testimony given by every witness who appeared before the House and State committees, both on the pending bill and on the original conscription bill—I am prepared to say that, in my judgment, there is no merit whatever to the argument in support of this bill in its present form which proposes a permanent conscript army of unlimited size, in which the selectees are to be held for an unlimited term, to be released solely in the discretion of the President and the Chief of Staff. To this proposition I am unalterably opposed, for it is my humble but my most earnest conviction that to pass this bill in its present form would not create an effective army. It would destroy its effectiveness. It would ruin its morale. It would constitute an absolute dictatorship in the hands of the President and the Chief of Staff over the lives and fortunes of millions of our citizens of military age and would unalterably damage and weaken the national defense.

Because my convictions in this regard are contrary to those of the military experts who appeared before the committees of the House and Senate, and because the opinions of the experts, when confined to their own field, would be entitled to more weight than mine, I must endeavor to show that, as to the particular question involved, the opinion of the experts should not be accepted in the face of what I believe to be preponderance of the evidence, entirely outside the expert field, that if the proposals of the experts, as embodied in the present form of this bill, are carried out, the result would be disastrous.

It must be remembered, in the first place, that what General Marshall wants and what this bill provides for is not an extension of the period of the service of the selectees for 6 months, or 12 months, or 18 months, or any other period. What he has asked for and what this bill provides is the removal of all legal restrictions both as to length of service and as to the number of the selectees to be inducted annually. He asks to create an army of whatever size he chooses and to keep the soldiers of that army in service for whatever length of time he chooses, and this is precisely what the bill provides for.

It must be remembered further that not all of the testimony of the Chief of Staff in support of this proposal lies within the field of expert evidence or opinion. In fact, I believe that any lawyer who has had experience in the trial of cases and the examination of expert witnesses will agree that very little of the General's testimony can be classified as expert testimony. This is not because General Marshall is not a military expert, which assuredly he is, but because most of his



testimony, that is to say most of his opinion evidence, was given on questions which do not require opinion evidence and upon which opinion evidence would not even be admissible in a court of law. The General is qualified, for example, to give his opinion as an expert on the question whether his proposal, if put into practice, would create an effective army. He said it would, and I would be the last to question his opinion on that because it is the opinion of an expert on a subject definitely within his own field. If he said an army created by this method would be more effective than one created under the law which we now have, I would not even question that opinion, because that, too, would be the opinion of an expert testifying on a purely military matter. But, on the other hand, when the General says that to create and maintain an army of unlimited size and indefinite term of service with all legal restrictions removed, would best serve the national interests, then he is expressing his opinion on a question of national policy, and in the field of national policy the Chief of Staff neither is nor is he supposed to be an expert. National policy under the Constitution is a question for the Congress and not for the Chief of Staff, even though that policy has to do with the Military Establishment.

I believe the Congress concurs generally in this statement. The philosophy behind the Chief of Staff's proposal is inherently abhorrent to the basic idea of democratic procedure. From a purely military angle there is perhaps no doubt that the totalitarian method of creating an army, such as the Chief of Staff proposes, would be the most effective. It is the method which has long been employed by Hitler, by Mussolini, by Stalin, and by the totalitarians who control the Japanese Government. In a democracy, however, we think that we can accomplish the objectives we want and need, even military ones, and still do it under democratic processes.

The Senate has already passed upon this all-important question. Although the Senate Military Affairs Committee reported a bill in all respects identical to the House bill, the committee itself was obliged to offer a committee amendment on the floor of the Senate striking out the provision for an indefinite term of service for selectees and substituting therefor a provision for a definite additional term of 18 months, so that under the bill as it passed the Senate the selectees would be obliged to serve for a period of 2½ years instead of 12 months. But the Senate repudiated the idea of an indefinite term. There is little doubt that the House committee will be obliged to offer a similar amendment, for I believe it is generally conceded that without such amendment this bill has no possible chance of passage by the House. The basic philosophy and the basic demand of the Chief of Staff in this bill, therefore, stands repudiated by the Congress, and in whatever form it may be enacted it will not provide for a permanent conscript army, the members of which are to serve for an indefinite period and to be released solely at the discretion of the President and the Chief of Staff.

The question remains then whether it is necessary to extend the period of service of selectees at all and, if so, for what additional period.

On this particular question the opinions of the experts are not only admissible but they are also definitely important, because this is a question properly within their own field. Dismissing then General Marshall's contention that selectees should serve for an indefinite term, there is left us for consideration the contention of the majority of the Military Affairs Committee that a much longer term than that provided under existing law is necessary for efficient training and service.

Fortunately for us who, as laymen, are obliged to question the opinion of military experts on this point, General Marshall, in his testimony before the House and Senate Military Affairs Committees on the selective training and service bill last year, has made a complete record showing that 12 months is a reasonably sufficient period both for the purpose of the training and the service of selectees. The General's testimony in this regard is clear and definite and it is supported by the testimony of all of the other high-ranking Army officers who appeared with the Chief of Staff before the committees in support of that bill.

You will recall, Mr. Chairman, that the selective training and service bill (H. R. 10132, 76th Cong., 3d sess.) originally provided for a period of 8 months' training in service. The group of people who assisted in the drafting of this bill—see page 9 of the hearings—included, in addition to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], Mr. Grenville E. Clark, Gen. John McCauley Palmer, Col. William J. Donovan, President Conant, of Harvard, and Mr. Elihu Root, Jr., all of whom had been studying this question continuously for years before the General Staff ever publicly expressed approval of any form of peacetime conscription. They had unanimously decided that the proper period for training and service of selectees was 8 months, and this was the period which the Military Affairs Committee wrote into the original bill.

Now let us see what General Marshall had to say about the bill generally and about the period of training and service, particularly. On page 100 of the hearings you will find this statement of General Marshall to the Committee:

General MARSHALL. It seems to me that compulsory service and training of some sort is so necessary that there is no longer time for debate except as to the details of the legislation required. This particular bill has been drawn by the Training Camp Association, and, in general, meets the ideas of the War Department. Only very minor corrections, in our opinion, are necessary to make it a satisfactory measure.

On page 104 of the hearings the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES], a member of the committee, asked the Chief of Staff this question:

Mr. HARNES. This called for 8 months' training. What was your thought about that?

General MARSHALL. That is too short in our opinion.

Mr. HARNES. What would you say?

General MARSHALL. A minimum of a year, but from our point of view we would prefer a longer period, of course.

It will be noted that neither here nor elsewhere in his testimony did General Marshall insist that a longer period than 12 months was necessary. On the other hand, he stated that with a 12-month period he could not only train and rotate the selectees and have them transferred to the Reserve as trained soldiers, but he even suggested that it might be possible to do the same thing with the National Guard soldiers. On page 111 of the hearings the chairman of the committee asks this question:

The CHAIRMAN. Just one thing, General, that I would like to say. I think you made a statement a while ago that at the end of the first year the National Guard would probably be sent back home and be through?

General MARSHALL. Assuming the general emergency has subsided, we believe that by the end of the year the National Guard might well be released from active duty.

The reason General Marshall made this observation, as appears clearly from the record, is that he believed, and this was his expert opinion on the matter, that with some eight or nine hundred thousand selectees coming into the service month by month each year, he would always have a trained army in being of at least one and a half million men and that he would be building up at the same time a trained Reserve through the transfer of trained soldiers year by year into the reserve component.

Neither was there any doubt in the general's mind that within a 12-month period he could equip these selectees for combat against a modernized European army. On page 110 of the hearings the general is asked this question:

Mr. KILDAY. There is no danger of calling these men from their home pursuits and then not having them turned out at the end of a year as modern soldiers, but a soldier of the World War type, you feel that you can give us definite assurance as to that?

General MARSHALL. Yes, sir.

The opinion of the Chief of Staff on these questions is supported by the testimony of many other Regular Army officers who appeared as witnesses with General Marshall. The testimony of all is to the same effect. The committee covered the point with the utmost thoroughness and it is clear from the record that had the Chief of Staff entertained any different opinion as to the term of service required he would have said so and that the committee very likely would have accepted his advice upon this point as it accepted it upon every other point in the bill.

Now it is contended by some that General Marshall, through the experience he has gained in training the Army under existing law, has come to the conclusion that a very much longer period of training and service is required than he at first thought; a period, in fact, two and a half times as long. The record does not support this contention. The contention of General Marshall is not that he requires an additional 18 months, or 2 years, or 3 years, instead of 1 year. His contention is he requires an indefinite period, and that the only kind of effective Army to have is one whose members are required

by law to stay in service until the President and Chief of Staff, in their own discretion, say they shall be released. The testimony of General Marshall on the pending bill, so far as the 12-month period itself is concerned, is simply and solely that it works an administrative hardship on him. He does not say that the selectees are not well trained at the end of 12 months. His testimony discloses simply that it is inconvenient to discharge the selectees at the end of that time, and that in some isolated cases, such, for example, as the garrisons in Alaska and Iceland, it is a practical impossibility to do so. If this is true, and I am quite willing to accept his opinion as a military expert that it is true, then I believe he should be given a reasonable and sufficient administrative leeway. I believe an amendment permitting him to keep selectees in service for an additional period of, say, 6 months, in cases where it is either impossible or contrary to the best interests of the service to discharge them, would be justified.

For such an amendment I would be willing to vote. But aside from this, General Marshall's own testimony as a military expert convinces me that no long extension of the term of active duty, such as the proposed 18 months, is either justified or desirable. There is no doubt whatever in my mind, and I say this after the most careful examination of the General's testimony that I can make, that General Marshall under the present law, with an amendment such as I have suggested, not only can but he will create the finest Army of its size in the world, an Army which, according to his testimony, will be large enough and well enough equipped, and well enough trained to successfully defend the United States and the Western Hemisphere against any possible contingency which he can now foresee.

I have the greatest confidence in General Marshall's ability to do this. I am convinced he can do it without adopting the totalitarian method of creating and retaining an army, without running the risk of destroying the morale of the Army, and without obliging Congress to surrender its policy-making authority over selective service. For this reason, it is my hope that a bill amended in the way I have indicated may pass. But for the reasons I have stated I shall be constrained to vote against any bill which provides for an indefinite period of service or which extends the service of selectees for a period longer than the Chief of Staff himself has testified is necessary to create and train an army competent to successfully defend this Nation and the hemisphere.

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

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against this bill. I rise to speak against it, first, because it proposes to break faith with the draftees themselves; it proposes to break faith with the mothers and fathers and with the wives, and the sisters and brothers of those boys; and second, because the bill, so far as it applies to extension of the period of service is entirely unne-

cessary. I rise to speak against it because the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, is asking this Congress to pass an act to give him authority which he already possesses by virtue of previous enactments of the Congress, and which he can exercise in his capacity as President of the United States, and as the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States.

I mean to say, Mr. Chairman, that as President of the United States and as the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt should be ready to take responsibilities as well as salutes.

It has already been pointed out on this floor, and I rise today to emphasize the point that under the terms of the Selective Service and Training Act of September 16, 1940, every man drafted for a 12-month training period automatically becomes, upon the expiration of his 12-month training period, a member and a part of a reserve component of the organized military reserves. As such, within 30 seconds after his 12 months' training period is ended he could be served, wherever he is, with a Presidential order calling him as a reservist into service, which simply would mean his continuance in the service for a period expiring 6 months after the President shall have declared the end of the unlimited emergency under which the Nation is operating at this time.

Furthermore, and in this I disagree with a point made during this debate, the National Guard is a part of the Organized Military Reserves of the United States and can be called into service or kept in the service so long as a national emergency shall be declared by the President to exist.

Let me read you the exact language of the section covering the draftees. It is section 3 (b) and reads as follows:

Each man inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) shall serve for a training and service period of 12 consecutive months, unless sooner discharged, except that whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense.

Now let me read you section 3 (c), which provides specifically that the draftee shall, immediately upon the expiration of his 12-month training period, become a part of a reserve component. Section 3 (c) reads as follows:

Each man, after the completion of his period of training and service under subsection (b), shall be transferred to a reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States; and until he attains the age of 45, or until the expiration of a period of 10 years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such reserve component, whichever occurs first, he shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component and shall be subject to such additional training and service as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me read you section 343 of chapter 20 of title 10 of the United States Code, covering the Organized Reserves of the United States. That section reads as follows:

Members of the Regular Army Reserves may be ordered to active duty only in case of emergency declared by the President, and when so ordered shall be furnished transportation and subsistence allowances at Government expense—

And so forth. This clause says further, Mr. Chairman:

Within 6 months after the termination of the emergency declared by the President they shall be placed on an inactive status or discharged, whichever is appropriate.

It is perfectly clear, Mr. Chairman, that the President now possesses ample authority to retain both the National Guard, the other Reserves, and the draftees in service for an indefinite period.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I voted against this original conscription bill. I intend to vote against this proposal now pending before this House, because I consider that there was a definite, unequivocal, unmistakable understanding between the fathers and mothers, and the brothers and sisters, and the wives, as well as with the draftees themselves, that these boys would not be retained in the service longer than 12 months. I consider that to take recourse now to "weasel words" and fox phrases in the act which were carefully omitted or slurred over in all discussions at the time the draft bill was considered, is so dishonest and unfair that it will not only shatter the morale and the esprit de corps of the draftees themselves, but it will do irreparable damage to the faith and confidence in their Government of the fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters and wives of the men whose confidence will thus have been betrayed.

I cannot conceive that any fair-minded person can fail to see what a dangerous thing is proposed here.

There is no question in law as to the President's power as President and as Commander in Chief to hold these men in the service if he sees fit to do so. I am confident that the legal authorities of the War Department would take the same view of this matter that I do insofar as regards the authority of the President to hold both the National Guard and the draftees in the service.

If the President chooses to hold these men in the service that is his responsibility.

I personally feel—and I am sorry that circumstances and conditions compel that feeling—that this bill is simply a forerunner to prepare the people of this country for still another demand—that the Congress enact legislation empowering the President to send these men anywhere in the world he chooses to fight.

Mr. Chairman, if, when this bill reaches final passage, it still contains the provision for an extension of the draft, I hope it will be overwhelmingly defeated.

The minority views submitted by the minority members of the Committee on Military Affairs are as follows:

#### MINORITY VIEWS

The two principal arguments advanced for the passage of House Joint Resolution 222 are—

1. The national interest is imperiled.
2. Unless this resolution is immediately passed our Army will rapidly disintegrate.



While there is some validity attached to each of these arguments, upon close and complete examination they will not stand the test of reason.

When a war of such gigantic magnitude as the present one is being waged, naturally, the interest of every nation is more or less imperiled, but it is the view of the minority that the danger to our safety or security is no greater now than it was when the National Guard and Selective Service Acts became law.

The President in his message of July 21, 1941, to the Congress on this subject declared "that the danger today (to our national safety) is infinitely greater" than it was a year ago. Gen. George C. Marshall in his testimony before our Committee on Military Affairs likewise states "that a national emergency now exists." However, neither the President nor the Chief of Staff would elaborate upon this broad general statement. No specific evidence and no definite data were offered to substantiate their contention. When pressed to give reasons for his blanket and dogmatic statement General Marshall said "unfortunately, it is not in the public interest to make a public statement of all we know." Our answer to that is that if the United States' interest is imperiled or if we are in danger of any immediate attack, certainly the enemy has knowledge of the facts and nothing can be gained by hiding any information from the American people. Certainly it would not injure us for our citizens to know what Hitler himself must already know.

With all deference to both the President and the Chief of Staff it is our opinion that the crisis today is not as grave as it was 1 year ago or when the selectees were first inducted into the military service. We then had approximately 300,000 men on active duty. Today we have 476,000 Regulars, 400,000 National Guard men and Reserve officers, and 600,000 selectees, or a total of almost one and one-half million men in active training and service. Our air force has been enormously augmented and already we have provided funds for an additional 152,000 men for this arm of the service. Not only our land and air forces but our naval forces also have been greatly increased and strengthened during the past year. The Navy has taken only volunteers, who have been sufficient in number to meet the demand. Today we have approximately 270,000 men on active duty in our naval forces. Our two newest and mightiest battleships, the *North Carolina* and the *Washington*, as well as a large number of other naval and cargo vessels, have recently been put into active service. While we are still sadly lacking in equipment, tremendous progress has been made in the production of ordnance. We are incomparably stronger today than we were a year ago and it is obvious that each day as the warring nations spend their strength and become weaker, the United States each day is growing stronger. Perhaps the reason our committee was not given specific and detailed evidence why the danger to the national safety today is "infinitely greater" than it was a year ago is because the administration does not take the American people into its confidence.

Winston Churchill only this week told the British Parliament that Britain's strength has doubled and that she is making progress on all fronts. He did not claim that the battle of the Atlantic had been won, but that it had "moved impressively in our favor" and that shipbuilding is keeping pace with war demands. He also claimed that Germany's air superiority "has been broken" and that the Nile Valley "is much safer." No one will for a moment deny or doubt that England is much stronger today than she was a year ago, due in part to American aid. How, then, can our position be weaker than it was? When we enacted the National Guard

and Selective Service Acts, Germany and Russia were allies but today Russia's well-trained and mechanized millions are sapping much of the strength of the Nazi war machine. Indeed, the stubborn resistance shown by the Soviet regime has surprised the world, and even Mr. Churchill said that Russia was manifesting "magnificent strength and courage." When all these many facts and factors are carefully considered it becomes plain that our position today is certainly no more grave than it was a year ago.

While this resolution declares only that "the national interest is imperiled" it is difficult to distinguish, at least in effect, this language from a national emergency. The two phrases are different sides of the same coin and the meaning is practically the same. The minority believe that the evidence and the facts do not support or warrant a declaration such as the President and General Marshall would have us make. Nor is such a declaration essential for our national defense. The danger from the increased powers given them by such a declaration would perhaps be far greater than the threat from any nation abroad. We would destroy democracy here before we could establish it elsewhere. To declare a full emergency or to extend the service of selectees would likely be the prelude to another American expeditionary force. General Marshall testified that he has never entertained the idea of another American expeditionary force and we do not doubt his word, but unfortunately the Chief of Staff does not make that decision. The President and the Secretaries of War and Navy might decide otherwise. Only Congress can hold them in check.

Now for the second argument of the proponents of this resolution. It is claimed that unless the selectees are retained beyond the 12-month period of their service the Army will be disrupted. No doubt the Army would be put to some inconvenience, but it would not be disrupted. Men constantly have to be replaced in the Army. Some die, a few desert, others are sometimes killed, and eventually there is a complete turnover. Both the President in his message to the Congress on this subject and General Marshall in his testimony before our committee say that unless the service of selectees is extended two-thirds of our men in the Army and three-fourths of its officers will suddenly disappear. This statement is very misleading. Of course, if all these men and officers were discharged in one day, it would indeed be a calamity, but the truth of the matter is demobilization is staggered over a period of time that will not cause disintegration of our armed forces. Testimony before our Committee on Military Affairs shows that the approximately 600,000 draftees now in service entered the Army as follows:

November	13,806
December	5,521
January	73,633
February	90,238
March	153,159
April	123,207
May	56,896
June	79,522

It is obvious that the largest number of draftees who will leave the Army in any one month up to July 1942, under the present law, will be 153,159. These are scheduled to go home next March, and between now and then the proper number of men necessary could be inducted to replace them. That would be only about 10 percent of our present Army and would not, in our opinion, disrupt the whole organization. If the men are properly inducted, in a gradual, steady, and efficient manner, it could be so arranged that even a much smaller number would be prevented from leaving the Army in any one month. This would not destroy the Army nor would it imperil the Nation's defense.

It would insure us a quick turn-over in our Army and it would give us many more trained men.

To prolong the period of the selectees now in our armed service and to freeze them there would produce a static army, instead of building up a mighty reserve by rotating the inductions. Frederick the Great, one of the greatest generals of all time, under compulsion, was limited by treaty to maintain an Army not in excess of 100,000 men. By intensive training for short periods he constructed a military machine that was without peer in his time and which later defeated some of the greatest powers in Europe. It would seem that we can create a mighty military machine by taking in different groups of young men each year and building up a powerful Reserve. General Devers, one of the ablest men in our Military Establishment, who has been in command of the Ninth Division at Fort Bragg, testified that his division, half of which are selectees, are now ready for combat service with less than a year's training. Instead of weakening our national defense this rotation of selectees will actually strengthen it. Russia would have fallen before now had it not been for the vast reserves she had to call into service.

General Marshall testified that our garrisons in the Philippines, Hawaii, and Panama are manned for the most part by Regulars and that only about 1,200 selectees would have to be brought back soon from Hawaii and about 1,800 from Alaska. The minority cannot see that the 3,000 selectees to be brought back from these posts will disrupt our present Army of 1,476,000 men. It is rather difficult to understand why selectees with little or no training should be sent to Hawaii and Alaska and the Chief of Staff must have known when he sent them when their term of service expired.

The minority, therefore, cannot agree that the national interest is imperiled more now than a year ago, nor do we believe that our Army will rapidly disintegrate unless this resolution is immediately passed. There are, however, several good provisions in this resolution with which we agree and which we feel should be enacted into law. Realizing that we do face a real danger, believing in an adequate national defense as strongly as anyone could, eager to maintain the morale of our Army, and desiring at the same time to exercise all caution to avoid a shooting war, the minority are willing to authorize the President to extend for such periods of time as may be necessary in the interest of national defense the periods of service of the National Guard, the reserve components of the Army, and the retired personnel of the Regular Army, provided that the authority conferred upon the President may be revoked at any time by a concurrent resolution of the Congress.

We do not feel that Congress should at this time continue selectees in our Army beyond their 12-month period of training and service. While the Selective Service Act states that the selectees could be retained longer than 1 year if Congress declared that the national interest is imperiled, it was generally understood at the time the act was passed by the young men themselves, by their parents, and by the public that their period of training and service was to be for 12 consecutive months. The young men were called from their farms, their businesses, and their vocations with this distinct understanding, and made their plans accordingly. For us to keep them longer than that would be a breach of faith, or at least considered so, on the part of the Government. This, in our opinion, would seriously disturb the morale of our men, and our opinion is based upon and supported by conversations with men in the

service and with their parents who testified before our committee. We do not believe that failure to retain the selectees for more than 12 months would lead to our Army's disintegration, but we do believe that if the selectees are forced to remain longer than their 12-month period it will lead to demoralization of the Army.

No doubt many of these selectees will volunteer to remain in the service for the duration of the emergency declared by the President, particularly if their morale is anything near as good as the generals testify. Other selectees are being placed in officers' training camps and these men no doubt will want to remain in the service. We also are satisfied from the testimony of General Marshall, but even more by the language of the National Guard and Selective Service Acts, that the President during the period ending June 30, 1942, has the power to order into active military service for a period of 12 consecutive months any or all of these selectees for further training and service as members of the Reserve should he deem it necessary for the strengthening of the national defense. Section 3 (c) of the Selective Service Act, Public, No. 783, specifically states that each selectee after the completion of his period of training "shall be transferred to a reserve component of the military or naval forces of the United States." Section 1 of the National Guard Act, Public Resolution No. 96, gives the President the power "to order into the active military service of the United States for a period of 12 consecutive months each, any or all members and units of any or all reserve components of the Army of the United States \* \* \*. It would seem, therefore, that so far as the selectees are concerned House Joint Resolution 222 is unnecessary since the President already has the authority to recall them if needed.

The minority also objects to section 6 of the present resolution because it removes the limitation on the number of men who may be in active training and service at any one time. Under present law the number of selectees is limited to 900,000. Since we now have only 600,000 in active service it is apparent that 300,000 more can be called. This number added to our present total strength of 1,476,000 plus the 152,000 which we have provided for the Air Corps would more than equal the 1,700,000 which General Marshall testifies is a sufficient force to defend the Western Hemisphere. It must also be kept in mind that we have already lifted the lid so far as enlistment in the Regular Army is concerned. Indeed some of our high military officials are not in favor of increasing our personnel any further until we can furnish them with proper equipment. Modern, mechanized warfare has demonstrated that a few men highly trained and well equipped are far more effective than millions of men who are ill equipped. Why should we freeze the present contingents into the Army indefinitely and then lift the 900,000 lid off the number of selectees, usable at any one time, unless it is to build a huge Army to send to Europe, Africa, or Asia? In the language of our President we want to make sure that our "defense is for defense." We do not want another Army of 4,000,000 men for an expeditionary force.

We heartily favor section 3 of the resolution which permits the Secretary of War to release from active military service those persons who would suffer undue hardship if retained on active duty and those men who had attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth on or prior to July 1, 1941. Section 4 of the resolution should also be enacted since the retired personnel of the Regular Army are needed as much as the National Guard to train raw recruits and selectees. Section 5, which insures to all persons who shall have entered active military service subsequent to May 1, 1940, the same

reemployment benefits as are now provided by the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 in the case of persons inducted under that act, should likewise be approved. We also believe that section 7 which authorizes enlistments in the Army of the United States without regard to any particular component should be adopted. Flexibility in the assignment of personnel is essential to the building of a strong Army.

The minority are for all-out national defense, but we have viewed with grave apprehension certain steps of this administration which have brought us closer and closer to the verge of war. We want to do everything we can to protect our interests, to insure our safety, to promote national unity, to maintain a high morale of both the Army and our citizenry, to invite neither disintegration nor demoralization of our armed forces, and we feel that for the reasons stated in this report the training and service period of the selectees now on active duty should not be extended beyond the 12-month period. Should our situation become more critical than it now is the President can call them back into the active service under existing law.

DEWEY SHORT,  
L. C. ARENDT,  
CHARLES R. CLASON,  
PAUL W. SHAFER,  
THOMAS E. MARTIN,  
CHARLES H. ELSTON,  
FOREST A. HARNES.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, when the Selective Service Act was passed on September 7, 1940, those who spoke for the measure, including the House majority leader, repeated time and again that it was a measure to prevent war; that our boys should be trained; that 12 months' time would be sufficient for that purpose; that those who served a year would be replaced by new ones coming in so that in time we would have, in case of an emergency, an army of several million trained men. The House, in passing this act, even went so far as to attempt to hold positions in private industry for the men when they finished their training. This, of course, could not be done constitutionally, but it was done, nevertheless, as a gesture of good faith with the draftees.

Every draftee in our training camps today was inducted into the service with that understanding and actual promise made by the Government.

What will our position be if we change that term of service now to 2 years or 30 months, or even longer? This Congress will be branded as an arm of the Government that has directly double-crossed and misled the men in training. If this Government cannot keep faith with those who will defend it, just what patriotic sentiment will there be among the soldiers to do the defending? Can fighting men have confidence in a government that has double-crossed them in a few months?

The argument has been advanced that the Selective Service Act provided that in case of an emergency the men may be recalled into service. Is the present Army all we expect to have? Are we to abandon our plan of training millions to be ready for actual war and hold the few we have in the service to do the fighting? If training is so essential to our

safety, let us keep on training and not now ride on the backs of the few men who are now in the service. If training for them has been a good thing and has strengthened our national defense, let us train more and let those who are trained go back to their homes and await a call to an emergency.

There is no emergency now, unless those in the control of the Government have done that which in their own conscience dictates that we now have such an emergency. Nothing on the surface of things indicates such an emergency. Germany has not yet been able to swim the English Channel; Germany has taken on new antagonists; Germany has taken over many governments within her reach, but can she keep them so well organized as to permit her to come 3,000 miles across the Atlantic to attack this country or any country in the Western Hemisphere? Germany understands what constitutes the Western Hemisphere, even if our ruling officials do not. No one in this country ever dreamed that Iceland, Dakar, Africa, Ireland, and the Far East were in the Western Hemisphere until the President announced it.

It is nothing but a pipe dream to think that Germany could land troops in the United States if there was any evidence that she intended to do so. From all the information I can secure, and reviewing it as one who intends to fight to the last line to protect this country against invasion, I see nothing in Germany's dream for a United States of Germany that contemplates including this country.

If Germany wants a United States of Europe and can put it over, that is the business of Europe and not ours.

If we desire to plant in the hearts of the people of this country respect for government and confidence in the causes that we deem worth fighting for, we must keep faith with the boys we are training to defend this country. We cannot afford to take a contrary course. The will to defend this country is more powerful than machines and engines of war. Let us keep that will strong and keep it based on honesty and integrity. If we now abandon our word, break our promises, or double-cross our own men, we, by so doing, break the Nation's will to defend the United States. I say that this will result; and I, for one, will not go back on my contract under the "slim end" pretext that we are about to be invaded and that, therefore, a crisis exists. When no such situation exists, let us keep our word.

It is bad enough to double-cross foreign governments, and we have always prided ourselves that we have not done this. How much worse it is to double-cross our own soldiers. This proposal to retain the men longer in service than that promised is, if we do it, the most perfidious thing, the most dishonest thing that this Government has ever done. Let us keep the respect and confidence of the people, and let come what will.

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



Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, it is my firm belief that the pending legislation will have a greater influence on the building of our defense forces in this country than any other commitment which may come before the House. Every boy who has been inducted into the service is watching the action of the Congress on this particular subject. The people of our country eagerly await our determination of the policy respecting the retention of the boys beyond the 1 year of their service. I feel the weight of the responsibility of our action here because I am convinced that any action which the Congress may take, which will tend to break the faith with the understanding of the boys at the time they were inducted into the service, and which same understanding has been repeated thereafter, will have a very great weight upon the morale of the boys in the Army. We cannot afford to commit any act which will break or diminish the morale of our defense forces. To the contrary, we must do those things only which will build and increase the morale of our soldiers.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, that those who sponsor this legislation present the two principal arguments for the passage of House Joint Resolution 222, which are as follows:

(a) The national interest is in peril; and

(b) Unless the pending resolution is passed immediately our Army will disintegrate very rapidly.

When we analyze the force of every argument presented in behalf of the passage of the resolution, based upon the premises aforesaid, we are constrained to say that they will not stand the crucial test of reason. Our defense preparations must stand upon the basis of sanity, justice, and reason—otherwise they will fail.

At the time we began our active preparation for our defense, in order that our Nation may be secure, we will remember that our Regular Army was small, the National Guard was below its normal strength, and our Navy was at a very low ebb in personnel. At that very time the Nazis had invaded many of the European countries and the savage attacks upon the British Islands was at its greatest height. The invasion of England seemed but a matter of days. The European situation was very critical. It appeared that England would fall. That dark picture was before us. But we will remember, when we turn through the pages of past events, that that situation has changed materially within the past few weeks. While the President, in his message of July 21, 1941, stated that "the danger today is infinitely greater than it was a year ago," and Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, in his testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs, stated "that a national emergency now exists," yet no specific evidence was given to substantiate those assertions. Of course, if we are in greater peril than we were 1 year ago, the people of this country are entitled to know of it, and they are entitled to know the reasons for such assertions made that we are in greater peril than we were heretofore.

Mr. Chairman, as we are engaged in this debate, we wonder where the President of the United States may be? It is publicly reported that he, with his Chief of Staff, and with his Secretary of War and his Secretary of the Navy, are holding a secret conference on a battleship with Winston Churchill and others on the Atlantic Ocean. If such a conference is being held, it is veiled in secrecy. If such a conference is now in progress, no one can tell what commitments the President has made, or will make, by which he will seek to bind the people of our country. Why all of this secrecy regarding this war and regarding our defense? The people want to know the facts about it. They are entitled to know the facts. There should be no secrecy if we are in peril.

If our peril is greater than it was 1 year ago, the President should let the people, or the representatives of the people, know what that greater peril is. If we are approaching this war so that we will soon become involved in it, our people should know of that situation because it is the sons of our Nation—it is the boys from the homes in our country—who will have to fight in that war in case it should come. There should be no secrecy about it. The people should know the facts.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe—I cannot believe—that the danger today is infinitely greater than it was 1 year ago, because we have built our Army, our Navy, our Air Corps, and every branch of the military and naval service; we have appropriated staggering sums of money for our national defense; we have additional battleships, destroyers, and submarines; we have equipment and munitions of war which we did not then have; we have tanks, planes, and guns in far greater quantities than we had 1 year ago. We are preparing for our defense. If we are in greater danger than we were 1 year ago, that is a challenge to our ability to produce and prepare for our defense, and it is a challenge to those in the Army and Navy who have had full charge of this preparation; it accuses those of utter inability to do the job to which they were assigned. Are we in greater danger than we were 1 year ago? England is far better prepared than she was 1 year ago; she has more planes and more guns; she has reorganized her Army; she has taken the offensive in the air. Germany has suffered greatly because of the bombing raids made by the R. A. F. Germany was unable to cross the Channel 1 year ago, and she, with her recent losses and reverses, is less able to cross the Channel and invade England than she was 1 year ago. Then, Mr. Chairman, Russia has come upon the scene, and while we do not agree with her philosophy of government, yet she has waged a great defense against the attack of Germany. The loss of manpower, equipment, and finances in that war with Russia has impaired the force and power of Germany. That war is not yet finished. That war has been of material assistance to England, because she has had the opportunity to reorganize and further prepare for her defense and for offensive action. Therefore I am constrained to say that I am convinced

Germany is weaker than she was 1 year ago and England is stronger; our country is much stronger than we were 1 year ago. We are far better prepared for our defense now than we were 1 year ago.

The question here involved is, Shall we keep our boys in the service who were conscripted under the compulsory-draft law beyond the 1 year? It was the original plan to train the boys for 1 year, then send them home but to retain them in reserve, and to then take other boys into the camps for their training. This would have developed a large army in a short space of time, at far less expense than to keep all of the boys in camp throughout this so-called emergency. This plan would strengthen our Army, because it would give us a large reserve of trained men. The plan, above mentioned, was frequently stated in debate when the draft law was under discussion in both the House and Senate. The President mentioned the plan, and not longer than a few short weeks ago the President again assured the fathers and mothers that when the boys had completed their 1 year of training they would be sent home and other boys would then have the opportunity to secure their training and the new selectees would take their places. At least the boys in the camps understood that they were to train for just 1 year and then they would be sent home, but they would remain in reserve, subject to call in case of our involvement in war. That was precisely the understanding the boys had, and that is the understanding the boys still have; and that is the understanding the fathers and mothers and the people had and still have respecting these boys. I am firmly convinced, Mr. Chairman, that if this proposed legislation is passed, it will have a material and a disastrous effect upon the boys in the training camps; it will destroy, to a large degree, the morale of those boys, and it will destroy the morale of the people of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, if the boys who are now in camp should be retained, as it is now proposed in this measure, and additional boys should be inducted into the service and sent to the camps in the large number proposed, every camp in our country would have to be enlarged in order to accommodate the additional boys inducted. With the very great cost that would entail to the people—the taxpayers—and in the face of our staggering national debt at this moment, which is rapidly approaching the sum of \$100,000,000,000, and with other requests for more money which will soon come from the President, we have the serious view of a general financial break-down before us. These are very serious threats to our country, and to our form of government. This very serious view of our financial condition, as we behold it, may well destroy our liberty and freedom in this Nation. To these we must hold fast. We must never surrender those elements which have made our Nation great. There are other very serious implications involved. We are yet at peace, and I sincerely hope we can forever remain at peace. We do not want any part in this war. We want to keep out of it. Yet we have those in very high places in our

Nation who appear to have a desire to cause our involvement in this war—regardless of cost in money and in men; we have the warmongers who want war. The people of this Nation want peace. And if these people who want war finally succeed in causing our involvement in this war, we will be faced with a Treasury which is entirely empty, and with a staggering debt upon us. One of the essentials for defense in case of war is a well-filled Treasury. This element of defense we will not have, because of the tragic spending of money by this administration before we began to prepare for our defense.

May I urge, Mr. Chairman, that we prepare for our defense soundly and wisely. We must not break the faith with the boys upon whom we must rely for our defense, by making a promise to them before they were inducted into the service, and then repudiating that promise after they are in the service, and by "changing the rule" when there is no necessity for it. May I say that the President of the United States has the full power to call the Reserves of our Army for active duty at any time he may so desire. When the boys serve their 1 year of training, and have returned home as Reserves, the President has the power to call them into active duty at any time in case of war, or in case of a great national emergency. That time has not yet come. The boys who have served in camps for 1 year should be permitted to go home, as Reserves. They were not all inducted at the same time; they were staggered into the service, and they would be, likewise, staggered out of the service to go home as Reserves. This would not disrupt the Army in any degree. The new men would immediately take their places under a well-organized plan of induction, and they would train along with our experienced soldiers, which would aid them in their progress as soldiers.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot cast my vote to break the faith with the boys of this Nation. We must rely upon the valor and the fortitude of those boys in case of war. We must not commit any act, no matter how insignificant it may appear, which will break the morale of our boys in the Army. Without a high morale among our soldiers, we will have but a makeshift of an army. Let us not impair the efficiency of our troops by rushing this measure through, which will be a direct repudiation of a promise. Let the President act, as he is empowered to act, in case of necessity, but let us keep the faith with the boys of our Nation.

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

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the Draft Act passed by Congress and approved on September 7, 1940, contained three important limitations: First, it limited the training service to 12 months; second, it prohibited the sending of members of the National Guard or the draft outside of the Western Hemisphere; third, not more than 900,000 could train at any one time.

The administration has been urging that these limitations and restrictions be

cut out and had a bill introduced in the Senate which cut out the 12-month limitation and extended the period of training and service indefinitely. It removed the limitation of 900,000 and permitted the President to call any number of draftees into the training service that he might desire. While many of the administration leaders favored the cutting out of the provision prohibiting the sending of members of the National Guard and the draftees to serve beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere, it was passed by for the present. No doubt they will urge it be changed in the near future. The administration had already violated this provision of the law by sending our marines to Iceland which is in the Eastern Hemisphere. The Senate by a close vote amended the bill extending the period of training and service 18 months beyond the 12 months for draftees and members of the National Guard and also extended for 18 months the period of service of those who had volunteered and enlisted for 3 years or more, and the Senate also removed the 900,000 limitation and gave the President the right to call any number of draftees, even millions. The Senate adopted an amendment increasing the pay of noncommissioned officers and privates \$10 per month. I cannot agree with the Senate on removing the 12-month limitation or the 900,000 limitation, but I do favor the \$10 increase of pay per month for noncommissioned officers and the privates of the Army. The Senate bill came to the House and was referred to the Military Affairs Committee, of which our colleague the gentleman from Kentucky, A. J. May, is chairman. He and the majority of his committee struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and reported the amendment now before us which strikes out the 12-month limitation of training service of the draftees and National Guard and makes the service extend for an indefinite period beyond the 12 months. The draftee could be held for 2 years or 10 years or so long after the 12 months as the President should order.

The May amendment also strikes out the 900,000 limitation provision of the present law and gives the President the authority to call into service and training as many of the draftees as he may desire even though it should be many millions. The May bill also strikes out the \$10 pay increase for the noncommissioned officers and privates. I strongly oppose both of these provisions in the May bill because, first, they are unnecessary, second, they break faith with the American boys and their parents and give the President the power to hold for service and training for an indefinite period an unlimited number of draftees which may be used by the President and his interventionists to involve us in the European-Asiatic-African war. I am advised an amendment will be offered to the May bill to increase the pay of the noncommissioned officers and privates in the Army \$10 per month. This is a salutary amendment. The pay of our noncommissioned officers and privates is too low. I shall vote for this amendment and I regret it will not provide larger increases. The young men who have been taken from their homes,

business, professions, their farms, schools, and other activities are making a great sacrifice for our country. Munition makers and other industrialist groups are making big profits and workers are receiving high wages. It is not fair to have one part of our population doing all of the sacrificing and another part receiving all of the profits.

#### CLAIM OF DANGER NOT SUPPORTED BY THE FACTS

The President in order to justify the breaking of faith with the American boys and their parents and to enable him to create a standing army of millions of men declared this country "is in infinitely greater danger now than it was a year ago." I respectfully take issue with the President on this statement. I have read the hearings before the Military Affairs Committee and I have been observing closely the events that have transpired in the world since September 16, 1940, when the draft act was passed. There were no facts presented to the Military Affairs Committee that had this resolution under consideration upon which to base or justify the President's claim. The President, General Marshall, and other backers of this resolution undertook to justify their failure to give to the committee and to Congress or the American people evidence in support of their statement by saying it is not in the public interest to state what these perils or dangers to the country are. If this country is in greater peril now than it was a year ago it must be from Germany, Italy, and Japan and the war lords of those countries. If Germany, Italy, or Japan is about to strike a blow at the United States the leaders of those countries know all about it and there is no reason or common sense why the President or other officials should withhold this information from Congress and the American people. If the war lords of Italy, Germany, and Japan know what they are going to do to this country why not let the Congress and the American people know what the peril is. The fact is this excuse is given by the backers of this resolution in order to frighten the American people and the Congress and keep concealed their real purpose in trying to pass the May resolution before us. They know they cannot state any facts that would show this country is in infinitely greater peril than it was 1 year ago.

#### WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

One year ago Germany, Italy, and Russia were full-fledged partners in this ruthless war of aggression. In fact, Hitler never would have invaded Poland but for the backing of Russia. Russia has all along been furnishing Germany oil, food, and other war supplies. Italy was going good at that time. She had moved a great army 70 miles in the East; she was threatening the Suez Canal. Now Italy has been practically put out of the war and Germany and Russia are engaged in one of the greatest and bloodiest wars in all history. In due time Germany may conquer Russia, but in doing so, she will have lost millions of men, killed, wounded or captured; tens of thousands of tanks, planes, bombers, and a tremendous quantity of other essential and necessary war materials. This campaign will have cost the German nation billions of dollars, and Germany then



will not be getting the supplies that she received from Russia before this attack, and while this war with Russia has been going on, the English, for 2 months or more, have been bombing almost undisturbed Germany and countries occupied by her.

It is said the industrial production in those areas have been reduced 40 percent. A year ago, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland, Poland, and France had been over-run and conquered. Germany had at least 3 to 1 superiority in the air over Britain and she bombed Britain and her military objectives day and night, and it looked as if it would be impossible to prevent Britain from being actually invaded by Germany. The British had suffered one of her greatest defeats in all her history at Dunkirk. The English authorities are now saying, that they are equal in air power to Germany and will soon surpass her.

When the Selective Service Act was passed a year ago there was great fear that Germany would break the English blockade. They were daily sinking thousands of tons of the English and allied ships. The English Government reported that during the month of July 1941 the English sunk 450,000 tons of German shipping and that sinking of English and allied tonnage had dropped off approximately 25 percent, and has decreased at a much more rapid pace during the month of August.

During the past year Britain has increased her navy, her merchant ships, planes, guns, tanks, and all kinds of war materials. The British say they are in a much stronger position than they were a year ago. No one now seriously contends that Germany can invade Great Britain. Lloyd's, great English insurance company, is betting 1,000 to 1 no attempt will be made to invade the United States. No one now claims any nation can invade the United States or even the Western Hemisphere. The 1940 election is over. These wild claims are now forgotten.

What about the United States? On September 7, 1940, when the Draft Act was passed, we had fewer than 300,000 men in our military service. We, today, have over 1,500,000 men in the active military service. These are made up of approximately 500,000 Regulars; more than 400,000 National Guards and Reserve officers, and more than 600,000 draftees, and thousands are being taken into these several units of our National Army day by day. Our air force has been greatly strengthened by thousands of men. Congress has provided for an additional 152,000 for our air force alone. We have tens of thousands of young men in the United States who are anxious to get into the Air Service. Since September 1940 we have turned out thousands of pursuit, bombardment, interceptor, and attack planes. The production of some of these units has increased more than 1,200 percent, and they will continue to increase by leaps and bounds. Tanks, guns, and shells have reached mass production. Hundreds of plants, factories, and shipbuilding yards to provide war materials and to build ships have been constructed during the last year, and production in these plants, factories, and

yards is going forward at a tremendous pace.

Mr. Knudsen, who is the real head of our war production management, stated recently that by the first of the year our production of materials will surpass any nation on the globe. No combination of nations in the world equals the combined production of Great Britain and the United States. We have turned over to Great Britain billions of dollars of cash, credits, ships, guns, planes, and other war supplies.

It is said that President Roosevelt and Britain's Prime Minister Churchill, had a meeting at sea to plan what would be done after Great Britain and her allies win the war. The British officials say we are furnishing to them supplies in greater quantities than we did to them during the first World War. A year ago we had the finest and best Navy in the world. During the last year we have added a great number of the finest and best battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and submarines ever built. Our Navy now could successfully defend this country against the combined attack of all the navies of the potential enemies of the United States. The personnel of our Navy has increased to nearly 300,000 men. I might say in passing there is not one drafted man in the Navy. The Navy insists that all of its men must be volunteers. The Navy thinks they make the most efficient sailors.

Many of us in the House and Senate favored a real test of the volunteer system for our Army. We believe that the Army could have secured all the men necessary to defend this Nation in that way. We pay the sailors more than we pay the soldiers. The last month before we adopted the Draft Act, more than 43,000 young men in this country without any special effort on the part of the War Department or the administration to secure enlistments volunteered and were accepted in the various branches of the Army, and the number of volunteers were increasing rapidly. Since the Draft Act was passed, only a few thousand have volunteered each month. When the Draft Act was passed, thousands of young men were on the waiting list trying to get into the Navy and the Air Service. With these impressive facts, how can the President, or anyone, say that this Nation is in infinitely greater danger today than it was a year ago? But the President and his associates had to make a claim something like this in order to justify their demand that we break faith with our American boys, and put at the President's beck and call at such times and in such numbers as he as he might desire the fifteen or more millions of draftees. The American boys, many of whom volunteered after the draft, certainly were taken into the service under the belief that they were to be discharged at the end of 1 year, and would become members of the Reserve.

I was on the floor of the House and I heard our colleague the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAX], and others, who urged the passage of the draft bill, state that these boys were to have 1 year's training. The President of the country emphasized 1-year training. American

boys, fathers, and mothers believed these statements. Some other Members of the House and myself in our speeches pointed out that there was a joker in the bill and that when the boys were once taken into the service efforts would be made to keep these draftees in the service for such a time as the President might desire, and now we have before the House the May bill that extends indefinitely beyond 12 months the time of service of these draftees and the National Guard. In other words, the President, under the May bill, could keep these men in the service as long as he desired. We had been told by many of our leaders in the Army that the European war may last from 5 to 10 years. Tens of thousands of young men arranged their business, financial and other affairs, for 1 year's service. They confidently expected at the end of the year they would be discharged and returned home. These young men have been grossly deceived. Those in charge of this resolution in the House are still expressing the desire for this unlimited time of service and unlimited number of men to be called. They are beginning to realize, however, that they may not be able to secure this unlimited period of service, and these proponents may finally agree on an additional 18 months—making 2½ years of service all together instead of 1 year, but there will be a joker in that provision. It will give the President the right to hold them for one or more additional extensions of service and, in effect, would be an unlimited period of time.

I am very much opposed to increasing this service 1 month, or for any period of time. If we expect to keep up the morale of our Army and the American people, we must keep faith with these boys, their parents, and the Nation. We must not resort to deceit and subterfuge. Such acts would surely break down the morale of our Army. We got them in the Army with the understanding that they would be discharged in 1 year, and now we change without giving them an opportunity to be heard. In fact, they are threatened with prosecution and punishment if they protest.

#### THIS MEASURE UNNECESSARY

These draftees, as those in our other Army units, are patriotic. They would be willing to serve any length of time or undergo any sacrifice, even to the giving of their own lives to defend the United States and defend the Western Hemisphere insofar as its defense is necessary to protect our own country. No one dares to say there is not as much patriotism among these draftees who insist that this Nation keep its contract with them as there is in the House, the Senate, or any other group, and I am sure they are more patriotic than a lot of the interventionists, warmongers, Wall Street bankers, and munition makers who are trying to involve us in this European-Asiatic-African war for profits and other ambitious and selfish considerations, but who will not fight or have sons to offer for the sacrifice. I have been impressed by the number of old men and elderly women who will not be called to the service and who have no sons in the service, but are fanatically engaged in efforts

to get other mothers' and fathers' sons in this bloody and costly war in Europe, Asia, and Africa. I have much respect for those who urge us to enter this war who will themselves go into the battle or who have sons that will take their places at the battle front and will not seek and be given soft Government jobs. We have no business meddling in the war of Europe, Asia, and Africa. We should arm to the teeth on land, on the sea, and in the air to defend our own country and if the American people could only believe that this is the policy of this administration, there need never be any fear, because there would be more men than necessary for our Army, naval, and air forces.

It is claimed that if these draftees were released it would disband one-third or more of our Army and would greatly disrupt our Army. This certainly is not true and is not supported by the facts. It was made for the purpose of deceiving and misleading the American people. The Draft Act provides that the President can call into the service and have at all times in training 900,000 draftees; this in addition to our Regular Army, National Guard, and naval forces. Approximately 17,000,000 men registered for the draft last fall and about 1,000,000 more were registered July 1. While a year will soon have passed since we passed the Draft Act up to this time only about 600,000 draftees have been taken into the Army and are being given training. This is 300,000 less than the draft law provides. The administration has offered no reason why 300,000 more were not brought into training for 1 year under the draft and thereby bring it up to the full quota of 900,000 draftees authorized by the Draft Act. On the side we are informed by some of our Army officers and it was so stated on the floor of the Senate that we did not have the camps, materials, or equipment or provisions to take care of the additional 300,000. Yet we are called upon today to force through a bill here that will hold the draftees for an indefinite period of time beyond the year and to remove the 900,000 Draft Act restriction and make the sky the limit as to the time of service and as to the number that may be called into the service. The War Department began drafting men in November 1940. The 600,000 drafted men now in the service were not all drafted in the same month or at the same time. Some have been taken in every month beginning with November 1940; only 600,000 have been taken in during all of these months.

The Army officers say that 80 to 90 percent of these young men desire to remain in after their year has expired. If this be true there is no necessity to pass this act to force them to stay in. It is likely possible that many of these young men would continue in the service even though we did not pass this act. Of course the year of the first draft will expire November 1941. If all went out November 1941 that went in November 1940 there would only be 13,000; 5,000 in December 1941, and 73,000 in January 1942, and 90,000 February 1942, and so on. In no month would there be a sufficient number of men go out to mate-

rially disturb an army of 1,500,000 men. The Army now has the right to call in 300,000 more draftees and that would almost cover all men that would go out in November, December, January, February, March, April, May, and June, 1942, and as these went out the Army could call in a like number of men to take their places so that we would have at all times 900,000 draftees in training.

It is suggested that we could not train our soldiers in 12 months. In the last World War young men were trained and put into the service as officers in 3 months and thousands upon thousands of young Americans were put into the battle line before they had been in the service for as long as 4 months. If we can train and make officers in 3 months we certainly ought to train privates in 12 months. Sergeant York, the great World War hero, had only been in the service a little over 10 months when he performed his great feat of heroism on Flanders field.

After the World War under the Treaty of Versailles Germany was not permitted to have more than 100,000 men in her army. She had short periods of training. She would train one group for a short period of time and let them out and place them in the reserve and then call in another group and in this way Hitler did much to build up his mighty war machine. If we train 900,000 each year and let them out and place them in the Reserve and then call in another group we would have a great reserve force of trained men in this country able to defend this Nation in case we were attacked. No good reason has been offered or can be offered for keeping one group of young men in for 2½ years or longer. If a young man is so inept that he cannot receive all the training necessary to become a good soldier in 12 months he should be turned out because of his lack of aptitude for training and get somebody in his place who has the intelligence and aptitude to make a good soldier.

General Marshall, Chief of Staff, stated in his testimony about 1 year ago that we only needed about 500,000 well-trained, well-equipped men to defend this country and he said we needed not more than 1,750,000 to defend our country and all of our possessions and the Western Hemisphere. He says he strongly opposes this Nation sending our boys to fight in Europe, Asia, or Africa. Under the present law governing our Army, National Guard, Reserve officers, and draftees, and increase of our air reserve we now have approximately 1,750,000 men and if we call in the additional 300,000 draftees authorized by the present draft law we would have more than 2,000,000 men and there is no excuse for keeping these draftees in the service beyond 12 months. It can be seen at once that we would build up a stronger military force in this country by constantly increasing the Regular Army and air force and training 900,000 young men every year and adding them to the Reserve to be called in the event of war.

Of course, many of us believe it is the purpose of the Administration to become an active belligerent and engage in a shooting war on the side of Great Britain

in the European, Asiatic, and African war, and they have extended the time and removed the 900,000 limitation in order to build up a great expeditionary force. I believe that is their purpose, and that is another reason why I strongly oppose this measure. It is suggested that we have sent these draftees to remote places to our Army posts and it would disrupt the Army to call them back again in 12 months. Practically every soldier in Panama, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippines, and Alaska and Iceland are Regular soldiers and are not draftees, and would not be affected by the 12-month limitation. A few draftees have been sent to the Hawaiian Islands and the Philippine Islands. They constitute almost a negligible number compared to the Regulars at those posts. But why did they send these draftees to these remote places when they knew the law provided for 12 months' service. They wanted to use that as an excuse to change the draft law and break faith with the American people. The truth about it, and General Marshall admitted it and so did Chairman May in their debate that politics caused the 12-month limitation to be written into the law last year. The election was on. They wanted to get the draft law through and they wanted to sugar-coat it with a 12-month term and deceive the American people, secure their votes and win the election. Those in authority no doubt had it in mind when the Draft Act was passed to do the very thing they are doing now. Many of us urged a year ago this would be done, and it is now being done. The American people in the last few years have been deceived in so many ways by the President and his associates, and the faith of the people has been so shaken that we could do nothing better now to strengthen the faith of these boys, their fathers and mothers, and raise the morale of our fighting forces than vote this resolution down and have our country stick to its contract.

WHO, WHEN, AND WHERE ARE WE TO FIGHT, IF AT ALL?

The question arises, Who, if anyone, when, and where are we to fight? If these questions were answered, we could better determine the size and extent of our Army and equipment. General Marshall said we need about 500,000 well-trained, well-equipped men to defend the United States and all her possessions, and we would not need over 1,750,000 to defend the Western Hemisphere, and we certainly have no business in being in any war, except in defense of our own country and our possessions, and the Western Hemisphere.

The President and the Congress have announced that they favor the Monroe Doctrine. The Monroe Doctrine means that we will not meddle in the domestic and political affairs of Europe, Asia, and Africa, and we will not permit them to meddle in the affairs of the United States and the Western Hemisphere. Neither Germany, Italy, nor Japan has laid the weight of a straw on any American citizen or his rights. Neither have they attacked or threatened to attack the United States, or any of our possessions, or the Western Hemisphere. No country wants to take on the United States in any war. Ger-



many got her fill of the United States in the last war.

The policy of this administration to interfere and meddle and undertake to control the countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa is our real danger. It is not our policy. We have no foreign policy. We are merely saying "me too" to the policy of Great Britain. President Roosevelt, many members of his Cabinet, and other leaders in his administration, international bankers and munition workers have insisted that the war over in Europe is our war, and our first line of defense is—any place on the face of the earth.

Under the lend-lease-give-away bill, which I opposed, the President was given unlimited power with almost unlimited resources to meddle with the domestic and political affairs of every country in the world and to carry on undeclared wars in every part of the globe, and he is doing that very thing. We butt into every scrap that Great Britain wants us to butt into. There has never been a great nation in all the history of the world that has been so completely possessed by another nation as has our country been during the last 18 months by Great Britain. The President has attempted to tie us hand and foot to defend the British Empire on every part of the globe, and that will bring to this Nation plenty of grief. I should like very much to see Great Britain win. However, my first interest is in the United States. We should not in our partiality for any nation involve this Nation in a shooting war in Europe, Asia, and Africa. We should take no steps for any nation that would involve us in that war. Our Army, Navy, and air force should be used only in defense of this country.

Great Britain has been served through the centuries by loyal and able statesmen. She started in the year A. D. 1170 with only 50,000 square miles. She at that time did not have control of Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. She took Ireland and Wales by conquest. Through all of these centuries Great Britain has added large territories to her possessions, so that today the British flag waves over and she has control of more than 16,000,000 square miles, which is more than one-fourth of the earth's surface. She has one-fourth of the earth's population—500,000,000; 430,000,000 of these are subject people. She has already increased her territory in the present war by more than 1,000,000 square miles. Where there are two islands in the Seven Seas, Great Britain either has one, or both of them. The deposed kings and emperors of many countries of Europe have now found refuge in London. Great Britain is tied up with all of them, and our President has attempted to tie us up with all of them and their wars. Great Britain has a million more square miles in the Western Hemisphere than we have, and by reason of the location of this vast territory in the Western Hemisphere, we must by necessity defend it in order to defend ourselves. The United States is the only country in the world that has raised a hand to defend the British Empire in this war. Other countries have fought for a time, and Russia is now

fighting, not because of her desire to defend the British Empire, but they fought when and only when they were attacked.

Why has not Great Britain more friends among the nations of the earth? A study of her history for 900 years shows that she has taken territory and important rights from every country in the world through the many wars that have been fought in Europe, Asia, and Africa, except the United States, and we had to fight and defeat her twice in order to be free. From '61 to '65 Great Britain tried to divide our Republic. Britain is a jealous country. She cannot bear to see any other country approach her in political, economic, or commercial prestige.

Our President talks about freedom of the seas. Great Britain has never favored freedom of any sea for any nation except herself. We have placed troops in Iceland, not to defend our own country, because no one has threatened us, or our rights, on land or sea. Iceland is 2,500 miles away from our shores. It is a few hundred miles from Europe's shores. Britain wanted us to do it and we did it. The President did not consult Congress or the American people about sending our boys to Iceland. A part of our fleet is now off the coast of Australia, and near the Dutch East Indies, five or six thousand miles away from our western shores. Britain owns a great deal of the East Indies. Our Navy and our men are there to protect and defend the British Empire. A number of our bombers and fighting planes and men are now at Singapore on the Malay Peninsula in Asia, on the shore of the South China Sea. We have no possessions there. These American soldiers and sailors are there to protect the British Empire. We have ships and men on the Red Sea, more than 12,000 miles from New York. Our ships, planes, guns, and men are being sent whenever Great Britain demands it—not to protect and defend the United States and the Western Hemisphere, but to uphold and preserve the British Empire.

Britain still owes us nearly \$6,000,000,000 she got in the last World War. This great debt she has repudiated. We have already given her \$7,000,000,000 more, with a billion or two dollars of supplies and war equipment. Of course, they are not going to pay it back. In a few weeks Congress will be called upon to vote another \$7,000,000,000 to Russia and Great Britain. What for? To protect and maintain the British Empire and Stalin and his bloody regime. Our equipment and money are now being used to help Russia hold the territory that she took from Finland, Latvia, Esthonia, Lithuania, and Rumania. We hear a lot of talk now from the President about taking possession of part of Africa, the Azores, Cape Verde, Canary, and other islands from Portugal and Spain. All of these are many, many thousands of miles away from our shores. If we carry out these pledges of the President to preserve the British Empire, then our front lines will be as the President says, "on any and every sea and in every country." With these pledges that our President has made to preserve the British Empire, in

order to carry them out it is necessary to break faith with our American boys and to give the President authority to call into the service an unlimited number of the young men of this country. It is because of these conditions that the industrial life of this Nation must be entirely changed by reason of priorities of materials and other considerations. A high administration spokesman, Hon. Leon Henderson, says that 5,000 factories not engaged in war production must go out of business and 2,000,000 workers thrown out of employment. It is for these reasons, also, that the House, the other day passed the greatest tax bill that was ever passed by this Nation or any other nation in peace or in war in 50 centuries of the world's history. It is for these reasons that there has already been forced through Congress appropriations and contractual authority more than \$55,000,000,000 in the name of national defense. This huge sum is 60 percent more than the entire cost to this Nation of the other World War, and the American people have seen nothing yet of taxes. They will soon wake up to find the national debt \$100,000,000,000.

