

alleged services in recovering pay or allowances of persons in the Army or Navy, or in the claims of beneficiaries of such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Resolution (H. Res. 425) requesting the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to inform the House of Representatives by what authority the Washington, Baltimore & Annapolis Electric Railroad Co. exercises corporate franchises in said District, etc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 12809) granting an increase of pension to Smith J. Dutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12810) granting an increase of pension to William H. McKay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 12811) granting a pension to Lee Nolte; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. BACHARACH: Petition of sundry citizens of Port Republic, N. J., in re war-time prohibition; also, petition of sundry citizens of Burlington County, N. J., protesting against the passage of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of James C. Reed, president of the National Commercial Teachers' Federation, protesting against the proposed tax on the tuition fees of business schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry business firms, against prohibition as applied to light wines and beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of the New York State Hotel Association, against prohibition amendment to the emergency agricultural appropriation bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, Petition of farmers of Kendall County, Ill., for bone-dry war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIEST: Resolution adopted by the Covenant United Brethren Church, of Lancaster, Pa., urging the enactment of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of R. W. Schreiner, H. F. Butzer, B. Franklin Futer, J. B. Flory, D. W. Ranck, and J. D. Rider, all of Lancaster, Pa., protesting against the passage of a discriminatory war tax on automobiles; also, a communication from Morris D. Neuman & Co., Philadelphia, Pa., recommending a substitute for the schedule proposed by the Ways and Means Committee as rates of revenue taxes on cigars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of Ulysses, Potter County, Pa., protesting against the lowering of the draft age below 21 years; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of J. C. Wilson and 48 other residents of Hannaford, N. Dak., urging war-time prohibition; also, a resolution of the same import from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, August 24, 1918.

(Legislative day of Thursday, August 22, 1918.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon.

PETITIONS.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of the Eleventh Suffolk Representative District of Massachusetts, praying for the submission of a Federal suffrage amendment to the legislatures of the several States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wareham, and of sundry citizens of Boston, Brockton, Granville, Somerville, Melrose, Gloucester, Framingham, Everett, Richmond, Leyden, Whitman, Lynn, Williamsburg, Littleton, and Saugus, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FERNALD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Maine, praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a telegram in the nature of a memorial from the Carpenters' State Council, of Jackson; memorials of Carpenters' Local Union, No. 1233, of Detroit; of the Federation of Labor of Detroit; and of local union, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Midland, all in the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the adoption of the proposed "work-or-fight" amendment to the man-power bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COLT presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Church of Bristol, R. I., praying for national prohibition as a war measure, which was ordered to lie on the table.

CHANGES IN DRAFT AGE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 4856) to amend sections 2, 4, and 5 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I want to make a brief statement that is rather in the nature of a personal explanation.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Asburt	Hale	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Harding	New	Smith, Mich.
Borah	Henderson	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Nugent	Smoot
Chamberlain	Johnson, Cal.	Overman	Sterling
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	Sutherland
Culberson	Jones, N. Mex.	Pittman	Thomas
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Polindexter	Townsend
Curtis	Kellogg	Robinson	Trammell
Dillingham	Kendrick	Saulsbury	Wadsworth
Fall	Kenyon	Shafroth	Walsh
Fernald	Kirby	Sheppard	Watson
France	Lodge	Sherman	Willsey
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Shields	Wolcott
Gerry	McKellar	Simmons	
Gore	McNary	Smith, Ariz.	
Guion	Martin	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum of the Senate present.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, in the short address I delivered the other day in speaking of sending the young men of the country over to Europe and brigading them with our allies I made this statement:

We sent them over so slowly at first—and I am not criticizing anybody for it, but I am just calling attention to the fact—that we did not have units large enough to have them fight under our own officers and our own flag, but we brigaded them with our allies.

It was like associating the living with the dead, this taking of these young men, with all the life and enthusiasm that America can give, and brigading them with men who had been fighting for four long, tedious years. They could not, in the very nature of the case, have had that vigor and enthusiasm which they would have had if they had been permitted to fight under American officers and under the American flag.

My attention has just been called to an editorial in the New York Times of this morning criticizing that statement. I infer from the article that the writer of it thought I intended by that statement to convey the idea that the allies were either not doing their part of the fighting or were not in condition to fight. I did not mean any such thing as that.

Mr. President, no man who knows the history of this war and the indomitable courage our allies have displayed, and are displaying, and the magnificent fight they have made for four long years, and are making at this very moment, could have found it in his heart to suggest such an idea. I am sure those who heard me did not get that impression, nor will those who will take the trouble to read my address. If others did, I am sorry, indeed, that my language was so unguarded as to convey such an idea, and I am taking advantage of this first opportunity to correct it. It was my purpose to suggest that it was, in my opinion, not wise to brigade the fresh soldiers from America with the war-worn veterans of our allies. That was all I intended to say. I only meant to draw a parallel between the active, vigorous men in the prime of life who had not done any fighting of any kind and eager to get into the fray being associated with the weary and worn soldiers of our allies who had been engaged in bitter struggle for four long years. I did

not intend to challenge, nor can any man, friend or foe, challenge the courage, the patriotism, and fighting qualities of our allies. I do think, individually and collectively, that the units of our Army ought to be commanded by American officers and under our own flag, subject, of course, to the supreme command which, in my opinion, has been wisely established with that distinguished and gallant French soldier and strategist, Gen. Foch, at the head.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I have been wanting to ask a Member of the Committee on Military Affairs or a Member of the Committee on Naval Affairs a little question, the answer to which might enlighten the country to a considerable extent.

We have heard on the Senate floor very often from members of the committee and from other Members the wonderful achievements of our Navy and what we have built it up to be. No one doubts the ability of our commanders of ships to accomplish good results if you give them the opportunity. But I can not help calling the attention of the Senate and of the country to the fact that a single submarine appears in our waters, captures a little trawler, puts 16 German sailors on board that trawler, puts a small gun or two on that trawler, and for more than a week has been destroying fleet after fleet of our fishing smacks. Where is there an end? Where are these swift U-boat chasers that we have been hearing about? Who is responsible for the fact that an American fishing trawler has been captured by a U-boat and converted into a man-of-war in our very harbors, and is traveling up and down the Atlantic coast without being molested in the slightest degree?

My information is that the speed of a trawler is about 8 to 12 knots per hour. It can not go under the water and hide itself. It is where it can easily be found. We can excuse our failure to capture the U-boat, because we can not find it, we can not see it, it does its work in the dark and under the sea, but here is a slow-moving trawler that is taking whole fleets of fishing vessels off the ocean under our very eyes.

I wish some member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the committee who have been telling us about the wonderful efficiency of our Navy, would enlighten us and explain to us why such a thing is possible. I think the people ought to know why it is. Of course, we know a great portion of our Navy is out at sea, but why are we unable with this mighty Navy to capture a trawler whose speed is 10 knots per hour?

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I think, as a minority member of the Naval Committee, I can in part answer the Senator's inquiry. It is easily demonstrated that the Secretary of the Navy lost at least three months, and very likely much more time, before he got started on his naval preparedness. This fleet of destroyers, which ought to have been gotten ready long before they were, are now being built, and very few of them have been turned out.

In my opinion, this is due very largely to the procrastination of the Secretary of the Navy, who for some reason or other was unable to reach conclusions or decisions about the matters submitted to him. At least 150 days elapsed before even many of the preliminary contracts were awarded.

Some people in close touch with the department, assuming that the war has been costing this country and the allies some \$100,000,000 a day, estimate that some \$15,000,000,000 or more have been expended merely to maintain a situation until the Navy Department could come to some conclusion, not to mention the losses in deaths and casualties on the different fronts.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Does not the Senator think it would be entirely proper to call attention to the fact that the Navy of the United States has done magnificent work in conveying the ships that bore over a million and a half of our young men to Europe, and conveyed the ships that have taken cargoes over and conveyed them on the return voyage? I do not know much about the Navy, I am frank to say, but I know the Navy has done most excellent work.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator allow me to ask, Have we not one little warship on the Atlantic coast that can do battle with this trawler?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The Senator puts that question to me?

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It may be that when the German submarine commenced its operations here we might not have had any ships along this coast, because it is straining the resources of the Government to take our troops safely to Europe.

Mr. McCUMBER. I can take the Senator down the coast and show him a dozen warships on our coast.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am not particularly well advised about the Navy. It does not come under our jurisdiction; and the good Lord knows it takes all one's time to try to help out the military situation, but I think they ought to be given credit for the splendid work they have done in getting our men across without the loss of a single troopship.

Mr. McCUMBER. What has that to do in the matter of allowing a trawler here that has been captured and can not go over 10 to 12 knots per hour to destroy our fishing fleets all along the Atlantic coast?

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, while I am on my feet, since the chairman of the committee has raised the point, my information is that the troops have been carried largely in British vessels.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I am speaking only of convoys.

Mr. PENROSE. The convoys have been very largely, though not entirely, British vessels.

I saw in the paper the other day, I do not know in any way how accurate it is, that the American vessels in the Atlantic waters are a very small percentage of the total allied fleet.

I want to take this opportunity, Mr. President, to address an inquiry to the chairman, because he is present, as he generally is. Many of us were called upon a few weeks ago to vote against what is known as the Fall amendment and other amendments looking toward the enlargement of the draft ages.

Within a very few weeks after we had thus voted in the negative on the supposed request of the War Department that such legislation was not necessary we were called here unexpectedly and at great inconvenience to meet a complete change of front on the part of the Secretary of War, and encountered a situation in which the Secretary and his military advisers seemed to recommend the very proposition that we were asked to vote against. I do not know whether the inquiry has been addressed to the Senator in the Senate or not—I have not been present all the time during this debate—but I should like to ask him whether he has any information, in the hearings of the Secretary of War or in any other way, which would explain this complete change of front on the part of the department?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I do not know that there is any other explanation for it than that which the Secretary of War has given, either in the form of interviews with the members of the committee or possibly in the testimony, that they concluded to enlarge the military program, and that enlargement takes over more men per month than they had been taking in the past. In order to do that this legislation became more imperative than was expected to get men into service and of the draft.

Now, I was in sympathy with the Fall amendment and so stated on the floor of the Senate. I thought myself we ought to have passed it; but I yielded my judgment, as I stated to a number of Senators, at the request of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff.

Mr. PENROSE. With all due respect to the chairman of the committee, I do not consider that the so-called explanation of the Secretary of War is anything but an evasion.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Probably.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator seems to agree with me. I sympathize with the position he faces in being compelled to call us here together in three weeks to meet a complete reversal on the part of the War Department. Certainly on first impression it would imply an absolute failure to comprehend the military requirements, which is almost beyond belief.

I do not often read from newspaper clippings in this body, but this is so pertinent that I simply desire to refer to it. I quote from the Evening Sun, of New York City.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What date?

Mr. PENROSE. Under date of August 17.

The article says:

It is well known that some months ago several Members of Congress, including Senator FRANCE, of Maryland, suggested the necessity of a large army, an army larger than could be raised by the 21-to-31-years draft law, and they introduced various bills and amendments to raise draft ages. Because their proposals were not sponsored by the administration it was to be expected that they would get little support. To their surprise, however, not only were their proposals not approved but they were actually declared to be repugnant to the War Department, which asserted there was no necessity of raising the draft ages.

It is now a matter of record that the War Department has seen the necessity for the draft-age increase that was urged by these Members many weeks ago. They are wondering what change could have taken place as to make a suggestion which was so repugnant to the authorities when it was made so much a necessity to-day that it must be passed into law with all speed.

BAKER OPPOSED DEPOSITIONS.

The answer lies, of course, in the fact that the War Department does not care to have Congress suggest legislation. This has been the course pursued for more than a year. In some cases, at least, it has resulted in delay in making efficient various branches of the Government. It is

well known that Secretary Baker strongly opposed the suggested deposition of Gens. Sharpe and Crozier from the positions of Quartermaster General and of Chief of Ordnance, respectively, when made by the Military Committee of the Senate. It is equally well known that he deposited them himself after having apologized for and defended the work they did.

Suggestions for one-man control of the aircraft situation were strongly opposed by the administration for some time. When the agitation for the change died down because of administration opposition, the administration suddenly made the suggested change.

William Howard Taft has advocated for months an army of 5,000,000 men to defeat the Hun. Theodore Roosevelt strongly urged an army of something like that size. Yet it is only within the last few days that steps have been taken to raise such an army.

Universal military training has been openly denounced by Secretary of War Baker, and the administration has frowned on the attempts of Senators CHAMBERLAIN of Oregon, NEW of Indiana, and others to put such a principle in effect. Yet it now appears that something closely akin to universal training is to be put in effect through the new draft bill, although it will not bear the name of universal training.

A PUZZLING POLICY.

Just why the administration assumes the attitude of opposing everything suggested from the outside, whether good or bad, and accepts those ideas later, is somewhat of a puzzle to the Members of Congress. They admit it is better for the War Department to accept the good ideas late than not at all, but they do not understand why the ideas do not receive thorough consideration at the time they are presented.

Politics, personal vanity and glory, changing military conditions, and just plain inability to foresee conditions of the future all probably have had their part in this attitude of the War Department. The developments on the man-power bill, in which the War Department changed its attitude completely in the course of a very short time, have probably done more than any other one thing to convince Members that a militarist and not a pacifist ought to be Secretary of War.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania permit an interruption at that point?

Mr. PENROSE. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the editorial which the Senator is reading does a gross injustice to the War Department. The testimony of the Secretary of War and of Gen. March before the Military Committee at the time the general military appropriation bill was under consideration and the statements of Senators here upon the floor of the Senate, including statements which I myself made, utterly disprove the suggestion that the War Department has changed its opinion as to increasing and lowering the draft ages and the enlargement of the Army.

What Gen. March and Secretary Baker said before the committee was that they did not approve the idea of engrafting upon the appropriation bill a hasty and necessarily ill-considered change in the draft law. What they asked was, and what we upon the floor of the Senate stated that they asked was, that the matter be postponed until August or September, when there would be ample time to take up this important question and to decide it in an intelligent way. They went on to say that the matter was under investigation by the War Department at that time; that the American authorities were in consultation with the international authorities, with those nations with which we are associated in the war, and that until they arrived at a definite understanding with those nations they did not think it advisable to propose a definite increase in the man power. Now, the lapse of time has occurred; those studies have been finished; the Senate's recess has come to an end; and the international authorities, including the United States, Great Britain, and France, have agreed upon what man power the United States shall put into the field. Thereupon the War Department comes forward with its proposal.

That is no change of mind; we are doing exactly what we expected to do; the delay has been exactly what the War Department suggested it should be. Many Senators who at that time approved the idea of increasing the man power agreed with the War Department that it would be better to leave it until this time and that no delay or any damage would thereby occur. Those are the facts; and the editorial is a misrepresentation, as I conceive it.

Mr. PENROSE. The department might even have left it until the international situation was fully confirmed by the return of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS].

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I add also to the statement of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] that there has been no loss of men by reason of this postponement of definite action? The men have been going over; they have been training, and the supply has not been diminished in any way under the present law.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have said all that I care to say.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Nebraska has said all he possibly could say on that point, it seems to me.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the Senator has said enough and said it well. The Senator from Pennsylvania, however, made reference to the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS]. I

think, Mr. President, that the assumption that the Senator from Illinois is the alleged representative of the Government of the United States is gratuitous and unauthorized. I give this assurance advisedly.

Mr. PENROSE. Well, Mr. President, I can hardly believe that the statement of the Senator from Colorado is well founded. The junior Senator from Illinois, in a recent interview, stated that the President of the United States knew where he was [laughter], and any individual who is important enough to focus the attention of the President on his local habitation for the time being is of more than minor importance, in my opinion. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, of course, will be unable to preserve order in the galleries unless Senators preserve it on the floor.

Mr. THOMAS. I think, in view of the cablegram recently received from France, that everybody knows where the junior Senator from Illinois is. [Laughter.]

Mr. PENROSE. Including the President.

Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs rather confesses that the Secretary of War has made no solid explanation of this matter; and it does not seem to me that the explanation of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] is satisfying to a serious-minded person. It is difficult to understand why a conviction as to the size of our Army was not entertained three weeks ago when thousands of men were being killed every day and our armies were threatened with retreat and disaster and why some mysterious international round-up had to be made before the War Department knew whether or not we needed two or three million more men one way or the other.

That may satisfy the War Department, but it will certainly not satisfy the great mass of the American people. That Secretary Baker did not know we needed an Army of 4,000,000 men until two weeks ago is too ridiculous a statement to pass muster without a challenge.

I am more disposed to think that they did not dream that they could get the troops over so speedily as they have done, or that the fatal defect of procrastination prevailed, which I have observed in many of the departments, and even in this body, as, for instance, when the majority failed to have a quorum the other day for the consideration of this measure, or that element of personal vanity which insists that suggestions must emanate from the department. But what makes it embarrassing, Mr. President, to Senators like myself—and there are many who think on this point as I do—who want to support the administration, is that, at the request of the War Department, I voted against the Fall amendment and other amendments proposing to extend the draft ages and enlarge the Army. Now, however, within three weeks, I am called upon to reverse myself and vote for the pending bill, which enlarges the draft, including the provision lowering the draft age to 18, and other features. I intend to vote for it, but I intend to be more cautious in the future, Mr. President, how I listen to the passing requests of the War Department, with a view of not being placed again in the position of having, in a period of three weeks, to reverse my vote in a matter of the magnitude involved in the question whether the Army shall be 4,000,000 men or one and a half million men.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PENROSE. I yield.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Pennsylvania if he voted against increasing the draft ages through any understanding or conviction communicated from the War Department or any other source that it would not be necessary in the future, and in the near future, to enlarge the draft ages?

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, my own belief was that we ought to have adopted the amendments then pending, but having recently voted on several occasions against what I considered to be obnoxious measures of the administration, I thought I would purge my conscience by voting with the administration, and therefore I voted against the amendments referred to.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I understand, then, from the Senator from Pennsylvania, that he waived his individual convictions in order to vote with the administration, and as a result of that he now feels that he has stultified himself.

Mr. PENROSE. Yes; and I confess my stultification in one case, whereas the Senator and his Democratic colleagues, having always trailed along behind the administration, have stultified themselves frequently.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, we all have a very high regard for the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate. The members

of that committee have had, during the time in which we have been engaged in war, a very difficult task to perform, at times a very delicate task, and I think every Member of the Senate hesitates to disagree with any part of a program outlined by that committee. But, after the best thought which I have been able to bring to the subject and a consideration which I have given to few subjects since the war began, I am unable to agree with a portion of this program. I feel that that disagreement is based upon such facts and conditions that I may justly ask the indulgence of the Senate for a short time while I state the grounds of disagreement.

Mr. President, when the case is made out and the necessity shown I shall vote to send the boys of 18 and 19 into military service. I shall dislike to do so at any time or under any consideration, but I am sure that I shall not hesitate when I feel the necessity has arisen. But in so grave a matter, involving as it does as serious a step as a legislator can be called upon to take, I want to feel clear in my own mind. I want the facts which will show that it is the only wise thing to do.

Our boys are the reserve force of our national life. Upon them we must depend for the future success and progress of our country physically, economically, and morally. As a matter of foresight and looking to the future as well as considering the immediate present, I do not want to draw on that reserve force until imperative necessity compels me to do so. It is the wise general who holds his reserves until the crisis commands them to be brought forth. It is the part of ordinary statesmanship not to deplete the reserves upon which we must depend for the great strain of the future until it seems there is no other alternative. The war must be won and won as quickly as possible. But we should not waste the boyhood or deal extravagantly with the future stay and support of the country. There will come a time after the war when we will appreciate having been most careful in the use of our young boys. If this fiendish plan to destroy free government requires the sacrifice we will make it, but I want to be satisfied that the occasion has arisen and can not with wisdom be postponed. I can not accept the unsupported opinion of any man upon this subject when I am called to vote. I want the facts.

Gen. March says in his testimony before the committee that we desire an army of 4,000,000 men upon the western front by next June. I am very glad to say that as a layman, although it adds nothing to the value of the opinion given by Gen. March, I am heartily in accord with that part of the program. I want to see 4,000,000 men upon the western front by June 1, and if the Government, or those in charge of the military affairs of the Government, feel in the meantime that it is necessary to have more, I shall follow their judgment in regard to that.

Some suggestions have been made that our Army should even be larger than 4,000,000 men. I take it that Gen. March and those with whom he is associated have in all probability raised the Army to as large a number as they feel it is possible to get to the western front; that they have called for as many men as it is possible to transport and to maintain when they are there. It is altogether probable that if we had a greater capacity for transporting and for maintaining them Gen. March and his associates would call for even a larger army; but I am perfectly willing in that respect to follow his judgment, whatever my judgment as a layman might be, as to the necessity of even a larger army.

Gen. March has also stated in his testimony that, in his opinion, even an army of 2,000,000 Americans could do almost anything in Europe, and that an army of 4,000,000 will walk through the German lines. I recognize that that is in all probability not only his judgment but the judgment of the able associates who surround him, his counselors and advisers, and probably the judgment of those on the other side. It is encouraging and inspiring to know that by putting 4,000,000 Americans in Europe by next June we can end the war. I do not offer any opinion on that, but I accept it as coming from those who are in charge of military affairs and console myself with the hope. I shall be happy if it transpires that after having placed these men there we shall succeed as is anticipated.

