

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

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

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

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

WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

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

SENATE.

MONDAY, April 23, 1917.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LUTHER C. HESS,
Speaker of the House.

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

Attest:

Passed the senate April 5, 1917.

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

Attest:

W. M. EDDY,
Secretary of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Territory of Alaska, ss:

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

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

[SEAL.] CHARLES E. DAVIDSON,
Secretary of Alaska.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Attest:

LUTHER C. HESS,
Speaker of the House.

Passed the Senate April 5, 1917.

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

Attest:

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

W. M. EDDY,
Secretary of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Territory of Alaska, ss:

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

CHARLES E. DAVIDSON,
Secretary of Alaska.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GUY H. HARVEY, Secretary.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

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

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

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

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

Resolved—

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

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

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

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

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

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

BOWLING GREEN, KY., April 20, 1917.

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

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

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

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

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

Passed this 20th day of April in assembled session.

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

Attest:

E. H. HYMAN,
Secretary-Manager.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To the Congress of the United States of America:

The Legislature of the Territory of Alaska respectfully represents that—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LUTHER C. HESS,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:

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

Passed the senate April 2, 1917.

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

Attest:

W. M. EDDY,
Secretary of the Senate.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
TERRITORY OF ALASKA.

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

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

[SEAL.]

CHARLES E. DAVIDSON,
Secretary of Alaska.

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

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

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, 1917.

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

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

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

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

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

A PETITION TO CONGRESS.

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

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

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

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

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

NEWTON, KANS., April 21, 1917.

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONRAD, MONT., April 17, 1917.

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

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

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

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

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

J. E. RITCHEY, Mayor.

Attest:

K. L. JOHNSON, City Clerk.

BUTTE, MONT., April 19, 1917.

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

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

BUTTE ROTARY CLUB,
CHAS. AUSTIN, Secretary.

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

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

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

ASSEMBLY CHAMBER, April 2, 1917.

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

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

CHAPTER 37.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SACRAMENTO, CAL., April 20, 1917.

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

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

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

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CAL., April 21, 1917.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FROSTBURG, MD., April 3, 1917.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[SEAL]

SALISBURY, MD., April 5, 1917.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Approved April 9, 1917.

[SEAL.]

Attest:

JAMES F. STRANGE,
Mayor of Annapolis.

PHIL. E. PORTER,
City Clerk.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Stand by President in all war measures, especially conscription.

Another:

We are with the President, and we want conscription.

Another:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Very respectfully,

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

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

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

JACKSON, MICH., April 21, 1917.

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

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

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

We have kept the original for our files.

Yours, truly,

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

JACKSON, MICH., April 21, 1917.

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

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

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

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

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

The Secretary read the letter, as follows:

APRIL 19, 1917.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With best personal regards, I beg to be,

Faithfully, yours,

J. E. BAYLISS.

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

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

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

LANSING, MICH., April 18, 1917.

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

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

ALBERT E. SLEEPER, Governor.

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

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

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

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

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

NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

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

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

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

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

A MEMORIAL FOR NATIONAL PROHIBITION.

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

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

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

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

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

MINISTERS.

Bishops: Charles H. Brent, Frederick Courtney, Walter T. Sumner, and Ethelbert Talbot.

Miscellaneous: Heber J. Grant, William Harmon Van Allen, Shailer Mathews, Percy S. Grant, and Newell Dwight Hillis.

INSURANCE.

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

Miscellaneous: H. R. Albee and John T. Stone.

TRANSPORTATION.

Presidents of railroad companies: Howard Elliott, P. W. Brooks, Henry W. Walbridge, J. H. P. Hught, W. J. Harahan, W. G. Blerd, George W. Stevens, Matthew C. Brush, and T. S. Williams.

Presidents of steamship companies: Robert Dollar, Joshua Green, H. Couby, and Calvin Austin.

Miscellaneous: Jonathan P. Reeves, Frank H. Alfred, J. M. Schoonmaker, Daniel W. McWilliams, Alexander Millar, C. A. Vinnedge, Albert J. Stone, and J. M. Gruber.

EDITORS.

Dailies: E. A. Van Valkenberg, William Allen White, Richard Lloyd Jones, Frank L. Dingley, E. J. Stackpole, Fred N. Dow, James Schermerhorn, George F. Milton, Clark Howell, S. S. McClure, Henry Rising, and Arthur Capper.

Magazines: Alice Stone Blackwell, Mark Sullivan, Lawrence F. Abbott, Paul U. Kellogg, Hamilton Holt, and David Beeroff.

Miscellaneous: G. Carl Huber, A. C. Caruthers, Charles K. Gilbert, G. Lord, E. C. De Wolf, Fred D. Porter, George G. Hunter, Richard H. S. H. Smith, Samuel S. Dale, Arthur D. Rogers, J. Malcolm Muir, Henry Edmonds, D. W. Payne, Harold S. Buttenheim, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Henry Colwell, Stanley R. Edwards, A. J. Findley, Fred E. Rogers, George N. Wardlaw, Arthur L. Rice, John M. Coulter, and Bernard L. Johnson.

BANKERS.

Presidents national banks: F. A. Vanderlip, L. A. Hodge, Eugene Levering, W. J. Montgomery, W. W. Miller, B. H. Scott, W. B. Bonfield, O. K. Taylor, A. J. Crookshanks, Charles S. Hitchborn, H. S. Bovard, Arthur H. Hale, H. J. Branson, George A. Litchfield, H. B. Powell, F. H. Packard, Webb Vincent, J. G. Rounds, Frank F. Bierly, F. A. Funkhouser, C. S. Campbell, James Mitchell, Edward Alley, Edward Bailey, F. E. Swift, Abraham S. Schropp, William Lawson Peel, W. P. Manley, David R. Forgan, Joseph W. Marsh, B. F. Harris, John H. Scudder, Charles Delaney, Eugene T. Norton, J. T. Hackworth, Gordon Jones, Amasa B. Bryant, Foster Copeland, Marvin Campbell, Jordan Philip, Benjamin F. Howell, T. M. Righter, Robert Wardrop, J. D. Baker, Samuel M. Bushman, B. R. Hieronymus, William W. Mills, Mason Evans, B. F. Davis, Clay H. Hollister, George W. Mead, George C. Gill, C. H. McNider, S. G. Bayne, and William Grote.

Presidents savings and other banks: Charles P. Smith, Benton Hanchett, P. W. Morgan, Simon Cassidy, J. W. Fieldhouse, George E. Brock, James Fraunfelder, D. V. Jackson, Newton Doremus, Charles W. Garfield, C. C. Bloomfield, T. B. Preston, L. J. Thomas, H. A. Tapps, A. W. Harris, and James Phinney Baxter.

Presidents trust companies: F. E. Carringer, Fred N. Dow, T. S. Lippy, C. C. Jenks, Frank N. Briggs, Clarence H. Kelsey, Charles A. Boody, Fred L. Childs, Bird W. Spencer, L. E. Kirkpatrick, and William R. Nicholson.

Miscellaneous: George U. Crocker, Samuel McRoberts, John F. Moors, Thomas W. Andrews, Edwin H. Bonsall, J. D. McDowell, Robert H. Gardiner, J. E. Fernald, B. H. Fancher, William M. Ladd, J. W. Hardinbergh, William S. Witham, Arthur S. Johnson, Arthur Perry, and T. G. Turner.

OFFICIALS.

Governors: Lynn J. Frazier, Carl E. Milliken, Thomas E. Campbell, George A. Carlson, M. Alexander, Woodbridge N. Ferris, Simon Bamberger, M. E. Brumbaugh, Arthur Capper, T. C. Rye, Theodore G. Bilbo, Sidney J. Catts, and George W. Hays.

United States Senators: J. H. Gallinger, Miles Polindexter, A. J. Gronna, Morris Sheppard, J. C. W. Beckham, Albert B. Cummins, Bert M. Fernald, James H. Brady, Luke Lea, W. L. Jones, and George E. Chamberlain.

Congressmen: Alben W. Barkley, Scott Ferris, Louis C. Cramton, S. D. Fess, Charles H. Randall, T. W. Sims, and George Edmund Foss. Assistant Secretary of Labor: Louis F. Post.

Former Secretary of State: William J. Bryan. Former governors: L. B. Hanna, E. N. Foss, Oswald West, Chase S. Osborne, Ben W. Hooper, R. B. Glenn, Chester H. Aldrich, Frank M. Byrne, George H. Hodges, John Franklin Fort, B. B. Comer, J. Frank Hanley, Rolland H. Spaulding, Hugh M. Dorsey, Charles W. Gates, and S. R. Van Sant.

Former Congressmen: Richmond Pearson Hobson and Frederick Landis.

JUDGES.