For some time certain Englishmen and Americans have been urging a union of the United States and Great Britain. Our forefathers made us an independent Nation. Are we again to become a colony or a dominion of the British Empire? It is now urged that the United States and Great Britain must police and control the entire world after the war. This will mean that we must control more than a billion people. What vast military and naval establishments will be necessary for this purpose, and what a tremendous burden will be thrown upon the backs of the American people. If our destinies continue to be tied up with the British Empire, it means we join the endless wars of Europe, Asia, and Africa. It means through the coming years millions of American boys must sacrifice and give their lives in foreign lands and on foreign seas. It means an unbearable tax burden on all our people, rich and poor alike. It means bankruptcy and ruin. Worst of all it means we must give up our freedom and become a great militaristic nation. The only way we can get into this war is to butt into it. We can expect to get nothing out of it except blood, tears, bankruptcy, and ruin. Mark my words, Great Britain will come out of this war with at least another million square miles of territory added to her world-wide Empire.

This measure before the House to keep these boys in the service and remove the limitation of 900,000 is just another step in a great scheme to involve us in this ghastly and bloody World War. Shall American taxpayers, the tears of American fathers and mothers, and the blood of American boys underwrite for centuries to come the British Empire? We are keeping our draftees in the service and sending them to foreign lands. Canada, Australia, and other British Dominions, with the exception of one, has a draft law of about 4 months for home service, and they receive much larger pay than American boys. They cannot be sent out of Canada, Australia,

or other Dominions to fight for the British Empire except on their own free will and voluntarily; and we are now and will continue to finance the British Empire and keep our boys in the draft. There can be no justification for this bill, and I strongly and vigorously oppose it. I pray this administration may give more consideration to our own country and our own people.

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

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, House Joint Resolution 222, in its provisions, proposes to extend the period of training for the men drafted in the Army under the Selective Service Act, otherwise known as the Conscription Act, for a period longer than 1 year, and for such periods of time as may be necessary in the interest of national defense.

General Marshall, less than a year ago, informed the Military Affairs Committee of the House that with 480,000 men, fully equipped and well trained, no nation on earth could land a hostile army corps on our shores, even though they held command of the sea.

I voted against the conscription bill. I believed, when the bill was before the House of Representatives, that it proposed to substitute a policy of compulsion for patriotism. Our ancestors fled Europe to escape that policy and its fruits. Compulsory military training has never saved the countries of Europe from the ravages of war.

The Conscription Act took nearly a million and a half young men out of their homes, from their firesides and families and friends, out of their normal life, and forced them into military camps and training. They became parties to an understanding with their Government to serve 1 year under the most rigid restrictions and discipline, for subsistence and a nominal allowance in money.

They had confidence and faith that their Government would carry out its part of the agreement with them. They are in the Army now. They are in uniform. They have done their duty. They have carried out their part of the understanding. The time is near at hand when their term of service will expire. The United States Government, not at war, fixed the period of training at 1 year. Canada, a belligerent, and at war, fixed the period of compulsory training of her young men for home defense at 4 months, and then sends them back into civil life. All foreign service—for those Canadian boys—is on a basis of voluntary enlistment. On what grounds, or for what reasons, does the Government of the United States now say to its young men: "We will not keep faith with you; we will break our part of the agreement, no matter how sacred it may be. You must remain in the Army, although we are at peace with the world?"

No one in authority, including the President of the United States, has indicated how long these boys will be asked to remain in the service or where they will be sent to serve.

Events have happened in the world since the Conscription Act went into effect, and the United States, in its foreign

policy, has taken steps which have edged us a little nearer to the brink of war, but no nation thus far has even threatened to attack us, much less invade us.

We are not a neutral Nation. We have committed many acts of hostility sufficient to embroil us in war if the nation or nations against whom they have been committed chose to take up the challenge.

Unless the President and high officials of the armed forces of this Nation are willing to make known to the American people that we do face imminent danger of war, and inform our people that we are threatened with attack or invasion, and say frankly what that danger is, or whence a threatened attack or invasion is expected to come, certainly there can be no ground or sound reason for breaking faith with the young men of America and violating one of the most sacred agreements ever made by our Government—the Selective Service Act.

To demand that the draftees now in the military camps of this Nation remain under military discipline for a period longer than 1 year would be a tragic mistake and would do more to destroy the confidence and morale of the armed forces of this country than anything else.

We must remember, also, another exceedingly important point. Let us not forget that the patriotism and loyalty of soldiers—the morale or esprit d'corps—are as essential to an efficient and successful army as the equipment which we are furnishing at a cost of billions of dollars to the taxpayers. To destroy the patriotism, the faith in their Government, the confidence in the pledged word of high Governmental officials, the morale, the esprit d'corps of the soldiers by violating this solemn and sacred understanding with them will be to destroy that vitally essential morale which must prevail in our armed forces if they are to give their best and do their best in defense of their Nation, should defense become necessary.

Let us now look at another point. The question of short-term enlistments is not something that is determined by any events which have taken place or which may take place anywhere else in the world. The question of short-term enlistments has been a fundamental, elementary military question since the days when General Washington commanded the Revolutionary forces. In the Revolutionary War, in the War of 1812, in the Mexican War, in the Civil War, the question of short-term enlistments arose. Military history is filled with instances in which masses of men left the Army—actually in time of battle—because their enlistments had expired. Military studies abound in discussions of the effect of short-term enlistments in great numbers upon the Army under any given condition. If General Marshall knows now that to release these conscripted men, in accordance with the understanding, at the end of a year's training period, would be a "national tragedy" and "unthinkable," he must have known that fact a year ago when the Draft Act was being discussed in committees of the Congress. If he did know it, he kept silent then, knowing that it must arise as a fundamental problem when the end of the

year's training for these conscripted men approached. If he did not know it, then he was unfit to be the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, or else, if it was not true a year ago, it is not true now.

The President of the United States has full access to the advice of the best military experts in the world, graduates of West Point, men on whom the taxpayers of the United States have spent millions of dollars to educate as responsible specialists in the national defense. Having access to that advice, if the President did not get it, something is dreadfully and drastically wrong with the officers and personnel of the Army. And, too, something was dreadfully awry with the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of the Nation. If the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, knows now that it would be an outrage, or a national tragedy, to let these men go at the end of their 12-month term of training, he must have known it a year ago, because it was just as much of a fundamental elementary military problem then as it possibly could be now. If the Commander in Chief of the armed forces did not know this a year ago, or if it was not true a year ago, he could not know it now, because it would not be true now.

Now, Mr. Chairman, General Marshall and the rest of the high military commanders, and the President of the United States may take their choice of either of these positions. It must be obvious to all fair-minded men that whichever proposition they assume will place them in the position they ask this Congress to assume, namely, of knowingly betraying the confidence of the fathers, and the mothers, and the brothers, and the sisters, and the wives, and the children, of the conscripted soldiers, and of the soldiers themselves.

To destroy faith and confidence, these most essential qualities in the breast of the American soldier, is to destroy the high requisite standard of a powerful fighting force. Such an act would shame the Stars and Stripes. Such an act would be the betrayal of the men who march under it and hold it aloft in freedom's breeze. Honor and loyalty to the Nation demand that this Government and the Congress of the United States and the President, keep faith with the people and particularly with those who have been called to defend this last citadel of freedom, our beloved Republic of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, let us not do this thing. Let us keep faith with these boys. Let us stand by the agreement. Let us again give notice to the world that the promise of the Government of the United States is as good as its bond. If we do not keep the solemn promises of the Government, the day will come when its bonds will be trusted by our citizens no further than its broken promises.

The danger to our national safety or security is no greater now than it was when the Conscription Act was passed. The national interest is not imperiled. No convincing evidence has been submitted from which anyone can come to that conclusion. If our national security is imperiled, then it is the duty of the President of the United States and the mili-



tary leaders of our country to make it known to the American people, who must defend it with their treasure and their blood.

The Army will not disintegrate by discharging the soldiers at the end of 1 year. It will be destroyed if we break faith with the young manhood of America.

For these reasons, I believe it to be a grave national mistake to enact this legislation, and, therefore, I shall vote against it.

If the national interest is imperiled, then the responsibility rests upon the President and high Government officials to furnish the evidence and submit it to the representatives of the people who are called upon to make a most solemn decision. If we cannot be entrusted with the facts, then no blame can attach to the Members of the House if a wrong decision is made. A million and a half young men are eagerly awaiting that decision, right or wrong. They are soon to learn whether or not their Government, our Government, is a Government of principle, a Government of character, or whether it is willing to break faith and fail—perhaps the first time in its history—to carry out its solemn pledge.

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

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I feel it my responsibility in the few minutes allotted me to rise and speak for the fathers and mothers of this country who were told a year ago that their sons were needed for military training and who were assured that training for a year was the answer to the problem of preparing the land forces. The statements made at the time the Conscription Act was under consideration by the Congress were taken by the people of this country to be true declarations and promises and by asking for an extension of service of the selectees we would most assuredly be breaking faith with them.

The question of the extent of the peril of this Nation is indeed confusing to most people as well as to Members of Congress and the feeling that the greatest peril lies within this very country is ever increasing. We have seen our national-defense program molested by communistic activities, we have seen Communists coddled in various responsible branches of our Government. A year ago Communist Russia was an ally of Germany against Finland. Today England is allied with Russia against Germany and the United States is about to furnish implements of death and destruction to Communist Russia in the name of the "four freedoms." It has been well said that the danger to democracy is here, not abroad. That need of the "four freedoms" is in our native land and that despite the fact that there were not many millions in our country when our liberties were gained the multitudes that we now have can, with difficulty, retain the freedoms our fathers won for us.

Yes, indeed, the peril from within is daily growing. This country is honeycombed with war refugees and many foreign agents are in Washington seeking to influence legislation and evidently

to assist in a program to prepare the American people emotionally and materially for war.

To offset these activities, do you not think that if the 600,000 young men now in training were allowed to return home and take up their places in the defense program in our shops and factories and on our farms that they would have a stabilizing influence in curtailing subversive activities and averting strikes in industries vital for national defense?

Do you not think that these 600,000 young men who have made the sacrifice of having spent a year in training for the small wage of \$21 a month could not influence the people in their communities to assume their just share of the sacrifice necessary for our national-defense program?

All of the forces for war, although they may be said to be few in number, are using every possible effort to throw our country into disorder and to drag us into war by one means or another.

I am reminded here of an old Negro spiritual, *Keep A-Inching Along*, the words of which song when written:

Keep a-inching along, keep a-inching along,  
War will come by and by;  
Keep a-inching along like a poor inchworm,  
War will come by and by.

And this truly expresses the spirit of the war party.

We have watched with grave concern the provocative steps taken by this administration which are moving this Nation closer to a shooting war, notwithstanding the fact that the vast majority of our people have used every means of expressing their opposition. The question today is not whether the people will stand by the President in this emergency but will the President keep his promises and stand by the majority of the people in their effort to stay out of war? In view of past events the people may well ask the meaning of the extension of the draft. What conclusion can be drawn from the demand for the violation of the promise made to the thousands of young men now in training? Can we afford to break faith with them? Would we not, indeed, be taking a far greater risk in breaking our promises to them than we would in the possible risk of a dictator? The selectees in service have been silenced, but their fathers and mothers have spoken, and it is our duty to heed their demands and to keep our promises.

The people of America are fully united in a program for national defense. We have a mandate from the people who believe in building an impregnable defense for this country in planes, guns, tanks, and ships that they may continue in their pursuit of the democratic way of a free independent America, and ours is the duty to carry out that mandate.

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

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, in registering my opposition to this resolution, whose purpose is to add indefinitely to the terms of service of the National Guard, selectees, and Reserve officers who have been drawn into the Federal Army in the past year, I am not unmind-

ful of considerations urged by proponents of the measure. It seems to me that as a matter of good faith to those who believed at the time of their induction into the Army they were being called for only 1 year the compact under which they entered the service should be respected. To pass this resolution in the form reported by the Committee on Military Affairs and retain the men in the Army beyond the period prescribed for their training would be such a violation of that compact that it would be resented, not only by those compelled to remain in the service but also by millions of our people who regard fair play and common justice as essential to that national unity about which so much is being said at this time.

Clearly it was the purpose of the Selective Training and Service Act at the time of its passage, about a year ago, to select and train in the Army not more than 900,000 men for a period of 12 months only, in addition to the National Guard and Reserves. That purpose was plainly stated at the time. After that period of training, those who received it were to be permitted to return to their homes and become a part of the Army reserves, subject to being called for active duty should the Nation become imperiled by invasion or otherwise.

Now all the promises made to all the people as to the purposes of the Selective Training and Service Act by the Chief of Staff and others of the War Department and by others in high positions are sought to be disregarded. When that act was passed the emergency which called it forth was apparent. Also it was apparent even then that there was small chance of the international situation becoming much less dangerous within the year. The provisions of the act and its purposes were set forth fully in view of that situation. Not until within the past 4 months has the idea been promulgated by widespread propaganda that the term of service should be extended, possibly for a year, as this resolution would authorize and permit.

The Army now numbers 1,476,000 men. Had the War Department called the additional men authorized by the act, there would have been 300,000 more under arms. The claim is made that some 3,000 selectees sent to Alaska and the Philippines will have to be recalled unless Congress passes this resolution, thus disrupting our Federal forces. Why men drawn into the service since November last to serve only 1 year, and without previous military training, should have been sent to such distant points is best known to those who sent them there. It seems evident, however, that the situation must have been known to those who issued the orders, and who are now responsible for any "disruption" their discharge from the Army would cause.

Congress is accustomed to claims of "national peril" when military measures are before it. In times like the present it may be said that the whole world is imperiled by the ruthless march of war-mad dictators. But Congress has dealt liberally with every phase of national defense. It has appropriated billions in providing for the necessary armament to protect our country under any and all

circumstances. It has done all that could be done to guard against the perils which exist and those which may arise. It also has passed the Selective Training Act to insure an army of such size and efficiency to defeat any or all attacks. That act provides not only for the present but for the future. It would authorize an army reserve of not less than 4,000,000 men.

It has kept faith with the people, who rightfully demand the fullest measure of protection for our country and its institutions. It should also keep faith with the young men whom it has called into uniform. Every promise made to them should be fulfilled as completely as has been the promise of effective national defense. If there are "weasel words" in the original act which qualified the promises a year ago unknown to those who responded to the call to service and realized only by those responsible, such words should not be an inducement to Congress to repudiate the compact which meant a year of service in 1940 and which still mean a year of service, and no more, now.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with this resolution so far as it provides for the retention in service of National Guardsmen and Reservists, if a proper limit is placed upon their service, but so far as it applies to men inducted under the Selective Service Act, I am opposed to it. I feel that certain sections of the resolution are objectionable so far as all groups are concerned.

When, almost a year ago, we took an unprecedented step and provided for compulsory military training and service in peacetime, we did not say that under no circumstances would we continue the period of training beyond 12 months. In this respect, therefore, there was no unconditional contract as between Congress and selectees under the act. But we did say, in clear and unmistakable terms, that the 12-month period of training would be extended only if Congress, and Congress alone, decreed that the national interest was imperiled. From this it is perfectly clear that we meant that the extension would take place only if the Nation were faced with greater peril than it faced at the time the act was passed. To this extent we imposed upon ourselves a moral responsibility which transcends even legal responsibility that we would not extend the training period beyond 1 year unless we believed, on good and sufficient evidence, that our national danger had increased. In determining the existence of national peril I submit it is for us to act upon the facts presented to us and not upon the opinion of others, however sincere those opinions might appear to be. To delegate to others the power to weigh the evidence and determine our peril would be an unwarranted delegation of our responsibility and the Nation will so construe it.

Though we are by law the judges of the facts we have been told that it would not be in the public interest for the American people or Congress to know the facts. Obviously, if we are threatened with peril,

the threat comes only from our potential enemies who certainly know of their own plans. Under the circumstances it is rather difficult for us to understand why we should not be given the opportunity to judge the question of our peril, particularly when the founding fathers considered it safe enough to vest solely in Congress the extraordinary power to declare war.

I know it may be contended that some information cannot be disclosed because it involves military secrets, but I submit to you that any peril to this Nation comes from only one source, and that is Hitler or his allies. If it comes from Hitler, he knows about it. If he knows about it I know of no reason why the Members of this House and the American people should not also know about it.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I could not resist yielding to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. MAY. I would like to say for the information of the gentleman—perhaps he did not know about it—that after General Marshall testified in executive session, first 3 hours openly, then 2 hours in executive session, as he requested, his testimony in executive session has been printed.

Mr. ELSTON. It is true that some of his testimony has been printed for the benefit of the Members of the House. If the Members have read it I am sure they will not find any specific evidence recorded therein which will justify us in saying that we are in greater peril today than we were a year ago.

The question of extending the period of training and service must be answered by Congress, and Congress alone. Had we intended it to be answered by the President or by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Chief of Staff, we would have said so when the Conscription Act was passed. Should we now let these officials, or any of them, decide the question for us, we have not only evaded a responsibility but we have perpetrated a fraud upon the young men who have been inducted or who have registered for training and service under the belief that we meant what we said a year ago.

Although the President and our Chief of Staff, General Marshall, express the opinion that our danger is greater today than it was a year ago, they offer no tangible evidence in support of their contentions. A comparison of conditions a year ago and now shows that both Great Britain and the United States are infinitely better off than they were when the Conscription Act was passed. A year ago we had almost 300,000 men in the military service. Today we have more than a million and a half. Of this number 669,500 are selectees, about 340,000 are guardsmen and officers, and the remainder members of the Regular Army. A year ago France had recently collapsed and the retreat from Dunkerque was fresh in our memories. It was expected that Hitler would soon attempt to invade the British Isles. Defense production had scarcely started in this country and we were giving no aid to Great Britain. Our Army was without modern weapons and there was no pros-

pect of obtaining them soon. Today we are furnishing, or will soon furnish, England with war matériel worth billions of dollars. Production in both countries has increased enormously. Germany, on the other hand, is deeply troubled by Russia, who was looked upon as her ally a year ago. Italy has shown more weakness than was expected. Invasion of the British Isles becomes more remote as the months pass by.

In his speech to Parliament a few days ago, Mr. Churchill said that Germany's air superiority "has been broken"; that Britain is slowly "but impressively" forging ahead in the battle of the Atlantic, aided by production far in excess of the World War period. Mr. Churchill indicated that the Nile Valley "is much safer"; that Britain's strength has developed, and that she is progressing on all fronts, in part due to American aid; that she has doubled her bomb discharge on Germany, will double it again in 3 months, and redouble it in the following 6 months.

A few days ago a former British Cabinet member, Alfred Duff Cooper, upon arrival in this country said:

The spirit of the people is good. The only criticism is that they are overoptimistic. Things are going very well in every direction. Great Britain is getting the full flow of American production. The material sent us has proved of enormous advantage.

A year ago there was no optimism in Great Britain. It exists today only because the people of that country believe that their peril has been greatly reduced.

While no one familiar with the facts would seek to discount the power of the Nazi machine or would suggest for a moment slackening the defense effort on all fronts, it must be admitted that Mr. Churchill's optimism is not without foundation.

It has been urged that if selectees are permitted to go home in accordance with existing law, the Army will disintegrate. In passing upon this question, as we would pass upon the question of our peril, let us resort to facts and not rely upon mere statements. The President, in his message to Congress, said:

If two-thirds of our present Army return to civilian life, it will be almost a year before the effective Army strength again reaches 1,000,000 men.

This statement, I am sure we will all agree, is misleading, particularly if National Guard men and other reserve components of the Army remain in the service. As it is apparently conceded that guardsmen and other reserve groups should remain in the service, let us consider what will actually occur if the law is unchanged so far as selectees are concerned.

General Marshall has testified before the Senate and House Military Affairs Committees that he can defend the entire Western Hemisphere and all our possessions, including the bases recently acquired from Great Britain, with 1,700,000 men. The strength of the Regular Army is now more than half a million men. It is contemplated that this number will be increased in the near future by approximately 150,000. We have provided for an additional 152,000



for the Air Corps. This will increase the strength of the Regular Army, including the Air Corps, to more than 800,000 men. Add to this number the National Guard and other reserve groups now in the service and we have an Army of more than 1,200,000 men, without selectees. On the basis of these figures not more than 500,000 selectees would be required to make up the army of 1,700,000 desired by General Marshall. Should we continue to rotate the training of selectees and use the full 900,000 which the present act permits, there would always be a surplus of 400,000 men, and we would be preserving the system of training which we were informed a year ago was so highly desirable, and so necessary in order to build up a big reserve civilian army. It should be manifest to all of us that if we are to freeze into the service the selectees already chosen, it will mark a change of policy announced at the time the Conscription Act was passed, and the abandonment of a plan for the training of civilians. Pass this act and you will destroy that plan.

Section 2 of the resolution before us vests in the President the power to extend the period of service of selectees and all reserve groups, including the National Guard, for as long as he sees fit, limited only by the right of Congress to revoke such power by concurrent resolution. Reserving unto ourselves the right to revoke power by concurrent resolution is no excuse for delegating power that should never have been delegated in the first place. Limiting the time of service to 30 months and, at the same time, making the sky the limit so far as the number of selectees is concerned is a compromise in name only, if perchance it is not a clear evasion of a constitutional requirement. Article I, section 8, of the Constitution vests exclusively in Congress the power "to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces." It may be seriously questioned that we are keeping within that mandate if we make the sky the limit and extend the period of training and service to 2½ years.

It is a simple matter to provide for the retention in service of the National Guard and other reserve groups, and to definitely fix their time of service. As to selectees, no additional legislation is necessary in order to continue them in the service for 1 year. In the so-called National Guard Act—Public Resolution 96, Seventy-sixth Congress—we gave to the President the right to call into the service any reserve component of the Army for a period not to exceed 12 months. In that act we fixed a limit not only upon the time of service but we also fixed a time limit within which men could be called out by the President for that limited service. Section 3 (c) of the Selective Service Act provides that all selectees, upon the completion of a 12-month training period, shall automatically become members of a reserve group liable for training and service for an additional 10 years, or until the selectee reached the age of 45 years whichever occurs first. In the same section, provision was made that persons within such reserve group could be called for

further service under existing or subsequent law. Public Resolution 96 then existed and still exists, and it is conceded by the War Department that under it the President may, at any time before June 30, 1942, call out selectees who have completed their 12-month period of training for an additional period of 1 year.

As the President has already been given the power to keep selectees in the service for an additional 12 months, what possible excuse exists for further legislation upon the subject prior to June 30, 1942? Why should Congress do something which Congress has already empowered the President to do? The President may find it a disagreeable responsibility to order selectees to remain in the service for another year, but the fact remains that he may do so without further action on our part. If the time limitation of 12 months provided for in that resolution is insufficient, the time to say so is when June 30, 1942, is near at hand, and not now.

It has been contended frequently during this debate that 12 months is an insufficient period of time in which to train a soldier. If you will examine the hearings you will find that the military experts who have testified do not agree on this. Many are seated here today who can attest, by personal experience, to what was accomplished during the World War by men who trained less than 12 months. A few days ago Washington was visited by World War hero No. 1, Sgt. Alvin York. Sergeant York became the outstanding hero of the World War when in the battle of the Argonne, with a Springfield rifle and an automatic revolver he killed 20 Germans compelled the surrender of 132 of the enemy, including a major and 3 lieutenants, and captured 35 machine guns. For the purpose of this resolution Sergeant York would probably be considered insufficiently trained, as he performed his great feat only 10 months and 21 days after he was inducted into the service. Whittlesey's famous lost battalion was made up almost entirely of draftees very few of whom could have had more than 1 year of training and service. As a matter of fact, during the World War we declared war, raised and trained an Army of several million men, transported them overseas, and gave sufficient help to win the war, all in less than 1 year and 7 months. It was September 5, 1917, before the first draftee entered the service and began to train, approximately 14 months before the Armistice. Some draftees found themselves in the trenches within 30 days after being called.

When we passed the Selective Service Act we were assured that a maximum limitation of 900,000 selectees in training and service in any 1 year was desirable. Now it is sought to remove that limitation through section 6. If section 6 should become law there would be no limitation. I have already given you figures which indicate that when the Air Corps is filled up and the Regular Army increased to where the War Department wants it, no more than 500,000 selectees would be required to make up the Army of 1,700,000 which General Marshall assures us is sufficient to defend the Western Hemisphere

and all of our possessions and bases. Why then the lifting of the 900,000 limitation? I have heard no evidence that would justify it, and if you will search the hearings I do not believe you will find any. To date we have called up almost 670,000 selectees, and have an Army of over one and a half million men. If we called up all of the selectees now authorized by law we would have an Army of 1,800,000. When the Air Corps is completed and we add 150,000 to the Regular Army, we will have an Army of approximately 2,100,000 men. Under such conditions, is it necessary to make the sky the limit if our purpose is only to defend the Western Hemisphere and our possessions and bases?

In this connection let us indulge in a few figures with a view to determining what our manpower will be over the next year and a half if we make no change in existing law so far as selectees are concerned. I have just pointed out that when all selectees allowed by law are called for training we will have an Army of approximately 2,100,000 men. We will have that Army by November of this year when the first selectees in the service begin to go home or very shortly thereafter. As selectees will be released in the order in which they were called, it follows as a matter of simple mathematics that the selectees who leave the service in November will constitute but six-tenths of 1 percent of our entire Army; less than three-tenths of 1 percent in December; approximately 3½ percent in January; a little more than 4 percent in February, and slightly more than 7 percent in March, which was the month in which the greatest number of selectees have been called thus far. If we were to assume that all of the 900,000 selectees authorized by law were to be released uniformly, 75,000 would go home each month. This would constitute but 3½ percent of the total Army. If 3½ men out of every 100 cannot be replaced every 30 days without disrupting our Army, there is something decidedly wrong with Army management. If it will disrupt our Army to replace 3½ men out of every 100 every 30 days while we are in the process of training them, what are we going to do if our Army goes into action?

If all selectees are called before next November they will all be in a reserve group by November 1942. By that time we will have trained an additional 900,000 men, thus giving us an Army of 3,000,000 men, or 1,300,000 more than are needed to defend the entire Western Hemisphere and our possessions.

In view of these facts what possible reason can exist for lifting present limitations if an A. E. F. is not in contemplation by someone? Let us not forget that when the President first suggested the retention of selectees, guardsmen, and reservists in the service beyond 1 year, he also asked that the provision of the law limiting their service to the Western Hemisphere be lifted. In the face of overwhelming opposition throughout the country that suggestion was withdrawn—but only for the time being. Pass section 6 and you will take the first step toward the creation of an A. E. F., and make no mistake about it.

It may also be the last step. I believe it was the President who recently said at a press conference that the line between the Eastern and Western Hemispheres is an imaginary one. We are already occupying Iceland and it is not in the Western Hemisphere. Congress was not even consulted about it. By the same process we may also occupy bases in Ireland or Great Britain, or even the Azores, the Cape Verde Islands, or Dakar. It would not take a vote of Congress to carry out these expeditions. The passage of this resolution is all that would be needed. If you favor going to war and fighting anywhere in the world, it may only be necessary that you vote for this resolution. If, on the other hand, you are interested solely in the defense of the United States, your only safe course is to vote against it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS].

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, this morning I received a letter in my mail on the pending bill warning me to be careful of my political scalp; warning me to take into consideration what would happen to me politically if I voted for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know when I received a shock equal to this since I have been a Member of Congress. To think that any man who is a Member of this body would take into consideration and weigh against the security of his Nation whether or not he was going to be returned to the House of Representatives. My God, what have we come to? To what depths have we sunk, when a man will consider his own political welfare before the welfare of the Nation? What kind of a soldier would a man like that make? What kind of a legislator must he be? I would rather be dead and in my grave. I hope those who will be swayed by any considerations of their political future will be few.

Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the legislation before us we must take into account what this legislation will do for the Nation. We are not enacting this legislation for the benefit of any individual. We are enacting it to provide for the security of the United States. That question must be paramount above any other consideration. When we took these men into service under the terms of the Selective Service Act, we did not take them into the service to provide for their future as individuals; we took them into the service to provide an army for the use of this Nation in assuring our national security. When we did so, we did so with the intention of training them until they would be soldiers in a team; not individual soldiers, because the day of the individual soldier passed with the passing of the knight in armor on horseback. From that day on down to the present day the soldier has been a man in a team. If he is to render any service to the Nation, if he is to protect himself throughout his career as a soldier, he must be trained as one of a team. In any other capacity he will be indeed but cannon fodder.

Mr. Chairman, the most humiliating chapters of our military history have

been brought on because of the refusal of the legislative branch of the Government to listen to the advice of the men in the Army and the Navy, who know their business, and to provide men for the Army and the Navy in times of peril with long enough terms of enlistment so that they may be of use to the Nation.

Anyone who is acquainted with the military history of this Nation must see time and time and time again instances where men with short-term enlistments have jeopardized the security of the Nation, have suffered unnecessary and severe loss of life, and have failed to accomplish the purpose for which an army is formed.

Washington struggled throughout 8 years of the Revolutionary War with this piecemeal policy. Men in the War of 1812 sat on the American side of the border, watched the Regulars on the Canadian side being defeated and would not cross to go to their assistance because they were not enlisted to go out of the Nation. Scott, in the Mexican War in 1848, lay for 3 months inactive in his invasion of Mexico because most of his volunteers had gone home, their time having expired. McDowell's men going to the first Battle of Manassas passed Union soldiers coming out because the term of their enlistment had expired.

Only a few months ago the House of Representatives passed a bill to provide travel pay for the members of volunteer units in the Spanish-American War serving in the Philippines, because they had been discharged in the Philippine Islands at the conclusion of the Spanish-American War and had been induced to reenlist during the Philippine Insurrection.

Is it not time that the legislative branch of this Nation begins to look with some confidence upon these patriotic, efficient, and highly trained men in our Army and Navy, men who have been accused here today of having political motives but men who have no other thought except the safety of their Nation? It is, indeed, ridiculous to hear those who have opposed all phases of this rearmament program quote as their authorities we who have absolutely no professional standing in military circles.

In this connection, and in answer to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], who just preceded me, I want to say that the Chief of Staff in approaching this proposition made the statement himself that he was not influenced by the White House in his considerations. He made his recommendations on this matter purely because he believed the security of the Nation demanded them. I think it is a bad habit we have gotten into when we accuse officials of our Army and our Navy of being influenced in their decisions by political considerations. In my time I have never seen one instance where I believed these men were so influenced. Oh, it is true that under our system of government the President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, and I believe that is a very wise provision. But just the same I say to you that I do not believe any man ever attained the rank of Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States unless he was a man possessed of independence,

initiative, and a mind of his own, with enough courage to make his own decisions and speak his own mind. They have dared to speak the truth regardless of whether the opinion of the Commander in Chief might conflict or otherwise.

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

Mr. FADDIS. I am sorry I cannot yield.

Now, the question has been brought up that in keeping these men in service for a longer period of time than 12 months we are breaking faith with them. I want to refute this statement. Certainly every Member on this floor knows that an act of Congress is not a contract. An act of Congress is a law. It is not a contract into which two parties enter and which can be broken or which should be broken by the insistence of any of those affected by this act of Congress. In this case the idea of mutual assent to serve is entirely lacking. When we by law substituted induction for volunteering we imposed the duty to serve. These men were brought in to assist in providing for the security of the Nation. I submit to you in all fairness that it is up to the Congress to keep faith with the Nation. Not only is it up to us to do so but it is mandatory upon us to do so, because under the terms of the Constitution we are charged with maintaining the common defense and to provide regulations for the governing of the land and naval forces as well as other duties.

There has been a great deal of talk during the past year and a half about the administration endeavoring to force this Nation into a war. It seems to me that those who have engaged in talk of this kind certainly cannot have read, or certainly cannot have read with much understanding, what is in the papers regarding the affairs in the world at large. If they had, it seems to me that they would be cognizant of the fact that everyday circumstances are taking place which threaten our security and which may force us into war against our own desires. After all, the average nation goes to war not because it wants to but because circumstances compel it to do so in order to provide for its own security.

The average man looks upon this war as a war of the machine. He sees where Germany has geared her Army to the spirit of the age, mechanization, and he sees that they have been victorious a great deal of the time with the machine. So it is a great deal easier for him to sit and think of the machine doing the fighting than to think of giving himself or his sons to the service. But after all, he must remember this: In every machine, in every airplane, in every battleship, are men who make the machinery function, and behind every gun and behind every wheel and behind every control is a man, and that that man, because of the demands of the times, due to the machine age, must be more highly trained than ever were soldiers trained before. So therefore we must realize that the army of today requires a great deal more intensive training than an army of yesterday.

The Army officials never wanted any limitations in this Selective Service Act.



They stated from the outset that 12 months was not sufficient time to train men with the demands of modern warfare. They did not want any limitations, and that is where politics crept into it. Last year because we were approaching a political campaign there were some of them who wanted to follow the ideal expressed in the letter I referred to in the first part of my speech and clear their own skirts as much as possible in order that they might be reelected to the House of Representatives.

That is what brought on the limitations and that is what brought on the fight we are facing here today, not the ideas or wishes of the Chief of Staff nor of the General Staff. As a consequence, we have an army that is so constituted that we cannot employ it for tasks that may arise necessitating its employment. Not very long ago we felt, in the interest of our national security, we should send a force to Iceland. I do not believe any reasonable man can disagree with a movement of that kind. Iceland is certainly one of the outposts we need in order to organize our defenses in depth. Organization in depth is one of the requirements of modern warfare. But when we came to send this force to Iceland did we have any troops we could send among our infantry divisions, troops which should have been employed upon a mission of that kind? No, indeed; because we had so many of these selectees in our infantry divisions it was necessary for us to use a force which did not contain these men. Therefore we had to take marines who are not properly suited for a mission of that kind. We should have had the necessary infantry to use on such a mission. The army that we may have to face is superbly trained. Not only are they superbly trained but they have had that experience on the battlefield that makes them veteran soldiers. They have long ago gotten over the feeling of sickness in the pit of the stomach at the sight of dead and wounded men. Today they are hardened, veteran soldiers, and they have an overwhelming advantage over men who have never been in action. So today are we going to expose ourselves to the same old dangers to which we have from time to time been exposed? Are we going to run the risk of being forced to train our armies under fire with the unnecessary heavy casualties which will certainly result? If so, their blood will be on the hands of those who lack either the foresight or the political courage to do what the occasion requires.

I want you to bear with me just a moment or so and see what it will do to a regiment to mandatorily discharge all of the men as their times expire. The War Department does not want to keep these men indefinitely, neither do they wish to be required to discharge them at any stated time. Say we have a regiment of 3,000 men and over 100 officers. Many of the officers are in there for a short term, just as the men are. We have perhaps a third of these men coming up for discharge on the first of December. Then the last half of October will be devoted to physical examinations, making out service records, preparing certificates of discharge, checking their property

into the hands of the supply sergeant, and making up a final account of these men. Many of the officers are being discharged also. Then when all this has been gone through with and the regiment has been disturbed for 10 or 15 days, they will take in an equal increment of new men. The various operations necessary to taking in these new men will again interrupt the regiment for a time. Then when these men have been taken in, they will be called upon to discharge another lot of men, and you will go through that disrupting process, and where are your regiments going to be? Under such a procedure no regiment can ever be in a condition of efficiency so that it may be used for any important mission. Let us not, by our actions here today, take any actions which will offer any encouragement to the leaders of our enemies, the leaders of Germany and Japan.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I am now going to yield to several gentlemen, and ask unanimous consent that they may be permitted to extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. THILL].

#### KEEP FAITH WITH THE DRAFTEES

Mr. THILL. Mr. Chairman, the war in Europe has been proceeding at a blistering pace for about 2 years. Thousands upon thousands of soldiers have been wounded or killed. Misery, suffering, and starvation have been the lot of the European peoples for many months and the end is not yet in sight. We can well imagine what the vast majority of individuals in Europe would give to come to free, peace-loving, and well-nurtured America. War may be the course chosen by despotic leaders but it is seldom the course desired by the people as a whole. It has been my wish, my hope, and my prayer that the United States would keep out of the conflagrations now raging throughout the world. To that end I have voted for defense appropriation bills so that we might make our country so strong and powerful that no combination of aggressors dare attack it.

In building up the defenses of our country it is not only necessary to have ships, planes, guns, tanks, ammunition, and other war matériel, but it is essential that we have in our armed forces a high degree of morale. The Congress, controlled by the Democrats, and at the insistence of President Roosevelt, is now considering a bill to keep the selectees in service longer than 12 months. We can do little else that would make the draftees more disgruntled or that would do more to break down the morale of our armed forces, than to break faith with the boys now in our camps. When the selectees were called for training it was understood that such training period would be 1 year. The mothers, the fathers, the girl friends, and the boys themselves all believed that the service period would not go beyond 12 months. The plans made by all of these individuals were based upon the thought that the draftees could complete their serv-

ice obligation within 1 year. Everyone thought that the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 was just what its name implies, an act to provide for the training of our youth in the defense of our country. Now the proponents of House Joint Resolution 222 want to keep these boys in the service for a much longer period than that prescribed by the law. In effect they want to take those boys who by chance were called during the first year of the draft and keep them in the armed forces as soldiers. Not by choice, not by agreement, but forcefully will these boys be taken to form a gigantic army. Is it any wonder that some of us suspect the underlying reason for this bill is the formation of another American expeditionary force?

General Marshall testified that a force of 1,700,000 men was sufficient to defend the Western Hemisphere. Our present total strength is 1,476,000 men, and the present law provides for 300,000 more selectees who can be called, plus 152,000 men provided for the Air Corps. So it is obvious that we can now more than equal the number of men who, as stated by General Marshall, would be a sufficient force to protect our western half of the world. Why remove the limitation on the number of men who may be in active training and service at any one time? We can always pass legislation, in a day if necessary, as future events unfold and the need for additional legislation is shown. What sense is there, what justice is there, what logic is there in increasing our armed personnel until we can furnish the soldiers with proper equipment? Why disrupt our economy and place millions of men who are ill-equipped in our camps when modern mechanized warfare has shown that a few soldiers highly trained and mechanically outfitted can overcome thousands of soldiers?

Military experts have stated that our Army is in need of younger men. The very fact that Congress has seen fit upon the recommendation of the military authorities to lower the draft age to 28, indicates that youth is to be desired in our modern Army. By letting the present selectees go after their year of training we can take into the armed forces younger men who can be trained and then will eventually be placed in a powerful reserve. One of the divisions which is now ready for combat service is the Ninth Division at Fort Bragg. Half of this division is made up of selectees with less than a year's training. The rotation of selectees will actually strengthen our defense instead of weakening it. By permitting the present draftees to leave after a year and by taking in others to replace them we will be building up a reserve force of trained soldiers which will be a powerful aid to our defense in an emergency.

Certainly it will not disrupt our Army to allow the draftees now in service to leave after their period of training expires. To argue that our forces would disintegrate or be demoralized by replacing the draftees with new recruits, is talking nonsense. One might as well argue that our Army will disintegrate if several hundred thousand men are killed,

wounded, or become sick during a war in which we are engaged. It would be more sensible to argue that our military forces should practice discharging thousands of men from various units and replacing them with new soldiers so we can approximate conditions which appear in actual warfare. The following table shows that approximately 600,000 selectees entered the service of our country, as follows:

November.....	13, 806
December.....	5, 521
January.....	73, 633
February.....	90, 238
March.....	153, 159
April.....	123, 207
May.....	56, 896
June.....	79, 522

So you can see that very few men will leave the service before January 1 and the greatest number—153,159—will leave in March of 1942. During the next half year induction could be so arranged that less than 10 percent—about 170,000—of our present Army would leave during any one month. It is clear that such a procedure would neither destroy our Army nor imperil our national defense. Instead it would give us the necessary rotation in our Army and it would give us many more trained soldiers.

Some of these selectees are in outlying military posts—1,200 in Hawaii and 1,800 in Alaska. Obviously 3,000 selectees can be brought back from these posts as conditions permit without seriously interfering with our military program.

This Nation is much stronger today than it was a year ago. Our Army, Navy, and air force have been built up with tremendous strides. Anyone who is familiar with the world situation and our national defense must state that we are in less danger today than we were last year. Many military experts believed that our country was safe and secure even last year and certainly there is every reason for thinking that we are less vulnerable to attack this year than ever before. My position has been clear. It is one for national defense to the limit. I have viewed with suspicion those steps taken by this administration which day by day have brought us closer to war. I will oppose all moves directed toward putting this free Nation into the torture and torment of a bloody conflict against the will of the people. I believe that all true liberty-loving Americans want nothing of the calamity which war brings. They do not want to spend useless blood, tears, toil, and sweat. I will do everything in my power to protect the interests of the United States; to insure the safety of our free institutions; to build up our armed forces not only in matériel but also in morale; and to maintain those cardinal principles which have made this country the envy of every nation in the world.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JARRETT].

Mr. JARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the original Selective Service Act, as I felt the voluntary enlistment system should be first tried out. But we will not go into that. I am now against

any amendment to the Selective Service Act which will extend the time of service. The country was led to believe that this service would be for 1 year. It is true the bill provides that it could be extended in case of emergency. I cannot see an emergency. I agree with our colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. Now let us look at this thing in the common-sense way. These boys were led to believe that the service would be for 1 year, then they could return to their jobs. They left their jobs and business for 1 year, and their hope for the future. It is true they had to, but they did so willingly. I feel the service of 1 year should train a soldier. They now pass into the reserve. Now it is only fair that while they were away during training earning \$21 a month and others were at home in the defense factories and other industry making from \$8 to \$15 a day that these boys should be able to return home and get in on the armament program and have a chance to recoup at the pay of \$8 to \$15 a day. If they have been properly trained, and I say they have been, it will help to purify the national blood stream to have them back in industry. They have shown their loyalty and they will be better able to compete against the subversive elements at work in this country, returning them home will mean real national defense. It is true they are but a handful, but it will be a powerful handful if they show their training and I think they will. They kept faith with us. We must now keep faith with them.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield low to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in the business world we find honesty is the best policy. Confidence has long been the cornerstone of all human relations. As we debate this resolution—House Joint Resolution 222—I think I hear the alarming words of a senatorial spokesman of the President. I am sure his remarks did not suggest peace. Rather, they prophesy war and a long war, and yet along this entire route, we have been told that our legislation was in the direction of peace—that our Government wanted peace.

I find myself troubled as I approach this vote. Like all of you, my first duty is to serve the country. This clear responsibility must rise above partisanship, but we ask the question, How can we best serve America? It seems to me that if we, as a Nation, are in danger, we should support the Nation's leadership; but likewise, it seem to me, if we, as a Nation, are in danger the leadership should, with plain, simple honesty, win confidence and national unity.

I ask you Members of Congress this question, as we travel this route, beginning with the legislation that took in the draftees under the Selective Training and Service Act, Were you in the 76th Congress told of the potentialities of war? Yes; that was the beginning of what I am inclined to call deception. Early in this Congress there followed the lend-lease bill. That was a peace measure, or a defense measure, as the proponents call it. Well do I recall the

oratory on that important piece of legislation. Yes; as we view it in retrospect, common sense should have told us that with the passage of that act, some sort of convoy must follow, but convoys found no place in the wording of that bill. I think that bill was definitely a bill for the preparation of war and, I think honestly, the passage of this act today, especially after the statement of the distinguished Senator from Florida, is a war measure. It is the further use of a slipper horn to slide us nearer and nearer to trouble.

Like any normal American citizen, I like to feel I can support my President—particularly on matters of foreign policy. I think I should, in many respects, like to support him now, but the methods employed up to date, do not win confidence. Deception still prevails. We are told we must call upon the best authority in the land—the specialist, if you please—on this great question, and yet I am sure all will quite agree that the heads of the military departments have failed to make a good case before the committee.

If we as a Nation are in danger, surely there is a way, and a convincing way, to inform us. Why this division in the Nation today? Unfortunately, back of this whole war program stands the ghost of socializing America along New Deal lines. Much of the legislation in this Congress has lacked candor. It has been passed under the label of national defense and, all too often, in many measures there has been tucked away wording that further solidifies and entrenches the New Deal with its domestic ambitions. Too much has been done to obscure the facts. For 8½ years we have had emergency after emergency. As one engaged in business, I recall that the whole period has been a continuous state of concern. We have waited in hopeful expectancy for the return of normal conditions. We have waited in vain. Instead has come one imaginary emergency after another.

Surely there is a way to produce unity in a nation, and unity we must have, first of all, if the emergency is as grave as this legislation would suggest. The administration has charged that the Congress and the people as a whole do not realize the danger which faces this country. If that is true, then I ask, Whose fault is it? Certainly the administration has had every opportunity to prove that that danger does exist. This Congress has pleaded with the President and his advisers to lay the facts before them; to come with clean hands and with nothing held back. That is the American way. That is the democratic process. If the administration had done that; if it had proven with reasonable satisfaction that a national emergency does exist, I would not hesitate a moment to support the legislation now before us for consideration.

We have been presented with no such proof. Instead of an all-out defense effort, the administration has been trying, by subterfuge, to entrench its bureaucracy and promote a questionable program of social reform. In other words, the administration, by its own deeds, has created confusion and suspicion as to its objectives. All too many



people are suspicious that in many instances this defense effort is an attempt to do what the New Deal has failed to do since it launched its social and economic program 8 years ago. Too many people think that under the guise of "saving democracy" we may lose the system of free private enterprise which has made our Nation the greatest in the world. That is one reason we have disunity today. That is one reason why this Congress hesitates in granting unlimited powers to the Executive. There has been too much of insincerity, hypocrisy, and sham in this whole program. If we are to have unity, if we are to restore the confidence of the people in the destiny of our Nation, we must first have frankness, sincerity, and a clear view of the objectives to be attained; we must know definitely that maintenance of the American way of life is the over-all objective.

I say to you that simple honesty will unite this Nation; that a forthright policy in dealing with the Congress will do much to solidify our country. I cannot support this legislation giving the President such unlimited powers over the lives and destinies of our young men because, like thousands of others, I do not know where the administration proposes to lead us. We cannot thus lightly break faith with those who went into the armed service of our country with the definite understanding that at the end of 1 year they would be released. Until the President and his advisors are ready to take steps that will restore the confidence of the Nation in his leadership, I cannot conscientiously support this legislation. If this Nation enters the war, it will be behind a false front and with mixed objectives, first to entrench a program and second to defend a Nation. Such a course can only lead to disaster.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 says:

Each man inducted under the provisions of section A, shall serve for a training and service period of 12 consecutive months, unless sooner discharged, except that whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense.

Mr. Chairman, all that is necessary for the purpose of extending the period of service of selectees is for the Congress to declare that the national interest is imperiled. Then the President is authorized to extend the time to such time as he may deem necessary in the interest of national defense.

However, the Military Affairs Committee discovered in the course of its hearings on this bill, that if such a national emergency is declared—

That nearly 50 statutes that were enacted during the World War are still the law of the land, and they would give the President, for instance, the power and authority to order men beyond the continental limits of the United States as he did during the World War.

These words I have quoted from the address of the chairman of the Commit-

tee on Military Affairs made on Friday last, and contained in the second column, page 6916, of the RECORD.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Chief of Staff of the United States, and through him presumably the Commander in Chief, have come before us and asked that we declare a full national emergency, which would bring into effect all of the 50 statutes of the World War referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee. Yet the gentleman from Kentucky and his committee have seen fit to doubt the wisdom of that course, and, in the language of this resolution—House Joint Resolution 222—have limited the emergency so declared to the sole purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. Was it the gentleman from Kentucky who said that he had full and implicit confidence and was willing to follow his Commander in Chief, or was it somebody else, or was it just political expediency that led him to compromise with the minority and exclude from the provisions of this act the 50 World War statutes? I hope the gentleman does not expect to reverse himself in conference with the Senate on this measure.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I have read the testimony and have heard General Marshall say in person that he proposed a period of 18 months for the training of selectees for military service. I have read in the testimony and heard it said that the national interests demand an additional period of service for selectees. I recognize that under the existing formation of the United States Army it might be disastrous to let 500,000 or 600,000 men go within a few months next spring, and to bring in 500,000 or 600,000 new men to take their places. I am willing to concede that if this process be carried out in a relatively few months, then the national interest might indeed be imperiled through diluting the effective strength with that number of green, relatively untrained men. I am willing to concede that the defensive posture of the United States, or adequate national defense, whichever you wish to call it, might not be provided by so diluting our Army with green untrained men at that time. I am willing to concede that next spring and summer may be a very critical period in the history of the world, and of the United States, and that it might be unwise to so dilute the Army of the United States.

At the same time I make these concessions, it appeals to my reason that between now and then 500,000 or 600,000 men from the new selection might be adequately trained to take their places. However, in order to do that, I must recognize the truth in the fact that it would take hundreds of millions more of dollars for lands and new cantonments for the housing, appurtenances, and training equipment of these additional men while the rest remain in service.

Therefore, and in the interest of adequate national defense, I intend to offer an amendment which would allow the President to hold in service not to exceed an additional 6 months, the present selectees and the other components of the Army. I do this reluctantly, as I

believe the original understanding with them should be carried out, but I do so in the interest of my country, its welfare, and its safety, and its adequate national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I voted against the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as I then stated, not because I did not wish our young men to be trained for the defense of their country—that I wanted then and want now—but because I did not believe that the terms of that act were equitable, nor based on sound practice. I favored what is commonly called the "Swiss system" for military training. I voted against it also, because it contained what is known as the Smith amendment, permitting the conscription of industry, which everyone knows leads on to the conscription of labor, and the ultimate setting up of the totalitarian state in this country. Some of the inequities of that bill have been cured by the practice of the War Department in not carrying out its terms in full. For example, the War Department has taken relatively few men between the ages of 28 and 35, and in this bill the more equitable limit of 28 years is established.

Now we find the truth of the whole matter set out in the hearings before the House committee, where the representatives of the Army have repeatedly used words such as the following: "We want to establish one basically sound force," and other correlative statements to indicate that the Commander in Chief wants to freeze into the Army everyone now in it for an indefinite period of time. In the other body, a spokesman for the Commander in Chief said they might have to stay in 5 years, 10 years, or more. I am against such unlimited service for any man, as I believe that all men should take their turn. Therefore, I shall vote against an unlimited grant of authority to keep these men in the Army, and if a definite limitation is not placed in the bill, I shall vote against it.

It would appear to me, as it does to many others, that this whole business has been badly handled. That while originally it may have been rightly conceived in the War Department, civilians from New York have been allowed to carry the ball and get their own pet legislation passed, in lieu of the proposals that the Army has been working on for 12 years. And it appears to me, as it does to others, that there has been much resort to political expediency, bordering on chicanery, not only in the passage of the original act, but in obtaining the passage of this joint resolution extending that act.

In the meantime, we have been led to a point near war, where we now find ourselves—largely by indirection. The Congress and the people are confused, they know not whither they are being led. Things have been done and are being done in secret, and no one knows how far we are on the road to war. It may come tomorrow, next month, or next year—and it may not come at all. We were told that never again would our young manhood be asked to set foot on foreign soil to fight, while at the same time, those responsible to the President ask that we declare war, when everyone

knows that the only place war is being fought is on foreign soil.

Evidently the President does not dare to come out and ask full dictatorial power, but he gets it bit by bit and piece by piece through legislation passed by this Congress and its predecessors. I have voted against these grants of power. Nevertheless they have been granted. I shall vote against the special grants of power contained in this House Joint Resolution 222.

However we have gotten there, our country is indeed in peril, and I sometimes believe that our way of life is more in peril from within our Government than from beyond our shores. These are difficult times, indeed, for anyone—including a Member of the Congress, to know what is right, what is good, and what is best for our country's interest. I cast the vote for my district as I now believe to be right and for the safety of my country.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me say that during the last few months I believe there has been a definite trend in public opinion in the following directions:

A large majority of our citizens are strongly opposed to our intervention in the European war and, naturally, to an A. E. F., and this majority has increased rather than decreased in number in recent months.

At the same time people generally are equally determined in increasing numbers that we should be prepared to impregnably defend the Western Hemisphere and our own country. The Congress only last year passed an act restating our adherence to the principles of the Monroe Doctrine.

I share these two sentiments.

Let me also say that, this being true, all citizens generally are entitled to be informed on what our exact situation today is; just where we stand as a Nation and how well prepared we are in this connection. I refer, of course, to the reasons for the introduction of the present bill.

Almost every Member of the House who has spoken in opposition to this bill has denied the necessity thereof, stating that we are in better situation than we were a year ago, while at the same time holding that the President is gradually leading us into a more serious position. These two statements simply do not jibe.

I share your anxiety and apprehensions as to the acts and attitudes and statements of the President, but let us honestly analyze our situation today, in the light of 1 year's history. Soon after the passage of the Selective Service Act last year Germany entered into a treaty for joint action with Japan.

I believe that what the Congress and the whole people have to realize is that a great, conquering power is loose in the world; that the entire resources of an immensely powerful nation with a strong military tradition have been supremely organized not only to conquer all Europe, but to dominate the whole world. Until we face up to these simple facts, we can-

not visualize the nature and the degree of the threat to our Nation.

After taking Austria, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Holland, and Belgium this course of conquest has been steadily and relentlessly pursued. We have seen the capitulation and with the news of the last week-end the complete subordination of France. We have watched vast and destructive attacks upon Britain, both by sea warfare and by the bombing of her forts, factories, and cities. While these attacks have failed to crush the spirit of the British people, they have inflicted a greater loss of life on sea and land than is commonly realized in this country. They have destroyed an enormous tonnage of merchant vessels and a large number of warships; and they have caused immense material damage to industrial resources and homes in Britain. We have witnessed the subjugation of Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary by coercion and threats. We have seen the military conquest of Yugoslavia, Albania, and Greece.

The net result of these vast events has been to give Nazi Germany actual possession or dominance of virtually all Europe. Now, we are witnessing the sudden and ruthless attack of Germany upon Russia—an attack which has already penetrated far inside the Russian borders and threatens to render Russia virtually, if not entirely, impotent. If Russia be conquered or rendered helpless, Hitler's conquests will have gone farther than those of any conqueror of modern times; his power will have increased to an extent that plainly constitutes a critical threat to every other country in the world.

We must face the fact that this danger may become still greater. In his testimony on July 17, General Marshall mentioned the possibility of the sudden overrunning of Spain, Portugal, and North Africa. Such an event would plainly endanger all of West Africa, and indeed the whole African continent, with tremendous implications for us. General Marshall also mentioned the urgent necessity of reinforcing our garrisons in Alaska for reasons which he did not specify but which any reasoning person can perceive. If the German invasion of Russia should run its full course through Siberia, the threat to our interests in the Pacific and our northwestern territory is plain.

We must further face the fact that German ambitions go beyond the conquest of vast territories and extend to the establishment of bases throughout the world and the ultimate control of all the oceans, as was publicly stated by Admiral Raeder, chief of the German Navy, in January 1941.

Beyond all this there is the doubtful position of Japan.

And during all this time the Nazis have been steadily raising hell in South America all the way from Argentina to Colombia and Mexico, approaching the Panama Canal.

But you say that we are in a more secure position today. How many people do you really think believe that? When the members of our Committee on Appropriations who are on their way to South

America, not on a junket, come back to this country and their constituents, what do you suppose they will tell them? Did they go to South America for a rest? Did they go down there to be entertained by South American dignitaries? No; they will say that the situation in South America has become very serious.

When members of the Committees on Naval Affairs or Military Affairs and others on inspection tours visit our bases, our outlying possessions, the Panama Canal, Alaska, and other places, what do they say to their constituents? Is it that they went there for sea air; to sit on a beach in Bermuda? No; they say we are in a very serious situation.

When you on my side of the House voted almost to a man in favor of billions for increased armaments, matériel, ships, a merchant marine, and what not, not last year but this year, and most of you who voted against the original Selective Service Act—did you do so because you thought the situation was better this year than it was last? No; there was a reason for it, and the reason was that you knew the situation is worse now than it was then.

Since the act of last year we have acquired leases for bases in Newfoundland, Bermuda, the Bahamas, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Trinidad, Antigua, and British Guiana. Prior to the acquisition of these bases the United States had forces outside of the continental limits in Alaska, Panama, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Philippines. In addition, we have established bases in Greenland and Iceland, and while opposed to our intervention in the European War and against an A. E. F., I consider these two bases in Greenland and Iceland for all real purposes a part of the Western Hemisphere and essential to our defense thereof.

To garrison properly all of these places we know it will take up to 800,000 men of the Army. Then take out your General Headquarters Air Force, services of supplies, special troops for anti-air and other activities, and 29 divisions, 18 National Guard, and 11 Regular Army, and where do we get off?

At the present time we have over 600,000 selectees included in the Army, and hardly any of them have had more than 6 months' service. So that by next January only a very few of them will have had a year's service.

I think I know something of how long it takes to make a soldier; something of the training of the men who served in the last World War; and I can say truthfully from bitter experience that during our short service in combat we lost many enlisted men, noncommissioned officers, and commissioned officers in action, more than was necessary, because of lack of adequate training.

The demands of the present day for mechanized military training are much more severe, require more intense training, and a longer one. The nation that threatens our security has had its men in strict training as boys, later in labor battalions, and then in its armies now in a succession of successful campaigns. They are seasoned veterans with ample and modern equipment and a tradition



of overwhelming victory. What we must have now and for the immediate future is the best and most efficient Army we can attain at least for the coming year and possibly longer. An Army of the present size, each man with 1 year's service, and replace them then only with men who have had a thorough training.

May I say here now and definitely so, that the original Selective Service Act was not conceived by the President. It was introduced in the Senate by Senator BURKE and in this House by Representative WADSWORTH. The President was no more for it at the start than some of you were, and accepted it only upon the urging of his military advisers.

Let me say also just as definitely that the recommendations for extension of this act came to the Congress upon the sole responsibility of the Chief of Staff of the Army, on his own word, and without consultation with the President.

Personally, I prefer the provisions of the bill before us rather than those of the Senate, with its greatly extended limitation period. I do not believe that we will ever require selective service for that long; but who knows, who dares to prophesy or guess in these days? I would rather predict that the Yankees will win the world's series even though they have yet to win the pennant and then defeat Brooklyn or St. Louis to do so.

If I could have my way, we would enact simply the following and no more, by striking out the enacting clause of this measure and inserting thereafter:

For the purpose of and pursuant to section 1, paragraph (c) and section 3, paragraph (b), of Public No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress "the Congress hereby declares that the national interest is imperiled."

What is the national interest? Is our everyday life the same as it has been; is our shipping going on as usual; are our citizens able to go where they will; do we know that everything is O. K.? No; we do not.

By the simple provision which I have just stated, the President would be empowered to do what is necessary. Moreover, all the present provisions of the Selective Service Act would be retained, including the limitation for service of troops within the Western Hemisphere only.

I am not so much concerned with the methods, but merely the necessity for its being done. I do not like the 30-month limitation, for I have an idea that long before that time the selective service trainees will have done their bit and returned home.