So, Mr. President, I do not want to say or do anything which will in the slightest manner hinder our having this number of men in Europe at that time. If I felt that we could not raise them otherwise than by summoning the boys of 18, so anxious am I to see a victory, and a speedy victory, and so willing am I to accept as to those particular matters the judgment of those in charge of the military affairs of the Nation, that I would vote for this bill as it stands. But, as I view the bill, the hearings disclose beyond mistake that there is not yet a necessity for calling the boys of 18 or even 19. If I am in error as to that I shall be glad to change my position when that error is shown, but if I could eliminate the deductions of Gen. March and Gen.

Crowder I would be perfectly willing to submit their figures as a complete brief for the position which I shall take to-day. I feel that as a legislator I am just as much under obligations to draw deductions, and perhaps, with reference to this particular matter, under quite as great obligations to express my opinion, as those in charge of the military affairs. As was said yesterday by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], there comes a time in this program when we as legislators are responsible. We can not shift the burden. If these boys are conscripted we alone are responsible. We are answerable as to who shall perform their service to the country and who shall be exempt; and we can not avoid that responsibility. We take upon ourselves the responsibility of setting aside these millions of men, if they are to be set aside, while the boys go to the front. We can not, in aftertime, place that responsibility either upon Gen. March or upon Gen. Crowder.

Mr. President, what has England done in regard to this matter? Her precedent and her example, it seems to me, are worth something as an illustration and something as an incentive and an inspiration to the American people at this time. England—sturdy, self-poised, far visioned and clear visioned, never discouraged or disconcerted by adversity—has been very careful up to this hour to preserve the youth of her country, upon whom the prestige and the future greatness of her country is to depend. Let us view the actions of that great nation and see whether or not we have reached a time when we must, in haste and inadvertence, call upon those who are boys but who must soon take over the burdens of government.

England has a population of from forty-seven to forty-eight million people. We have a population of 105,000,000 to 108,000,000 people. England put into her army, by voluntary enlistment alone, 4,000,000 people. She has raised up to this time six and a quarter million of people for the army. If we should raise the same number in proportion to our population, according to the statement of Lloyd-George in his great speech of August 7, we would have 15,000,000 men in arms. Before England put a single youth of the age of 18 upon the battle line, she, with a population of 47,000,000 or 48,000,000 people, had raised six and a quarter million men and put them in arms. And under what circumstances did she put the boys of 18 and 19 in battle? It was during the great drive which began upon the 21st of March. After Germany had had released from the eastern front her soldiers and concentrated them upon the western front and began her drive, upon the result of which depended the civilization of the world, you remember that it continued for weeks and weeks, and that every morning we arose to look at our papers with trembling lest they had broken through and gone into Paris and to the ports of France. Lloyd-George, in his speech, described the condition of affairs—the enemy knocking at the door—and said only under such circumstances could they have been justified in calling their boys of 18 and 19 into service.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. May I ask the Senator what the age limit for volunteering in England was during this period?

Mr. BORAH. I do not know what the age limit for volunteering is. My understanding is that it was 19, but I can not say positively.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the Senator know whether the volunteer army of Great Britain did or did not comprise boys of 18, 19, and 20?

Mr. BORAH. I know it is reported not to comprise boys of 18; I can not say, of course, with absolute certainty. But I judge from Lloyd-George's speech that they had never before been put in to fight. Speaking of the proposition of putting upon the battle front these boys of 18 and 19 and 20 under these perilous conditions, Lloyd-George says:

We took a step which only the emergency could have justified; that is, the sending of lads of 18 and 20 . . . into the line.

After a nation of forty-seven or forty-eight million inhabitants had raised an army of six and a quarter million, they felt constrained, under those supreme conditions, to send the boys of 18 and 20 to the battle front. Have we, as a people, reached or neared that condition of affairs? Have we raised anywhere near from those over 21 the number England raised before she called on the boys?

Italy, engaged in the war for over three years, has refused to reduce her age limit below that of 19. France, brave, dauntless France, carrying the brunt of the fight for three years, has not gone below that of 19 yet. We, with an army of 1,700,000 over there and another going of 1,300,000, and 2,000,000 more to raise, an army of four to five millions, and 110,000,000 population, pro-

pose to call upon the boy of 18 to go and fight the battles of this country! Is it really true that we can not raise these 2,000,000 from our vast man power over 21?

Mr. President, the proposition has been put out that these boys will be called for training, and be trained for a length of time, and when they have been matured or have neared the age of majority they will be called into the service. If this were a matter of training these boys for service after they had reached the age of majority, of course we would not object, because I can realize that the time may come in this contest when we will necessarily have to call them; but that is not this program. Every one of these boys of 18, 19, and 20 is supposed to be upon the fighting line in Europe on the 30th day of next June. The boy of 18 and 6 months will be there; the boy of 19 and 6 months will be there; the boy of 20 and 6 months will be there, with six months' training, and no more. This is not a question of universal military training, such as was suggested in the report of Secretary Knox, read by the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] a few days ago. This is a question of calling men for service just as soon as they can be trained and fitted for service. This is calling to fight with a hurried training. It is expected to have this Army ready for fighting as soon as possible. Gen. March was very frank about this, as is characteristic of both March and Crowder. So, we can not be misled nor need we be confused by mixing this subject with that of universal military training.

Now, Mr. President, let us look at these figures for a minute and see the story they tell.

First, bear in mind that we have 6,000,000 men in classes 2, 3, and 4 under the present draft law set aside, exempt. Then we have a figure given us by Gen. Crowder of 10,028,973 between the ages of 32 and 45. You have there 16,028,973 men, including those of classes 2, 3, and 4 under the present law, from which to draw an army of 2,000,000 men—for that is what we propose to raise—men matured, men under equally great or greater obligation to serve, men millions of whom are fit to serve. Sir, what I am really arguing for here is reclassification. It all comes to that. Shall we take the boy of 18 rather than reclassify?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WOLCOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BORAH. In just a minute. Is it claimed, Mr. President, and if so, upon what is the claim based, that we can not get an army of 2,000,000 out of sixteen to seventeen million men? It is so claimed because they refuse to reclassify.

I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I desire, in connection with the Senator's argument, to call attention to this phraseology in the pending bill on page 2, line 6:

Provided, That the President may draft such persons liable to military service in such sequence of ages and at such time or times as he may prescribe.

Under this language it would be possible to call to the colors and place in the battle line all the boys of 18 before any of those of a higher age were called.

Mr. BORAH. It is evident from the testimony that Gen. March is in favor of that proposition, because he says they make better soldiers.

Now, let us see what we do with these 16,000,000 men.

The total number of males in the United States who are 32 to 45 is given as 10,028,973.

Deduct arbitrarily 7,734,482 men married.

Deduct 902,307 deferred for other reasons.

Total deducted, 8,367,089 men.

Subtract 8,367,089 from 10,028,973 and it leaves 1,391,884 men. Then deduct again, for estimated physical unfitness, 435,378, which leaves a total number of effective men between 32 and 45 of 601,236 out of 10,028,973. In order to reach the boy of 18, you deduct every man except 601,236. Upon what theory? We will come to that in a few moments.

Now, let us see the other figures as to the boys under age.

Total number of males from 18 to 21, 3,171,671.

Deduct married, 158,185.

Deduct for other reasons, 114,179, giving a total of 272,354.

Subtract 272,354 from 3,171,671, which leaves 2,899,317.

Deduct for physical unfitness, enlistments, aliens, and so forth, 1,101,708, which leaves a total number of effective serving men under the age of 21 of 1,797,609.

We propose to raise under this bill an army of 2,000,000 men, and out of that army we propose to raise 1,797,000 from boys under age. We take people to the number of 10,028,000 between 32 and 45 and from them raise 600,000 men. We take the boys then under age and raise from them 1,797,000.

Now, friends, do not forget that in the Army to-day there are nearly a million men under age fighting in France. Add to that the 1,797,000, and this great war—a war for civilization and liberty—is being fought by the boys of the country, by those under the age of majority. I believe, sir, that there are 2,000,000 men both fit and willing out of this 6,000,000 deferred under the present law and the 10,028,000 between 32 and 45. I am sure they are fit and I am equally sure they are willing to go.

My friends, do you think it is necessary, in order to raise 2,000,000 men, to take these boys? Do not forget the fact that when the first conscription bill came into this body, when we only proposed to raise a few hundred thousand men, they then started at 19 years of age. It was then proposed to take boys of 19 and 20 in order to raise 500,000 or 1,000,000 men from a population of 108,000,000 people; and now, in order to make it a certainty, they arbitrarily relieve from service 741,000 men—arbitrarily.

What is the reason given for calling these boys? The first reason is said to be that we do not want to invade classes 2, 3, and 4. Why do we not want to invade classes 2, 3, and 4? Are there no men in classes 2, 3, and 4 so situated that they can be called upon to serve their country? But the statement is made that if we invade classes 2, 3, and 4 it will interfere with the social and industrial life of the Nation, and that it is necessary to set aside this large number from the 10,000,000 men in order to preserve the social and industrial poise and efficiency of the country. It is strikingly strange to me, Mr. President, that the boy who is able to carry the accouterments of war, to handle the death-dealing, hellish instruments of destruction, to go to the battle line and bear a man's part, is not considered capable of discharging the ordinary duties in the industrial conditions of the country.

Why is it that the man of 31 or 32 is more necessary unless we assume that the boy is unfit to perform his duties and to do service in the industrial world? If he is indeed immature and undisciplined for that kind of work, shall we send him for a more strenuous and a more burdensome task, and that is fighting the battles of his country? Give him an equal chance. Let him have his proportion of the home industrial work. Let him be dealt with fairly and equally and proportionately to the others, and you will not have to reach the age of 18 at all.

I read in a newspaper editorial two days ago:

If men were called to the Army without any consideration of their dependents, the result would be a tremendous increase in the number of persons who are charges upon the public. Suffering would increase, charities would multiply, and eleemosynary institutions would be overcrowded. It is to avoid this condition that the selections are made with due regard for the dependents.

That does not dispose of the proposition that there are hundreds of thousands of people in this country who are not indispensable at all to the industries of the country and who have no dependents in any true sense of the word who could be called without interfering at all with our social and industrial conditions.

I have had a gentleman who I believe capable estimate the number of men engaged in nonessential industries in this country, and he tells me that there are over 2,000,000 men over the age of 21 and under the age of 45 engaged in nonessential industries in the country in no wise necessary for the running of the war who could respond to this call.

Shall we permit these unessential things to go forward, a mere coining of dollars and cents out of the war? Shall we continue to be married to the material side of this question and overlook entirely the value to a country of an educated and sound youth? Would we prefer to close the schools and colleges to closing these nonessential industries?

We are not yet stripped for war. When we are, these unessential industries which call for so many who are fit to serve in the war should be closed before we call upon those of 18 and 19 to take up arms.

But is not the boy of 18 or 19 a part of our industries? Is there any more vital employment than that which the boys of 18, 19, and 20 are doing throughout all the Middle West and the West? The only farm help that you have got in the Middle West and the West upon which you can rely is the boy of 17, 18, 19, and 20. The only man upon whom you can rely throughout the season and who remains with you is the boy who has been reared upon the farm and is a part of it. The itinerant workman comes and goes; he is utterly unreliable. If he has reached the age of 21 to 35, he leaves and goes into more lucrative industries where he can get a higher wage. He has departed, but the boy of 17, 18, 19, and 20 remains and is essential and indispensable to the raising of the vast crops which it is necessary to have in order to feed those who are in Europe. A

man of wide experience and wide acquaintance wrote me a few days ago:

Our boys are now the support of the farm. We have no other reliable help. Already the draft law has crippled us throughout the Middle West. Now, if the boys of 18, 19, and 20 go, we know not where to look for help.

Are not those boys essential to a most vital industry? Can you say that you are not interfering with vital industries?

And as to interfering with the social life of the Nation, could a greater blow be given to our national life than to close our schools and colleges, to deprive our young fellows of education, and send them out to be maimed and killed? It is quite as vital to the social life of the Nation as that of husband and wife where they have ample means to take care of the wife.

A few days ago in one of the little towns in a Western State, even under the call of the present draft law, after the call had been made, three farmers came into town, turned their crops and their utensils over to the bank, and said, "Our boys are gone. If you can get anything out of this, take charge of it."

You can not claim, Senators, that the boy of 18, 19, and 20 has not his place in the social and industrial world. He is just as essential to the work as the man from 21 to 45, with the exception of a few men who are overseers or in charge of business, and there is a very small percentage of those.

There is not a Senator in this Chamber but can think over and in his mind count instance after instance of a man under the present draft law from 21 to 31 who was exempted simply because he was married. His wife may be perfectly capable of taking care of herself, they may be perfectly independent and have ample means, and yet by reason of the fact that he is married or probably has a child he is exempted from the service.

Mr. President, it is no purpose of mine to criticize the able men at the head of our Military Establishment. In common with the people of this country, I respect the great ability and patriotism of the Secretary of War, Gen. March and Gen. Crowder, and their associates and advisers. They are rendering great and distinguished service to their country. I have long hesitated before expressing any views out of line with their program. But looking at our national life steadily and as a whole, and especially in times like these, one comes inevitably to entertain some very firm convictions. We are not permitted to look alone to the days that are passing, but we are to consider also the days that are coming, when the strain will be equal almost to the strains and burdens of the war. And viewing the situation as a whole, the exigencies of the present and the undoubted demands of the future, I confess I want to be economical in the flesh and blood of the youth of our land. I want to conserve, in so far as it is wise and safe under present conditions to do so, the brain and the possibilities of those who must soon assume the task of rehabilitating a tax-ridden, debt-burdened, and war-torn Republic.

Of course, you will say to me in answer that we will have no Republic to rehabilitate if we do not send these boys to fight back and destroy its enemies. When I am satisfied of that I will vote to send them. But in order to show that it is necessary to send them now you eliminate from military service hundreds of thousands whose duty it is to take up this burden. My contention is not that the boys of 18 and 19 should not go, but that they should not go until those who are under equal or greater obligations shall have been called.

When that has been done, if the necessity still exists, they should go. Yes; we will throw the boys of our homes into the pawn before we will submit to anything else than victory. But as a wise and prudent and humane people, we will not do this until the matured men fit and capable have fully met their country's call.

Remember, Senators, no sacrifice for country is equal to that which the boy makes before he has been fitted for the battle of life. He is too young to vote. He is too young to command. The lads, it seems, are only fitted for frightful sacrifices. Whatever else happens, you know he will go into the trenches. His position, therefore, is not only the most circumscribed, but his obligation is the most exacting. He not only offers his young life, health, and limb, but he forfeits all opportunities for that preparation which in this day and age of the world is so essential to success. If he is so fortunate as to return from the war, he will return to civil life handicapped, his education interrupted, his plans broken, and all his life dreams changed. The boy not only offers his life on the battle field, but is also hazarding to a greater extent than anyone else success in life after the war. I beg to say again that it seems to me the case is not made out for this program; the facts and figures do not sustain the demand; reason and justice do not seem to me to support this provision of the bill.

I am willing to agree with those who say we must not let sentiment stand in the way of victory. I especially agree with those who call for complete victory. I am even willing, for the sake of the argument, to agree with you all when you say that war tramples under foot all ties of kin and blood, all bonds of human sympathy; that it turns a deaf ear to the voice of humanity and silences the plea of the mother. But I can not agree to that arbitrary program which places the burden of this war upon those who are yet in their minority but who, it seems, must fight their country's battles and then come home and pay its debts. I will not agree that war wipes out justice and equality of burdens among our own people. I can not agree that we should draw first and heaviest and disproportionately from the only guaranty that we have for the future—the brain and soul, the flesh and blood of the youth of our country.

Senators, remember when you vote to conscript these boys of 18 and 19 we are proposing to raise an army of only 4,000,000 men. According to the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], nearly a million of those upon the front are now under age. According to these figures, we are going to put nearly 2,000,000 more in the Army who are under age, and this Nation, with a population of 108,000,000 people, will have 4,000,000 men on the battle front, and nearly 3,000,000 of them will be boys under age. Is it fair? Is it just? Is it manly? Is it noble? Is it in harmony with the supreme and sublime task before us? Have we as a people risen to the ordeal of the hour? Is this in accordance with the conscience and honor and manhood of a great people?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it was not my purpose to enter into this debate, but after listening to some of the remarks that I have heard on this floor I can not help but give my views on the question before the Senate.

I want to say first of all that I have had no trouble about this war from the very beginning. As soon as the great war broke out in Europe it was evident to me that it would ultimately be our war as much as the war of those countries in Europe. It was evident to me that if Germany should succeed in vanquishing France and England and obtain complete control of the Continent in Europe there would be no place in the sun for America; that we would be the next victims of German aggression. So from the very beginning my heart has been in favor of this war. At the earlier stages of it we met all kinds of objection in one form or another, some sugar-coated, others not, but we finally got to a sound military basis.

Now, I do not refer to anybody in this Chamber, but the men who claim to be spokesmen for the boys of 18 and 19 and 20 hardly realize what they are talking about. Those boys are the most patriotic among all our people. If we were to-day to raise a volunteer army instead of resorting to the draft, it would be the boys of 17, 18, and 19 who would fill our ranks.

More than that, Mr. President, those boys are not as a rule grumbling. It comes from some of their uncles, aunts, and other relatives. The boys themselves are anxious to go, and in my opinion, and in the opinion of all military men who have had any experience about it, boys 18, 19, and 20 make the very best soldiers we can possibly get. Take a man after he is over 30 years. He has not got the physical tenacity, he can not stand the stress and strain of marching, watching, and fighting as they have to do in these modern times. He becomes sick and goes to the hospital. To send a lot of these superannuated men, as I call men over 30, to Europe and put them in the fighting line would be simply having that many to carry back in the course of a year.

There is another thing I want to disabuse Senators about. They think these young men who go into the Army will come back ruined; that they will enter our body politic a depraved and inferior class, because they have been in the Army.

Mr. President, in my opinion the best education a young man of 18 or 19 can have is to have a postgraduate course of one year at least in the Army of the United States. It takes the conceit out of him, makes a man of him, and enables him to enter upon the vicissitudes of life with energy and perseverance.

Did our old soldiers of the Grand Army of the Republic, or did the Confederate veterans, when they returned to their homes prove a bad element in our body politic? Were they ruined and depraved men? When the Stuarts came into possession of the government after they had overwhelmed Cromwell and his government, they disbanded those old veterans who had fought under the Commonwealth. A good many of the followers of the House of Stuart said that there was great danger to the British people by disbanding those soldiers; that they would be a vicious and dangerous lot in the community. But the historian Macaulay tells us that they were needlessly alarmed. He said that wherever you traveled through any village in

England, if you found an industrious mechanic, a thrifty and prosperous shoemaker, or a well-to-do carpenter and scratched his head you found he would be one of Oliver Cromwell's old soldiers.

Look at the Confederate soldiers. They had a harder time of it than we did when they returned home, but they buckled to their task and did their duty as good citizens in rehabilitating their country. So with our people here, when the boys march back after this war in Europe, whether they were 17 or 18 or 19 years old, they will come back better citizens, more loyal, and with a higher spirit of patriotism than they ever had before. They will never be a menace or a danger to the community, and they will not come back as ruined men.

Mr. FALL. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. NELSON. Yes.

Mr. FALL. Who ran this country in every State and the National Government for 34 years after the Civil War? Who filled the Halls of this and the other House?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in the North that service was performed in large part by the old soldiers, and in the South the same rights were accorded to their veterans.

I come now to another matter. The great war is still going on, and we are far from having attained victory. The most critical time of this war, barring the first battle of the Marne, was on the 21st day of March last, when the Germans inaugurated their great offensive. They had had months in which to bring back their divisions from the Russian front; they had eliminated all of the sick and the feeble; they had assembled such an army as they had never before had, and it was all concentrated on the western front. They saw the importance, indeed they felt the necessity of crushing the allies before the American troops in large numbers could arrive on the scene.

What was the result? The allies met with a reverse. The British Fifth Army on the left flank to the north, owing partly to the fact that the Portuguese troops on the extreme left gave way, and partly owing to the fact of being surprised had to retire. Upward of 60,000 prisoners were taken and a large quantity of ammunition and guns was captured. That was the most critical time of the war since the first battle of the Marne.

Mr. President, in this connection I want to call attention to an extract from a speech of Lloyd-George delivered in the House of Commons on the 5th of August last. After describing the utter collapse of the English Fifth Army, and how they were forced to fall back, he said:

Look what has been done. In February the Americans brought over 48,000 men. I think. In January it was still fewer, and the German general staff, which seems fairly well informed, came to the conclusion that if what was said in the British press of our having no men was true, and they knew what was being brought over in American ships was true, and if what a certain section of the press said about our having no ships was true, then the destruction of the allied army was a certainty.