Supreme or superior State court: Nelson Y. Dungan, W. H. Sawyer, Joseph A. McCullough, W. H. Thomas, Rollin H. Person, and W. H. Taylor.

United States district court: William B. Sheppard, John M. Killets, Frank A. Youmans, Edward R. Meek, Francis E. Baker, Alston G. Dayton, E. S. Farrington, Walter I. Smith, James D. Elliott, Thomas Ives Chatfield, Thomas C. Munger, Benjamin F. Bledsoe, Harland B. Howe, Page Morris, C. C. Kohlsaat, and Arthur L. Sanborn.

State supreme court (retired): Claudius B. Grant, Manoa B. Reese, J. B. Hannah, Samuel D. Weakley, and Lucius A. Emery.

Miscellaneous: Arthur J. Duntun, Ben B. Lindsey, Edwin C. Reynolds, A. L. Sutton, J. W. Curtis, and William A. Gemmill.

ENGINEERS.

Civil, mechanical, electrical, and miscellaneous: Fay Woodmansee, Harry McCormack, Walter Renton Ingalls, Harold B. Smith, Horace C. Gardner, Herbert S. Kimball, Bion J. Arnold, Knight C. Richmond, Arthur F. Gray, Benjamin F. Bailey, R. M. Catlin, W. H. S. Stevens, George F. Hardy, Henry H. Humphrey, George M. Brill, J. Well, Simon Lake, and J. C. Clark.

ATTORNEYS.

G. T. Fitzhugh, John N. Dryden, William T. Thompson, Mornay Williams, Frank M. Thompson, Robert McMurdy, George Wharton Pepper, Edward Elliott, and Charles Thaddeus Terry.

LABOR LEADERS.

E. J. Keenan, J. Stitt Wilson, J. M. Kline, Warren S. Stone, and John B. Lennon.

MEDICAL SPECIALISTS, HEALTH COMMISSIONERS, ETC.

W. J. Mayo, Victor C. Vaughn, Haven Emerson, Richard C. Cabot, Theodore C. Janeway, William A. White, Richard M. Pearce, Henry R. Christian, Ludwig Heekte, Edward Martin, James J. Walsh, William R. Williams, J. Emmons Briggs, W. W. Keen, Eugene L. Fisk, L. Emmett Holt, Francis Carter Wood, William De Kline, J. K. Kellogg, J. E. W. Wallin, E. E. Montgomery, William G. MacCallum, James Bronson Reynolds, Henry O. Marcy, W. A. Evans, and Charles H. Young.

HUMANITARIANS AND SOCIAL UPLIFT WORKERS.

Maud Ballington Booth, Owen R. Lovejoy, Jane Addams, Charles Stelzel, Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch, Warren F. Spalding, Luther H. Gulick, Dudley A. Sargent, Don R. Grout, Borden Harriman, C. C. Carstens, V. Everit Macy, William T. Shanahan, W. D. Weatherford, John F. Moors, Homer Folks, Timothy Nicholson, Raymond Robins, John Haynes Holmes, Robert Treat Payne, Frederick Almy, Robert A. Woods, Charles W. Birthwell, Katherine Bement Davis, Louise de Koven Bowen, Francis H. Gavis, Charles Loring Brace, C. W. Stiles, and Albert Warren Ferris.

AUTHORS, POETS, ARTISTS.

Vance Thompson, Ray Stannard Baker, Samuel Hopkins Adams, John Sparge, George W. Cable, Hamlin Garland, Nathan Haskell Dole, Mary Antin, C. Hanford Henderson, Vachel Lindsay, George Sterling, Ernest Thompson Seton, Upton Sinclair, Booth Tarkington, Jack London, John Burroughs, Meredith Nicholson, Gutten Berglum, Winston Churchill, Austin O'Malley, William Lyon Phelps, Walter Rauschenbusch, and Robert Haven Schauflier.

ARMY OFFICERS.

Nelson A. Miles, L. Mervin Maus, and Edward L. Munson.

CAPITALISTS.

J. G. Phelps Stokes, James N. Jarvie, William F. Cochran, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., V. Everett Macy, and John E. Gill.

ECONOMISTS.

Walter W. McLaren, Willard E. Hotchkiss, Jessica B. Poixette, Davis R. Dewey, Robert T. Hill, James D. Barnett, Frances Newton Thorpe, Robert C. Brooks, R. S. Saby, William A. Schaper, John H. Vaughn, Donald F. Grass, Oswald W. Knauth, Henry S. Seager, Karl F. Geiser, William Watts Folwell, J. W. Gardner, George Elliott Howard, F. E. Horack, and J. Allen Smith.

SOCIOLOGISTS.

Robert N. Shenton, Loran D. Osborn, Edward A. Ross, Walter G. Beach, F. H. Hawkins, Frank W. Blackmar, and Edward Cary Hayes.

PROFESSORS OF MEDICINE AND ITS BRANCHES.

Henry J. Berkley, Albert M. Barrett, Thomas Ordway, M. J. Rosenau, Paul F. Clark, Oscar B. Hunter, Edwin O. Jordan, E. D. Congdon, Basil C. H. Harvey, Simon H. Gage, F. N. Whittier, Max F. Meyer, Mazyck P. Ravenel, John B. Johnston, C. S. Merrill, John M. Dodson, N. Emmons Faine, Joseph Saller, George W. Bartelmax, Thomas G. Lee, Edwin B. Frost, and Maurice Mulvania.

MEDICINE.

Howard A. Kelly, H. Gideon Wells, John M. T. Finney, Harold E. Robertson, Frederick T. Lewis, Walter S. Cornell, Walter B. Cannon, James P. Porter, Albert Poffenberger, C. J. Bartlett, Aldred Scott Warthin, Harvey Ernest Jordan, Warren P. Lombard, H. F. Hewes, Joseph McFarland, Albert C. Crawford, Stevenson Smith, and Norman Wilde.

POLITICS AND LAW.

Charles Shirley Potts, Wm. L. Burdick, Arthur N. Holcombe, Harry F. Ward, Meyer Bloomfield, William Starr Myers, Joseph W. Bingham, Ella Flagg Young, Edward A. Steiner, Samuel McCune Lindsay, and Wm. Bethke.

PROFESSORS OF PHYSIOLOGY.

E. T. Reichert, Yandell Henderson, Edwin Fauver, C. C. Guthrie, Colin C. Stewart, Horace C. Swan, Albert P. Mathews, Winfield Scott Hall, Warren H. Lewis, Theodore Hough, A. J. Carlson, E. B. Delabarre, and F. H. Howard.

PROFESSORS OF CIVIL, MECHANICAL, AND MISCELLANEOUS ENGINEERING.

C. J. Tilden, Walter Rautenstrauch, Arthur F. Barnes, E. G. Hoefler, John R. Allen, A. E. Kennelly, F. F. McIntosh, F. L. Bishop, George C. Whipple, Lewis J. Johnson, J. H. James, Wm. H. Walker, Wm. E. Wickenden, A. C. Boyle, James P. Calderwood, P. F. Walker, Edward N. Zern, Reid T. Stewart, Robert Fletcher, C. N. Little, Morgan Brooks, and Edward Bennett.

BIOLOGISTS.

Lorande Loss Woodruff, C. E. Turner, Morton J. Elrod, F. W. Carpenter, William A. Kepner, Spencer Trotter, George F. White, Lucius H. Merrill, Ulric Dahlgren, Wm. C. Rose, Albert B. Ulrey, D. E. Merrill, H. W. Conn, Alfred O. Gross, and Francis Ramaley.

ZOOLOGISTS.

John T. Patterson, Theodore D. A. Cockerell, Alexander G. Ruthven, William L. Tower, Harold Heath, William Patten, O. C. Glaser, George C. Price, C. H. Gilbert, Herman Carey Bumpus, Edwin G. Conklin, and Henry F. Osborn.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Howard R. Reiter, Wilson H. Henderson, George W. Ehler, Clark W. Hetherington, E. F. Ladd, W. A. Henry, J. S. Jones, E. V. McCollum, R. C. Bentley, Ellwood P. Cubberley, M. V. O'Shea, David Snedden, F. E. Austin, R. L. Green, James N. Hart, James P. Lichtenberger, William Pepperell Montague, W. W. Comfort, Richard J. H. Gotthell, Vida D. Scudder, F. R. Hamilton, John C. Van Dyke, George B. Haven, Amos P. Wilder, Charles B. Davenport, Alexander N. Winchell, Joseph Barrell, Ellen Hayes, Paul A. Lewis, Samuel S. Edmands, James C. Egbert, H. H. Goddard, Fernando Sanford, Norton A. Kent, June E. Downey, Edward L. Thorndike, Walter B. Pillsbury, Erwin W. Runkle, Elliott Park Frost, Lawrence W. Cole, Henry Clay McComas, Jr., W. S. Hunter, Madison Bentley, F. R. Kneeland, Marston T. Bogert, Allen W. C. Menzies, George A. Hulett, F. W. Christensen, John Dewey, William Romaine Newbold, George H. Palmer, Edwin Diller Starbuck, and P. P. Claxton.