Personally I was opposed to the 12-month limitation last year, but I hoped from the start that inducted men would be through at the end of 12 months. It is true, also, that instances of undue hardship will arise from a service longer than 12 months, because of home circumstances and other reasons. These cases, as General Marshall has testified, will be properly taken care of. Two thousand a month at the present time are being released for good reasons. General Marshall himself has repeatedly testified that his disposition would be to turn the selectees home as soon as possible, once he has one completely trained Army and

a new trained group of substantial size ready to take their places.

We all hate the situation that has been brought about by the aggressions of the dictators. We all hate war. We all hate the inconveniences and hardships that arise from the necessity of being prepared to defend the country as the price of retaining our integrity and our independence as a free people. We all hope that the impending crisis may soon pass, but all these legitimate hates and hopes do not alter the fact that in the world as it is today we must have an effective army of trained men ready to protect our hemisphere. Nor do our emotions change the fact that we cannot have such an army unless the time of service restrictions is removed.

At the same time, I must deplore the fact that our preparedness program has not progressed as it should have had the President or the Congress acted strongly on the strike situation. While we blame him and know he should have made changes in the set-up of this program, we can blame him no more than ourselves, for we have done little or nothing about the strike situation.

Herein I know we have not treated or played fair with the selectees, or any man in the military service, for that matter.

So I now come to my conclusion. It is not an easy thing to do. It is just as hard to vote for an extension as it is to serve under the extension, and I have had both experiences. My fervent hope is that we will extend this service. Maintain an Army of the desired strength; have it trained as efficiently as possible, and then stand on our feet in this country and the Western Hemisphere, ready to protect it. And I hope for even better than that with this extension—that, in the meantime, the World War will have terminated. When that time comes, whether in 6 months or 8 months, or 10 months, or 2 years, these men will have gone home knowing that they have stood for the security of this country just as well as those who, in the last war, went to France in an A. E. F., and even better, from the standpoint of the Nation; for, by their unselfish action, they will have contributed to peace for our country without our country's having become involved. I remain opposed to our intervention and to another A. E. F., but I, for one, am not willing to gamble on this proposition; and I shall cast my vote regardless of any consequences for what I know to be the soundest course for the security of our country and its future.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, it is with some misgiving that I undertake to follow the very able address of my friend from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs. His argument was unanswerable. I think he convinced everyone who heard him that he was placing the welfare of his country above every other consideration.

He is a very modest man, but it would be interesting to the Members of this House if they should read the history of

Mr. ANDREWS and his outfit in France during the World War. He knows from experience what war is, and he wants this country to be so well prepared that no nation would dare attack us.

The gentleman from New York referred to some of the inconsistencies of some of his Republican brethren. Before I begin my few remarks I would like to point out what I regard as another inconsistency. There are only two points at issue, as I see it, in this controversy. The first one is whether there was a contract with the selectees. Well, I do not want to be legally technical, and it is therefore unnecessary for me to agree with my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] when he says there is no such thing as a binding contract with the Government, because it is not necessary to even discuss that question if you will read the act where it says that these men are in the service for 12 consecutive months, unless sooner discharged, except that whenever Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled.

I wish some of you would go back and read the debate, not only in this House, but particularly in the Senate, when the Selective Training and Service Act was under consideration at the time of its passage. I think you will read with great interest the remarks of the then chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, my late friend, Hon. Morris Sheppard, and likewise Senator LODGE and others who discussed this very question. Nearly all of the leading newspapers of the country discussed this very question of the continuation of longer than 12 months, provided the emergency still existed. Any man who read the bill knew that it contained this proviso.

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

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; for a brief question.

Mr. HARE. Does it not follow that as long as this conflict continues in Europe the danger will increase?

Mr. THOMASON. I cannot conceive of how it takes any hearings before a committee or any evidence to say that this country is not still in peril. I wish to refer to the minority report on this bill that is signed by seven of our good friends on the Republican side. If you will turn to page 18 of that report you will find these words, which I say is even a more glaring inconsistency than the one pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]:

There are, however, several good provisions in this resolution with which we agree and which we feel should be enacted into law. Realizing that we do face a real danger, believing in an adequate national defense as strongly as anyone could, eager to maintain the morale of our Army, and desiring at the same time to exercise all caution to avoid a shooting war.

We favor, in effect, retention of the National Guard and of the Reserves.

Well, they say there is a real danger. We say the national interest is imperiled. So I went into the library a few minutes ago to find out what the word "peril" meant. Mr. Webster says:

A situation founded on the state of being in impending or threatening danger.

To save my life, I cannot understand how anybody would not feel that we are in impending danger.

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

Mr. THOMASON. No; not just now.

When you look back on what has happened in the world in the last 4 years, especially by Hitler and his army, I cannot conceive how any person can say that this country and our national interest is not imperiled. We are not getting nearer war. The war is getting nearer us. There is no such thing as neutrality in this country or anywhere else—you are either for or against Hitler. That is the paramount issue in this country today, and in fact in every country in the world. But if you look back at the history of what has happened during the last 4 years, Hitler has conquered 13 nations. I take the following from the record:

On March 18, 1938, Hitler occupied Austria, with 7,000,000 people. On October 1, 1938, Hitler takes the Sudetenland. March 15, 1939, Czechoslovakia, with 10,000,000 people. March 22, 1939, he takes Memel. September 1, 1939, he invades Poland with its more than 20,000,000 people. On April 9, 1940, he invades Norway and Denmark, with a total population of 7,000,000. On May 10, 1940, he begins his campaign on the western front and takes over Holland, with 8,000,000 people, Belgium with 8,000,000 people, and on June 17, 1940, France surrendered with 42,000,000 people. On October 14, 1940, less than a year ago he occupied Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, with 35,000,000 people.

On April 6 of this very year—4 months ago—he attacked Greece and Yugoslavia and took over another 22,000,000.

On May 20, 1941—3 months ago—he took over Crete.

On June 20, 1941, he declared war on Russia.

I repeat, that in less than 4 years Germany has conquered 13 countries. She now dominates and has in enslavement over 200,000,000 people. Spain, Portugal, Sweden, and Switzerland are at her mercy. Virtually all of Europe today is in bondage. If Germany conquers England and her possessions she will then have under her domination over 1,500,000,000 of the less than 2,000,000,000 people in the world.

What did Hitler say his purpose was? What is he doing about his program? Why, he is ahead of his program; he is ahead of his schedule. Talk about peril. All these countries are under his control, and now Japan, his ally, moves to the south and west in French Indo-China and threatens the Philippines—and only yesterday, and again this morning, you saw in the papers where the Vichy Government is about to submit to his domination. This means he will soon occupy Dakar and in air-bombing distance of South America.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just a question?

Mr. THOMASON. In a moment, if the gentleman will permit me to continue.

Talk about the peril of the situation. It was bad enough a year ago, but when you realize that he has now cap-

tured 13 countries and getting nearer every day, I say our peril is greater than a year ago. Our military experts whom we must trust and who know what they are talking about will tell you that. They say the Germans are going to take Russia. There is no use living in a fool's paradise. Let me give you some more figures from the records. Our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, says the failure to pass this bill would have a serious and dangerous effect.

The land army of Germany is 260 divisions fully trained for combat. They are seasoned soldiers who have seen much combat. Ours is 33 divisions and many of them only partly trained. Germany now has 40 divisions in training that will be ready for combat service this year. This makes a total of 300 divisions of seasoned soldiers who have been trained since boyhood. They have been forced as boys to enter the army and when they get up to 18 or 20 years of age they are taught to be mechanics. As for planes, the Germans have 12,000 in their combat squadrons and 8,000 in training squadrons, or a total of 20,000 planes. Germany today has 8,000 tanks in her armored divisions and 22,000 tanks in reserve. She has a tank production of approximately 800 per month. I am just trying to give you some facts and figures. If I had time I would give you more accurate figures.

The combined strength of Germany, Italy, and Japan, is more than 10,000,000 troops of 449 divisions, with 37,000 fighting airplanes and 32,000 big tanks, a plane production of 3,160 per month and a tank production of 900 per month. Here we have hardly started. Our production is just getting under headway. As my friend from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] asked a while ago: "What have we been appropriating all this money for?" Go into the Appropriations Committee Room and you will learn that we have either appropriated or authorized \$52,000,000,000 for national defense. Time after time in this very Congress since we met here on January 3d bills have passed through this House by unanimous consent, appropriating hundreds of millions of dollars, sometimes even billions for national defense, without a single man on either side voting against them. If we are not in peril what are we spending this money for? Why a two-ocean Navy? Why thousands of airplanes and tanks?

But, more than that, if we expect to meet this situation as Americans always meet a crisis, who is going to run these tanks and these planes that we are providing money to build? Somebody must man, operate, and repair all these machines, and they must be trained men. I regret there has been delay in production, arising from labor trouble, shortage of materials, and what not, but now production is coming off the lines in a very satisfactory way. A year from now we are going to have a mighty Army, I think certainly the best of its size in the world. With war threatening us on every hand, with Hitler saying in his book, *Mein Kampf*, enough for us to know that if Russia falls England is next on the list—brave old England. I hope she stands,

but whether she stands or not, there is not a man on this floor but who knows we are next on the list. If Russia falls, I fear for old England.

As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] told us, this morning's mail brought us a letter from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. I regret he has made a political issue of this. This is not a political question, this is a bill for the preservation and security of our country. This is no time for politics. This is not a time to hate Roosevelt. This is not a time to hate Willkie. This is not a time to hate anybody who is a loyal and patriotic American. This is a time for a united people in this country, if we expect to survive as a Nation true to our ideals.

The flag that hangs behind the Speaker's desk has never yet trailed in the dust of defeat, and I trust that in the providence of God it never will, because it will never espouse an unjust or unholy cause. And so I think that if ever there was a time in the history of this country when we ought to be united and be certain of our defense, it is now. Politics can wait until the next election.

I have many figures at hand but not the time to go into detail. It is important to say that 576,000 of these selectees will pass out of the service in the next 6 months if this bill does not pass.

Do not forget these figures. Let us be fair about this thing. Today we have approximately 1,400,000 in the Army, over 600,000 of which are selectees. In addition to that, we have less than 500,000 in the Regular Army, and a little less than 300,000 in the National Guard.

Of those 576,000 selectees that are going out the first part of next year there are 14,000 of those boys in Puerto Rico, Alaska, and Hawaii. Here is the serious part about it, and I speak from the record, Mr. Chairman, because this has been testified to before our committee. From 75 to 90 percent of all the officers in every division are Reserve officers. What type of an Army would we have without them? We have marched up the hill, and we are fixing to march right down again.

I undertake to say that the most cheering wireless message that could be sent to Hitler today would be that less than a year ago we passed a selective service law providing for compulsory and universal military training in this country, and now we come along and say we will let the boys out, in spite of the great peril that exists to our country today. That is the very thing that Hitler and the Japanese want.

We are facing, as I see it, the most frightful crisis in all our glorious history. None of us wants war. None of us wants an A. E. F. We want defense and protection. I think this is the best life insurance policy we can buy. An Army that cannot win is the same as no Army at all. Money spent on an Army that cannot defend us is wasted. Let us leave the President out of the situation. Leave Secretary Hull out of it if you want to, although I believe everybody in the House trusts him. For the last year he has been telling us what the situation in the various parts of the world has been. He has given us due warning.



The gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] did not tell half the story about South America. I cannot quote anything that happens in executive session, but if you will read the New York Times, or if you will talk to people who have been down there, you will find that there are more than 200 German schools in Argentina. You will find that there are 1,200,000 Germans in Brazil, many of them actively organized, scattering their propaganda. They have numerous air bases, and they are in control of air lines, and they have bases within striking distance of the Panama Canal.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill passes, so that word may be sent to Hitler and all other active or potential enemies that regardless of what it costs in either blood or treasure we expect to defend this country and the ideals for which it stands.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we are about to conclude general debate on this bill and will in a short time take the bill up under what is known as the 5-minute rule. The other day I took the floor and called attention to the fact that the matter we are considering today is the recommendation of the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, the man to whom the people of America must look to to guide and direct us in our preparations, the man to whom we must look to lead our armed forces on land in case of attack. His recommendation is not political in nature. He made his recommendation as chief Army officer at the present time, carrying out his business, his job, which is to take those steps that in the light of existing circumstances he thinks are necessary for the best interest of our country.

He transmitted his recommendation to the Secretary. He made it public to the American people at the same time. The President of the United States sent a message to the Congress and in the closing sentence of that message the President stated:

The responsibility now rests with the Congress.

The other day the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], in a remark that I hoped he would withdraw said that "the Chief of Staff was a good soldier, but he had to obey the orders of the Secretary of War." I cannot picture any Chief of Staff who would be so derelict in his duty on military matters as to bow his opinion, which opinion is not only his personal opinion but the opinion of those who comprise his staff, fixed opinions which he felt are necessary for the best interests of our country, to the opinion of anyone else. The hearings in the Senate clearly show the testimony of General Marshall in which he said that he made those recommendations himself and that when he made them to the Secretary of War he released them to the public and, further, that they are his own opinions. He stated:

In the first place, the matter before us is of such public importance, and the interest of the public and of the Congress is apparently so intense that it might be well to

go back to my original recommendations in my biennial report, covering the period of my stewardship, from July 1, 1931, until June 30, 1941. It may clarify the atmosphere for me to explain that I made the specific recommendations regarding the extension of the 12-month period of service for the three categories purely on the basis of a military necessity for the security of the country. The Commander in Chief, that is, the President, had no knowledge that I was going to make them. My report was submitted to the Secretary of War, and at the same time was released to the press.

I hold in my hand a powerful telegram from the national commander of the American Legion, Milo J. Warner, which I will insert in the RECORD. This telegram was received this morning, and sets forth the fact that as the national commander he places the American Legion strongly and unreservedly behind the passage of this bill.

There is one primary duty that confronts us today, a duty that we must face and take without regard to the personal hopes, desires, or feelings of anyone, and that is to take such steps as are necessary to protect and defend our country, and to preserve the institutions of government we have inherited. When a crisis confronts our country everyone must expect to make sacrifices for the general welfare. Members of Congress must possess the courage to make sacrifices. As I stated a few days ago, "We are the trustees of the present and the future of our country." That is our job. It is our duty to perform it, without fear of the consequences. The question that confronts us is not "What we would like to do, but what we must do under the conditions that exist throughout the world today."

Last night there appeared in the Washington Star a statement of an interview with my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], in which he is quoted as saying:

The minority party opposition is opposed to 6-, 12-, or 18-months' extension of service.

He stated that that was the question involved, and then I quote him further:

The question is whether we should break with the selectees at all.

That may be the question that addresses itself to my friend from Missouri, that may be the question that is paramount in his mind, but that is not the question that is paramount in my mind.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. In view of the fact I mentioned the gentleman, I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I would like to know what it is that has caused the majority leader and the Speaker to have changed their minds, because it was reported by the press a short time ago that they were opposed to any extension for the draftees.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Missouri misquotes the majority leader.

Mr. SHORT. I am simply quoting the papers.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have only 10 minutes. I have answered the gentleman. The gentleman from Missouri misquotes the majority leader.

Mr. SHORT. I am quoting what the papers stated.

Mr. McCORMACK. I tell the gentleman I deny the statement. That is enough.

To me, it is not a question of whether we should break with the inductees, to me it is a question of whether we should break with our country and whether we should break with the trust that is imposed upon us by the past generations of Americans. All of us must make sacrifices when a crisis confronts our country.

I wonder if my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and some others, think for a minute that they are going to fool the young men of our country. The young men of our country are patriotic, they are willing to make sacrifices when the Nation's interests are involved.

I resent the implied argument made by those who oppose this bill on the ground, as stated by the gentleman from Missouri, that those in the service are not willing to serve longer at this moment of peril; in other words, that they are not patriotic. The only ground upon which such an argument can be based is that where danger exists to our country those in the service now and in the future are willing to think of themselves first and our country second. No country could long survive where that thought generally existed.

Further, gentlemen fail to read the minds of these young men. Naturally, they would like to go home. That is a natural personal view for them to hold. But as citizens, with their love of country, the great majority of them are willing to make personal sacrifices for the country's best interest. If that were not so, if personal interest is placed in time of danger paramount to the national interest, than God help our country.

The great majority of the youth of our country are loyal, they are patriotic, they are willing to make sacrifices, and when they have done so, they will go back to their homes and communities proud of the service and the sacrifices they have made for their country. Then those who today try to belittle them by their specious and fallacious arguments will have to answer to them. I resent this argument, and I challenge it as false. The youth of America today are just as loyal and are just as willing to make the necessary sacrifices for our country as were the youth of any past generation of Americans.

Some say they will vote to extend the time of the National Guard and the Reserves but not of the inductees. Why this willing discrimination? Is it because they want our people to feel that the National Guard and those in the Reserves are more loyal and patriotic than the inductees? That is one of the inferences that can be drawn from their argument. If so, I challenge it. Is it because they feel that the voting influence of the National Guard and the Reserves is less than that of the inductees? That is a proper inference to draw from their arguments when they state they are willing to treat two groups differently than they treat another group. The justification for extending the time of the National Guard and Reserves is the changes that have taken place and with which our country is confronted.

Mr. Chairman, this is a serious moment. Republicans and Democrats, let us transcend our personal views and vote as Americans clearly and distinctly for the best interests of our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make known my opposition to the measure upon which we are about to vote, providing for the extension of the period of service for selectees beyond the 1 year provided in the Selective Service Act of 1940.

My position on this bill coincides with the position taken by the minority members of the Military Affairs Committee. I am willing to keep the National Guard, the Reserve officers, and the retired Regular Army personnel in active service as long as it is necessary to carry out our training program; but I fail to see the need for keeping selectees in service longer than 12 months.

Those who argue for the passage of this measure would have us believe that the release of selectees at the end of the original 12-month period would disrupt the Army expansion program. In so arguing, they completely lose sight of the original purpose of the Selective Service Act, which was to provide a large, continually revolving supply of trained men for the reserve pool of the Regular Army.

Certainly none of us desire to hamper the Army or endanger its program, but it is hard to believe that conditions have changed so greatly in the past year as to demand that we discard our original training plan and substitute it with a plan for a permanent, standing Army of unlimited proportions.

The only way that Congress can honorably keep selectees beyond the 1 year they were told they would have to serve is to find that the Nation is in greater peril than it was when the Selective Service Act was passed. No information has been presented to Congress to sustain such a claim. On the contrary, world events favorable to the Allies, coupled with the progress of our own defense program, indicate that the opposite is true.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for us to consider how the selectees themselves, whose vital interests are tied up in this legislation, feel about the prospects of remaining in service indefinitely. I have the keenest personal interest in their training and welfare, and the greatest admiration for their loyalty and good sense.

Only last month I had the privilege of serving a 28-day tour of active duty with the First Cavalry Division at Fort Bliss, Tex., during which time I came in close contact with hundreds of selectees. I observed nothing which would leave the slightest doubt about the patriotism of these men. They are a splendid lot,

willing and eager to make whatever sacrifice their country's security demands.

Quite naturally, however, they wish to be sure, and deserve to be shown, that the sacrifices they are making, or may be called upon to make, are absolutely necessary to the national defense. All of them entered the service with the expectation that future groups of trainees would take their places at the end of a year.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that to change the rules at this stage of the game would be an unpardonable breach of faith on our part and would be so construed by these selectees. There is no blinking this fact. I speak from personal knowledge when I say that this is true. As for myself, I intend to have no part in it. I expect to vote against this measure and, in all fairness and honesty, I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the author of the original Selective Training and Service Act the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it is pretty certain that I cannot add a great deal to this discussion. Practically every point at issue here has been discussed, and ably so, by the men who have spoken on both sides of the question. It shall be my effort in the very short time permitted to gather up a few of the loose ends perhaps and try to straighten out some of the conceptions that have been evidenced here about an army, and especially our Army at its present stage of development.

The great issue at stake here is whether or not we shall retain in service beyond their first 12 months these soldiers known as selectees. Incidentally that is a name I have always detested, but there seem to be no hope of wiping it out of our vocabulary. There are 640,000 of them. We have a population of 130,000,000 people. It is thus apparent that they constitute about one-half of 1 percent of the entire population of the United States. An understanding of that will convince anyone, I am sure, that we are not indulging in a severe draft upon the manpower of the country. Indeed, our whole Army, roughly, of 1,500,000 men, is only slightly in excess of 1 percent of our entire population. When one considers our population and our resources, our Army today is about the smallest Army proportionately on the face of the earth.

What sort of an Army is it to be if it is to be retained at that comparatively low figure, and I am not urging an increase in numbers? It must be the most efficient Army for its size, if we can make it so. At the present stage of development these 640,000 men are of an importance in this Army of ours far beyond their numerical proportions.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] has stated to the House, following out the suggestions of the minority report, that these selectees came into the Army in dribbles, unevenly through the months, and that it will be just as easy for the War Department to let them out in dribbles in an equal number of months without hurting efficiency. The trouble is that the minority report—and I refer to

the minority with all respect—does not paint the entire picture.

True, the selectees came into the Army in uneven numbers from month to month, but they did not join the units of the Army in uneven numbers from month to month; quite the contrary in most cases. Very properly the War Department, in cooperation with the selective-service system, arranged it so that in most cases men should be drawn into the service from time to time, collected into groups, these selectees, and a specific group added to an existing unit of the Regular Army or of the National Guard to bring that unit to war strength. I will give you an example of it. Take the case of the Twenty-seventh New York Guard Division down at Fort McClellan, in Alabama. Those guardsmen went down there 12,000 strong on October 16 of last year. After shaking down for 3 months and building a new camp and training themselves and training a "training cadre" within their own ranks, that division received in 1 week's time 6,000 recruits from the draft. That was a wise way to manage it, because it made it possible for the division to take the 6,000 men as you take a freshman class into a college on the same day in the autumn and move them along in their training, so that at the end of their initial training they could be put into companies, battalions, regiments, brigades, and special troops, and at a definite period you would have a war-strength division, a team. That is what an army is composed of today—teams—teams beginning down with the squad, whose leadership is of enormous importance these days.

Now, suppose a bill such as this does not pass. Six thousand men in one group sometime next year will be taken away from the Twenty-seventh Division. And what have you done to the division? You have wrecked it as a team for at least 8 or 10 months.

This is the situation in unit after unit clear through the present Army of the United States. And the Army, which is just beginning to get good, must go a considerable distance farther before it reaches a point at which we can say it is efficient to the last word and down to the last man. If the selectees are not to be kept in, team after team will be smashed in the Regulars and in the guards, both.

Only yesterday I sought the figures from the Twenty-ninth Division in training over here at Camp Meade. There are seventeen-thousand-and-odd men in that guard division—8,200 of them originally were guardsmen, 9,500 of them today are selectees. True, those 9,500 in the Twenty-ninth Division did not all come into the division within a 1-week period, but they came within a period of a few brief weeks, and the division commander very properly used the increments as they arrived, not by scattering them clear through the entire division but by using his first increments to build up the artillery regiments, to put them at war strength right away and get their training started. Then an infantry regiment was brought up to war strength on a certain day, then another



regiment, and then another regiment, team after team. You take 9,500 men away from that division in a 2-month period, we will say, next year and you have wrecked every team in the division from a military standpoint.

There is your practical consideration, which, I am sorry to say, the minority report does not mention. It is proposed time like this. Frankly, I am disturbed—deeply, deeply concerned—that such a thing may happen to the Army of the United States in the year 1942.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would prefer not to. I only have a moment.

Now, let us look at the world situation. It has been discussed and very ably, and, as I said at the beginning I may not be able to add anything to it. Using a football expression, Hitler has carried the ball from the beginning of this terrific game. He has given all the signals. He has made all the attacks. He has gained ground on every play. He still gains, he still carries the ball, he still gives the signals, and there are no rules in the game as he plays it, much less a referee. You see his activities today, plus the activities of Japan. A naval member of the Japanese Cabinet said only last week that the situation in the Far East was such that a mere spark would set off the explosion, and you all know that to be true. Against whom was the alliance between Japan and the Axis Powers primarily directed? Against the United States; have no doubt about it. And that alliance was made after we passed the selective-service law. Look at that far eastern situation. Is it of no concern to us; and is it not of more concern today than it was a year ago? See what the Japanese are doing. Every sensible man knows that our vital interests are menaced. Vital supply lines would be cut off and all Asia would be organized against the Western Hemisphere if the Fascist Government of Japan has its way in that part of the world, with its alliance with the Axis Powers of Europe. Just the other day our Government thought so seriously of that situation that it mobilized the Army in the Philippine Commonwealth and merged it into the Army of the United States. Is there a man on this floor who disapproves of that action? Not one. Is there a man on this floor who disapproves putting General MacArthur in command of that Army? Not one. But why was it done? Because the situation is serious to the extreme; something that did not exist a year ago.

During these months what has happened in France? I wish I had time to give some information on that. Month by month we have seen the Vichy Government yield to the pressure of Germany. Month by month, we have seen them give over to Germany. They have not stopped giving over; make no mistake about that. It was at Germany's insistence, of course, that the Vichy Government gave over Indo-China to Japan, on the road to Siam, the Malay Peninsula, Singapore, Australia, and the Dutch East Indies. There is where your pres-

sure is coming, and coming stronger all the time.

Hitler rolls on through Russia today. Should he win, and it appears that he has a good chance to do so, he is more powerful than ever. His next demand upon France will be for northern Africa. And it may be of interest to you to know that ever since the armistice between France and Germany the German Government has compelled General Weygand and officers of the French north African Army to surrender their technical weapons, to disband troops. Tanks have been taken away from them and sent to Dakar. Heavy artillery has been dismantled. Even the French Foreign Legion, famed in warfare, has been decimated. Why? To make more easy infiltration by Germany into north Africa. They already have a bridgehead into north Africa in the shape of Spanish Morocco. Spanish Morocco today is filled with troops of Spain, armed with German weapons of the last design. When will he give the signal? When he gets ready. That is the way he believes. The signal will go to Japan as well as to his own forces—when, none of us can tell.

I think Mark Sullivan expressed it pretty well the other day when he said that America is not moving toward war; the war is moving toward America. We are doing our best to fend it off, to hold it at arm's length. That is why we are organizing our defense. We are trying to do something from day to day which will discourage anybody from attacking the Western Hemisphere. The fend-off policy accounts for the acquisition of the island bases. So it accounts for the occupation of Iceland and Newfoundland. Would this House vote to retire the marines from Iceland today? I think not. It is not a move on our part toward war; it is an effort to fend off war. We all want it fended away. We all want to hold it at arm's length; but the way to hold it at arm's length is to perfect our defense, never to weaken it one little bit. We do not dare take chances, not for one moment. It is conceded that if legislation of this kind is not passed the defense of the United States will be seriously weakened for many, many months. That is the whole question before us, as I see it. I know it involves inconvenience. I know it involves some measure of sacrifice, but I have confidence in those men. I do not call them "boys." They are men. Take a look at them as you see them. They are men who will do their duty. American soldiers always do when they know that a great decision is made.

My prayer is, Mr. Chairman, that our decision shall be made in the interest of the safety of the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, in the remaining 4 minutes I would like to make a brief explanation by saying that on yesterday I undertook to get a meeting of the House Military Affairs Committee, but could not, due to the fact that the House was meeting at 10 o'clock this morning. I therefore polled the committee.

I have at the desk five amendments which will be proposed as committee amendments, and in my time I would

like to ask that they be read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the five amendments mentioned by the gentleman from Kentucky, for the information of the House.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments proposed by Mr. MAY:

(1) Page 4, after the colon in line 10, insert: "Provided, That extension of the periods of active military service, or training and service, in the case of any person subject to the provisions of this section, shall not, without his consent, exceed 18 months in the aggregate; except that whenever the Congress declares that it is in the interests of national defense to further extend such periods of active military service and training and service, such periods may be further extended by the President, in the case of any such persons, for such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense:"

Amendment No. 3: Page 4, strike out lines 13 to 15, inclusive, and insert: "Provided, That the authority hereby conferred is subject to the condition that the delegation of such authority may be revoked at any time by concurrent resolution of the Congress."

Amendment No. 3: Page 4, strike out lines 13 to 24, inclusive, and insert:

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of War shall, when not in conflict with the interests of national defense, release from active military service those persons who apply therefor through the regular military channels and state their reasons for such release, and whose retention in active military service would, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, subject them or their wives or other dependents to undue hardship if retained on active military service. Any person so released who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, has served satisfactorily shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect, which shall be in the same form and have the same force and effect as a certificate issued under the provisions of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. Any person so released shall be transferred to, or remain in, as the case may be, a reserve component of the land forces for the same period and with the same rights, duties, and liabilities as any person transferred to a reserve component of the land forces under the provisions of section 3 (c) of such act."

Amendment No. 4: Page 6, strike out lines 6 to 10, inclusive.

Amendment No. 5: Page 6, line 13, after "amended", insert "(1)", and beginning with the colon in line 16, strike out down to and including the period in line 20, and insert "and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section the President is authorized to order the same member or the same unit into the active military service of the United States for more than one period, except that in the case of any such member any active military service under authority of this resolution in excess of 12 months shall be deemed an extension of active military service within the meaning of section 2 of the Service Extension Act of 1941.'"

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have supported, and I will continue to support, every measure proposed in the interests of national defense. I am opposed to this measure because I am convinced it is not in the interests of national defense. I realize that this is a serious problem, and in order to do justice to the gravity of the situation I read all the hearings and as much else as was possible pertaining to this subject.

One of the items I read I want to recall to you gentlemen now. It appeared in the Washington Post for June 24, 1941. It was the report of an interview with General Marshall right here in Washington. He was talking about the same boys we are considering today. I quote the general—remember, this was not a year ago; it was not 2 months ago:

We want the selectees to continue to come in annual increments—

The Chief of Staff said—

we want them flowing into the camps and then back home again. When we send a man home, we will make room for another.

That gentlemen, is the statement of our own Chief of Staff in June of this year, a man in whom all of us have great faith.

I have read also the statements attributed to General Wavell and General Auchinleck, both to the effect that American men must be sent to Europe to defeat Hitler. I read the speech of Mr. Churchill in which he told us we are on the verge of war. I read also, in the RECORD, the speech of our Senator PEPPER, who waxed eloquent in telling us these boys will be in the Army at least 5 years, and perhaps a generation; that the war would not end until America had drawn its sword "across the ocean chasms." These things point the way we are traveling—to join in the European war.

That is why I oppose this extension, because I am of the firm conviction that it does not serve our purpose but serves only the purpose of European war lords who would have our boys slaughtered to maintain their positions and rescue them from the results of their own folly.

Help Britain win—yes. Give her everything that money can buy; but money cannot buy back the life of one American boy dangling from a barbed-wire barricade, with his belly blown out—and for what? For the same type of peace that came after the last war?

We take such a funny position, gentlemen. We talk about an association of nations—and fight for democracy—when we are giving help to the treacherous tyrant who has stifled all vestige of democracy wherever he was able.

Finland we have been so proud of. The only nation in the world who honored her obligation to this country. Now, because she fights Bloody Stalin to maintain her democracy and win back that which the ace double-crosser stole from her through ruthless warfare, we are supposed to consider that noble little Republic an enemy. We recently enacted legislation to relieve in some measure the strain of Finland's repayment of her war debt—this because of her sufferings at the hands of Joe Stalin, and now we give

aid and comfort to the thieving scoundrel who today bombs her cities and subjects her civilians to the renewed horrors of war.

How can anyone suppose that after this war is finished Russia will give back to Finland the land and plunder it robbed her of? And can it be maintained that Stalin will reimburse Poland, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania? Are we to be a party to upholding Stalin's right to that booty?

If we prepare to engage in this European debacle, as Senator PEPPER urges—for 10 years or a generation—then what in God's name are we fighting for? How can we hope that the peace to be established will be humanitarian when we join hands with the plunderer whose agents are the sworn enemies of all free government? It cannot be democracy we fight for—nor for world trade. We did not profit by the last war in the matter of world trade. We have always been competing—most always unfavorably—with European countries and Asiatic countries for world markets. We have to compete with cheap labor, poor living conditions, and greedy selfishness. But the minute there is trouble we have to play the crusader and tour the world, ramming peace down the throats of people who later hate us for it and call us Uncle Shylock when we send the collector around for the installments.

I really believe the training these boys have received and are receiving has been good for them and for the country. But too much military training cannot do them or the country any good, and for that we have the War Department's word. On June 24 of this year all commanders were instructed by the War Department to discourage the reenlistment of 3-year regulars, because fully trained troops "offer little benefit to the Army."

I am no hypocrite, and I am not laboring under a terrible misconception on the question of our involvement in this European war. Go back to your districts, and what is the first question the man on the street asks of you—"Are the boys going to be sent over?" The dogs in the street know where we are heading; yet we stand here preaching national defense, and pay it merely lip service.

Tanks, planes, munitions, and food are going across the water. If we are worth our salt we will at least make certain that we keep the best kids in the world right here at home.

If die they must, then die they shall, but, please God, let their deaths be a sacrifice for home and not for a dream Utopia in an association of nations where we try to do business with tyrants of Stalin's type, double-crossers of Hitler's breed, militarists, monarchies, empires, and cowards; and when Old Glory has ceased to be an emblem of national freedom, and represents the three balls over the international hockshop, and Uncle Sam is no longer the grand Yankee but the cashier—paying the bills for a world police force.

If you gentlemen want to guarantee to the United States an adequate Army, with a huge reserve of young men who have had a full year of intensive training, then leave the bill alone. Maybe there is

no danger of a new A. E. F., but you can guarantee there will not be by defeating this measure.

Let me give you a reminder of the sentiment of the country on the twentieth anniversary of our entry into the last war. This is from an editorial in the Providence Evening Bulletin, April 6, 1937. I quote:

What is American sentiment 20 years after the war? Unanimously it is never again! Never again! Never again! We are completely disillusioned. We saw the supposedly high idealism of the Allied cause and the war aims of Woodrow Wilson betrayed by the cynical peacemakers. They forced Germany at the ends of bayonets to make a bad peace—and the Germans did not forget. Twenty years after we see the war to make the world safe for democracy has produced more tyranny. Dictators are everywhere. \* \* \* It is discouraging. The war upset the economic system of the world, intensified nationalism, let loose a violence that has not been checked. The severe depression is traceable directly to the war. \* \* \* Nothing but sorrow and tragedy the war brought. Nobody gained—everybody lost. Twenty years after the war let us keep the conviction clear: Never again!

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I expect to vote for this bill. I intend to do so because I consider its passage is vital to the interests of the Nation. I intend to do so because its passage at this time seems to me to be imperative.

We are not at war and, God willing, we will not be at war, provided those who not only have threatened the peace of the world but who so far by bloody means have imposed their will upon the greater part of Europe realize that we are in earnest in our decision to defend the rights and liberties of the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

You may rest assured that the guiding spirit of the Nazi program will not be satisfied with a conquest of Europe, nor will his ally in the Far East, Japan, rest content with the territorial acquisitions that it has already made.

National socialism, the Nazi theory, is a philosophy of life or an economic doctrine, whichever you may consider it, which in order to be successful, assuming it can be successful in the long run, must be imposed upon the whole world. Abraham Lincoln said that this Nation could not live half slave and half free. Neither can the world live half under the democratic system that we have grown up under and know, and half under the Nazi system of totalitarian government. Whether we are at war or not, therefore, it is our prime duty to see to our defenses and in so doing we must assume that, should Hitler vanquish Britain and Russia, the Americas will be the next point of attack.

Under the terms of legislation heretofore enacted, we have been lending, leasing, and supplying ships, airplanes, arms, and ammunition to Britain. We have done so because Congress and the Executive in their wisdom have realized that it is not merely to our interest, but to our life to do what we can to stave off this danger that threatens the world. It is now proposed, among other things, that



the terms of the selectees chosen under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 be extended for an additional 18 months. A good deal of propaganda has been circulated to the effect that to do so would break a pledge which was made with the young men who were inducted into the service. Congress, however, reserved the right to extend such service provided it felt that the interest of the country was imperiled. The debate on this bill therefore has centered very largely around the question of whether the country is imperiled or not. If we have not felt that we were imperiled, why have we appropriated and voted contract obligations to the amount of approximately \$40,000,000,000 for our national defense? If we did not think we were imperiled, why did we authorize the loan of approximately \$7,000,000,000 worth of matériel and credit to the British Empire? Would it not be folly now, whether or not they are yet fully trained, and I question if they are, to release the selectees who were brought into training less than a year ago?

The citizens of this country should realize that there is a madman loose in Germany and that the whole civilized world, not only the United States, is imperiled by the philosophy of government which he and his associates have evolved. That philosophy would destroy all we have fought for and cherished since the inception of this Republic. Those of our citizens with average intelligence who cannot or do not understand this either have not studied the matter through or are blinded by partisanship or local considerations.

There is in Congress what is known as an "isolationist group." These Members have shouted for months that this is not our war but that America should defend itself and put itself in a position to defeat any attack that may come. Members of this same group Friday and today on the floor of the House opposing this resolution have been doing their best to destroy just such a defense as is being built up and trained under the terms of the Selective Service Act of 1940. All of those now opposing this resolution refused to vote for the original Training Act, but now they are going further and attempting to scuttle an essential part of our Army.

Is it mere blind partisanship that makes them take this attitude or is it fear of a Hitler victory? Shakespeare said:

When our actions do not, our fears make us traitors.

One argument advanced on the floor has been that the extension of the time of service of the selectees is an effort to get us into war. This argument has been made by the isolationists against every step which Congress has taken to protect the Nation and to give aid to Britain. Now they demand that two-thirds of the Army be eliminated, after a period of training for only 1 year. That is too much for me to stomach. I am for the extension of the term of service, and I am for the other provisions of this resolution, feeling as I do that it is vital to our own defense.

This morning a group of lovely ladies called at my office. They said they represented America First and they were opposed to this resolution. Bless you, this resolution is for the purpose of protecting America first. While I hope and pray that we will never have to go to war to protect our liberties, I am not going to be found at any time in the position of knuckling down to anyone to avoid their defense, nor to appease anyone at the sacrifice of those liberties and our Nation's independence. There is not one man here who would not personally stand up and fight for what our ancestors fought for to leave to us.

America first, but in the Hitler program it is America last, after all the other nations of the world are conquered and brought under Nazi domination. Others have put in the RECORD that dire chronology which shows his progress of gnawing away like a rat the freedom and liberty of other nations. Thirteen of them are under his domination today. Their resources have been ruthlessly seized and exploited for Nazi benefit. Should the greater resources of Britain fall into his hands, do you not realize those would be used against us? Where is there a richer spoil to be obtained than in the United States of America?

My friends, the United States is definitely in peril. It will continue to be in peril as long as Europe is Nazi dominated. The declaration of this resolution, therefore, is not only wise and timely, but it is true and it is imperative that the selectees be kept in the service and that the number that may be in service at any time be increased. For these reasons, I urge upon you, my colleagues, that you forget local considerations, and looking forward toward the welfare of the Nation, vote for the resolution.

Act, act in the living present!  
Heart within, and God o'erhead!

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that it appears to be necessary for Congress to extend the service of our selectees. I deny that Congress is breaking faith with these young men by so doing. The statute under which these selectees were chosen specifically provided that they could be kept in the service beyond the period of 12 months if Congress "declares that the national interest is imperiled." Certainly—it must appear to this country that our national interest is imperiled or else there can be no justification for Congress voting \$40,000,000,000 for our national defense, besides lending the British Empire about \$8,000,000,000 worth of material and credit with which to protect her Empire in the war in which that nation is now engaged. If any living soul with average intelligence cannot see that the civilized world is now imperiled by the mad dictator of Germany and cannot understand that his philosophy of government and conduct is most inimical to our Nation's life and destructive of all that we have fought for and cherished for more than 150 years, then that soul

must be shackled by prejudice or blinded by partisanship.

I shall never admit that the average American boy is averse to doing his duty as a citizen of this Republic. Four generations of these boys have been tested and their heroism and fidelity to duty are unsurpassed on this earth. The duty which they are now called upon to do is just what any generation might have been called upon to perform. Surely, we would not discredit this generation by intimating that they would not fight for this Nation which has extended to them privileges and opportunities far superior to any other boys on this earth. The opponents of this extended draft service insist that this administration is designedly conducting this Nation into a foreign war. I deny this emphatically. I have no brief for some of the advisers of the President of the United States, but I do not think that the President is following the warmongers of this Nation. I am convinced that his attitude in this serious matter is largely determined by the advice of the Chief of Staff of our Army, General Marshall. I have had the opportunity for 2 years to sit around the committee table and discuss this national problem with General Marshall. In my opinion, there is no man on this continent more familiar with the problems involved in this defense and more loyal to the history of this country than he is. He impresses those with whom he comes in contact with his superb military knowledge as well as his love for those ideals of life which have made this Nation great. I am satisfied that the President's viewpoint is largely the result of his confidence in the advice and ability of General Marshall. This world would not be fit to live in if we did not put confidence in our fellowmen. I do not believe that General Marshall or his inferior officers want to precipitate this Nation into a war any more than I believe that Gen. U. S. Grant or Gen. Robert E. Lee wanted this Nation to go to war in 1860.

I have supported every measure proposed in Congress which had for its purpose the defense and protection of this country and also those measures which extended aid to the British Empire. By doing this I hope and I believe that we will keep war away from our country and make it unnecessary to call our young men into war service or send them anywhere away from this continent. Under our program for defense, if it can be pursued for 18 months without molestation or interference, we will be equipped to resist the attack of any nation or any group of nations; no one will dare fight us. It is necessary, of course, that we shall have a well-trained and intelligent Army in order to man and operate the present machinery and methods of warfare, and the acquisition of this knowledge undoubtedly requires more service, more discipline, and more practice for our soldiers than was necessary in our previous wars. The extension of the draft service is an incident made necessary by the present war methods, and the comforts and opportunities which this Government is extending to our selectees surpass any such training ever extended to any other group of soldiers on this earth. For

these reasons I shall support this legislation and prefer to go along with the President, General Marshall, and our great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time for general debate has expired.

Under the rule, the substitute will be read as an original bill for the purpose of considering amendments. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the national interest and welfare of the United States are gravely imperiled by the international situation; that a national emergency therefore exists; and the President is hereby empowered to employ the armed land forces of the United States in excess of those of the Regular Army in the national defense.

Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, all enlistments, appointments, and commissions of limited time or tenure now existing and which may hereafter exist in the Army of the United States, and in every component thereof, are hereby extended and shall remain in force unless sooner terminated by direction of the President, for the period of the national emergency hereby declared and for 6 months following its termination.

Sec. 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the limitation on the number of men who may be in active training or service in the land forces of the United States at any one time under the provisions of the act approved September 16, 1940 (Public, No. 783, 76th Cong.), is hereby suspended, and the President is hereby authorized to employ retired personnel of the Regular Army on active duty in such manner and to such extent as he shall deem necessary in the interests of national defense.

Sec. 4. Every person who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, and prior to the termination of the emergency above declared, shall have left a position, other than a temporary position, in the employ of any employer, to perform active military or naval service in the land or naval forces of the United States and who in the judgment of those in authority over him satisfactorily completes such service, shall, upon his relief or honorable discharge from such service, be entitled to a certificate to that effect, which shall include a record of any special proficiency or merit attained. Any such person who is entitled to such a certificate shall also be entitled to all of the rights, privileges, and benefits now provided by sections 8 (b), (c), (e), and (g) of the said act approved September 16, 1940, and, if the employment he shall have left to enter the military service was in the service of any federally owned or controlled corporation, agency, or instrumentality, shall be entitled to the same rights, privileges, and benefits with respect to such corporation, agency, or instrumentality. In any case where the position which such person shall have left shall, during his absence therefrom in such service, have been covered into the classified civil service of the United States, restoration to such position or to a position of like seniority, status, and pay shall be made notwithstanding the change of status of such position and without examination. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to deprive any person of any right which he would have enjoyed except for the provisions of this section.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the Congress, acting in accordance with and solely for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of section 3 (b) of

the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, hereby declares that the national interest is imperiled."

Mr. TARVER rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire recognition?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia for whatever purpose he rose.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to have the chairman yield to me. I rose to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire recognition?

Mr. MAY. No.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. A member of the committee is entitled to preferential recognition. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHORT to the committee amendment: Page 3, strike out lines 21 to 24, inclusive, and insert:

"That section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Any such man may volunteer for an additional 12-month period of training and service, and upon so volunteering shall, unless sooner discharged, serve for such additional period if he is acceptable to the land or naval forces, as the case may be, for such additional training and service. For the purposes of the limitation on the number of men who may be in active training and service at any one time, the number of such volunteers shall be disregarded.'"

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, so that I may apprise all Members of the House of this and two other major amendments that the minority proposes to offer, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to continue for an additional 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, there are many sections of this pending resolution which the minority favor and would like to see enacted into law. We propose to offer the pending amendment and two others. The first amendment that has been offered, which is the consensus of our minority of the Committee on Military Affairs, simply strikes out section 1 of the resolution, where Congress declares that our national interest is imperiled, which, in our opinion, is equivalent to a declaration of a national emergency, which would extend to the President in time of peace wartime powers. I call attention to section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act, which provides:

Each man inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) shall serve for a training and service period of 12 consecutive months, unless sooner discharged, except that whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interest of national defense.

Mr. Chairman, if that portion of this resolution as agreed to by Congress de-

claring that our national interest is imperiled, then the time of service for all these persons, including selectees, may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interest of national defense. That is, they may serve for an unlimited amount of time, and so, instead of keeping this section 1, we offer an amendment that will permit or allow these trainees, at the conclusion of the 12-month consecutive period of service, to volunteer and serve for another year if they so choose, and if they are acceptable to the military and naval authorities.

We also take off the lid on the number of volunteers for the year period just as we have already taken the lid off those men who enlist in the Regular Army. In other words, they would not be included in the limit of 900,000 selectees who can now under existing law be in service at any one time. We feel that this is a good amendment, and unless it is adopted that the President would have power, of course, to extend the time indefinitely.

For the enlightenment and edification of both the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wadsworth], I want to say I have talked to many of the selectees and I have been deluged with correspondence. I want to read brief excerpts from two letters that came in this morning's mail taken from innumerable letters I have in my office. One is dated August 6 and comes from San Mateo, Calif. It reads:

I am a trainee and have been in the service 10½ months, having enlisted for 1 year shortly after the passage of the Selective Service Act. During this period I have had ample opportunity to observe at first hand the reaction of the boys in training.

Regarding the morale, may I say that any extension of service would be disastrous in this respect. In spite of General Marshall's statement to the contrary, I can say that by passing the extension bill Congress will automatically create an army of "fifth columnists" far exceeding the fondest hopes of our enemies. The boys feel that they have been deliberately tricked and railroaded into this extended-service business. A bitter, disillusioned man makes a poor soldier. In time of crisis you cannot expect such a man to put forth any effort for a government which he feels has let him down.

And the boy appeals that I not disclose his name for fear, perhaps, of reprisals.

The other is dated August 10, and comes from Camp Bowie, Tex. It reads:

I am writing you at my own risk in order to let you know the true feelings of the draftees on the proposed time extension in the draft bill—

I agree with the gentleman from New York that these are red-blooded men, but this is how they actually feel about this bill. This draftee continues:

The principal reason that your mail hasn't been flooded with letters from draftees expressing their opinions is that we, the draftees, are forbidden to write to any of our Congressmen, etc., without the commanding officer's consent.

Almost to a man we feel that the proposed service extension is unjust and unfair in every respect. Many of us volunteered for 1 year so as to get our service over with. Since



we volunteered with that understanding, the Government is really committing a breach of contract in forcing us to stay longer than the time we were led to believe we would have to serve.

I am offering something substantial and definite, something from the draftees themselves. All that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] did was to deal in glittering generalities.

This is the first amendment, to strike out that section wherein the Congress declares that the national interest is imperiled. That would give the President wartime powers under a declared national emergency and would permit him to extend the service indefinitely of these selectees. Unless our amendment is adopted that very thing can happen.

The second we propose to offer is an amendment to the amendment to be offered by the chairman of the committee to section 1. I understood from its reading by the clerk that under it the components of the Army, the selectees, the National Guard, the reserve components, and the retired personnel of the Regular Army will have their service extended 18 months. In other words, we adopt the Senate provision. The minority of the House Committee on Military Affairs is anxious to go just as far as we possibly can, but we are going to offer an amendment to the committee amendment when we reach section 2 that will eliminate selectees from compulsory continued service but will allow them to volunteer for a year if they so wish. Then we limit the continued service of the National Guard, the reserve component, and the retired personnel of the Regular Army for 12 months. Under the language of the committee amendment the President would be given power under section 2 to continue in service the National Guard, the reserve component, the retired personnel, and enlisted men of the Regular Army for a 12-month period instead of 18, but we exclude selectees unless they want to volunteer.

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

Mr. SHORT. In just a minute, if the gentleman will permit me to proceed.

A third amendment will be offered to strike out section 6 of the resolution that would lift the ban on the 900,000 limit to the number of selectees that can be in training at any one time.

We feel that this section is dangerous and that it is wholly unnecessary. General Marshall himself testified that he needed only 1,700,000 men with which to defend the Western Hemisphere. We already have over 1,521,000 men in our armed forces and there are almost 250,000 selectees who have never been inducted into the service. So under existing law the Chief of Staff can have an army in excess of that number which he claims is necessary to defend the Western Hemisphere and, do not forget, Mr. Chairman, in addition to these three amendments that we have offered, we want unity, we want to go along, we want to adopt sections 3, 4, 5, and 7. They are

all good provisions that the minority are for.

There are three things we want to do. We want to strike out the declaration that the national interest is in peril. The second is in section 2, eliminating the selectees, but giving the President the power to continue in service for 12 months all National Guard, reserve components, and the retired personnel. We want to strike out section 6.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I merely want to make a very brief statement as to the meaning of this amendment and the purpose for which it is offered.

The House Military Affairs Committee unanimously adopted the first section of this bill, in which it is declared that the national interest is imperiled. The only amendment to the Senate provision which the House bill inserted was one offered by a member of the minority of the committee, which states "and solely for the purpose of."

The second proviso of this amendment or, rather, the closing paragraph which provides that for limitation on the number of men who may be in active training and service at any one time the number of such volunteers shall be disregarded, of course, would allow the number of volunteers to be in the Army in excess of the present limit of 900,000 at any one time. The provision which relates to volunteering is unnecessary for the reason that the law as it now exists permits such volunteering, if they desire to do so. It is the law of the land at this time. As a matter of fact, it is a provision of the original Selective Service and Training Act.

The only purpose of this amendment is to strike from this bill the foundation upon which it is based, which is the declaration that the national interest is imperiled. The amendment should not be agreed to and I therefore ask for a vote.

Mr. HARNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS. I am sure the gentleman did not want to make the statement that that section was accepted unanimously by the committee. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs knows very well that the minority opposed that from the time it was placed under consideration until it was reported out.

Mr. MAY. Might I remind the gentleman that what I said was that the provision inserted by the minority there was agreed to unanimously? That is, that this act should apply and be enacted for the sole and only purpose of section 3 (b) of the Selective Service and Training Act in order to prevent the President from exercising power under numerous other statutes that are the law of the land. If I am not mistaken, the amendment was offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. HARNESS. But not to the section. The gentleman means the words "acting in accordance with and solely for the purpose of carrying out this act."

Those are the words the chairman has in mind; but the entire section declaring that the national interest is imperiled was opposed by the minority, and we still oppose it.

Mr. MAY. I did not say that. I said it would apply to that amendment. Of course, I know that the minority on the committee have been from the beginning opposed to removing the limitation which would limit the number of selectees at any one time in the service to 900,000. The view of the majority side of the committee has been, and is now, that it is shortsighted and unwise to impose so many restrictions on our military leaders, to whose judgment and leadership we must look for the defense of this country.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Chairman, this day we Members of the House of Representatives will make a momentous decision. It is my profound conviction that in our hands rests not only the welfare of our beloved country but also the fate of the world. What we here do will echo down through the years to come either for good or evil, for weal or woe. There are some in this Chamber who honestly believe that the best way to save democracy is to extend the draft service. All honor to them for holding to their honest convictions. There are others who as fervently believe that the only way to save our free institutions is so long as we are not actively in the war to use the democratic way of the volunteer system, keeping those we have trained in reserve for a real emergency of attack should it arise. All honor to them for holding to their honest convictions. There are still others who waver. For them I have the highest respect if their indecision rests on honest doubt as to the best method. Let us once and for all grant to all the Members of this House the highest and most sincere motives for their views and their votes.

As for myself, I long ago made my decision as to how I would vote should the question be presented. I made it when I cast my vote against conscription in the first place. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS for the dates when that issue was debated you will find my reasons therefor. "Conditions alter cases" it is said. So they do as to matters of detail and policy—but never as to principle. Moreover, notwithstanding the loud cry of the press and interventionists to the contrary, I affirm and declare that the emergency is no greater than it was then—that there is no more danger now than then of an invasion of the Western Hemisphere, and that we are not—I repeat it, sir, we are not in active war at this time. Nor can we be until the Congress so declares. Furthermore, we who represent the people—the only sovereigns in these United States—are not going to declare war until there is an actual threat of an invasion of the Western Hemisphere. The people

have by their polls and by their letters and telegrams so spoken in no uncertain terms.

So first, by conviction I cannot vote for an extension. Secondly, it is the mandate of a majority of the people, at least of a majority in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington. Many of those who even do not concur in my views write me that they want me to follow my own honest convictions, as I am here as their Representative. But let us go farther. It was clearly understood when the original draft law was enacted that the service was for the 1 year. Do not be misled by the statements of the interventionists. Read the debates of those days on the floor of both Houses. Furthermore, read the newspaper columns of those days and compare them with the same columns of these days. And I repeat and emphasize the fact that the present emergency is no greater than when conscription was enacted. With the two great war dogs snarling and fighting each other, let us fervently hope and pray that they will destroy each other. Should either win—and God forbid—which would you choose, nazi-ism or communism? As for me, I want neither. I want to build up an impregnable defense of the Western Hemisphere against any possible invasion of any foreignism—be it fascism, nazi-ism, or communism. We can and must do this very thing.

It is declared time after time that our draftees are not yet trained. Well, where lies the fault? We have sent our equipment abroad so that our draftees have been trained with dummies and playthings. I saw an awkward squad being drilled without any equipment except khakis on an airport in my own district last month. It is my contention that had our equipment been kept at home all these young men could have been efficiently and properly trained for defense purposes in 1 year.

Then, again, a large Army is declared indispensable. I cannot concur in this. This is essentially a machine age. This holds true in warfare as well as in peaceful pursuits. Even the most cursory observation of events in Europe during the past year should convince reasonable men of this fact. Men are necessary—this is irrefutable—but only a fraction in proportion to the mass troops of even the last World War. We need far less men but they must be the best skilled men in their field. For this purpose tens of thousands would volunteer if the pay was anywhere near adequate. Oh, do not talk to me about patriotism. With war profiteers even now making their millions, with common laborers making as much in 3 days with overtime as a selectee gets in 1 month, do not talk to these selectees or their parents about patriotism. That is a word too sacred to be bandied about like that. Patriotism must and, by the grace of God, shall be applied to all men and women regardless of race, color, or creed and to corporations as well as individuals. There is only one brand of American patriotism and that is service and sacrifice by all and fairness and justice to all. We demand this even though you should pass this bill.

It has been and is my contention that for actual defense purposes of this hemisphere we should let these trained men as their year of service expires, leave active duty for their civil occupations again with the full understanding that as long as the present emergency continues, they are subject to call at any time in case of invasion, and, secondly, that every year for a brief period they report for active duty—the same as the National Guard. This is on somewhat the same basis as the Swiss system—a system which has kept Swiss borders inviolate for centuries despite her small population and small army.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Chairman, lastly may I call your attention to an article on a separate air force by Al Williams, who served for 23 years in the Air Corps, which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 29. There is conclusive proof from an experienced airman that if we could break down the opposition of the Army and Navy against a separate air department and build up the greatest air force in the world—which we could do if we kept our own marvelous planes at home—no possible invasion could be made by any dictator or group of dictators now living or in decades to come. We could stop any navy 500 miles from our shores—and Hitler knows this full well. Our "brass hats" do not seem to know it and they seem to control the policies of those urging extension and increase of our Army.

May I before I conclude say a brief word about at least one of the "four freedoms"? It is our duty to see these preserved and defended in the United States. One woman, intelligent and patriotic, came into my office yesterday and related the following incident: A friend of hers wrote a letter to a person high in official circles relative to the extension of time for the selectees. She was visited soon thereafter by a representative of one of the law-enforcement branches of the Government. He questioned her at length as to her purpose in writing. She asked if he were telling her not to write. He said, "You are putting words into my mouth." However, he let her know that she was being warned not to write. She said, "Wait until my friends hear about this." He replied that he would not advise her to tell her friends. She asked if she would be put in a concentration camp if she did. He said, "No; we will merely send a psychiatrist to visit you." In other words, St. Elizabeths for her. And this in free America.

Fellow colleagues, is it not more important to protect the right of free speech here in our own country than to try to guarantee it abroad? Is it not far better to convince and convert by example than to force upon an unready world even our splendid way of living and government? We are great enough, strong enough, good enough, if you please, to teach the world

by precept and example that democracy can prevail, can succeed, can best serve the common weal.

For my stand on this and other non-interventionist issues I am threatened with political extinction and oblivion. So be it if necessary. Most of these threats come from extreme interventionists. But in the years to come I must live with my own conscience and not with these extremists—for which I fervently thank Almighty God. Believe me when I say that were this vote cast on the eve of an election and should it result in my defeat at the polls, so help me God I could not do otherwise. It may not be politically expedient, but I have and now want every voter in the Fourth Congressional District of Washington to remember this vote as well as all others on next election day. If I cannot express and vote my honest convictions, then I cannot claim the respect of my fellow men, much less my own self-respect and guidance of a kind providence.

On my recent birthday my office force presented me with a plaque on which are written these words: "A politician thinks of the next election; a statesman, of the next generation." How little—how very little claim I can lay to the latter distinction. But by the grace of God and the good will of real friends I can and will follow in the footsteps of those who choose to "think of the next generation."

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have received a letter advising me that, unless I vote against any extension of the time of service of those inducted into the Army, my term of service here will be shortened and my political hide tanned on somebody's barn door. Now I have been threatened before with worse things than that. Under such circumstances, this question arises in my mind, "What does it profit a man to gain the whole world if he lose his own soul?"

My friends, there is no such thing as political expediency. History proves repeatedly that those who have tried to be politically expedient have found their efforts to be a boomerang.

Not only the first reason given in the letter is bad, but all of them are. The first is particularly so, for in my judgment the measure of the man is found in whether or not he will vote in such a way as to save his own hide or will vote to protect the lives of the thousands who are in training for the defense of all of us. His constituents will have to be the judge of his motives.

Delayed as such training may have to be or may be because of reasons over which he may have had no control, the trainee is entitled to it and should have it.

I am opposed to the amendment.

I would like to read you a couple of telegrams I received yesterday. The first is from the commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Vermont:

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,  
Congressman for Vermont,  
Washington, D. C.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars for the Department of Vermont urge you to support the



extension-of-service bill. Most Vermonters have confidence in the judgment of the War Department. Give our boys the training so few of us had. Unprepared and untrained will take a far greater toll of life and property.

ROBERT A. ROSENBERG,  
Commander of the Veterans of Foreign  
Wars for the Department of Vermont.