What did the British do?

Before the battle was over—

Referring to the battle on March 21—

In a fortnight's time 268,000 men were thrown across the channel, one of the most remarkable feats of British shipping, and the organization of our British transport and for the war office. In a month's time 355,000 men had been thrown across the channel. A fresh gun had been put back for every gun that was lost, and every deficiency in a machine gun, not merely supplied, but the number increased.

Now, here is what I desire particularly to call to your attention:

Our losses were great. We took a step which only the emergency could have justified, that is the sending of lads of 18 and 20, who had received five or six months' training, into the line.

Then he proceeds:

I remember coming at 9 o'clock one dark night from Boulogne after I had been to see the generals. I saw these boys coming up by torchlight from the boat straight to France. No sooner were they there than these lads had to face veteran and victorious troops. No veterans ever fought with greater courage and with greater splendor than these lads to help hurl back these legions that had fought to destroy the British Army. We must all be proud of the boys who so upheld the honor of their British native land and helped to save the cause of the allies from disaster.

There, Mr. President, you have ample proof of the efficiency of soldiers from 18 to 21 years of age. The fact is that they make the best soldiers. They can stand more hard work; they have more energy, more vim; and, what is more, they can really be better spared from home than can any other class of men of whom I know.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota, who was a soldier in the Civil War, how old he was when he entered the Army?

Mr. NELSON. I was a little over 18 years of age.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And the Senator entered as a private soldier?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir; I entered as a private soldier and attained to the high rank of a corporal. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Which rank the Senator from Minnesota greatly dignified.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like to suggest this thought to the Senator, in connection with what he is saying: We are holding responsible for the conduct of the war those who have made a thorough study and investigation of this whole subject. The question therefore arises, Can we deny to them the resources and supplies which they say are necessary to carry out the program decided upon? In connection with what the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] has said on the subject this morning, I desire to call attention to the hearings on page 72, where the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] propounded this inquiry to the Secretary of War:

Senator JOHNSON. I find in talking to Members of Congress a decided reluctance to decrease the draft age to 18. I confess to a similar reluctance. I think, however, that those with whom I have talked—and I know this is my personal attitude—are all willing to do it if the military necessities and the exigencies demand and require it. As I understand it, that is the situation?

Secretary BAKER. That is my belief about it.

Senator JOHNSON. So in order to carry out the purposes for which we have entered this war, successfully to prosecute it, this particular measure you deem essential?

Secretary BAKER. I believe that to be the fact. My own judgment about it originally was that 19 should be the minimum, and I came to the 18 minimum only after very thorough study of the situation and with some reluctance, but finally believing it to be necessary to secure the appropriate number of men.

That is the opinion of the Secretary of War on that subject.

Mr. BORAH. Permit me to say that the same kind of testimony, not referring particularly to Mr. Baker, was introduced in support of the first conscription bill, which started with 19 years of age. It was stated that in order to raise the small army that we were then proposing to raise it was necessary to take the 19 and 20 year old boys.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as Secretary Baker and other officials have been quoted on this matter, I beg leave to say I have always thought, with due respect to Mr. Baker and some of the other officials of the War Department, that in many respects they were not equal to the situation. It has been a slow process to educate Secretary Baker up to the standard set by this new draft law.

Mr. President, I am for this bill with its age limits for these reasons:

First, because I am in favor of getting the most efficient set of soldiers that we can "over there," so that we shall not have to be carrying an army over and bringing an army of invalids back again.

In the next place, young men at this age are not married; as a rule they have not entered into any business engagement. They are, as might be said, to use an everyday phrase, foot-loose, and are of the classes of men who can be better spared out of the community than can other men. Take the men of advanced years, from 35 to 45, and you will find that the most of them are engaged in business or in the pursuit of some useful calling where they are needed. Such men are of little use as soldiers. I remember that in the company in which I served the men when they enlisted were nearly all under 20 years of age. We had, however, an Englishman who was the oldest man in the company. We called him "Old Dad," though he was only 35 years of age; he was half the time on the sick list or attending the surgeon's call. He was not an effective soldier at all, although otherwise he was an estimable man.

I sometimes wish, Mr. President, that I could share the feelings of some of those who indulge in this maudlin sentiment, but I fear that my years and my experience, both in the Army and outside, have made me rather callous, so that I can not indulge in hysterics in behalf of the boys of 18, 19, and 20.

Furthermore, I believe the best education these boys can get is that which will be derived from their life and training in the Army. A boy who has attended college or high school, if he goes into the Army, will receive an education and training that he can acquire nowhere else. The Army to-day is a perfect paradise compared with the army in which our soldiers served in the days of the Civil War. Now our soldiers have innumerable advantages and facilities which were then unheard of. They have the comforts and benefits afforded by the Y. M. C. A. and other organizations; they have the Red Cross; they have the service of dentists, and in many other directions are provided for in a manner heretofore unknown. They have movie shows and other entertainment, and they get food and

clothing that we never thought of in the days of the Civil War. Why, Mr. President, the soldiers in the Union Army never had ham and bacon; we received nothing but salt pork in the brine or salt beef in the brine, and hardtack. In those days we were not even able to get "Hoover bread."

We have evidence as to how the boys feel. We provided for an increase of the Marine Corps, that increase to be secured by voluntary enlistment. Under that provision over 13,000 of the number we authorized to be recruited for that corps were made up of boys 18, 19, and 20 years of age who voluntarily enlisted. Look at the magnificent record the Marines made in France at Chateau Thierry. When the Germans had succeeded in compelling the French to retire and were forcing them to the rear that small brigade of Marines hastened to the front, drove the Germans back, and turned the tide of battle, which ultimately led to victory. That was the nearest point to the city of Paris which the Germans reached since the first battle of the Marne.

I wish to say to Senators that few of the boys under 21—and they are our most patriotic citizens—will thank you for trying to exempt them. I venture to say that if the door is left open for volunteers more boys of 18, 19, and 20 will volunteer than of any other class of our citizens.

I am for the prosecution of this war with the greatest efficiency. What we need is an overwhelming army "over there" in Europe. I think it was Bonaparte who said that the Lord was on the side of the strongest battalions. So, Mr. President, in order to be victorious in this war we want to outnumber and outclass our enemies.

We can outnumber them if we extend the draft as is proposed by this bill, and we can outclass them if we have a large portion of our Army made up of soldiers from 18 to 21 years of age. I am anxious to have this war terminated as soon as possible, and that is one of the reasons why I am heartily in favor of the bill. It would be too bad to allow the war to drag and drag as our air program has done. The sooner we can finish it the better for the people of this country and the better for the entire civilized world.

Let no man be alarmed concerning our boys when they come home again. I will make the prediction that as the Confederate veterans in the South and the Grand Army boys in the North came to the front in political life in their respective sections of the country, so it will be found when this great war is over that the soldiers of our grand Army in France will have to be reckoned with. Those soldiers are not possessed of such a spirit as some of our citizens have indicated in connection with this draft bill.

Mr. President, I did not intend to take more than a moment to speak on this bill. I sincerely trust that the bill may pass in the form in which it is now pending before the Senate, especially in respect to the age limit.

There is another provision in the last part of the bill looking to the education of the soldiers after they return, which I think is unnecessary, and yet I shall not vote against it. When the boys come home from the war I think they will know what to do with themselves. They will know whether they want to go to school or enter into active business, and I feel confident that very few of them are likely to avail themselves of the provision in the bill to which I have referred. However that may be, I shall make no objection to it, although I repeat that, in my opinion, it is wholly unnecessary.

Aside from that, it is a good bill, and I wish to congratulate Gen. March and Secretary Baker on finally coming to see the light. It is a pity that they did not see it long ago; it is a pity that they did not see it three or four months ago, in which event there would have been no necessity for the present urgency. However, it is better to be late than never to arrive. It is our duty now, if we want to prosecute the war successfully, to give our country an army that will be victorious, and I therefore hope that this bill, with the age limit as proposed, may pass.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] criticized the Navy Department this morning because the Germans were able, by capturing one of our trawlers with a submarine, and putting 16 men on board of her, to ravage to a certain extent our fishing fleets. Of course that is a deplorable thing. It is deplorable that the fishermen should be deprived of their livelihood. In former wars they have rarely been interfered with; but, of course, Germany is making this war as horrible and as barbaric and as uncivilized as possible, and she has taken this opportunity to hit the fishermen along with everybody else.

It seems to me, however, that the learned Senator is missing the main gist of the question. What we want to do is to win the war, to bottle up the submarines as nearly as possible at

their base, to convoy our armies and transports of food and other necessary materials to Europe, and to carry on the major operations of the war. We can only be successful in our military and naval operations by attacking the main objectives and centralizing our efforts on things that are absolutely essential. This the Navy Department has very wisely done; and the result has been that we have carried a million and a half men to France without the loss, I believe, of a single transport that was convoyed by the American fleet. We have also aided the British and French Navies in the splendid work they are carrying on that they have turned from a defensive to an offensive warfare against the submarine; and the result of that has been that the submarines instead of concentrating along the coasts of England and France, have had to go elsewhere and try to do damage farther from their home base and farther from the center of the circle, for, after all, the greatest results are to be accomplished on the coasts of England and France near the Channel, where all the traffic lines concentrate. This has been said time and time again. As you get farther and farther away from the center you meet less and less ships, and the chances of the submarine are less and less for destroying numbers of merchantmen.

The aid that we have been able to give the British Navy has resulted in increased submarine destruction, forcing a change of their plans, and the necessity of seeking to do damage elsewhere. Of course, they did not want to give up their policy of attacking near the English coast. They only did it reluctantly, and when it was forced upon them by the superiority of our offensive against them. Now they come to this shore, to my mind largely with the idea of propaganda, with the idea that if they could wreak havoc along our own coast possibly some outcry might be made among the American people, and that ships, destroyers, and submarine chasers might be withdrawn to this country from Europe, where they were essential, and then they would be able to reap the great harvest that they had before. But what we must do, and what the Navy Department is doing to-day, is to stick firmly to its original and sound policy of concentrating its efforts along the European coast, France, and England and the Mediterranean, where necessary, but principally France and England, and then, when that has been looked after, to take care as best we may of the other exigencies of the naval war—our fishing boats and our coastwise vessels that are far out at sea.

The Germans are only repeating the history of naval warfare in the slight successes of their commerce-destroying venture. The fallacy of the German submarine policy from the beginning has been that it has been commerce destroying, and only that. I believe that it is sound naval theory that where a vessel is used whose object is solely commerce destroying, it is bound to be a minor operation and in the end fail. In our own War of 1812 we were able, with the *Constellation* and the *President* and other of our fast frigates, to do great harm to the English carrying trade. We lay in the route of the Indian trade; we made them raise the rates of insurance; we made ourselves most unpleasant, and we made them send frigates out to attack us; but in the end we were doomed to failure, and in the end our frigates were driven off the seas.

The Atlantic Ocean is a very big place. We have an enormous coast to defend. There are at least 1,500 miles of our coast, if we take it on a straight line, and not only that but if we go further and take into consideration the Canadian coast and the great fishing banks we are really seeking for a needle in a haystack. I contend that while we deplore these losses, we must not play the German game and think for one moment that we should change our policy and weaken in any way the support we are giving to our allies and the magnificent work that we are accomplishing.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat may I ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. GERRY. With pleasure.

Mr. McCUMBER. The Senator's statement of what our Navy has achieved in this war, and what it is capable of achieving, only adds to the reason for being astounded at a spectacle such as we have observed, of a little trawler of 8 to 10 knots an hour plying along our coast for a week and destroying fleet after fleet of fishing vessels. I am informed that we have a vast number, perhaps hundreds, of submarine chasers along all through the ports of New England. I am informed that we have battle ships, probably not of the higher class, because most of them are in European waters, but we have them along in all of our ports. I have also been informed by a Senator that this submarine was actually discovered, and that two depth bombs were sent directly over it and both of them failed to explode.

But that deals with the U boats; and the Navy can not be responsible in any way if by a possibility these depth bombs did not explode. I have this only upon information. But the main thing that I wanted to get at was, why it was possible, with the vast number of chasers and warships we have along our coast—and I do not want to draw from our Navy across the ocean—for a little slow-running vessel, that could not make over 8 or 10 knots an hour, and could not get under the waves, though possibly small enough to hide behind them, to escape detection and destruction and continue its ravages for a whole week? Now, there may be an explanation for it, but the average American does not understand what it is; and if there is a good one we will all be glad to hear it.

Mr. GERRY. I am very glad to have the Senator's further statement and explanation. I think the reason of the escape of the trawler *Triumph* from our defensive fleet is a simple one and one that I have already given, namely, that the ocean is a very large place, and this trawler has been lying fairly well out at sea. I do not know, but very likely there have been fogs, and simply by a question of chance she has not been sighted by one of our patrol vessels; or probably, if she were sighted in the earlier part of her career, they might not have known that she was an enemy ship.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; but let me suggest that we have known within a very few hours, at least, when one of these fishing fleets has been destroyed, and an 8 or 10 knot vessel could not get very far into the ocean before we would be able to find out something about its whereabouts.

Mr. GERRY. My recollection is that they did not know for a week that that vessel was sunk. I am speaking simply from memory now, from reports I saw in the press.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the part of the country from which I come is the one most immediately affected by the recent operations of the U boat and of the trawler *Triumph*. In regard to the fishing fleet, the vessels that fish on the Georges Bank, where the first destruction by the U boat occurred, I think, were exclusively Massachusetts boats, and the great bulk of the Bank fishermen are composed of the Gloucester fleet. Therefore the interest of all the people on that coast of my State is very profound in these operations.

Mr. President, meeting the U boats coming up out of the Atlantic is an extremely difficult thing. On the other side of the water the whole commerce of England and France finally comes into what may be called the narrow seas. It has to come there, and the U boats are operating in a very restricted field, comparatively speaking, the field where they are most certain to meet incoming and outgoing ships; and, of course, their enemies have the same advantage of a restricted area, where the U boat is most certain to be found. Yet, with that advantage of a restricted area, comparatively speaking, we know how many U boats have escaped the British destroyers and submarine chasers and inflicted vast damage on the commerce of the world. We have no such narrow waters here. Of course, the bulk of the shipping finally comes into the harbor of New York or into the harbor of Boston, but the ships come up to those harbors right out of the ocean, especially the harbor of Boston.

Now, Mr. President, if you know that there is a needle in a haystack, it is a very difficult thing to determine beforehand just at what point in the haystack it is coming out. They have to be on the lookout, as they are and have been all along, at every likely place.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] spoke of the failure of those depth bombs. I was at home at the time that happened, and I know as well as I know anything that the hydroplanes were over the submarine, and saw her. There is a dispute about the bombs. The first story was that they had bombs and dropped them, and they turned out to be useless—what are commonly called, I believe, "duds." In any event, they did not explode. I have also seen it stated that they had no bombs.

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

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. GERRY. I am informed that they did have bombs, and that there was a reason why they did not explode. I do not know that I am at liberty to make the reason public.

Mr. LODGE. I only knew there was some discussion about it, and I have not been in Washington long enough to get all the details.

But now we come to the question of the trawler, the *Triumph*. I think the question which the Senator from North Dakota puts is a very natural one. If I remember correctly, the trawler was seized or made her first destruction on the 20th of August, and I think I am right in saying that the information was received by the Navy Department on the 21st. To-day is the 24th. Three days is not a long time in which to find a small vessel on

the Atlantic Ocean. I am at liberty to state that every possible vessel in the way of destroyers or submarines or any other kind of craft useful for the capture or destruction of such a vessel as the *Triumph* has been sent to that area, where the trawler has been at work. They are covering this area with all the vessels possible without interfering with what are necessary for convoys, which have first to be considered, and, of course, without bringing home destroyers from British and French waters, which would be a great misfortune and a great mistake. But a large number of vessels suitable for the work of capturing the *Triumph* or destroying her are on the ground or on the way to the ground.

The trawler was in the region, as I understand, of the Grand Banks. That is a region of mists. An almost perpetual fog hangs about the Banks. It is not an easy place to hunt a trawler or any other comparatively small vessel. All I desired to say was that the Navy Department, of course, feel a keener anxiety about this matter than any other branch of our Government. Their attention is concentrated on it. They are doing, I am sure—in fact, I know—everything that can be done to capture that boat which is on the surface. I believe they will succeed in doing so, for I do not believe a surface boat can long escape, even in the great expanse of the Atlantic Ocean.

As for getting the U boats, that is necessarily a matter, to a certain extent, of chance; but there again they are using every resource that they have in submarine chasers, in hydroplanes, in wireless telegraph to get at the submarine.

I think the Senate and the country may rest assured that there is nothing which knowledge and ingenuity can suggest which is not being done by the Navy Department at this moment to try to reach and capture or destroy the trawler and also the U boats.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed amendment which, while not offering it at present, I ask may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. After the word "prescribe," in line 8, page 2, insert the following:

Except that persons under the age of 20 years shall not be called into other than training service, and that periods of training for persons under such age shall be so prescribed as to least interfere with farm work or production on the part of those actually so engaged or with the attendance of duly registered and bona fide students at school or college.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, the proviso to which these words are added by way of amendment is as follows:

Provided, That the President may draft such persons liable to military service in such sequence of ages and at such time or times as he may prescribe.

Mr. President, I am in hearty sympathy with the general purpose of this bill. That purpose is to materially increase the armed forces of the United States, and to increase them with all possible speed, in order that we in conjunction with our heroic allies may all the earlier win this war and compel the acceptance by the central powers of the terms of a just peace, and by a just peace I mean such a peace as that so admirably and forcibly described and defined on yesterday by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Nothing else will be a righteous peace or involve that element of retributive justice which ought to prevail.

I agree to the proposition, too, that "the sooner the better," the better because in the end it will be cheaper and involve less of loss both in money and in men than if we went at the business or at any time continued in the business slowly and hesitatingly. To make the struggle as short, sharp, and decisive for our side as possible should be the mainspring of all effort to enlist, to equip, and put on the battle front from one and a half to three million more men who can fight only as the trained American soldier can fight.

Nor would I be particular which battle front. It is likely that the battle that decides the issue will be fought in the west, where have been the greatest stress and struggle from the very beginning. It is barely possible that such a battle is being fought there even now; I hope so. But, with due regard to the relative importance of the several fronts and the question where our men are most needed, we should strike Germany wherever our resources and the numbers and the strength of our forces will permit, whether it be on the Italian front, in the Balkans, in the Ukraine, or on the Murman coast to the north, or in aiding our latest allies, the Czecho-Slovaks, in holding against both the Germans and the Bolsheviks the great Siberian railway, or whether it be on that worst of all battle-torn and devastated fronts, that of northern France.

But, Mr. President, what are the necessities of the hour? What are the requirements in order that we may take this proud place and do our great part in the complete defeat and over-

throw of the German military power? Is it necessary that we go far beyond what we have ever gone before, beyond what until lately we never dreamed we would go in this war, and draft into actual over-seas service the boys of 18 years of age? Let Gen. March himself answer in part. Not long ago, as I understand it, he thought 2,000,000 men would be required for the task. I should have said that that estimate was too conservative; that our distinguished and able Chief of Staff would not have surprised the American people when he made that utterance if instead he had then said three or even four instead of two million men. But now, in the hearings of a few days ago only, Gen. March is reported as saying:

It is my belief that with an Army of 4,000,000 of men in France under one commander we can go through the German line wherever we please.

And again:

We reached the conclusion that the enlarged program was necessary on the 30th day of July.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. Does the Senator understand from that statement of Gen. March that he believed that with 4,000,000 American soldiers on the battle front assisting the allies we could not only go through the line at any particular point, as the Germans went through the British line at a particular point, which was far from a victory, but he meant that we could go on to Berlin with our allies with a mere addition of 4,000,000 men to our forces?

Mr. STERLING. I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that I hardly know whether he meant that or not, but I think it is a fair implication from his language that we needed an army of 4,000,000 men in France, and that that in conjunction with the allies would be a force sufficient for us to furnish.

We have now in France 1,500,000 men. We have in the United States under arms, trained or in training, now 1,500,000 more, making a total of 3,000,000 already in or ready for your army of 4,000,000.

How many more may be procured by taking into the service under the draft law—this proposed law—men of 20 according to the figures submitted by Gen. Crowder and made a part of the report of the committee? Taking the ages from 32 to 45 and within those age limits he gives the total net effectives as 601,236, which, added to the 3,000,000, make 3,601,236.

But the amendment I have proposed permits the drafting of the men of 20 years. The tables do not show how many effectives of that age may be found, but for the ages 18 to 20 the number is given by Gen. Crowder as 1,797,609. I assume that the call for men of 20 years of age would yield one-half that number, or 898,804, or call it in round numbers 900,000. This, added to 3,601,236, gives a total of 4,501,236 men, or a half million more than, according to Gen. March, would be required to go through the German line wherever we pleased in France. So there you have an army of 4,000,000 men for France and a half million besides for service in other fields or for reserves.

But, Mr. President, this does not measure the forces we should be able to raise under a law changing the limits of the draft ages to 20 and 45 years for active service, leaving those under 20 to be called to training service only.