MANUFACTURERS AND MERCHANTS.

Iron and steel products: Elbert H. Gary, John C. Haswell, Wallace H. Rowe, C. S. Robinson, Edward O. Goss, C. W. Martin, William A. Harris, E. C. Spear, Bishop White, R. C. Kirk, Charles L. Huston, John A. Mathews, T. J. Gillespie, Lionel J. Kane, C. Edward Murray, J. J. Eagan, J. W. Harrison, William R. Rogers, David D. Lupton, W. R. McClave, J. A. Campbell, W. A. May, Milton T. Pickles, R. M. Downie, Howard A. Fitch, Thomas J. McKaye, Charles Streatman, N. N. Hill, C. B. Calder, E. C. Knapp, W. H. Wilbur, C. R. McIlroy, Alton Farrel, W. H. Reid, W. F. Evans, James Bowron, Harry M. Estabrook, L. M. Bowers, W. T. Hildrup, Jr., W. H. Cowdery, Thomas E. Palmer, Alfred H. Ames, H. A. Higgins, Byron A. Walker, William H. Hamilton, Charles B. Eddy, Frederick E. Perkins, G. E. Savage, W. E. Sessions, C. Edwin Michael, Fred W. Snow, J. Henry Longmaid, H. Gerrish Smith, J. E. Baum, Jeremiah

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

MACHINERY.

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

TEXTILE.

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

PAPER.

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

AUTOMOBILES.

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

MINING AND OIL.

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

WOOD AND LUMBER.

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

SHOES.

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

FOODSTUFFS.

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

ELECTRICAL.

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

GENERAL MERCHANTS.

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

MISCELLANEOUS.

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

MISCELLANEOUS SCIENTISTS.

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

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

COMPULSORY MILITARY SERVICE.

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

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

The Secretary read as follows:

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

Hon. PORTER J. McCUMBER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yours, truly,

H. R. STRONG.

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

INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

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

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

The memorandum is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted.

NORMAN THOMAS,
Secretary Fellowship of Reconciliation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland:

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

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

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

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

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

By Mr. CURTIS:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By Mr. PHELAN:

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

By Mr. KENYON:

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

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

By Mr. OVERMAN:

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

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

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

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

By Mr. SHAFROTH:

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

By Mr. WALSH:

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

By Mr. WEEKS:

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

By Mr. ASHURST:

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

By Mr. WATSON:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By Mr. LODGE:

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

By Mr. GALLINGER:

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

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

SEIZURE OF ENEMY VESSELS.

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

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

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

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

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

INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REQUISITION OF VESSELS.

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

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

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS.

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

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

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

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

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

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

RAILROAD FREIGHT RATES.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AFFAIRS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

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

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

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

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

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

ADDRESS BY JOHN SKELTON WILLIAMS.

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

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

INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

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

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ISSUANCE OF BONDS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

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

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

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the conference report, as follows:

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

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

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

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

And the Senate agree to the same.

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

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

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

Managers on the part of the Senate.

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

Managers on the part of the House.

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

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

The report was agreed to.

INCREASE OF MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WEEKS. I do.

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

Mr. WEEKS. Not at all.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the Senator.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. LODGE. Above the average.

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. I think so.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator thinks so?

Mr. WEEKS. I absolutely think so.

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

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. I do not think so.

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. More than five.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. I think I can answer that.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Florida: Lake City Citizen-Reporter and Index.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

South Dakota: Aberdeen News and American.

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

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

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

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

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

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

New Mexico: Albuquerque Journal and Roswell Record and News.

Nevada: Reno Journal.

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

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

Idaho: Boise Statesman and Twin Falls News and Times.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WEEKS. I yield to the Senator.

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

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

Mr. WATSON. Precisely; but—

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

Mr. WATSON. Certainly. Pardon me.

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

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

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

Mr. WATSON. Precisely; one follows the other.

Mr. WEEKS. One follows the other.

Mr. WATSON. Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. He will.

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

Mr. WEEKS. Not at all.

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

Mr. WEEKS. Not at all.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

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

Mr. WEEKS. It is.

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

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

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

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

Mr. LODGE. They had four years' training.

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

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WATSON. But after all—

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

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. Oh, I understand.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

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

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

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

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

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. WEEKS. I do.

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

Mr. WEEKS. Absolutely so.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vaillant has said that—

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

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

ORGANIZED LABOR ACTED WISELY IN ENDORSING COMPULSORY UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

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

Mr. WEEKS. That is quite true.

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

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

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Delaware: James F. Price, Wilmington.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

New Mexico: J. H. Mullin, Roswell.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WEEKS. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to ask the Senator, since he has made a number of references to what is popularly known as the slacker, if he considers the slacker morally deficient?

Mr. WEEKS. Well, Mr. President, I had not thought of it in exactly that way.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator knows that this bill exempts the morally deficient from the operation of the law.

Mr. WEEKS. That being the case, I do not consider him morally deficient.

Mr. THOMAS. I presume that for the purposes of this bill the Senator would include him as an individual subject to its terms?

Mr. WEEKS. I think so.

Mr. THOMAS. To my mind this is a remarkable bill in that it seems to me to exempt the very class the existence of which is one of the strongest arguments that the Senator is using in favor of this bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

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

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

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

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

Mr. McKELLAR. Most of them are.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And then he made this appeal:

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

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

Mr. WADSWORTH obtained the floor.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. Certainly.

Mr. KELLOGG. At once?

Mr. WEEKS. I certainly do.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. KELLOGG. That is what I mean.

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. Of course not.

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

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. I have yielded the floor.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator means above 25?

Mr. KENYON. Above 25.

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

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

Mr. WEEKS. Quite likely.

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

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

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

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

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

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

Mr. KELLOGG. Yes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true.

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. It will.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BORAH. Exactly.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. BORAH. Except that they have had training.

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

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

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

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

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

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

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

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

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

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

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

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under the existing law?

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

Mr. WADSWORTH. I can answer "yes" and "no" to that question. At the present moment, of course, he would enlist subject to the regular enlistment contract; but the assurance has been given to all those who have presented themselves for enlistment since April 1 that, whereas they sign such an enlistment contract as is provided for by law for the Regular Army, they will, in fact, be discharged at the end of the war.

Mr. SHERMAN. That, however, is merely a regulation of the War Department, and there is no authority of law, is there, to recruit forces—

Mr. WILLIAMS. There will be after this bill passes—

Mr. SHERMAN. There is no authority of law, outside of this bill, is there, to recruit forces except under the regular terms of enlistment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is what we are waiting for.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand that. I am not talking about the provisions of the bill; I am talking about the conditions attending enlistment under existing law.

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

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator knows that the President can discharge any man at any time for the good of the service; and if he can discharge one man, he can discharge a unit.

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly; but I know equally well, if the Senator from New York will permit me, that when war exists and any private or officer is discharged for the good of the service, he will be regarded as having a dishonorable record. So, practically it leaves, does it not, the recruiting stations in a condition where the recruit must enlist, outside of this extra legal contract, for the full term of seven years? He can not enlist legally for the period of the war, can he, under the present provisions of this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true.

Mr. SHERMAN. May not that have something to do with the indisposition in many places to volunteer?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I said a few moments ago that I believed that the comparative indisposition of men to come forward and volunteer at this time is due to the fact that they do not know what the policy of the Government is going to be, and that when this act is passed we will find volunteers much more ready to come forward.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I ask further, if the Senator will permit me—because sometimes we can get a great deal of information as we go along in an informal way—if at the time the resolution declaring war passed the President did not have power to issue a proclamation calling for volunteers, in the absence of special legislation on the subject?

Mr. WADSWORTH. He did.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think he did. I believe that power has been exercised, Mr. President, a number of times in the history of this country, notably on the 15th day of April, 1861, the day following the surrender of Fort Sumter, when he called for 75,000 volunteers. The President convened Congress in extraordinary session on the 4th of July, 1861, not to pass a conscription act, but to consider legislation generally.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. THOMAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. SHERMAN. I will conclude in a moment. The President at that time called for volunteers. Suppose the President of the United States at the time we declared war a few days ago had called for volunteers. He would possibly have had power then to limit enlistments for the period of the war. He did not do so. If such a call had been made, as it was made in 1861, would not that have completely demonstrated whether volunteers would offer in adequate numbers for the public defense?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President—

Mr. SHERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee, with the consent of the Senator from New York.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator from New York yield to me to answer the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to direct attention to the fact that the act of April 25, 1914, known as the volunteer army act, specifically provides that volunteers can only be called for by the President after the President has been authorized to do so by Congress.