The second telegram, is from the commander of the Vermont Department of the American Legion and reads as follows:

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,  
United States Congressman,  
Washington, D. C.:

The Vermont Department, American Legion in convention assembled at Barre, July 26, unanimously adopted a resolution, copy of which has been sent you, calling upon Congress to enact legislation extending the period of service of those now in the Army until such time as the national crisis is over. To do otherwise is to jeopardize the security of our country, and give the "fifth columnists" their initial victory. We know you will give this legislation your fullest support.

EDWARD J. CASEY,  
Department Commander.

These two telegrams tell the whole story in a nutshell, as I see it.

After all the tumult and the shouting die, there stands the inducted group, unprepared. That they are unprepared cannot be denied. No man dares say that they are prepared either to take care of themselves or to save the country, which has spent billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money in order to make it possible that these young men shall be trained in both respects.

The arguments of those who talk about the contract do not prove a thing except perhaps that they are against universal service, are opposed to military training, are playing politics, or as isolationists or pacifists they learned nothing from our experience in the World War—or that is the way it seems to me.

Every mother, wife, widow, sister, or sweetheart, or any girl child of any man who was in the World War does not want any member of her family to be in another A. E. F. Of course, she is right, and she is right when she insists that the way to keep them from being in another A. E. F. is for us to have the best prepared man Army in the world, no matter how long it takes. If I know American women—and most of them I do know are very sensible—they do not want their men relations unprepared for defense as were those of their relatives who went with the A. E. F. in 1917.

Let us say that somebody has fallen down with the arrangements for training. We know that is true, and woefully true, but is that any reason why the men should not be trained? It is not. Why should we take it out on these trainees whom we contracted to train—and have not—and offer them up as a bloody sacrifice on the altar of hate for those who have failed to do their duty or for any other reason?

A little inconvenience now, perhaps more than a little, no matter who is to blame for it, must not be permitted to deprive this country and these young men of an opportunity to live. That is what it reduces itself to in the last analysis.

I am for no short-sighted, ostrich policy which will permit a recurrence of the destruction, devastation, disaster, and depression that have followed us since the World War because of our lack of appreciation of what was necessary, even elementary, for preparation, for preparedness.

In the ardor of sacrifice, with a passion for ideals and unshakable loyalty to a cause, as fine a group of young Americans has been assembled as ever despised death or loved life. For lack of proper preparation which we could afford, we now propose to offer them up on the bloody altar of Mars. It is unthinkable. To turn them out unprepared by reason of our failure to extend the time long enough to prepare them for their job is neither sensible, nor fair, nor right, and is a breach of contract on our part.

To justify such action, some say we are in no greater peril today than we were a year ago. That is a fiction of wishful thinking, for the hard, cold facts dissipate the fog of oratory, the glittering generalities of which have left an impression more delightful than permanent, and which cloud the vision of those who listen to such statements.

What means this passionate discourse, This peroration with such circumstance?

is a question it is always well to ask under such circumstances. It is time to take quiet hold of the realities when one is swayed by the emotions or superinduced to be swayed by those who can make a lion look no more than a cat.

The truth is found in the fact that our peril is greater. It is greater because, as Mark Sullivan says, the war is coming closer to America every day. The closer it comes, the more it becomes necessary for us to prepare ourselves as expeditiously as possible for defense. The fallacy of saying or thinking that defense will grow out of a 4,000,000-man army springing to arms has been exposed.

It is costly wisdom that is bought by experience, but

Experience joined with common sense  
To mortals is a providence.

The uncalled-for sacrifice of men and brains and blood and brawn, out of sight and buried in foreign soil, in the last war because of a lack of preparedness, the responsibility for which lack rests on the Congresses of the days preceding the World War, was a high price to pay for the wisdom that should be ours.

The burden of responsibility for the crippled and maimed in body and mind who came back from overseas, and the blood of those dead who lie there is on the heads and drips from the hands of those who mistakenly insisted that there never could or would be a war and therefore opposed all forms of universal military training and blocked all attempts to prepare this country for war in a time of peace. We should not repeat that tragedy of errors.

We are in a greater peril today, as every day the war comes closer.

And war is coming closer. I say with Mark Sullivan that—

War is coming closer to America and its vital interests. It made a new jump of some thousand miles last week when Japan moved into Indo-China. It made a long jump in

June, when Hitler attacked Russia; because, if Hitler crushes Russia utterly, he would be in Vladivostok and elsewhere in eastern Siberia only a few miles from Alaska.

This has been going on since the war began. When Hitler crushed France, his approach toward America in miles was not much, but in essential meaning, very great. We recognized it instantly. It was in the very month of Hitler's conquest of France that we set about our enormous increase of naval and military armament, and Congress began consideration of the draft.

War made another long leap toward us when France put her dependencies at the disposal of the Axis. Just as France put Syria at the disposal of Germany, and let Japan have Indochina, so might she let Germany make use of Martinique, which is within a few hours by air from the Panama Canal and our continental soil.

All this is war coming closer to the United States. It is not the United States going closer to war.

We know, too, that we must not wait until war makes the final leap upon us. We know that our defense must be not merely static. We know that if our defense is to be effective, it must at some point become offense—or, let us put it this way, prevention of offense by the Axis. It was in this spirit that we occupied Iceland; we occupied it to prevent Germany from occupying it first. We may need to make other such steps in the Atlantic. And in the Pacific, the time may be close ahead when we need to make a move, lest Japan move first.

I am opposed to the amendment, and I am for such extension of the service as in the judgment of the War Department is necessary to train these men properly. It would be not only most reprehensible but decidedly dishonorable for us to break our contract by depriving these young men of an opportunity to fit themselves properly and adequately for the service they are ready to give their country.

As John Elliot said:

Those rights that made our fathers freemen  
are in question. If they be not now the more  
carefully preserved \* \* \* they will render  
us to posterity less free, less worthy than our  
fathers.

In the long vista of the years to roll,  
Let me not see our country's honor fade.  
Oh let me see our land retain her soul,  
Her pride, her freedom; and not freedom's  
shade.

We must be fit in order to be free.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 2 words.

Mr. Chairman, the first paragraph of the committee substitute bill is as follows:

That the Congress, acting in accordance with and solely for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, hereby declares that the national interest is imperilled.

Let us refer to section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act. The last part of it reads:

Except that whenever Congress has declared that the national interest is imperilled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense.

The minority members of this committee are opposed to declaring the national interests imperilled when it carries with it that indefinite and interminable extension at the call of the President. There is nothing more oppressive to morale than

an indefinite extension of service. I know what I speak about because I had the privilege in the World War of seeing the 7-year enlisted men kid the duration boys on the length of their enlistment. Perhaps it goes over your head a bit, but it was a very real experience to see the 7-year boys in my regiment kid the men that enlisted for the duration. You put an indefinite extension of enlistment on these boys, and you lower morale.

I wanted to get the attention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wadsworth] during his talk to tell him that I am not wholly departing from General Marshall on that point. At pages 25 and 26 in the hearings General Marshall made the following statement:

If there is a prolonged period of uncertainty, such as we now have, we wish to continue the rotation of the selectees as far as possible, in order to bring new men in for training. The longer we freeze the men in the ranks of the Army, the more difficult it will be to maintain their morale, unless real trouble starts. Then morale takes care of itself.

I think we are very logical in supporting General Marshall in that point of view and I, for one, do not wish to press down on the brow of these soldiers an indefinite extension, an interminable extension, of their period of service.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is my understanding that an amendment will be offered to meet that point, making the period of time definite, 18 months.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. May I add, however, that the declaration of a national peril carries with it the enforcement of section 3 (b) as it now stands in the statute, and that is indefinite.

There are a few things I believe to be vastly important at this time as to how far we shall go in following the high-ranking general officers of the Army. If you look at the front page of the hearings, you will find there the six witnesses who appeared to support this bill and no others in support of it. Five of those six are generals of the Army. The sixth was Grenville Clark, who enjoys a very wide reputation as a militarist.

I agree with General Marshall on the effect of an interminable extension in its effect on the soldiers and when it comes to the purpose of building a solid civilian morale. I believe we should look into some of these problems from the viewpoint of our foreign policy and from the viewpoint of our economic structure and we should consult representatives of other departments of the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs Committee promised me time under general debate which through circumstances beyond his control he was unable to accord me, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I hope it may be possible to discuss this measure without being properly criticized as either a warmonger, a pacifist, a partisan, or a demagogue.

I have voted for every defense measure which has been proposed during the period of this crisis. I intend to vote for this one. However, that does not mean that I do not intend in the Committee of the Whole to submit myself at least one amendment and support others of a substantial character.

I believe that it is not only the right but it is the duty of the Members of the House to lend such aid and assistance as they can in the formulation of a reasonable, sane measure, and at the same time, after the judgment of the Committee of the Whole has been taken as to the form which the measure should take, I believe it to be my duty to support that judgment, although I may not be in accord with it in all particulars.

I heartily favor the retention in the service and the provisions in this bill providing for the retention in the service of Reserve Army officers and the National Guard. The terms of over 69,000 of the National Guard expire next month. It is imperative, in my judgment, that action should be taken now as to National Guard men and Reserve officers rather than to allow this at least partial disintegration of the Army.

I favor the removal of the over-all limitation as it is proposed in the bill upon the number of those who may receive training. I do not believe that at this time the Congress should take the action which is proposed in this measure with reference to selectees. The terms of the first selectees do not expire, as you know, until November and only the terms of 13,000 of them expire at that time. There is no necessity, in my judgment, for the haste with which we are asked to act here in determining, not whether an emergency exists now but whether an emergency will exist in November which will require the retention in service of these selected young men. I feel that we ought at least to accord to them the consideration that we have accorded to the membership of the National Guard.

It is said the Army has to plan, it has to know in advance just what to expect in order that it may make proper plans for the maintenance of the Army. What opportunity has the Army had to plan about the National Guard? Sixty-nine thousand of them go out of service next month unless we pass this law, and here we are at the middle of August undertaking to make some legislative provision on the subject. Cannot we extend to these thirteen-thousand-odd November selectees the same consideration that we have already extended to the National Guard? Can we not wait at least until the first of October to determine then whether it is probable an emergency will exist in November which would make it unwise that they should be discharged from military service?

I do not think any one knows at the present time what the situation is going to be in November. We are told by military experts that if Russia succeeds in holding the Germans until bad weather sets in along the last of September, that our emergency situation will be materially ameliorated. Why should we not wait until that time? It may be there is no possibility of it, but if there is a possibility that this crisis or emergency may pass without our having to continue beyond 12 months the service of these selectees, why ought we not to give the boys the benefit of the doubt? We are going to be here all the time. Congress is not going to adjourn. If a crisis exists or if a severe emergency still continues the first of October, it would not require long to make the necessary provision for the continuance of the service of the selectees. Why in the name of common sense should we undertake to do it this long ahead of the period when the act will become effective for any selectees at all?

There is this further thing and it has been discussed somewhat in the debate, but I do not think that sufficient importance has been attached to it. Under section 3 (c), of the Selective Training and Service Act, the President has the right to call these selectees back the next day after their discharge for an additional period of service which, under Public Resolution 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, cannot be for over 12 months. There is no difference between the exercise by him of that power and the exercise of the authority which we are asked to delegate here, except that if the President calls them back under existing law it can only be for a 12-month period, whereas if he calls them back under the provisions of this bill, it will be indefinitely and can be from now on, in the discretion of the President. Why is it necessary that the Congress should at this time undertake to vest the President with additional authority, as to continuing the service of selectees? You, by declaring the national interest imperiled, vest him with the authority contained in section 3 (b) to continue their service indefinitely whereas he already has the authority, if he is so disposed to call them back to service for an additional period of 12 months under the present statute. Can we not afford to leave him with that authority which ought to be sufficient for the purpose for the present and at least defer until the early part of October consideration of whether or not the delegation of additional power to him is necessary?

I do not favor the disintegration of the Army. I am heartily in accord with everything that has been said with reference to the necessity of retaining in the service trained men. I do not think their discharge, so long as this period of emergency continues, ought to be for a moment considered, but at the same time I cannot understand why it is necessary this long in advance of the time when the first ones of the selectees will go out of the service, for the Congress to determine that at that time—not now, but then—there will be an emergency neces-



sitating their retention, not for 12 months, but for an indefinite period of time.

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

Mr. TARVER. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SHORT. And under the proposed amendment each selectee will be allowed at the conclusion of his 12 months' service to volunteer for another year.

Mr. TARVER. I am opposed to the amendment that the minority of the committee has offered. I am not supporting that and I do not wish to be misunderstood by the membership of the House. I do not think we would be justified in undertaking to depend upon volunteers to continue our Military Establishment under present conditions.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman is not for the amendment and is in favor of retaining section 1, which declares that the national interest is imperiled, then he is going to vote to continue these selectees in service indefinitely?

Mr. TARVER. No; I am going to vote for the amendment which I am going to offer myself, if the parliamentary situation permits, which provides that:

Page 4, at the end of line 12, strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following proviso: "Provided further, That notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, the power of the President to require more than 12 months' service and training in the cases of men selected under section 3 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 shall be limited to the powers delegated under section 3 (c) of said act."

I wish I had reason to feel as cocksure as some of my colleagues apparently do with regard to the many and important decisions we are constantly being called upon to make upon questions affecting the national defense. There are many men in Congress who apparently entertain no doubt whatever upon any issue. Part of them strongly oppose all defense measures and part of them vigorously support every item of such legislation proposed. I do not doubt that most, if not all, of them are conscientious. Perhaps there is not any excuse for indecision, and yet I cannot tell the truth and say that with regard to everything that has been done or is now proposed my mind rests entirely satisfied.

The press and radio of the country and propaganda in the mails are all so prolific of alleged information that is patently intended to influence public opinion, rather than to inform it, that it is with difficulty that grains of truth may be segregated from the chaff of error. So far as what is happening abroad is concerned, the average Member of Congress is unable from vastly different and conflicting reports to reach conclusions in which he has confidence. Under these circumstances it is but natural that we rely largely upon advices from our Commander in Chief, who has available sources of information in every country on the globe; from our Secretary of State, likewise having opportunity for contacts with qualified and capable informants throughout the world; and upon such advices in the press and on the radio as

appear from lack of substantial contradiction to be unquestionable.

However, in the unsettled and unknown matters, there are many things that trouble me. I am not sure about everything, as some men profess to be. I read all I can, listen to all I can, and, yes, I pray all I can. I profess no high degree of piety, but if ever men needed a God they need Him now.

I have supported, as I have said, every defense measure that has been enacted since this emergency began. Some of them I have supported because my analysis of the facts available led me to the strong conclusion that they were necessary to the national welfare. Some of them I have supported in part because of my reliance in what I believed to be the sincere purpose of the Commander in Chief to keep our country out of war, if possible, and upon the advices of the men in the Army and Navy, whose life work has been keeping our national defenses strong, and who ought to know more about what we need than the man who has not had that kind of training. I expect to continue in general that policy. I believe we are in the midst of a terrible crisis in our national history, and that only by the most tremendous and united efforts will it be possible to keep our country safe. I believe it will be possible, I believe it will be accomplished, and I am not inclined to split hairs with those who have the same objective in determining just how it ought to be done. I shall lend what aid and influence I can toward seeing that it is well done.

There is no political consideration involved. I have been honored by being permitted to serve the people in one capacity or another for 32 years and I shall not tarnish that record of honorable service by casting a vote in this time of national emergency dictated by re- and Service Act provides:

Section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act provides:

(b) Each man inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) shall serve for a training and service period of 12 consecutive months, unless sooner discharged, except that whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense.

There are those who say that Congress made no promise to selectees regarding the period for which they would be inducted. I say it did. It did not promise them they would have to serve only 12 months, but it did promise them under the express language of this section that they would serve only 12 months "except \* \* \* whenever Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled," or when they are called from reserve status by the President under section 3 (c) which reads as follows:

(c) Each such man, after the completion of his period of training and service under subsection (b), shall be transferred to a reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States; and until he attains the age of 45, or until the expiration of a period of 10 years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such reserve component, whichever occurs first, he shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component and shall be subject to such additional train-

ing and service as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law: *Provided*, That any man who completes at least 12 months' training and service in the land forces under subsection (b), and who thereafter serves satisfactorily in the Regular Army or in the active National Guard for a period of at least 2 years, shall, in time of peace, be relieved from any liability to serve in any reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States and from further liability for the training and service under subsection (b), but nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any such man, while in a reserve component of such forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such forces.

Thus, there are two ways provided in the act itself by which the period of 12 months' service may be extended. One is by the declaration of Congress that the national interest is imperiled. The period for which this may be done is indefinite. The other is by Presidential action in calling a man to active duty after he has served 12 months and been placed in a reserve status "as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law." How is the exercise of such authority by the President now prescribed by law? I quote here the first section of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, Third session, which is the existing law on this subject:

*Resolved, etc.*, That during the period ending June 30, 1942, the President be, and is hereby, authorized from time to time to order into the active military service of the United States for a period of 12 consecutive months each, any or all members and units of any or all reserve components of the Army of the United States (except that any person in the National Guard of the United States under the age of 18 years so ordered into the active military service shall be immediately issued an honorable discharge from the National Guard of the United States), and retired personnel of the Regular Army, with or without their consent, to such extent and in such manner as he may deem necessary for the strengthening of the national defense: *Provided*, That the members and units of the reserve components of the Army of the United States ordered into active Federal service under this authority shall not be employed beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere except in the Territories and possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands.

From this it will be seen that if Congress does not declare that the national interest is imperiled under section 3 (b), making the further stay of the selectee beyond 12 months indefinite, the President, the day after his 12 months is out, can call him back into the active service for an additional 12 months but no more. Why all this talk, then, about the Army disintegrating if we do not pass this bill as written? The terms of the first selectees do not expire until November, and only 13,000 of them then, with five or six thousand more expiring in December. I include here a letter from the Secretary of War with an attached statement, which explains itself:

WAR DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, July 28, 1941.

HON. M. C. TARVER,  
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. TARVER: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of July 21 relative to the future monthly periods when the term of service for National Guard men and selectees will expire.

Enclosed is a tabulation showing the number of National Guard men inducted into the

military service each month, beginning September 1940. They are subject to correction, however, since no deductions have been made for losses from various causes. Figures are also given for the induction of selectees by month beginning November 1940.

These figures, with the appropriate corrections for losses, represent the number eligible after a year's training for release in the corresponding months from September 1941 to June 1942.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,  
Acting Secretary of War.

Induction by months, 1940-41

Month	National Guard men	Selectees
September 1940.....	69, 112	-----
October.....	36, 843	-----
November.....	28, 416	19, 327
December.....	18, 275	-----
January 1941.....	42, 519	73, 633
February.....	68, 132	90, 238
March.....	13, 668	153, 437
April.....	4, 711	124, 982
May.....	-----	62, 456
June.....	462	79, 522
In service June 30, 1941..	282, 138	603, 595

<sup>1</sup> Includes December.

For the sake of emphasis, I repeat, who knows now whether an emergency will exist in November when the terms of the first selectees will expire? Why should Congress make any declaration to that effect now? It is expected we will not adjourn; that we will be continuously in session until this emergency is over. We are told that if Russia holds the Germans in check until October 1, our national danger will be greatly decreased if not eliminated. Why should we not wait and see what the next 50 days bring forth? I agree that if an emergency then exists, we should so declare, because the law under which these men were drafted so provides. I do not agree that we should declare now that an emergency will exist in November when the terms of the first selectees expire, necessitating their continuance in service for an indefinite time.

How long will that time be? A hot-headed fanatic, who has been howling for war ever since this emergency began, is reported to have said the other day in another body that these boys must serve 5 or 10 years, or perhaps a lifetime. I am unwilling to accord with such statesmanship. I conceive that in some instances it is inspired by considerations foreign to our national welfare; in any case, it is foolish madness. I am not willing by legislative act to destroy the hope for lives of happiness of millions of American boys. So far as I am concerned, I voted to put them into involuntary military service because it seemed absolutely necessary to our country's defense; and when it comes to the question of extending that service beyond 12 months, I am willing to do it when it appears necessary to do it, and I do not want to do it before then.

Oh, it is said, the Army must know now; it must be able to plan. The Army knows now, or it ought to know, that this Congress will keep the utmost number of trained men available in the Army until the emergency is over. The Selective Service Act in effect so declares. It

knows that the induction of additional men for training is in the discretion of the Army itself, subject to the over-all limitation in the size of the Army and the number of the selectees who may be in the service at one time.

Is it merely desired to remove that limitation? Then let us pass that part of the bill.

What is the other objection to delay, so far as the selectees are concerned? "Why," they say, "some of these men are stationed outside the United States and we have to get them back home if they are to be discharged."

There are about three or four thousand out of over 600,000 stationed outside continental United States. To talk about trouble in getting them home in a month if necessary is to reflect on the capability of the Army.

But it has been said the National Guard men and Reserve officers who have been called for 1 year's service will start going out of the service right away; the 1-year terms of over 69,000 National Guard men expire in September.

Pass this law, then, insofar as it applies to Reserve officers and National Guard men. I do not believe in allowing the Army to disintegrate until the emergency is over. These men will, in my judgment, gladly accept the call to continued duty, just as the selectees will, if, when their terms expire, the national interest requires it. What I am objecting to in this connection is determining now whether there is going to be a national emergency in November, when nobody knows, and by such determination making it possible for these men to be kept in the Army either indefinitely or for a long period of time.

It seems to me, sometimes, that there are high officials in the War Department who want a big army, whether there is an emergency or not. A big army means more big officers, higher salaries, far more numerous promotions. This emergency has already resulted in the making of so many major generals and lieutenant generals, not to speak of the smaller fry, such as colonels, majors, and what not, that the lists of nominations for promotions sent to the Senate from time to time have filled many pages. It may be that some of the Army officers who are behind this bill in all of its details so vehemently want us to act now because they are afraid that if we wait until October 1, there would not be any emergency justifying action, and the tremendous army they envision will be unnecessary. Whether that is true or not, neither the country, the Army, nor the selectees, can be hurt if Congress waits as long as it is possible to wait in safety before taking this drastic action. Pass the portions of the bill removing the over-all limitation on the number of men who may be in training at any one time; let them train all they want and can. Pass the part which will not allow these trained National Guard men and Reserve officers to be lost to the Army; and then wait a while to see if it is going to be necessary to keep these selectees more than 12 months. If, at the proper time,

it appears then to be necessary, I should certainly vote to do it; but I dislike to decide that question now.

If this bill as applicable to selectees is to be enacted, then the provision in the Senate bill for \$10 per month additional pay should be inserted. What does it matter if it costs \$171,000,000? When did any of you ever raise the question of economy effectively when we have been pouring out these billions of dollars for defense, a large part of which went to pay men in aircraft and other defense industries \$8, \$10, maybe \$12 or \$15 per day in some cases? And some of whom were not willing to work for that, but by strikes for higher wages and shorter hours have so impeded the defense program that it is only 70 percent up to Army plans and hopes? Thousands of them are striking now at Kearny, N. J., on shipbuilding contracts aggregating over half a billion dollars. These selectees cannot strike; you have had the opportunity to do something about these labor disputes in defense industries and refused to do it; you are appropriating the money to pay these high wages. Who are you to say that a selectee is not entitled to \$40 a month, \$1.33 a day, when we are told that in his job his very life may soon be endangered and perhaps sacrificed?

I am for national defense, but I am not for everything that anybody wants in the name of national defense. I do not want any American boys sent to fight in Europe. I would not sacrifice the life of a single American boy to save Bangkok or Singapore, Chungking, or Moscow. I would like to see England win, but I believe we can protect ourselves, whether she wins or not. I want us to help her win in the ways we have been helping her, and I believe she will win, but I am not willing to send another A. E. F. to help her win.

These are my views. I know they are not popular views in many quarters. I do not call everybody who disagrees with me a warmonger. I question the good judgment, both of some of those who are howling madly for immediate involvement, and of some of those who want us to stick our heads, ostrich-like, in the sand and insist there is no danger. There are some parts of this bill, as I have pointed out, which I think the national interest requires shall be promptly enacted into law. I have presented my views with regard to other provisions which I think ought to be changed, and I shall support amendments to change them. But after the composite judgment of this Committee of the Whole, composed of Representatives from every section of the United States, is taken, I shall, if the bill is not then in all respects as I would have it, submerge my own convictions as to some portions of it, if I feel that on the whole its enactment will contribute to our national welfare. In this struggle for the survival of civilization, I am in a way a soldier, and after I have done what I can to influence the plan of operation and that plan has been decided upon by a majority of my fellows, I shall not join the ranks of those who would



hamstringing every defense effort by insisting rigidly that every such effort shall be made in accordance with their own viewpoint or not at all.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, let us see if we cannot agree upon a time to close debate upon this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in approaching this bill, to my mind we must consider what is for the best interest of the United States of America. That is our job, and it is our job to protect the interests of the United States of America. We cannot do it without providing in every way possible for the best kind of national defense, regardless of whether or not the administration has done what it ought to do in connection with the defense program, regardless of whether it has done what it ought to do in reference to these men. We must provide the men that are needed to take care of the situation.

When General Marshall was before the committee in 1940, on page 104 of the hearings he said in answer to a question of Mr. HARNES—

This calls for 8 months' training. What was your thought?

General MARSHALL. That is too short in our opinion.

Mr. HARNES. What would you say?

General MARSHALL. A minimum of a year; but from our point of view we prefer a longer period.

That, Mr. Chairman, to my mind, is the statement with which we went before the country. I did not promise any man that he would be let out of the service before the need for him was exhausted. I do not like this idea of subterfuge, and frankly this language on page 3, lines 21 to 24, of section 4, is a subterfuge. If we have a situation to meet, let us meet it; let us say to these boys in the service that we propose to permit them to stay in the service for 6 months additional or for 12 months additional, but let us not muddle the thing all up in the kind of language you have here. Let us say definitely that we propose to give them that much additional training. General Marshall in his testimony as it appears on pages 26 and 27 of the hearings says that he proposes to let them out as soon as the need for them goes by. Why can we not have a definite period, and let the Congress meet its responsibility instead of beating around the bush? That is what I do not like about this proposal. I hope before we get through with this that that kind of a solution may be arrived at. I hope that the Congress will not dodge its responsibilities and shove them onto someone else. I hope as we get to considering this bill that we will stop all this idea of anything except that the men in the service are patriotic Amer-

icans and that they are prepared to do what is necessary for the defense of the United States of America.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, today, with a war raging in Europe and Asia, we are face to face with realities and it may well be that the time has come for a show-down in America. Of course, none of us want war. Neither did the free countries of Europe, which have been swallowed by a war machine the like of which no sane human being could ever have imagined. That being the case, and all indications pointing our way when and if Europe and Asia are conquered, it is up to us to stop wishful thinking and become realistic. God knows that I do not want to see our country plunged into war. I pray daily that I shall not be called on to vote for or against war. It would be horrible. And, because I feel so deeply on the subject, I have given it much thought and my convictions are firm that the only way to keep our country free is to first give all possible aid to England, which is our first line of defense, and then to build the defense forces of our country so strong that not even Hitler would dare to challenge us.

I am not unmindful of the fact that to do this will necessitate great sacrifice on the part of every man, woman, and child in America today and probably for generations to come, but if we succeed in maintaining our freedom—our way of life—all the things our forefathers fought and sweated for that we might enjoy the liberties and comforts they were denied—then it would seem that no sacrifice on our part would be too great.

I am not unmindful of the tears that are being shed by many of the mothers of America whose sons are now in the service of their country. Nor am I unmindful of their desire to see that service terminated. But I would remind those mothers that their Government is responsible now for the ultimate future decision, which may not be in their favor if a few years from now we become involved in a war with pagan gangsters. I would also remind them that hundreds of thousands of casualties of the World War might have been avoided had our boys been better trained when the call came.

Clear thinking, free from personal wishes and stripped of all emotion, would seem to indicate that this is no time to gamble with the destinies of a great country. Regardless of possible personal advantage our duty and responsibility to our great country seems plain.

Only God knows what the future holds. All we know now is that we are living in a period of crisis, that regardless of everything else we must cooperate with the Commander in Chief of our Army and of those responsible for the welfare of our country. They are in possession of facts. It is their business to see that the defense forces are as strong as it is humanly possible to make them. We cannot and we must not take chances with the future of the greatest country in the world. To do so would be treason to the men who fought and died for our freedom and for the blessings we have enjoyed because of their faith and their hope that freedom of religion, of speech,

and of the press was necessary to make a people and a country great. These have been our heritage—the greatest heritage that could come to humanity. It is ours not by right of working for it or of deserving it, but because of the sweat and blood of those who conceived it to be the greatest gift that could be bestowed on posterity. Can we break faith with those unselfish pioneers of freedom? Can we dare to say, "I am an American," with all that title implies and for selfish reasons close our hearts and our minds to the responsibilities we must face in defending our title. When we have a serious illness, we consult the best doctor. When we are engaged in a legal battle, we secure the best lawyer. It would seem logical, therefore, that, confronted with a problem about which we know so little, we must take the advice of those whose business and responsibility it is to know much. They may make mistakes, but we have no reason to believe our mistakes may not be greater.

Realizing all of these things, I believe it to be my duty as a Representative in Congress of a loyal district to vote for an extension of service in the hope that it may strengthen our defenses and eventually prevent the necessity of fighting in a ruthless war. I could take what for the moment seems the popular side of the argument and vote to send our boys home at the end of a year of training regardless. To do so would be to violate my conscience and my oath of office. I could not do this and consider myself worthy of having been born an American. During the past year many of our colleagues have been called to give a final accounting of their stewardship. Before another Congress meets many more will be called. I may be of that number. If so, I would not want to meet my Creator and have to acknowledge that for political expediency or lack of courage I had sold my country short when I had the rare opportunity of rising about selfish impulse and distorted facts to render service and show some appreciation for having been born an American. It is my hope that by our vote today we may serve notice on the "king of gangsters" that America means business.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. It was impossible for me to get any time during general debate. I make no tragic statement as to what the effect will be on myself if I vote one way or the other, pleading that conscience dictates sacrifice of our political future. I advise little of that kind of oratory at this time. Events will determine whether you are right or wrong. Public opinion will change overnight if there is any shooting. I voted for the repeal of the embargo, and quantities of mail threatened me then. I voted for the lend-lease bill, and quantities of mail threatened me then. I am indeed glad that I voted for both measures. I still firmly believe I voted right. I want to go along with any reasonable demands for defense; but today I am to vote with the minority on the committee. In their report I think they have proved their case. I have taken considerable pains to inquire into this matter. A large camp is within

7 miles of my home. I have visited and talked freely with the officers and many of the men. These many officers with whom I have talked said to me that 50 and even 90 percent of those boys were willing to continue in service. But I have talked to very many boys by themselves, and I could not find one who was willing to continue. It did not check up at all. However, the officers are Army men and feel that the boys are so well fed and cared for that they could be easily misled. The boys would hardly make an acknowledgment complaint to them.

As far as the political significance is concerned, a great number of people have been made to believe it is really necessary to keep these boys; and it is possible that other boys who may be selected would like to have these fellows kept in so that they will not have to go. So that when you come to judge the majority on this question you are treading upon thin ice. You may just as well let your conscience be your guide in the matter, but do not get tragic about it. We will all rather be forced to vote our conscience, not being able to know or depend upon what public opinion really is and especially is it doubtful as to what it may be in the future.

I can assure you that events that will transpire will settle it. I greatly regret if anyone should think I am putting my country in jeopardy by an adverse vote on this bill. I am sure that I am not. Enlarge the Navy all you possibly can. You probably are going to need it, but I cannot see where, in what spot, or when, you will possibly need in the immediate future a large army. You cannot convince me of that. It has already been certified that about 1,500,000 soldiers are all that is necessary for defense. We have allowed for 1,900,000. It is plain that number is all that we can take care of and train for some time. They have not trained the men inducted, lacking material for such training. The boys who have served almost a year have had no opportunity to train with instrumentalities and they cannot be blamed. It is not their fault. Let some other boys take their turn as promised and there will now be plenty of time yet before sufficient instrumentalities for training will be put in their hands. I am told that in the camp in my own locality only one contingent had sufficient equipment in the way of those instrumentalities. Some boys declared they had been there about 4 months and had learned all that their officers knew to teach them. You ask the Regular Army officer if that is true and he hesitatingly says, "Yes, in regard to the National Guard it is quite true, as, of course, generally those officers themselves have not had extensive and sufficient training in modern warfare, although they are the highest type of individuals, willing and courageous."

I have always paid attention to the promises and views of the President in the last 8 years. I seldom have depended on his promises since his early reversals in 1933. Other facts have determined my decision on this matter, rather than any prejudices I may have because he may not have kept his promises made since he came into office. These were

domestic questions. I now disagree with him in his plea that we are in much greater danger than 1 year ago. I wish I had the time to enlarge upon that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. My terminal facilities are not good. I do not want you to misunderstand me. I sympathize greatly with the President. I greatly admire his political sagacity. I think he has gotten there first on many occasions and gaged the public's approval quite accurately. We disagreed with him, but when we found public opinion was with him, we acquiesced. We awakened generally to a fait accompli. He has great authority. He has great constitutional powers and can easily forestall delay and action by Congress. The public usually applauds his actions. I regret if I err today in his latest plea. He has cried wolf so many times and created a host of emergencies, especially on the home front.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to fix some reasonable time on this amendment, if possible. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

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

Mr. WILSON and Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan objected.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a move on the part of the minority who are reluctant to admit that the national interest is imperiled. As I went down to the dining room to get some lunch, I picked up the Evening Star of this day. There is the headline "Darlan to become dictator of France. All military powers put in the Admiral's hands."

Is there a man on this floor who has been following the international situation who does not know what this move means? The French admit there are two orders in this world. One is the German order and the other is the British. They have made up their minds, beyond the possibility of a doubt now, that they are going to follow the German order; that they are going to do everything they can to promote the supremacy of the German order. With the supremacy of the German order comes the supremacy of Japan also, because when Germany wins Japan wins twice as much. She wins a position twice the strategic importance of that of Germany, and control of strategic commodities twice as important as any that Germany can control. Make no mistake about it. If Germany and Japan win we become a second-class Nation, because we are then deprived of many of the strategic commodities so important to us, the most important of which is rubber. The American Nation

travels on rubber. Millions of men go to work every day of the world from 10 to 50 miles in their own automobiles.

If we were deprived of rubber, our automobile industry would be destroyed. If we were deprived of rubber at this time and this traffic borne on rubber should be thrown upon our already existing systems of transportation, they would collapse. How, therefore, in the face of these conditions can anybody doubt that our national interest is imperiled? Oh, if you are willing to follow the same road that Norway, and Holland, and Belgium, and France, and the Balkan States followed, refusing to admit the existence of a peril, burying your heads in the sand like an ostrich in an endeavor to justify the mistakes of your leadership made some 20 years ago, continue on. The people will catch up with you. You cannot continue a policy of that kind and not come to personal disaster. I am not afraid the Nation is going to follow you in a policy of that kind. The American people as a class are too sensible. They are not going to follow you down that road in an attempt to justify the mistakes of your leadership when they turned down the League of Nations and insured the war which has come upon us. I say to you, therefore, "Vote down this amendment." Take a flat-footed stand that the national interest is imperiled, because every man who is following this situation knows it is. Where are the nations today who refused to meet this question face to face? They are numbered among the nations of the past. Let us insure that we are never so numbered.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, although I recognize that time is all important, yet in view of the fact I could get no time during general debate and because I would like to make my speech all at one time, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object to this request—unless we can get some reasonable agreement as to time for discussion here, I shall have to object to other requests for additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, if we are facing a great emergency today, it is not one that has arisen from any war that may be raging in some part of the world, nor from the threat of war. The seed of this emergency was planted in the Selective Service Act of 1940, in the sense that the administration failed to disclose frankly and fully to the American people just what that act contained. It is true there are provisions in it for extending the period of service. Likewise, in every insurance policy we will find a great many clauses that cannot be read without a magnifying glass. It



cannot be denied, Mr. Chairman, that the 1-year service period was played up with every brass instrument in the band, and the provision for extension of service was played down with every muted instrument in the orchestra. The boys who were led to believe that they were going to get a full college course in 1 year's time now learn, to their amazement, and chagrin, that they are still in the freshman class. They are hurt and discouraged. They are prevented by Army regulations from making their views known to us, but every now and then we hear their voices through the fog of imposed silence when they speak to us through the medium of a family member or a civilian friend. Here is an excerpt from a letter from a selectee that was transmitted to me by its recipient without the knowledge of the writer. In my judgment it epitomizes the consensus of the selectees:

There is one outfit in camp—a whole regiment—that would "go over the hill" if the bill for longer than a year is passed. People think we are making progress, but we are not. We now have in our battery just two guns, which a few sergeants have fired, and we have been here about 6 months. The morale of the entire camp is very low. A battery in one regiment went "over the hill" from the top sergeant to the lowest private. If the Congress lets this bill go through it will be a breach of faith, and the men won't give a damn. The outcome is obvious. There is no interest in the Army here and no morale. It will be a fearful thing, and I hope it is not passed. God help the public if it is.

But this mood of resentment and disillusionment could be dispelled if the President would make the proper appeal to these boys and their families. If there ever was a time when Mr. Roosevelt should make one of his radio fireside chats to the people, that time is now. He should speak to them in somewhat the following vein: "My friends, the administration now realizes that a grave mistake was made when the selective-service bill was first before the Congress. At that time it should have been clearly and carefully explained to you that, under the terms of the bill, your sons, your brothers, and your sweethearts might be held for more than 1 year. That feature of the bill should have been given the same prominence in the headlines as the 12-month training feature."

Now, the Chief of Staff, and our other military experts, advise the Congress and me that the events of the past year, and the existing world situation, make it imperative that the draftees be held under arms for a reasonable period beyond 12 months. In the name of national unity and our common welfare, I appeal for your cooperation in carrying out the recommendations of our military authorities. Mr. Chairman, such an appeal would not fall on deaf ears. There is no place for dogmatism if a situation of such magnitude, and the American people are not being dogmatic in their opposition to the resolution now before us. I represent a district in which the spirit of nonintervention is particularly strong, but there are no more patriotic and loyal Americans anywhere than the people I have the honor to represent. I made a trip home the past week end for the express purpose of sounding out their sen-

timent on this measure. I talked with dozens of my constituents—mothers and fathers, boys home on leave from training camps, boys scheduled to be drafted, and other people not directly affected by the draft. With one accord, they are willing and eager to make every sacrifice for the defense of their country within the confines of the Western Hemisphere. They will go along with the administration on a reasonable extension of the service period, and I underscore the word "reasonable." But they oppose, with every fiber of their being, the holding of their boys under arms indefinitely to cope with perils to our national security which have not been proved to exist. In brief, I am prepared to cast my vote in behalf of my constituents for carrying out the real intent and purpose of the Selective Service Act—namely, the training of our boys for the defense of their homeland, and for no other purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who offers this amendment, opposed the Selective Service Act. He advocated the volunteer system. He now undertakes to substitute for selectees volunteers. This would be a backward step. For the first time in 1940 the Congress decided to profit by the mistakes of the past and to provide for training an army in times of peace, by selecting men for the Army.

After careful consideration in 1940 Congress, in the national and international emergency, adopted the selective-service system and not the voluntary system. If it is necessary to draft men in the first place it is necessary to draft them for extended service. The amendment would cripple the administration of the Selective Service Act. The second proposition is that this amendment would eliminate the declaration that the national interest is imperiled. I believe the declaration should be made. We have heard much about keeping faith with the men in the Army, but who is there among us who would say if the United States were in a declared war that the selectees should not be retained? Congress should justify by declaration the retention of the selectees.

Before we provide for extending the time, I think we owe it to the selectees to make a declaration that the national interest is imperiled. The pending amendment analyzed is without merit. It provides that after 12 months the selectees may volunteer. No such statute is necessary because there is nothing to prevent any draftee who has served 12 months from volunteering now.

In the minority report it is asserted that the President can recall the selectees after the expiration of 12 months. Why quibble? If he has the authority, if the opposition to this bill is well founded, those who are opposed should advocate the repeal of that authority. It begs the question to say that the President has the authority and that it is not necessary to pass this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, we have appropriated \$52,000,000,000 for defense—twice as

much as we planned to appropriate a year ago—and there has been no objection by Members of the House. Why? The national interest is in greater peril than it was a year ago. The purpose of this bill is to declare that very thing to be true, to provide for the continuance, reasonably, of those who have been selected, and to provide for their discharge. We owe it to the men that we propose to retain longer in the Army until they can be released to make that declaration. The statement of the pending amendment that would provide for the repeal of that declaration is contradicted by the next section of the bill and the committee amendment to be proposed by the chairman wherein the Congress of the United States instead of delegating the power to the President stands up and boldly provides for the continuance of the selectees in service.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to strengthen the Selective Service Act, to make the Army stronger, in the gravest emergency ever confronting our people. The responsibility is on the Congress of the United States. We have had time in the past 6 weeks to strengthen our Army; we have had time to provide further for our national defense. Will we profit by Russia's resistance? There must be no relaxation; there must be no turning back. We shall either strengthen the existing Army, as provided in the bill now under consideration, or we will provide for demobilization of an untrained Army by the defeat of this bill. For my part I say there must be no turning back.

I extend by saying, as the President pointed out in his message of July 21, that a grave national risk is involved unless the present effective strength of the Army is maintained. It can only be maintained by the defeat of the proposed amendment and by the passage of the pending bill.

The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, approved September 16, 1940, provided that the draftees should serve for 12 consecutive months unless sooner discharged, except, and I quote—

That whenever Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled, such 12-month period may be extended by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interest of national defense.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize such extension. As it passed the Senate the extension is limited to 18 months.

There is a provision in the bill as passed by the Senate that increases the pay of draftees \$10 a month after the 12-month period.

The bill also provides for the release of those who would suffer undue hardships if retained. This provision would apply to married men and those with dependents.

The bill also provides for the release of draftees who attained the age of 28 on or prior to July 1, 1940.

There are other provisions in the bill, but the extension of the term of service is the heart of the bill.

On July 21, 1941, the President of the United States delivered a message to Congress urging that the present effective strength of the Army be maintained, that the period of enlistment be extended. In his message the President

recommended that there be an extension in order that the defense forces of the Nation might not be disrupted. At the same time he stated that the Army planned to release selectees from service as soon as practicable after the completion of the 12-month period.

Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army, appeared before the Military Affairs Committees of the Congress and supported the recommendations of the President. He stated that the limitation upon the size of the Army should be removed and that a reasonable extension of the time of service should be made and that, unless such extension was made, the Army would be disintegrated and disrupted. Selectees are distributed among members of the Regular Army; members of the National Guard and with selectees. There are members of the National Guard in Hawaii and there are selectees at various places in the Western Hemisphere.

The purpose of the Selective Training and Service Act is twofold: First, it is to train the individual selectee; and, secondly, it is to prepare and maintain an army for national defense. The extension is essential for both purposes.

Congress for the first time has seriously prepared for war. It is now for Congress, as I have stated, to strengthen or weaken that preparation. The purpose of the bill is to strengthen. It is evident that the selectees cannot be fully trained in 12 months. It is evident that dangers will appear if there is disruption and disintegration in the Army.

Dangers do not pass with the expiration of terms of enlistment. Wars do not await congressional enactments. Preparedness is essential and training is imperative in preparedness.

#### NATIONAL INTEREST IMPERILED

The first argument in behalf of the passage of the bill is that the national interest is imperiled. The peril is greater and graver than it was in September 1940. Those who maintain that there is no greater danger are merely indulging in wishful thinking and in a false optimism.

We are living in a day of world crises. Whether war comes and whether it comes next month or next year, we must be prepared to meet it. The Army is the police force of the Nation. A police force must remain on the job. There is only one safe course to take. We should be prepared for the worst. We cannot afford to gamble with security.

Since the passage of the Selective Training and Service Act in September 1940, Hitler has conquered Greece, Yugoslavia, Crete; has invaded Africa; and for 6 weeks and more has been invading Russia. His oriental Axis partner, Japan, has entered Indochina and each day brings ominous threats from the Orient to the United States.

Is the emergency greater? Is the danger greater? Congress has spoken. A year ago we had authorized \$20,000,000,000 for national defense. Since last September the amount has been increased to \$52,000,000,000. If the danger is not greater, Congress erred in making or increasing appropriations. By the lend-lease bill, by all the national-defense ap-

propriations of the past 12 months we admit that the emergency is greater.

If airplanes are to be constructed, if tanks are to be manufactured, there must be men to man them. Machines cannot think; trained men are imperative. Is the danger greater? When Hitler invaded Poland on September 1, 1939, he had 54½ divisions. His divisions have multiplied with the passing months. When he invaded Russia 6 weeks ago Hitler had 260 divisions. He has 40 more divisions in training. If the Hitler threat was great in 1940, it is greater today.

Italy today is rejuvenated. In 1939 the Italian Army was approximately 1,500,000 men. Its present strength is 2,000,000.

Japan is in league with Germany. Who doubts that Germany and Japan will wage war at any time they think they can do so successfully? Whenever we cease to prepare, the danger becomes greater.

It is said that there is no danger from Hitler. The fact is that there is danger in the Western Hemisphere. His agents are in South America. He is fomenting a revolution in Argentina. The United States has banished or deported German and Italian consuls. "Fifth columnists" abound in the South American republics. Nazis are in Colombia, just south of the Panama Canal, spreading distrust of the United States and undermining the faith and confidence of the people of the South American countries in the integrity and purposes of the United States.

Statesmen in other countries refused to look the facts in the face; they refused to see danger; they refused to prepare; they maintained they were in no danger; they insisted that they were prepared to defend. Thirteen nations of Europe, without attacking, have gone down before Hitler. Will Congress make a similar mistake?

The danger is greater than ever before. The responsibility is on Congress. If there is no danger, why the burdens of taxation; why the greatest appropriations for national defense in the history of the country?

#### DISRUPTION AND DISINTEGRATION

Those who oppose say that the Army will not be disrupted. They admit that the Army would be put to some inconvenience; they maintain that those released will be replaced, but the Commander in Chief, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, and the Chief of Staff, Gen. George C. Marshall, say that, unless the service is extended, a majority of the men and officers will disappear. They maintain that the Army will be disrupted. We have followed the President. We have followed the Chief of Staff in the manufacture of guns and munitions. Why follow them respecting tanks and cannons and disregard them respecting men?

#### MECHANIZED WARFARE

There are those who opposed the Selective Training and Service Act in the first place on the ground that we needed mechanized equipment rather than men. We did need mechanized armaments, but we also needed men. Hitler has utilized mechanized armaments, but he has also trained men. Today

he has five times as many men under arms as he had 2 years ago. It is a fallacy to assert that building tanks and constructing airplanes will eliminate the necessity for enlarging and increasing the Army. I do not underestimate mechanized warfare, but something has happened in Russia. Mechanized troops have bogged down. The most gigantic battles in history are being fought between Germany and Russia. There are tanks by the hundreds, but there are men by the millions.

#### FAITH

Again it is asserted that the enlistments should not be extended to keep faith with the selectees and that to make the extension would be to break faith. I have already pointed out that the Selective Training and Service Act provided that the draftees could be retained.

If war were now actually declared, who is there who would advocate releasing the draftees upon the expiration of 12 months? While war has not been declared, the clouds are more ominous in the Pacific, and they are more ominous in South America and in Europe than they were a year ago. The peril is greater. If the security of the United States is undermined, Congress would be breaking faith with the citizens of the country. Trained soldiers can only match trained soldiers. The legions of Germany have gone from victory in one country to another. They are seasoned. The need for trained soldiers is far greater today than it was a year ago.

#### PRESENT AUTHORITY

It is urged that under the Selective Training and Service Act the President of the United States has the authority to extend the terms of the enlistments. There are those who deny his authority. The opposition begs the question. If there is any doubt about the authority to make the extension, why quibble? Why not clarify the situation? Why quibble with national security?

#### DISTRUST ROOSEVELT

Many opponents maintain that they cannot trust the President of the United States. They criticize him in connection with establishing a base in Iceland. They do not oppose the marines being in Iceland, but they criticize the Commander in Chief for sending soldiers to Iceland until Congress authorized him to do so. They admit his authority as Commander in Chief; they admit the wisdom of his program. They know that if Roosevelt had not gone to Iceland Hitler would have gotten there first. It is absurd for those who gamble with the security of their country to put the grounds of their opposition in the distrust of President Roosevelt.

He is unique in history. He was re-elected President of the United States for a third term less than 12 months ago. He is the spokesman for all of the people. There is nothing strange in the personal opposition to the President. Washington received similar treatment. Lincoln was abused and denounced as a dictator in his efforts to preserve the Union. We do not know the names of his detractors or his defamers, but the name of Lincoln lives on.



The opponents may criticize Roosevelt, but they dare not assert that they would oppose the United States defending our base in Iceland. They criticize the President, but they admit that it was wise to transfer destroyers to Great Britain. It is the same type of opposition. It is easy to find fault; it is easy to criticize, but those who criticize Roosevelt should match his accomplishments with their own.

#### POLICY

In the Revolutionary War, in the War of 1812, in the Mexican War, and in the War between the States the policy of short-time enlistments, the policy of relying upon voluntary enlistment, instead of the policy of voluntary enlistment coupled with conscription, the policy of bonuses and of gratuities has failed. Such policies have led to prolonged wars and have led to excessive costs of wars.

Washington was hindered and beset by short-term enlistments. In the Revolutionary War the invasion of Canada under General Montgomery ended in disaster and in the death of Montgomery because of the attempted assault on Quebec at a time when the Colonials were unprepared, rendered so because enlistments would soon expire.

In a written communication, Washington said:

That this cause [limited enlistment of troops] precipitated the fate of the brave and much-to-be lamented General Montgomery, and brought on the defeat which followed thereupon, I have not the slightest doubt.

If Congress refuses to extend the enlistments, we will be repeating the errors of 1776, 1812, 1846, and 1861. The problem of short enlistments was the main military trouble which beset Washington in the Revolutionary War and Lincoln in the Civil War. Washington, in a communication to Congress dated August 20, 1780, said that the retreat across the Delaware in 1776, the Battle of Brandywine, and the sufferings of Valley Forge would not have occurred if it had not been for short-term enlistments.

The army of General Scott in the Mexican War following the battle of Cerro Gordo was almost depleted because of the expirations of the terms of volunteers.

In the War between the States the Battle of Bull Run resulted disastrously to the Union because of untrained troops and because of volunteers, some of whose terms of enlistments expired during the battle.

#### BONUSES AND GRATUITIES

Bonuses to volunteers and gratuities to volunteers were tried in the War between the States. They failed.

The provision in the Senate bill to pay selectees serving more than 12 months \$10 a month additional is discriminatory. Why pay the draftee more than the Regular soldier? Why penalize the soldier who volunteers in the Regular Army for 3 years? Bonuses do not make soldiers; gratuities do not train armies. Patriotism and country count far more than money. Love of country and the desire to serve cannot be estimated in dollars and cents. Service cannot be bought. A mercenary soldier never won a battle.

#### DISCRIMINATION

The opponents of the pending bill deny that the terms of selectees should be extended, but they advocate that the periods of service of the National Guard, the retired personnel of the Regular Army, and the reserve components of the Army should be extended. They thus discriminate. They have no objection to the extension of service of members of the National Guard, but they oppose such extension for the selectees. If there is reason to retain the National Guard, there is reason to retain the selectees. If there is reason to retain the Reserve officers, there is reason to retain those who have been selected. The discrimination is wholly unjustified and wholly unjustifiable.

#### SMALLEST ARMY

The pending bill does not provide for an American expeditionary force. Armies can only be provided for by appropriations. Congress has made provision during the next fiscal year for an army of 1,700,000. The Chief of Staff, General Marshall, states that such an army is sufficient for the defense of the Western Hemisphere. This army could not be materially increased without materially increasing the appropriations for the maintenance of the Army. Congress would thus have another opportunity to pass upon the question of whether or not it is desirable to increase the size of the Army. There should be flexibility, but there is no intent materially to increase the size of the standing Army in the pending bill.

The United States today has the smallest Army among all of the great powers of the world. The other powers are armed to the teeth. While we have the smallest Army, we have made the most generous appropriations for the training and maintenance of that Army. We are determined to make our Army the most efficient.

#### THE RESPONSIBILITY

There is often criticism of the Congress. It is said that Congress has abdicated to the Executive. Congress sometimes indulges in criticism of the President. The fact remains that Congress passed the Selective Training and Service Act. It is the most constructive measure ever passed by any Congress to prepare in times of peace for war. Congress has a responsibility and so has the Executive in a great emergency.

The question is, Will Congress discharge its responsibility? If Congress fails to provide for an adequate army, for an efficient army, for a well-trained army, Congress cannot be heard to criticize the Executive with respect to his responsibility.

The President has met one emergency after another during his terms of office. He was inaugurated during a great emergency. He was reelected during the second World War. He has acted promptly; he has responded quickly in emergencies; he has not shirked executive responsibility. Will Congress shirk the responsibility that rests upon the representatives of the people in making our Army effective? Will taxes and appropriations be in vain; will they be wasted? The responsibility of making

effective national defense now rests with the Congress of the United States.

It is said that after the Battle of the Marne someone asked General Joffre: "Who won the Battle of the Marne?" The General replied: "I do not know who won the Battle of the Marne, but I can tell you who would have lost it if it had been lost."

If the first Battle of the Marne had been lost France would have fallen in 1914 as France fell in 1940. If the first Battle of the Marne had been lost all of the world would have said that General Joffre lost the Battle of the Marne.

If the United States is not prepared to defend the Western Hemisphere, if the Army is not trained, if the Army is not maintained, upon whom will the responsibility rest? There can be but one answer. While the Congress deserves the thanks of the Republic for passing the Selective Training and Service Act and for providing for the first time for defense before the declaration of war, if the battle of preparedness is not won, if the United States is not defended, let it not be said that the battle of preparedness was lost by the House of Representatives.

Congress cannot afford to take chances with the security of the Republic. Congress cannot afford to make ineffective the billions of appropriations for national defense and the billions levied and to be levied against the taxpayers of the country by refusing to make effective the Selective Training and Service Act.

The refusal to extend means crippling the Army; it means disruption; it means disintegration; it means demobilization. If our Army is disintegrated, what will happen in South America? The South American republics will fall an easy prey to Hitler and to totalitarianism; they will undertake to get aboard the Hitler band wagon.

We pay tribute to Russia in her resistance to the Hitler machine. The Russians are fighting nobly and bravely. They did not attack; they are defending. Whatever else may be said of Soviet Russia they are fighting in defense of their own country. Whatever else may be said of prior wars, Russia at present is not the aggressor. Russia has surprised the world. Great Britain has been given a breathing spell by the invasion of Russia by Germany. So has the United States. Both Great Britain and the United States have been given a further opportunity to prepare.

There are those who mistake preparedness for aggression. The American people must not be misled. The United States is not moving toward war but war is day by day moving toward the United States. The supreme obligation resting upon the Congress is to keep that war out of America by keeping Hitler and Japan off of the Western Hemisphere. The United States cannot be defended unless the United States is adequately prepared, and the best way to prepare is to make the Army of the United States the most efficient in all the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, though it is a known fact that the Axis Powers—Germany, Italy, and Japan and their lesser allies—have under canvas and in the field 25,000,000 perfectly trained and perfectly equipped soldiers, there are some amongst us who would disband our small, comparatively, insignificantly small, Army of 1,500,000. In the same breath each of them tells us that he stands for preparedness of this country; that he wants to build a national-defense establishment so strong that the soldiers of no nation nor combination of nations will dare place foot upon our sacred soil. Oblivious to their inconsistency, they would in blissful disregard of the consequence of their folly disband our small, half-trained Army of 1,500,000 men.

Oh, they say, there is no peril. Yet soldiers are marching, guns are being fired on every side, hostile airplanes plow the air. But, they protest, there is no peril.

The French regime is wobbling. Word reaches us today that Darlan, the puppet of Berlin, is soon to be set up as the dictator of all the French. Can it be said that that means nothing to America; that America is not in peril? Even the most obtuse should foresee the armies of Germany marching through what is left of free France, down through Spain into Africa, to Dakar, the jumping-off place to South America. When those German armies move into Spain the Portuguese Government will be compelled to flee to the Azores, outpost of North America, where if America does not offer effective aid another nation of brave people who could see no peril will be ground under the heel of remorseless aggression. We will not have gone down the road to war, war will have come down that road to us. With the surrender of the Vichy Government, Martinique, in American waters, and the French colony on the northern shores of South America will come under Nazi control. Can America stand idly by when that transition occurs? Does not this spell peril to the country we love?

In the Far East the Japanese armies numbering millions are moving south, down into Indo-China. The once-proud armies of France are no longer able to resist their demands. Soon these conquering hordes will cross into Thailand, to ride rough-shod over the gentle people of that ill-fated country who ask naught but to be left alone to pursue happiness in their own simple way.

Their battleships patrol the waters of our Philippines, their bomb-laden airplanes threaten and menace Manila as we frantically muster the Philippine Scouts into the American Army, hastily throw up defenses against the anticipated raids upon our territory by a hostile army that has spent years in preparing for the assault.

In the face of all this, some say there is no danger. Oh, you who sit with me on my side of this aisle, you with whom I usually cast my vote, you from whom I on this issue regretfully part company, think carefully of what might be the consequences of the vote you are casting today. In all charity and kindness let me say that the vote you cast this day

to disband the American Army, small as it is, might well be a vote the casting of which you may regret for the balance of your days. It is better to be safe than sorry.

America is the ramparts we watch.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want it brought home to everybody that there is no purpose on the part of anyone, so far as I know, to disband the American Army. At the present time there are 1,531,800 soldiers and officers in the American Army, according to the War Department, and there are still more than 250,000 selectees who can be called up under the 900,000 limitation placed by the Selective Service Act of 1940. All that is asked is that all of the soldiers be placed upon exactly the same basis.

It has been pointed out that if the President decides there is any peril in November, as was stated by the gentleman from Georgia, he will have plenty of time right then and there to say that there is danger and to order any selectee who is about to be released to return to duty for 1 more year by the act of August 27, 1940. The purpose of the minority amendment is just this: As the law stands now the members of the National Guard, the Officer's Reserve Corps, the Enlisted Reserve, serve 12 months. They were ordered to duty for 12 months under the act of August 27, 1940. They can serve just that period, then have to be released. To that extent they are better off than the selectees who by virtue of that same law, when their present period of training runs out, can be called back for another 12 months' training. That is provided under the act of August 27.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. POWERS. And the selectees may be called back within 1 minute after the time they are discharged and before they ever leave the camp?

Mr. CLASON. Yes. They may be discharged at 12 o'clock and can be called back by the President at 12:01 o'clock the same day. What the minority members by their amendments are asking is that the National Guard, the enlisted Reserves, and others, shall be in exactly the same boat with the selectees under the present law. If these three amendments are adopted, these groups other than the selectees can be called back for an additional period of 1 year. Those are the facts.

General Marshall himself testified that a year is the shortest time he would like to keep men in for training. General Devers says that at the end of 6 months his trainees are ready to fight. Major General Reckord says he is making great progress with his men at Camp Meade. You get the same story all down the line. Further, the big maneuvers are yet before us this year, before these boys leave by January 1.

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

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. POWERS. Many Members of the House back in 1917 became so-called 90-day wonders; in other words, they attended training camps and within 90 days were commissioned as officers. If they could make officers of us within 90 days then, they can certainly now make mighty fine noncoms and privates in a year with the material we have in these selectees.