These figures, submitted as a part of the committee's report, on their face show an injustice, an unfair discrimination in favor of married men and against the agricultural interests of the country.

Look at the table on page 7 of the committee report. Total males in the ages from 32 to 40 is given as 6,960,532, of whom there are married 5,311,952, and who are put in deferred classification because they are married, I assume. But if this number is intended to represent only the married men who will be entitled to deferred classification because of dependent families, I insist that it is too large altogether.

But, Mr. President, it has been urged so often here on the floor that this includes all the married men that I can not now question it. They meant to say by this table that all married men were to have deferred classification.

How many married men between these ages themselves depend on the wife's labor or industry or on the business which belongs to her or on the wife's fortune, which they married? They will constitute a great class who can not claim the dependency of a single relative.

But aside from this, as a ground of exemption or deferred classification, how many men from the beginning of their married life have had a competency or have since acquired a competency for themselves and families, so that the family for its

support now is not dependent on the labor or management of the husband at all, and he would be left free to do his part and to take his place among the armed forces necessary in this great war?

Now, Mr. President, out of this 6,960,532 between 32 and 40 the Provost Marshal General gets in net effectives the pitiable number of 448,086 men. He ought to get, and I believe any just and fair administration of the law would give him, at least 1,500,000 effective men instead of 448,086. It would give him this number of men—a million and a half—while between the ages of 32 and 45, the limits prescribed by the bill, he would get a proportionately larger number.

But allow now 1,500,000 as the number which could be reasonably raised between the ages of 32 and 45, and then add to that the 900,000 which the boys of 20 will furnish, and you will have, without touching the boy under 20, an additional force of 2,400,000 men; and this is 100,000 in excess of the number Gen. March says may be obtained under the law and which they expect to have in France by June 30, 1919. This force, added to the 3,000,000 already there and here ready to go there, would make a force of 5,400,000 instead of 4,000,000, who would "go through the German line wherever we pleased."

As showing something of the sentiment in regard to the deferred classification for married men, I desire to read an extract from a letter received from the chairman of one of our local drafting boards in South Dakota. He says:

I have noticed in the papers that the President says he wants the fact of a man being married to be sufficient grounds for deferred classification.

Gen. Crowder, evidently acting in accordance with that suggestion, has put all married men in deferred classification in these tables, and thus it is that out of the totals he produces such a small number of net effectives.

Then, says the chairman of this board in answer to this suggestion which he understands was made by the President:

This will never do, for we have men who have been married several years who have permitted their wives to work and really support them, and who are really worthless otherwise in the community. The same rules should apply to the new draft as we have had all along.

"This county of Tripp, which is one of the new counties of South Dakota, with a registration of 1,057, has sent 430 soldiers to the front, and Tom has come under the same rule that has governed Harry."

But, Mr. President, there is one interest that this proposed law ignores, and that is agriculture—and that, too, in face of the fact that "food will win the war," a manifesto we see everywhere on signboards, in the papers, electric-light displays, at the movies, "food will win the war"—and yet this bill and these estimates of the Provost Marshal General fail utterly to recognize the needs of the farmer. Look at the tables and note how very few are excepted for deferred classification because of industry, including agriculture.

I take the table in which he gives a list of the effectives between the ages of 19 and 20. Total males, 2,106,386, but the deferred classification solely for industry, including agriculture, is only 10,532, out of this great aggregate of 2,106,386. By the language of the table agriculture is included under the head of industry. How many is it intended shall be deferred for the purpose of agriculture purely? I go to the table giving the list of effectives between 32 and 45. The total number of males is 10,028,973, less married deferred 7,734,482, less deferred solely for industry and agriculture the pitiable number, compared with the whole aggregate and with the needs of agriculture, of 401,159.

Take 18 to 22. Total males, 3,171,671, less married deferred, 158,185, less deferred solely for industry and agriculture, mind, that includes every known essential industry, as well as agriculture, 15,855.

Mr. President, the evidence of the needs for men in agriculture in my own State of South Dakota, particularly—I can not speak so advisedly as to the conditions in other States, although I have a general understanding that the need is great everywhere—is simply overwhelming. I read from a letter dated August 16, written by Mr. Charles McCaffree, our State director of United States Employment Service. He says:

There have been no announcements or any communications concerning the matter of reduced fares for the harvest hands transported under the direction of the Employment Service.

This is significant for the reason that they are asking for harvest hands and help in thrashing through the Employment Service:

I have been wondering whether you secured any encouragement at all in the matter. We are getting by our harvest now, but it is not quite completed. We have a very great need for assistance for thrashing. This is brought to the office every day, but we can not get the men needed without a reduced rate. This stretch of territory is so remote from the best recruiting districts.

I read another letter from a farmer in my own county whom I know very well and on whose word and judgment I am accustomed to rely. Says the writer of this letter:

I wish you would use your influence, as far as possible, on the draft bill now pending before Congress, and see that they do not lower the draft age. It is going to be a hard blow to the western farmer if they take the boys between 18 and 21. The most of the farming is being done by the boys of these ages. Take it in my own precinct, at least half of the farmers in this vicinity would be left alone. I think the farmers of the West are as patriotic as anyone, but they do feel that these boys should be left at home until they are 21. I have talked with several Army officers, and they all tell me to keep the boys at home if possible until they are 21. If you think a petition signed by the voters of this vicinity would do any good, would be glad to secure one.

I will simply say that I have not encouraged the sending of a petition, although there is no question but what in any county in South Dakota the general sentiment would be as described by the writer of this letter.

As further indicating the situation and the needs of agriculture and the need to make better provision than has ever yet been made under the administration of the former law or is likely to be made under this law, I call attention to this telegram just received this morning from the Aberdeen Commercial Club:

ABERDEEN, S. DAK., August 23, 1918.

HON. THOMAS STERLING,
Washington, D. C.:

Heavy rains here have caused shocked grain to sprout. Labor supply about 300 short. Seventy-five selected men due from our county Tuesday; mostly from farms. Will increase labor shortage. Will you use your influence to secure postponement of this quota? Will mean thousands of bushels of wheat saved.

And yet "food will win the war," and wheat is the kind of food which we are asked to supply over and above everything else.

Such is the situation in regard to farm labor in South Dakota. I shall hesitate to go and interview Gen. Crowder in regard to excusing the men of this quota badly as they may be needed. I have had some experience in regard to a former quota. I was simply told that if South Dakota did not wish to make default in her quota she must answer the call. In the activities of this war South Dakota is not of the defaulting kind. But this telegram and these letters express the need in that particular farming region where they raise the grain which of all other kind we most need to supply ourselves, our armies, and our devoted allies.

Mr. President, my amendment, it will be noticed, contemplates another class, too, than those necessary for farm work and farm operations. It contemplates the boys of 18 to 20 who ought to get some additional education at school or college. It provides—

That persons under the age of 20 years shall not be called into other than training service, and that periods of training for persons under such age shall be so prescribed as to least interfere with farm work or production on the part of those actually so engaged or with the attendance of duly registered and bona fide students at school or college.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. STERLING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Suppose the law provided that boys of 18, 19, and 20 years of age could enlist, does the Senator from South Dakota think that the boys of South Dakota would enlist?

Mr. STERLING. Very many of them would enlist, I will say to the Senator from Michigan; and I have thought, Mr. President, of advocating the idea that the boy from 18 to 20 years of age might be permitted to enlist if he so desired. I recognize the efficiency and the valor of a boy from 18 to 20 years of age and the truth of everything that has been said in regard to that; but, Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. STERLING. If the Senator will just excuse me one moment—

Mr. McCUMBER. I merely desire to ask the Senator if boys have not been allowed up to the present time to enlist at 18 years of age and above?

Mr. STERLING. I understand that they have been, but the recent order has prevented such enlistments.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is not permissible now.

Mr. STERLING. But the one question in my mind has been as to whether there is not wisdom in the policy advocated by the Provost Marshal General in regard to having but the one system. I confess that I have some sympathy with the idea that soldiers should come in altogether under the selective-service law rather than be allowed voluntarily to enlist. There is no approbrium attached to the draft. We may thereby have, if I may so express it, a more harmonious system and one that

gives better opportunity at least to recognize the needs of various industries than any dual volunteer and selective-draft system would give us. Hence, I have not here urged that boys from 18 to 20 should be permitted to enlist, although it is probable that many thousands of them would enlist.

I wish to call attention in that connection to another letter which I have received in regard to boys under 18 and the objection to a law that takes them into the actual service, whether or no, and without regard particularly to their mental development and equipment, even if physical requirements are met. This letter is from the dean of the college of medicine of the University of South Dakota and was only received on yesterday. He says:

Just a word to express my hope that the age limit for the selective-service draft will not be lowered to 18 years. You know I have three boys who are of draft age as the age limits now stand.

And I think, if I remember correctly, although the dean does not say so here, two of them are already in the service. One, a soldier, has visited me here at Washington—

And I have no fault to find with that; in fact, I am rather proud that such is the case. But if the age limit is reduced to 18, the draft will take my fourth boy, Harold. * * * While it is true that a large number of boys reach their full physical development at 18 or 19, it is also true that a very large number do not reach their full growth until they are 20 or 21. All my boys have been of that kind. It would be nothing less than a tragedy to put boys of that type into the Army at 18.

Not a tragedy simply because he is a boy of 18 years, but because he, like many of the best and strongest later, is at that age an undeveloped boy.

Mr. President, in addition to the agricultural industry, which will be served by not calling the boys between 18 and 20 into active military service or into service overseas, there are the advantages that will be afforded to those boys who desire and can acquire an education. It will give them the two-year period, from 18 to 20, during which they may attend school or college. Their vacations of three months each year will be spent in intensive military training. Oh, yes, Mr. President, I hear it urged here on the Senate floor that the experience a man will have by enlisting as a young man at 18 will in itself be a liberal education. I grant the educational value of service in an American Army and in a great cause such as that in which we are now engaged; its value can not be overestimated by the right-minded, aspiring young man of fine and high ideals of patriotism and of duty; but, Mr. President, I have heard more than one old soldier, a member of the Grand Army of the Republic, say that the one thing he deplored of all others in his experience as a young man was that he had by entering the service missed the education which he ought to have had in order to equip himself for the serious business of life or for a profession for which he believed he had some natural gift.

There, Mr. President, is the tragedy, sometimes in calling the young men of 18 into a long period of military service. These boys, who as old men I have heard express that regret, volunteered into the service, and they volunteered under a law and at a time when 20 years was the minimum age at which they could be drafted—during times of great stress in the War of the Rebellion. It is even worse when the boy desirous of an education—if there be no urgent need—instead of being allowed to volunteer is drafted into the service.

Mr. President, there are two armies necessary to the winning of this war. We are compelled to take both into consideration in considering this bill—the military army and the industrial army, which latter includes the farmer. The farmers of this country constitute the largest and most important part of the industrial army for the purposes of this war. From the beginning they have been admonished over and over again to increase production and they have responded nobly to the call; but by this bill it is proposed to further deprive them of the means of production.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will seriously consider this amendment, and I invite consideration of it too in view of the much-urged necessities of the case and in view of the desirability of making the war as short, sharp, and decisive for us as it is possible for America to make it. We shall be able to achieve our full part without yet at least drafting into overseas service the boys from 18 to 20. However, let it be remembered that my amendment does not exempt from the draft. It limits the service only. Under it the boy will be a well-trained soldier at 20, and be ready at once without further period of training for overseas duty, either in the field or in the trenches. How different this bill from our policy during the Civil War! The boy was not enrolled for any previous period of training. At 20 he went into the fighting service, but not before the age of 20. The amendment proposed makes him a trained soldier at 20. The time between 18 and 20 will not have been unemployed,

but it will be all employed in the service of his country. Indeed, it will have been a strenuous life for him, for he will alternately serve as a farmer and as a soldier in training; but it will have been a continuous service.

Mr. President, I merely wish to add this word in conclusion. When I think of the actual need of men for the Army—and, in my opinion, the figures in the report of the committee demonstrate that need—and when I think, too, of the need of conserving our young manhood for needed work in industry and agriculture as well as for the duties of life and citizenship after the war, it seems to me that the system I here propose in connection with the other features of this bill will make the ideal system. It will in a large measure protect the industry on which the Army depends, and, rightly applied, will furnish all the men which our largest needs demand.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, having received such definite and concise information from the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs as to why, with hundreds of submarine chasers in our Atlantic ports, and with our battleships in every port along the Atlantic coast, it was impossible for us to overtake and catch a trawler running at a 10-knot speed, I shall not press the question any further, but shall proceed to the consideration of the pending subject.

Mr. President, I have received from farmers and others in my State letters of the same character as those which have been read by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STEELING], from our neighboring State. The conditions there are practically the same as they are in North Dakota, but, possibly, unlike some of the letters received by the Senator from South Dakota, the letters which I have received for the most part have been based upon the industrial rather than upon the sentimental aspects of the question. Labor is sorely needed on the farms. The excessively high wages paid and encouraged by the Government in all other industries, together with the leisurely method indulged in by those performing service in other governmental industries, have left no field from which the farmer can draw to secure the labor which is necessary to harvest his crops. It is, therefore, quite natural that he should ask that the draft be deferred at least until his crops shall have been harvested by his own boys who are old enough to do the work. But, Mr. President, I can not see that this situation can be remedied. It can only be temporarily relieved to some extent by deferring the draft call in the agricultural sections.

Our farmers, I believe, recognize that we need an Army of 5,000,000 men. I know that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STEELING] thinks we can get along with 4,000,000 men; the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], and undoubtedly other Senators think that 4,000,000 will be as many as we will need, and they find support for their conclusions in the remarks of Gen. March; but I believe that we should have 5,000,000 men in France, and I believe that we should have them there just as quickly as it is possible to get them there.

Such an army, no matter where it is drawn, or at what age, will necessarily take just so many men out of the avenues of production. It makes no difference to us where we draw them from; we are drawing 5,000,000 men from the avenues of production. There is left, therefore, for us to decide only from what ages it is best to draw this number. If we do not take the boys between 18 and 21, Mr. President, we must draw this force from the men who are above that age. Which would it be better to take?

We all admit the necessity of continuing our industrial efforts not only to the extent to which they are now being put forth but far beyond that mark if it is possible to do so. Very few, indeed, of the younger men, the men of 18 to 21, have entered into the industrial lines; most of them have been attending school; most of them would still have to learn a trade, and, therefore, in drawing from the older men we would draw from those who are most needed, who are already skilled in industrial lines, and would have to fill their places by those who have had no experience at all along those lines.

Nor, Mr. President, is that all. We want to win this war with a minimum casualty list. We all agree to that. I fully appreciate the sentimental side of this question. A mother who sends her boy of 18 years to death must suffer agony indescribable; but does she suffer any more than the wife who sends her husband to death, who sends to the trenches to be slaughtered the father of her children? Is not the death of the latter as serious a loss as the death of the former? It is hard to make any character of distinction between the death of one individual and the death of another; but, Mr. President, while we can not make comparisons between the death of a son and the death of a husband, there is an element of chance that we never should lose sight of in determining which we should choose.

We want to win this war, I repeat, with the least possible number of deaths and casualties. We owe that to our soldiers; we owe it to the people of the country. It is probably true that in battle the number of wounded exceeds the number of killed—instantly killed, I will say—by nearly 10 to 1. Possibly under the newer methods of warfare the difference between the number of those killed and those wounded may be somewhat smaller than I have indicated. We can not save the one killed. We, then, become deeply concerned in saving the greater proportion of the other nine.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] who speaks from actual experience in war, have declared what is apparent to everyone, that the boy from 18 to 25 can stand greater hardships and can recuperate far more quickly than the man from 25 to 35. This is due in the most part to the recuperative quality of youth. The older man may be so worn out that he can not sleep even when opportunity is afforded, while the younger man entirely yields to this strength-reviving process of nature and awakens refreshed and invigorated.

I think those Senators, Mr. President, could have gone a step further and could have shown that of a given number of men between the ages of 18 and 25 and another equal number of men between the ages of 25 and 32, all equally seriously wounded, the death rate of the latter will be about 20 per cent greater than the death rate of the former. While this may not seem important when you consider only a company or a regiment, in the aggregate, in an army of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 men, it means an enormous saving of life; it means the saving of the lives of hundreds of thousands of men.

We have heard arguments on the floor of the Senate by earnest and zealous Senators designed to establish the fact that we can secure a sufficient army without extending the draft age. Gen. March is quoted as declaring that if we had an army of 4,000,000 men on the battle line we could break through the German lines. Well, Mr. President, Gen. Byng broke through the German line without having such an army; the Germans broke through the British line and broke through the French line, but they did not thereby secure a victory in either case. However, Gen. March has never stated that with an army of 4,000,000 Americans we could plant the American flag over the castle of the Hohenzollerns; he has never made such an intimation; he has simply stated that by concentrating with the forces of our allies and having at our command 4,000,000 men we could break through any particular section or line of the German defense we saw fit. Well, that will not win the war. I repeat, Mr. President, that nothing short of planting our flag in Berlin is going to win this war as we ought to win it—win it so conclusively that we can dictate the terms of peace which were so eloquently portrayed by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] on yesterday.

I agree with every one of the terms he outlined, Mr. President, but I do not agree that his suggestions cover all of the terms that we ought to demand. If a man breaks into my house, burns it down, and murders members of my family, you can not satisfy my sense of justice by saying to him: "Get off these premises; go back home." That does not restore my murdered children or rebuild my destroyed home. That is not the German way of making peace terms where she has triumphed. Let us stop for a moment to ask ourselves, What would Germany do if she should be victorious in this war? What did she do in 1870, when she made a war on a nation wholly unprepared? She took from France two of her fairest Provinces, and then she immediately levied a tribute of a billion dollars upon her and has never forgiven herself for that leniency. What has Germany done in every Province that she has conquered in this war? She has bled it white; she has made slaves of the population. Are we going to be satisfied with a peace that shall say to Germany, "Go back into Germany and we will stop the war"? No, Mr. President; the American people will never allow the Senate to vote for a peace of that kind. We have declared what the terms of our peace shall be, and the two most important conditions, the two brightest stars in the firmament of our peace declarations, are restitution and reparation. Germany can not return the lives of those whom she has brutally murdered; but she can pay in part the damages which she has caused by forcing upon an unprotected and unprepared world such a barbarous war. We can not bring back to life the little nurse, Edith Cavel, who was brutally murdered in defiance of every principle of humanity and every rule of civilized warfare, because some British prisoners escaped from a Belgian hospital. We can not compel Germany to give back the life of Capt. Fryatt, who as a prisoner was foully murdered because he was brave enough to defend himself against the U boat; we can not compel her to return to life the prisoners she tortured to death, the prisoners who were compelled by her

U boat to stand without life preservers on the outer deck while the vessel submerged and drowned them; we can not compel her to return to mothers the infants whom they have savagely slaughtered; but we never ought to sign a peace pact until there has been an unconditional surrender and that unconditional surrender has compelled Germany to deliver up these murderers to the hands of an international board for justice.

Every officer who commanded or allowed the atrocities, every soldier who cut off the arms or legs of a little child, should be delivered up and shot. We never ought to agree to a peace until we have taught the military autocracy who encouraged these crimes and taught the world that no such atrocities as those that have been practiced in this war can ever be practiced again in any other war, if unhappily another war shall again curse this old earth of ours.

But, Mr. President, let us not be misled by the success of our armies and those of our allies upon the western front into too great expectations. That success is most gratifying; that success has dispersed the gloom that pervaded this country at the close of the two great German drives which were inaugurated on March 21; but with all our success we have not nearly accomplished what the German drives accomplished between March 21 and the day those drives were checked and broken by the French and British Army. Those drives netted the Germans in prisoners alone nearly 200,000 allied soldiers. The late reports claim that so far we and our allies have taken about 100,000 prisoners, or about half the number that were taken by the Germans in their two drives.

The present reports indicate that we have taken guns, great and small, less than one-half the number we lost in the German drives, and less than a quarter of the war material that they obtained from us in those drives. And why, Mr. President, were those German drives so effective? Because we were grossly outnumbered—outnumbered at every battle during that drive, all the way from two to five times the number that we could place against the German onslaught. The encouraging part of this last battle to me is that it has demonstrated that on equal terms, with equal numbers of men, with equally favorable conditions, the allied armies where the battle is now progressing are to-day superior in quality and in every respect, man for man, to the armies of the central powers; and if you could give them the opportunity to fight squarely in the open, with the old Anglo-Saxon idea of fair play, the war would be of short duration. The superiority of the central powers has been in the murderous gas, in greater numbers, in their liquid fire, and in a thousand other hellish devices which they have contrived to meet their enemies in an underhanded and cowardly way.

But, Mr. President, I can not blind my eyes to the fact that back of these German lines all the way to Berlin are fortress after fortress, trench after trench, already completed, which will enable them to retreat into their own country, disputing inch by inch every mile from the Rhine to Berlin; and in the present offensive warfare I am inclined to think that the losses in number of men killed are about equal. Our gain alone is in the prisoners taken. What we need, Mr. President, is an army of such numbers that we can drive forward more rapidly than it will be possible for the enemy to retreat, taking with him his supplies.