Mr. SHERMAN. I understand that. The information I am trying to get is what is responsible for the apparent indisposition in certain places of men to volunteer; and I think the Senator will agree with me that the difficulty I have suggested may have something to do with it.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I will.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Illinois has referred to the first call for 75,000 men by President Lincoln. He will find if he examines the form of that call that it was a call upon the National Guard, on the militia, for that number of troops.

Mr. WADSWORTH. On the militia of the States.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have read the call. They were called for the Federal service.

Mr. NELSON. It was a call upon the militia to furnish that number of soldiers. It was a call upon the States.

Mr. SHERMAN. They were for the Federal service. I will ask further if the call of April 15, 1861, was not followed by the call of May, 1861—about the 22d of May, if my memory serves me aright—in the absence of legislation? Congress did not convene in extraordinary session until the 4th of July of that year. The second call was for 500,000 men. That tested the question of whether volunteers would offer themselves in sufficient numbers. Now, would it not have been fair, at least to the volunteer system, for the Executive to have made a call in this crisis, so that we might have some adequate information as to the response of the loyal sentiment of the country? That would have met any argument that might be offered by Senators if it had been done. There is no answer to arithmetic. All we can do now is to say what possibly would have happened if it had been done.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I ask this question, Mr. President, because I think the Senator from New York has a familiarity with the subject that is possessed by few of us. First, I should like to inquire, under the bill as it is now presented, how long, in the opinion of the Senator from New York, will it take the United States to have an effective fighting force?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, Mr. President, I hardly dare venture an opinion on that question. It depends upon the definition of an "effective fighting force." There are so many elements that enter into it that I hardly feel competent to answer it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The bill provides, first, for a half million men by selective draft. How long, in the Senator's opinion, will it be before that half million fighting force will be ready to engage in the present conflict?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, as was brought out in the debate on Saturday, it has been estimated that on or about August 1 those half million men produced by the selective draft will be in the mobilization camps in the 16 divisional areas, with all their equipment ready for them. We can only estimate the length of time after that which must transpire to make an effective force suitable for use in this tremendous war by having regard to the experience of other countries. It is generally understood that the British consume eight months in steady, unrelenting work teaching their men how to wage this kind of warfare. Then they are sent to France and there have a month or six weeks' additional training in conjunction with veteran troops, who, as it were, teach them the finishing touches. So that it would be 9 months or 10 months, in all probability, before we could send those 500,000 drafted men into the trenches.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the Senator will allow me to continue my answer, much will depend also upon what sort of officers are teaching those 500,000 men.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Everything will depend upon that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It would not be extravagant, then, Mr. President, to concede that, under the proposed legislation, it would take a year, substantially, to have any sort of effective fighting force in the United States?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; Mr. President, I do not concede that. My observations were directed only toward the 500,000 to be produced by the selective draft.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But, in the meantime, the expanded Regular Army will be far ahead of the selective draft army in efficiency, and so will the expanded National Guard. I think those troops, or, speaking generally, the average of them will be ready for effective field service long before the 500,000 secured under the draft.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is, if you succeed in having men volunteer substantially in those two branches of the service.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; Mr. President, the success of filling those two branches is not dependent upon volunteering.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Substantially.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken, if I may say so. The bill provides that if volunteering does not produce them within a time deemed reasonable by the President, they shall be filled by the draft.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, yes; but first you undertake to obtain the requisite number by volunteering. Now, there are a very large number of our citizens, are there not, who have had military training in one form or another, who might volunteer for service under a general call for volunteers—

Mr. WILLIAMS. They all want to volunteer for commissions.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (continuing). And particularly if they believed that they were to have actual service in the military department of the Government?

The point I should like to make with the Senator is this: If, after Sumter had been fired upon, a proposed measure such as this had been presented in order that there might be an effective force in this Nation, we can let our imaginations run rife as to what might have transpired during that effective force coming together under a selective draft. But the President then resorted to the two modes of seeking volunteers. He resorted to them in an emergency, it is true. In this instance, if we are going to fight our war otherwise than by money, and if we may obtain an army by a call for volunteers more quickly than

by the proposed method, what objection is there to the call for volunteers being made in conjunction with all that is now proposed by this bill?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not think the analogy recited by the Senator from California is an accurate one. No comparison can be made between the conditions of 1861 and the conditions here in the United States with respect to the great world war of 1917. In 1861 there was no time whatsoever to lose. Both sides rushed to arms under the volunteer system. Of course it would have been impossible for President Lincoln to ask the Congress in 1861 to take a bill such as this and build up, through the processes of a selective draft, a carefully devised and constructed army. Washington would have been captured by the Virginians while the bill was being discussed here in the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is exactly the point.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But, Mr. President, fortunately the United States is in no such peril to-day. Our own Navy and the British Navy are protecting us from invasion and giving us, thank Heaven, time to build a real army from the ground up, which shall be efficient, carefully selected in all its elements, all errors, if possible, avoided, built upon the experience of other nations, lessons learned from their mistakes and their successes; assistance from such an army. It could not be done. Our duty is to build a real army, which can compare favorably with the best armies now fighting and hold its own against any enemy that confronts it. That is the purpose of this bill. This new army is to stand the test as long as this war lasts and bear every conceivable burden that can be placed upon it in this war of trained men. The two conditions are not analogous, I say, with all respect to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, the reason I asked was because I knew the Senator was thoroughly prepared to answer any query of the sort.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not boast of that, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Oh, well, I grant it to the Senator, and grant it to him very readily, indeed; but I am still unable to understand why, if we are going to fight in this war, we should not take every available means—the volunteer system, the draft, begin with our universal military training, and the like. I assume that the Senator from New York perhaps is not familiar with what may be the ultimate policy, but may I inquire whether the ultimate policy is that this country shall or shall not send soldiers abroad?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I am not competent to announce what the policy of the administration is. I can state my personal view. My personal view and hope is that at the earliest opportunity a force of trained American troops shall appear upon the soil of France.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator from New York will pardon me for the interruption, it seems to me that this bill answers the question just propounded by the Senator from California. There is no reason for the existence of this bill unless our object be to prepare an efficient army, ready to go to France or Belgium or Germany, wherever the war in Europe may call us and making ourselves fit to go when we are sent. If we were merely preparing an army to keep Germany from invading America we would not resort to this, of course, nor resort to the idea which the Senator has in his mind now. We would be making a useless waste of money. We had better turn the entire Army appropriation bill into the Navy and be done with it. The bill itself answers the question as to whether there is any intention to send troops to Europe if we ever get the troops, fit troops, equipped troops. We do not want to send boys there to be murdered—untrained, unequipped, unfit in every way.

One more word in this connection: If we had to meet conditions like those during the Civil War, of which Von Moltke said that for 12 months it was a war of armed mobs, that would be a different proposition, because the northern armed mob and the southern armed mob were equal to one another. Sending an armed mob to Europe to be shot down with machine guns and under modern conditions of trench warfare would not only be unwise but it would be brutal; and the very reason why we are undertaking here to prepare an army which shall be, individually and by companies and by regiments and by divisions, prepared to do actual service, is that we expect them to see actual service abroad. Nobody expects Germany to invade America, unless she invades the border down by Mexico, through Mexican machinations by German bribery with a few Mexican bandits.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Mississippi for a very definite answer to the query that I propounded. It is exactly in line with what I thought would be the answer to that particular query.

Let me set the mind of the Senator at rest by saying that there is no design upon my part, there is no design upon the part of any man who believes in a volunteer system, to send a mob, unprepared and unequipped, to be shot down in France or Belgium or any other place on the face of the earth. The insistence is that any army that we have shall be equipped and prepared, and the like; but the problem is whether you can not prepare and equip an army more readily and quickly under a call for volunteers than you can under the particular system that is suggested by this bill.

All of us agree, none of us disagree, that any men of our fighting force must be physically fit and must be fully equipped. There is no disagreement upon that score in the slightest degree.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield further to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I rise again for the purpose of saying that I did not misunderstand the Senator from California. I had no idea that a man of his good sense would have had the notion that we should send men unprepared to become merely food for cannon. I was merely answering the question and explaining, upon the basis of the bill, that the question answered itself, provided that the bill be passed, and that the question answered itself for the reason that I knew he would agree that we do not want to send abroad merely "food for cannon."