Mr. CLASON. I believe Sergeant York is one of the finest arguments to show that an American can become a well-trained soldier in less than 1 year. I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey.

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

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

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The gentleman has made a very good reply to the very eloquent argument made by the gentleman from California. The gentleman has pointed out that if we let these draftees out as their time expires, we yet can fill up all their places by the 250,000 and the new soldiers that will come in under the new draft, and we will not tear up the Army in any way at all.

Mr. CLASON. No; we will not. Further, General Marshall says that he intends to have not more than 1,700,000 men on duty on July 1, 1942, and on page 29 of the hearings he states that so far as he is concerned—these others talk about trouble in Japan, Africa, and elsewhere—he does not foresee any activity on the part of American troops in any foreign country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SMITH of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the arguments advanced for this amendment seem to ignore one very important part of this problem; that is, that this is not a question, if there is danger in the world, of the number of men you may have individually in the status of soldiers; it is a question, and it was so intended in the Selective Training and Service Act, of not only the number of individually trained men but the number of units which may be available in case the units are needed to meet a threat. By units I mean the divisions and the corps and the armies that may be needed to meet a particular situation.

We have altogether in the Army 9 Regular divisions and 18 Guard divisions in the Infantry, 2 Regular Cavalry divisions, and 4 armored divisions. These divisions are made up of both Regulars and selectees on the part of the Regular divisions, and National Guard men and selectees on the part of the National Guard divisions. The percentage ranges from the First Division, which has 90 percent Regulars, down to the Fourth Armored Division, which has only 20 percent Regulars and 80 percent selectees.

We talk about peril. If there is peril, some of these units should be in shape to be used either to protect the bases or, if necessary, to move to protect the gov-



ernments whose overthrow probably will be attempted in South America, to be at hand in a place and in a shape as units so that they can be used. Otherwise, there is no purpose in having a great number of individuals in an army. The situation is such that you cannot assign those units to a task that may come up tomorrow in case a fight should start in the West Indies as a result of the turning over of Martinique to German domination, which, apparently, is coming.

You would not have units that you could use because you cannot operate units with men having the right to stop on a particular day wherever they might be.

It is not the intention of the Army to keep these men indefinitely. Anyone who read the whole testimony of General Marshall can see that, without picking out an individual phrase or sentence here or there. The Army wants to carry out both purposes of the Training and Service Act, to rotate the men through and build up a trained reserve, and at the same time have units available which can be used without a crippling restriction in the law. The amendment that is proposed would completely cripple the Army in the second respect.

There is no question as to the wording of the Selective Service Act. To attempt to quibble about meeting this situation of whether there is peril today by using a subterfuge is something that we should not countenance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of the House understand my position quite clearly as far as this bill is concerned. I have stated repeatedly on the floor of the House that I am for national defense, and I shall vote for every bill that builds up our own national defense.

What is the issue here today? There is no escaping the fact that we are confronted with a great moral issue, one of the greatest and one of the most important moral issues that has been presented here in half a century.

What constitutes our national strength? There are many things of a spiritual character that enter into our national defense that are being overlooked. That which raises a country; that which strengthens a country; that which dignifies a country; that which spreads her power, creates her moral influence, and makes her respected and submitted to, bends the hearts of millions, and bows down the pride of nations to her, the instrument of obedience, the fountain of supremacy, the true throne, crown, and scepter is character.

The very basis of our Nation, the genesis of it, is in character. It was the spirit of Washington, his integrity, his fairness to his soldiers, that carried him through Valley Forge and carried him on to final victory. It was character that built our Constitution and when you vote here and break the promise, if you do, made with these soldiers and with their parents, you are stultifying the character of the United States, and you cannot have an army without a morale.

There has been much said here about team work. It is the spirit of the team that counts. No man in this House has dealt with more young men than I have over a long period of years in athletics, and when the spirit is right they are invincible. Broken shoulders, sprained ankles, broken ribs mean nothing to those boys when they are called upon to carry the ball over the line, but here you propose to do the ignoble, the dishonorable thing in dealing with these men whom you are asking, perhaps, eventually to fight in your own national defense. You cannot afford to mislead them. Start now and rebuild the Army on an honorable basis and then you will have an invincible army. Otherwise you will have a cancer eating at the very vitals of the invincibility which you are trying to establish for our national defense.

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

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman now speaking, I want to say to the House, was a great coach of great Cornell football teams for many years.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I did not support the peacetime conscription law. I characterized it on the floor of this House as a negation of democracy when it was passed. We had 4,000,000 men from 18 to 25 years of age roaming the streets of this country unemployed. If we had offered them sufficient money, \$50 or \$75 a month, and they had volunteered you would have had an army now of 2,000,000 men. The emergency was not here when the selective-service law was passed, and it is not here now. These emergencies are created up in the State Department and the War Department. They have a machine up there and they turn out emergencies every time we have a controversial question here. How long are they going to continue to fool the American people?

The big issue involved here, as I see it is that we made a contract with these American boys. Oh, some interventionist papers and Members of Congress say it was a unilateral contract with a big "if" behind it—that "if" was the emergency. What is the emergency? We ask for a bill of particulars and we do not get it. The Congress waits until after something is done and then they are told something about it. Fifty destroyers go to Britain and Congress has nothing to do with it and knows nothing about it. Our men are taken up to Iceland outside the Western Hemisphere and Congress is notified about it 2 or 3 weeks later. This is the American people's branch of the Government and you and I ought to know what is going on. Let's stop this government by subterfuge. These are our boys and we ought to know daily what is going on. The people of England at war know more about the international scene than we over here do. I have 300 letters in my office from boys who say, "Do not break that contract or we will go over the hill." This is bad for the morale of any military body, but we are to blame, not the boys. We made the contract. I fear they will

walk out if they are to go into a fighting war just like the misled people of France and her soldiers who said, "What the hell are we fighting for," and the poor drafted soldiers of Belgium, who said, "What the hell are we fighting for?" I hope to God the soldiers of Germany and Russia say the same. I have told the story before of how wars are caused by the money trust and the international bankers of the world—some Jews, some Catholics, some Protestants, some atheists, but all strangers to Christ. War is a racket, the conditions existing in Europe for some time are not of our making. These boys in camp know that over across the border, in Canada, which is part of the British Empire, they have a 4-months' conscription law for home defense only, and these boys know that every piece of munitions and every bit of supplies that go from Canada to England are bought and paid for by the British Government, while poor Uncle Sam gives \$7,000,000,000 to Britain and China and Russia, and is not getting anything for it. Our boys also know that poor, little Finland, who is now being crushed by Russia, is to be crushed with our aid. They know all this. A year ago we eulogized Finland on the floor of this House and passed a resolution to cancel her war debt because that gallant little nation paid on the line. Now, today, we are, through you action, thank God not through mine, by the appropriation of \$7,000,000,000, to implement the lend-lease "give away" bill we are permitting aid to go to communistic Russia and Red Joe Stalin, who killed 20,000,000 people by the cruel process of starvation in the Ukraine. Read your history before you take a final step toward another expeditionary force. I have here an editorial from one of the Washington papers stating that the belief is there will be a panic or an actual revolution if you double-cross these boys. When an editorial can say that in a paper like the Times-Herald, and say it boldly, it is time for the Members of the Congress to give sane and serious consideration to the problem you have before you today. I have been among these boys. I have talked with them. They are your boys and they are my boys. They are youngsters, and they will fight to defend the sacred soil of this country, but they have a strong suspicion because of the side-stepping you have been doing, consciously or otherwise, that they are being prepared as an expeditionary force and they will say boldly, "We will not go," and that is a dangerous situation. It is all right to hate Hitler, but let us love America more than we hate Hitler.

Henry Ford, the richest man in America, said, on the occasion of his 78th birthday celebrated recently, "Wars are caused by the munitions trust of the world. Nationalize the munitions industry, take the profit out of war, and wars in these modern days will cease."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six or seven words. The security of our country requires us to extend the service period of the draftees. This will unquestionably work a hardship upon many of our soldiers

and their families. Before this emergency is over, all of us will be compelled to sacrifice to preserve our democracy. The least that Congress can do is to prevent inflation by imposing adequate taxation and greatly curtailing non-defense expenditures. As the Commander in Chief, the President should immediately expel the hundreds of Communists who are working for the Federal Government. Some of them hold responsible positions in the defense set-up. For instance, let us consider the case of Emil John Lever, who is principal field representative in the Labor Division of the O. P. M., with a salary of \$5,600 per year. In 1927, Mr. Lever made the following speech, which was reported by the Daily Worker:

The leaders of the A. F. of L. and the four railroad brotherhoods claim that the American workers do not sympathize with the Russian workers. This is entirely false. The records of the conference of the international unions representing the workers in the United States and Canada prove conclusively that they were unanimously in favor of the recognition of the Soviet Union by the United States, and demanded the immediate resumption of trade relations. The Russian labor movement alone has shown the courage and the ability to take over the Government and industry. The rank-and-file American delegation was greatly impressed with the achievements of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Millions of workers in the United States and Canada hope for the success of the Soviet Republics.

Mr. Lever was a member of the executive committee and treasurer of the Conference of the Progressive Labor Action.

Not only was he a member of it, but I have the names of others. Among others is the name of Tom Tippet, who sponsored a banquet for Mother Bloor and was a speaker at a conference called by Browder and Foster. Tippet was employed on June 2, 1941, as an Assistant Chief of Division of Rents, in Leon Henderson's organization, at a salary of \$5,600 a year.

This organization sets forth its purpose in the following language:

It seeks to stimulate in the existing and potential labor organizations a progressive, realistic, and militant labor spirit and activity; it aims to inspire the workers to take control of industry and government, abolish the present capitalistic system and build a workers' republic and economic system operated for the benefit of the masses and not of the few.

I hold in my hand the record of Mr. Lever in the Communist movement. He is only one among many connected with this Government and with the defense program. The President can never prepare this country and preserve our form of government until he cleans house. When may we expect action, Mr. President? As the foe of totalitarianisms, there is much that you, Mr. President, can do in the city of Washington and in your own executive departments to demonstrate your dislike of the agents of totalitarianism who hold public jobs and are seeking to sabotage from within the American way of life and make it impossible for the American economic system to function.

I also have the record of a man in the War Department, a man who is in a position to render great harm to the Amer-

ican Government. I wish I had the time to read the record of this man, who is in the most important department of this Government at the present time—a man who does not believe in the American form of government; a man whose allegiance is to a foreign power. What I say is, if we believe in defense, and are going to prepare this country for defense, then the first step is for the President to stop dodging this issue, and get rid of the Communists and Fascists and Nazis, and when he does that, I will have more confidence in the safety of the country.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I object. Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close at 2:30 o'clock today.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close at 2:30 p. m. Is there objection?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I object. Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close at 2:30 p. m.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close at 2:30 p. m.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I listened to our friend from New York, Mr. WADSWORTH, this morning, as he painted a dismal picture of Oriental danger. While he was talking it occurred to me that this is the same Japan that was appeased with high-octane gasoline up to 3 weeks ago, when the danger was evidently not so apparent as now; that this is the same Japan that is moving away from America and not toward America; that this is the same Japan that undertakes to occupy a country, not in the Western Hemisphere, but in the Eastern Hemisphere. I submit to you today, Are these appeals to fear the prelude for the elimination of the third and final restriction and limitation that was put in the act of 1940? We propose today to take two of these limitations from the act. Are we prepared to take the next one, and send the young men of America outside the Western Hemisphere?

I am informed that 30 minutes ago the radio announced that an announce-

ment or notification was issued that unless we entered the war England would negotiate. Is that one of the reasons for the pressure, for the heat, for the intensity that is behind this resolution today?

Mr. Chairman, there is but one issue here before us, and that is the issue of faith. A Canadian colonel in 1918 watched the boys roll down a hillside, and wrote on a piece of soiled paper, "If ye break faith with us who die."

He was talking about the dead. We are talking about the living. I read every word of the debate on the original act in September 1940. The chairman of the committee, Mr. MAY, said:

At the expiration of their training period automatically they go back home.

That will be found at page 11368.

Mr. MOTT said:

Service is limited to 12 months (p. 11371).

Mr. HARTER said:

The training period is for 1 year (p. 11431).

Mr. CELLER, at page 11434 said:

Give these draftees a year's training. They are then to be returned to private and civil life.

Mr. KILDAY said, at page 11460:

So that at the end of his year's tour of duty.

Mr. SPARKMAN, on page 11488 said:

Trainees cannot, except in case of war, be retained longer than 12 months.

That is seven times that same thing in effect was said. In 1938 and 1939 and 1940 the Gallup poll put the question to the country and was in fact one of the most potent media for bringing the conscription issue before the Nation.

What was the question? They asked, "Do you think every able-bodied young man 20 years old should be made to serve in the Army or Navy 1 year?" It said nothing about the exception. It said nothing about a proviso. It said nothing of retention. It said nothing about extended service in case of an emergency.

Three weeks before the vote was taken on the Selective Service Act the Gallup poll again asked the question: "Do you favor increasing the size of our Army and Navy by drafting men between the ages of 18 and 32 to serve in the armed forces for 1 year?"

Did they say anything about a proviso? Did they say anything about an exception?

Seven days before we voted in this chamber on that act the Gallup poll again asked, "If the draft law is passed will you personally have any objection to spending a year in some branch of the military service?" One year! There is the emphasis. That is the bill of goods that we sold to America in 1940. Are we now to crown the infamy of repudiated pledges by saying to the young men, and to their parents in this country, in a rather anxious hour, "We shanghaied you into the Army. We have you there now. We will write the ticket for extended service." If so, I suggest that we change the name of



this law to "the Selective Shanghai Act" instead of "the Selective Service Act."

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The first section of this act provides that the Congress declares the national interest is imperiled. Section 3 (b) of the Selective Service Act says "in case the national interest is imperiled the President can continue these selectees in this country. The pending amendment to this section 1 of the bill, unless adopted, will allow, of course, a national emergency to be declared and the continuance of these selectees indefinitely?"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Right.

Mr. SHORT. But if we adopt the pending amendment we strike out that first section but will allow every selectee who so desires to volunteer for 1 additional year's service at the conclusion of his present service.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Correct. I was at a War Department conference last Wednesday morning, and without conveying any secrets, here is the stated disposition of the types of troops in the outlying possessions: At the Philippines, all Regulars. In Panama, all Regulars. In Alaska, only 3 percent are selective service. In the four bases that we took over, 75 percent are Regulars. In Puerto Rico all are Regulars or National Guard. In Hawaii, only 3 percent or less are selectees. Will anybody be so bold as to say, in view of those official figures from the War Department to those who attended the conference last Wednesday, that as we progressively demobilize some of these boys whose period of service expires in the danger spots of the country in the outlying posts, there will be any danger of imperiling or diminishing the military effectiveness of the United States forces?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say in the beginning that I feel this amendment goes to the very heart of this bill. Striking out that phrase "that the national interest is imperiled," strikes at the very heart of this bill.

A great deal has been said about selectees not wanting to stay in the service. I believe every person will admit that those selectees who have gone into service would be perfectly willing to stay in the service, and our papers have printed articles to that effect and most of the speakers have said they would be willing to stay, if they really believed the national interest was imperiled. Now, this is an occasion where the Congress has the right to say and has the opportunity of saying to our selectees that the national interest is imperiled, stating the very condition that you say, if shown to exist, that will make them willing to stay.

I do not believe anyone can question the fact that the national interest is imperiled. I think there has been sufficient discussion of that today.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Is it not true that the first draft of this bill that came to the House committee did provide for a national emergency?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. THOMASON. And in order to meet the very criticism that is now being made we adopted the very exact language that is in the Selective Service Act?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. THOMASON. And it is based upon the question of whether or not the national interest is imperiled. If so, we should say so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is absolutely correct.

If any of you have noticed, the signers of this minority report are exactly the same as signers of the report against the selective service, with the exception of our good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], who has joined the others in signing this, and two other Members on this side who signed the minority report on the Selective Service Act but who are not here today. In that minority report the gentlemen said:

The imminence of these perils is pure assumption.

I do not believe there is a Member of this House who has voted for these millions and even billions of dollars in the months that followed the filing of this report who today would say that those gentlemen were correct a year ago when they said that the very argument that we are in peril was pure assumption.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman say where he found that? That is not in the minority views.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am reading from the minority report signed among others by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], under date of August 29, 1940, Report No. 2903 of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Mr. SHORT. That is a different act from this.

[Here he gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] for 3 minutes.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, the proponents of this bill have consistently inferred that the draftees are mere machines. If that inference is correct then I agree we should hold these draftees for the duration of the emergency. However, I disagree with those proponents of this measure. These boys are not mere machines. They are flesh and blood. They have a heart, a soul, and a morale. Morale is essential for any victory. We must not break faith with these boys and, therefore, destroy their morale. A 3-percent turn-over per month will certainly not disrupt our defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] for 3 minutes.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, since becoming a Member of this body I have heard every phase of the foreign situation discussed on this floor, and I have never been presumptuous enough to participate in that debate without first spending many hours in study. I take the floor today in view of the fact that

practically every speaker has referred to our army of draftees, and I want to attempt to correct the impression that it is composed of a group of men who are chafing at the bit to come home and who have no concern for the peril of our Nation.

I am a member of this generation of draftees. I marched up on last October 16 and registered with the other 16,000,000. They are not soft men. Very few of them are concerned about this illusory pledge we have heard so much about. Most of them are as concerned as all Americans should be with the welfare of this country. They were reared in an era of depression. They realize the merits and priceless value of American liberties, and they are prepared to give their bit so that the Nation may be strong and prepared. I feel that I know these men as well as any Member of this body. I was born and reared and lived with them, and to say that these men are chafing at the bit to get out of the Army is to cast a reflection upon their patriotism.

Mr. Chairman, I feel this issue more seriously than any that has been presented since I came to this body. I believe that the defeat of this legislation today will be a green light to the aggressors in the Far East and on the Continent of Europe. To those who say they are opposed to war I say: "Defeat this legislation and let Japan march into Siam and let Germany march into Dakar, and you will plunge this country into war quicker than anything else could." That is the issue.

For my part, I would rather be wrong about this than to have the responsibility on my shoulders of giving away the liberty and the security of my country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] for 3 minutes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I realize that in the brief time allotted to me it will be impossible for me to discuss this subject thoroughly. However, I am going to ask, Mr. Chairman, that you bear with me until I state my position on this bill—that you bear with one who still has vivid recollections of what service in France means.

Mr. Chairman, during the past 8 or 9 months I have had at least 100 young men come to my offices in Trenton and in Washington. Their stories vary, but fundamentally are about as follows:

"Pop is not very busy in the store right now and he thinks I ought to go and get my 12 months out of the way. What do you think, Mr. Congressman?"

My reply always has been, "Yes; do it by all means."

I have had several young lawyers come in and say, "We are not very busy in my office. We realize we must serve a year and we want to serve. Would you advise us to go in now?"

I have always replied, "Yes; I would advise that."

Young men from the farms, young men from factories which are not now in defense production, have come to me for advice as to the wisdom of volunteering out of turn for their year of service. My constant thought has been for the welfare

of the Army and the individual welfare of the selectees. Because of this, I have always advised the young men to volunteer. I gave this advice last November and December to young men who, if they had waited their turn in the draft, would probably have not been called until now. I gave that advice because these young men had received the solemn promise of the Congress of the United States that they would be required for peacetime service of 1 year only. They and I believed that the promise of the Congress and the President would be kept, that this Government would not retract.

Mr. Chairman, if this original 12-month agreement with the selectees is broken, I am going to vote against the entire bill. I have no honorable alternative. No matter what the President and the rest of the Congress may do, I intend to keep the promise I made when I voted for the original Selective Service Act.

As is the case with most legislation sponsored by the New Deal, there has been combined in this measure now before us three components which do not have a similar standing. I refer to the fact that this measure extends the service of the National Guard, the Reserve officers, and the selectees. I cannot quarrel with the extension for the Guard and the Reserves. When any young man joined either of those branches he did so with the knowledge that he was subject to call to duty for any emergency, and for the duration of that emergency. The case of the selectees is entirely different. They were promised only one year of service—and the promise was made by the most responsible Government in the world—the Government of the United States. Let us not lie to them. Let us not break our word.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with the contention made by the administration that if the service of the selectees is not extended our Army will disintegrate. We have now in service some half a million selectees, who were brought into the Army over a period of months, starting with last November. They will be discharged, not immediately, but also over a period of months. Furthermore, we must remember that there are still some 250,000 selectees to be inducted from the original registration, and hundreds and hundreds of thousands who registered last July 1. They will not only replace the selectees discharged after their year of service, but will actually swell the size of our Army to almost 2,000,000 men. It should be constantly remembered that Gen. George C. Marshall, the Chief of Staff, has stated publicly that to defend the Western Hemisphere he would only need an Army of approximately 1,700,000 men.

History has repeatedly taught us one elementary lesson. It is this: The morale of an Army is in direct proportion to the integrity of its Government. We have made a covenant with the selectees for 1 year of service. Let us abide by that covenant. Let us keep our promise.

Mr. Chairman and my fellow colleagues, I implore you; let us not destroy the morale of our Army, let us not tarnish the honor of our Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY].

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the passage of House Joint Resolution 222 because, if passed, it would, in my opinion, do more harm to the cause of national unity than any other single legislative act. By voting for this resolution, we would automatically repudiate our agreement with the men inducted into the service under the Selective Service Act of 1940. They expected to be in training for a period of 1 year and they planned accordingly. Now it looks as if the administration wishes to extend the period of 1 year into some indefinite period of service. To do this would be a mistake.

Let us adopt an amendment to the Selective Training Act which would make service beyond 1 year optional and not compulsory. This would be according to the American principle and would not be resented by our people. The passage of House Joint Resolution 222 would destroy the morale, not only of the soldiers but also their relatives.

We, in Congress, can argue, debate, and discuss this problem, but we cannot deny that the real problem confronting the Nation is the lack of unity and the absence of enthusiasm among our American people for our so-called defense program.

Many parents of boys now in the Army, who live in my district and in other districts in New York City, find it impossible to obtain employment in industry engaged in defense work because they were born in a country now involved in war. To their utter amazement and bitter disappointment these parents learn that, although the Government has called their boys to serve in the Army, they themselves will not be employed in defense activities.

The Selective Service Act provided for 1 year's training. One year means 12 months or 365 days. It means no more! The Government must recognize this agreement with our trainees. We cannot have national unity and complete cooperation from our people unless we keep faith with them. We owe our citizens more than lip service.

It would be well to follow public opinion on a matter as vital as the Selective Service Act. In New York City, the papers which have the largest circulations, running into millions and which are read and supported by the masses are opposed to our tampering with the Selective Service Act, while editors of the "silk-stocking" press are daily screaming for war. My well-known opposition to all legislation, which in any way might be construed as antipeace legislation, makes it necessary for me to oppose the pending resolution.

Daily, we are told of the millions of people being killed and maimed in the war zone. Such statements about killings are made as if these unfortunate persons were machines and not human beings. The entire subject of disease, torment, and death is regarded as indifferently as the weather.

On other occasions, I have addressed the House of Representatives on the subject of peace. It is my intention to continue my efforts to change our national viewpoint from one of war preparation to one of preparation for world peace.

We support the program of national defense, we are sympathetic to the people in the war-stricken countries, but not to the point of becoming involved in that age old European intrigue. Our first duty as Congressmen is to the American people and we should never forget that obligation.

Because the passage of the pending resolution would aggravate the people of the country, it seems to me to be unwise and unnecessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]: On page 3, strike out lines 21 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment in this form in order to clarify the issue before the House. No doubt the balance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is important, but I think, perhaps, it could come at a later place in the bill.

Anyone reading section 1 of the pending measure will find that it declares the national interest imperiled solely for the purpose of effectuating section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act. That is, it is intended to have no other force and effect. Then in section 2 of the bill you proceed to amend section 3 (b) and do a few other things to the National Guard, and so forth. In other words, you have a duplication of effort in this bill and that effort is to extend the time of training for the selectees under the Selective Training and Service Act.

It seems to me it is entirely unnecessary to have section 1, but if section 1 is necessary then it is entirely unnecessary in section 2 to refer to selectees, because the President is empowered under section 3 (b) to extend the term of the selectees' service.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ELSTON. As a matter of fact, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri does seek to strike out section 1.

Mr. HINSHAW. It does, but it goes further than that and it has language which I believe may be included later in the bill; therefore, I have offered this amendment. If the amendment is adopted, and whether it is adopted or not, I intend to offer an amendment later, unless someone else offers it first, to limit this additional service to 6 months. I do this on the basis of a statement of General Marshall that 18 months' service is adequate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, vote on the substitute will be reserved until expiration of the time for debate on this section.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].



Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to propound a question of the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House or any other distinguished lawyer in this body who is a student of our constitutional Government.

I notice on page 3, line 24, the declaration that the national interest is imperiled. I believe that statement to be a fact. I believe this Nation confronts the greatest peril it has ever faced in its entire existence. That is my personal opinion, but what I want to know from the chairman of the committee or any other distinguished lawyer is, What will be the effect of enacting that language into law? If the purpose of that language is to prevent the reviving and applying any unrepealed legislation still on the books from the first World War, and if the intent of it is not to confer or delegate any war-making powers upon anyone outside this Congress, then I shall be for this language. When the Congress of the United States says that, does it give the President any more power than he would otherwise have? Does that announcement give the President the power to declare war without a further act of Congress?

Mr. MAY. I regret that I cannot claim the distinction the gentleman imputes to me of being a distinguished constitutional lawyer, but may I say to the gentleman that the Constitution expressly provides that Congress alone shall have the power to declare war. This is the answer to his last question. I may explain to the gentleman that when the committee had under consideration the phrase that "the national interest is imperiled" we spent hours and hours in its consideration, and found that there are some 40 or 50 statutes that were enacted during the World War under which the President would have vast authority if we used the phrase "a national emergency." We therefore chose the language of the Selective Service and Training Act and confine it to the provisions of that act.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, probably there is no Member in this Chamber who surpasses me in confidence in our Commander in Chief. I have many times publicly and privately stated that I do not believe that the President of the United States wishes to get us into a "shooting war," and certainly not to the extent of sending a second expeditionary force to Europe. I believe he is doing everything possible to keep us out of war by doing everything in his power to keep war away from America. I know, of course, other Members entertain a different idea.

The reason I have asked the question just answered by the chairman of the committee is that I wanted to bring out the fact that by the terms of the bill on page 3, lines 21 to 24, inclusive, the expression, "the national interest is imperiled" is inserted "solely for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940."

As I said before, I believe our national interest is imperiled, and we should act

accordingly. I am willing to vote for a modified form of this bill because of that fact, but I do not want to confer upon the President, or upon any combination of military leaders, the authority to send a second expeditionary force to the Old World. If that should ever be done again, and I cannot now see the wisdom of it ever being done again, it must be only after full consideration and vote by the Congress, into whose hands the Constitution places the power to declare war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, much has been said in this debate about the recommendations of General Marshall, and there has been insistence that we must have absolute reliance upon the General Staff. In the debate on the rule, one of the majority leaders said this:

Let us not be put in a position now in this time of crisis to our Nation of having it said in the future that this Congress refused to follow the recommendations of General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

Mr. Chairman, I direct your attention to the fact that when the War Department recommended this legislation it insisted on having declared a national emergency, but the bill before us now simply provides that "the national interest is imperiled."

When the General Staff recommendations were first made, there was to be no limit on the extension of the service of these selectees, but we have read recently and heard statements made by majority leaders to the effect that there may be a compromise limiting this service to an additional 18, 12, or 6 months.

May I call your attention to a newspaper clipping appearing on July 24, taken from the Times-Herald, which states:

Incidentally, informed sources indicated last night that the Army was prepared to revive its highly controversial plan to obtain congressional authority to send draftees, Reservists, and militiamen outside the Western Hemisphere if necessary. A request to this effect may go to the House committee today.

So we face this realistic situation, that of the three original recommendations made by General Marshall and his staff, two have been compromised and modified, and the third has been completely rejected. So, I say to you that today there is evidence of political expediency, and I ask you, where has that political expediency originated, on the part of the majority leadership or elsewhere?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Louisiana that the selectees are not chafing at the bit to be relieved from service. In my opinion, the selectees are among the most patriotic men in the United States of America today. I cannot understand how Members can rise on the floor of this House and say that in their opinion these men are patriotic and in the same breath in effect

say "but we do not trust your patriotism to volunteer, we do not trust you enough to believe you will volunteer for further service even though the Nation may be in danger. The only way we will trust your patriotism is to have the long arm of the law grab you by the back of your neck and throw you in the Army and keep you there."

Mr. Chairman, I have more faith in the youth of America than that. I trust their patriotism. I trust you will have faith enough in them to believe in their patriotism by giving them a chance to volunteer. If you keep faith with the youth of America they will keep faith with you. It is their Nation as well as yours.

Is the national interest imperiled? It happens to represent a district that produces two of the most strategic metals used in the defense program. The greatest iron-ore mines in the world are in my district. The greatest copper mines in the world are in my district. Yet just 2 weeks ago, without any threat of strike, without any labor troubles, two of these iron-ore mines were closed down, throwing many hundreds of men out of work. Still they say that they are short of steel. Private industry closing down because the Priorities Board claims shortage of steel. What a farce. Henderson pegs the price of copper at 12 cents a pound and because of his actions the copper mines cannot operate. The price of copper must be raised if you expect to increase production. These mines cannot produce copper for the national defense because they cannot operate at that price. Common sense seems to be lacking. Coordination seems to be lost in the shuffle.

It may be that the national defense is imperiled, but it is about time that national unity in the interest of America be the watchword. Is it not better to have a united America in the interest of national defense and the welfare of our own people, than a divided America and a few foreign allies? Let us keep America for Americans. Vote for America today. Let us have national unity and national morale, because without national unity and national morale you will have no national defense. Break faith with those to whom you made a promise when you passed the Selective Service Act and you will break down the morale of this Nation.

Give the youth of America a chance and they will not fail you. This Nation is safe in their hands. You do not need to drive them like cattle, but should treat them like the men that they are. Vote against this bill and protect the national-defense program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks, which are always very illuminating, of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the author of the original Selective Service Act. A year ago he did not seem to be desirous of creating the largest standing Army in our history—then he said we would create a civilian army only. I want to ask

the gentleman where his remarks about teamwork were a year ago. Where did he tell this House a year ago that at the end of 1 year it would be impossible to break up these units? Did he tell the House a year ago that he would now be advocating keeping these boys in service for an indefinite period? How can you have teamwork without morale? How can you have morale when you break faith with those boys? How can you have teamwork when you do not have adequate reserves for the team? Yet you now propose to shanghai these particular boys into the service, as was said so ably by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and train your reserves later. You now propose to shanghai these boys for an indefinite period—many of these same boys who have volunteered within the past year in all good faith to put in their year of military training. But today the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] now tells these boys that if we now permit them to go home—if we now keep our word with these volunteers as well as selectees—we will break up the team—we will disintegrate the Army.

These boys who went in first will now form our standing Army—those henceforth to come in will become the reserves.

Every team playing in any game has to have trained reserves to step into the broken ranks and take the place of those who may be pulled out of the game. We are not demobilizing this Army, but we in the minority are for sending these boys back home and saying to them, "You will now be the reserves as we promised you a year ago and we will bring fresh boys in for adequate training." This is what the author of this bill promised them then.

While I am talking about training, let us remember this. Literally many of these boys may not have received adequate training so far because they have not had the equipment with which to train properly and I say to you that one of the reasons they have not had this equipment is because the Congress has been derelict in permitting strike after strike to hamstring the defense of this country. Now, Mr. Chairman, if you will send these boys back home, send them back into the defense industries, these boys who for the past year have been serving in training for \$21 a month—send them back into the defense plants, then I predict those men who are now getting from \$5 to \$21 a day and yet tying up our defense production by strikes will very soon find themselves adequately squelched and they will be kept on the job turning out defense material which we admittedly may need for the defense of this Nation at some future time if and when we have learned that we have talked too much and bothered too much about the affairs of the rest of the world and spent far too little time in taking care of the dangers within our own country. Yes, Mr. Chairman; America is in peril, but it is far more in peril from our unwise actions here at home than our actions in the international field. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] pointed out a few moments ago,

America will ever be in peril right here at home as long as we continue to permit known and acknowledged Communists, Nazis, and Facists to occupy key positions in our defense industries, our defense organization right here in the Capitol—yes, even in high spots in our War Department.

Let us send these boys who have spent their year in training back home, let us keep faith with them, they will guard our morale, they will promote unity, they will stamp out subversive elements in our defense program. Thus will our team become a true all-American team.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, if I were convinced it was necessary for the defense of our country to break my word and vote for an extension of a year and a half I would do it, but I have heard no evidence whatever that this is necessary in order to safeguard our own national defense.

I have just returned from one of our largest military camps. I visited and inspected the replacement centers. I know what the processing of a soldier is. After these selectees come to camp and after they are given their uniforms they go into replacement centers for 3 months or for 12 weeks' training in the artillery, the infantry, or the engineers or some other branch of the service. At the end of that time they are fully equipped to replace trained selectees, in the Twenty-seventh Division that the gentleman from New York spoke about, or in the Twenty-ninth Division, without impairing the efficiency of the Army or breaking up the much-debated teamwork.

If I were to make any concession at all—and I am willing to make only one, on the 12-month extension—then I would keep the noncommissioned officers for a year or for 6 months for training purposes. They are the ones who do the training and are best qualified to train the new selectees. If the Army cannot train our selectees in 1 year, then that is a reflection upon our Army, and there is something wrong with our system. Why, in Canada they only keep them for 4 months for purposes of defense; and if Canada can train its selectees in 4 months' time for purposes of defense, then we in America certainly ought to be able to do it in 1 year's time. That is the issue before us today. I am sorry in the brief time I cannot take up and discuss foreign affairs and answer the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] about darkest Africa. If the Germans get into Africa, they will be twice as far away from the United States as they are in Germany. They would be going backward; and even if they seized Dakar and got over to Brazil, that is twice as far away from America, and yet we are told we must go to war for Dakar and for Africa, and somebody the other day in debate said we must go to war against Japan for rubber, tin, quinine, and nuxvomica.

Let us get down to facts and reason. If it is necessary for our own national defense, let us vote to keep the selectees for another year or 2 years, but nobody has made out a case, and I submit it is not necessary for purposes of defense, and

I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] will be voted upon favorably by the Committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the amount of time which has been consumed upon this amendment I am wondering if we may not have forgotten some of the terms of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], so I shall just take a moment or two to restate it. This amendment does just two things. In the first place, it strikes out the one section which would declare a national emergency, or that the national interest is imperiled. In the second place, it amends section 3 (b) of the Selective Service Act and permits men whose 1 year period of training has expired to enlist for an additional period of 12 months if they so desire. That is all it does. This amendment does not, as some speakers have intimated, in any sense of the word stop inductions of new selectees. We will go on inducting men into the selective service army just the same as we have heretofore. We have said that we want to make this act apply only to National Guard men and to other reserve groups within proper limitations and we want to keep faith with the selectees, whom we promised we would not retain in the service beyond 1 year. This is an amendment which will allow us to keep faith with those men. If we vote down this amendment, we may not have another opportunity to vote upon this subject.

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

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from California as a substitute for the Short amendment is adopted, it would, in effect, deny the right of these men who are serving their 1 year as selectees, to volunteer if they so desire.

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW rose.

Mr. ELSTON. I cannot yield further. I hope, therefore, that the Committee will vote down the amendment of the gentleman from California and vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri, because the latter contains the former. We not only said to selectees that we would keep faith with them and release them from service at the end of 1 year, but we went further. We sold the American people on the idea that we were adopting a new plan of military training. We told them we were going to form a big reserve civilian army, but if we do not adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] we have abandoned that plan, and we have not only broken faith with the men in the service, but with the American people as well.

This morning I pointed out that 1 year from next November we will have more than 3,000,000 men available for military service. We will have more than 2,100,000 men in the service at that time, and we will have 900,000 men who have received their 1 year of training. General Marshall says he wants only 1,700,000 men. What are they going to do with



the other 1,300,000, if they do not have in mind an expeditionary force? I know there are some here today who say that we cannot have an expeditionary force unless we declare war, but they should remember that it was only a short time ago that the President told us that the hemispheric line is only an imaginary line. If we can move men into Iceland, obviously outside the Western Hemisphere, we can also move them to some other place, and eventually send men to Ireland or to England, or to Dakar, or other places even more remote. This resolution may be all the authority the President may need. If you adopt this resolution, you may pave the way for an A. E. F., and later on find it difficult to explain that you had no such intention in mind.

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

Mr. ELSTON. I shall be glad to.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not also significant for all Members to bear in mind that the Chief of Staff said in the original proposal that the War Department wanted to remove the restrictions and send these men beyond the limits of the Western Hemisphere?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. He wanted to order them any place in the world at any time he might choose.

Mr. ELSTON. That is true.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] is recognized.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will vote down the amendment to the amendment and also the amendment first offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. To my mind, you might just as well strike out the enacting clause as to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. There is no use in the world for me or anybody else to argue over this question with any person who thinks the national interest is not imperiled. If there is anybody here who honestly and conscientiously believes that the national interest of this country today is not imperiled, there is no use arguing with him about the amendment and he ought to vote for this amendment and then vote against this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this bill declares the national interest is imperiled solely for the purpose of recognizing section 3 (b) of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. THOMASON. I think it is immaterial whether it be for any purpose other than what the gentleman states, but I call attention to the fact that when this resolution was originally introduced by the chairman it provided that "the national interest and welfare of the United States are gravely imperiled by the international situation and that a national emergency, therefore, exists." Now, we struck that language out and rewrote this in order that it would conform exactly with the present law. There is not a thing in the world in this bill now under

consideration that is not in the present law. I repeat that if any man thinks that the national interest is not imperiled, there is no use arguing with him.

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

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, every Member who feels that the extension is necessary, whether for 6, or 12, or 18 months, no matter how much they may favor all that, all such Members ought to vote against this amendment?

Mr. THOMASON. The language is only a statement of fact as we see it. It is a declaration of what the Congress believes. You talk about fairness to the men in the service, it seems to me that if you expect to pass a law keeping the men in the service for another 18 months, it can only be done upon one condition, that is, that the national interest is imperiled. That is our justification for this bill. That is the reason we want to pass this bill, if we do pass it, and that is the reason the men are to be retained in the service for an additional 18 months.

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

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman feel, therefore, that enacting this phrase, "That the national interest is imperiled," will not constitute authority in the President to send an A. E. F.?

Mr. THOMASON. It does not give the President one bit more power than he now has, because that is exactly the language in the law today.

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

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Does not the gentleman believe that a person who feels that the interest of the Nation is not now imperiled should also vote to release all of the other soldiers except the Regular Army itself?

Mr. THOMASON. Of course. In my judgment, outside of the Regular Standing Army, I agree with what the gentleman from Louisiana says. You ought to release every man now in the service, if the national interest is not imperiled. That is the very basis upon which this legislation is founded. That is the reason we passed the Selective Service Act. That is the reason the committee the other day, after much deliberation, changed the language from "national emergency," which might give the President authority to do most anything he desires. I contend that the national interest is imperiled—seriously imperiled. We must meet this issue squarely. We are in danger or we are not. If we are this bill ought to pass.

This amendment ought to be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. No. I cannot yield now. I only have a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a little more than a year ago the Army of France, believed by most of the world to be the finest and

best army in the world, was entrenched before the Maginot Line, while Hitler's legions marched to the conflict. A little more than a year ago this House of Representatives sat here in session with grim faces as they contemplated the fall of Paris. Today Darlan, the man who has charge of the French Navy when the test comes, is the recognized puppet dictator of what we once knew as free France, the instrument of Adolph Hitler; the man in charge of what we read about a few months ago as being free France and occupied France. Today the great old hero of the World War, Marshal Petain, has been overcome in his resistance to German domination, and German ideology has been accepted by free France. All of the wealth, all of the power, all of the resources of France are at the disposal of Adolph Hitler, now on march to world conquest.

What does that mean? It means that the 100 bombing planes you heard so much about last year down in Martinique are in French hands; that Dakar, the jumping-off place in Africa, is in French hands, under the leadership of Hitler; and yet some men stand on the floor of this House and talk about the Nation not being imperiled.

There is but one question to determine here: Is the Nation, as your committee has decided, is the Nation, as a man after man on both sides of this House has stated, in peril? If it is, what is the plain duty of the House of Representatives? The plain duty of the House of Representatives is to defeat this amendment that would chop the heart, the soul, and the virility out of this bill and leave us with no ground on which to stand unless the Nation is imperiled.

The House of Representatives ought to defeat this amendment on its merits. If you adopt this amendment, you have defeated the bill to begin with, because you have not a leg to stand on if you vote for this amendment. I therefore urge you in the name of the defense of my country to vote down the amendment that is pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from California to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 109, noes 156.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. MAY and Mr. SHORT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 146, noes 185.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to extend, for such periods of time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense, the periods of service, training and

service, enlistment, appointment, or commission, of any or all persons inducted for training and service under said act, members and units of the reserve components of the Army of the United States (including the National Guard of the United States), retired personnel and enlisted men of the Regular Army, and any other members of the Army, who are now, or who may hereafter be, in or subject to active military service, or training and service: *Provided*, That the authority hereby conferred may be revoked at any time by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments to section 2, and ask unanimous consent that they may be considered together.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the two committee amendments offered by him to section 2 may be considered jointly. Is there objection?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 4, after the colon in line 10, insert "Provided, That extension of the periods of active military service, or training and service, in the case of any person subject to the provisions of this section, shall not, without his consent, exceed 18 months in the aggregate; except that whenever the Congress declares that it is in the interests of national defense to further extend such periods of active military service and training and service, such periods may be further extended by the President, in the case of any such persons, for such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, before asking recognition for discussion of the amendment, I wonder if I could reach an agreement with my colleague on the other side as to a limit on debate on this section?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, since I have an amendment I desire to offer for the minority to the committee amendment offered by the chairman, I should think it would be wise to allow debate to run along for a few minutes before attempting to limit it. This is a very important section of the bill dealing, as it does, with all four contingent elements in our Military Establishment.

Mr. MAY. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment presented by your committee relates to the question of the additional time beyond 12 months for the training of the men in service.

At the outset let me call attention to the fact that this is not an amendment which actually requires men to serve an additional 18 months, for it fixes a ceiling beyond which the service may not go; in other words, at the end of the first training and service period of 12 months the men are subject to retention in the service for such additional time as

the Army authorities and the Secretary of War deem essential to the adequate and proper training of the men. They could keep them another 18 months if they desired to do so, but the evidence before our committee disclosed that it is the purpose of the Army not to adopt an unyielding hard rule with respect to the trainees. As they were inducted in different increments under the provisions of the Selective Service and Training Act they were started into training. They went first to the reception center, where they had, I believe, 13 weeks' training, and then they were assigned to the units in which they were to serve and train the additional time within the year. And if at the end of the year there should be those who have been inducted who have had previous military training or those who for any other reason have achieved the proper training and have become accomplished and efficient soldiers, then they may be discharged at that time in the discretion of the Secretary of War. But I am not going to undertake to mislead anybody in this House by saying they will not be kept 18 months longer. I do not know what will be done about that. I do know that as this emergency grows worse and worse from day to day, and I might say from hour to hour, after a while it may become so severe that it may be necessary not only to keep those who have been inducted into service for that period of time but to induct others. Therefore, I want it definitely understood that there is no misrepresentation about this, so that a year from now or a year and a half from now or 2 years from now or if at any time in the future we are called upon to make another extension, which we may be called upon to do, I do not want it said of me that I promised anybody that they would be kept only 18 months and no more.

Mr. Chairman, that is the meaning of this amendment, and I hope after it has been discussed briefly we may agree upon some reasonable time for its discussion.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHORT to the committee amendment: After "shall not," and before "without his consent" insert: "in the case of any person in training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, be made."

And after "without his consent" insert: "and in the case of any other person subject to the provisions of this section shall not, without his consent."

And strike out "eighteen months" and insert "twelve months."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has very clearly and accurately stated the effect of the amendment offered by the majority of the committee. If I may have the attention of the Members of the House I believe I can tell them very briefly the exact purpose of the amendment to the committee amendment which I have offered.

The committee amendment would limit the extension of the period of training

and service to 18 months in addition to the 12 months' period of their present training and service for all four components of our Army, the selectees, the National Guard, the reserve components, and the retired personnel of the Regular Army.

The minority amendment to the committee amendment simply authorizes the President to extend the time, not for 18 months but for 12 months, and using the exact language in the Selective Training and Service Act, for 12 consecutive months of training and service for the National Guard, the reserve components, and the retired personnel of the Regular Army, but it exempts all selectees from further service unless they care to volunteer. So that if the amendment I have offered to the committee amendment is adopted it will read exactly this way, and I should like to have you listen to it carefully:

*Provided*, That extension of the periods of active military service, or training and service, in the case of any person subject to the provisions of this section, shall not, in the case of any person in training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, be made without his consent, and in the case of any other person subject to the provisions of this section shall not, without his consent, exceed 12 months in the aggregate; except that whenever the Congress declares that it is in the interests of national defense to further extend such periods of active military service and training and service, such periods may be further extended by the President, in the case of any such persons, for such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I think that should be clear to every Member of the House without having a dozen Members coming to me and asking me what the amendment will do. It will simply authorize the President to extend the service of the National Guard, the reserve components and the retired personnel of the Regular Army, not for 18 months as the committee provides but it sets a ceiling of 12 consecutive months, another year. It will also allow any draftee or selectee to volunteer for another year, but it does not authorize the President to extend their time beyond the present 12-month period of training and service.

I trust that is clear to all Members. If anyone has any questions to ask, I wish he would ask them now or forever hold his peace.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman's amendment does not relate to the enrollees. Their time will expire at the end of the year?

Mr. SHORT. That is right. Of course, the 300,000 in reserve would be subject to induction from time to time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 97, noes 136.



Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SHORT and Mr. MAY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 176.

So the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts to the committee amendment: After the word "aggregate," insert "and provided further, That of the persons inducted for training and service under said act prior to the approval of this act, not less than 50,000 shall complete such training and service during each calendar month of the year 1942, as nearly as feasible in the order of their induction."

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple one and can be explained very briefly. It applies only to men who have already been drafted. There are approximately 600,000 of such men. Under this amendment, 50,000 of those drafted men would be released from training camps each month of the year 1942, beginning next January. Thus, by Christmas of that year, all the men heretofore drafted will have been sent home.

That is the entire amendment. It is not in conflict in any way with the committee amendment. The committee amendment applies to all reserve components, the National Guard, men hitherto drafted, and those to be drafted in the future.

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

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. In that 50,000 would be included the hardship cases, the married men, and those over 28?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. The gentleman is correct. The Army would choose the 50,000 men to be sent home.

Mr. McCORMACK. Personally, I hope the Committee will not object to this amendment being adopted, for the purpose of conference, because there is something there that the conferees may well consider. I hope the amendment will be adopted so that the conferees may have the opportunity of considering it in connection with the other hardship elements involved, when the bill is in conference.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I thank the majority leader, and am glad he is in favor of the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Under the gentleman's amendment, no Army unit would be broken up; it would be left entirely to the Army officials to select the 50,000 who should go home?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. That is correct.

The Army's greatest objection, as I take it, to the existing law is the fear that various units of the Army may be disrupted by men going home in large numbers at the end of their particular year of training. It is pure chance when the day of their induction comes around the next year and they go home. That fear is obliterated by this amendment, because the Army would have wide discretion to send the men home at the rate of only 3 percent of the total armed force each month, and replacements would be immediately available. That is the chief objection the Army has to the existing law.

The chief objection many people have to the present bill is the fear, which may or may not be groundless, that the boys who have been drafted have been drafted for semipermanent service.

This amendment is not perfect. It does not send each man home at the end of exactly 1 year, but it does give concrete evidence to the boys at camp and to the people at home that we meant what we said when we passed this act to train a civilian reserve. The men would be going home beginning next January at the rate of 50,000 a month.

Before I sit down, I think I must mention the fact that I am speaking here in behalf of a considerable group of Congressmen who took a part in framing this amendment. They have asked me to read their names. They are Messrs. ANDERSON of New Mexico, MCINTYRE of Wyoming, WICKERSAM of Oklahoma, WEISS of Pennsylvania, KELLEY of Pennsylvania, SCANLON of Pennsylvania, FOGARTY of Rhode Island, WASIELEWSKI of Wisconsin, MACIORA and DOWNS of Connecticut, SIKES of Florida, and DAVIS of Ohio. Several of these gentlemen, and also the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], are prepared to speak in behalf of this amendment if given the opportunity.

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

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is the gentleman's amendment applicable to Reserve officers and National Guard men and officers?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. No; the amendment applies only to men heretofore drafted under the Selective Training and Service Act.

Mr. COOLEY. Why would it not be well to make it applicable to all men in the service, including Reserve officers and guardsmen?

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

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. THOMASON. Does the gentleman mean the selectee must have served out his full year before he would be eligible under the amendment?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. That is not necessarily stated in the amendment; it is in the present law.

Mr. THOMASON. It ought to be stated.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I think the Army officers could be trusted.

Mr. THOMASON. What about the next section of the bill to be considered, which covers the hardship cases, married men, and those who are going to be released anyway? Under the gentleman's amendment, should not a man be required to serve a full year before he would be eligible?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I certainly think he should be required to, although I do not think it should be in this amendment. However, I will accept an amendment to that effect if the gentleman feels that it is important.

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

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. In the event the gentleman's amendment is adopted, what is the maximum length of service any man would have to serve?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. The maximum conceivable length of service would be 2 years. Of course, men inducted at the end of last year might conceivably be kept, if they were particularly valuable men, until the end of 1942; but the average length of service under this amendment would presumably be about 14½ or 15 months.

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

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman's amendment would permit showing complete favoritism all the way through in connection with discharges. I am afraid of that whole set-up.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. In the amendment there is a statement that the discharges should take place as nearly as feasible in the order in which the men were inducted.

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

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARNESS. In connection with the question of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that this would be discriminatory, is it not a fact that under the gentleman's amendment one of these boys might be kept in for 18 months and another boy discharged in 6 months?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. That is possible, but that is even more possible under the present bill, and under the committee amendment without my amendment, much more possible.

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

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think it would be well to make his amendment apply to National Guard men?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I have not expressed any opinion about that because, as I say, I speak for a group which has considered only the draftees.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, compromise is certainly a wonderful thing. It may be that legislation is contrived by compromise, but in my lexicon there is not going to be any compromise with

principle. That is what this amendment seeks to do. It is simply fishing around for support in order to get around the vital issue that is involved here, and that is the question of human faith.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman care to yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would prefer not to yield, if the gentleman does not mind.

I am not going to kid myself as to the kind of bill of goods we sold the American people in September of 1940. They sought to make it appear that the whole picture had been presented to the public at that time. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER] read some newspaper dispatches last Friday to prove that point. The difficulty with those dispatches was that when he sought to prove that the proviso and the exception in the original act had adequately come to the attention of the people, it proved that some of those dispatches were dated on the 15th of September, whereas the bill passed the House on the 7th of September and the conference report was approved on the 14th of September.

Do not be hoodwinked and kidded by th's kind of business. We are here to determine whether or not we are going to keep faith with the boys in the camps, and you can argue until you are blue in the face as to whether they are patriotic or whether they are unpatriotic, but that kind of argument is all beside the point. The representations went out from this Chamber, they went out in newspaper dispatches, and they came to the attention of the people in the form of nine separate Gallup polls that emphasized the whole idea of 1 year. Are you now going to adopt an amendment that may keep one boy in the Army for 6 months and another one for 24 months? If the Army determines that in the mechanized divisions they ought to be kept for 2 years, they will keep them for 2 years; and if they figure that the doughboys have had enough in 6 months, they will let them out in that time. But how are you going to justify discharging one boy living on N Street in your district in 6 months and another on M Street in 24 months, when both may have been inducted at one and the same time? Can the Congress justify that kind of discrimination when the peril has not been shown, when the necessity has not been demonstrated that they ought to be kept beyond the original period as set up in the Selective Service Act?

There will be no compromises. Do not be lured by this kind of blandishment. We are faced with a problem of resolving a principle.

In 1920, when the United States Senate was fighting our entry into the League of Nations, even Henry Cabot Lodge, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate, from Mr. Eliot's own State, was ready for compromise until Senator JOHNSON of California and Senator BORAH went everywhere and said there can be no compromise, and they defeated the proposal for our entry into the League of Nations. When the Supreme Court packing bill was pending in the Senate, what happened? Some of

those who were weak of heart and faint of hope began to prepare a substitute and a compromise. Once more there were those redoubtable souls who were willing to make an American fight and let it rest upon the rock of principle, said there can be no compromise with principle, and that measure was defeated in the Senate of the United States. In this rather tragic and eventful hour, when principle is involved, are we going to run out on the American people or are we going to reject compromises and let the issue be clear-cut when the time comes to go on record? As for me, I want none of these blandishments and no compromise at this time.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Is not this amendment merely to soften and cushion the conscience of those men who have just voted to retain these men in service for 18 months?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Far be it from me to reflect on any Member of this House, but I simply say I want no part in this temporizing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. We have just had one opposing speaker and now we have a second one following him.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] would be grossly unfair to many American boys having been drafted under the Selective Service Act and in the service at the present time. It would be an awful hard job for the Army to administer this provision in a fair manner. Another thought which I wish the Members of the House would get is that General Marshall and his staff want to get these boys trained and out of the service and new boys in the service to take their places in order to build a reserve for the safeguarding of our country just as badly as the boys themselves want to get out of the service and get back home. We are just now getting into real production on our new Army matériel. New model planes, tanks, and guns are coming off the production lines all over the country, and will rapidly be supplied to the Army. Let us not kid our men that they are trained when we know and the Army knows they are not.

They have no desire to hold these boys past the time they are trained. They are making an honest effort, and last month they discharged 2,000 hardship cases where they felt the families of the boys were suffering. I think this amendment would hamper the Army in letting the hardship cases and men over 28 years of age out of the service, rather than help.

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

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman not think it would tend to disrupt the morale of many of the boys who wanted to get out, if they saw other boys getting out before they did?

Mr. EDMISTON. I definitely do; and I do not think it is fair in any way to pass an amendment here this afternoon whose author admits that under it some might be kept for 2 years and others get out at the end of 6 or 7 months.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And, of course, every selectee would be expected to write to his own Congressman, asking for political pressure to get him out of the Army.

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes; that is true. It would be an impossible job for the Army to do.

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

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. And is it not true that this makes two classes of draftees—one class that will stay in 2 years, those that are drafted from now on; and another class that may get out any time from 6 months up to 2 years?

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes; the amendment is discriminatory, or could be made very discriminatory.

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

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Regardless of what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] said about some men being able to get out within a year, is it not a fact that the Selective Service Act authorizes the President to do that? I see nothing in this amendment that will let any of them out in less than 12 months under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. EDMISTON. There is nothing in the amendment under which a man drafted next month could not be discharged in the January quota.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe the present law states 12 months unless otherwise relieved.

Mr. EDMISTON. Does not this amendment otherwise relieve them?

Mr. HINSHAW. They do not have to serve 12 months.

Mr. EDMISTON. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, when I heard the high-powered oratory that took place this morning to create some more war psychology, I was wondering if some of the Members were being afflicted with the jitters, and for that reason I have taken the floor to try to allay their fears. Lloyds of London has offered a 1,000-to-1 policy that Washington will not be bombed. A bookmaker in Glasgow—I hope you notice the place—has offered 20,000 pounds that this war will be over in a year. Are we getting worried? Is somebody at the head of the class getting excited for fear we will not get in before the year is over?



I also call attention to a few of the features of the draft act over in Canada. Apparently Canada is not nearly as much worried about war, although they are in it, as we are, and we are not yet in it. In Canada the draft is for 4 months, and only for home defense.

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

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Not now, I am sorry. They cannot be taken for overseas service. That is prohibited. Furthermore, they receive \$39 a month, while our draftees receive \$21 a month, and after 4 months' service, if they have acquired sufficient skill, they are promoted into the rank of first-class private, when they get \$30 a month. In addition to that under the Canadian act a married man has \$35 a month allotted to his wife, and \$12 a month for two children under 16 years of age, which makes his entire allowance in salary \$98 a month. Compare that with what you are doing here in the case of our own selectees. And I would like to know how much of that money is some of the lend-lease money that we voted. Have we been withholding from our men the salary that is now being paid to the Canadian selectees?

I could go on along this line indefinitely, but it seems to me that inasmuch as Canada, which is in the war, is not at all excited about it, and that her men are only drafted for 4 months and then cannot be taken overseas, what is all the shooting about? What are we getting excited about?

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I call the gentleman's attention to an article by Constantine Brown in Sunday's Star, where he says:

Another 450,000 young men were ordered to the colors in July this year in Germany. Their military training and equipment is expected to be completed by November of this year.

Four months for Germany; 4 months for Canada, but the United States must have 30 months' training.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. If you are going to send them over to Freetown, as the story now is, 500 miles south of Dakar, to carry the "four freedoms" to darkest Africa, I suppose there is reason for this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the House Committee on Military Affairs has had no opportunity whatsoever to consider this amendment. We do not know exactly how far-reaching it is. It is at least highly discriminatory, and the committee cannot accept it. Therefore I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for me to prefer a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. TARVER. Certainly.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the entire membership of the House is restless about the comple-

tion of this bill, I wonder if we cannot agree upon 1 hour's debate upon the bill. Has the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] any objections?

Mr. SHORT. I should think we could get by with his amendment in much less time.

Mr. MAY. No, no. I mean on this section and all amendments.

Mr. SHORT. I think we could finish in at least that time or less.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment upon which I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I will be able to get 5 minutes on my amendment under such an agreement.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I will modify the request, and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock. That will be 35 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky as modified?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered a substitute amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER offers a substitute for the May amendment: Page 4, at the end of line 10, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided further, That notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, the power of the President to require more than 12 months' service and training in the cases of men selected under section 3 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 shall be limited to the powers delegated under section 3 (c) of said act."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, this morning I endeavored to discuss this amendment, which I announced I proposed to offer. I shall not consume your time other than in an effort to clarify the meaning and effect of the amendment. I sincerely hope that the membership of the committee will give me attention for 3 or 4 minutes in order that I may endeavor to do that.

This amendment would have no effect whatever upon the provisions of the bill relating to the National Guard and the Reserve Army officers or retired officers. It affects only the selectees.

It proposes to affect them by limiting the President's power to that delegated by section 3 (c) of the Selective Training and Service Act. In other words, if this amendment is adopted, the provisions of this bill will not change existing law insofar as the selectees are concerned.

I endeavored to point out this morning that it is uncontroverted that the President, under existing law, without the passage of any additional legislation whatever has authority to recall any selectee, discharged after 12 months' service, for an additional 12 months' service. That results because of the provisions of section 3 (c) of the Selective Training and Service Act, which reads as follows:

Each such man, after the completion of his period of training and service under subsection (b), shall be transferred to a reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States; and until he attains the age of 45, or until the expiration of a period of 10 years after such transfer, or until he is discharged from such reserve component, whichever occurs first, he shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component and shall be subject to such additional training and service as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law.