Mr. President, we have heard so much about what Gen. March has said with reference to the number of men that will be sufficient to break through the German line that I think I am excusable in quoting, without giving the name, the words of one of our American generals, acknowledged by all to be the greatest American general—one who is not to-day in active service in France, but is well known to you all; and this is what he said to me:

We need upon the western front—

And it was after he had returned from France—

5,000,000 men on the fighting line. We should have back of that line 1,500,000 men in training in France. We should have, back of them, 2,000,000 men in training in the United States.

That makes 8,500,000 men. That is the estimate of a general who has been on the battle front and understands the situation, and who is talking not of breaking through the German line wherever we see fit but of winning this war and winning it, as we ought to, in the shortest possible time.

The other day, Mr. President, I received from a major now serving in France a letter, excerpts from which I am going to ask the Secretary to read. I will ask that those portions which I have marked may be read, because he is giving us the view of the men and the officers in France as to what the American people ought to do, and he is giving it after having visited every portion of the line. I will say that both the name of the general and the name of this major I have omitted, because it is prob-

able that their views might disagree with those of the Secretary of War, and therefore I would not wish to give publicity to their names; but I ask that the marked portions of the letter may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WATSON in the chair). In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR McCUMBER: It is now nearly a year since I came to France with my regiment, and though I would enjoy a good long talk with you, if it should cover just a little of the vast array of new and unusual experiences I have had it would be a long and probably tiresome one indeed.

The American soldier is ever resourceful in frolic or fight, and in his efficiency, ready capability, and world-astounding adaptability has surpassed and often surprised himself. He is a constant source of wonderment, too, and has won the unqualified and openly expressed admiration of the finest fighters of the oldest armies now in Europe. His perennial kindness, his never-fading good cheer, his undiminished "pep," and his spontaneous eagerness to "take a chance," no matter what the odds against him, and the fact that he always "gets away with it" have won for him the reputation of being the most modest and best soldier now fighting in Europe. He is just exactly the sort of soldier to completely dissolve the morale of the enemy, and by his alertness takes immediate advantage of the fatigue or mistakes of the enemy. We have nothing but unstinted praise for all of our allies, but they are war weary; their enthusiasm is blunted by four years of preparing with one hand while fighting with the other an enemy not only overwhelming in numbers but unscrupulous in means and methods.

You already know what our boys have accomplished since they have entered the trenches, especially during the last week. Side by side with the French, who love them like brothers, they have beaten the Hun at his own game and pursued him without pause until they have recovered all that was lost in the last big German push through the French sectors, and they are still after them. This ability to, after starting the Hun, to keep him on the run, if kept up, will soon win the war; but the soonness depends upon our ability to keep him going. The war has lasted as long as it has because the allies have only had the ability to "hold him," or, if conditions have favored a counter-attack, the pursuit of him was limited in length and he was always given time to dig in. Such methods were unavoidable and due to no lack of valor on the part of our brave allies. It must be different now; our lines must be kept fresh and reserves and supplies must come so fast and in such numbers that the enemy will be given no time to recoup or reform his lines, until he will be rolled back demoralized, and to the very gates of Berlin.

I see your name so frequently mentioned in connection with the desire for sending over here an army of unlimited magnitude that this letter is written largely for the purpose of telling you that you exactly express the wants and needs of the present situation. The number should be overwhelming, so that the usual winter rest which has every year been accorded the Boche, and of which he has taken such costly advantage, will be denied him this year. And we not only need the numbers, but need now some bold and dependable pronouncement of the unlimited millions to come, advertised so loudly that it will give a solid and lasting encouragement to our tired but courageous allies, and reach to the remote regions of Germany with crushing emphasis. Such an announcement coming from the highest places would strike terror to the whole Prussian régime, which already glimpses its defeat.

The larger the army the fewer lives it will cost to win the war, and the bolder the announcement the easier the enemy is prepared for quick and complete defeat, and the sooner will come peace with victory. You have always seen clearly and right. I have just returned from an inspection of 48 camps, and I know just how a large part of the Army feels. The time for secrecy is past. We are in a position now to do big things; and telling it frankly and in the proper manner will not only stimulate their accomplishment, but shatter the morale of the enemy to such a degree that maybe a lot of it won't have to be done. In the face of what our own boys have already done over here, such advertising will not be regarded as boasting.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, when we had the bill before us just prior to our unanimous-consent agreement—which I think was on the 13th of July—I introduced an amendment to the then pending measure providing that we should say to the world, and that we should say to Germany, that we intend to put at least 5,000,000 men in the field in the quickest possible time. I stated that that ought to be placed in our legislation for the purpose of giving encouragement to our soldiers battling upon the western front, and discouragement to the enemies who are battling against them. This letter responds to that sentiment, and shows that it is the sentiment of officers and soldiers battling in France. But, Mr. President, for some unaccountable reason—and I think the only possible reason was that this amendment originated in the Senate, and did not originate in one of the departments—it was thought best to kill it, and, of course, it suffered the execution that has been accorded to everything that has not received its O. K. first from the departments.

Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], in speaking about this trawler and the fact that we had actually dropped depth bombs over the U-boat, stated that he was informed, if I understood him rightly, that the bombs were dropped all right and that the U-boat was clearly seen all right, but that the bombs did not explode, but he did not feel that he was at liberty to inform the American people why they did not explode. I think the American people are entitled to know why they did not explode. It is through this knowledge that we will assure ourselves of having those that will explode. I do not believe that there is anything gained by

hiding anything concerning this war from the American people. We will meet the emergency. We will get our airships all the sooner because the American people have been informed of the awful squandering of the tax-paid money of the American public with no results. The airship board says to Congress: "Give us another chance." Well, we are going to give them another chance to produce these airships; but if they had told us what they were doing in the very beginning, if they had kept us informed of what they were not doing during the whole year they were burning up nearly a billion dollars, we would have been a great deal further on our way toward securing the necessary airships for service in Europe to-day.

Mr. President, we must conduct this war on the theory that the central powers will fight as long as they have power to fight, and that this war will last two or three years longer. The principal reason that justifies us in saying that the war will last at least two years is that it will take us at least two years before we can get fully into it at the rate we are now progressing; and if we win this war sooner than that it will be because of the wonderful fighting qualities of the Americans who are over there, and of our allies, who are carrying the principal burden of this conflict. It is our duty to save the lives of as many of our allies as we possibly can as well as the lives of our own soldiers. We can save them only by rushing our troops to the front in overwhelming numbers; and our fatalities, we know, will be fewer in number by sending the younger men, who can stand the fatigue that is imposed upon our soldiers in France.

Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has introduced an amendment to compel those who have taken advantage of the privileges of a deferred classification because their services were needed in the industries to surrender this privilege if they fail to continue their work. The amendment is right so far as it goes. There can be no just argument against it.

Every American capable of working or fighting ought to be doing one or the other, and he ought to be doing it to the very best of his ability. But, Mr. President, I predict that but very little benefit will come from this amendment, even if it passes, and I will tell the Senator why.

The Senator, in his remarks, struck the keynote of the whole question when he stated that just in proportion to the increase in wages there had been a decrease in efficiency; and no one will deny to-day that while we are conducting this most desperate warfare individual energy, individual efficiency, has absolutely decreased from 35 to 50 per cent. That certainly is a bad situation; and therein, Mr. President, lies our principal trouble. That is why we have not the ships; that is why we have not the steel to build the ships; that is why we have not the guns; that is why we have not the ammunition; that is one of the reasons, though undoubtedly a minor reason, why we have not the airplanes; and all these together are the reasons why we have not the men in France that we ought to have to-day.

I called attention yesterday to what I regarded as the shameful manner in which work for the Government is being conducted under our very eyes. If any Senator will step outside this Capitol—any Senator who knows what real physical work is—and for five minutes will watch the time-killing methods adopted in the construction of these buildings he will understand why we are so shamefully behind in our war efforts. The Government to-day is entitled to the best energy and efforts of every man and woman in the land, and we should put every man, woman, and child who is able to perform any service for the Government under military control, and demand of each that he do his whole duty. If we have the right to enlist and drive our American citizens over the top, in the face of gas and liquid flame, the field gun and artillery; if we have the right to drive them to their deaths, then I want to ask any Senator if we have not the same right to ask their brothers here at home to do an honest day's work to support those boys? I want to ask those Senators if we should stand idly by and see the vast number of aliens, who are to-day the disturbing element, who are to-day doing most of the slacking in our work, remaining here under the protection of this Government, receiving wages ten and twenty times what they ever received before—employed for the very purpose of speeding up and being paid these enormous wages to insure such speeding up—if we should stand idly by and allow them to defeat our war purposes by giving us 30 to 40 per cent efficiency for these exceptionally high wages? By allowing this are we not committing a grievous offense against our soldier boys? Are we not responsible for the thousands and hundreds of thousands who will be killed in this war because of our delay?

I saw the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] in the Chamber a moment ago. I notice that he is absent now; but I wanted at this time to read to him a clipping from the Washington Times of to-day which will support his theory that there

ought not to be any strikes during the continuance of this war. We have constituted organizations that will see to it that no injustice is done any laborer, and he can trust his case to those boards and continue to perform his services until such board can act on his complaint.

I stated yesterday, in describing the character of work that was being done in the shadow of this Capitol, that I would to God that the soldier battling all day long in France, and digging himself in all night long, could for a moment look at the character of work that is being done to support him and to support his brothers on the line of battle. I am supported in that declaration by this publication which brings before us to-day the view taken by our soldiers on these strikes. The news article is from the Washington Times of to-day and reads as follows:

PORT M'HENRY TROOPS ANGERED BY STRIKE.

BALTIMORE, August 24.

Soldiers at United States General Hospital No. 2, Port McHenry, were enraged when 54 bricklayers employed on hospital buildings walked out because their demands for increased pay had not been granted.

The men are now being paid 75 cents an hour—

That is, for eight hours a day; and if they work an additional two hours they are paid a half more; and if they work on Sunday—which nearly all of them do, and then cut out Monday—they receive \$1.50 an hour for their work on Sunday—

and some time ago asked for an increase to \$1 an hour.

The soldiers were of the opinion that these men should be immediately drafted and put to work again at \$1 a day instead of a dollar an hour. The foreman explained that they would not get the increase any sooner by striking and it might result in them losing their positions.

There has just been handed me another article, headed as follows:

Two thousand plumbers on Government work go out on strike. Men employed at all camps and Government operations on both sides of Hampton Roads quit work. Big increase in pay asked. Want increase from 75 cents per hour to 87½ cents, with other concessions. Chairman of committee will have nothing to say.

Mr. President, I think no stronger arguments could be made in favor of the amendment that is offered by the Senator from Colorado than are contained in these published statements. I think we all know something about plumbers' wages. We all know something about the profits in them; and we know that plumbers receiving 75 cents an hour, with higher wages for overtime, certainly have no just or moral right to strike, while our boys are battling for \$1 a day in the trenches. It ought not to be allowed. Any man who does it, knowing its consequences to our soldiers, is not loyal, and any statesman who stands by without voicing his protest, to say the least, is lacking in courage, if not in fidelity, to the country.

Mr. President, I tell you the American people want every man from 65 years down who can perform an honest day's labor to perform it, and they will back this Congress and they will back this Government if we will enforce it. The country demands, our soldiers at the front demand, humanity demands that we do the very best that we can in winning this war and winning it in the shortest possible time.

But I admit we can not put 5,000,000 men over there to-day, because we need 30,000,000 tons dead weight of shipping to transport and to maintain an army of 5,000,000 men. We need that in addition to the shipping we now have. Are we going to get it either in 1918 or 1919? We were promised by the Shipping Board in 1917 that they would construct from six to eight million dead weight tonnage during the year 1918. They have delivered to-day, or up to August 1, about 1,470,000 dead-weight tons, but of this there were requisitioned ships built or in building amounting to 1,224,000 dead weight tonnage, leaving to the credit of the Shipping Board in actual new construction about 246,000 tons dead weight. Now, that is your shipping situation.

Last year the U-boats disposed of over 10,000,000 dead-weight tons. In the first seven months of this year, 1918, they have disposed of 3,500,000 tons dead-weight.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator stated, as I understood him, that it would require 30,000,000 tons of shipping to supply an army of 5,000,000 men.

Mr. McCUMBER. Yes; dead-weight tons.

Mr. FLETCHER. Dead-weight. I do not quite follow the Senator in his calculation. I suppose he is basing that on the idea that it requires 6 tons to the man per annum. Six tons per annum would mean that you would need 30,000,000 tons of shipping per annum, but when you figure that a ship will require not only 90 days to make a return trip, but will make three trips at least a year, it would be 10,000,000 tons, would it not?

Mr. McCUMBER. What I mean is this: That if we have an Army in France of 5,000,000 men it will require the constant use of 30,000,000 tons of shipping carrying men to take their places, carrying ammunition and supplies, even without taking

into account the number that will go down to the bottom of the ocean through ordinary marine disaster and through the U-boats. That is the information I have, and that is the information which appears in your committee hearing. I forget which one of your expert witnesses testified and stated that it would be about that. He gave the number, however, in gross tonnage, which reduced to the dead tonnage would be about 6 tons.

Mr. FLETCHER. I do not think it would require the constant use of 30,000,000 tons of shipping to take care of 5,000,000 men. I will admit it will require that much to be used in a year, undoubtedly.

Mr. McCUMBER. The British report was that it took 7 tons per man during their war in South Africa. That is equivalent to 7 tons in actual use.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think the later estimate was 6 tons per man.

Mr. McCUMBER. Now, Mr. President, that is our present shipping situation. The chairman of the Shipping Board says we will secure ships enough to win this war. Oh, yes, that is true; but he did not tell us when. To win this war when, Mr. Hurley? The question the American people want to know is how soon you can produce the shipping that will take care of from five to six or seven million men. Of course, we will win the war. We will win it if it takes us 40 years to do it, but we will win it sooner and we will win it with fewer, vastly fewer casualties and deaths if we send over enough men and if we produce the shipping to take care of that number of men. In the meantime while you are getting these ships ready hundreds of thousands, yes, millions of brave boys will die, will be killed, because of our neglect.

Now, we ought to hurry matters up. We ought first to provide for an army of at least 5,000,000, and I would say 7,000,000, and then we ought to concentrate all our energies toward the production of shipping and other material to take that army over and to support them. The way we can do it and the way we ought to do it is not to conscript labor, but to conscript the manhood and the womanhood and the childhood, if necessity demands it, of our American people. We have got the mills, we have got the steel, we have got everything we need in raw material to meet the demand; but if the productive energy of the American people is going to be allowed to be reduced from 100 per cent efficiency to 60 and 70 per cent efficiency, there is a duty upon the part of the American Congress that ought to be performed.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I only want a moment and in that moment mainly to talk to the Record. I came to the Senate yesterday expecting a vote on the pending measure either yesterday or to-day and was very anxious that I might be recorded in its favor. I find myself obliged to leave to-night for my own State in response to some of the obligations that come to a man in public and political life, and I therefore want the Record to say that I would very gladly and whole-heartedly vote for this measure.

I am not deeply concerned about any of the pending amendments, and I say that without disparaging the merits thereof in any way. I think the bill ought to pass. I am in favor of the committee's bill. I accept it without reservation. I put aside my personal sympathies, some of my own notions of the righteousness of universal service, to accept that which the War Department thinks necessary for the winning of the war. I would very gladly vote for the bill, because, in my own judgment, the speedy passage of this measure and its speedier application is going to save the Nation millions in treasure and thousands in lives.

It is going to do more than that. It is my conviction that we are so adrift in this Republic to-day in the fever of war and the attendant conditions abnormal to our American life that unless it is speedily brought to a triumphant ending the cost of the aftermath will be infinitely more than the winning of the war.

I do not think the Republic has yet taken the part it ought in bringing about a victory for world civilization and its preservation. I think we ought to have armies of many millions and I think that the conscience of the Republic will impel a reclassification of men enrolled and commit the man power of this country to the winning of the war, no matter what the sacrifice may be in the industrial life of the Republic.

So, Mr. President, I just want the Record to say, first, that I find my presence unnecessary. The bill is sure to have the sanction of this body, but in my absence from the roll call which is to be had I want it known that I gladly give my voice to the enactment of the measure.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, if my rising upon this occasion would defer for a moment the vote upon this bill I would not have a word to say. However, upon the assurance of the chairman that the bill will not likely come to a vote this afternoon and

that my action will not delay a vote, I desire to offer first an amendment to the committee's bill, on page 6, which I will ask to have read that it may go into the Record and may be printed. I offer it now for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico offers an amendment, which the Secretary will read.

The SECRETARY. Amend paragraph 7, on line 14, page 6, as follows:

Strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the words: "and such person shall be entitled to the same rights under the homestead and other land and mineral entry laws, general or special, as those over 21 years of age now possess under said laws: *Provided*, That any requirements as to establishment of residence within a limited time shall be suspended as to entry by such person until six months after his discharge from military service."

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, the amendment speaks for itself. It needs but little explanation. It simply extends the right of land and mineral entries to the drafted man of 18 possessed now by the citizen of 21. There is a requirement of the homestead law that residence shall be made upon a homestead so applied for within six months after the application is made. Of course, if a drafted man had a right of entry he could not make his residence within the period unless he was discharged prior thereto.

Mr. President, when I offered in June the amendment to the Army appropriation bill at that time and kept the amendment in various forms before the body for several days, securing votes upon the proposition to increase and decrease the age limit of the drafted men as is provided exactly in terms in this bill, modifying it, and securing votes upon the proposition when the first was defeated to make the ages 20 and 40, I introduced the amendment in perfect good faith, because it was as apparent to all of us then who had given any thought to the subject as it is now that so long as the present rules and regulations and classifications with reference to drafted men are enforced as they have been drawn and are being enforced by the War Department, if it is necessary to raise an additional number beyond the number we now have in the service, an additional reservoir must be supplied. That was as apparent in June as it is now, and I congratulate the country upon the fact that the Senate has been brought to a realization of the necessity.

Mr. President, the Senate knows very well from repeated expressions of my opinions that I have believed in the constitutional duty of the Congress of the United States, as expressly set forth in the Constitution itself, to itself provide the rules and the regulations for governing any army raised or authorized to be raised by Congress. The Constitution is specific in its terms. We are not only authorized but, in my judgment, directed by the strict terms of the Constitution to ourselves enact by legislation the regulations and the rules governing even the disciplining of any military force which can be raised under the authority of the Constitution.

When the draft measure was first up, more than a year ago, I discussed this subject as I am now discussing it. Congress in its wisdom saw best, at the request of the administration, to delegate the authority to the Secretary of War or the Commander in Chief of the Army to classify the recruits or the drafted men and to himself put in force such regulations and rules as the War Department or its advisers might adopt. They have adopted such rules and regulations and classifications as to preclude the possibility of securing another man unless the draft ages are now raised or lowered. In so far as that necessity now arises, the responsibility is between the Congress and the administration, equally divided. The Congress, in my judgment, has shirked its duty in not providing the rules itself. Unless Congress goes back and performs its duty and changes the classification or changes the rules and regulations with reference to the classification of these men, unless Congress itself does what, in my judgment, it should have done in the beginning, more than a year ago, then Congress is compelled to decrease and increase the draft age. For this reason I offered the amendment which created so much discussion and which was not only voted down but every proposition in connection with it was voted down by this body in June.

For the reasons then given, which I have not seen fit to change at all and which I am glad are now concurred in by the War Department as they were then disagreed from, I propose to vote for this bill. If we do not provide more men in the trenches we will not win this war, in my judgment. The War Department have concluded that we must have more men. They have stated frankly what they propose to do with the men, and Congress must provide some method of securing the men for the purposes needed. The present proposition is the only one which will be presented unless Congress decides to take in its own hands the matter of classifying those now under registration.

I can not understand, I will say frankly, the argument of my distinguished friend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] who would vote against the proposition that a slacker in work should be forced to fight, as is proposed by the amendment of the committee, when he admits 4,000,000 men must be provided for, and yet he will not go with us to provide the only reservoir from which the man power may be drawn.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. The difference between the Senator and myself is that according to my view of the figures which have been presented it is not necessary to go to the age of 18 in order to get the 4,400,000 men. In order to reduce it to the point where they must go to the 18-year-old men they arbitrarily exclude from the 10,800,000 men a much larger number than in my judgment is necessary.

I do not wish to be understood for a moment as opposing the sending of 4,000,000 or 5,000,000 men to Europe. I differ with the able Senator from New Mexico as to the necessity of sending the 18-year-old boy, because I believe that there are plenty of men between 32 and 45 to make up the list.