Now, there is one other thing. Do not make this mistake about the volunteer system: In the War between the States here were brothers quarreling in a family, and whenever brothers do quarrel, and reach the fighting point, each one is anxious to get at the other's throat, principally for the reason that he is so indignant that his own brother should be angry with him and should be fighting with him. Now, if you expect to arouse that sort of passion, which existed in the South and in the North both when the War between the States began where each man wanted to get at the other and kill him, you are not going to have that. There is no hatred of the German people in the American heart to-day, as there was hatred of Yankees in the southern heart and hatred of rebels in the northern heart at that time. You can not rely upon that spontaneous feeling that makes every fellow rush for fear the war may be over before he can get there. This is a different proposition. It is a matter of modern military machinery and mechanics, and the men have got to be taught to manage the machinery and the mechanics; and they ought to be taught it under men who at least have made a study of the science, whether they have succeeded in becoming masters of it or not, but at least men who are supposed to have some knowledge of it. My own father's regiment at the Battle of Shiloh ran over a whole brigade of Federal troops at their breakfast. Why? Because they were under the command of political general, a political brigadier, who had never known what to do with himself or his troops.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, just one word and then I am done.

I am very thankful for the remark of the Senator from Mississippi. He is quite right. I agree entirely with all that he has said. The idea that is in my mind, of the generation since the Civil War—and I may pause to say that the most charming thing in this whole debate has been to see the men of the North and the men of the South uniting for a common country—but of a generation since the Civil War, as I am, I have just this thought: If the Nation goes into war, it goes into war to fight, and there is something that is repugnant to me as an American in thinking that there is a possibility—which now happily is removed by the remarks of the Senator from Mississippi—of our fighting alone with our dollars.

We are going to fight, I see from the remarks that have been made, not alone with all of our resources, but we are going to fight with well-equipped men; and I quite agree, as well, that it is not a fight in animosity or in hatred or in bitterness at all. It is not at all a contest wherein the German people have from us anything but the kindest sentiments and the kindest feelings, and wherein we do ought else than desire to see a lasting and a just peace for that people as well as for every other people on the face of the earth. Nevertheless, we are in war, and when you are in war there is just one thing to do—to fight with every bit of force that you possess. That is why I asked the questions concerning the various modes of fighting, merely to elicit the information in that regard.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope to have an opportunity to continue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One word, and I will cease to interrupt the Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a brief statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to say that one reason why I said what I said was because I agree precisely with the Senator from California that about the most contemptible thing any people on the surface of the earth can do, or has ever done, or may hereafter do, is to fight merely with dollars; and, above all people in the world, the people from my section of the country, who know how much a dollar does accomplish in war, have that feeling, because we suffered by it, and suffered a great deal.

There is no intention upon the part of this administration—and I am authorized to speak that far by my knowledge of the character of the President and of the men who are running the administration—to sink to the low level of defending American rights and avenging American lives and defending the liberty of the world and small States and defending the right of democracy to have a place to stand in under the sun with nothing but dollars. We are going to defend those American and humanitarian rights with dollars and with men and with endurance and with suffering, and with everything else of which we assert mastership. Whatsoever it shall cost, that we shall pay. Whatsoever suffering comes, that we shall endure; and whatsoever there may be of worse than suffering, that too, we shall stand to the bitter end. Whatsoever must be borne, that we shall bear. One of the beauties of the opportunity that we now have is this: We can put an end forever to the infamous lie that the American people are not a nation but are nothing but a conglomerate association of dollar hunters and of dollar makers. I am glad that the Senator from California had in his heart and has expressed the very feeling that every man south of Mason and Dixon's line has—that is, every man who has a right to live there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I had reached that point in my remarks where I had about concluded a discussion of the use of the instruments which we now have at hand, or, rather, the enlargement and perfection of them, and had not reached that part of my discussion which has to do with the selective draft as contrasted with the volunteer system. However, at this point I desire, if I may, to impress upon the Senators some of the elements of the task that we are about to embark upon if this bill or a similar bill becomes a law.

Under this bill, and even under the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], it is contemplated that 36 tactical divisions shall be organized, equipped, and trained in the continental United States. They will total a little over 1,200,000 men. It will be seen at a glance that that is the biggest single effort that the United States has ever embarked upon. It will be recognized also, I think, by every thoughtful man that there is a very dire scarcity in the United States of trained and educated soldiers who can lead us in that effort, and that whereas enthusiasm is always good and outbursts of patriotism, of course, are valuable and never should be discounted, nevertheless, when we view the size of the task ahead of us, and the scarcity of the tools with which at the beginning we must work, it ought to be apparent that we would better go slowly and build surely than to act with haste and make a complete failure of it, as we have done on former occasions when we have attempted tasks which at the outset were nowhere near as big as the one we are going to attempt under the provisions of this bill and the plans of the administration.

Thirty-six tactical divisions, 28,000 men to a division; 12,000 animals, horses and mules, and at least 1,000 wagons for each division; approximately 600 motor trucks for each division; each division containing every element that is ever seen in an army, every branch of the service being represented in proper proportions; presumably 36 divisional mobilization camps, at which will be congregated, respectively, the 28,000 men and 12,000 animals, requiring a water supply equal to and probably exceeding that of a city of 25,000 people—all must be prepared from the ground up. No mistakes must be made. It can not be done in a hurry. If it is, you will have thousands of men fill in hospitals and wasted. Mile upon mile of cantonments must be built in which the men will live—for they can not be expected to live under canvas with any degree of comfort in the northern part of the United States subsequent to December 1 next. Mountains and mountains of sacked oats and baled hay for the horses and mules, exceeding anything we have ever attempted before; medical supplies accumulated to an extent that we have never comprehended before; hundreds of physicians as commissioned surgeons to take care of these

1,200,000 men, most of whom will be green recruits. The mind can scarcely picture the extent of this effort and the enormous undertaking it represents; and no man can exaggerate the utmost importance of building carefully, conserving our resources, controlling every stage of the progress, reducing to a minimum the waste in human lives and in the materials upon which the soldiers and the animals must live.

It will not do for us, Mr. President, to say, "Let us throw together a volunteer army of 500,000 by the mere proclamation of the President." That would be but the beginning, and the vice of such a process is this: That in the hasty throwing together of an army of volunteers of 500,000 men the Government would have little control over the qualifications of the officers. It would be compelled, in the very nature of things, to take the men who present themselves in units already organized. A patriotic and popular citizen in my town or your town under such a call can organize a company or a troop, and by his personal influence and his popularity he can get them together, no doubt; but he will want to be the captain. That is the way it will work; and the chances are he will not be an efficient captain. Likewise, it is said, regiments can be organized overnight. I have heard it stated that it can be done in 48 hours in some of the communities of this country, and probably it is true; but you have got to take the colonel and the lieutenant colonel and the three majors that are offered to the War Department under those circumstances. If the War Department attempts seriously to resist that pressure for commissions in the Volunteer Army, Senators will find themselves wearing out shoe leather between the Capitol and the War Department trying to get commissions for their friends. We will all have to do it under any such system, begging for special favors for men that we happen to know back in our home States; and this great effort of ours that I have tried to picture, and have failed utterly in painting adequately, will inevitably fail, and we will be the scorn and the laughing stock of the great military nations of the world, particularly the allies, who are fighting our battles to-day. But if they see us starting in by a process of careful selection to use our wonderful material in all those channels of effort in which it can be best used, when they see that we mean to build something that shall endure, that shall not stumble or fail in this great emergency, which can carry the burden, no matter how heavy it may be, then they will know that America's assistance is a real force in bringing this war to an early conclusion. That will be the sign that will tell England, and France, and Russia, and Belgium, and Serbia that America is enlisted for the war, no matter how long it lasts. But if we take the old-fashioned, haphazard methods under which we have wasted thousands and thousands of lives in the past, and prolonged our wars instead of shortening them, our efforts will not command the respect of the Governments of the allied powers, with whom eventually, I hope, we shall be co-operating actively upon the battle fronts of Europe.

I have just as intense a desire as the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] that we shall join in the fighting at the earliest possible date, provided we do it effectively. Should we send over a body of half-trained volunteers, it is true, enthusiasm would sweep over this broad land, and we would give them a send-off that no expeditionary force leaving the shores of America ever received; and undoubtedly the devoted people of France would greet them with an enthusiasm and a heartiness that would bring the tears of gratification to our eyes; but, my friends, when they got into the trenches such a force would be a burden upon France instead of an assistance.

Mr. HARDWICK and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator yield?