The service which is now prescribed by law is the service outlined in the first section of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, which provides:

That during the period ending June 30, 1942, the President be, and is hereby, authorized from time to time to order into the active military service of the United States for a period of 12 consecutive months each, any and all members and units of any or all reserve components of the Army of the United States—

And so forth. All you propose to do in this bill insofar as the selectees are affected is to give the President power to retain the selectees in service after the expiration of the 12 months' period. He already has that power under subsection (c) of section 3 of the Selective Training and Service Act which I have just read to you, with the difference that under that law he can only recall them for 12 months.

The effect of my amendment would be to have the pending legislation make no change whatever in the existing legislative situation but to permit the President, under the provisions of existing law, if he feels justified in doing so, to call the selectees back for an additional period of training not to exceed 12 months after the expiration of their first 12 months. That is what existing law provides. This statement has been made to you repeatedly. If I have made any mistake as to the accuracy of the legal proposition, I have stated I would be glad to have anyone call my attention to it. I do not believe I have been laboring under any mistake as to the existing power of the President without any further action by the Congress, but if I have I certainly would like to be advised of the fact, but so far in my contact with various members of the committee I have not been advised that there is any conflict of opinion on that point.

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

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS. I understand the gentleman has reference to the law that applies only to selectees.

Mr. TARVER. That is right.

Mr. HARNESS. I agree with the gentleman that existing law gives the President the right to call these men as a reserve component for 12 months' additional service; but I do not know that

the gentleman's amendment goes far enough to cover the authority the President wants to keep the National Guard and reserve personnel in the service for an additional period.

Mr. TARVER. The amendment does not affect the bill as it applies to the National Guard and the Reserve. The gentleman doubtless did not hear my statement with regard to that at the opening of my remarks. It applies only to the selectees.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment that has been proposed by the gentleman from Georgia. What he seeks to do is simply to rely upon the power that was given in the original act for the President to call these selectees after they become members of the reserve component into the service for an additional period of service; but in order to exercise that authority he must invoke a previous act, Public 96, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, which became law on August 27, 1940. That is the one giving the President the right to call reserve components into the active service.

I call attention to the fact that at the very best there is a very considerable legal question raised by this amendment, in that reliance must be had upon an act passed prior to the enactment of the Selective Service Act, and the further fact that when the Selective Service Act was passed a specific means of keeping these men in active service was provided. This specific plan was that the Congress should declare the national interest to be imperiled. Certainly the argument might be raised that in the event an effort was made to hold these selectees in service under that act that no authority had been given because of the express power granted and the express method set up in this subsequent act. Besides, when this bill was considered in the House and also in the Senate last year that very matter of just what was intended was discussed. Over in the Senate you will find, if you follow the debates, that the matter was discussed, and in the hearings of the House Committee on Military Affairs there was some questioning of General Marshall by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] along this line. I read from the hearings:

Mr. HARNESS. Under the first act that we passed in August of 1940 we provided that the President had the right to call the reserve component of the Army into service for a period of 12 months.

General MARSHALL. You mean to transfer the men into the Reserve and then call them back to active duty?

Mr. HARNESS. As soon as they are discharged, automatically they go into the reserve component of the Army and are subject to such additional training as the law provides.

General MARSHALL. That is correct, but I think it would be most unfortunate to do that at this time, because the soldier would feel that he had been victimized by a maneuver, by sharp practice, under cover of the law.

Then he goes on to say it would have a most unfortunate effect on morale if we adopted that method. To that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] replied:

I agree with what you say, General, in what has been suggested here, that we ought to come out honestly and say what we are going to do. It just adds to the confusion.

That is the whole situation about this particular amendment.

Mr. HARNESS. And I believe just exactly what I said then.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am very glad to know, then, that the gentleman is going to oppose this amendment that is offered at this particular time, in order that we may come out and be absolutely fair and open with these selectees and not contribute to the confusion which otherwise would result.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. As far as any confusion is concerned, may I point out to the gentleman that my amendment expressly ratifies and continues the authority of the President under section 3 (c), and there could be no possible confusion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It does not tie in with Public Law 96, which preceded the enactment of this particular measure.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is mistaken, for section 3 (c) refers to existing law, which is Public Resolution 96.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER].

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Chairman, I think the real honest procedure that should be initiated before we consider any more of this pre-war legislation is that somebody in the administration ought to recommend the repeal of the Neutrality Act. There is still a so-called Neutrality Act on the lawbooks, but it has been completely ignored. Of course, it does not mean anything. It was very seriously emasculated and manhandled when the interventionists brought about the repeal of the arms embargo. In view of events transpiring since that repeal, the Neutrality Act is a fine sample of pure unadulterated hypocrisy.

Along about 1933 our very distinguished President informed us that all we had to fear was fear itself, and fear has been the theme song of this administration for more than 8 years. One now listens in vain for the swingtime strains of Happy Days Are Here Again, which was the elixir of life at every gathering of new dealers from a ward meeting to a Jackson Day banquet.

In the interim they have developed a war psychology as a smoke screen in order to escape constant criticism of their ridiculous domestic policies. We have a batch of new slogans: "Quarantine the aggressor nations"; "The stab in the back" speech, directed at Mussolini; "Repeal the arms embargo"; "Conscript the boys"; "Lend-lease to England"; and the \$7,000,000,000 of American taxpayers' money to pay the bill and the "four freedoms." Now we find ourselves in a sorry predicament. Many of us voted to deport Harry Bridges. Earl

Browder is serving time in jail, and the Dies committee has given us a very complete picture of what the Communists are doing in and out of governmental departments. Now we are faced with the spectacle that would have an element of humor, if it were not so tragic, of the President of the United States and his Department of State with their arms around bloody Joe Stalin and begging us all to call him comrade.

Now comes a new demand, not for continued training, as was advocated at the time of the passage of the first bill for the development of Reserves, but for the immediate building of an Army of 1,750,000 and the requirement that the agreement we entered into in sending them for a year be now disregarded. The language in the existing law limiting the selectees' service to 12 months is, in my estimation, a legal and a moral obligation. I am unalterably opposed to this bill and I shall keep faith with the selectees now in service. They are the only group of Americans who up to this good hour has really made a genuine sacrifice for their country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], because I think the amendment offers the logical action for the House to take. It lets those of us who believe that there is a problem meet that problem in an honorable way. It extends service for the National Guard and Reserve officers in keeping with the obligations they took voluntarily when they entered the service; but, as to selectees, it requires that any extension of service be under the liability for reserve duty as established in paragraph (c) of section 3 of the Selective Service Act, so that they may get reserve credit for time served.

Many of us recognize that it is difficult to man the outlying bases and maintain army units with 1-year men. I raised that specific question after a trip to Panama, as the hearings of the Appropriations Committee on the War Department bill will show, the hearings for April 30.

We want to maintain the effective organization of the Army and we believe that it can be done in a way that keeps faith with the men involved.

It can be done by permitting 2-year enlistments with credit for time already served as a selectee with a reduction in reserve duty liability, as proposed in H. R. 5286, which I introduced July 10, or it can be done by requiring that additional duty by inducted men be done as reservists rather than as selectees, and that is what is proposed by the gentleman from Georgia in his amendment to the committee amendment now pending.

The gentleman from Alabama objects that the Selective Service Act made no specific reference to the act previously enacted under which the President would call the selectees after they were in the reserve category. I call your attention to the language in paragraph (c) of sec-



tion 3, the Selective Service Act, which specifically states:

Each such man, after the completion of his period of training and service under subsection (b) shall be transferred to a reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States—

And—

He shall be deemed to be a member of such reserve component and shall be subject to such additional training and service as may now or hereafter be prescribed by law.

That "now" embraces Public, 96, which was adopted in August and approved August 27, 1940. The Selective Service Act was passed in September and approved September 16, 1940.

As I said in my remarks on July 24, this 10-year reserve liability of the selectees was repeatedly discussed during the debate on the Selective Service Act. Many of us based a great deal of our objection to the act upon this heavy reserve liability for the man who happened to be called while leaving the uncalled man go scot free. Not forgetting it, on January 26 this year, shortly after the new Congress convened, I introduced H. R. 2241, to reduce from 10 to 3 years the reserve-duty liability of persons inducted.

In the appropriation hearings already referred to, on April 30, I suggested using that reserve liability to meet the problem we now face, and suggested giving the selectee credit for time already spent if he enlisted for extended service. I counseled with the War Department on the matter and H. R. 5286 was drawn to meet suggestions made by them in that connection.

The reserve liability of the selectees has been generally debated and it is recognized by those who have studied the matter that something should be done to credit these selectees with active service rendered so as to reduce the heavy reserve liability they face. The gentleman from Alabama has attempted to suggest that there was some doubt as to the legality of their reserve liability. There can be none. The acts speak for themselves. And I have in my hand a memorandum prepared by the War Department for the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], ranking minority member of the Military Affairs Committee. It is dated August 6, and it concludes as follows:

Summarizing, any selectee who completes his period of training and service in the land forces, as prescribed by section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and who is not otherwise exempted, is subject to transfer to a reserve component of the Army of the United States.

And—

If the completion of his training and service and his transfer to a reserve component is completed at any time prior to June 30, 1942, such person may be ordered into the active military service of the United States as a member of a reserve component of the Army of the United States for a period of 12 consecutive months, provided such order is issued at any time prior to June 30, 1942. Subject to the foregoing, it is therefore legally possible to require a selectee to serve for 12 months under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, transfer him to a reserve component as above noted, and

immediately issue an order requiring him to render 12 consecutive months of further active military service.

That is the opinion of the War Department, and it will be the opinion of anyone who reads the language of the two acts. In other words, no legislation is needed to get an additional 12 months of service from the selectee. The only question is whether you are going to require him to give it as a selectee or as a reservist.

Now, then, why is it desirable for the selectee, if he has to serve additional time, to serve it as a reservist rather than as a selectee? It is because that as a selectee he gets no credit on his reserve liability. As a member of a proper reserve component he can. His time as a reservist does not begin to run until he becomes a reservist. If you extend his period of service as a selectee, you are piling that onto the time already served and to the 10 years of reserve liability which begins when finally he concludes service as a selectee. It is grossly unfair.

The man who is not called has neither training liability nor reserve liability. Upon the selectee whose number is called, who already has given a year of active duty, who already faces 10 years of reserve duty, you now propose to add 18 months of active-duty training and service. The least you can do is to let him get credit for additional active duty by having him take it as a reservist so as to cut down on that 10 years of reserve liability, which is what the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia proposes.

I am confident that if the membership of the House were to understand the situation, the amendment would be adopted. I regret that the sharp limitations on time prevent further statement. [Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] for the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 31, noes 78.

So the substitute for the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH as a substitute for the pending committee amendment:

On page 4, line 10, after the colon insert "Provided, That the extension of the initial 12-month period of training and service under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, in the case of any person inducted under such act who is a non-commissioned officer at the completion of his first 12 months of such training and service shall not, without his consent, exceed 12 months: *Provided further*, That any person inducted for training and service under section 3 (b) of said act who is not a non-commissioned officer upon completion of his first 12 months of such training and service shall, upon the completion of his first 12 months of such training and service, be released from training and service under section 3 (b) and shall be transferred to a reserve component of the land or naval forces for the same period and with the same rights, duties, and liabilities

as any other person transferred to a reserve component of the land or naval forces under the provisions of section 3 (c) of such act: *Provided further*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to require such release and transfer in the case of more than 45,000 men in any one month."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] for 3 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I think the 3 minutes is sufficient because I believe the mood of the House, particularly on the minority side, is such as not to be willing to accept any compromise.

The purpose of the amendment must be clear. Those who say that we must retain these draftees or selectees for over a year maintain that if we do not we will disrupt the Army, we will demoralize it, we will disorganize it, and it will disintegrate and, therefore, it is necessary to hold them in for an additional year and a half.

I submit that holding these selectees in more than 1 year will not help at all in the training of the Army. In fact, it may seriously impair its morale. If you actually want to train the Army, then the simplest and best procedure would be to retain in the service for another year the noncommissioned officers. These selectee noncommissioned officers are trained and are now training soldiers in all branches of the service and could train the new selectees. They receive more pay than the privates. The corporals receive \$54 a month and the sergeants all the way from \$66 up to \$120 a month, so there will be no financial hardship to them if we retain them in the service. This proposal is in the nature of a compromise. As I stated in the beginning, I do not believe the House is ready to accept any form of compromise, but if you want to actually train the new selectees quickly and efficiently, the thing to do is to hold on to the noncommissioned officers. There will be no hardship in doing so because they are well paid and many of them would be glad to stay longer under the circumstances.

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

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

Mr. MERRITT. Does not the gentleman think that will take away all the incentive for these young men to become noncommissioned officers?

Mr. FISH. No. Many of the noncommissioned officers who have knowledge of Army life and who are well trained themselves would like to stay in the Army. Also, they are far better paid—two or three times better paid—than the private soldiers.

I believe if we gave these noncommissioned officers a chance to volunteer a large proportion of them would volunteer. But if you gave the private soldiers among the selectees a chance, I believe 90 percent of them would get out of the Army.

I offer this amendment simply in order to get it before the House. If the Members want a compromise of that nature, that will provide for adequate training and not disrupt the Army, this amendment would do it.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. The gentleman might say he wants to keep one quarterback and one halfback.

Mr. FISH. We want to keep the best-trained men in to train the others. That is exactly what I want to do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the committee amendment.

The substitute amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, with the time allotted the way it is, many Members, including myself, who have amendments to this section at the desk would be deprived of an opportunity of being heard on their amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that the amendment of the gentleman from New York proposes to add a new section. If that is correct, that would not be included in the time fixed.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW to the pending committee amendment: In the committee amendment, strike out "18 months" and insert "6 months."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I cannot do adequate justice to this amendment in 2 minutes. All I can say is that there are 165 Members of this House who have had military service of one sort or another, and they can read these hearings intelligently. When they read the hearings they will find that what the Army is in is a pickle. They have too many men due to come out of the Army at one time, and that is the whole trouble. That is what this thing is all about. That is what is stated throughout the hearings by General Marshall.

I propose to give them 6 months more in which to get themselves straightened out so they can let those men out of the Army in a more orderly way, and bring in the selectees in a more orderly way, and thereby not disrupt the service. I cannot see any excuse at all for freezing these men in the Army for an indefinite period of time. I think that 6 months is plenty for the Army to carry out its plans for releasing selectees in an orderly way.

Here and there in the hearings you recall that General Marshall has referred again and again to the 18 months necessary for training. If what we are going to do is freeze an Army here and freeze these men into the service who have been inducted, then I am against the whole bill. If what we are for is adequate national defense, then a total of 18 months for these selectees is certainly adequate for them to receive training and to give the Army time enough to get them organized and get them out and get some others in.

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

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I agree with what the gentleman has said in reference to the orderly retirement of the men now in the service. If the gentleman will refer to page 19 of the hearings he will see that the major portion of the selectees came in at the end of a 4 months' period. What we want to do in this bill is give the Army latitude in retiring those men in orderly fashion.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that, and I am giving the Army 6 months more to do the job. That ought to be plenty. Our young men should not have to suffer for the mistakes beyond their control.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California to the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HINSHAW) there were—ayes 61, noes 97.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] offers another committee amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 3, after "authorized" in line 25, insert " , subject, however, to the condition hereinafter stated."

And on page 4 strike out the concluding proviso in section 2, and insert "Provided further, That the authority hereby conferred is subject to the condition that the delegation of such authority may be revoked at any time by concurrent resolution of the Congress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: Page 4, strike out line 7, and insert: "United States", retired personnel of, and enlisted men who hereafter enlist in, the"

And after line 12, insert "Sec. 2A. During the existence of the authority conferred by section 2, an enlistment allowance equal in amount to that provided by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army, and to be in addition to the enlistment allowance so provided, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the Regular Army who reenlists within 24 hours after such discharge."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The amendment I offer at this time is designed to recognize a contract in existence between the enlisted men of the Army and the Government of the United States. Every Member of this body knows that when a citizen of the United States enlists in the Army it is either for a 1- or 4-year period, and at expiration of the enlistment, if he has served honorably, he receives an honorable discharge. The bill we are

now considering when a law will freeze these men in the Army beyond the date of expiration of their enlistment, therefore it can be properly said the Government is not keeping its part of the contract. My amendment will permit the enlisted men of the Army to reenlist after discharge within a 24-hour period, and for so doing will receive a double reenlistment bonus or gratuity. In addition my amendment will permit the Army to retain for duration of the emergency all men who enlist in the Army for a first enlistment after this bill becomes a law.

The membership of the House, I am sure, want to treat the enlisted men of the Army just the same as they treat the enlisted men of the Navy and with that in mind let me remind you of the fact that last week this House passed Senate bill 353 without a record vote providing for the same thing my amendment calls for. Gentlemen, by passing S. 353 you provided that when a man reenlists in the Navy 24 hours after discharge he will receive a double reenlistment bonus or gratuity; now, surely you are willing to grant the same privilege to the men of the Regular Army.

In asking your support for my amendment, let me remind you that the backbone of our Army today is as it always has been, the men of the Regular Army, therefore a vote for this amendment is a vote for this group.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk, which proposes a new section to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MERRITT as a new section: Page 4, after line 12, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 2A. Any person whose period of active military service or training and service is extended under section 2 and who was (a) ordered to active Federal service under Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-seventh Congress, or (b) inducted under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, prior to the enactment of this act, shall, notwithstanding the limitation in section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 upon the time within which application for National Service Life Insurance may be made, be granted insurance under such section without further medical examination if application therefor is filed within 120 days after the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire recognition?

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to put the committee on record in regard to this amendment because having contacted the War Department I find there may be some objection to the fact that I ask for this insurance without further physical examination. I am afraid when the bill goes to conference with the Senate they may strike this out. I contend that any young man who goes into our armed forces in good health and is accepted by our Army and Navy doc-



tors and later on should he in some way become sick or physically disabled, his first examination should stand. Inasmuch as the committee is anxious to endorse this amendment and is willing now to accept it, I trust when the time comes for conference they will insist upon this insurance being given these young men without further physical examination.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MERRITT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new section, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: At the end of section 2-A, as amended, insert a new section, as follows:

"The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, under such regulations as they may respectively provide, shall issue to each person inducted into the service under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, upon such person's being given a furlough at any time, a furlough certificate without cost to such person for travel to and from his home during such furlough period."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, in a nutshell this amendment provides for one of the most necessary things that we have considered for the preservation of our constitutional form of government and for our family life in America. It provides for free transportation home during furlough for every man who has been inducted under the service act of 1940. It is an amendment which I know you will agree with me is necessary, and at least from what I can gather from letters from various constituents it is absolutely necessary to maintain the contact which our selectees and soldiers should have between their families and themselves. They are not Germans, they are not Russian soldiers, but are volunteering to the call of the American Government, and I submit that on a salary of \$21 a month which they are receiving, and in certain cases where they are receiving \$30 a month, and so forth, they need such certificates for traveling during furlough, so that they may visit their homes and family. I submit that if this Congress is going to pass the bill that is now under consideration, providing that these selectees and soldiers be kept in camp and in training for an indefinite period, it is high time some provision is made so that they can get home free of charge and that Uncle Sam will pay their transportation charges.

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

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. I am very much in sympathy with the gentleman's amendment. I think it would do a great deal to improve the morale of our Army, but the main thing to improve the morale and keep the morale is to keep our word and keep these selectees in the service for 12 months and no more.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I agree with the gentleman on that point.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Yes.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Would it not be well to include in the gentleman's amendment all branches of the services, Regulars and National Guard?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. According to the amendment, it includes all those inducted into the service under the act of 1940.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. That is all right for inducted men but is not so good for the men of the Regular Army.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That could be amended.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the gentleman made any estimate of what this will cost the Government annually?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I have not the slightest idea of what the cost is annually to pay a furlough home for these boys, but I will answer the gentleman in this way. You are going to destroy family life in America and deprive them from seeing their folks. If a man is in Louisiana, and his home is in New York State, he will be unable in most cases to get home because of the fact that he has not money enough to get home, and I ask the Congress at this time to consider the transportation of these men home as a necessary part of maintaining the morale throughout the Army and the Navy of the United States.

Mr. POWERS. And may I suggest to the gentleman that before this vote is taken he amend his amendment to include every enlisted man in the armed forces, both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. DONDERO. And it should provide for not more than one furlough in each year.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman think of sending these boys home in ordinary cabs, or in Pullman cars?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is up to the War Department.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman had better write that into his amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do say this, that it is absolutely necessary to consider this from the standpoint of morale and national defense, and I ask the support of the House at this time for this amendment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment and other amendments that have been proposed and much that has been said influence me to say that there is a great deal more to what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] said a few days ago, if he said it, that "this whole defense program has been handled as if it were a glorified W. P. A. project, a continuation of the effort to obtain security and salvation without sacrifice and without work."

Whether you subscribe to this or not, you are obliged to concede that the effort to fit round pegs to square holes has not ceased—something that has outraged the common sense of common-sense people. There has been too much hitching of goats to carts that were made to be pulled by oxen; too much mismatching everywhere, running all the way from Mr. Frankfurter's Court down through O. P. M. to the W. P. A. worker who

leans upon his spade. We have reached the point where no one has faith in anything or believes anybody.

There prevails right here in our midst as poor a spirit as has ever existed in America. Here we are, if not in war, then upon the very brink of war, and talking about disbanding our fighting forces—still clinging to the idea that we can win the war by placing a mortgage upon present and future generations.

Let me say to you that if we were to enter a shooting war in the spirit now prevailing, we would be driven from every battlefield where we might be engaged by the enemy.

Let the old American spirit assert itself. Let it be asserted right here and on this bill. I like less than you the goats hitched to carts made to be drawn by oxen, the misfits, the profit takers, the money changers, the left-wing reformers, the professional social uplifter—the rats that gnaw away at the foundations of our Government, the Communists now entering upon their second honeymoon, the racketeers in labor that strike against national defense and the people—but I love America more than I hate all these.

All these will disappear in the fire of war, and, make no mistake, we are on the brink of a war of fire. Such a war has been decreed by the powers that be, such a war events have made our fate.

So, let us stand upon our own feet and meet this issue in the light of what we know. Let us hit now and hit hard for national defense. Slackness breeds worms, and distrust is cowardice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York which provides that the Government shall pay the transportation of soldiers on furlough. I saw a very striking cartoon the other day. It had to do with our aid to Britain. Britain was pictured across a broad expanse of water and an American crippled boy was sitting on this side of that broad expanse of water. A kindly American lady was standing also on this side offering help to Britain, and this youngster looked up at her and said "I wonder if I am so close to her that she cannot see me?"

That is what I am wondering about these boys. I am going to support this bill. I think it should be done as protection for the boys themselves. I know they are not trained. They have not had the equipment with which to be properly trained, and it would be a travesty to send them home and say to them. "Boys you are now soldiers. You are now fit to defend yourselves in battle." I know they are not. I know it is the responsibility of this Government to give them that training before we send them home as finished soldiers. But I want to take them off the highways. I want to stop these American soldiers from becoming hitchhikers, as they thumb a ride back home. Just think of a soldier in the Army of the richest Nation in all the world thumbing a ride on the highway. When a boy is entitled to a furlough and must travel a distance, long or short, to get back to his home, why in the name of common sense should not we, great

people that we are, pay that boy's traveling expenses? We take airplanes from the commercial airlines of this country in order that generals may ride in them. Maybe that is all right, but if it is, then there is no reason under the sun why we should not provide in this bill, and no reason why the money should not be appropriated by Congress, to pay the traveling expenses of these boys, surely at least the transportation expense of boys who some day, if we get into this conflict, will be fighting your battle and my battle on the front line some place, are entitled to this consideration.

Do we think less of them? No. The Nation would have you do this thing. I am surprised that it was not in the bill, but I shall be more surprised if in the end the committee does not accept this amendment. I say to you frankly that the only excuse for not doing it can be the cost, the expense.

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

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. If this amendment were adopted and became law, I wonder if it would not have a tendency to stop furloughs from being issued.

Mr. NICHOLS. I presume maybe it would retard them to some extent, but I am one of those who believes in the integrity and good judgment of the officers of our Army, and so I presume that when a boy makes application for a furlough, if he is entitled to it, it will be granted whether his expenses are paid by the Government or not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, but shall not take very much time.

Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a great degree of merit in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] providing it is in proper form. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment as modified by him a few moments ago be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment has not as yet been modified.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be modified according to the modification that is at the Clerk's desk, and that the Clerk may read the proposed modification.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FADDIS and Mr. POWERS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the committee.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. FADDIS. If it is not taken out of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman yields it will be taken out of his time.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield.

Mr. POWERS. I am sorry.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I deplore the idea that is becoming more and more prevalent all the time, that the House of Representatives can solve every difficulty it encounters by dipping into the Public Treasury to spend more, and more, and more money in order to try to overcome the objections of some minority. It seems that few of us know there is a bottom to our Treasury, but some day we are bound to reach it. There are some here who have endeavored to keep down expenses wherever possible, but we seem to be laboring for a lost cause.

If we at this stage in our military history have not learned from the disastrous policies of the past when it comes to giving bounties and subsidies to those in the military service then we must be beyond learning. Let us consider what this amendment would do.

To begin with, this amendment applies to but one component of our Army, those taken into it under the provisions of the Selective Service Act. If we adopt this amendment we shall have the National Guard and the Regular forces not enjoying the provisions of this gratuity. Furthermore, where it is possible to do so at the present time great numbers of these men obtain leave every week to go home, if their homes are anywhere within reach. Certainly anyone is bound to realize that if provisions of this kind were placed in this legislation this practice of week-end furloughs would be discontinued of necessity. The labor alone of writing out transportation requests for these men would be excessive. Furthermore, no one has considered what would be the cost if this amendment were adopted. We must remember that some of these men are great distances from their homes.

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

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

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman mentions distance from home. What would happen to the troops in Panama? Would we have to pay their transportation to the States for these furlough periods?

Mr. FADDIS. Yes; and those in the Philippine Islands and other distant points.

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

Mr. FADDIS. I am sorry, I cannot.

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

Mr. FADDIS. I cannot yield.

So I want to ask the Members of this body in the consideration of this legislation not to attempt to solve every difficulty at the expense of the already overburdened taxpayers of this Nation. It might be a comparatively small sum, but each and every time we add one of these so-called comparatively small sums to the load on the taxpayers we heap up difficulties for ourselves to solve when we come to writing tax legislation.

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

Mr. FADDIS. Yes; I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAY. Can the gentleman give us any idea how much this amendment would cost the Government?

Mr. FADDIS. No; I cannot; nor can anyone in this body begin to give even a slight estimate of how much it may cost. It would undoubtedly run up into many millions of dollars each year.

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

Mr. FADDIS. Yes; I yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. The number of furloughs are limited, I think; but I believe, furthermore, the railroads would be very glad to give much lower rates to all enlisted men.

Mr. FADDIS. And the gentleman will remember some time ago we passed legislation doing away with the 1-cent fare for soldiers on land-grant railroads. The result is that today they have to travel at regular fares so far as the law is concerned.

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

Mr. FADDIS. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. For several weeks I have been in correspondence with the transportation division of the Quartermaster General's office in an effort to get the railroads to grant the soldiers reduced fares. They have succeeded to the extent that the railroads charge the soldiers only a cent and a half a mile, and they hope to have it reduced to a cent and a quarter. They are in further negotiation and expect to get further reductions in September.

Mr. FADDIS. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NICHOLS to the amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: After the figures "1940", insert "and enlisted men and noncommissioned officers of the Regular Army and the National Guard."

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment, which is my amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, does is to include all enlisted men and noncommissioned officers of the United States Army, which, I am sure, will remove the objection of my distinguished friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], who objected to this being done by unanimous consent, then immediately took the floor and said he was against it because the amendment did not apply to all. It now applies to all enlisted men and to all noncommissioned officers.

Let me answer a thing or two. The gentleman from Pennsylvania bemoans the fact that this Government is giving a subsidy. He cannot possibly mean that he thinks that it is a subsidy to pay the transportation of soldiers who have been taken into the Army against their will when they want to go back home on furlough.

I want to answer another proposition that the gentleman made in answer to another distinguished Member. He said that when these men are brought back from Hawaii and the Philippine Islands, that their expenses would have to be paid and that this debt is liable to be too much of a burden on the Government. Well,



when we move them to those far-away points, the general rule is that they are moved on Army or Navy transports, and men at those posts get furloughed but once every 2 years.

One other thing: Millions of dollars, they say, it will cost the Government. Suppose it does. Playing fair with these boys is worth something to the American people, and this Government is not yet in the shape, I hope, that the millions of dollars that would be paid to transport these boys who expect to fight for us will break the Government.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Will the gentleman include in this the personnel of the Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps?

Mr. NICHOLS. I would be happy to, but there is some distinction there. In the Navy you get an additional allowance for reenlistment. The Navy gets breaks that the Army does not get. This is an Army bill.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Does not the gentleman think that the enlisted man's pay should be raised to \$50 a month?

Mr. NICHOLS. Yes; I do.

Mr. FADDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FADDIS. If this is not a bounty or subsidy, will the gentleman tell us what it is?

Mr. NICHOLS. Why, certainly, I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. FADDIS. Let us have it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Why, it is just plain, common justice, that is all it is. Is it a bounty when you pay them a salary? In the name of common sense, would you have them serve for nothing? Then certainly this is nothing more than an additional emolument for services rendered, and I think 90 percent of the people will agree that they are entitled to it.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Was there not provided during the last World War transportation on the railroads?

Mr. NICHOLS. As I remember, it was. I never had a furlough while I was in the Army.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. This bounty will make up the difference between the buck private's pay and the pay of the fellow who works in the shipyard?

Mr. NICHOLS. There is something to that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania or the gentleman from Kentucky heard the testimony given before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to the effect this country will be spending \$3,000,-

000,000 a month in 1943 for national defense. What are a few millions more or less?

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield? Mr. NICHOLS. Is the gentleman going to ask a question?

Mr. MAY. No. I am going to respond to what the gentleman just said.

Mr. NICHOLS. The gentleman has lots of time.

Mr. MAY. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. NICHOLS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman stated he did not know what the original amendment would cost. Now, since he has put in every unit of the armed forces, three others, does he know now how much it would cost?

Mr. NICHOLS. No. I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky I do not know, I do not think he knows, but I know that it is not going to hurt the Government. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MAY. I am referring to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I have heard many interesting and informative statements during the course of this debate. From the beginning I have looked upon this measure as a war measure. I am confirmed in that belief by the statement of the eminent gentleman from Georgia, who says that war has been decreed by the powers that be. What powers have decreed this war? Maybe the gentleman can speak for the Almighty, but certainly the Congress has not yet decreed a war.

I have also heard it said that it will not be long before we reach the bottom of our Treasury. I feel that the bottom has long since been out of our Treasury.

There is a better way than that proposed by this amendment to pay the way of these boys home to see their parents, and that is to keep faith with them, discharge them from the service when their year has expired, and let them go back as members of the component parts of the Army of this country. In that way their way home will be paid. In addition, the most tremendous fact with which we are concerned as Members of this House is to maintain the morale not

only of these boys but of their fathers and mothers back home.

Mr. Chairman, we are now considering House Joint Resolution 222, as reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. This resolution, if adopted as reported, does the following:

First. It declares that the national interest is imperilled.

Second. The President is authorized to extend, as he may see fit, the periods of service and training of all selectees under the Selective Service Act; all members and units of the reserve components of the Army, including the National Guard, retired officers, and enlisted men who are now or who may hereafter be members of any of said classes.

Third. It removes the limit, under the Selective Service Act, of 900,000 selectees who can be in training at any one time, and leaves the number subject to the discretion of the President.

The authority thus sought by the President to hold indefinitely the boys now in training, and to increase by millions those hereafter to be brought in under said act, is demanded on the ground the national interest is so imperilled as to make necessary this unlimited authority for the President. It is contended that, unless this resolution is adopted, our Army will be disintegrated by the release of selectees now in service.

This resolution is a proposed surrender by the Congress of its constitutional power to raise and equip armies.

The gravity of the duty resting upon each Member of this House in this issue is realized by all of us. We are considering a measure which, in the opinion of some, is necessary to the safety of the Republic. Its enactment, in the considered judgment of others, is uncalled for at this time and is another step down the road toward war and toward another American expeditionary force to be sent to Europe, Asia, and Africa.

I do not raise here the issue of sincerity. Each Member of this body is entitled to his or her opinion. The Nation is entitled to independent, fearless action on the part of each of us on the great issue here submitted.

It has been suggested by the majority leader that the opinion of the Chief of Staff should control; that this House should be governed by his advice; that since he has expressed the opinion this resolution should pass, therefore all that is left for us, as the Representatives of our sovereign constituents, is to approve the resolution as reported.

That is the way of Germany, Russia, perhaps even of Britain. This, however, is the United States of America. As the chosen representative of my people, and as a Member of the Congress of the United States, I deem it my solemn duty, and high prerogative, to consider this resolution in the light of its broad terms, far-reaching provisions and dangerous possibilities, as well as from the standpoint of the Chief of Staff. I shall consider it in relation to Public Resolution No. 96, passed by the Seventy-sixth Congress; in the light of the provisions of Public No. 783, passed by the Seventy-sixth Congress. I shall further consider the proposed resolution on the evidence

heard by the Committee on Military Affairs; on the reports of the committee members who heard the evidence; in the light of what is going on here in this country; and in the light of what is going on in Europe, Asia, and Africa. Then, having considered these phases, by the use of common sense, by the standards set up by my official oath, and by the interests of this Nation, I shall support such amendments to the proposed resolution as will best serve the interest of this Nation.

Each Member of this House could not attend all the hearings held before the Committee on Military Affairs. A minority report was submitted by seven Members of this House, who are members of the Committee on Military Affairs. Each of those seven is a World War veteran. Four of them are able and distinguished lawyers. No man can question the sincerity, the ability, the courage, or the patriotism of these distinguished men. They are DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri; L. C. ARENDS, of Illinois; CHARLES R. CLASON, of Massachusetts; PAUL W. SHAFER, of Michigan; THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa; CHARLES H. ELSTON, of Ohio; and FORREST A. HARNES, of Indiana.

As members of the Military Affairs Committee they report to us: That the national interest is now in no greater peril than when the Selective Service Act was passed and finally approved on September 16, 1940; that, in fact, the peril of this Nation is much less today than it was in September 1940.

To determine what the peril was then, and is now, let us look to what was going on in Europe and Asia in 1940. Let us first see what the facts were then. And let us take stock of the situation today. In September 1940, Czechoslovakia had been overrun and dismembered by Germany. Poland had been conquered and divided between Germany and Russia. Norway, Denmark, France, Holland, and Belgium had been overrun and their governments overthrown by Hitler's army. Italy was then in possession of the Ethiopian empire, and Russia was the active ally of Germany. England had been driven from the continent of Europe in defeat and disaster. She had retreated from Norway with heavy losses. Her terrible losses in men and equipment at Dunkirk had her dazed. We had in our Army less than 500,000 men, and our rearmament program had not even gotten under way.

At that time, when these were the facts, the representatives of the Republican Party met in Philadelphia in national convention for the adoption of a platform and the nomination of a candidate for the Presidency and for the Vice Presidency. The delegates composing this convention were in possession of all of the facts with reference to world conditions at that time and, after full discussion, they adopted a platform and solemnly pledged the people of this Nation that:

The Republican Party is firmly opposed to involving this Nation in foreign war.

We are still suffering from the ill effects of the last World War—a war which cost us a \$24,000,000,000 increase in our national debt, billions of uncollectible foreign debts, and the complete upset of our economic system, in addition to the loss of human life

and irreparable damage to the health of thousands of our boys. \* \* \*

The Republican Party stands for Americanism, preparedness, and peace.

This platform further declared:

We condemn all Executive acts and proceedings which might lead to war without the authorization of the Congress of the United States.

Three weeks after the adoption of this platform by the Republican Party, the Democratic Party, in its national convention in Chicago, solemnly declared in its platform that:

The American people are determined that war raging in Europe, Asia, and Africa shall not come to America.

They then wrote another powerful, unequivocal plank with no strings to it. Here it is:

We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval, or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack. \* \* \*

The direction and aim of our foreign policy has been, and will continue to be, the security and defense of our own land and the maintenance of its peace.

President Roosevelt accepted the nomination for a third term in the Presidency on that platform. He did not equivocate. He did not straddle. He had his finger on the pulse of the American people. He had his ear to the ground. He put the political stethoscope to their hearts, and throughout that campaign in each of his campaign addresses President Roosevelt seemed to talk into the hearts and minds of the young men of this country and into the hearts and minds of the fathers and mothers of this country. In those speeches he reaffirmed, repeated, and expanded "again, and again, and again" the promises of the platform on which he was nominated and elected.

On September 11, 1940, in his address to the teamsters union in Washington, D. C., he said:

I hate war, now more than ever. I have one supreme determination—to do all that I can to keep war away from these shores for all time. I stand, with my party, and outside of my party as President of all the people on the platform, the wording that was adopted in Chicago less than 2 months ago. It said: "We will not participate in foreign wars, and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

On October 23, 1940, in his address at Philadelphia, he used these words:

We are arming ourselves not for any purposes of conquest or intervention in foreign disputes. I repeat again that I stand on the platform of our party: "We will not participate in foreign wars and we will not send our Army, naval or air forces to fight in foreign lands outside of the Americas, except in case of attack."

On October 30, 1940, in his address at Boston Garden, he again promised the people:

Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores.

The purpose of our defense is defense.

And while I am talking to you fathers and mothers, I give you one more assurance. I

have said this before, but I shall say it again, and again, and again, your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars.

And in his fireside chat of December 29, 1940, the President used these words:

There is no demand for sending an American expeditionary force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

Yet today, "again, and again, and again," we hear from the Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, from the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, from Harry L. Hopkins, and from other war makers, the declaration that we are in the war, on the sea, in the air, on land, everywhere in the world.

The mask is off. One of the blood-thirstiest and most warlike among those administration spokesmen who advocate this measure and our participation in the war, shouted:

Talking about these boys going home? \* \* \* They will be in the Army for at least 5 years, and maybe 10. And this war will last at least 5 years, and maybe 10, and maybe a generation.

And then he said:

The \$40,000,000,000 we have spent in the year and a half is just a drop in the bucket—

And that—

in less than 2 years' time we shall be spending \$100,000,000,000 a year, and the total cost of this struggle to America will be not a cent less than \$300,000,000,000.

Bear in mind that this resolution gives the President the power to hold these boys in the Army for life; that it takes the lid off and makes the sky the limit. And we are told that we are approaching the battle of Armageddon.

The sixteenth chapter of Revelation details the ghastly events which are depicted as leading up to that bloody and destructive struggle. And so it is that it is now proposed to draft millions of American boys for an indefinite period of service, and to force them into the miasma of Asia's jungles, the pestilential lands of the Orient, and the dark plague spots of Africa, where, on scorched and thirsty sands of the deserts, those boys may shed their blood, not for the freedom of America or for the protection of this hemisphere, but for world trade and other nations' dreams of colonial empires.

Since when did that bloody-handed despot, Joe Stalin, become the defender of democracy? Since when has Russia, which raped and overran Poland, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, and Finland, become the land of the free and the home of the brave? Since when has Russia, where millions were starved by official ukase, become the refuge of the four freedoms? Millions and millions brutally murdered by Stalin and his gang of terrorists lie moldering in the soil of Russia.

In the battle now raging between Russia and Germany, it is my devout hope that they shall so exhaust each other that the two of them together could not constitute a threat to the honest people of brave little Finland.

No nation has ever been more generous than we in the support which we have



given, and are giving, to Great Britain, to China, and will give to Russia. We have made ourselves the arsenal and the treasure house of Britain, China, and Russia. It is enough to open the financial veins of this country, but it is too much to issue a blank check payable in the blood of our boys. We are not dealing with inanimate objects when we come to human life and human agony. These boys are more precious than ships, planes, guns, food, and shells. They are bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh—the hope of the Nation—the seed corn of the future—the promise and assurance of all the days that are to come after us.

Under the Selective Service Act and through the volunteer system we have called to the colors the strongest, the bravest, and the best. They are willing to fight and, if necessary, to die for this country and for the protection of this hemisphere. But we have no right, legal or moral, to use them as pawns in an international poker game of power politics.

By the promises made in the debates in Congress; in private correspondence of the Members; in speeches over the radio; and by the interpretation made by the President to the boys and their fathers and mothers, we persuaded them that after 1 year of service and training the boys could go home as members of a reserve component of the Army. These boys and their fathers and mothers had the right to assume we were telling them the truth.

These promises of the two great political parties; these promises of the Congress; these promises of the President; were solemnly made when this country was weaker than it is today, and when the danger from abroad was vastly more threatening than it is today.

On this subject of the boys serving for 1 year the President repeatedly gave his interpretation and his assurance. Here are his words. Before the introduction of the Selective Service Act, at a press conference on June 19, 1940, the President indicated that all Americans, upon reaching the age of 18, should be subject to a year's discipline and training, not necessarily strictly military training.

On September 24, 1940, in a letter addressed to the Governors of the various States on the subject of the draft machinery, he stated:

Since so many of our young men will be asked to devote a year of their lives to the service of their country, I feel certain that others . . . will wish to make their contribution.

On October 16, 1940, in his address on Registration Day, he stated:

Our present program will train 800,000 men this coming year and somewhat less than one million each year thereafter.

Again, on October 29, 1940, in a radio address at the drawing for selective service, he used these words:

On October 16 more than 16,000,000 young Americans registered for service. Today begins that selection from this huge number of the 800,000 who will go into training for 1 year.

They must profit as men by this 1 year of experience as soldiers.

On October 31, 1940, in his campaign address at Boston Garden, he said:

The boys in training will be well-housed. . . .

Throughout the 1 year of their training there will be constant promotion of their health and well-being.

On April 16, 1941, the account of the President's press conference stated:

The President intimated at his press conference that there had been some discussion, too, of extending the present selective-service system beyond the 1-year maximum but he declared emphatically that this phase was not now under study.

And, as if to confirm the binding force of these promises on the part of the Chief Executive, Harry L. Hopkins, just the other day, in a pro-war broadcast to the British Nation, made by him in London, England, stated:

Our President does not give his word lightly.

The Republican Members of this House were elected on the pledges of the Republican platform heretofore quoted. I promised my people that on the pledges of that platform to keep America out of other people's wars, I would not vote to make a European or Asiatic policeman out of Uncle Sam. On the faith of the promises we made to our people we were elected to this body. Those promises made and the votes of the people given upon faith in them constitute a solemn and binding contract between the representatives of the people and the people.

There is no question here of the absolute loyalty and support of every Member of this Congress if it should ever be necessary that this Nation get into a shooting war. Every loyal American will support his Nation in time of war. But if these boys are put into this war needlessly, and as a result of a breach of faith on our part with the people, and they are needlessly sacrificed on foreign soil, in foreign wars, then when their broken and mangled remains come home in wooden boxes and are lowered into country graveyards, brokenhearted fathers and mothers, relatives and friends, may well point at us the accusing finger and say: "You broke faith with us; you put this boy's body, a living and unnecessary sacrifice, in the red-hot hands of the Moloch of war."

It is but natural for the British, the Chinese, the Russians, the Norwegians, the Dutch, the Belgians, to do all in their power to involve this Nation in their wars. We played a valiant, a costly, and a victorious role in the first World War. Mr. Churchill has since said that we should have kept out of it. Lloyd George said that we played but a minor and indecisive part in it, and the roar of the guns on Flanders Fields had scarce died away when we heard ourselves referred to not as "Uncle Sam" but as "Uncle Shylock."

We do not decry the devotion, the diplomatic skill, the unwavering courage, yes, the heroism, of the British people and their great Prime Minister. Based

upon historic fact, Shakespeare put these words in the mouth of the great Cardinal Wolsey, who, after a life of service and devotion to his monarch was accused of high treason:

Had I but served my God with half the zeal I served my king, He would not in mine age have left me naked to mine enemies.

And if we but serve our country with half the zeal, the fidelity, and the ability with which foreign statesmen, seeking to involve us in this war, are serving their countries, we, in our necessity, will not be left naked and unprotected.

Much of the demand for the enactment of this legislation is based upon a manufactured hysteria produced by a skillfully engineered propaganda. An inferiority complex, for the first time in the history of this country, is sought to be built up in the minds of the American people, at a time when Hitler is burdened with policing the sullen, hostile peoples of Poland, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, Holland, Czechoslovakia, France; while he is bogged down in Russia, is being blasted from the air by British bombers and fighting planes, and is unable to cross the 20 miles of English Channel. There are those who would have the American people believe he will land on our shores overnight, take a blood bath, and eat a lot of us raw for breakfast. The facts do not justify any such hysteria. An invasion of this Nation by Germany at this time, or any time in years to come, is a physical impossibility. Mr. Joseph P. Kennedy, our Ambassador to Great Britain until just before the last election, when he came home to make a speech for the reelection of President Roosevelt, and who is one of the best informed men in the world, made this statement:

The people who must suffer and give up their lives are entitled to know the facts before their judgment can be won to the interventionist cause. We must have the completest candor; we must have the fullest disclosure; we must have the freest debate. . . .

A direct attack on us would require an armada mightier than the power of man could create.

This Nation has today the mightiest Navy in the world. By 1945 we will have a two-ocean Navy. We have today in the Navy 60,000 marines; 300,000 sailors. We have in the Army today 1,531,800 men. Under the present Selective Service Act, by January 1, 1942, we will have in the Army of this country 2,100,000 men. As pointed out by the minority report on this bill, neither the President nor the Chief of Staff produced any facts establishing the claim "that the danger today (to our national defense) is infinitely greater" than it was a year ago. This is the expression of a mere opinion. It is not supported by any facts. And then our able Representatives on the Military Affairs Committee made this answer to the claim that the national interest is imperiled:

Our answer to that is that if the interest is imperiled or if we are in danger of any immediate attack, certainly the enemy has knowledge of the facts, and nothing can be gained by hiding any information from the

American people. Certainly it would not injure us for our citizens to know what Hitler himself must already know.

The report further points out:

Our two newest and mightiest battleships, the *North Carolina* and the *Washington*, as well as a large number of other naval cargo vessels have recently been put into active service. Tremendous progress . . . has been made in the production of ordnance. We are incomparably stronger today than we were a year ago, and it is obvious that each day as the warring nations spend their strength and become weak, the United States each day is growing stronger.

Winston Churchill only this week told the British Parliament that Britain's strength has doubled and that she is making progress on all fronts.

Churchill also stated that the battle of the Atlantic had "moved impressively in our favor," and that "shipbuilding is keeping pace with war demands." Mr. Churchill also now claims that Germany's air superiority "has been broken," and that the Nile Valley "is much safer."

The report then goes on to say:

The minority believe that the evidence and facts do not support or warrant a declaration such as the President and General Marshall would have us make. Nor is such a declaration essential for our national defense. The danger from the increased powers given them by such a declaration would perhaps be far greater than the threat from any nation abroad. We would destroy democracy here before we could establish it elsewhere. To declare a full emergency or to extend the service of selectees would likely be the prelude to another American expeditionary force. General Marshall testified that he has never entertained the idea of another American expeditionary force and we do not doubt his word, but unfortunately the Chief of Staff does not make that decision. The President and the Secretaries of War and Navy might decide otherwise. Only Congress can hold them in check.

These able members of the Military Affairs Committee heard the testimony of all the witnesses, and they find and report as a fact that there is now no emergency constituting a peril to the national interest. The minority report then completely answers the claim that unless the selectees are retained beyond the 12-month period of their service the Army will be disrupted. By virtue of the composition of an army, the fact that soldiers get sick, that some die, and that they are sometimes killed necessitates replacements from time to time. It is pointed out that the President, in his message to the Congress on this subject, and General Marshall, in his testimony before the committee, stated in effect, that unless the service of selectees is extended, two thirds of the enlisted men and three-fourths of the officers in the Army will suddenly evaporate or disappear. The facts do not bear out this claim. The truth is that all of the selectees now in the Army which the Government desires to hold, will serve until November of this year. In November 13,806 will be released from service; in December 5,521 will be released; in January 1942, 23,633 will be released; in February 1942, 90,238 will be released; in March 1942, 153,159 will be released; in April 1942, 123,207 will be released; in May 1942, 56,896 will be released, and in June, 79,522 will be released. Immediately upon their release

these men will be a component part of the Army Reserves. They will constitute a reserve force of trained and experienced soldiers. And, under the law, they can be called back, not only in the event of war, but immediately. Upon the discharge of each of them they are subject to be called back into the Army for active military service until June 30, 1942. During the months in which these trained soldiers would be released from service, even though they are not called back by the President, their places would immediately be filled by other selectees who would begin their training and service in the Army. In the opinion of the seven able Members of this House who made the report I am now referring to—

If the men are properly inducted in a gradual, steady, and efficient manner, it could be so arranged that even a much smaller number would be prevented from leaving the Army in any 1 month. This would not destroy the Army nor would it imperil the Nation's defense. It would insure us a quick turn-over in our Army and it would give us many more trained men.

In the opinion of military experts, it is not to our best interests to freeze men in the Army and hold them there. The best method is to build up a professional army and create a strong reserve by constantly turning out trained men and bringing in others to be trained. This report then goes on to say:

Frederick the Great, one of the greatest generals of all times, under compulsion, was limited by treaty to maintain an army not in excess of 100,000 men. By intensive training for short periods he constructed a military machine that was without peer in his time and which later defeated some of the greatest powers in Europe. It would seem that we can create a mighty military machine by taking in different groups of young men each year and building up a powerful reserve. General Devers, one of the ablest men in our Military Establishment, who has been in command of the Ninth Division at Fort Bragg, testified that his division, half of which are selectees, are now ready for combat service with less than a year's training. Instead of weakening our national defense this rotation of selectees will actually strengthen it. Russia would have fallen before now had it not been for the vast reserves she had to call into service.

General Marshall testified that our garrisons in the Philippines, Hawaii, and Panama, are manned for the most part by Regulars and that only about 1,200 selectees would have to be brought back soon from Hawaii and about 1,800 from Alaska. The minority cannot see that the 3,000 selectees to be brought back from these posts will disrupt our present Army of 1,476,000 men. It is rather difficult to understand why selectees with little or no training should be sent to Hawaii and Alaska and the Chief of Staff must have known when he sent them when their term of service expired.

The minority, therefore, cannot agree that the national interest is imperiled more now than a year ago, nor do we believe that our Army will rapidly disintegrate unless this resolution is immediately passed.

The report then stresses the fact that it is unwise to continue these selectees in the Army beyond their 12-month period of training and service. It is true the Selective Service Act provides that "whenever the Congress has declared that the national interest is imperiled," the "12-month period may be extended

by the President to such time as may be necessary in the interest of national defense." These young men were called from the farm, from their jobs, and from school, with the distinct understanding that they were to serve for 12 months, and they made their plans accordingly. To now hold them longer, in the opinion of the great majority of the people of this country, and certainly in the opinion of the selectees and of their fathers and mothers, would be a breach of faith on the part of the Government. This is the opinion held by seven Republican members of the Military Affairs Committee. In their opinion, to hold these boys longer than the 12-month period will seriously shake the morale of the men. It is the opinion of these gentlemen, each and all of whom served in the World War, that to keep faith with these soldiers, and release them at the end of their 12 months' service, will not lead to the disintegration of the Army, but that, on the other hand, if they are forced to remain longer, such treatment of them "will lead to demoralization of the Army."

The passage of the proposed resolution at this time is wholly unnecessary, even though the President wishes to hold these boys in the service up until June 30, 1942. He already has this power under the National Guard and Selective Service Acts. At any time up until June 30, 1942, the President can order into active military service for a period of 12 consecutive months any or all of these selectees for further training and service immediately upon the completion of the 12 months' period of service and training of any or all of them. Section 3 (c) of the Selective Service Act, specifically states that each selectee, after the completion of his period of training "shall be transferred to a reserve component of the military or naval forces of the United States." Section 1 of the National Guard Act gives the President the power "to order into the active military service of the United States for a period of 12 consecutive months each, any, or all members and units of any or all reserve components of the Army of the United States." This is the construction put upon these two acts by the War Department.

These facts and these provisions of the law, therefore, render the passage of the resolution wholly unnecessary and uncalled for. General Marshall has testified that an Army of 1,700,000 men, properly trained and equipped, is amply sufficient to defend this country and this hemisphere against foreign aggression. Some of the ablest generals in the United States Army testified before the Military Affairs Committee that 12 months, and even 6 months, affords ample time within which to train a soldier for combat duty in modern warfare. Of course, if we are to raise, train, equip, and transport across the seas to Europe, Asia, or Africa an expeditionary force to fight and bleed and die in the churned houses and slaughter fields of the war now going on, the passage of this resolution is necessary. On the other hand, if we intend to preserve this Nation as a solvent country and conserve its man-



power for the defense and preservation of our own homes and our own liberties, this resolution should be defeated.

I am old-fashioned enough to believe that when a promise is made by a candidate for a public office, that promise should be kept inviolate, and that when a Member of Congress has become clothed with the powers that go with his office, he should hold those powers in sacred trust for the sole and exclusive benefit, protection, and welfare of the people of his district and of this entire country. A promise given and power conferred as a result of that promise is a solemn contract, upon the faithful performance of which depends the safety and perpetuity of our institutions.

I therefore concur in the conclusions of the distinguished Members who bring in and sign the minority report, and I wish especially at this time to emphasize the concluding paragraph of that fine report:

The minority are for all-out national defense, but we have viewed with grave apprehension certain steps of this administration which have brought us closer and closer to the verge of war. We want to do everything we can to protect our interests, to insure our safety, to promote national unity, to maintain a high morale of both the Army and our citizenry, to invite neither disintegration nor demoralization of our armed forces, and we feel that for the reasons stated in this report the training and service period of the selectees now on active duty should not be extended beyond the 12-month period. Should our situation become more critical than it now is, the President can call them back into the active service under existing law.

For these reasons I cannot support the resolution proposed by the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, but I am wholeheartedly in favor of the proposals and suggestions made and contained in the report of the minority members of the Military Affairs Committee of the House.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just addressed the Committee has revealed the philosophy of some of those who have been opposing this and other legislation for the defense of America. He says that we are enveloped by a wave of hysteria and that this country is in no danger; that what we have seen of this danger does not exist.

Another gentleman who spoke here today in opposition to this bill said he was not afraid of Hitlerism. The trouble with those in America who are opposed to legislation like this is that it has not yet dawned upon them that this country is in danger, and in grave danger, at this time. Any man who states that it is hysteria which confronts us is either ignorant of what he speaks or reckless with the truth.

Coming over the tickers at this time is a report with reference to the attitude of the French Vichy Government, in which that government, if I am correctly informed, is alining itself outright with Hitler and Hitlerism. This means that not only the French forces but the French Navy will be alined against us.

Why have we voted all these millions and billions of dollars if we are not in danger? It is time for us to quit playing with the defense of America. We are either in danger or we are not in danger, and if we are in danger, then I say that the highest consideration that should actuate every Member of this House in voting on this bill should be the safety and the preservation of the United States of America.

I read a statement which was sent to me today to this effect: "If you want to save your political hide, vote against this bill." I say it is something terrible if the Congress of the United States can be swayed by an appeal like that. If any Member of this House votes upon this measure in this crisis thinking only of his own political welfare he is not worthy of a seat in this House.

I say to you that the crisis is here, the danger is here. Those who would try to soften it render a disservice to America. I believe and hope that this Congress will rise to this emergency and provide for the defense of America, not to demobilize our Army in whole or in part, but to keep it intact during the grave crisis which confronts us.

Our danger is far greater now than it was when we passed the draft bill. We have the situation in France, of which I spoke. We have a situation in Japan which grows more serious every moment. Every man who wants to do his duty to the United States of America now I believe can follow no other course than to support this bill, from the standpoint of America and for the preservation of America alone.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. NICHOLS) there were—ayes 48, noes 98.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I have heard the many arguments, both for the retention and the release of the men in the Army, the so-called draftees. One must realize what is happening throughout the world today. There is war all around us. Undeclared countries have gone down to defeat and have been lost, so far as their respective governments are concerned. International law has not been observed. Defenseless nations have been ruthlessly attacked. Treaties have been violated. In fact, many of the things that we have consid-

ered to be cardinal principles, up to this time, have been violated.

These things going on all around us, I believe, create an extremely critical period for this country, and they do create an emergency so far as the security of this country is concerned, particularly with reference to our defense program.

Nobody actually, definitely and positively knows what the future holds. Having these things in mind, I do not propose to take any chances, or gamble with uncertainties that will affect the security and future of this Nation. Therefore, I am going to do what I think is best for the security of this country and for the defense of this country, and vote for the retention of these men in the Army.

We have spent many billions on our defense program. The weapons of war have changed materially from what they used to be, our new weapons now being those that are highly mechanized and technical in their operation. Men to utilize these weapons must be highly trained, not only in the normal functions of "squad right" and "squad left," but in coordination and correlation of units, in an army that is of a new type.

There is no doubt in my mind but that there was at least an implied moral contract limiting the service of these men to 1 year, but, on the other hand, we cannot destroy the Army, particularly at this time. I am following my usual custom of taking the advice of the military experts. I believe these men to be the best qualified to determine that which constitutes defense, to know what offense is, to know what strategy is, and all the things that go to the making of an effective Army and Navy. These men have studied these things all their lives, their careers have depended upon them, and I do not distrust General Marshall or the other officers and do not believe them to be traitors, or that they would willingly or knowingly do the thing that would injure this country. General Marshall has stated that it would weaken and injure our Army if these men were released. His job is to defend this country, and I am going to follow his advice. I feel the responsibility of my vote, and under no condition would I knowingly do anything that would weaken our defense program, nor anything that would destroy the effectiveness of any part of our defense forces. I believe, too, although many might not agree with me now, that the best interests, from a long-term view, of these same young men who will be affected, will be served. It would not be so good for them if we were to accommodate them now, only to find, later on, that they have lost their country to Hitler or any other ambitious would-be conqueror, and all that would go with this loss in the way of American liberties. It would be a signal disservice to these men.

It is indeed unfortunate that we should have to make such a choice as we here must make. As I said above, there is an implied moral obligation to release these men, but nevertheless, I have made my decision and believe I have made it in line, not only with the best interests of the men themselves, but also of the country as a whole.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War may, when not in conflict with the interests of national defense, (1) release from active military service those persons who in his judgment would suffer undue hardship if retained on active duty, and (2) release from active training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 men now in such training and service who had attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth on or prior to July 1, 1941, and prior to their induction for such training and service: *Provided*, That any person so released under this section who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, has served satisfactorily shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have a committee amendment to offer to this section which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 4, strike out lines 13 to 24, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of War shall, when not in conflict with the interests of national defense, release from active military service those persons who apply therefor through the regular military channels and state their reasons for such release, and whose retention in active military service would, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, subject them or their wives or other dependents to undue hardship if retained on active military service. Any person so released who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, has served satisfactorily shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect, which shall be in the same form and have the same force and effect as a certificate issued under the provisions of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. Any person so released shall be transferred to, or remain in, as the case may be, a reserve component of the land forces for the same period and with the same rights, duties, and liabilities as any person transferred to a reserve component of the land forces under the provisions of section 3 (c) of such act."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take up the time of the House in discussing this amendment. I simply want to make this statement, which probably will serve to expedite the consideration of the amendment. If this amendment is adopted it will provide a more liberal rule by which these hardship cases, including cases of married men in the service, may be disposed of. If this is done, then I propose to offer as a new section at the end of this provision language which will provide that those who have been trained for a period of 12 months in addition to their first 12-month period shall be credited with that on their reserve service.