Mr. FALL. There is no difference between the Senator and myself, except that I insist unless the Senator and a majority of the Congress will join me in reclassifying we can not get the men. So long as he yields to the classification as established by the War Department he can not get the men.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho will be delighted to join the Senator in a reclassification, but unfortunately, or fortunately perhaps, the Senator from Idaho is not a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and did not frame this bill and could only speak to the bill as it was presented to the Senate. But the able Senator from New Mexico, who is much more competent to deal with this subject than myself, can present no amendment here for a reclassification that the Senator from Idaho will not support.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I am glad to know that. Upon some other occasion I think the question will undoubtedly be raised in the Senate. Not being a member of the Military Affairs Committee myself I could only point out what I thought were the objection to the provision in the original draft bill. I did not assume then, immediately after the declaration of war, when it was so necessary that we should have an army of some kind and when it was so insisted upon by the administration that it should be only in a certain way, that we should delegate the power to classify it and to exempt to the administration rather than to provide ourselves how these exemptions and classifications should be made. When it was so necessary, as I said, immediately after the declaration of war to provide a method by which an army should be assembled the Senator from New Mexico, not being a member of the Military Affairs Committee, offered no direct amendment but simply made suggestions, which were not listened to then so much as they were listened to in June, when he offered the amendment which is now the provision pending in the bill with the approval of the committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CUMMINS. As the Senator from New Mexico knows, I agree with him entirely with regard to the duty of Congress in raising an army, but I assume he does not doubt that the President, through his proper officer, could reclassify the men who have been hitherto included within the draft age, and that they could present an entirely different classification for the men whom we are about to bring within the draft age. I assume there will be no doubt of that. If we must have the men—and I think we should have 4,000,000 and many more, for that matter—and if the administration is denied the privilege of getting 18-year-old boys, it will be compelled to reclassify, because it must have the men.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, in part I agree with the construction of the draft law, as just referred to by the Senator from Iowa. In part I am afraid I must disagree with him. Congress enacted this law—I have the draft law in my hand:

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 from those liable to draft as in this act provided, persons of the following classes.

Now, there is a classification specified by the Congress itself in this act which under one construction the President might be precluded from touching except for semimilitary purposes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from New Mexico and myself differ with regard to that, but—

Mr. FALL. Then as to the other draft classification I think we agree.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator is, of course, aware of the fact that a very large proportion of the men who have been put in the deferred classes were put there because they are married and have in some fashion or other somebody dependent upon their labor. We have in the deferred classes all the State officers and all the county officers, although I think we did that partially in the law.

Mr. FALL. If the Senator will permit me right here, that is the classification I had reference to. I think the Senator and myself thoroughly agree.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think so.

Mr. FALL. As to the other classification not specially mentioned here, those drafted for partial military service, I agree that the President has the right to-day to reclassify them.

Mr. CUMMINS. Eighty per cent of the men of draft age substantially have been put in deferred classifications because they are married and have in some degree dependents.

Mr. FALL. I am not familiar with the exact figures, but I accept those suggested by the Senator. As I said, I think we are in thorough agreement in our construction of the law as it stands; but, Mr. President, to use a hackneyed phrase, this is a condition and not a theory which confronts us. Shall I refrain from voting for the passage of this bill because the War Department refuses to reclassify, when we all admit we must have the men? Shall I not perform my duty to the best of my ability, whether I can perform it in the exact way which would suit me best or not?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. FALL. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Suppose we should cut out the 18 and 19 year old boys, that would probably compel a reclassification.

Mr. FALL. It might.

Mr. BORAH. Then, I do not see how a man is not doing his duty according to the lights which are before him if he votes to cut out 18 and 19, and it compels a reclassification, when he is in favor of a reclassification. I am in favor of a reclassification. I arrive at that by two opposites. First, I cut out the 18 and 19 year age, and, secondly, I force a reclassification. That is precisely what I want.

Mr. FALL. Of course the Senator knows well that what I said was no reflection upon him or upon any other Senator who might disagree with me, nor was it so intended. I was simply expressing my own conviction as to my own thought as to what is actuating me in the matter, that we are confronted by a condition, and I will either attack that condition directly by compelling by law a reclassification, or, if I can not do that, under the necessities of the moment I shall attempt to supply some other reservoir from which the necessary number of soldiers may be obtained with which to win this war. I agree with the Senator, and he agrees with me, that if he and I could rewrite the bill or write a provision into it we would compel a reclassification.

We would compel the War Department to take from those now registered an additional number of men; but unfortunately his experience, I presume, has been as mine, that we were unable to compel action of that character or to secure a sufficient number of votes in this body with which to compel such action. We have thus been in the position of seeing ourselves—or I have, at least—compelled to wait two or three months to have carried out by the suggestion of the War Department a proposition the necessity for which was so perfectly plain, simple, and apparent two months ago that there could be no discussion about it, except that the War Department was not ready for it, so long as we allowed the law as it was written and the rules, regulations, and classifications made under that law to remain as they stand to-day.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, will the Senator allow another suggestion?

Mr. FALL. With pleasure.

Mr. CUMMINS. I make it because I would not have it understood that anything that I have said or any inference from anything that I have said could be interpreted as a criticism upon the Provost Marshal General. The classification which is now in force was made, I assume, with reference to the number of men intended to be raised for the Army. I do not think that any Provost Marshal General or any Secretary of War would ever have made the classification that we have before us if the purpose had been to raise five millions of men. The officers did not intend to raise any such army, I assume, because they thought it was not needed; and I would be very sorry to believe that, with the emergency that is now apparent, they would not be perfectly willing and glad to revise the classification so that the requisite number of men could be raised from it.

Mr. FALL. Well, Mr. President, I have understood that this bill was here because they had refused to revise the classifications. I have understood that the Secretary of War and the Chief of Staff, who have been before the committees of both Houses, have decided upon this plan, and, rather than do what they could do themselves without any demand upon Congress, have demanded that Congress lower and raise the age limit, although they themselves, as the Senator has said, have now the power to reclassify without further act of Congress.

Mr. President, as I have said, that forms the condition with which we are confronted; but their failure to reclassify, as I think they should do, and thus provide a sufficient number of men to fill the quota at present required offers no excuse for me, at any rate, to refuse to vote for this measure and say that the responsibility then is upon them to reclassify.

Mr. President, I think that the very fact referred to by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], that at the time this classification was made the officers making it did not contemplate the raising of a large number of men, is, as he says, at the root of the trouble. Still, I think that that very fact constitutes a very grave reflection upon the wisdom of this body and the wisdom of those administering the law.

The draft law, as I have pointed out heretofore, and as I pointed out when it was here before us for passage, was a limitation upon the fighting force of the United States, although it pretended upon its face to be an emergency measure to provide all the man power necessary with which to win the war. As I pointed out again in connection with the Army appropriation bill which was brought in here in June, to which I offered the draft amendment, again, in the face of the declaration of the President of the United States that there should be no limit upon the number of men who should be placed at his command, that legislation was in itself a limitation on the number of men to 3,000,000, and no more. The bill we have before us now, even going into the home and taking boys of 18 and going into the business houses and taking men of 45, itself is avowedly a limitation upon the man power to be placed at the disposal of the President of the United States with which to fight this war. According to the evidence presented and under the statements made here by Senators who have this matter in charge, the Army now is to be limited to 4,000,000 men. While Gen. Wood and men of that character have for three, four, or five years been clamoring for at least 5,000,000 men, we limit the number to be raised under this draft to not more than one and a half million men in addition to those covered by the original bill. Then, while pretending to remove the limit, under the last bill, which was passed in June, under the rules and regulations provided and under the testimony—which must be taken as a part of the history of this legislation, and under which it must be construed—we specifically again limited, as I say, the armed forces of the United States under the draft measure to 3,000,000. Now, under the same rule of construction and by direct wording, we are limiting the military forces of the United States, including volunteers and all those under the draft, to 4,000,000 men.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] and other Senators who have avowed that they were satisfied with the program, because they were guided by the advice of the authorities, are right and I am wrong, they are justified in their contention; of course, ordinarily, we should be able to place absolute confidence in the plans and the program offered us by our War Department; but, Mr. President, while I may be wrong, I yet find myself, with reference to this very bill, in exactly the same frame of mind which I avowed here in interpellating the chairman of the committee and the Senator from New York in June last, when the chairman stated that, while he favored the proposition which I had introduced, and which was then pending, to make the draft ages 18 to 45, yet, in view of the statements of the Secretary of War and his Chief of Staff, he would vote against it for the time being. You will remember that then—and it is in the Record—I stated that, in view of the declaration of the Secretary of War that, with 750,000 troops then in France, we were six months ahead of his program, he necessarily, by his own declaration, must be six months behind the crisis in his plan, and that I, for one, would decline to take his advice or to abide by it until he caught up with the crisis. I am in the same frame of mind now, sir. While I shall vote for this bill, I am yet not satisfied that the plans of the honorable Secretary of War are not more than six months behind the necessities of the occasion.

Mr. President, I have really said more than I intended to say. I shall vote for this bill; I shall vote for any measure—and I beg of the Military Committee that they will give us an opportunity to vote for some such measure—which will compel the

War Department to reclassify those who are subject to military duty.

Mr. NEW. Mr. President, I shall vote for this bill for reasons which may be very briefly stated. I shall vote for it because the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, and the War Department say that it is a necessary measure. It is not, in my opinion, a question of putting confidence in the judgment of the War Department in all things; but somebody must be charged with the responsibility of framing a war policy; somebody must be charged with the responsibility of raising the Army; and this is the method that has been adopted and which has been recommended by the War Department.

Not only is that true, but the Secretary of War and his Chief of Staff, both of whom were examined and interrogated at length before the Committee on Military Affairs, have expressed it as their judgment that nothing short of this will suffice to raise an army of the size required to carry out the program of the department. For that reason, Mr. President, if for no other, I shall vote to give them what they ask. If I were to consult my sentiments I should vote against sending boys of 18 to the colors. That may sound strange coming from the lips of one who, like myself, has been from the first so strong an advocate of universal military training. I have for years been very much in favor of universal military training. Several months ago I offered an amendment to a bill then pending before this body by the terms of which I sought to have that system adopted. I did that at that time, Mr. President, for the reason that some of us thought at least that we foresaw the very emergency which has now arisen. I remember very well—and the Record will bear me out—that in addressing myself to that measure I then said if it were not adopted at that time I felt certain that we should be called upon to vote for that or a more drastic measure before this session of Congress expired. Here it has now come to pass. This is, indeed, a very much more drastic proposition than the one which was then advanced.

I will go further, Mr. President, and say that I think the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] is right in thinking that there have been mistakes made in the classifications in the past. I think that the deferred classes contain the names of many who should not be on those lists, and I believe that before we reach the end there must be a change in that as well; I think that we shall go into them; but at this time, for the reason given by the authorities upon whom responsibility must rest, that this measure as now framed is an absolute necessity for the success of the military program made by those authorities, I shall vote to support the bill.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I shall consume but a very few moments of the time of the Senate this afternoon in the discussion of the pending measure. I am convinced that the senatorial mind is about made up and really I think the matter has been talked about enough and ought to be disposed of. The subject has been exhausted and there is no necessity for further long-drawn-out debate on this question, and I am not going to contribute to the tedium of the hour and delay action in the Senate by anything that I may say.

Merely to keep my record straight and with a desire only to promote the interest of my country, Mr. President, I desire to say that whatever Army may be necessary to win this war I shall vote to raise it in the proper way. But I will not consent to impress 18-year-old boys into the service of this country; I will not consent that the conscript officer shall be authorized to invade the sacred precincts of the home and take the tender youth of 18 years of age from the bosom of his mother, to send him across the ocean to die in the trenches of France until it shall be demonstrated beyond doubt that there is not sufficient man power above 21 years of age available to win the war. I think it has been clearly shown in this debate that there are ample men, men fit for military service, men who can leave their homes and their respective vocations without detriment to the industrial and social interests of the Nation to win this war who are above 21 years of age. I do not think it is necessary to go into the nursery to secure soldiers to fight this war. As the able and learned Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] has well said on yesterday, "This is a man's war and ought to be fought by men." To take the boy just 18, in the formative period of life, and compel him to render service whether he has the spirit or the physical strength is not conducive to the better interests of America. Voluntary service on the part of the youths of the country is an inspiration, but compulsion kills the spirit of enterprise and stifles the patriotic impulse. I do not believe the American people will approve the conscription of the youth of the land to fight this war, and it is my conviction that the enactment of this feature of the bill will be a source

of profound disappointment to the men and women of this Republic. And I am still of the opinion, Mr. President, that the wishes of the people even in this matter should be considered.

The 18-year-old boy is not consulted about the law; he is not permitted to participate in the election of Senators and Representatives; he is not allowed to settle with the Senator or Representative whose vote compels him to submit to the infinite sacrifice which he is called upon in this crucial moment to make; and such treatment, I submit, is not fair, especially when we consider the fact that there is ample man power above the age of 21 to win this war. It is unjust; it is un-American; it is contrary to every idea of liberty which is vouchsafed to every citizen by the Constitution of the United States.

I think the whole plan of conscripting the boy under 21 years of age is contrary to the letter and spirit of the Constitution and the genius of our institutions as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States. The law books are full of cases that sustain this view, and it will be prudent for Senators to consult them before this radical and unusual step shall be taken.

It is my judgment that the principle is irrevocably fixed that the full burdens of citizenship, including compulsory military service, do not accrue until the American youth has reached the age of 21 years. But, Mr. President, I am not going to take the time of the Senate to argue that proposition at length. It is too well established to call for elaboration. There is not a lawyer in this body, there is not a student of American history that is not familiar with it. I desire to say, however—and I can not make it too emphatic—that every idea of justice and fair dealing condemns the suggestion to take the boy from his home and force him to perform compulsory military service in a foreign land before he is given the right to cast a vote for or against the Congressman who makes the laws. To my mind, such a law is the acme of injustice.

It seems to me that the American Congress has forgotten the source of its authority. The feelings and wishes of the people are ignored. It is my deliberate judgment that if the people of the United States were permitted to vote on the proposition as to whether or not boys 18 years of age should be conscripted that 85 per cent of the vote would be against it.

It is so manifestly improper that for its utter condemnation I need only to reproduce the inspired words of one of America's greatest advocates, who on a somewhat similar occasion said:

"I need not grope among the ruins of antiquity, stumble over the fallen columns of obsolete statutes, or delve in the pages of black letter lore in order to establish a principle written by the finger of God upon the heart of every man." And he might have added "upon the heart of every mother." And I would rather trust that mother heart to guide me aright than the logical processes of the cold-blooded, selfish politician.

I am going to vote against conscripting boys under 21 years of age, but if my views shall not be adopted by the Senate I shall vote to pass the bill, preferring, however, that the maximum age limit should be 60 rather than 45. If it shall be discovered that there is not enough man power between 21 and 45 or 60, we will then do the thing needful to raise the requisite number. The war must be won, but it should be won by men and not boys of 18 years of age taken from the parental home without their consent.

I wish to say in conclusion, Mr. President, that I shall be very glad to vote for an amendment to this bill authorizing the 18-year-old boy to volunteer, even against the wishes of his parents, if Congress has the power to give to him that exemption.

With this simple statement of my views I am now ready to vote on the bill.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I ask permission to have read into the RECORD a letter I received this morning, in view of the statements which have been made with reference to young men in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to reading the letter requested by the Senator from Oregon? There being none, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

AUGUST 23, 1918.

HON. GEORGE E. CHAMBERLAIN,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am glad that you recalled the plans of Washington and of Gen. Knox for an Army service including men from 18 to 45 years of age.

You may also remember that in the constitutions of many of the States there has been and yet is a militia schedule that includes men of those ages.

You may also remember that some of the most distinguished soldiers of our own and other countries, in both Army and Navy, entered the service at ages earlier than 18, and many at 19 and 20.

Lafayette came to America at 19 and was made a major general in our Army at 20.

Washington himself was a Lieutenant colonel at 22.

"Lighthouse Harry" Lee entered the Army with Washington at 20.

Gen. Alexander Macomb, who became Commander in Chief of the Army (1835-1841) entered the Army at 17.

Commodore Stephen Decatur—"My country, right or wrong," Decatur—entered the Navy at 19.

James Lawrence—"Never give up the ship"—entered the service at 16.

Commodore Barney also entered at 16.

Commodore Matthew F. Maury and Admiral A. T. Mahan both went into the service at 19.

Gens. Wilkinson, Armstrong, William J. Worth, and Stephen W. Kearney entered at 18.

Gen. M. C. Meigs, of Georgia, who superintended the Capitol extensions and was Quartermaster General of the Army, entered the Army while yet a youth.

Gen. Robert Anderson, of Fort Sumter fame, graduated from West Point at 20 and became an officer immediately.

Gen. John Mosby Bacon, of Kentucky, entered the Army at 18 and served in both the Civil and Spanish-American Wars.

Gen. Frank D. Baldwin—with whom I served in Cuba—entered the service at 19, was given the congressional medal of honor at 20, and again a like medal for Indian service.

Lieut. Gen. John C. Bates, lately Chief of Staff, entered the service at 19 during the Civil War.

Rear Admiral Benham entered the Navy when he was 15.

Rear Admiral Charles Stuart Boggs, who fought past Forts Jackson and St. Philip in the Mississippi during the Civil War, also entered the Navy at 15.

Gen. Braxton Bragg—"A little more grape, Capt. Bragg"—of the United States Army, and famous Confederate commander, after whom an Artillery training camp has just been named by the Secretary of War, graduated at West Point when 20 and became a second lieutenant of the Third Artillery.

Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner graduated at 17 and at once became an officer of the Army.

George W. Cable, famous novelist, entered the Confederate Army at 19 and served to the end of it.

Lieut. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, late Chief of Staff, entered the United States Army as a private at 19.

Gen. Samuel Cooper, who was Adjutant General of both the United States Army and the Confederate Army, graduated at West Point and entered the Army as a lieutenant at 17.

Rear Admiral Dupont, whose statue is in Dupont Circle of the National Capital, was a midshipman at 12 years of age.

Rear Admiral English entered at 16.

John Ericsson, inventor of the *Monitor*, entered the Swedish Army at 17.

Admiral Farragut became a naval officer at 19.

Ex-Senator J. B. Foraker became a soldier in the Civil War at 16.

Capt. Gridley, of Manila fame under Dewey, entered the Navy at 15.

Gen. William Henry Harrison, President of the United States, served at 18 on Gen. Wayne's staff.

Gen. Franz Lieber was a soldier at 15, and was the author of "the Code of War for the Government of Armies of the United States in the Field."

Capt. Richmond Pearson Hobson, of *Merrimac* heroism in Santiago Bay, entered the Navy at 19.

Gen. Henry W. Lawton, who died in action in the Philippines, entered the Army as a private in 1861 at the age of 18.

Gen. W. W. Loring became a soldier at 17, serving in the United States Army, the Confederate Army, and the Egyptian Army.

Gen. Arthur McArthur entered the Army as first lieutenant at 17.

The list could be amazingly extended, but the instances cited should assure the timid that there is no great hardship or any terrible "robbing of the cradle" in enlisting soldiers, at least for training, at the age of 18.

I served myself for three months in the Confederate Army and surrendered to the Union forces before I was 14 years of age.

With all high consideration,

Truly, yours,

SAM W. SMALL.

Mr. YARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon permit a suggestion?

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

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Certainly.

Mr. YARDAMAN. It is needless to say that none of the men referred to in that letter were conscripts.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, that seems to be a sort of man of straw that the Senator from Mississippi sets up every time we talk about getting young men into the Army.

Gen. Grant said—and I believe his testimony is worthy of consideration—that the men who fought for the South during the Civil War were proud of the fact that they were conscript soldiers. The fact is the South adopted conscription before the North. There is not a gallant man of the South to-day who served as a conscript whose patriotism or valor anyone would challenge because of the fact that he was a mere conscript soldier.

Mr. President, I have had that letter put into the RECORD simply because it shows the possibility of young men making reputations for themselves in the Army. The names given are only a few of those who entered the service before they were 21 years of age and who attained fame in the service of their country. The list might be multiplied to over two million and a half young men who went into the Army under 21 years of age. The figures have been read into the RECORD a number of times, and I am not going to insert them again.

Mr. President, the young men are the men to fight this war if it is intended to fight it to a successful finish, and America intends to fight it to a successful finish, as Gen. March so posi-

tively stated in his testimony not long ago, and as the American people firmly believe will be done.

Mr. President, not to go out of the Senate itself, I want to call the attention of the Senators to our esteemed colleagues, some of whom are with us now, some of whom have passed over, and some of whom are not now in the Senate. I call attention to the fact that the Senator from Virginia, Mr. MARTIN, was in the Confederate Army when he was 18. The Senator from Minnesota, Mr. NELSON, was in the Union Army when he was 18, and his record shows that he was captured before he was 20. The late Senator from Virginia, Mr. Daniel, was in the army at 18, and was an officer before he was 19, and obtained a prominent position as an officer of the Confederate forces. Mr. Kenna, of West Virginia, a former Senator here, was in the army at 16. Our very distinguished and beloved colleague from Alabama, Mr. BANKHEAD, went into the service at 18 and served throughout the war. The Senator from Wyoming, Mr. WARREN, whom we all know and love, went into the service at 17, and he is with us yet.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff] went into the Army at 18 and is now a Member of this body.