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

Mr. HARDWICK. I was just going to inquire of the Senator whether he regarded Canada's efforts—in which three-quarters of a million men were raised, or some such number as that—as of the same character as the situation which he has just described; and, if not, why we could not try for a while the same system that Canada seems to have tried with some success and without exciting the contempt of the allies? Also, I should be glad if the Senator would state how many men England raised by voluntary enlistment before she undertook to enforce conscription, and why she delayed so long in putting into effect any form of conscription there.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, those very topics were discussed in a running debate here in the Senate on Saturday afternoon, and at the risk of repetition—

Mr. HARDWICK. By the Senator? I did not hear the Senator on that subject.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The Senator from New York was one of perhaps six or eight Senators who took part in a running debate on this question of the volunteers of Canada and the volunteers of England.

Mr. HARDWICK. But, really, I am seeking information about this matter to a greater extent than is perhaps apparent from the latter part of what I have said. I am thinking about these things, and I should like to have the Senator's views on these questions.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, of course it is well known that the Dominion of Canada has sent approximately 400,000 men into the army.

Mr. HARDWICK. I saw the statement made very recently that the figure now was nearly three-quarters of a million.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Seven hundred and fifty thousand?

Mr. HARDWICK. Nearly that; yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am quite certain that the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, the statement was made yesterday in the public press of the country.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The number, I am quite certain, is in the neighborhood of 400,000 men. True, that number was raised by a so-called volunteer system.

Mr. HARDWICK. Are not the Canadian troops the best the allies have had?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am not denying their excellence for a moment.

Mr. HARDWICK. Why should not America have the same system under the same category?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I was about to reach that. It is true, as I said, that Canada has sent in the neighborhood of 400,000 under the volunteer system. The truth of the matter is, however, that Canada in the first six months of actual fighting in France wasted the best men of Canada, who should have been carefully selected, and would have been under the provisions of a law similar to this, and been used as officer material. I mentioned a regiment Saturday afternoon as an example, two-thirds of which was well known to be of officer material, 1,600 men, the Princess Patricia Regiment. There has never been a volunteer regiment that I know of in the history of any country that had a finer and a more splendid personnel than that. In six weeks' time after reaching the trenches only 40 were left. They can never be replaced. They should have been officered the other Canadian regiments. The sacrifice of those men was infinitely more than that represented by the killing and wounding of, say, 1,500 of them, because they would have been of more service to their country in the positions for which they were best qualified. The same is true of the first troops sent by Great Britain to France in that wonderful response to the call for volunteers.

Mr. HARDWICK. May I interrupt the Senator again? Could not the selective principle be applied just as well to the volunteer system as to the conscriptive system?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do not see how.

Mr. HARDWICK. Is not that exactly what Canada is doing?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If you could not fill your quota with volunteers you must resort to draft.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not know, but I have been informed by a Senator on this floor that Canada is now applying the selective principle—the main principle the Senator is lauding now—to the volunteer system and in practically three years has not yet resorted to conscription.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There is another reason, however, for their failure to resort to conscription.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator state it, because I should like to have all the information I can?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The political influence in the Canadian Government of the Province of Quebec, which is largely responsible for their not having conscription.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Province of Quebec is of very small influence in the Dominion.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is sufficient to have great power in the Canadian Government as now constituted, as the Senator can readily see. Of course, that is a mere expression of opinion and may or may not be well founded.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not belittling the volunteers of Canada. The Senator misunderstood me. The Senator is mistaken when he says that the Province of Quebec is exerting an influence to prevent conscription. The truth is that the Province of Quebec furnishes a very small quota to the Canadian Army.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is true.

Mr. GALLINGER. Inasmuch as the Province of Quebec is negligible, so far as the Dominion of Canada is concerned, it would seem as though the conscription would be resorted to so

as to force those men into the army to the extent of other Provinces. I suppose the Senator knows that Australia rejected the system of conscription. So it is not universal. Yet the Senator contends that conscription is universally recognized as the best system.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In commenting on the first portion of the Senator's question or answer, as it may be termed, I do not know whether I am confusing cause and effect with respect to the Province of Quebec or whether the Senator is doing it. It is true a much lower percentage of men in the Province of Quebec volunteered in the Canadian Army than in the other provinces, and therefore it is not surprising that Quebec is not in favor of conscription.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me just one further observation. Is it not surprising, I will ask the Senator, that the Dominion of Canada with the Province of Quebec as a negligible quantity should not enforce conscription so as to make those men enter the service?

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the Senator's assumption that Quebec is a negligible quantity politically is correct, to which I can not agree—

Mr. CURTIS. Would not the objection the Senator urges against the manner in which the officers are now selected from volunteers be avoided by a provision in the law that no one shall be commissioned an officer unless he has had a sufficient amount of training?

Mr. WADSWORTH. That would leave the volunteers without any officers.

Mr. CURTIS. Not necessarily. The officers now in England according to the testimony before the committee must have served so many weeks in the ranks and then they must have taken a course at a training school before they can be commissioned as officers. Congress could make a similar provision relative to officers.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think the statement of the Senator with reference to the selection of these officers of volunteers is altogether one of the strongest arguments against the volunteer system. I agree that that proposition is one of the objections to the volunteer system. But I wish to ask the Senator solely for information, how are we going to supply the officers for the different regiments when we have such a limited number of officers now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The bill makes provision for that very thing.

Mr. BORAH. Have we enough officers in the United States to supply them?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have not now.

Mr. BORAH. I mean trained officers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. We have not.

Mr. BORAH. We must necessarily, then, resort to some extent to untrained officers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. We shall have to train officers in large numbers. The first effort will be, as I understand it, to train 10,000 new officers.

Mr. BORAH. The thought occurred to me that we could train volunteers perhaps as early as we could train other officers.

Mr. WADSWORTH. With whom shall we train them?

Mr. BORAH. With whom are you going to train the men you are going to train?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The present trained officers will have to train new ones.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly. Could they not train the new officers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. They could not train the volunteers for an army of 500,000 at the same time. The system would break down.

Mr. BORAH. Gen. Sherman says, in his memoirs, some of the best officers who came out of the Civil War were men who were discouraged in the first instance to become officers. If we are going to select these men in the first instance without having been trained and having their capacity developed, I do not see why we could not select them just as well from volunteers as from conscripts.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think the Senator misunderstands the provision of the bill with respect to training officers and also the policy of the administration. These officers are not to be selected before they show their fitness. They are to be trained, and then they are to be given commissions after they show their fitness. That is the whole point.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know how the officer is to show his real fitness before going to war. It took the first year of the Civil War to get rid of the blunderers of West Point.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I would first prefer to answer the question of the Senator from Idaho a little more fully, because he has brought up a very important topic. The Senator says the best way to develop the fitness of an officer is in war. Certainly the Senator would not urge sending green officers to Europe in charge of troops to see how many of them would turn out to be fit.

We must give them all the instruction we can and test them out—test their ability in mobilization camps and in handling troops—and pick the best men. That is what this bill contemplates, and even then, may I say to the Senator from Idaho, the commissions that are to be given under the bill, outside of commissions already existing in the Regulars and in the National Guard, are to be temporary. They are probationary commissions. They may be withdrawn, if need be, after troops have been sent to Europe—in fact, at any time—by the President for failure to come up to the standard. So every effort is made to prevent that horrible tragedy of sending troops into battle under officers who have never been tested anywhere.

Mr. BORAH. In order that the Senator may understand me, I say frankly I have what some would call hereditary prejudices against conscription; but the Senator has done much toward causing reconsideration.

Mr. WADSWORTH. My hereditary tendency should also be against it, because every member of my family above the age of 17 was a volunteer in the Civil War, and I volunteered as a private in the Spanish War myself. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. On the question of officers, which is the most important one of all to be considered, I understand that it would take 18,538 officers to command the first increment of 500,000 men. We have about 8,000 in the Army Officers' Reserve Corps now—young men who, for the most part, have filed applications and had their names put on the list. Does not the Senator think—and that was the suggestion of the Senator from Idaho awhile ago—that officers who have seen service in the Spanish-American War, for instance, or officers who have been trained in the military schools of our country would be more competent and just as easily trained as the 8,000 young men we already have on the roll and the 10,500 others we have to put on that roll from some place or other, we know not where?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, the bill on page 3 provides exactly for what the Senator from Tennessee is contending. It proposes to make use of men who have graduated from military institutions at which courses approved by the War Department are prescribed, or "from the country at large," which would include Spanish War veterans. Now, if these men want to be officers in command of troops in the service of their country, all they have to do is to present themselves at an officers' training camp within certain reasonable limits of numbers, take the course of three months which has already been outlined by the War Department, mix in with the men who are now upon the officers' reserve list, mix in with the men who are graduates of military academies, schools, and colleges, take their chance with the rest, learn something of the care and sanitation of camps, of drilling and handling troops, show their efficiency, and they will get their commissions. But what many of them want to do, Mr. President, is to organize their own companies at home and get the commissions before they are trained.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I do.