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

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SACKS. How about the boys over 28 years of age? The gentleman's amendment does not take care of them.

Mr. MAY. They are taken care of by another act, or in the conference report on Senate 1524.

Mr. SACKS. Has that been taken care of?

Mr. MAY. Yes; that is the reason it is not taken care of here.

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

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

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding—and I would like to have the opinion of the chairman of the committee—that the Senate amendment on hardship cases confined itself only to inductees and was related to hardship cases.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. This amendment relates to married men, persons with dependents, hardship cases, and applies not only to inductees but those in the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Reserves.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to congratulate the committee upon its action.

Mr. MAY. And it is mandatory that they be deferred in such cases.

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

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

Mr. DONDERO. Will this amendment nullify the act we passed the other day exempting men beyond 28 years of age?

Mr. MAY. No; that is a separate bill and has been signed by the President. This provision does not repeal that act.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman from Kentucky will permit, I can assure my friend from Michigan that that is not the case because I personally looked into it and was assured that the previous bill relating to those 28 years of age or over would not be affected or changed in any way by this provision.

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

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLANNERY. By the phrase "or other dependents" are we to assume that that means members of the family generally and will not receive a strict interpretation of the word "dependent"?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman will notice that the language refers to "wives or other dependents." That would include any member of a man's family, a child or any person who is dependent upon him in the sense of being supported by him.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. SACKS. In the act that has been signed by the President with respect to those over 28 years of age, is it made mandatory that the Army release those who have reached the age of 28?

Mr. MAY. Senate 1525 does not make it mandatory, but the Army is discharging them at the rate of 2,000 a month now, and just as fast as they can dispose of them, having in mind the best interests of the service, they are doing so.

Mr. SACKS. Did the gentleman get any assurance from those on the General Staff that they will take care of the boys over 28 years of age now in the service?

Mr. MAY. The testimony given before our committee by an Army authority was to the effect that all the grief they have had in relation to hardship cases was with respect to those above the age of 28 years, and that is the group that the legislation was intended to take care of, and does take care of.

Mr. FLANNERY. Would they have to be wholly dependent or partly dependent, or either or both?

Mr. MAY. If it was a hardship case, even though they were not wholly dependent, it would be taken care of.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts to the committee amendment: "Provided further, That the Secretary of War, may, when not in conflict with the interests of national defense, after first providing for cases of undue hardship, release from training and service, as soon as practicable after the completion of 12 months' training and service by them, those persons inducted for training and service under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, who were in attendance at, or who were enrolled in, or in good faith about to enter an institution of higher learning at the time of their induction for training and service and who are prevented from continuing with or entering upon such course of higher education by reason of their induction and their continued training and service. Such persons shall be required to apply for such release through the regular military channels, stating the reasons therefor, and if released shall be transferred to a reserve component as provided in section 3 (c) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940."

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, General Marshall stated that he plans to release a good many of the selectees. This amendment of mine would simply provide for the release of men, who made application to the War Department after their 12 months of training, if they wish to continue a higher education which was broken as a result of their selection, or if they were about to enter an institution of higher learning. It does very little more than to give those men an opportunity to apply to the War Department to be relieved after their 12 months of service if it does not jeopardize their military training and the War Department feels it can release them without weakening the national defense.

It seems to me that there are only two reasons why we should pass this bill today, why we should extend the time for the selectees for a period of months: First, it is our very great responsibility to the Nation; second, it is our bounden duty and our very great responsibility to these selectees to give them the very best education in national training that we can give them, and provide them with every facility to train them to protect themselves and their country in any eventuality.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would not the adoption of the gentleman's amendment be preferential to a comparatively small number of selectees whose fathers might happen to have a little money?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Oh, no; I do not agree with that, because if a selectee's father had a lot of money, that selectee could get an education at any



time, even 3 or 4 or 5 years from now, but it would help those men who have a meager amount of money or whose fathers have a meager amount of money, and would not take them away from their training.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentlewoman's amendment singles out young men who have gone to college, but what about the young man in the machine shop who is learning to be a machinist, or a molder, or an electrician?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to help those, and I understand from reading General Marshall's testimony that a good many of those will be given preferential treatment, after they have received their 12 months' training. There is no excuse for this bill, except for national-defense training.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In my section, throughout the great Middle West, there are numerous cases where farmers are left without even one son to help run the farm.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I can answer the gentlemen's question now.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; I am sorry I cannot yield any more. I have but 5 minutes' time. I ask the gentleman to turn to the hearings and read the statement of General Marshall, in which he says that they have released men already to return to their families in order to help work on the farm.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment would be discriminatory, and could be construed as class legislation. Under the provisions of the amendment some young man who has been taken away from a good paying job would be retained in the service, whereas another one, who was financially able through his own means or the means of his family, would be allowed to leave the Army and resume his education. It would not be in the interest of distributing the burden of military service uniformly throughout the United States, without respect to class. Therefore, we ask the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment to the amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, from my district, one of the greatest agricultural districts in America, there has come to me numerous letters from

farmers concerning their sons leaving for the service at a time when these boys were badly needed on the farm.

We all recognize the need for a well-trained army and a superbly equipped army, large enough to defend the Western Hemisphere against any possible invasion. The House is fairly evenly divided on the one vital question, Are we, as a Nation, in peril today? That is the issue now before us.

There are those of us who honestly feel that the one and a half million men we now have in the Army, coupled with our great Navy and air force, constitutes ample defense, once a huge reserve is developed, for this hemisphere. Thousands will volunteer for service if a decent rate of pay is established.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the creation of this great reserve of men through rotation of the selectees is absolutely vital. Under our present law we could in 1½ years' time have 3,000,000 trained, well-equipped men in our Army. Surely that should take care of our needs. Or is more than our own needs contemplated? Is a second A. E. F. in the offing?

I cannot agree to break faith with the men who were clearly inducted into service for a 1-year period. There are other millions of men eligible for their tour of duty in our Nation's defense. Why compel one group of men to stay in the Army for 2½ years, when many military men have testified to the fact that troops can and are being well trained in 1 year? Is it not better to have 1,800,000 selectees 90-percent efficient than to freeze in the present group of presumably 900,000 men?

Many farmers in my district have been looking forward to their sons' return from service next spring. Few of you Members realize the difficulty in securing good farm labor. Very few strangers can take the place of your own boy on the farm, who has your interests at heart. I know this from many years farming experience. No hired man can do what the son, trained by his father, can accomplish on the average farm.

Just a few days ago, Mr. Chairman, there came to my desk a pitiful letter from a couple in my district. These folks have a son in the service and have endeavored without success to have him released from the service so as to help support his parents.

These two people, too proud in their honest American lineage to ask charity of county, State, or Nation, have an income of only thirty-some dollars per month. The man is partially crippled from arthritis. In order to see their way through without requesting aid, these two people do without breakfast in order to make their pitifully small income suffice. This is unknown to their neighbors.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No; I am sorry. The lady refused to yield to me.

Mr. Chairman, much as I want to see the boys of this Nation given an opportunity to go to universities to complete their education, I cannot vote for the amendment of the lady from Massachusetts, when I think of the farm boys and others that must, for our national de-

fense, leave their parents in a straitened position. When I think of those parents in my district who cannot have breakfast because their boy is in the service, I must regretfully vote against any preference to the young men desiring to enter college.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I can but assert again that our own national-defense needs will be taken care of amply by the great reserves of manpower created by the present Selective Service Act. This is assuming, of course, our own defense, and not that of Iceland, Dakar, Singapore, and other far-distant fields, as contemplated. We will all fight to defend our own shores and this hemisphere. God forbid we must go abroad, unless attacked.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McINTYRE, as a substitute for the committee amendment: Page 4, strike out lines 13 to 24, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 3. Any person below the rank of captain who is ordered into additional or continued active military service pursuant to section 2 of this joint resolution, who has a gainful occupation or the assurance of gainful employment or who has any person or persons dependent solely upon him for support, shall, upon request made within 20 days after the end of his first 12-month period of active military service, be transferred to a reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States: *Provided, however,* That the Secretary of War may limit such transfers, when the interests of national defense require it, so that not more than 5 percent shall be transferred from any regiment or similar unit during any calendar month."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTYRE. I yield.

Mr. JONES. Does not a perfecting amendment to a committee amendment have preference over a substitute for a committee amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to the amendment is voted on first, but an amendment may be pending, and a substitute for that amendment pending, and an amendment to the amendment and an amendment to the substitute, all pending at the same time. If the gentleman will refer to page 6 of Cannon's Precedents he will see the diagram of the order in which they are voted on.

Mr. JONES. Is my amendment pending, inasmuch as it has not yet been offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment is not pending until he is recognized to offer it.

Mr. JONES. Under those circumstances, is the substitute amendment entitled to preference over a perfecting amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman has an amendment to the pending committee amendment or if he has an

amendment to the substitute that is now offered, he will have an opportunity to offer his amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MCINTYRE. I yield.

Mr. MAY. A great many of the Members already have tickets to leave this afternoon. I wonder if we could agree on 10 minutes' debate on this section and all amendments thereto? I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

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

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I object to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MCINTYRE] is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the situation has developed into what it appears to be at this moment. I had hoped that if we ever came to the point of declaring or failing to declare a national emergency in the United States, we might be able to do it, not by a mere majority one way or the other but by somewhat of a substantial unity. I am sorry that it seems to me that we take an arbitrary view on this side of the aisle with reference to this bill and another arbitrary view on the other side of the aisle with reference to the bill, and that we cannot get closer together in our opinion. I believe it is because we are not fair and not reasonable and do not recognize the fact that if we unite in a program as Americans it must be on a give-and-take proposition.

I think that some of the leaders of the Nation are just exactly like the Members of this Congress today. I think that is the reason that as nations we cannot get closer together than we are today, because we have not learned how to give and take. We have not learned how to approach a common ground where we can unite.

Now, we have debated for a long time on this bill, and, after all is said and done, the issue finally simmers down to this proposition: On the one hand, it is maintained that not to extend the service of these selectees will disintegrate the Army.

On the other hand it is maintained that we must be fair with these selectees, must keep faith with them. May I say in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that I think I know something about this proposition as an officer of the National Guard, because for years the National Guard has been a citizens' military organization and I know something of what morale is in such an organization. Whether it was intended or not, regardless of whether there was a contract or not, I know that many, in fact all, of these selectees have gone for their training thinking they were coming back at the end of a year. Why can we not get together on a common ground in this regard? And may I say to you I offer this amendment as a substitute for the committee amendment in all good faith, in all good sincerity. It

is not a result of political maneuvering of any kind whatever. May I read it for you?

Any person below the rank of captain—

And, by the way, this language is taken from the National Guard bill. The rank of captain is specified because a captain has sufficient salary to warrant his staying in the service, and he is needed in the service. The same applies to those holding higher ranks.

Any person below the rank of captain who is ordered into additional or continued active military service pursuant to section 2 of this joint resolution, who has a gainful occupation or the assurance of gainful employment or who has any person or persons dependent solely upon him for support—

In this connection may I say we define what the hardship cases are.

shall upon request made within 20 days after the end of his first 12 months' period of active military service, be transferred to a reserve component of the land or naval forces of the United States—

With one exception—

*Provided, however,* That the Secretary of War may limit such transfers, when the interest of the national defense require it, so that not more than 5 percent shall be transferred from any regiment or similar unit during any calendar month.

In conclusion, may I suggest that it is a question whether we as the Congress are going to say when draftees shall be released rather than the Secretary of War, and the percent who may be released. I submit that we as Members of Congress are the ones to make this determination.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but shall not detain the membership any length of time.

I want to call the attention of this Committee to what the real effect on the bill will be if this amendment is adopted and written into it. Bear in mind it is a substitute for the committee amendment which has been offered to take care of the hardship cases. This proposed substitute would give a right to every person who is held in the service beyond his 12-month initial training period, and who has a job back home or who has assurance of a job back home, to be relieved from duty provided he asks for such relief within 20 days after that time, subject to the limitation and the concluding part of the amendment that the Secretary of War may within his discretion limit the number of such transfers to 5 percent of the regiment involved.

This places a premium upon those people who are gainfully employed and penalizes the relievers and the unemployed. It does the very thing that has been objected to for so long a time with reference to military training for the C. C. C. boys. It would simply penalize the unemployed and the men on relief. Talk about discrimination. What kind of mess do you suppose the regimental commander would have on his hands when all of the men in his regiment fell within this class? It would be a task for him to select the 5 percent he might let out of his regiment.

The gentleman advanced the argument that Congress should determine how they should be let out, but as this amendment is worded the decision is left with the regimental commander.

Personally I feel that the amendment is impractical, is discriminatory, unfair, and unworkable. I hope it is voted down.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the existing amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas moves to strike out the last word. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas having been recognized, I will ask the gentleman to yield to me for the purpose of submitting a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the length of the debate and the length of consideration of the amendment, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the remaining sections of the bill and all amendments thereto close at 6 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. FISH. Reserving the right to object, provided that half an hour is allotted to section 6.

Mr. MAY. That will be agreeable to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky will restate his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending bill and all amendments to sections not disposed of close at 6 o'clock with the understanding that 30 minutes of the time be devoted to the discussion and consideration of amendments to section 6.

Mr. SHORT. And that the time be equally divided.

Mr. MAY. The time to be divided as nearly as practicable, but within the discretion of the Chair.

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] is recognized.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word, suggested by the remarks of the gentleman from Wyoming. He deplored the fact that we had lack of unity. My own opinion is that we had unity the week before election; then minds changed in this country. What we have been suffering from since is lack of straightforward dealing. We have been suffering from subterfuge.

The gentleman from Texas, [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] spoke a while ago. I recall how vocal he was during the debate on the lease-lend bill, how he promised us so vigorously and with finality that if we passed the lease-lend bill it would guarantee that we would not be in the war, it would keep war from our shores. He said it over and over again. He came on the floor a few minutes ago and warned us that war is right here, that it is about to get us, it is about to eat us up.



Talk about inconsistency. Let us consider all these steps toward war that the majority have taken, by subterfuge principally. It is no wonder we do not have unity in this country.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that from the very inception of the New Deal we have had nothing but deceit and deception?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. We have had nothing but deceit and deception since the election. There was unity the week before election about how the boys would be treated.

If we pass this bill today, it will be but a forerunner to sending the boys any place in the world. It will be the green light to war. Nobody can say that the President cannot get a declaration of war now from the majority, if he wants it. If we put this bill through this afternoon, there is no use for us to contend anything to the contrary. With inconsistencies such as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON], exhibited this afternoon, we cannot expect anything else. Extension of service means another A. E. F.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, in an effort to arrive at a unanimous-consent request, may I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, that debate close at quarter past 6, and that the last one-half hour of the debate be confined to amendments offered in connection with section 6?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And everybody will have an opportunity to present any amendments they may have?

Mr. McCORMACK. The debate will close at quarter past 6, one-half hour of the debate to be confined to section 6. The Chair will recognize everyone fairly, I am sure.

The CHAIRMAN. And also that it be in order to offer amendments to any part of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. To any part of the bill that has not thus far been read?

Mr. McCORMACK. To any part of the bill not read, and that the last half-hour be confined to debate on section 6.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I take it, of course, that the Chair will recognize members of the committee and divide the time as equally as possible?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we can trust the Chairman.

Mr. SHORT. I think that is satisfactory.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is a very important bill. It has been mentioned here that there are some gentlemen who want to go home. If they are more anxious to go home than to finish this bill, let them go home.

Mr. JENSEN. The boys want to go home, too.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Let them go. The statement has been made that the Chair will divide the time between the members of the committee. We all know they are entitled to preference, but some other Members of the House want to say something on this bill other than members of the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say anything about members of the committee.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Somebody did.

Mr. MAY. The Committee of the Whole.

Mr. McCORMACK. Members of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will that time limit afford Members who have amendments at the desk an opportunity to present them?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, if that question is propounded to me, the unanimous-consent request includes the right to present all amendments that it is desired to be offered to the different sections.

Mr. HEALEY. I would like to propound that question to the Chair. Will Members who have amendments at the desk be recognized to present them?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly, under the unanimous-consent request. If this unanimous-consent request is granted, all amendments to that part of the bill that have not thus far been read will be in order; that is, provided the amendments are in order. Certainly Members will be given the opportunity to offer amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I undersand that the objections voiced so far have been chiefly to the fact that 30 minutes is not enough on section 6. Can the gentleman extend that to allow 45 minutes?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have undertaken to be very liberal about debate and about time today. If I am charged with the consideration of this bill I intend from now on, unless this is agreed to, to move to close debate at the end of each section. That is going to be my endeavor from now on.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we can work this out. The House has been very fair on all sides of the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request and submit another, that the bill be considered as read, and that debate close at 6:30, the last 45 minutes to be devoted to the consideration of and debate on amendments to section 6.

Mr. BOREN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I am not going home tonight, I am going to go home when and if the Congress recesses. However, we have spent a lot of time here discussing minor matters, and the House, I feel, wants to get down to the issues. I believe that is too much time to waste.

Mr. McCORMACK. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. BOREN. I think 6:15 was a fair request, and that is 15 minutes more than is needed. Let us close it at 6:15.

Mr. McCORMACK. It has to be by unanimous consent. Six thirty is the last request, and that allows only 9 minutes more now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential motion at the desk. Under that request, would I be given a chance to speak on that motion?

The CHAIRMAN. If it is a preferential motion, the gentleman would be given an opportunity to speak on it.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. The regular order was demanded.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet demanding recognition at the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the gentleman on his feet at the time seeking to object or reserve the right to object?

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. I reserved the right to object, Mr. Chairman, but I shall not object if the unanimous-consent request is phrased so that those who are on their feet seeking recognition will have their names taken down in the customary practice, so that they may be recognized by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair state in reply to the parliamentary inquiry that the gentleman's name was listed this afternoon and the Chair sought to recognize him but did not find him present at the time.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan objects.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH to the committee amendment: In line 7, after the word "services", strike out the period and insert the following: "or in the case of persons in training and service under section 3 (b) of said Act and enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States, would best serve the national interest by maintaining their families as units and by performing at home their obligations to persons dependent upon them for marital, paternal, or financial support."

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Does this amendment take preference over my substitute amendment to the committee amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not take precedence or have any preference over it, except that the vote will come first on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York to the committee amendment.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, in view of the confusion that exists in the House, would it not be wiser to adjourn to next October, and then we might find out something about these dangers that menace us from abroad and might know what we are legislating about, instead of trying to get this bill through in the next hour.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have proposed is an amendment to the committee amendment. I hope the House will bear with me. This is not a compromise amendment. It provides that all those who are married and in the service at the present time, in the National Guard, and among the selectees, shall be released and permitted to go home. If this amendment is adopted, I shall offer another amendment providing that married men shall not be inducted into the service.

I believe it is in the interest of the service and of our national defense. You have provided in this bill for an 18-month extension of service for married men, all of whom are under 28 years of age. You will take these young men away from their families another 18 months.

It must be self-evident to every Member of the House, regardless of partisanship, that these married soldiers paid \$30 a month, cannot support their families at home; cannot provide for their wives and children; and now, in addition to the original 12 months, you have added 18 months' longer service and longer separation of husbands and wives.

This is one of the problems you have raised yourself by adding 18 months. You have created discontent and dissatisfaction in the Army and lowered the morale. When the draft boards determined whether or not a man should be inducted into the service, there was nothing to go by regarding the status of married men. There was great confusion. Some boards took in married men, but most did not. We have 50,000 married selectees in the service now. The Army would be much better off without them, provided the 18-month extension-of-service provision remains in the bill. When I was at Fort Bragg, I visited one of my constituents who was married and was in a desperate state of mind in a hospital.

His wife was pregnant and was threatening suicide. She had no money. He had not been paid for 2 months because he was in the hospital. Wherever there are married men in the service there are bound to be not only hardships but discouraged and discontented soldiers, and I am asking you to adopt the policy of letting all the married men out of the Army now. If you maintain them in the service for another 18 months you are going to disrupt families and homes. You are going to break up marriages of these young men and for no purpose, because we would get better soldiers among the unmarried who are not bothered about trying to support a wife or family at \$30 a month.

This is the purpose of the amendment. It goes further than the committee amendment which does not make it compulsory to release married men but merely makes a gesture on the basis of hardship. They will let out married soldiers if they will plead poverty and destitution, but everybody knows that no one can maintain a family at \$30 per month. The Canadian Government knows it well enough because they provide \$20 a month additional for every \$20 a soldier puts up, and in addition to that they provide a dependent's allowance for each child of \$12, a total of \$67 a month for all the

soldiers if they are married and have dependents and if we are not going to do that, in the name of common sense, let the married soldiers get out of the service now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preferential motion offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Mr. HOFFMAN moves the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer this motion because I am opposed to the bill and also for the purpose of making reference to a letter sent out yesterday, in which I called attention to the fact that there was going to be an election in 1942 on the third of November.

In that letter, which was sent to all the Members of the House, I wrote that November 3, 1942, will soon be here and said that—

If you don't watch your step, your political hide, which is very near and dear to you, will be tanning on the barn door.

That is what your forefathers did to the varmint which bothered them. Civilization has rendered the custom obsolete, nor are Congressmen varmit. But the home folks still have long memories and the, to us, unpleasant practice of storing up their wrath and letting it loose on election day against those who break faith with them.

There are three reasons, one bad, two very good, why your vote should be cast against any extension of service, whether it be for 5 minutes or for an indefinite period.

The first reason, which is a bad one, is the preservation of your political hide. But, after all, you know very well what the people of your district want. You know very well what every poll taken anywhere in the United States shows. You know that at least 75 to 80 percent of our people do not want war and you know that the present bill is just another of the administration's moves to get us into this war, which the people do not want.

British officials have demanded men. The President proposes to furnish them. Is this to be a government by the people and the people's representatives, or a government by Wavell, Auchinleck, Churchill, and Roosevelt, acting at their suggestions? Are we to have a government by the people's representatives, following the wishes and desires of those who sent them here? The people do not want this extension of service.

Second, keep faith. Every man in the House knows, or should know, that, when this bill was passed, regardless of what may be in it, "fine print" or hidden meaning, we were given to understand, as were the people of the Nation, that the term of service was to be 1 year. Let us not quibble. That was the understanding, and we know it.

Break faith with those young men and you will have all too many, disgusted, disgruntled, resentful soldiers in the Army. Keep faith with them, and they and their

parents will be proud of the Government they will willingly serve.

Third, Every Member of this House knows, or should know, that when this bill was under discussion in the House we were told by the administration and by those who sponsored it that it was purely a defense measure. We have been advised by the military experts that 1,700,000 men were all that were needed for national defense. We can get that number and more under the law as it now stands. Unless the President intends to again violate his promises, solemnly given, and send an A. E. F. to Europe, this extension of service is not needed.

Beware. Do not be deceived by offers of compromise. A determined effort will be made to sugar-coat this bill. But poison is poison, no matter how pleasant to the taste, nor how small the dose. Just remember that the people are sick and tired of broken promises, of those made by Roosevelt and Willkie. They will not tolerate a breach of faith by Congressmen.

Keep in mind that national defense is the objective—not an invasion of Europe, of China, or the sending of soldiers to Russia. Don't forget—election day in November of 1942 is coming and the Congressman who breaks faith, who lends his aid to the sending of another American expeditionary force, after that election will be sitting at home, crying alone.

So don't compromise. Have the courage of your convictions and, if you believe that the keeping of these men in service indefinitely or the sending of them to fight with our "red" comrades in Russia is necessary for national defense, vote for an indefinite extension of time. But, if you believe to the contrary, do not go along with any extension of the period of service just for harmony or because your "leader" asks it.

If I was wrong in sending out that letter to the Members of the House, then I want to express my regret. But I had assumed, with millions of other Americans, that we would have an election in 1942 and again in 1944. But if you gentlemen do not propose to hold any more elections—and it has been intimated many times that such was the purpose—then let me confess my error, for, if we are not to have an election in 1942, naturally nothing is to be gained by calling your attention to an event which will not occur.

It is by no means absurd to raise the question of an election in 1942 or in subsequent even-numbered years, in view of what has happened since the New Deal came to power.

Who a few years ago would have thought that we would have peacetime conscription; that we would tax our people billions of dollars to give that money to other nations and to the people of other nations? Who would have dreamed that we would again send an expeditionary force to fight in Europe? Would anyone imagine a few years ago that we would again expend billions in treasure and risk the lives of a million or more American boys, just to satisfy the ambition of a President who wanted to sit in on the war games of Europe?



Did anyone ever think for one moment that Congress, having passed a conscription law for national defense, would, after the boys were once in, break faith with them, keep them in the Army, and send them to the slaughterhouses operated by Hitler, "Bloody Joe" Stalin, and the empire builders of Britain?

I am quite sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania who criticized me because I referred to the political hide of Members—and that is not an expression which would be used by the professors of the New Deal—and called their attention to the fact that there is a day of retribution, is convinced beyond a doubt that his services are more valuable to the Nation here in the Halls of Congress than the services of any other man in his district could possibly be. Now, that being true, certainly the gentleman does not want to do anything that will prevent him from being here in 1942 and in subsequent years so that he may serve his people and the Nation. I am sure he does not want to do that. He does not want to deprive the Nation of his valuable services. I do not know of any other Member on the majority side who would do anything to prevent the country having the benefit of his services here in Congress in the years to come. Who are you going to represent if you do not represent your constituents, and if you do not represent your constituents should they not keep you at home? I do not represent the royalty that is coming over here. A head that once wore a crown does not mean anything to me. I do not want to represent Great Britain any more than I want to represent Hitler or the German people. I would like to represent, if I can, the American people, the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, and when the time comes that I cannot represent them, when I do not think of my country first, then I hope they will keep me at home. And while you are talking about being influenced by political activities, or of having your political future called to your attention, I wonder how many Democratic politicians have been hanging around this Capitol in the last week putting the heat on you fellows of the majority. Now, how many? Confess. I wonder how many C. I. O. lobbyists were up here a week or two ago, and you remember they claimed in the C. I. O. News how they controlled 100 votes, and in the C. I. O. News referred to my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], unjustly, as being a fair-weather friend of labor. That is not true. He has been a friend of labor all the way through. There is no doubt about that. So why talk about politics? We are all very much aware of the power, the pressure that has been put on by the administration. We know of the millions that have been spent to get us into this war, to make us forget our country and become the tail on Britain's kite.

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

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield.

Mr. FADDIS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We all represent our folks to the best of our ability and there is no question about that, but I did

not mean and I do not mean and I never even intimated on the floor that there was anyone here who would let his own personal fortunes stand in the way if he honestly believed it was interfering with the welfare of the Nation. But to get back to the argument, if we want to represent our folks, and we do, we have to be elected, do we not? And our people, at least by all the polls I have seen, by 80 percent at least, have declared that we do not want war, and many of us, and millions of our people believe that this extension of service means nothing but war. So please be as charitable as we are and give us, too, the credit of wanting to serve our Nation and only believe that we see it in a little different light and we do not believe in another expeditionary force. My thought was that we can best defend our Nation by keeping at least some of our resources and some of our men here at home and then, too, that the morale of the Army can best be maintained by dealing honestly and fairly with the drafted men. As has been pointed out so many times, it does not make any difference what is in the act, the boys understood from what we said, they were to be kept a year, and if we break faith with them, the morale is gone. A nation which does not keep faith with its fighting men may learn to its sorrow in time of need that such policy is a ruinous one.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my preferential motion to strike out the enacting clause.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words. The hour is late and I have no desire to impose myself upon the already strained endurance of the Members, but I do feel that the situation which confronts us might be at least relieved by some cow-country observations. I come from the cow country. I have had an awful lot of dust filter through my hair and nose and a lot of things between my toes. I have listened to a lot of comment here this afternoon pro and con from distinguished Members on both sides, who like other Members on both sides have been blessed with good common sense and reason. Today we are dealing with cold facts. That is what a fellow has to deal with when his pony gets out from under him and drops him 30 miles from camp or town and runs away. This measure that we are considering here tonight is a measure fraught with incomparable importance. It is a measure which everyone must deem as one of the facts properly before this body, following proper procedural methods, considered by a great committee of this House, composed of men who have long been engaged in the business of performing the functions of handling the military situation. Such amendments for the purpose of limit or compromise that are offered on the floor can be nothing more or less than encouragement to those who do not

wish us well and great discouragement to our friends. As a matter of fact, I do not know whether we have any friends or not, but I do know that 90 percent of the people subscribe to the first law of nations, which is national defense, and a much higher percentage will heed the first law of Nature—self-preservation. Our action here must be, and is, essentially selfish, so far as other people are concerned.

The question of whether we are pro-British, or whether we are pro-Russian, or whether we are pro-Nazi, or pro any other isms that have been thrown hither and thither at random in this debate has absolutely no place among the facts which I marshal for your consideration. The facts I refer to are these. The House is considering a bill for the continuation of certain men in the armed service of this country. Either we need or do not need an army of the best trained men it is possible for us to get together. It has been proved to us conclusively time and again that Americans generally are essentially patriotic, and all of these appeals to passion and sympathies will tend to produce only disunity or introspection and not only our own people here in this country are awaiting our unwavering decision, but people abroad in Europe, in the Eastern Hemisphere are alike awaiting our decision, and I appeal to you all, as a fellow who has been slipped out from under by his horse as it were, and who faces the hard earth, to give your dispassionate consideration to the facts that I have stated in this late hour.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, are we now considering amendments to section 3 of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. There is a committee amendment pending to section 3. An amendment to the committee amendment is pending, and a substitute for the committee amendment is also pending.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, we have been debating this section now for over an hour. I move that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the real issue involved in this controversy is: Shall Congress keep faith with the boys who have been called to the service? I cannot be held to account by the boys and their parents for the Draft Act because I voted against it. Those who voted for that act expressly agreed with the boys that they would be called for 12 months only. At that time they followed the President and those who usually follow him. They should have known that the President and his followers were not sincere and frank. Let

me read to you what the President said about this matter just a few days before the November election of 1940. He made this as a public statement in New York City. Here it is:

In and out of Congress we have heard orators and commentators and others beating their breasts and proclaiming against sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefields of Europe. That, I do not hesitate to label as one of the worst fakes in current history. It is a deliberate setting up of an imaginary bogeyman. The simple truth is that no person in any responsible place in the national administration in Washington, or in any State government, or in any city government, has ever suggested in any shape, manner, or form the remotest possibility of sending the boys of American mothers to fight on the battlefield of Europe. That is why I label that argument a shameless dishonest fake.

Now the President and his followers are departing from their promise. I voted against the draft for the reason that we were at peace at that time and for the reason that I felt at the time that it was not intended to be on the square. I think that a selection method is the only proper and fair way to build up an army. I did not vote against the draft bill simply because it was a draft bill. I believe that the draft system is the only fair method, but I am opposed to any policy that is insincere. I am opposed to this bill under consideration today. The only fair way to handle this matter is for the Government to keep its promise to these soldiers. They are entitled to that much. It will be a shocking case of breach of good faith to pass this bill.

The proper course is to permit these soldiers to go home at the expiration of their 1 year. Then we can start over and build an army upon the solid principles of patriotism and common honesty.

We can do this without disrupting the present Army. As we all know the service of these soldiers will not all expire at the same time. They will be going home at intervals just as they were inducted at intervals. As they go home others will be coming in. This process will continue and the result will be that the Army will be held together as a working organization. The great lack of morale that is in evidence in all the camps is due absolutely to the insincere action of the administration and is not due to any lack of patriotism. As it may be said of human beings in their relationship so may it be said of a nation: "Righteousness exalteth a nation."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish].

The question was taken, and the amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATES of Massachusetts to the pending committee amendment: Before the period at the end of the first sentence insert "or, in the case of persons in training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, who attained the age of 28 prior to July 1, 1941."

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it seems it is quite generally

understood by Members of the House that anyone who arrived at the age of 28 prior to July 1, 1941, can be released from the service. In fact, I have just spoken to some of the members of the committee who have been under that impression.

During my trip back home a few days ago one case was brought to my attention, which typifies many others, of a young man who arrived at the age of 28 on May 1. He volunteered. He felt that he ought to get in his time and get it over with. He was under the impression that it would be for a period of 1 year, and up to the present moment, though he is now over 28 years of age, his draft number has not yet been called. Now, if we are under the impression that a young man who has arrived at the age of 28 prior to July 1, 1941, is eligible for release, it is not so, because under the Senate bill, now in the hands of the President, Senate 1524, they added this language:

Any person who has theretofore been inducted into the land forces under this act and who requests such release and who has attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of his birth on or prior to July 1, 1941, and prior to such induction.

The fact that that language was added to the bill, "and prior to such induction," practically nullifies the whole purport of that amendment. Under the amendment that I have offered to the committee amendment, anyone who has arrived at the age of 28 prior to July 1, 1940, will be eligible for release, whether he volunteered or whether he was drafted prior to that time.

It is a very simple amendment and it seems to me if there is any misunderstanding we ought to clear it up in that respect.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES to the pending committee amendment: Before the period at the end of the first sentence insert: "or, in the case of persons in training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, who attained the twenty-eighth anniversary of the day of their birth prior to August 12, 1941."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Jones] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. McIntyre] for the committee amendment.

The substitute for the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I think I have another amendment pending to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment in the nature of a new section, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 4, after line 24, insert a new section, as follows: "Sec. 3-A. Section 3 (c) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The active military service of training and service of any person pursuant to section 2 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 shall be credited against the service in a reserve component required by this section or section 3 of the Service Extension Act of 1941."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this is an extremely important measure. It affects the plans and lives of more than 600,000 of the cream of our citizens. The question involved is whether we believe our national safety is so imperiled that it is necessary to require these boys to continue in active training for more than the 1-year period for which they were inducted. Let it be made clear that these boys, when released from active training, can immediately and without any delay be called right back into active service by the Commander in Chief. They are in reserve and subject to the call of the President at any time.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that since so much has been said about the disruption that would be created on account of releases, that less than 4 percent are subject to release before January 1942, and more than two-thirds of these men came into service after March 1, 1942. So, if by the end of the year it is deemed that these men should be retained in order to defend our country against attack, it can be done then as it can at this time.

Mr. Chairman, as far as disruptions are concerned, we have far too many other disruptions that are hurting our defense efforts, both in our Government and on the outside.

Mr. Chairman, if the situation is as critical as the proponents insist—and I grant the situation is grave, although we do not seem to get all the facts—then we should not only require that the 1 percent of our people give their time, their energy, and lives if necessary to prepare to defend our homes and our freedom, but we and all the rest of the 99 percent of our people should begin right now to do a little sacrificing on our own account. Quit thinking so much how much the defenses are going to mean to us—so much in dollars and cents—but rather what they mean to our country and our liberties and to the liberties of those of future generations. Put the flag first and the dollar sign second.

That 1 percent in the service will feel a whole lot better if they can be convinced the other 99 percent is really trying to do its part by doing a little sacri-



ficing in an effort to build an impregnable defense for our country.

Mr. Chairman, we need a whole lot better understanding and more cooperation among all of those connected, either directly or indirectly, with our defense program. And, by the way, if these boys are not properly trained because of lack of equipment, it is not their fault. That blame lies somewhere else.

Mr. Chairman, we need a better and clearer understanding in this Congress and among our people, as regards our foreign policy, our war policy and our peace policy. We need a clarification. We ought to have the candid facts, whatever they are. Why not tell us about them? There has been a holding back of information. That might be alright in totalitarian governments, but not in a democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I think we are agreed that we must provide our country with the very best defense possible. We must defend our country against its enemies both within and without. I do not want our country to get into a position whereby we may be obligated again to send our boys to the battlefields of Europe and Asia.

Mr. Chairman, if this congress decides that it has changed its position as to the time during which these boys should remain in active training our soldiers will abide by the decision. But let me repeat, that from now on they are going to want to know, that if the situation is so critical that they must remain in active service, that the average citizen is also thinking a little less of his self-interests, and showing a willingness to do a little sacrificing for this great democracy.

Mr. Chairman. I regret that so much feeling and so much misunderstanding has been created on account of this legislation. Above all things it is not a political matter, and I regret that the matter of politics has even been mentioned. I also regret that in this great democracy Members of this House have been so severely criticized, when they have not seen fit to follow the administration in all of its views. We need more tolerance and a better understanding in these trying times.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 4. The President is hereby authorized to order retired personnel of the Regular Army to active duty and to employ them as he shall deem necessary in the interests of national defense.

Sec. 5. Any person who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, and prior to the termination of the authority conferred by section 2 of this joint resolution, shall have entered upon active military or naval service in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be entitled to all the reemployment benefits of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to the same extent as in the case of persons inducted under said act: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 8 (b) (A) of said act shall be applicable to any such person without regard to whether the position which he held shall have been covered into the classified civil service during the period of his military or naval service.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have spoken on this bill. I have studied

this question, read the hearings, listened to the debates. I have tried hard to keep an open mind. A little later on I shall offer an amendment which will not take long to explain, but it comes at the very end of the bill, and I have one or two things I feel should be said now. I want very much to say them if I may have the attention of the Committee.

It has been said by several Members that political consequences ought not to enter into the consideration of this bill. Certainly this is true, and certainly for that matter those of us who have doubts about this bill and who may vote against it ought to know that in the long run a vote against this bill is going to be a tough vote on anyone who casts it—that the tide is running so that the smart political vote will be an "aye" vote. But I honestly do not think very many Members are considering this question from any political standpoint whatsoever.

The thing I want most of all to say is this: Every Member of the House, no doubt, would like to do in matters affecting the Army what the military leaders like General Marshall ask. So far I have always done that. But national defense can never be built wholly on military organization. There has got to be a spirit about it, too. I had hoped that we might arrive at some meeting of minds on this matter so that we might approach it in some such spirit as this, where we would frankly say, "Yes, assurance was given that this would be just a 1-year training period. We are given now certain reasons why it would be more convenient for the Army if it is extended. If therefore we are going to extend their time, we propose to recognize a special service on the part of the men that are called upon to serve beyond their time. We know that if a mistake was made it was not the drafted men who made it." But so far no provision of this sort has been written into the bill nor can any such intention be understood from the debate. We are confronted with a bald choice between: Shall we extend this period of compulsory service for 18 months, or shall we not extend it for 18 months?

From military people we can get military advice and guidance, and we have got to take it seriously indeed, but I think the Members of Congress are the ones who have the duty of considering also another factor—that is the basic importance of the spiritual relationship between our people and their Government. That is part of national defense too. Morale plays a great part in any nation at a time like this. France had a great army of trained men—perhaps the greatest in the world—yet France fell because there was too little spirit in her people, and so there is a very direct relationship between the men in an army and their feeling for their government, their feeling that they have been dealt with fairly.

I want to say right at this time that I do not agree with those who say that if this bill passes we are going to have great trouble with our people, that we are going to have lack of discipline in the camps. I do not believe for a moment that is going to happen. I believe the men are going to loyally do whatever is asked of them. But I would rather see them have

the kind of dynamic spirit that I am sure would follow if they could say, "Our Congress leaned over backward to be fair to us."

It has been said by many Members that we must all make sacrifices. That is true. Indeed, as an object lesson I might suggest that we reduce our own salaries—just for the effect it would have.

I say, yes, if you really carried it out it would be fine, but we are asking a good deal of just one group of people, and the recognition of what that one group of people is being asked to give up seems to me is pretty short under the present circumstances, and in this bill as it now stands.

It is most necessary to remember that our country is not at war. If it were, not only would there be unquestioned power in the President to hold every one of these men but we would be calling lots more and every one of us would seriously do his part.

And it is necessary to remember that every one of these men is subject to call to service at any moment whether or not his period of training is extended.

Further, may I say that had the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] been adopted I would have been prepared to vote for this bill. For to me the fundamental thing about this whole question is the purpose of the Selective Service Act and the principles of our Army and our national defense on which that act was based. I voted for the act. At that time its purpose and aim was set forth and universally understood as follows: To have as the core of the American Army highly skilled men volunteering for long-term enlistment with proper inducement designed to make it attractive to the best class of men, with better pay and opportunities for promotion and special training; that that would be the core of our Army; that the second thing would be a broad civilian training, a civilian-trained Reserve running maybe into many hundreds of thousands or millions of men; that they would become the trained Reserves for the Army; would become the backbone of American security. I still hold to that conception and I must consider this bill from that standpoint, and I fear it means the substitution of a very different principle, the principle of a mass army of drafted men.

I know the arguments on the other side. I am not one of those who says all is well and we need not concern ourselves about the international situation. I have voted for every single measure for national defense up to this time. But on this bill I am not one bit sure that the best way to provide effective national defense is just to require this 18-month extension.

I think there is a big principle involved here. The dynamic spirit of our people may be all important right now. I do not believe the situation for our country today is so imminently dangerous as to prevent us from doing the thing that will be regarded as keeping our understanding with the selectees completely. Americans are going to march together through this critical period whatever is done on this bill, of course. Our people

have always done whatever was necessary. But I want the Congress to consider carefully what it is going to ask. I would not oppose increasing the number of men who could be called for training. And I am open to correction that longer than 12 months may be needed for basic training. But if so it is the basic act that should be amended. The one thing that—for me—is different about this bill from every other measure we have had up to this time is my own personal belief that I would be violating the understanding I had with these men when I voted for the Selective Service Act. I have tried to keep my word. I have got to go on on that basis.

One more word: Whatever the outcome of this vote—especially if the bill is passed—none of us who may vote against the bill should continue any argument about the matter, nor should we encourage in the slightest way any expressions of resentment. We will have done our best—and will have to proceed to try in other ways to build the kind of nation these young men desire to live in and to attempt to really equalize as between different groups and kinds of people the sacrifices that are to be asked in this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the remarks of my friend from California, one of the most serious-minded Members of the House, and I can very easily see that he is greatly troubled to decide between what he terms the "moral obligation to the individual" and the general welfare of the Nation. This question, of course, presents itself in all crises. The interest of the Nation—and I say this not in any way misunderstanding my friend's remarks, because I am not addressing my statement to the gentleman—the interest of the Nation of necessity transcends the interest of the individual.

I call the attention of the Members to the headlines in the papers at the time we passed the original Selective Service Act. Time has naturally elapsed between then and now. Enemies of our way of life and of our form of government have moved. In a sense, we are legislating through reaction. Inevitably we must react to other things that happen and somebody else is determining those happenings. Only last night we saw these headlines: "Tokyo hints conflict with United States." "New economic steps taken." "America ready, envoy warns"—that is the Japanese envoy returning to Japan; and we see the utterances of our distinguished Secretary of State, whom everybody respects. These things are worthy of profound consideration.

We see in the headlines today, "Darlan to become dictator of France." We know a radio speech is going to be made that Vichy, France, is entering into close cooperation with Nazi Germany. We know what that means. We know what the pact between Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and army- and navy-controlled Japan means. It is aimed at the United States.

We know that Japan is moving. We know that Japan would never move of itself against the United States.

In 1931, President Hoover saw the Japanese danger to our future when Japanese imperialism started. He tried to stop it then and protested. In the infant days of the present danger from the east he foresaw and acted to try and avert its journey.

Everyone knows, or ought to know, that the situation in the east is so delicate that only the most powerful diplomatic actions have averted a direct crisis. Let us hope the leaders of Japan will return to the policy of reason, as our country has no desire but to have peaceful relations with Japan. But there is a point beyond which we cannot stand. Japan is at the point where it will have to choose between the warm friendship of the United States or the hypocritical and insincere friendship of Nazi Germany. Italy, under the guise of Nazi friendship, is nothing but the "tail of Hitler's kite." Nazi Germany has conquered its ally, Fascist Italy. The fine people of Italy, whom we Americans respect and admire, are the sufferers. Is that to be the lot of Japan if it chooses to go along with Nazi Germany in a continuance of its warlike attitude toward our country? The one act at this critical time in our associations with Japan that would inspire it to go ahead would be the defeat of this bill.

Can we afford to take the chance?

When the Japanese occupied Manchuria it gave assurances to our Government that the "open door" in Manchuria would be maintained. That has not been done. American business has been forced to leave Manchuria.

On October 26, 1938, Secretary Hull, in a diplomatic note to the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs said:

In the opinion of my Government equality of opportunity or the open door has virtually ceased to exist in Manchuria notwithstanding the assurances of the Japanese Government that it would be maintained in that area.

He then said:

The Government of the United States is now apprehensive lest there develop in other areas of China which have been occupied by the Japanese military forces since the beginning of the present hostilities a situation similar in its adverse effect upon the competitive positions of American business to that which now exists in Manchuria.

That has come to pass.

We know of the attack on China and the reasons therefor. We know what their future intentions are, which will be carried into effect unless we prepare.

As an industrial Nation we are vitally concerned in southeastern Asia. The United States cannot stand idly by and permit any power or powers to threaten or to sever our trade lines with that part of the world. Southeastern Asia supplies to us the bulk, if not all, of five first priority materials: Manila fiber, 100 percent; quinine, 99 percent; rubber, 98 percent; silk, 98 percent; and tin, 93 percent.

It also supplies two second priority materials: Tungsten, 92 percent; mica, 61 percent of the preferred grade. The

bulk of coca shell char is also produced in this region.

We import as well large amounts of chromium from the Philippines, manganese from British India, and wool from China and India, as well as chromium from French Oceania and wool from Australia and New Zealand, located in the south Pacific. We also obtain some nickel from New Caledonia. The Netherlands Indies has developed an important aluminum-mining industry. Nickel deposits also exist in the offshore islands of Sumatra.

There is no other part of the world that bears so vital a relationship to the United States in peacetime, and particularly in case of emergency, than the countries of the South Pacific, and particularly of southeastern Asia.

While we obtain some necessary materials from Europe in time of emergency, we could dispense with our strategic-materials trade without serious consequences. But that is not so in our trade with southeastern Asia in particular.

In a naval article written by Robert Barnet Hall, appearing in the *Geographic Review* for April 1940, he said:

Only on the lands west of the Pacific, and especially in southeastern Asia, is our dependence so vital and complete that our very existence as a great industrial power, and perhaps as an independent state, is threatened, if the sources should be cut off.

Furthermore, the United States stands for the freedom of the seas. We cannot permit any hostile nation or nations to dominate the seas of the world, and who would or might exercise such dominating positions to our disadvantage. Freedom of the seas is an important integral part of our national defense. While we do not want to dominate either the Atlantic or the Pacific, we cannot permit other nations to do so without becoming a subservient nation.

In the light of what is happening in the East, as well as elsewhere, all of these considerations are vital questions which demand, in our best interests, the passage of the pending bill.

Let us remember that "time passes on." Let us remember that to date every prediction made by those who have opposed in the past have been incorrect. They failed to take into consideration what Hitler, Mussolini, and Japan might do.

In a sense, we have been and are legislating by way of reaction to what these forces have done or may do in the future.

Viewing world conditions, having in mind our vital interests in the east, looking into the near future and seeing the probable steps that could and will be taken against us, if we are not prepared and, voting as Americans, determined to the best of our ability to courageously perform the duties or our trust, with the overwhelming evidence of danger that confronts us, it is our duty and obligation to pass the pending bill.

This question transcends party considerations.

The future of our Nation is paramount to everything else of a worldly nature.



I appeal to all Members to forget all considerations of a human and emotional nature, of a political nature, of any nature, except one: "Under present conditions, what vote should I cast today for my country, and for its best interests?"

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section do now close.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I object. Mr. HEALEY rose.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman have an amendment?

Mr. HEALEY. I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. MAY. To this section?

Mr. HEALEY. It adds another section.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, with the understanding that the last 5 minutes be reserved to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair inquire what section the gentleman is referring to? Does the gentleman refer to section 5 of the bill?

Mr. MAY. Section 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] is seeking to offer an amendment providing a new section.

Mr. HEALEY. After section 5.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section 5 and all amendments thereto do now close.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 111, noes 71.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers. If a member of the committee cannot get 5 minutes to answer, then I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can make his demand without explaining his reasons for making it.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. MAY and Mr. SHORT to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 125, noes 69.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEALEY: On page 5, after line 15, insert the following new section:

"Sec. 6. (a) Any person inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States for active training and service, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 shall, in addition to the amounts otherwise payable to such person with respect to such training and service, be entitled to receive the sum of \$10 for each month of such training and service in excess of 12. The provisions of this section shall also apply (1) to any enlisted personnel of the National Guard of the United States or of any other reserve component of the Army of the United States ordered into the active military service under the authority of Public Resolution No. 96, approved August 27, 1940, or section 37a of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, for such service so rendered by any such personnel in excess of 12 months, and (2) to any enlisted personnel of the Regular Army for each month of military service rendered by him after

the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and after his total military service (rendered before or after such date) exceeds 12 months.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall be applicable only during the period of the unlimited emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941."

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the hour is late and the patience of the House has been sorely tried throughout this long day. I am going to try to explain this amendment as briefly as possible.

May I say at the outset that this amendment was adopted by the Senate. It is the identical amendment, perfected so as not to make it possible for it to be retroactive insofar as it affects the personnel of the Regular Army. In simple language, the amendment provides that every man in the Army, after he has completed 12 months' service, from there on during this emergency will have added to his pay \$10 a month. It is uniform and affects every enlisted man in the Army, National Guard, selectees, Reservists, and Regular Army alike. It is uniform as to all.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it has been the time-honored custom of our country to reward men for reenlistment. We passed a bill here just the other day, and the Senate has since passed it, providing for awards of \$200, \$400, and \$600 to members of the Navy personnel who reenlist. This is a matter of simple justice, I contend, to those men who will have completed a year's service. By your action today in the enactment of this bill you will undoubtedly require some of them to serve beyond the year which was originally provided in the selective-service bill. In order that there should be no discrimination against any of the personnel of the Army, this amendment covers them all.

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

Mr. HEALEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say to the gentleman that I favor his proposed amendment and was prepared to offer the same. I have before me the measure that passed the other body. I find it is not identical. Are the two enough alike in substance so that they cannot be thrown into conference?

Mr. HEALEY. It perfects the amendment of the Senate and does everything that the Senate attempted to do with that amendment.

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

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the amendment apply to noncommissioned officers and officers?

Mr. HEALEY. It applies to all enlisted personnel, but no officers.

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

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

Mr. MICHENER. Is there not some way the gentleman can arrange to have included a prevailing wage scale as provided in the Walsh-Healey Act?

Mr. HEALEY. I think the gentleman is a little facetious in his statement, but I believe he wants to do substantial justice to the men of the Army. I believe the gentleman must realize that the men in our Army are underpaid. A private in the Canadian Army gets \$1.30 a day. I do not believe the gentleman from Michigan, who is just across the line from Canada, would want our boys to receive less for their service than the men in the Canadian Army receive, so I hope he will support this amendment.

This is the last opportunity we will have during the consideration of this bill to offer some added compensation to the men of the Army who are required to serve over a year. I do not argue that such a measure is necessary to strengthen the morale of the Army. I do not contend that, because I think the morale of the men of our Army is already strong. I have the utmost faith in the esprit de corps and the patriotism of the men of our Army, but I think it is a matter of simple justice that after they have completed a year of service some consideration should be extended them for their faithful service.

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

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Unfortunately, I did not hear the amendment read. May I ask the gentleman if it includes noncommissioned officers?

Mr. HEALEY. This includes all enlisted men in the Army.

I hope the House will recognize the fact that we do owe something in the way of added recompense to these men after they have completed a term of a year in the Army.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment, as I understand, provides that any person inducted into our land or naval forces for training shall be entitled to \$10 per month increase in salary following his first 12 months in service.

Since a previous amendment providing an opportunity for selectees to volunteer after 12 months was defeated, I consider this the next best amendment, and shall support it for three reasons.

First, it will give the selectees \$40 per month, or an increase of \$10 per month, following 1 year's service. I am confident that after a year's training a man is a more efficient soldier and should be paid accordingly.

Second, it will be an inducement to release those men who have obtained sufficient training at the expiration of their 12-month service, or shortly afterward, for General Marshall says he plans

to do this. On page 11 of the hearings he says quite positively:

We wish to pass the selectees out of the service as rapidly as we can after they have completed their 12 months of service. We think we can release some of them ahead of time, both to our advantage and also to theirs. We want to bring in new selectees, so it follows that we must release men in order to make room for them.

Third. It will be the first step toward reorganization of our Army on a basis that will afford a career for men following this emergency or possibly before it is over.

To me this is a highly important matter, and I shall, therefore, discuss it at greater length. The passage of this bill will not solve our military problem from the standpoint of an army, and now is the time to study and prepare legislation that will provide an army of sufficient strength and efficiency to meet any future emergency.

Regardless of the outcome of the present world conflict, I am convinced this country will not follow a disarmament policy for the next 25 or possibly 50 years. On the contrary, we are going to maintain a much larger Navy and standing Army than at any time in our history, and the question now confronting us is how we can best achieve these objectives. We have already made provision for a two-ocean Navy, and it is high time we begin considering a program for strengthening the Army. I have an open mind as to the program to be adopted, but my feeling is we should not delay in submitting plans for study and consideration. There is wisdom in a multitude of counsel and it may be a good idea if we begin now to make suggestions, with the hope that the best policy may be evolved. I am not enthusiastic over the idea that we should wait and let one or two men work out a plan without suggestions from anyone, and then expect everybody to say by their actions that the best possible conclusion was reached. This is really one of our troubles today. Instead of trying to plan a long-time policy for our land forces when the existing emergency arose, we proceeded with a temporary expedient. Possibly this was the best that could be devised within a short time. The prevailing thought a year ago was that we should proceed to provide for a very large army, and we were told the best way to do it was to train some for 12 months and place them in reserve and then train others. However, we are now told that it may not be necessary to train an enormous number of men but it will be best to train them longer and make them more efficient. If we were certain they were to be needed in war, we are inclined to subscribe to the latter theory, but we acted upon a different theory last year, and I assume it was done for the reason we did not have more time to deliberate. It will be very embarrassing for some of us to admit that we were wrong or made a mistake last year when we passed the Selective Service Act limiting the time of training to 12 months and now say that the training should be for a longer period. It is also going to be disappointing to many young men who patriotically made their plans

and volunteered to take a year's training in order that they might be fitted for military service, if needed. However, if we made a mistake, then we might just as well admit it now and correct it instead of repeating it because two mistakes do not make a right.

For the past 25 years, particularly the last decade, Congress has been very considerate of those selected to serve the Government in a civil capacity. That is, those employed in the discharge of the functions of government from an administrative standpoint are now able to make such work a life career. I feel that our Army should be reorganized in such a way that it will offer a career and make it sufficiently attractive for men to make it their life work. Such a policy has in a way been adopted for the Navy, and if adopted for the Army, I think we could reasonably expect to keep trained men—men who would be real experts in military life. The reorganization should provide for a graduated scale of pay according to length of service, with the right to retire after 15, 20, or 25 years with a fair and reasonable annuity or compensation. Such a program would not only be a good guaranty against war but should be sufficiently attractive to insure a volunteer army made up of sincere, capable, loyal, and patriotic citizens. My further thought is that such a program will not only strengthen and develop the spirit of loyalty and patriotism of coming generations but will in a measure take the place of what has heretofore been a relief program. In other words, instead of encouraging the youth to look to our Government for aid and support with the least possible amount of service in return, the suggested policy will afford an opportunity to develop a different spirit, a different type of devotion, a different type of loyalty, a different type of citizenship on the part of many who are to direct, protect, defend, and perpetuate our system of government. Our Military Affairs Committee should begin now to study and provide for an army commensurate with our needs and in keeping with our other military agencies, such as the Navy and Air Corps.

#### RESPONSIBILITY OF CONGRESS

The President was right when he said a few days ago that the problem of providing a system of training men for military service in this country is the responsibility of Congress. It was not absolutely necessary to say it, but he is correct and instead of trying to dodge the question or shift the responsibility we should face it courageously. Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution provides:

Congress shall have the power to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a Navy.

In construing this provision of the Constitution our Supreme Court has held that the power to raise armies carries with it the exclusive power to say who shall serve in them and in what way. Some have said that the President wants this or he wants that, but I want to say that his responsibility is not involved here today. The Constitution makes him Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. His responsibility begins when an Army has been raised and Navy provided

for, but not before. Undoubtedly, he has the right to make suggestions by reason of his position as Commander in Chief of the armed forces and they should be given due consideration, but we cannot shift our responsibility to him. We are representatives of the people and our responsibility is to them. In the last analysis the people will determine the nature and extent of our defense program. They will get a defense program sufficient to defend their rights and interests if they want it. If this Congress does not provide for it they will get a new Congress.

A further interpretation of this provision in the Constitution by the Court holds that the power of Congress to raise and support armies carries with it the power of determining how they shall be raised, whether by voluntary enlistment or by the selective draft policy under which we are now proceeding. The Congress is also charged with the responsibility of determining the age at which a soldier shall be received, the period for which he shall be taken, the compensation he shall be allowed, and the service to which he shall be assigned. This is an extraordinary power lodged in the Congress, but it was placed there by the framers of the Constitution and ratified by the people. It is a power that even supersedes the rights of parents in the control of minors, for the Congress has the right to say when their sons shall be wanted and fit for military service. Time and again it has been held that Congress may confer upon minors the privilege of serving in land or naval forces, authorize them to enlist, or draft them upon such terms as it may deem expedient or just. As a matter of fact, the exclusive power given to Congress to raise and support armies carries with it a responsibility equal to or greater than the responsibility placed upon any other branch of our Government. It should, therefore, be exercised with great deliberation and patriotic courage. It is a power not to be treated lightly and in the exercise of which the individual Member cannot consult his personal feelings. He must be guided by a patriotic sense of duty and demonstrate the courage of a conscientious conviction. In the exercise of this power and in the discharge of this obligation he should have in mind the protection and maintenance of the rights and liberties of the people. It is not an easy matter for Members of Congress to know at all times the proper and best way to proceed in protecting the rights of our Nation, but if we could see the agencies of force now operating in Europe placed upon a screen as a moving picture and observe their actions for the past 2 years and properly analyze each step taken, we could not escape the conclusion that our national safety is seriously threatened, and, therefore, it becomes necessary for Congress in the discharge of its responsibility to devise the best ways and means for raising an army that may successfully meet the enemy forces as they draw nearer and more pronounced in their designs day by day.

I am not alarmed over the probability of immediate invasion of our landed territory, where an army will be needed in case of invasion, but I am greatly con-



cerned about raising an army and being ready if there should be an invasion. We cannot wait until an invasion actually begins and then try and get ready for it.

Nor am I greatly alarmed about this country going to war in Europe. The thing that worries me is the possibility of the war in Europe coming to this country. I am opposed to going to war in Europe or in any other foreign country, but I am convinced of the necessity of making whatever preparation is necessary for us to successfully meet the enemy at our border should occasion arise.

I cannot understand how a person can say he is in favor of full and complete defense and at the same time be unwilling to provide an adequate army. They are saying, "Hitler will never come here." He may not. I hope he will not, but I would like to know where he is going, because there is no evidence he is planning to stop any time soon. Within less than 3 years he has overrun a dozen separate countries and virtually placed in bondage over 150,000,000 people. How did he do it? Every high-school boy in this country will tell you his success is due primarily to his large and well-trained army. Most of the people balking at building up an army put their objections on the ground that they do not want our boys to go to Europe. Certainly, we do not want them to go to Europe and I would be one of the last Members of Congress to send them there or to any other foreign country but, as I have said, I am interested in making necessary preparations to defend this country against invasion and we cannot wait until invasion begins to make preparation. Just where the invasion would begin if undertaken, no one seems to know; but I know that invasion by an army will not begin in Europe and it is, therefore, no use to send our Army there. I think a strong and permanent army is going to be essential in any defense program and I have taken this time to suggest to the Committee my thought and ideas as to how such an army can be provided.