As Rev. Dr. Small says in his letter, the names might be multiplied a thousandfold of men who have distinguished themselves and who have gone into the Army, whether by conscription or by volunteering matters not. But I call the attention of the Senate to one or two names that he did not mention that just happened to come to me while I was reading his letter.

Alexander Hamilton was born January 11, 1757, and entered the Continental Army in 1776 at the age of 19, and was a captain of Artillery. He was appointed aid-de-camp to Gen. Washington March 1, 1777, just as he had passed his twenty-first birthday. He served with Washington nearly through the war in a most gallant fashion, and left a record to be proud of.

Aaron Burr, who distinguished himself in more than one severely fought battle, was born in 1756, and entered the Continental Army in 1775. And so you might go down the list and find men who served before they were 21 years of age, and who had commissions in the service of their country.

I think it is a reflection on the young men of the country to talk about not taking them into the service. I am besieged all the time by young fellows of 18 years and upward who are anxious to have the bill passed, and are anxious to know what is going on in the Senate with reference to it; and there are those who are still younger than that who are anxious to be permitted to go in.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I had hoped that we might get a vote on this bill to-day. I shall be obliged to be absent on Monday and Tuesday, and I was very anxious to vote on this bill, and to vote for it.

Like a good many other of my colleagues, if I had had my choice I should have preferred to have the age not as low as 18, on account of the educational advantages that so materially aid a young man at that time in the prosecution of his future life's work; but I recognize the fact that we need now, as rapidly as we may get them, an army of sufficient size to bring this conflict to an immediate end, if possible. I believe that the interests of the country, the interests of the boys even of 18, will be better served in the long run by having them join with their older colleagues in the Army and put an end to this conflict, so that the normal condition of things may be resumed as soon as possible, and the Government may be turned back into the hands of the people unmenaced and unjeopardized by this sinister host that has withstood the forces of civilization for the four years the war has been in progress.

I think, Mr. President, that perhaps it is wise to widen the difference between the ages, because of the industrial conditions that exist in the country. If it were limited to just 21 to 31 the Army that we might raise perhaps would not be sufficient to equip those in the field and to take care of the industries at home, because at every age there are some men peculiarly equipped for certain work, and there are others of the same age who are not so equipped, who can be spared for the war. So that if we have the region from 18 to 45 from which to choose, we will do the least violence to the commercial and industrial life of the country, while having a wider area from which to select men for service in the field.

I shall vote for the bill for the ages from 18 to 45, as I said, with reluctance on account of denying the young men of the lesser ages, 18 to 21, the educational privileges that are so much greater now than they were in former years. An education to-day means more than it ever meant before. It is a real, practical equipment for life work. It is not like the condition a few years ago, comparatively, when education was a literary affair. Our great grandfathers knew nothing of the practical application of the forces of nature in the great affairs of men. A

liberal education may be obtained by a real working knowledge of a steam engine or of a telephone, properly constructed, so that in getting his life work a man gets a trained brain; for there is no schoolmaster equal in his exactness to science. You have to get the conditions perfect before you ever get the answer. It trains the mind to think truly and think clearly, and also gives the student his life work while he is obtaining his education. That has never occurred before in the history of the world; and the young man who misses it to-day, who has not what we term a technical education, must fall in the class of the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. He must be subservient to the man who does know more than ever before in the history of the world; and it is with reluctance that I would deny any boy, any citizen of the United States, the matchless privilege, the necessary privilege of securing the proper equipment for his life work during those years of accretion, those years between 18 and 21 when the imaginations of childhood are beginning to give place to the real facts of life.

But there is a greater problem before us than that of solving the problem of one's individual life work. It is solving the problem of America's life work. It calls for all men; it calls for the women; it calls for the children; it calls to every citizen of the United States now, regardless of every advantage or disadvantage, to join in the conflict to do away with that horrible revelation of savagery under the guise of civilized form known as the Prussian autocracy—one that has paraded itself in civilized garb while its heart was as black as the hell that gave it birth. I think it is time for us to unite to raise an army sufficient to crush it out, and allow us once again to resume the blessings of our American civilization and government.

I shall see that my vote is properly protected by a pair. I want to state that were I here I would vote for the bill; but, not being able to be here I wanted to go on record as to how I stood in reference to it, and I will use my best endeavors to have my vote protected by virtue of a pair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] to the amendment of the committee, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the House bill on this subject is likely to pass some time this evening, and the Military Affairs Committee will meet Monday morning, and be ready to report out the House bill as soon as the Senate convenes on Monday. In view of the fact that to pass this bill now in any shape and send it over to the House with the House bill on its way over here would create an unfortunate legislative condition, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I move that the Senate take a recess until Monday at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, August 26, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 24 (legislative day of August 22), 1918.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be first lieutenant with rank from July 25, 1918.

Second Lieut. Henry M. Atkinson, jr.

FIELD ARTILLERY.

To be first lieutenants with rank from July 22, 1918.

Second Lieut. Robert E. Crotty.

Second Lieut. Wilton Lloyd-Smith.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Brig. Gen. John A. Lejeune to be a major general in the Marine Corps, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Brig. Gen. Littleton W. T. Waller to be a major general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named colonels to be brigadier generals in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

James E. Mahoney,

Charles G. Long,
Ben H. Fuller,
Wendell C. Neville,
John T. Myers, and
Albertus W. Catlin.

Col. Cyrus S. Radford, assistant quartermaster, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps, with the rank of brigadier general, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named lieutenant colonels to be colonels in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Newt H. Hall,
Smedley D. Butler,
George C. Thorpe,
Charles S. Hill,
George C. Reid,
Robert H. Dunlap,
Randolph C. Berkeley,
Carl Gamborg-Andresen,
Harry Lee,
John F. McGill,
Louis M. Gulick,
Hiram I. Bearss,
Frederic L. Bradman,
James C. Breckinridge,
Arthur T. Marix,
George Van Orden,
James T. Bootes,
Logan Feland,
William Hopkins,
Dickinson P. Hall,
Charles H. Lyman,
Charles C. Carpenter,
Louis McC. Little,
Frederic M. Wise,
Richard M. Cutts, and
Henry C. Davis.

Lieut. Col. William B. Lemly, assistant quartermaster, to be an assistant quartermaster in the Marine Corps, with the rank of colonel, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Lieut. Col. David D. Porter, assistant adjutant and inspector, to be an assistant adjutant and inspector in the Marine Corps, with the rank of colonel, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Lieut. Col. William G. Powell, assistant paymaster, to be an assistant paymaster in the Marine Corps, with the rank of colonel, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

The following-named majors to be lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Harold C. Snyder,
Alexander S. Williams,
Julius S. Turrill,
James McE. Huey,
Jay M. Salladay,
Macker Babb,
Frank E. Evans,
Harry R. Lay,
Charles B. Taylor,
Rush R. Wallace,
John W. Wadleigh,
William C. Harlee,
Richard S. Hooker,
Richard P. Williams,
John C. Beaumont,
Paul E. Chamberlin,
Lee B. Purcell,
Douglas C. McDougal,
Presley M. Rixey, jr.,
Theodore E. Backstrom,
William H. Pritchett,
Thomas H. Brown,
William G. Fay,
Robert Y. Rhea,
Eli T. Fryer,
Thomas Holcomb,
Edward A. Greene,
Edward B. Manwaring,
Thomas M. Clinton,
Hamilton D. South,
James T. Buttrick,
Giles Bishop, jr.,
Frank Halford,

James K. Tracy,
Berton W. Sibley,
William Brackett,
Chandler Campbell,
Arthur J. O'Leary,
William L. Redles,
Charles T. Westcott,
Frederick A. Ramsey,
Earl H. Ellis,
John A. Hughes,
Thomas C. Turner, and
Raymond B. Sullivan.

The following-named assistant quartermasters with the rank of major, to be assistant quartermasters in the Marine Corps, with the rank of lieutenant colonel, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Henry L. Roosevelt,
Norman G. Burton,
Hugh Matthews,
Frank J. Schwable,
Rupert C. Dewey, and
Walter E. Noa.

Maj. Harold C. Reisinger, assistant paymaster, to be an assistant paymaster in the Marine Corps with the rank of lieutenant colonel, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918.

Maj. Elias R. Beadle to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of August, 1916. (To correct date of present rank.)

Maj. Arthur B. Owens to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 18th day of October, 1916. (To correct date of present rank.)

The following-named temporary major to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of October, 1917:

Alexander M. Watson.

Capt. Wilbur Thing to be a major in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 22d day of May, 1917.

Capt. Edwin H. Brainard to be a major in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 16th day of October, 1917.

Capt. Alfred A. Cunningham to be a major in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 19th day of June, 1918.

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Alley D. Rorex,
Samuel M. Harrington,
Harold L. Parsons,
Chester L. Gawne,
Dwight F. Smith,
Thomas E. Thrasher, jr.,
Ernest A. Perkins,
Nedom A. Eastman,
Randolph T. Zane,
Clarence C. Riner,
Leon W. Hoyt,
Julian C. Smith,
Charles J. Miller,
Otto Becker, jr.,
Leander A. Clapp,
William S. Harrison,
Robert W. Voeth,
Thomas S. Clarke,
Clarence E. Nutting,
Bernard L. Smith,
Edward M. Reno,
Joseph C. Fegan,
Joseph D. Murray,
Woolman G. Emory,
George H. Osterhout, jr.,
John Q. Adams,
Francis T. Evans,
Charles G. Sinclair,
Adolph B. Miller,
Allen E. Simon,
Ralph E. Davis,
Harry W. Weitzel,
Sidney N. Raynor,
Frederick R. Hoyt,
Alexander A. Vandegrift,
Fred S. N. Erskine,
Roy S. Geiger,
Ernest C. Williams,
Richard H. Tebbs, jr.,
Robert E. Messersmith,
George W. Van Hoose,
Arthur J. White,
Samuel P. Budd,
Charles D. Barrett,
Emond H. Morse,

James T. Reid,
Robert P. Peirce,
Oliver Floyd, and
Gerald A. Johnson.

First Lieut. Arthur B. Jacques to be a captain in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 23d day of May, 1917.

First Lieut. William Merrill to be a captain in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of June, 1918.

First Lieut. Joseph Jackson to be a captain in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 5th day of June, 1918.

First Lieut. Clate C. Snyder to be a captain in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 7th day of June, 1918.

First Lieut. Thomas B. Wood to be a captain in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 8th day of June, 1918.

First Lieut. William J. Borden to be a captain in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 12th day of June, 1918.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Joseph M. Swinnerton,
Leslie G. Wayt,
Charles A. Smith,
Archie Farquharson,
Robert W. Winter,
Edward P. Oliver,
Sidney O. Thompson,
Glen C. Cole,
Max Cox,
William H. Haggerty,
Walter J. White,
Edgar S. Tuttle,
Thomas L. Edwards,
Charles McL. Lott,
Joseph Reardon,
David T. Jackson,
Russell A. Presley,
William L. Erdman,
John H. Nichols,
Ernest L. Russell,
Frank N. Gilmore,
William J. Flanagan,
James F. Robertson,
George L. Littlefield,
William F. Becker,
Charles H. Martin,
Rolin A. York,
Charles F. Kienast,
Harvey B. Mims,
Earl B. Hammond,
Charles G. Haas,
Charles E. Rice,
Mark A. Smith,
Timothy J. Holland,
Vincent E. Healy,
Daniel J. Readey,
Charles D. Sniffin,
Walter A. Powers,
William H. Abrams,
Edmund G. Chamberlain,
Clarence E. Nelson,
George H. Martin, jr.,
Benjamin DeW. Knapp,
Robert J. Archibald,
Gilder D. Jackson, jr.,
Franklin T. Steele, and
Percy D. Cornell.

Second Lieut. Arthur B. Jacques to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 22d of May, 1917.

Second Lieut. Roswell G. Ham to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of June, 1918.

Second Lieut. Antonio Moschella to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 5th day of June, 1918.

Second Lieut. Earle F. Swett to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 7th day of June, 1918.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 8th day of June, 1918:

George L. Cherry,
Walter S. Poague, and
Paul S. Hanway.

Second Lieut. William W. Nottingham to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 12th day of June, 1918.

Second Lieut. Charles J. Churchman to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 13th day of June, 1918.

Second Lieut. Allan C. Perkinson to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 14th day of June, 1918.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 15th day of June, 1918:

Everett R. Brewer and
Blythe G. Jones.

Second Lieut. Robert D. Evans to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 16th day of June, 1918.

Second Lieut. Melvin H. Hass to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 19th day of June, 1918.

Second Lieut. Henry Gund, jr., to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 28th day of June, 1918.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Philander B. Briscoe,
Herman R. Anderson,
Clarence M. Ruffner,
Philip B. Blake,
Albert C. Simonds,
Horace L. Hrschler,
Kenneth K. Boynton,
Frederick L. Kolb,
George R. Coxe,
Paul E. Cheney,
Samuel J. Melick,
Darrell J. Bogardus,
Walter M. Brewer,
Garrison P. Anthes,
Chester L. Fordney,
William J. J. Elger,
King H. Young,
Hu H. Phipps,
Harold P. Nachtrieb,
Roy E. Bledsoe,
Thomas A. Langford,
Lucius Q. C. L. Lyle,
Alexander P. Brown,
Walter E. Lawson,
Neil F. Dougherty,
Evans Spalding,
Carman B. Smith,
Donald U. Bathrick,
Norman E. Burbidge,
Leland I. Tolman,
Ulva L. Ettinger,
Gerald J. Pyle,
Frederick C. Lusk,
Matson C. Terry,
Willis F. Ostrander,
Frank J. Haight,
Roy A. Stoner,
Thomas G. MacCarthy,
James H. Williamson,
David A. Redford,
George G. Munce,
Carroll F. Byrd,
Frederick S. Manter,
Ralph W. Marshall,
Samuel F. Hollins, and
Raymond J. Kirwan.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 17th day of July, 1918:

Second Lieut. Henry D. F. Long,
First Lieut. James Diskin,
First Lieut. Ross L. Iams,
Second Lieut. Lee Carter,
First Lieut. George Nielsen,
First Lieut. Wyle J. Moore,
First Lieut. Charles D. Baylis,
Second Lieut. Richard B. Dwyer,
Second Lieut. William G. Kilgore,

First Lieut. Harry E. Leland,
 Second Lieut. John F. Leslie,
 Second Lieut. David R. Nimmer,
 First Lieut. William J. Platten,
 Second Lieut. Allen G. Williams,
 First Lieut. Georges F. Kremm,
 First Lieut. Jesse F. Dunlap,
 First Lieut. Melchoir B. Trelfall,
 First Lieut. Walter H. Batts, and
 First Lieut. Trevor G. Williams.
 Marine Gunner Winfield S. Cranmer to be a second lieutenant
 in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 17th day of
 July, 1918.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve to
 be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary serv-
 ice, from the 15th day of August, 1918:

James McI. Adam,
 Corlies Adams,
 Herbert F. Adey,
 Harvey B. Alban,
 Norman T. Alexander,
 Raymond D. Andrews,
 Ray M. Angell,
 Theodore F. Appleby,
 Anthony G. Armstrong,
 George S. Atkinson,
 John Ayrault, jr.,
 Harry W. Bacon,
 David Ball,
 George L. Ball,
 Robert L. Bard,
 William D. Bassett,
 Arthur J. Bancroft,
 John W. Beckett,
 Robert S. Benepe,
 Byron M. Bickford,
 Paul E. Bierly,
 Ivan E. Bigler,
 Frank X. Bleicher,
 Arthur O. Bodine,
 John J. Bogardus,
 Edwin M. Borgen,
 William E. Bowe,
 Sherman H. Bowles,
 Richard Boydston,
 Eugene D. Bradbury,
 Alfred H. Branham,
 Frank B. Bready, jr.,
 Charles N. Briggs,
 Clarence E. Briggs,
 Leslie Brown,
 Irwin T. Brown,
 Oliver D. Brown,
 William F. Brown,
 Joseph F. Burke,
 Leonard S. Burns,
 Richard L. Byrd,
 Laurence D. Berlin,
 Charles C. Cameron,
 Henry A. Carr,
 Robert T. Carrithers,
 Theodore H. Cartwright,
 Arthur D. Challacombe,
 Arthur F. Chmelik,
 Solon B. Clark,
 Bernard W. Coldewey,
 Charles F. Conahan,
 John F. Connaughton,
 Stewart P. Corning,
 William S. Cowles, jr.,
 Alfred C. Cottrell,
 David S. Craig,
 Gerald A. Craig,
 Charles W. Creaser,
 John W. Cunningham,
 James B. Darby,
 Hubert J. Davis,
 Louis J. Davis,
 Edward Earle,
 Nathaniel W. Emery,
 Fred N. Estopinal,
 Phillips Eastman,
 Charles W. Ebnother,
 Carlton E. Edwards,
 John F. Ellis,

John J. Emmons,
 John F. Eskay,
 William W. Eustis,
 James C. Faw,
 Francis I. Fenton,
 Guy L. Ferguson,
 Michael J. Finn,
 Carlton A. Fisher,
 George C. Flanders,
 James W. Flett,
 Charles P. Flood,
 Harry G. Fortune,
 James Gandee,
 Frank B. Geottge,
 Frank D. Gibson,
 Wallace G. Gibson,
 Frank S. Gilman,
 Newell S. Gordy,
 Moses J. Gould,
 Frank P. Graham,
 Homer J. Gravelle,
 Edwin U. Hakala,
 Charles H. Hassenmiller,
 August L. Huhn, jr.,
 George M. Hunter,
 Robert E. Hutchinson,
 Henry N. Hale,
 Elmor E. Hall,
 William C. Hall,
 John Halla,
 Charles F. Hansel,
 Eugene B. Hanson,
 Page V. Hart,
 Clarence H. Hartley,
 Leo Healey,
 Frank W. Heinrichs,
 Gerald K. Hemsing,
 Frank W. Hemsoth,
 Eugene G. Henry,
 Russell A. Hicks,
 Grant L. Hill,
 Ogbourne A. Hill,
 Sidney Hodges,
 Leo W. Horejs,
 George W. Houghton,
 Morton B. Houston,
 Ross M. Hutchinson,
 Carles E. Huntting,
 Kenneth A. Inman,
 Elijah H. Ikard,
 Orrel A. Inman,
 Charles V. Iredell,
 Edward B. Irving,
 William S. Ive,
 John R. Jacob,
 Paul Jahn,
 Robert L. Jarnagin,
 Robert B. Jeffrey,
 Irving A. Jennings,
 Barton I. Jenson,
 Harold S. Jones,
 William J. Jones,
 Elmer W. Johnson,
 Byron F. Johnson,
 Earl F. Johnson,
 James B. Johnson,
 Nathaniel B. Johnson,
 Oscar B. Kaufman,
 Loren P. Kesler,
 James J. Keating,
 Oscar D. Keown,
 Frank M. Keller,
 Oscar E. Kelly,
 William S. Kelley, jr.,
 Harold E. Kellogg,
 Harold E. Kelsey,
 Arthur F. Lamey,
 Irving H. Lambert,
 Fletcher H. Lansing,
 Arnold C. Larsen,
 Aubrey O. Loughmiller,
 Ralph K. Lawson,
 Paul A. Lesser,
 George R. Lewis,
 Charles E. Lighter,

Jack B. Loraine,
Kessler B. Low,
Orlando A. MacKinnon,
Paul F. Moran,
Grover C. Moore,
Joseph E. Magnus,
Edward W. Mahan,
Edward E. Mann,
Cyril W. Martyr,
Lester N. Medaris,
Frank A. Messmer, jr.,
Sidney M. Michael,
Wells W. Miller,
George E. Monson,
Edward B. Moore,
Robert B. Moore,
Roy S. Moore,
Gomer W. Morgan,
Charles F. Morrison,
Melville L. Moore,
Merwin C. Morrison,
Richard F. Mott,
Robert P. Moyer,
Sydney M. Moore,
Chauncey L. Mullen,
William W. Multer,
Raymond F. Murphy,
Maxwell F. Musser,
Frank C. Myers,
Gail D. McDowell,
Oscar D. McDaniel,
Homer H. McIntyre,
William R. McKee,
James P. J. McKevitt,
John C. McLean,
Clinton W. McLeod,
Martin L. McManus,
John W. McNamara,
Hubert B. McPeak,
Wendell S. McRae,
John A. McShane,
Edmund D. Nelson,
Edmund C. Norton,
Nathan S. Noble,
Joseph L. Nolan,
Emil M. Northenscald,
James C. Norton,
Donald G. Oglesby,
William G. Olive,
Ruel G. O'Neil,
Edward B. Orr,
Ralf C. Paddock,
Jackson C. Palmer,
William C. Parker,
Bradford A. Parrish,
Farold K. Patchen,
Gerald R. Patten,
Albert W. Paul,
Donald E. Paul,
Louis F. Peifer,
Louis A. Perraud,
Lynn E. Perry,
Charles P. Phelps,
Claude A. Phillips,
Basil H. Pollitt,
Leigh A. Poole,
Lester E. Power,
William B. Pressey,
Clifford Prichard,
Lindley H. Pryor,
Irving B. Purdy,
Alfred Putnam,
Harry S. Radcliffe,
Joseph W. Rafter,
Charles J. Reilly,
Eldred I. Rawles,
Charles E. Richardson,
Howard A. Rogers,
Howard E. Rothrock,
Frank W. Rugg,
Earl L. Ryan,
John F. Ryan,
Samuel B. Ryan,
Robert K. Ryland,
George C. Schleeter,
Harry N. Salet,