Mr. HARDING. I wish to ask the Senator from New York if he does not think the acquirement of a sufficient force under the volunteer method is entirely dependent upon the acceptance of these unfit officers at home?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Absolutely; you can not raise 500,000 volunteers unless you let down the bars in the matter of commissions.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President—

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

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I merely wish to ask the Senator a question for my own information. Does the Senator understand that with the bill as it is now prepared the National Guard would come under its provisions?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Yes, Mr. President; I discussed that earlier in my remarks. The National Guard is to be drafted into

the Federal service, and will be just as surely Federal troops as the Regular Army itself. I discussed that when the Senator may not have been in the Chamber.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I was not in the Chamber when that was discussed. Would not that eventually destroy the National Guard, the militia? Our law in section 11 of the national defense act reads that "all persons so drafted shall from said date of their draft stand discharged from the militia."

Mr. WADSWORTH. May I say to the Senator from South Dakota I have already discussed that. I am anxious to conclude my remarks within a reasonable time, and at the same time, of course, I do not wish to be discourteous to the Senator. That matter was discussed in a running debate while I had the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. In that case I beg the Senator's pardon for my interruption.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. FALL. The Senator discussed the point a few moments ago, to which I was attempting to direct his attention at the time before he got away from the subject of the terrible sacrifice of the few English troops Great Britain was able to send to France when the war commenced. Does not the Senator believe that that sacrifice was not only absolutely necessary but was justified, if ever a sacrifice was? In other words, is it not a fact that the flower of the English Army in France hanging on to the German right flank finally enabled the French to come out from Paris and hurl the Germans back? Had it not been for that would not Paris at that time have fallen into the hands of the German Army?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, I am not able to answer the concluding portion of the Senator's question; I do not know. But may I say in partial answer that undoubtedly the situation demanded that a terrific drain in the lives of men should be imposed upon Great Britain. In the first six months or year of the war she had to send men to France half trained. She had to take in the first few weeks the flower of the manhood of England, because always they are the first to offer themselves. But no such compulsion falls upon us, and if England had to do it over again I have not the slightest doubt but what she would have first trained, in advance of the events, a democratic army on the plan of universal compulsory service for her forces, and thus would not have wasted her best men.

Mr. FALL. I understand from the general trend of the bill it is the theory of some in this country, and evidently of the General Staff, that the United States is not to take any part in this war for a long time, not perhaps for a year or more.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is not my understanding of the bill or the purpose of the General Staff.

Mr. FALL. Well, that is mine. So Senators differ on those lines.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is not my understanding of it.

Mr. FALL. At the same time I would like to ask the Senator is it not his impression that the sacrifice of the Princess Patricia Regiment was absolutely necessary, and if it had not been made the Germans could have reached the coast of France and this war might have had a different termination?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It might be so.

Mr. FALL. Of course, if there is no emergency, I do not see any reason why we should not discuss this matter for a week or 10 days.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, may I say in regard to the matter of volunteers in our Army there is room for 600,000 of them, if these men desire to come forward to join units already organized and reasonably well officered. There is no room in the bill for any volunteers who are to organize themselves under officers of their own choosing, and who, according to the lessons of the past, will be 75 per cent inefficient.

This bill does not contemplate that method of recruiting an army. The bill contemplates that our new army shall be built up by a process of selecting the most available instruments, building it upon a sure foundation, and making it so strong that it will carry any burden imposed upon it, and that, furthermore, in that army all kinds and classes of Americans shall be represented.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WOLCOTT. For my own information, Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator a question. The Senator from New York has just stated that the present bill furnishes the opportunity for 600,000 men to volunteer. I desire to ask how many volunteers of the 600,000 under existing law may come

into the Regular Army and how many in the Organized Militia? How much of an increase is to be made in the Regular Army and how much in the Organized Militia?

Mr. WADSWORTH. As I said earlier in the day—I feel as if I should call it a day now—the Regulars are to be increased to 270,000 men.

Mr. WOLCOTT. How many men are in the Regular Army now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. About 130,000. The Regular Army is to be increased from 130,000 to 270,000, and the National Guard up to 330,000.

But, in addition to supplying volunteers for the existing units of the Regulars and National Guard, it is inevitable that many thousands of Regular enlisted men and of National Guard enlisted men will become officers, so that the number of men necessary to fill up those two branches of the service on the present basis must be largely increased. That is how the War Department has computed, roughly, that 600,000 Volunteers will be necessary to fill these forces up; and if they do not come forward, the President may draft them.

Mr. FALL. The Senator is now speaking of officers. Does not the Senator think that the United States has power and authority to provide absolutely the qualifications of the Volunteer officers?

Mr. WADSWORTH. It has.

Mr. FALL. Then the Senator's idea is, so far as officers are concerned, that just as easily, under exactly the same conditions, officers for both the Volunteers and the drafted quota of 500,000 can be provided for.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I do not think it possible; politics would prevent.

Mr. President, I want to say a word with respect to the contrast between the volunteer system and the selective draft system. As the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] has so well said, when volunteers are called for the best blood of the country comes to the front. That is to be expected. Much of it should not be allowed to come. Under a volunteer system, practically speaking, there is no way of preventing that. If you are to get the requisite number of volunteers, you must take practically every able-bodied man who comes forward; and when you do that, Mr. President, you take thousands of men away from tasks at which they are of more value to their country in the waging of the war than they would be in the trenches themselves. That has happened time and time again.

The Southern Confederacy was much wiser than the North, generally speaking, in its military policy during the early part of the Civil War. They were the first to come to the conclusion that the volunteer system was inadequate. They were the first to come to conscription, and it was not solely because they lacked men. It was because the leaders of the Southern Confederacy were military men, competent to judge what the future would bring forth in the maintenance of the Confederate armies. For the first two or three years of the war the comparative success of the Confederate forces over the Union forces was due largely to the superiority of the Confederate military policy. Of course some of their advantage was due to the fact that they were on the defensive.

It was on April 16, 1862, that the Confederate Congress passed their conscription act. They had learned the lesson in just one year. It took the northern people two years to learn it.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator give me the date that act went into effect?

Mr. WADSWORTH. In the volume from which I am reading, unfortunately, on the pages which are before me the date on which the act went into effect is not given. I am reading from the Military Policy of the United States, by Maj. Gen. Emory D. Upton, where, on page 466, in the midst of a discussion of Confederate military legislation, he uses this language:

The next law, April 16, 1862—

Then follows the description and a copy of the conscription law itself. So it was either passed or went into effect on that date. I think the former is correct.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think that law did not go into effect until about the 1st of January following.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But, at any rate, I am correct in saying that the leaders of the Confederacy saw the wisdom of conscription at least a year in advance of the leaders of the North, and at the same time they provided in their military policy one of the most important things which we attempt to provide for in this bill, and that is the maintenance of a system of recruiting depots at home in order to keep the forces in the field filled to war strength, or approximately so, while they are doing the

fighting. It was the fact that during the Civil War the average Confederate regiment at the front was equal in numbers to the average Union brigade, with the single exception, I may say, of the Wisconsin regiments. The State of Wisconsin apparently adopted an internal State policy by which they kept sending fresh men to the old regiments who were serving at the front and discarded the practice of organizing new regiments of green men under inefficient officers. The Confederacy knew better from the beginning. We have often wondered, as we have read accounts of battles of the Civil War, how it was that Confederate regiments "stood off" Union brigades. It was because the Confederate regiments were kept at nearly war strength and the Union regiments went down to 200 and 150 men each.

We are attempting in this bill to prevent with absolute certainty that very evil. You can not keep the regiments at the front full, you can not make good the wastage, unless you are sure to get the men from the rear, and the only way you are sure is by a selective draft. If you rely upon the volunteer system to keep your regiments at the front filled, you are gambling—you can not tell from day to day how many recruits there will be in the rear ready and trained to go to the front.

That is one of the phases of this bill that I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate, because when armies are actually fighting the wastage is enormous and it must be filled.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to remind the Senator from New York that the very policy to which he so correctly refers followed in the Union Army added enormously to the expense of the maintenance of the service. There was always a colonel of the regiment to be paid a colonel's pay, a lieutenant colonel, a major, and other superior officers even with not more than a hundred men in the regiment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. They generally had a full complement of officers.

Mr. GALLINGER. Would not that be so under the drafting system?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Except that the regiment would always be full.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is worth while to employ a colonel to command a regiment of 1,900 infantrymen, but it is not worth while to employ a colonel to command a regiment of 150 men. That is the command of a captain. A company of Infantry at war strength is composed of 150 men.