As stated at the outset, I am not wedded to any particular program or policy. I may be wrong in the program suggested, but I am submitting it for whatever it may be worth. If there are other plans and better plans they should be submitted for the purpose of discussion and consideration. I repeat, it is the duty of the Congress, the representatives of the people, to provide appropriate and adequate defense for this country and we cannot afford to neglect our duty and shift our responsibility to our successors and hope for perpetual security, because they may be as weak and indifferent as we are should we neglect or fail in the discharge of our responsibility at this time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] is a very far-reaching proposal. Nobody knows here—and it would perhaps take extensive hearings to find out—just how much it would cost; but, based on the present strength of the United States armed forces, it would probably cost at least \$300,000,000 a year to begin with.

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

Mr. MAY. In just a moment.

And the selectees who have served 4 months—and most of them have served that length of time—go from \$21 a month immediately to \$30 per month, and this would increase their pay to \$40 per month.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. This will not increase their pay until after they have served 12 months in the Army. They do not begin to get the increased pay provided in the amendment until the thirteenth month of their service.

Mr. MAY. They begin at the end of the year; but as the gentleman recalls, the act itself provides that after 4 months they go to \$30, and they are now drawing \$30 a month, and at the end of the year they will draw \$40 a month.

Mr. HEALEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. MAY. So it is an unusually expensive amendment to write on the floor of the House, and I do not think it ought to be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HEALEY) there were—ayes 67, noes 86.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered and the Chair appointed as tellers, Mr. MAY and Mr. HEALEY.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 131, noes 84.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. During the existence of the authority conferred by section 2 of this joint resolution and for 6 months thereafter the limitation on the number of men who may be in active training and service at any one time under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby suspended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall report to the Congress each month the number of men in active training and service in the land forces under section 3 (b) of said act.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: On page 5, strike out lines 16 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, section 6 of this bill is the section that lifts the lid and makes the sky the limit so far as the number of selectees in the Army at one time is concerned. Almost a year

ago, when we passed the Selective Service Act, many Members feared the act might make it possible to create a very large military establishment. At that time Congress and the Nation were assured that if a proper limitation were placed upon the number of men who could be in the service at one time this would not happen. As a consequence, a 900,000 maximum was provided for. Now, less than a year later, we are told that this limit must be forgotten and that all restrictions as to the size of our Army be canceled.

We have heard a great deal of discussion in the last day or two about men leaving the service and how it will disrupt the service, but we have not heard anything on the subject of taking into the Army an unlimited number of men. It has been pointed out that in a little more than a year we will have an army of over 3,000,000 men. Over 2,100,000 of this number will be in the service, and 900,000 will be selectees who have had a year of training. Only 1,700,000 men are needed to defend the Western Hemisphere and all of our possessions, according to General Marshall. Despite that fact section 6 seeks to destroy all limitations, and we are asked to make it possible to conscript an army as large as the President and the War Department may consider advisable. If we pass section 6, we may even be violating a constitutional provision—namely, article I, section 8. The founding fathers thought it inadvisable that a big Military Establishment be created. We cannot make appropriations in this House for the Army beyond a period of 2 years. The obvious purpose of this constitutional requirement is so that Congress can keep a check on the Army through appropriations. Article I, section 8, provides that Congress alone shall make all rules and regulations for the government of the land and naval forces. This was wisely considered to be another check against the creation of a huge and unwieldy Military Establishment. Section 6 of this resolution ignores that check, and Congress, by agreeing to it, will surrender another power to the executive department.

If we pass this act with section 6 in it, there is no limit to the number of men that can be called, and we will have delegated to the President, the Secretary of War and to the Army powers which the Constitution vests solely in us. I hope therefore that this amendment is adopted. If it is accepted, the present limitation of 900,000 will still prevail. If it is not adopted, the sky is the limit, and heaven knows where we are going from there.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, in September of 1940 we wrote three limitations into the original Draft Act. The first one was a limitation on the period of service for 1 year. The second one was a limitation on the number in the service, namely, 900,000. The third limitation was that the area of service could not be beyond the possessions of the Western Hemisphere. Today, as I watch the elimination of two of these restrictions, I must say that I feel like one of the martyrs of the ancient faith, who when he was getting ready for combat with the lions in the arena, said morituri

te salutamas, meaning, "We who are about to die salute you." I suppose you have the votes, but while there is still opportunity, let me recapitulate for a moment the psychology that surrounded this whole draft extension bill from its introduction. When it first went to the Military Affairs Committee, the United Press polled the Congress and said they could not find the votes to pass it. Strangely enough, the votes, it seems are here today.

I wonder what the score will be if the President should send a message in a week or two or three and ask you to delete the third limitation, namely, to permit the boys to soldier beyond the Western Hemisphere. Will it be the same psychology. Will it first be met with the great objection. Will we first see a swelling crescendo of opposition and then watch it gradually melt away under the same kind of pressure that has been so manifest in this Capitol today. Everybody knows it.

But perhaps we will not have that chance. Perhaps the President will not even come and consult us upon it, because the Western Hemisphere will be where he decrees that it shall be.

Four hundred and fifty years ago by papal decree it was that area west of the forty-sixth meridian of west longitude. Later it went to the twenty-sixth. The State Department geographer, Mr. Boggs, in a letter to Mrs. ROGERS on the 8th of June, said that it is the twentieth meridian, and that includes Iceland. A degree of longitude is about 60 miles. Project it 180 miles farther east, and what have you? Within the Western Hemisphere you will have the Canary Islands, Cape Verde, and the Azores. If you make it 17 degrees west longitude you will have Dakar. Thus under existing limitations it might still be so defined as to make service possible in places not contemplated in the original act. The President said to his press conference 4 weeks ago that it would be where the last geographer with whom he conferred said it would be. Maybe he will not have to consult the Congress after the eventful action of today, because then he may be able to include the western coast of Africa under his own definition of the Western Hemisphere. Then the infamy will be complete, and reckoning retribution will come from the hearts and the minds of a great awakened electorate in the United States of America.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why should the gentleman be so concerned over the action of the majority in committing hara-kari. They are going to put this bill through, and in the next Congress we will have to have a Cherokee strip over on the other side.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall tell you why. I am interested in every young American life.

Mr. KNUTSON. And so am I.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They have not been told what they are going to defend. They have not been told where they are going to defend it. The Congress and

the people have not been told what we are to defend and where it shall be defended. How are you going to plan the strategy with which to defend it?

The President is going to write a series of five articles for Collier's magazine. The first is to appear in the issue of September 5. What a tragedy and what a travesty on the legislative branch of the American Government that in the analysis of the basic causes of the war, we, the Congress, we the 435 Members of the House, should not have the benefit of the President's observations on the analysis of the war.

Thus in darkness, with important information undisclosed to the Congress, we today legislate on the future of our country and its young men. May some providential power watch over our country and its future.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just preceded me, Mr. DIRKSEN, is one who on every occasion when a bill has been pending during the last 2 years for the defense of our country, has made substantially the same speech he made today. I remember almost 2 years ago when the resolution to repeal the embargo passed this House there were Members who said our country would be in war by January 1, 1940.

Mr. KNUTSON. We are.

Mr. McCORMACK. Some of you are very disappointed that we are not, apparently. There are those who said, after January 1, 1940, had passed, that we would be in war by April 1940. In April they said it would be in June 1940. After June it was December 1940. Those dates have come and passed. Then they said April 1941, and July 1, 1941, and this is August 12, 1941. A conversation is reported to have taken place by one of the Members of the House on the Republican side, when he was talking to a friend of his, and he said, "What do you think about Roosevelt? He has double-crossed us by keeping us out of war." That seems to be the impression of some—not all, but by some.

Mr. KNUTSON. Who was he?

Mr. McCORMACK. A voice from the distance. Always from the distance. Those who are sending out their dire predictions—it seems to me as though the reported conversation represents the feelings of some, that they feel disappointed that their predictions of the past 20 months have not materialized. Over 20 months ago they said we would be in war by January 1940. President Roosevelt has consistently said that he is taking steps for the defense of America and for the purpose of keeping us out of war, and he has kept us out of war to date, August 12, 1941, despite the predictions of the past 20 months. The steps we are taking are realistic steps to prevent war from coming to our shores. Thank God, as in the days of the Revolution, as in the early days of our constitutional government, we were given a great leader in Washington, and as in the Civil War days when we were given a great leader in Lincoln, thank God in this crisis our country has been given a great leader in Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ELSTON) there were—ayes 96, noes 134.

So, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. During the existence of the authority conferred by section 2 of this joint resolution, enlistments in the Army of the United States, without regard to component, are hereby authorized in the manner provided by the concluding paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. As we near a decision on this bill, I have asked for this time for the purpose of explaining to the membership of the committee a motion to recommit, which I shall offer at the proper time. Because the motion is lengthy, it will save time if you will permit me to explain it briefly here, so that it will not be necessary for the Clerk to read it at length.

I hope that this motion to recommit will be given the most careful consideration by every Member of this House. When I spoke at some length on this measure last week I insisted that there is just one real question at issue, namely, Is the national interest actually imperiled in the sense in which this phrase was intended in the original act?

I said originally, and I repeat with all possible emphasis, if you are convinced that the national interest is imperiled, that we are faced with a national emergency, and that the danger now is infinitely greater than it was a year ago, you should by all means vote for this measure. But I said then, and I repeat, if the meager facts available to you from official sources fail to convince you of this perilous necessity, then you cannot in good conscience and in honesty to the American people support this proposal. I must say over and over again that I have not been able to convince myself of this necessity.

The motion to recommit will strike out section 1 of the bill which is the declaration that the national interest is imperiled. It will limit the period of service of the selectees now in the armed forces to the 12 months for which they were originally inducted, unless the President sees fit under certain circumstances to retain them under existing authority.

The motion authorizes the President to extend the service of members of the National Guard, the Reserves, and the retired personnel of the Army for any additional period of 1 year. It will also retain the present provision in the Selective Service Act which limits the total number of selectees who may be called into service at any one time at 900,000.

In fact, this motion will effectuate the amendments which we of the minority have offered here today. It will preserve the selective-service system as a training program which will strengthen our national defense by pouring a steady stream of men trained to Regular Army standards into an ever-increasing pool of reserves. This is the sound, long-range program which was contemplated a year



ago. It is a defense-training program, not in any sense of the word a war program.

If the administration proposal is predicated upon information not available to the average Member of this House, that war is imminent, and if we really should freeze our present Army personnel into a wartime organization, then you must by all means defeat this motion.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES. If, on the other hand, you are not convinced that we are preparing our Army for immediate war, but believe that the President should continue the training program as contemplated, then support the motion which will keep the National Guard and reserve components in service, release the present class of selectees, and permit Army officials to call up new classes of trainees within the presently authorized limits. We are just at the point where our first class of selectees will go into the reserve. These trained men will become our back-log of national defense. Actually, the system is just beginning to function. Flatly contradicting the assertions of the proponents of this proposal, I believe that to preserve the status quo is to assure national defense, not disorganize it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Do I understand the motion to recommit will authorize the President to do these things?

Mr. HARNES. The motion to recommit provides that the President may extend the service of the National Guard, the Reserves, and the retired personnel of the Army for a period of 12 months, but no new authority would be given the President to hold the selectees in service.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the gentleman believe the President would do that?

Mr. HARNES. Does the gentleman mean to ask if I believe that the President will hold the National Guard and Reserves in service?

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the gentleman believe that the President will act under the authority he gives the President under the motion to recommit?

Mr. HARNES. I am unable to predict what the President will do.

If the House supports the motion to recommit, I will vote for the bill incorporating the provision of the motion when it comes back; but I will not support the measure in its present form, because I believe it is unwarranted and unjust. I do not see any necessity to impose the sacrifices upon these men which this legislation proposes, and I cannot agree that it is in the best interest of the national-defense program.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the gentleman from Indiana, who has just left the floor, has stated clearly and courageously the issue before the House. He stated that if he believed the country faced an emergency he would vote for

the bill. I would like for the country to understand, and I think it is vital—I am not speaking as a Democrat now—I think it is a very important thing that the country understand that the division which will be manifest here by this vote will, or should, depend largely upon the judgment of the Members of the House as to whether this country faces an emergency.

Now, let us see whether or not we face an emergency. Let us see what the situation is. America today has declared itself to be the arsenal of one of that group of nations of the earth which one by one are being conquered. Today America is the only Nation on the earth of major rank that is not now either conquered or threatened with conquest, and we have challenged and are now challenging that group of nations which is sweeping in devastating conquest over the world. There is no question about that, is there? We are declaring to all nations of the earth: "You stay out of this hemisphere from tip to tip. If you come we will fight you." What with? We are telling the people of Asia, of Europe, and of Africa, all over the world, what they may do and not do in those continents. It does not matter whether you approve it or do not approve it, we have to face these facts; we have got to deal with a particular situation. We have been using fighting words. We have been doing fighting things. We are not going to be able to bluff our way through the middle of this World War. We have moved into shooting territory, making faces at one group of these belligerents, and at the same time providing arms and food and ships and planes and money to the other. We have taken sides definitely and hurtfully to one group of nations, and that is the winning group. We are in their way now. We challenge them. We hinder them. We are a menace to their ambitions. Whether wisely or not, we face them in that position. In such a position in this world aflame with the passion of war we have a single business in America that is relatively worthy of consideration and that is to make this country so secure that nobody will dare attack us. We owe that duty to these men in uniform. We owe it to the Nation. That is our only chance, as I see it, to keep them from having to fight.

Maybe we have made a mistake in getting into this position, maybe not; whatever opinion may be as to that, I believe what I have said with all my soul. We hear a good deal said that Congress ought not to break faith with these men. I agree with that. I do not like to vote for this sort of legislation but, considering our actual situation, our peril, and the danger we would expose these men and our country to by taking a backward step in preparedness, I should feel I would be breaking faith with them and with the Nation if our vote would make it possible for the message to go out to the world that the present partly trained Army personnel is to be discharged and raw recruits be taken in, because the Congress does not consider the Nation to be in peril. The effect would not only be disastrous upon our own military pre-

paredness but upon our thinking and conduct. These strikes, this profiteering, and so forth, would largely disappear if we really understood our danger.

Oh, we talk about economic interests, we talk about what it will cost, we talk about the inconvenience; but, men and women of this Congress, the world is aflame with the passions of war and America has challenged a large part of the people fit to fight, the greatest fighting machine that has ever been on this earth. We have but one business in this world of blood and fire and death, of conquest and slavery, and that is to make America safe, if it can be done. I would vote every dollar in America, if necessary, and bring every man, myself and everybody else to her defense, if I could, to make certain that my Nation would be saved. As I see it, and I do not see how I can be mistaken, there is but one way we can escape attack, and one way only. Do you mean to tell me we can challenge every people in the world now engaged in its conquest and escape attack unless we are so strong that nobody will dare attack us? Of course, I hate to have these boys stay in the Army at the sacrifice of their convenience and substantial interest, but I had rather have that and have the Nation united by the realization of our peril than to deceive them and, as I see it, deceive the Nation as to that danger by sending them home and then calling them back, possibly to sacrifice their lives in an attempt to save a Nation who, like France, lulled by a false sense of security, until it was too late, moved step by step to its inevitable doom. We have had the notion in America that we are not going to be in any danger unless we shoot first. That day is past. Your Nation and my Nation, in this world picture, this bloody, horrible world picture, is next on call unless we are able to become so well prepared before, that we will not be attacked, and, if attacked, we can defend our independence. The greatest issue of the ages is pending now, while you sit there and I stand here.

I believe these men and women who state today that they are unconcerned for their political future. Any man or any woman on the floor of this House who determines his or her conduct, his or her vote today by the probable consequences of the next election is unfit to be in this Hall; and I do not believe many are unfit. It is a question of difference of opinion: You think one thing, I think another; you do not think we are in danger, I do. Look about us at the world today. Ask the people in France, ask the people in England, ask the people of blood-soaked Europe if there is any business in this world for us but to make this Nation secure? Ask them what would they give now if they had our chance to preserve their independence, their homes, their property, their lives, all the things which make life worth living.

We owe a supreme duty to these boys and to their children and to their children's-children this day; we owe it now. I would like for this Nation to know—I may be wrong, you may be

wrong, but I would like for this Nation to feel—that this division of opinion that will be manifest by this vote is based upon that one question, that one difference of opinion as to whether we are in peril. That might lessen the hurt which I fear may come to the country, to its morale, to its solidarity, to its strength, to its fitness to survive from the words spoken today in this debate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Texas would have us believe that we are next on call. Does not the gentleman know that there is not enough tonnage afloat today to bring an expeditionary force to our shores or to the shores of South America to endanger or imperil the sovereignty of this country or the South American republics? A great deal has been said about South America. We cannot hope to hold South America in line indefinitely from an economic standpoint. Why? Because South America produces the very things that we do, therefore South America must naturally look to Europe to dispose of her products, outside of coffee and perhaps rubber and tin. We may spend billions, as we have, and we may send playboys from Hollywood down there as messengers of good will, Hollywood stars and one thing or another, but they merely laugh at us. When Russia got into the war we lost whatever chance we had to hold South America in line, because South America is opposed to communism, whatever the New Deal may stand for.

It will be interesting to know, and I am anxiously awaiting a report from the Dies committee as to just how many Communists hold key positions in this Government. Do you suppose that South America, with its long background of political and religious beliefs is going to fall in line with us now that we have embraced bloody Joe Stalin? No. Anyone who believes that is just deluding himself—in the parlance of the street, he is kidding himself. We lost the good will of South America through the entrance of Russia into this war. You can talk until doomsday but it will not change the picture, because I have this from very good authority, from Americans who have recently returned from South America.

The gentleman from Texas would have you believe that we are exposed to instant invasion, that it may come tomorrow, next week, or next month. No. Study the tonnage figures. You know, soldiers cannot swim across the ocean. They have to be transported on ships, and there are not enough ships to bring an expeditionary force to these shores that will in any way jeopardize our national security.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 8. Section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by inserting after "May 15, 1945," the following: "or 6 months after the termination of the authority conferred by section 2 of the Service Extension Act of 1941, whichever is the later."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 6, strike out lines 6 to 10, inclusive.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. Section 1 of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 27, 1940, is hereby amended by inserting after "June 30, 1942," the following: "or 6 months after the termination of the authority conferred by section 2 of the Service Extension Act of 1941, whichever is the later": *Provided*, That nothing in said Public Resolution No. 96 shall hereafter be construed as limiting the power of the President to order the same units and individuals into the active military service of the United States for two or more periods of service.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 6, line 13, after "amended", insert "(1)", and beginning with the colon in line 16, strike out down to and including the period in line 20, and insert "and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section the President is authorized to order the same member or the same unit into the active military service of the United States for more than one period, except that in the case of any such member any active military service under authority of this resolution in excess of 12 months shall be deemed an extension of active military service within the meaning of section 2 of the Service Extension Act of 1941.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 6, line 20, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 9a. Any person inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States for the training and service provided for by the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and (2) any person (other than retired personnel of the Regular Army) ordered to active duty or into the active military service of the United States under the authority of the act of August 27, 1940, or section 37a of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, shall, in addition to the amounts otherwise payable to such persons with respect to such service, be entitled to receive the sum of \$30 for each month of service, in excess of 12 months, rendered as a member of the land or naval forces of the United States during the period beginning with August 27, 1940, and ending at the end of 6 months after the termination of the unlimited emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941. The sum payable to any such person under this section shall be paid in monthly installments of \$30 each, the first installment to be paid during the first month following the month within which said service terminates. Such installments shall be paid by the Veterans' Administration, under such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, with the approval of the President."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment,

but I will reserve it if the gentleman desires to speak.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I cannot see how a point of order would lie against this amendment. It certainly has to do with the question of the extension of service.

Mr. Chairman, I laid the foundation for this amendment awhile ago in what I said in my former speech. It seems to me the only way in which a real coming together of the minds of the two factions here in the House on this bill could be accomplished would be by an attitude that ran something like this:

First, to admit that it is true that practically every one of us said that this was to be for a 1-year training period when the Selective Service Act was passed; second, we felt it might be wise, it might make the work of the Army simpler, if certain changes were made in those arrangements at present, but, third, in so doing we proposed to take such action as would be eminently fair as near as we could do it to the men of whom we were asking almost alone in the United States at present great sacrifice.

What this amendment proposes is that if a man, any man, National Guard, selectee or anybody else, is asked to serve more than 12 months, then whenever his service ends but not before, and he is let out of the service, he shall, beginning in the next month thereafter, be entitled to receive the sum of \$30 per month for the same number of months as his period of service exceeded the 12-month period.

In the long run I do not believe there is any difference of opinion in this House on the question of defending the United States with all that we have in us; neither would there be if this Nation were at war any question about the service not only of the men in the service but a lot of other people, too. But we are not at war at present. As a matter of fact, we are asking a special peacetime service of these men and it seems to me that some decent recognition has got to be given in connection with it or we ought not to do it at all.

One of the biggest problems in connection with the lengthening of this period of service is the economic problem that will face a lot of the men in service, not the lack of patriotism on their part but the fact that although a man might hope to go back to his job at the end of 1 year, it is going to be very difficult for him to expect to go back to it in 2½ years. Therefore, this might be some cushion for him—a help at a time when he needed it very much due directly to his extended service. Another way to get at this same problem and one I think should be considered, is to bring these men under the Social Security Act by having the Government pay their contributions. In the second place, at the time that these men are being let out of the service, it may well be that we will be confronted with a period when the reduction of expenditures for defense will be taking place at a great rate, and if that be true, such a provision as this would be one of the soundest economic measures you could have at a time like that. I leave it to the House.



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

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman explain how this amendment coincides with or differs from the amendment we approved a moment ago?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes. The gentleman from Massachusetts offered an amendment which provided that after a man had served 12 months, if then his service was extended beyond the 12 months his pay should be increased to \$40 for the time he is in service. My amendment does not have anything to do with the time he is in service. It states that if he serves more than 12 months, then when he goes out of service he receives \$30 a month for as many months as his service exceeded 12.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order and urge the House to defeat this proposal, because it is stacking money on top of money that has already been voted by the House in another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 10. This joint resolution may be cited as the "Service Extension Act of 1941."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute amendment, as amended, for the joint resolution.

The committee substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 222, declaring a national emergency, extending terms of enlistments, appointments, and commissions in the Army of the United States, suspending certain restrictions upon the employment of retired personnel of the Army, making further provision for restoration of civil positions to members of the Army on relief from military service, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 290, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HARNES. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARNES moves to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment, as follows: Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

"That section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Any such man may volunteer for an additional 12-month period of training and service and, upon so volunteering shall, unless sooner discharged, serve for such additional period if he is acceptable to the land or naval forces, as the case may be, for such additional training and service. For the purposes of the limitation on the number of men who may be in active training and service at any one time, the number of such volunteers shall be disregarded.'

"Sec. 2. The President is hereby authorized to extend, for such periods of time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense, the periods of service, training and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission, of any or all persons inducted for training and service under said act, members and units of the reserve components of the Army of the United States (including the National Guard of the United States), retired personnel and enlisted men of the Regular Army, and any other members of the Army, who are now, or who may hereafter be, in or subject to active military service, or training and service: *Provided*, That extension of the periods of active military service, or training and service, in the case of any person subject to the provisions of this section, shall not, in the case of any person in training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, be made without his consent, and in the case of any other person subject to the provisions of this section shall not, without his consent, exceed 12 months in the aggregate; except that whenever the Congress declares that it is in the interests of national defense to further extend such periods of active military service, and training and service, such periods may be further extended by the President, in the case of any such persons, for such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense: *Provided further*, That the authority hereby conferred may be revoked at any time by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

"Sec. 3. The Secretary of War may, when not in conflict with the interests of national defense, (1) release from active military service those persons who in his judgment would suffer undue hardship if retained on active duty, and (2) release from active training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 men now in such training and service who had attained the 28th anniversary of the day of their birth on or prior to July 1, 1941, and prior to their induction for such training and service: *Provided*, That any person so released under this section who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, has served satisfactorily shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect.

"Sec. 4. The President is hereby authorized to order retired personnel of the Regular Army to active duty and to employ them as he shall deem necessary in the interests of national defense.

"Sec. 5. Any person who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, and prior to the termination of the authority conferred by section 2 of this joint resolution, shall have entered upon active military or naval service in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be entitled to all the reemployment benefits of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to the same extent as in the case of persons inducted under said act: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 8 (b) (A) of said act shall be applicable to any

such person without regard to whether the position which he held shall have been covered into the classified civil service during the period of his military or naval service.

"Sec. 6. During the existence of the authority conferred by section 2 of this joint resolution, enlistments in the Army of the United States, without regard to component, are hereby authorized in the manner provided by the concluding paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended.

"Sec. 7. Section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby amended by inserting after 'May 15, 1945,' the following: 'or 6 months after the termination of the authority conferred by section 2 of the Service Extension Act of 1941, whichever is the latter.'

"Sec. 8. Section 1 of Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 27, 1940, is hereby amended by inserting after 'June 30, 1942,' the following: 'or 6 months after the termination of the authority conferred by section 2 of the Service Extension Act of 1941, whichever is the latter: *Provided*, That nothing in said Public Resolution No. 96 shall hereafter be construed as limiting the power of the President to order the same units and individuals into the active military service of the United States for two or more periods of service.

"Sec. 9. This joint resolution may be cited as the 'Service Extension Act of 1941.'

Mr. HARNES (interrupting the reading of the motion to recommit). Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the motion to recommit was explained rather briefly, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered as read.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask if the gentleman in his speech covered all the points which are in the motion?

Mr. HARNES. I think so; yes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 215, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—190

Allen, Ill.	Capozzoli	Dondro
Andersen,	Carlson	Douglas
H. Carl	Case, S. Dak.	Downs
Andresen,	Chenoweth	Dworshak
August H.	Chiperfield	Eaton
Angell	Clason	Elliott, Mass.
Arnds	Clevenger	Elston
Barry	Coffee, Nebr.	Engel
Baumhart	Cole, Md.	Englebright
Bender	Connery	Fenton
Bennett	Copeland	Fish
Bishop	Cravens	Flaherty
Blackney	Crawford	Fogarty
Boehne	Crosser	Gale
Bolton	Crowther	Gavagan
Bradley, Mich.	Culkin	Gehrmann
Bradley, Pa.	Cullen	Gerlach
Brown, Ohio	Cunningham	Geyer, Calif.
Furdick	Curtis	Gifford
Butler	Day	Gilchrist
Canfield	Dewey	Gillie
Cannon, Fla.	Dirksen	Graham
Cannon, Mo.	Ditter	Grant, Ind.

Guyer, Kans. McArdle  
Gwynne McGregor  
Hall, McKeough  
Edwin Arthur McLean  
Halleck Magnuson  
Harness Marcantonio  
Hart Martin, Iowa  
Hartley Martin, Mass.  
Heidinger Mason  
Hess Meyer, Md.  
Hill, Colo. Michener  
Hill, Wash. Moser  
Hoffman Mott  
Holmes Mundt  
Hook Murray  
Hope Nelson  
Howell O'Brien, Mich.  
Hull O'Brien, N. Y.  
Jacobsen O'Leary  
Jarrett Oliver  
Jenkins, Ohio Osmer  
Jennings O'Toole  
Jensen Paddock  
Johns Pfeiffer  
Johnson, Calif. Joseph L.  
Johnson, Ill. Pfeiffer  
Johnson, Ind. William T.  
Jones Ploeser  
Jonkman Powers  
Kean Rankin, Miss.  
Keefe Rankin, Mont.  
Kelly, Ill. Reece, Tenn.  
Kennedy, Reed, Ill.  
Martin J. Reed, N. Y.  
Kennedy, Rees, Kans.  
Michael J. Rich  
Kinzer Rizley  
Knutson Robertson,  
Kunkel N. Dak.  
Lambertson Robson, Ky.  
Landis Rockefeller  
LeCompte Rodgers, Pa.  
Ludlow Rolph

## NAYS—215

Allen, La. Edmiston  
Anderson, Calif. Elliott, Calif.  
Anderson, Ill. Ellis  
N. Mex. Faddis  
Andrews Fellows  
Arnold Fitzgerald  
Baldwin Fitzpatrick  
Barden Flannagan  
Barnes Flannery  
Bates, Ky. Folger  
Bates, Mass. Forand  
Beckworth Ford, Leland M.  
Beiter Ford, Miss.  
Bell Ford, Thomas F.  
Bland Fulmer  
Bloom Gamble  
Boggs Gathings  
Boland Gearhart  
Bonner Gibson  
Boren Gore  
Boykin Gossett  
Brooks Granger  
Brown, Ga. Grant, Ala.  
Bryson Green  
Buck Gregory  
Buckley, N. Y. Haines  
Bulwinkle Hall  
Burch Leonard W.  
Burgin Hancock  
Byrne Hare  
Byron Harris, Ark.  
Camp Harris, Va.  
Cartwright Harter  
Casey, Mass. Healey  
Chapman Heffernan  
Clark Hendricks  
Claypool Hinchshaw  
Cluett Hobbs  
Cochran Holbrook  
Cole, N. Y. Hunter  
Colmer Imhoff  
Cooley Izac  
Cooper Jarman  
Costello Johnson  
Courtney Johnson, Luther A.  
Cox Johnson,  
Creal Lyndon B.  
D'Alesandro Johnson, Okla.  
Davis, Ohio Johnson, W. Va.  
Davis, Tenn. Kee  
Dickstein Kefauver  
Dies Kelley, Pa.  
Dingell Keogh  
Disney Kerr  
Domeneaux Kilburn  
Doughton Kilday  
Drewry Kilwan  
Duncan Klein  
Durham Kocalkowski  
Eberhart Kopplemann

Smith, Va. Tarver  
Snyder Taylor  
South Terry  
Sparkman Thomas, Tex.  
Spence Thomason  
Starnes, Ala. Tolan  
Steagall Traynor  
Stearns, N. H. Vincent, Ky.  
Sullivan Vinson, Ga.  
Sumners, Tex. Wadsworth  
Sutphin Ward  
Taber Wastelowski

## NOT VOTING—27

Beam Houston  
Buckler, Minn. Jackson  
Carter Jenks, N. H.  
Celler McMillan  
Coffee, Wash. Maas  
Collins Mitchell  
Doxey O'Connor  
Harrington O'Day  
Hébert O'Hara

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Beam for, with Mr. Hébert against.  
Mr. Rabaut for, with Mr. Houston against.  
Mr. Scott for, with Mr. Jackson against.  
Mr. Coffee of Washington for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mrs. O'Day for, with Mr. Scrugham against.  
Mr. White for, with Mr. Mitchell against.  
Mr. O'Hara for, with Mr. O'Connor against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Doxey with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.  
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Vreeland.  
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Maas.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Carter.  
Mr. Collins with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on the passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 203, nays 202, not voting 27, as follows:

## [Roll No. 106]

## YEAS—203

Allen, La. Cartwright  
Anderson, Calif. Casey, Mass.  
Anderson, Chapman  
N. Mex. Clark  
Andrews Cluett  
Arnold Colmer  
Baldwin Cooley  
Barden Cooper  
Barnes Costello  
Bates, Ky. Courtney  
Bates, Mass. Cox  
Beckworth Creal  
Beiter D'Alesandro  
Bell Davis, Tenn.  
Bland Delaney  
Bloom Dickstein  
Boggs Dies  
Boland Dingell  
Bonner Disney  
Boren Domeneaux  
Boykin Doughton  
Byrne Duncan  
Bryson Durham  
Buck Eberhart  
Buckley, N. Y. Edmiston  
Bulwinkle Elliott, Calif.  
Burch Ellis  
Burgin Faddis  
Byrne Fellows  
Byron Fitzgerald  
Camp Fitzpatrick

Johnson, Luther A.  
Johnson, Murdock  
Lyndon B. Myers, Pa.  
Johnson, Okla. Nichols  
Johnson, W. Va. Norrell  
Kee Norton  
Kefauver O'Neal  
Kelley, Pa. Pace  
Keogh Patman  
Kerr Patrick  
Kilburn Patton  
Kilday Pearson  
Kilwan Peterson, Fla.  
Kleberg Peter, Ga.  
Klein Pierce  
Kocalkowski Pittenger  
Kopplemann Plauché  
Kramer Plumley  
Lanham Poage  
Larrabee Priest  
Lea Ramsay  
Leavy Ramspeck  
Lesinski Randolph  
Lewis Rankin, Miss.  
Lynch Richards  
McCormack Rivers  
McGehee Robertson, Va.  
McGranery Rogers, Mass.  
McLaughlin Rogers, Okla.  
Maciejewski Russell  
Mahon Sabath  
Manasco Sacks  
Mansfield Sanders  
May Sasser  
Merritt Satterfield  
Mills, Ark. Schaefer, Ill.

## NAYS—202

Allen, Ill. Gerlach  
Andersen, Geyer, Calif.  
H. Carl Gifford  
Andersen, Gilchrist  
August H. Gillie  
Angell Graham  
Arends Grant, Ind.  
Barry Guyer, Kans.  
Baumhart Gwynne  
Bender Haines  
Bennett Hall  
Bishop Edwin Arthur  
Blackney Halleck  
Boehne Harness  
Bolton Hart  
Bradley, Mich. Hartley  
Bradley, Pa. Heidinger  
Brown, Ohio Hess  
Burdick Hill, Colo.  
Butler Hill, Wash.  
Canfield Hoffman  
Cannon, Fla. Holbrook  
Cannon, Mo. Holmes  
Capozzoli Hook  
Carlson Hope  
Case, S. Dak. Howell  
Chenoweth Hull  
Chiperfield Hunter  
Clason Imhoff  
Claypool Jacobsen  
Clevenger Jarrett  
Cochran Jenkins, Ohio  
Coffee, Nebr. Jennings  
Cole, Md. Jensen  
Cole, N. Y. Johns  
Connery Johnson, Calif.  
Coppeland Johnson, Ill.  
Cravens Johnson, Ind.  
Crawford Jones  
Cresser Jonkman  
Crowther Kean  
Culkin Keefe  
Cullen Kelly, Ill.  
Cunningham Kennedy  
Curtis Martin J.  
Davis, Ohio Kennedy,  
Day Michael J.  
Dewey Kinzer  
Dirksen Knutson  
Ditter Kunkel  
Dondero Lambertson  
Douglas Landis  
Downs LeCompte  
Dworschak Ludlow  
Eaton McArdle  
Eliot, Mass. McGregor  
Elston McIntyre  
Engel McKeough  
Englebright McLean  
Fenton McMillan  
Fish MacIora  
Fiaherty Magnuson  
Fogarty Marcantonio  
Gale Martin, Iowa  
Gavagan Martin, Mass.  
Gehrmann Mason

Meyer, Md. Michener  
Moser  
Mott  
Mundt  
Murray  
Nelson  
O'Brien, Mich.  
O'Brien, N. Y.  
O'Leary  
Oliver  
Osmer  
O'Toole  
Paddock  
Pfeiffer  
Joseph L.  
Pfeiffer  
William T.  
Ploeser  
Powers  
Rankin, Mont.  
Reece, Tenn.  
Reed, Ill.  
Reed, N. Y.  
Rees, Kans.  
Rich  
Rizley  
Robertson,  
N. Dak.  
Robson, Ky.  
Rockefeller  
Rodgers, Pa.  
Sauthoff  
Scanlon  
Schulte  
Secrest  
Shafer, Mich.  
Shanley  
Shannon  
Sheridan  
Short  
Simpson  
Smith, Ohio  
Smith, Pa.  
Smith, Wash.  
Smith, W. Va.  
Somers, N. Y.  
Springer  
Stefan  
Stevenson  
Stratton  
Summer, Ill.  
Sweeney  
Taler  
Tenerowicz  
Thill  
Thom  
Tibbott  
Tinkham  
Treadway  
Van Zandt  
Voorhis, Calif.  
Vorys, Ohio  
Walter



Weiss	Willson	Wolverton, N. J.
Welch	Winter	Woodruff, Mich.
Wheat	Wolcott	Young
Williams	Wolfenden, Pa.	Youngdahl

## NOT VOTING—27

Beam	Houston	Robinson, Utah
Buckler, Minn.	Jackson	Romjue
Carter	Jenks, N. H.	Scott
Celler	Maas	Scrugham
Coffee, Wash.	Mitchell	Sheppard
Collins	O'Connor	Sutphin
Doxey	O'Day	Thomas, N. J.
Harrington	O'Hara	Vreeland
Hébert	Rabaut	White

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Beam against.  
 Mr. Houston for, with Mr. Rabaut against.  
 Mr. Jackson for, with Mr. Scott against.  
 Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Coffee of Washington against.  
 Mr. Scrugham for, with Mr. O'Day against.  
 Mr. Mitchell for, with Mr. White against.  
 Mr. O'Connor for, with Mr. O'Hara against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Doxey with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.  
 Mr. Harrington with Mr. Vreeland.  
 Mr. Romjue with Mr. Maas.  
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Carter.  
 Mr. Collins with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.  
 Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recorded as voting "yea."

Mr. SOMERS of New York. I change my vote and vote "no."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I call for a recapitulation.

The SPEAKER. The request for a recapitulation is not in order at this time. The vote has not been announced.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recapitulation of the vote if it is in order at this time.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire that before the vote is announced?  
 Mr. SHORT. It was so done, as I understand it, the other day, but I shall wait.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 203 Members have voted "aye," 202 Members have voted "no," and the bill is passed.

Mr. SHORT. I demand a recapitulation.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, I qualify and vote "aye."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is too late.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recapitulation of the vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is a reasonable request, the vote being so close. The Clerk will call the names of the Members recorded as voting "yea."

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NICHOLS. Do I understand the rules of the House to be that Members who have not now voted cannot be recorded as voting?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry. Do I understand that after the result of the vote has been

announced Members can or cannot change their votes?

The SPEAKER. They cannot change their votes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if a Member finds that he is wrongly recorded he can correct the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Certainly he can correct the RECORD. The Clerk will call the names of the Members recorded as voting "yea."

The Clerk called the names of those voting "yea."

The SPEAKER. Does any Member state that his name has been wrongly recorded?

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Speaker, I was present and voted "aye."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, was the gentleman present in the Chamber and voted? We cannot hear what he said.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Aye.

Mr. MICHENER. When his name was called?

Mr. SUTPHIN. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman state that he was in the room and answered to his name?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the hall and did he hear his name called?

Mr. SUTPHIN. I did not hear it called back.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not qualify. The Clerk will call the names of those recorded as voting "no."

The Clerk called the names of those recorded as voting "no."

Mr. BAUMHART. I did not hear my name called. I voted "no."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recorded as voting "no."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. First, how am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recorded as voting "no."

Mr. POWERS. That is correct. Mr. Speaker, maybe my hearing is not too good, but I was under the impression that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] voted "no." Am I correct?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the bill on final passage and then went out of the room.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recorded. No correction in the vote, the vote stands and the bill is passed and without objection a motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed—

The SPEAKER. That motion has been laid on the table.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, the vote has not been announced.

The SPEAKER. The vote was announced some time ago.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announced the vote before the recapitulation. There were no changes whatsoever and the Chair announced that the vote stood and the bill was passed, and without objection a motion to reconsider was laid on the table, and there was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I object, and I demand recognition. I wanted to move to recapitulate the vote by which the bill was passed.

The SPEAKER. That has already been done.

Mr. SHORT. I mean to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The SPEAKER. The vote has been recapitulated.

Mr. SHORT. I meant to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, there is no use getting excited about this.

The SPEAKER. The Chair trusts the gentleman from Michigan does not think the Chair is excited.

Mr. MICHENER. The only thing that would make me think it was the speed with which the Speaker passed the bill and refused to recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], who was on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman did not state for what purpose.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I did not have time. I wanted to move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman, in the first place, is not eligible to make that motion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did I understand the Chair to state that at the time the Chair announced the bill had been passed, he stated that without objection a motion to reconsider was laid on the table?

The SPEAKER. The Chair so stated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sorry, but I was listening and failed to hear the Chair so state. I am glad to have the Chair make that statement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair announced that the vote would stand, and the bill was passed, and without objection a motion to reconsider was laid on the table, and recognized the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] which he now does.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ with the Speaker. The Speaker did not announce that a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has stated twice that he did make that statement.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am sorry to differ with you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not intend to have his word questioned by the gentleman from Minnesota or anybody else. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] has been recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to correct the section numbers in the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, that is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, a further request. I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House have 5 legislative days in which to extend and revise their remarks.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, what was the first request?

The SPEAKER. The first request was, and it has already been granted, that the Clerk may be allowed to correct the sections. There was no objection to that. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 290, I call up the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 95) to extend the periods of service of persons in the military service, and for other purposes, and I move to strike out—

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. KNUTSON. Well, Mr. Speaker, let us have the full motion.

The SPEAKER. The full motion is before the House. The gentleman has called this joint resolution up. The Clerk will report the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out all after the resolving clause of the joint resolution and insert in lieu thereof the text of the bill, House Joint Resolution 222, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Strike out all after the resolving clause of Senate Joint Resolution 95 on page 1, beginning in line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the Congress, acting in accordance with and solely for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, hereby declares that the national interest is imperiled.

"Sec. 2. The President is hereby authorized, subject, however, to the condition hereinafter stated, to extend, for such periods of time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense, the periods of service, training and service, enlistment, appointment, or commission, of any or all persons inducted for training and service under said act, members and units of the Reserve components of the Army of the United States (including the National Guard of the United States), retired personnel and enlisted men of the Regular Army, and any other members of the Army, who are now, or who may hereafter be, in or subject to active military service, or training and service: *Provided*,

That extension of the periods of active military service, or training and service, in the case of any person subject to the provisions of this section, shall not, without his consent, exceed 18 months in the aggregate; except that whenever the Congress declares that it is in the interests of national defense to further extend such periods of active military service and training and service, such periods may be further extended by the President, in the case of any such persons, for such time as may be necessary in the interests of national defense: *Provided further*, That the authority hereby conferred is subject to the condition that the delegation of such authority may be revoked at any time by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

"Sec. 3. Any person whose period of active military service or training and service is extended under section 2 and who was (a) ordered to active Federal service under Public Resolution No. 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, or (b) inducted under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, prior to the enactment of this act, shall, notwithstanding the limitation in section 602 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 upon the time within which application for National Service Life Insurance may be made, be granted insurance under such section without further medical examination if application therefor is filed within 120 days after the date of enactment of this act.

"Sec. 4. The Secretary of War shall, when not in conflict with the interests of national defense, release from active military service those persons who apply therefor through the regular military channels and state their reasons for such release, and whose retention in active military service would, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, subject them or their wives or other dependents to undue hardship if retained on active military service. Any person so released who, in the judgment of those in authority over him, has served satisfactorily shall be entitled to a certificate to that effect, which shall be in the same form and have the same force and effect as a certificate issued under the provisions of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. Any person so released shall be transferred to, or remain in, as the case may be, a reserve component of the land forces for the same period and with the same rights, duties, and liabilities as any person transferred to a reserve component of the land forces under the provisions of section 3 (c) of such act.

"Sec. 5. Section 3 (c) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'The active military service or training and service of any person pursuant to section 2 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 shall be credited against the service in a reserve component required by this section or section 3 of the Service Extension Act of 1941.'

"Sec. 6. The President is hereby authorized to order retired personnel of the Regular Army to active duty and to employ them as he shall deem necessary in the interests of national defense.

"Sec. 7. Any person who, subsequent to May 1, 1940, and prior to the termination of the authority conferred by section 2 of this joint resolution, shall have entered upon active military or naval service in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be entitled to all the reemployment benefits of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to the same extent as in the case of persons inducted under said act: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 8 (b) (A) of said act shall be applicable to any such person without regard to whether the position which he held shall have been covered into the classified civil service during the period of his military or naval service.

"Sec. 8. (a) Any person inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States for active training and service, under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 shall, in addition to the amounts otherwise payable to such person with respect to such training and service, be entitled to receive the sum of \$10 for each month of such training and service in excess of 12. The provisions of this section shall also apply (1) to any enlisted personnel of the National Guard of the United States or of any other reserve component of the Army of the United States ordered into the active military service under the authority of Public Resolution Numbered 96, approved August 27, 1940, or section 37a of the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, for any such service so rendered by any such personnel in excess of 12 months, and (2) to any enlisted personnel of the Regular Army for each month of military service rendered by him after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and after his total military service (rendered before or after such date) exceeds 12 months.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall be applicable only during the period of the unlimited emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941.

"Sec. 9. During the existence of the authority conferred by section 2 of this joint resolution and for 6 months thereafter the limitation on the number of men who may be in active training and service at any one time under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby suspended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall report to the Congress each month the number of men in active training and service in the land forces under section 3 (b) of said act.

"Sec. 10. During the existence of the authority conferred by section 2 of this joint resolution, enlistments in the Army of the United States, without regard to component, are hereby authorized in the manner provided by the concluding paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended.

"Sec. 11. Section 1 of Public Resolution Numbered 96, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 27, 1940, is hereby amended (1) by inserting after 'June 30, 1942,' the following: 'or 6 months after the termination of the authority conferred by section 2 of the Service Extension Act of 1941, whichever is the later' and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following: 'Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section the President is authorized to order the same member or the same unit into the active military service of the United States for more than one period, except that in the case of any such member any active military service under authority of this resolution in excess of 12 months shall be deemed an extension of active military service within the meaning of section 2 of the Service Extension Act of 1941.'

"Sec. 12. This joint resolution may be cited as the 'Service Extension Act of 1941.'

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those who favor taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.



The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those who favor taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

The resolution was passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent House Joint Resolution 222 was laid on the table.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 95 and request a conference of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAY moves that the House insist upon its amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 95 and request a conference of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When does the gentleman expect this conference report to be brought back?

Mr. MAY. I hope we can get it back here day after tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It cannot be brought in tomorrow because the Senate is not in session. Can we have an understanding that it will not be brought up before Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the question of when the conference report can be brought back depends upon what the other body does. If the other body accepts the amendment of the House it would not, of course, go to conference.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I agree with the majority leader, of course, that if the Senate should agree to the House amendment, the resolution would not come back for further action on the part of the House; but in the event the resolution does go to conference the conference report really could not be brought back before Thursday.

Mr. MAY. I do not see how it could.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In that event there will probably be another vote on this same resolution on Thursday.

Mr. MAY. If a conference report comes in that is a reasonable inference to draw.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, HARTER, ANDREWS, and SHORT.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own re-

marks in the RECORD and to include a printed statement appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer as of this date.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### AMENDMENT OF VAGRANCY LAW OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 5447) to amend section 907 of the act entitled "An Act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to second conviction of criminal offenses, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may we have this bill explained?

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to strengthen and define the vagrancy law in the District of Columbia. At the present time, in order to obtain a conviction, it is necessary to prove that the person so arrested has no visible or lawful means of support. Hence a person possessing funds regardless of the source cannot be convicted. This measure is directed primarily to persons who are a potential menace to the community and it is so drawn as not to be a burden upon the person who is the victim of temporary misfortune.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, if this bill provides for more worthless police here, I am against it, and I object.

Mr. SCHULTE. It has nothing to do with that.

Mr. BOREN. If the bill does not provide for any more worthless police here, I withdraw my objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know something about the terms of this bill.

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I tried to explain the bill, that it just tightens up the vagrancy law, something that every Member of this House has been calling for for the last 8 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot hear, Mr. Speaker, and I object.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the minority report submitted by the minority members of the Committee on Military Affairs.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement made by the America First Committee.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole and include therein certain ex-

cerpts from the Democratic and Republican platforms, and certain statements by the President and by other parties.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESSANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein statements on decentralization of Government agencies.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain articles.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a bit of verse by a former Congressman.

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

There was no objection.

(Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in extending the remarks I made today I may include certain excerpts from existing law and a letter from the War Department.

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

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 a series of editorials on the St. Lawrence seaway.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two telegrams, one from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Massachusetts, and and from the American Legion, regarding the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 295), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That ARTHUR G. KLEIN, of the State of New York be and he is hereby elected a member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives, to-wit: Patents, Claims, Revision of the Laws, and Elections No. 1.

The resolution was agreed to.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MOSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the Record on the resolution just passed.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an address by the dean of the law school of the Notre Dame University.

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

There was no objection.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes at the close of the regular order of business tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in two instances; in one to include a letter and in the other to include a speech.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include certain quotations of the President and Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record on two subjects and to include in each an article.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Sweeney] may have leave to extend his remarks in the Record and to include copy of a speech of Colonel Lindbergh.

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

There was no objection.

## MEETINGS ON MONDAYS AND THURSDAYS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows (H. Res. 296):

*Resolved*, That after August 18, 1941, the House shall meet only on Mondays and Thursdays of each week until September 15, 1941: *Provided*, That if in the discretion of the Speaker legislative expediency shall warrant it, he may designate a date prior to September 15, 1941, on which the business of the House shall be resumed, in which case he shall cause the Clerk of the House to issue notice to Members of the House not later than 1 week prior to the date set by him.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understand this is the usual resolution which is adopted when we have 3-day recesses?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And ample provision has been made so that if any emergency should arise Members who want to come back will be given the opportunity by the leadership? In other words, the leadership will see that that is done?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thought the emergency was here. Did we not declare that today?

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the floor leader if there will be any business transacted at all on these Monday and Thursday meetings?

Mr. McCORMACK. No.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this minute so that we may get more clearly in the minds of the membership what we might expect on these days when the House will meet. As I understand it, extensions of remarks will be permitted, but there will be no speaking and no business transacted?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my understanding.

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels certain of that, he will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I concur in the expression of the Chair.

Mr. McCORMACK. The opinion expressed by the Chair is one that I personally concur in as majority leader.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would think that under an agreement like this debate would be business and the resolution does not contemplate that kind of business.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. McCORMACK. Gladly.

Mr. DITTER. In view of the fact that a delegation of the House is about to attend services for our distinguished friend who has just left our midst, are we to understand that under no circumstances will the conference report be brought back tomorrow on the amendment of the Selective Service Act?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know whether the other body is sitting tomorrow but without regard to what the circumstances may be, as I have stated to my distinguished friend, the minority leader, the report will not come up before Thursday.

[Here the gavel fell.]

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, I understand, there are two conference reports coming up for consideration. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Fulmer] has stated that he intends to call up a conference report from his committee, and I assume the Military Affairs Committee will call up the conference report on the property-requisition bill. I believe there was one other conference report reported today. I assume the chairmen of the committees will call up these conference reports tomorrow. These are the matters that will be taken up aside from some other matters which are of a noncontroversial nature and about which I do not know now. But, of course, such matters will be taken up with the minority leader or members of the minority party if any such matters come up. Aside from the conference reports I know of nothing else this week. Of course, there is a conference report on the supplemental appropriation bill, but I understand there is not much controversy about that.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the Senate committee has cut \$1,300,000,000 from that measure. I do not know what will happen to it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman expect it will be in this week?

Mr. TABER. I expect it will be taken up on Thursday in the Senate, and it should be over here by Friday noon if things go normally.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all the business I know of other than the conference report on the present bill and, personally, I hope there will be no necessity for a conference.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. RABAUT, indefinitely, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARRINGTON, indefinitely, on account of official business.



## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, at 8 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m., the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 13, 1941, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

854. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 3, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on reexamination of Delaware River in the vicinity of Camden, N. J., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 16, 1940 (H. Doc. No. 353); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

855. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report covering operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the first quarter of 1941, and for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to March 31, 1941, inclusive (H. Doc. No. 352); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

856. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. S. 162. An act to strengthen the national defense by creating the grade of chief warrant officer in the Army, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses. S. 1579. An act to authorize the President of the United States to requisition property required for the defense of the United States (Rept. No. 1153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 143. A bill to confer to certain persons who served in a civilian capacity under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General during the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the soldiers' homes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 4787. A bill to provide that the unexplained absence of any ex-service man for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1155). Referred to the Commit-

tee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 4853. A bill to amend section 4, Public Law No. 198, Seventy-sixth Congress, July 19, 1939, to authorize hospitalization of retired officers and enlisted men who are war veterans, in Veterans' Administration facilities under contract on parity with other war veterans; with amendment (Rept. No. 1156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 4905. A bill to facilitate standardization and uniformity of procedure relating to determination of service connection of injuries or diseases alleged to have been incurred in or aggravated by active service in a war, campaign, or expedition; without amendment (Rept. No. 1157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5289. A bill to dispense with the requirement of clearance and entry for certain United States vessels on the Great Lakes which touch at Canadian ports for bunker fuel only; with amendment (Rept. No. 1158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 5305. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in certain lands to the town of Bedford, Mass., for road-widening purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 5425. A bill to permit the steamship *Port Saunders*, official No. 220150, and steamship *Hawk*, official No. 220149, to engage in the fisheries; with amendment (Rept. No. 1160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 5143. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 5511. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; without amendment (Rept. No. 1170). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SWEENEY: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 3549. A bill for the relief of postal employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2208. A bill for the relief of Lloyd Bryant; without amendment (Rept. No. 1161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2724. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary E. Philpot, Sandra G. Philpot, and Mrs. R. L. Keckler; with amendment (Rept. No. 1162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3141. A bill for the relief of Fred Farner; with amendment (Rept. No. 1163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RUSSELL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of the Lawson Coffee Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4557. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Edna B. Crook; with amendment (Rept. No. 1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4587. A bill for the relief of Ray C. McMillen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4964. A bill for the relief of Elsie Hugaboom; without amendment (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5498. A bill for the relief of Lillian Korkemas and Rose Grazioli; without amendment (Rept. No. 1168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 5552. A bill to increase participation of share-rented farms by amending subsection (e) of section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 5553. A bill providing an appropriation for additional members of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 5554. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of a naturalized wife, husband, or child under 21 years of age residing abroad with husband or wife a native-born national of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 5555. A bill to authorize the release of certain property by the Federal Works Agency; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. YOUNGDAHL:

H. R. 5556. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Minnesota and the city of Minneapolis to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Minneapolis, Minn.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 5557. A bill authorizing the State of Indiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Wabash River at or near Montezuma, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 5558. A bill increasing motor-vehicle-fuel taxes in the District of Columbia for the period January 1, 1942, to June 30, 1949; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI:

H. J. Res. 230. Joint resolution transferring the administration of the homestead projects established in the Virgin Islands from the government of the Virgin Islands to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 294. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the national-defense program in its relation to small business; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 5559. A bill for the relief of William Horsman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 5560. A bill for the relief of George H. Hines, Jr.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 5561. A bill for the relief of George H. Hines, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 5562. A bill for the relief of Eugene Nero; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 5563. A bill for the relief of Joe A. Mumford and the estate of W. C. Mumford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 5564. A bill for the relief of Harold Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 5565. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. R. Bennett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 5566. A bill for the relief of Ernest A. McNabb; to the Committee on Claims.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1755. By Mr. CANFIELD: Petition of the Prospect Park Memorial Post, No. 240, American Legion, of Prospect Park, N. J., urging the enactment of legislation giving free mailing privileges to persons in military service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1756. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of Carrie M. Spafford and other citizens of South Hadley, Mass., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors on military or naval reservations or within a reasonable distance therefrom, and to prohibit prostitution within a reasonable distance of such reservations; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1757. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of H. E. Withereil and 74 others, protesting against the 49-cent wheat penalty; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1758. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of J. T. Kay, secretary of Midlothian Agricultural Association, Midlothian, Tex., favoring Senate bill 1735; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1759. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Arthur Montz and 32 other citizens of Burlington and the First Congressional District of Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 4845, to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from \$30 to \$40 per month, etc., and House bill 2290, to provide pensions for disabled veterans of the World War under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for as to disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1760. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petitions of sundry citizens of Vermont, opposing enactment of House bill 3852, to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1761. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Vermont, urging passage of House bill 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1762. By Mr. REES of Kansas: Petition of Dickinson County, Kans., farmers, protesting against the Agricultural Adjustment Administration Crop Quota Control Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1763. Also, petition of the Agricultural Producers Association of Geary County, Kans., asking repeal of the Agricultural Adjustment

Act and amendments; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1764. Also, petition of Mrs. J. L. Dunham and other residents of Broughton, Kans., supporting House bill 2475; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1765. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Lena Robuck, urging that the bill to extend the period of service of the selectees and National Guard be defeated; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 13, 1941

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose greatness is unsearchable and whose amazing love crowneth all our days, we are again approaching Thy throne, compelled not only by our necessities, but encouraged by every gracious invitation in Thy Holy Word.

Let Thy hand of blessing rest this day upon all whom Thou hast called to positions of leadership and service in the life of our Republic. We pray that Thou wilt kindle within our hearts the light of divine truth that we may see our duties more clearly, understand them more wisely, and perform them more faithfully.

Help us to cleave with increasing tenacity of purpose and with fond affection to that glorious promise when Thy will shall be known on the earth and Thy saving health to all nations.

Hear us in the name of Him who is the King of kings and the Lord of lords. Amen.

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

## CORONADO INTERNATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 15, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 752) to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial, in the State of Arizona, to make the following change, viz: On page 2, line 7, of the Senate engrossed bill, after the figure "20" and the comma, strike out the words "west half" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "lots 3 and 4."*

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. As I understand it, this resolution is to correct a description of land, which was found to be in error in a bill which the House and the Senate have already passed.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is correct. This is merely a corrective measure.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

## AMENDMENT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE OF LAW

Mr. SCHULTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 5447) to amend section 907 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to second conviction of criminal offenses, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Is this one of the bills to which reference was made yesterday, which bill was to come up yesterday but went over because of the business of yesterday?

Mr. SCHULTE. That is correct. These bills which I shall call up are designed solely to strengthen the laws within the District of Columbia to get rid of the criminal population.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out section 907 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:*

"Sec. 907. Second conviction of misdemeanor: Every person, upon his second conviction of a misdemeanor, may be sentenced to pay a fine not exceeding 50 percent greater, and to suffer imprisonment for a period not more than one-half longer, than the maximum fine and imprisonment for the first offense."

And by inserting immediately after section 907 the following:

"Sec. 907-A. Punishment for second offense of felony: A person who, after having been convicted in the District of Columbia of a felony or, under the laws of any State, Territory, government, or country, of a crime which, if committed in the District of Columbia, would be a felony, commits any felony in the District of Columbia, shall be punished upon conviction of such second felony as follows:

"If the second felony is such that the maximum penalty prescribed by the statute condemning it is imprisonment either for a term of years, or for a term of years and a fine, or for life, then such person must be sentenced to the maximum term of years prescribed or for life, as the case may be, except when such second felony is rape, in which case the punishment shall be imprisonment for the maximum term, or death, as provided by law.

"Sec. 907-B. Punishment for third offense of felony: If any person, having been so convicted the second time as above provided, shall again be convicted of any felony, committed after said second conviction, he shall be punished as follows:

"If the third felony is such that the maximum penalty prescribed by the statute condemning it is imprisonment either for a term of years, or for a term of years and a fine, or for life, then such person must be sentenced to the maximum term of years prescribed, plus one-half of such maximum term of years, or for life, as the case may be, except when such third felony is rape, in which case the punishment shall be im-