To come down to the basis of this whole discussion, Mr. President, we have to admit, so long as we are the devotees of a democratic system of Government, that the burdens of a great war should be distributed as evenly as may be upon all the men who are capable of bearing any share of that burden. If we are to be true to the ideals of a democracy, we must insist that every citizen owes it to his country to help in her defense. We want our defensive system so contrived that it shall not only be fair and democratic in its spirit but that it shall be employed in the most efficient way. Hence the necessity for selection, for selecting the instruments which we are going to use in waging our part in this great war.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. I propounded an interrogatory to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], but the answer was not very conclusive to my mind. I am going to ask the Senator from New York the same question. When Great Britain resorted to conscription, she conscripted men from 18 to 41 years of age. Upon what theory or hypothesis has the committee restricted the age in this bill to from 19 to 25?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, Mr. President, as I understand it, there are 7,000,000 men in the United States between the ages of 19 and 25. That is a great many more than we could use for a long time to come. I suppose it was the policy of the General Staff, who have studied this matter for months and months, to select from our male population capable of bearing arms the most available material, and that material which could be drafted into the Army without inflicting unnecessary handicaps upon the industries of the country. They decided apparently—and I am disposed to agree with them—that between the ages of 19 and 25 a young man can be taken from his civil employment with less disturbance to his family or his industry than at any other age. So this bill provides that the selective draft shall apply to the men between 19 and 25. It is perfectly true that there are large numbers of men, aged 26, 28, and 30, who are fit to bear arms; but as we go up the scale in age the further we go we find the greater hardship inflicted on the country—not only on the men but on the country at large—

if you take them away from industrial pursuits and put them into the Army.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; but I am still puzzled as to the system pursued by Great Britain.

Mr. WADSWORTH. She had to do it, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. I am not so sure about that. Great Britain called back a great many men from her army and put them into civil occupations, inasmuch as they were there needed; and yet, when she came to conscript men, she conscripted them from 18 to 41. I should think she would have needed a great many of those men in her industries, as much so as we would in the United States.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, many of them were needed in her industries and were kept in her industries. If we wanted to apply this selective draft to all the men in the United States between the ages of 18 and 45, we should have available 20,000,000 men. It is the policy of the Government, or it should be the policy of the Government, to take the men whose departure from civil life causes the least hardship, and who at the same time will make the best soldiers. If this war should go on for 5, 6, or 10 years, we might very well find it absolutely necessary to draft men up to the age of 45.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator knows this war will not go on for 5, 6, or 10 years.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I certainly hope it will not.

Mr. GALLINGER. Still, I am puzzled to understand why Great Britain did not make similar exemptions. Now, I will ask the Senator from New York if any calculation has been made by the Senator or by the committee as to how numerous are the exemptions which are provided by this bill? The Senator from New York states the number of men who are liable to conscription. What about the exemptions? As I read the bill, there can not, under it, be conscripted a man who is useful on a farm.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is scarcely accurate, if I may call the Senator's attention to the language.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is the way I read it.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There are certain specific exemptions established by this bill. One of them is on the ground of religious conviction.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; applying to three or four denominations.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then, there are discretionary exemptions, which are lodged in the hands of the President. Among them are those men who, in his judgment, would be of more value in industries at home than in the ranks at the front.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I should like to conclude.

Mr. KELLOGG. I merely want to ask the Senator a question. Is it not a fact that Great Britain could not get the number of men it was necessary for her to have by taking those from 19 to 26 years of age, and that she was forced to require the service of those 40 years of age?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Certainly; that is the fact. England had to take men who were as old as 40 years in order to get enough. She had to create an army of four and a half million men out of a population of fifty-one or fifty-two million. Mr. President, I am very anxious to conclude, if I have a chance.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I desire to suggest that he is not consistent. He is insisting on compulsory military service, and I think he ought not to object if he is compelled to occupy the floor.

Mr. POMERENE. Particularly when he is speaking so well. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). Senators will kindly address the Chair.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, my great concern in this whole matter is that my country shall acquit herself creditably and in such a way as to bring this war to an early conclusion. I know that some of the ideas incorporated in this bill do not meet with the unanimous approval of the people of the United States; but, sir, I am looking toward the future, in which I hope to see our efforts, great or small—and I hope they will be great—crowned with a victory, achieved in such a way that every man in the United States will be able to say at the conclusion of this war that he has borne some part of the burden and thereby is entitled to look the rest of the world in the face and be deserving of his share of the blessings which our institutions have vouchsafed to us.

Mr. THOMAS addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time, he said:

Mr. President, the hour of half past 5 o'clock has arrived, and I am somewhat weary. If the Senator from Oregon will consent, I should like to yield the floor until to-morrow morning.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 2762) to authorize the issue of bonds to meet expenditures for the national security and defense, to extend credit to foreign governments, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

RECESS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 24, 1917, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 23, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, Author of every great thought, of every high and holy aspiration, clarify our minds that we may think clearly, and fill our hearts with pure motives in the epoch-making period through which the world is passing, that we, as a people, may do our part in shaping the destiny of mankind. It is a gigantic undertaking for truth against error, righteousness against evil, liberty against oppression, democracy against autocracy, the divine right of men against "the divine right of kings." Without Thee we are impotent; with Thee we are strong, for Thou art mighty to deliver. Uphold, sustain, and guide us, and inspire every American heart with patriotic zeal, that no man, no woman, may be found wanting; that out of the great holocaust shall come a brighter day when men shall learn war no more; and liberty, justice, righteousness, and peace shall reign supreme and the old earth shall rejoice and blossom as the rose, to the glory and honor of Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 19, 1917, was read and approved.

ALLEN F. COOPER.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great personal sorrow that I announce to the House the death of former Congressman Allen F. Cooper, of Pennsylvania, who died at his home in Uniontown, Pa., on Friday, April 20. Mr. Cooper was a Member of the Fifty-eighth Congress and each succeeding Congress, including the Sixty-first, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a short summary of his services in this body.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD, as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAGO. Mr. Speaker, Allen Foster Cooper was elected to the Fifty-eighth Congress from the twenty-third Pennsylvania district, and was reelected to the Fifty-ninth, Sixtieth, and Sixty-first Congresses. He was not a candidate for election to the Sixty-second Congress, and I was elected by the voters of the district to succeed him.

As a Member of Congress, Mr. Cooper was active, energetic, and always watchful of the interests of his district. He was chairman of the Committee on Printing, and gave to this work his close attention.

Mr. Cooper was a lawyer by profession, and was also identified with the large business interests of his home town and Fayette County. He was active and influential in the councils of his party, a man of high character and ideals, domestic in his tastes, and ever ready to take an active part in public affairs. His life and work have left an impress which will last, and his sudden death, which occurred at Uniontown, Pa., April 20, 1917, in the very prime of his life is a distinct loss to the splendid community in which he lived, the State, and the Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STRONG, for to-morrow, Tuesday, on account of important business.

To Mr. DIES, for several days, on account of illness.

WILLIAM H. PARRY.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, with much sorrow I announce the death in the city of Washington, Saturday last, of Hon. Will H. Parry, vice chairman of the Federal Trade

Commission, a citizen of the State of Washington. I shall not take the time of the House further, except to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD concerning his life, character, and services.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1845. An act to authorize PETER GOELET GERRY to enter into a contract with the Secretary of the Navy, in behalf of the United States, for the use of the steam yacht *Owera*;

S. 995. An act to authorize the issue to States and Territories and the District of Columbia of rifles and other property for the equipment of organizations of home guards; and

S. 1006. An act authorizing the county of Morrison, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said county.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 2338. An act to authorize the detail of additional officers to the Hydrographic Office;

H. R. 2339. An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy until September 1, 1918;

H. R. 2340. An act to increase the age limit for persons appointed as officers in the Naval Reserve;

H. R. 1771. An act to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," relative to the Fleet Naval Reserve; and

H. R. 2008. An act to provide for the extension of minority enlistments in the naval service.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 1845. An act to authorize PETER GOELET GERRY to enter into a contract with the Secretary of the Navy, in behalf of the United States, for the use of the steam yacht *Owera*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 995. An act to authorize the issue to States and Territories and the District of Columbia of rifles and other property for the equipment of organizations of home guards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1006. An act authorizing the county of Morrison, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said county; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 1771. An act to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," relative to the Fleet Naval Reserve;

H. R. 2338. An act to authorize the detail of additional officers to the Hydrographic Office;

H. R. 2339. An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the Naval Academy until September 1, 1918;

H. R. 2340. An act to increase the age limit for persons appointed as officers in the Naval Reserve; and

H. R. 2008. An act to provide for the extension of minority enlistments in the naval service.

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an editorial from the Evening Sun, of Baltimore, on "Maryland does its bit."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. DOWELL. I shall have to object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa objects.

EMERGENCY BOND ISSUE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to present the conference report and accompanying statement on the bill H. R. 2762, authorizing the bond issue.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the conference report.