Joseph F. Simmons,
Leslie R. Smith,
Paul R. Schoenlaub,
Carey J. Scott,
Jesse C. Scroggins,
Edward Selby,
John T. Selden,
Arthur F. Sennholtz,
Allen R. Sherman,
Henry D. Shields,
Edward P. Simmonds,
Frank P. Simons,
Earl K. Smith,
Francis M. Smith,
James E. Smith,
Dale R. South,
Fred R. Sparger,
Frederick L. Spear,
Harry P. Strong,
Edward W. Staunton,
Kenneth M. Stead,
Melvin J. Stinchfield, jr.,
Uley O. Stokes,
Ray Sunderland,
Harry R. Swanson,
Joseph F. Szeszycki,
George Tholin,
Bruce E. Tow,
Robert E. Towey,
John A. Tracey,
Charles L. Turner,
Pierson M. Tuttle,
Frank D. Upchurch,
Ross G. Van Gundy,
Alfred J. Wainman,
John D. Wagstaff,
Arthur L. Whiteside,
Alphonse H. Wambsgans,
William J. Wallace,
James D. Waller,
Byron J. Walters,
Joseph E. Watson,
Harvey D. Weaver,
Hilliard C. Wellborn,
James G. White,
Maurice B. Wiedemer,
Hansel D. Wilson,
Robert A. Wilson,
Norman H. Wilson,
Stanley E. Wilson,
Kenneth A. Williams,
Harold P. Williamson,
Carl D. Wingstrand,
Earl J. Witt,
Clinton H. Wooten,
William D. Wray,
Ernest L. Wright,
Joseph A. Yeager,
Sherman L. Zea,
Chester A. Zeller,
John H. Andrews,
Edward C. Apperson,
Clay R. Apple,
Michael J. Barry,
Merton J. Batchelder,
Olin L. Beall,
Kenneth R. Berkey,
Thomas E. Boliver,
Josiah B. Bristol,
Marshall Y. Chapman,
Daniel L. Clifford,
Alan M. Cohen,
Harry P. Crouch,
Charles A. Craig,
George W. R. Davidson,
Joseph De Paiva,
James D. Desmond,
Joseph L. Doll,
James H. Eason,
Earle S. Eastham,
Walter S. Farley,
Kenneth S. Ferguson,
John McP. Gault,
George M. Goodman,
James B. Gracy,
Miner P. Gross,

Tom H. Hayden,
Lyle Harper,
John W. Housewright,
William T. Howze,
George S. Huggard,
Joseph A. Jensen,
Aubrey L. Johnson,
Michael J. Kelley,
Sherman B. Kramer,
Clinton S. King,
Leonard Kinsell,
Charles T. Langan,
William R. Langford, jr.,
Phillips T. Lehmer,
Harry B. Liversedge,
Guy Lewis,
Frank C. Logue,
Ralph W. Luce,
William G. Lodwick,
Nathan D. McClure,
Dan McFarland,
Hugh A. McGann,
John M. McGregor,
Clifton G. McMeen,
Colin J. Macdonald,
Maurice F. Mackey,
Jo G. Martin,
William F. May,
Howard Mayes,
Norman McA. Moss,
Don D. Newton,
Bertram S. Nickerson,
Vincent M. O'Donnell,
James W. O'Neil,
Robert C. Patchell,
Lawrence R. Patterson,
Otey H. Pettigrew,
Francis A. Porter,
Arthur C. Prine,
William B. Prior,
Stewart W. Purdy,
Laurens H. Reyburn,
Herbert B. Renninger,
Harvey J. Rice,
Richard V. H. Ridgely,
Ralph R. Rieker,
Walter Roll,
John A. Scanlon,
Barney M. Shively,
Rees Skinner,
Francis McF. Snider,
Kenneth B. Stiles,
Alvan E. Stoddard,
Donald G. Stookey,
Harry C. Swanstrom,
William M. Thomas,
Samuel F. Vance,
Joseph F. Verhelle,
Robert L. Waddell,
George M. Wolcott,
Ray F. Wetter,
James F. Wilmeth,
Hubert C. White,
Charles F. Worthen,
John A. Zimmerman,
Horace Talbot,
David Kipness,
Earl W. Garvin,
Harold W. Whitney,
Fred Thomas,
Victor F. Bleasdale,
Harold F. Swindler,
Harold T. Palmer,
Merwin H. Silverthorn,
Aaron J. Ferch,
Russell C. Bayne,
Jacob H. Heckman,
Kyle C. Hash,
Arthur J. Pelander,
Tolbert W. Wagoner,
Herbert G. Joerger,
Claggett Wilson,
Charles R. Francis,
Oscar A. Swan,
Joseph C. Grayson,
Walter S. Gasper,

Henry McClintock,
John H. Parker,
Nicholas E. Clauson,
Carl P. Hedberg,
Roger B. Kirkbride,
Sydney Thayer, jr.,
Arnold D. Godbey,
Herman L. McLeod,
Joseph D. Broderick,
Carl R. Dietrich,
George Ehrhart, jr.,
Donald S. Gordon,
William T. Hutchinson,
Harold Powell,
Albyn A. Wilcox,
Donovan Wilmot,
Alfred Wilkinson,
Joseph H. Mueller, jr.,
Jacob Lienhard,
Patrick J. Grealy,
James G. Brennan,
Robert E. Conner,
James P. Schwerin,
Bernard L. Fritz,
William J. Mosher,
Vernon Bourdette,
Robert I. Avery,
Samuel T. Jackson,
Guy L. Pyle,
Marvin Scott,
William P. Henschel,
Irving F. Bigelow,
John L. Hunt,
Delos D. McKenzie,
Charles A. Ingram,
Edward T. Bayman,
John T. Thornton,
Fitzhugh L. Buchanan,
Joseph N. Shaw,
Ralph C. Judd,
Chauncey H. Applegate,
Edward F. O'Day,
James McClelland,
Tom E. Wicks,
John A. Gustafson,
David P. Colvin,
Jacob J. Kesel,
James Carbary,
Muri Corbett,
William H. Schmidt, jr.,
Ray Rindfleisch,
William P. Grow,
Eugene West,
Amor L. Sims,
Robert C. Pitts,
Joseph B. Carhart,
George L. Brown,
Howard L. Vose,
Emmet Trainor,
Earl T. Martineau,
Kenneth W. Harding,
Joseph F. Maher,
Peter Morgan,
Henry L. Nabbefeld,
Hugh P. Kidder,
William A. Zook,
George Bower,
Charles W. Brooks,
Ben L. Taylor,
William F. Drummer,
Lloyd E. Battles,
Jay Van Housen,
Palmer Ketner, jr.,
Henry P. Cottingham,
Arthur C. Cooper,
Charles H. Ray,
John Groff,
Henry P. Glendinning,
Willis H. Prather,
Prentice S. Geer,
Irving G. Beckwith,
William R. Bockus,
George W. Walker,
Richard R. Day,
Marshall E. Simmons,
George Draine,

William A. Bradley,
George R. Rowan,
Leonard E. Rea,
Harry G. Lane,
James E. Stanners,
Clell G. Johnson,
Lucas I. Bruns,
Richard H. Schubert,
Herbert V. Hansen,
Egbert J. Wood,
Melvin E. Fuller,
George E. Gardner,
Holton Y. Ditto,
Claude B. Taugher,
William B. Kinkad,
Bruce C. Lubers,
Thomas R. Wert,
Charles F. Dalton,
Samuel K. Eaves,
Charles M. Adams,
Earl F. Lucas,
Axel G. Johnson,
Bert O. Herreid,
William K. MacNulty,
Edwin J. Davenport,
Hamlet C. Sharp,
Edward C. Fowler, and
Richard Cornelius.

First Lieut. Earl C. Nicholas to be a captain in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 13th day of June, 1918.

First Lieut. Frank F. Zissa to be a captain in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 15th day of June, 1918.

First Lieut. Martin J. Kelleher to be a captain in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 16th day of June, 1918.

First Lieut. Martin Canavan to be a captain in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 19th day of June, 1918.

Quartermaster Clerk David L. Ford to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 16th day of August, 1918.

Second Lieut. Josephus Daniels, jr., Marine Corps Reserve, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 16th day of August, 1918.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Newton Best and
Angus A. Acree.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 1st day of July, 1918:

Clifton B. Cates and
George T. Hall.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 15th day of August, 1918:

William English,
George W. Hopke,
Frederick Israel,
Carl J. Norstrand,
Cecil J. Widdifield,
Robert C. Babcock,
Dave W. McClain,
Frank Neider,
Morris C. Richardson,
George Belmont,
George B. Batten,
John T. Foster,
William Zoltowski,
Russell M. Frederick,
Edward E. Lindgren,
Bayard Vasey,
Jesse L. Crandall,
Vincent A. Brady,
Edward F. Dunk,
Harry L. Smith,
Robert L. Young,
Charles S. Thompson,
Terrence J. Callan,
Paul J. Ogden,
Maurice E. Barnett, jr.,
William W. Rogers,
George F. Stockes,
William J. Whaling, and
Curtis T. Beecher.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 24 (legislative day of August 22), 1918.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

James S. Persinger to be collector of internal revenue at Salem, Va.

PROMOTIONS IN COAST GUARD.

Third Lieut. Fletcher Webster Brown to be second lieutenant.
Third Lieut. Robert Donohue to be second lieutenant.

Third Lieut. James Alexander Frost, jr., to be second lieutenant.

Third Lieut. Loyd Vineyard Kielhorn to be second lieutenant.
Third Lieut. Gordon Whiting MacLane to be second lieutenant.

Third Lieut. Elmer Fowler Stone to be second lieutenant.
Third Lieut. Carl Christian von Paulsen to be second lieutenant.

Third Lieut. John Elliot Whitbeck to be second lieutenant.
First Lieut. Charles W. Cairnes to be captain on the retired list.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, August 24, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

O Lord, our God and our Father, who holdest in the hollow of Thy hand the destiny of men and of nations, so move upon their hearts and assert Thy wisdom, power, and goodness that they may bring order out of chaos, truth out of error, love out of hate, peace out of war, righteousness out of sin, joy out of sorrow; that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done in earth as in heaven, through Him who taught us the way and the truth and the life. Amen.

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

CHANGES IN THE DRAFT LAW.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 12731.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill amending the draft law.

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Speaker, while that is pending I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a letter from The Adjutant General regarding the ages at which men can enlist under the law. Yesterday the question was raised, and the statement was made that men of 16 or 17 could be enlisted. I stated the contrary, and I would like to insert this letter in the Record.

Mr. LANGLEY. Let the letter be read, Mr. Speaker. We would like to hear it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, the proper place for that is in the consideration of the bill in Committee of the Whole. I do not think we ought to do it in this way.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects. The question is on the motion to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Those in favor say "aye."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, on that I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on going into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 337, not voting 93, as follows:

YEAS—337.

Alexander	Beakes	Brumbaugh	Carter, Mass.
Almon	Bell	Buchanan	Cary
Anderson	Beshlin	Burnett	Chandler, N. Y.
Anthony	Black	Burroughs	Chandler, Ohio
Ashbrook	Blackmon	Byrns, Tenn.	Church
Austin	Bland, Ind.	Caldwell	Clark, Fla.
Ayres	Bland, Va.	Campbell, Kans.	Clark, Pa.
Bacharach	Blanton	Campbell, Pa.	Classon
Baer	Bowers	Cannon	Claypool
Bankhead	Brand	Cantrill	Cleary
Barnhart	Brodbeck	Carlin	Coady

Collier	Gordon	McClintic	Sears
Connally, Tex.	Gould	McCulloch	Sells
Cooper, Ohio	Graham, Ill.	McEadden	Shallenberger
Cooper, W. Va.	Gray, N. J.	McKenzie	Sherwood
Costello	Green, Iowa	McKeown	Shouse
Cox	Greene, Mass.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sims
Crago	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sinnott
Crisp	Gregg	McLemore	Sisson
Currie, Mich.	Griest	Madden	Slemp
Curry, Cal.	Griffin	Magee	Small
Dale, N. Y.	Hadley	Maher	Smith, Mich.
Dale, Vt.	Hamill	Mansfield	Smith, C. B.
Dallinger	Hamilton, Mich.	Mapes	Smith, T. F.
Darrow	Hamilton, N. Y.	Martin	Snook
Davis	Hamlin	Mason	Snyder
Decker	Hardy	Meeker	Stafford
Dempsey	Harrison, Va.	Merritt	Stegall
Denison	Haskell	Miller, Minn.	Stedman
Dent	Hastings	Miller, Wash.	Steele
Denton	Hawley	Montague	Stephens, Miss.
Dewalt	Hayden	Moon	Stephens, Nebr.
Dickinson	Heaton	Moore, Pa.	Sterling, Ill.
Dill	Heflin	Moore, Ind.	Stiness
Dixon	Helm	Morgan	Strong
Dooling	Helvering	Morin	Sullivan
Doolittle	Hersey	Neely	Sweet
Doremus	Hilliard	Nichols, Mich.	Swift
Doughton	Holland	Nolan	Tague
Dowell	Houston	Norton	Taylor, Ark.
Drane	Hull, Iowa	Oldfield	Taylor, Colo.
Dunn	Hull, Tenn.	Oliver, N. Y.	Temple
Dupré	Humphreys	Olney	Thomas
Dyer	Husted	Osborne	Thompson
Eagan	Hutchinson	O'Shaunessy	Tillman
Eagle	Igoe	Overmyer	Tilson
Edmonds	Ireland	Overstreet	Timberlake
Elliot	James	Paige	Tinkham
Ellsworth	Johnson, Ky.	Park	Towner
Elston	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. J.	Treadway
Emerson	Kahn	Parker, N. Y.	Van Dyke
Esch	Kearns	Phelan	Vare
Estopinal	Kehoe	Platt	Vestal
Evans	Kelley, Mich.	Polk	Voigt
Fairchild, B. L.	Kennedy, Iowa	Porter	Volstead
Fairchild, G. W.	Kennedy, R. I.	Pou	Waldow
Fairfield	Kettner	Pratt	Walker
Ferris	Key, Ohio	Price	Walsh
Fess	Kless, Pa.	Purnell	Walton
Fields	Kincheloe	Quin	Ward
Fisher	King	Ralney, H. T.	Wason
Flood	Kinkaid	Ralney, J. W.	Watson, Pa.
Focht	Kitchin	Raker	Watson, Va.
Fordney	Knutson	Ramsey	Weaver
Foster	Kraus	Ramseyer	Webb
Francis	Kreider	Rayburn	Welty
Freeman	La Follette	Reavis	Whaley
French	Langley	Reed	Wheeler
Fuller, Ill.	Larsen	Robbins	White, Me.
Fuller, Mass.	Lazaro	Roberts	White, Ohio
Gallagher	Lea, Cal.	Rodenberg	Williams
Gallivan	Lee, Ga.	Rogers	Wilson, Ill.
Gandy	Lehlbach	Romjue	Wilson, La.
Gard	Leshner	Rose	Wingo
Garland	Lever	Rouse	Winslow
Garner	Little	Rowe	Wood, Ind.
Garrett, Tenn.	Littlepage	Rubey	Woods, Iowa
Garrett, Tex.	Lobeck	Rucker	Woodyard
Gillett	London	Sabath	Wright
Glass	Loneragan	Sanders, Ind.	Young, N. Dak.
Glynn	Longworth	Sanford	Young, Tex.
Godwin, N. C.	Lufkin	Saunders, Va.	Zihlman
Good	Lunn	Scott, Mich.	
Goodall	McAndrews	Scott, Pa.	
Goodwin, Ark.	McArthur	Scully	

NOT VOTING—93.

Aswell	Farr	Lundeen	Scott, Iowa
Barkley	Flynn	McCormick	Shackelford
Booher	Foss	McKinley	Sherley
Borland	Frear	Mann	Siegel
Britten	Graham, Pa.	Mays	Slayden
Brown	Gray, Ala.	Mondell	Sloan
Browning	Harrison, Miss.	Mott	Smith, Idaho
Butler	Haugen	Mudd	Snell
Byrnes, S. C.	Hayes	Nelson	Steenerson
Candler, Miss.	Heintz	Nicholls, S. C.	Sterling, Pa.
Caraway	Hensley	Oliver, Ala.	Stevenson
Carter	Hicks	Padgett	Summers
Carter, Okla.	Hollingsworth	Peters	Switzer
Connolly, Kans.	Hood	Powers	Talbot
Cooper, Wis.	Howard	Ragsdale	Templeton
Copley	Huddleston	Randall	Venable
Cramton	Jacoway	Rankin	Vinson
Crosser	Johnson, S. Dak.	Riordan	Watkins
Delaney	Jones	Robinson	Welling
Dies	Juul	Rowland	Wilson, Tex.
Dillon	Keating	Russell	Wise
Domlnick	Kelly, Pa.	Sanders, La.	
Donovan	LaGuardia	Sanders, N. Y.	
Drukker	Linthicum	Schall	

So the motion of Mr. DENT was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. STEELE with Mr. BUTLER.

Until further notice:

Mr. HENSLEY with Mr. MUDD.

Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. LA GUARDIA.

Mr. ASWELL with Mr. SANDERS of New York.

Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina with Mr. BRITTEN,
Mr. BARKLEY with Mr. SANDERS of Indiana.
Mr. BOOHER with Miss RANKIN.
Mr. MAYS with Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin.
Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. COPLEY.
Mr. KEATING with Mr. BROWNE.
Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. NELSON.
Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. CRAMTON.
Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi with Mr. MONDELL.
Mr. HOWARD with Mr. DILLON.
Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. MCCORMICK.
Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. DRUKKER.
Mr. CAREW with Mr. LUNDEEN.
Mr. FLYNN with Mr. FREAR.
Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas with Mr. JUUL.
Mr. DOMINICK with Mr. FOSS.
Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
Mr. PADGETT with Mr. HICKS.
Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. SCOTT of Iowa.
Mr. RANDALL with Mr. SIEGEL.
Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.
Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. SLOAN.
Mr. WELLING with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.
Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. HEINTZ.
Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. TEMPLETON.
Mr. STEVENSON with Mr. HAUGEN.
Mr. VENABLE with Mr. SWITZER.
Mr. WILSON of Texas with Mr. FARR.
Mr. WATKINS with Mr. SNEEL.
Mr. WISE with Mr. ROWLAND.
Mr. VINSON with Mr. HAYES.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.
A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HAMLIN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12731) amending the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose the committee had under consideration what is known as the Madden amendment. Debate had been exhausted on that amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Did I understand the Chair to state that all debate had been exhausted on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. As a matter of fact, debate had been exhausted on the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. There were one or two gentlemen asking for recognition, and I personally wanted recognition for a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I apprehend that it was the intention of the gentleman from Illinois in offering the amendment that employees of the executive departments of the Government should not, by reason of that employment, be exempt from military service. If that is the intention of the author of the amendment I beg to submit to him that it is the law now. The man who is in the executive departments of the Government to-day by reason of that position is not exempt from the operation of the draft. If this becomes a law, as we expect it will, there is nothing in this amendment to the selective-draft act that will exempt such individual from its operation. Now, if that is the purpose of the amendment, I suggest that the amendment is unnecessary.

As the practice now is, the heads of the departments are required to certify and ask for an exemption for those in that department or bureau whose services are necessary for the proper discharge of the duties of the bureau. I think it is the common sense of mankind, certainly of the membership of the House, not to interfere with the orderly discharge of the many responsible duties of the executive departments of the Government. I think we ought not to adopt any amendment calculated to interfere with the discharge of their important duties.

If it is the intention of those in favor of this amendment to do more than that, or if the amendment without that intention will do more than that, then I submit to you that it is positively harmful. It seems to me entirely unnecessary that we should write into the law an amendment with this particular phraseology. If it is desired to express the congressional intent that men who are in the executive departments shall not be relieved from military

duty unless their services are indispensable to the proper discharge of the work of that bureau, then let us say that in so many words. That might have some moral effect in the operation of the administration of the law.

I am willing to admit, I am even willing to affirm with emphasis, that in my humble opinion there are many employed in the Government departments here in Washington to-day that are not indispensable to the proper discharge of the functions of the various bureaus. I will go further, if you please. I believe one of the causes of inefficiency, or perhaps I had better say lack of maximum efficiency, in the several bureaus to-day is the surfeit and surplus of employees. I have said before, and I now repeat, that in one bureau of this Government in Washington, the name of which I forbear to mention, there are more employees than there are in the entire military establishment of Great Britain.

They are standing in the way of each other, and they are, by their numbers, impeding the proper discharge of the duties of that particular department.

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

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. But we do not correct that by this amendment. It may be that we should affirmatively say that we should write in the law that no head of a department should ask for the exemption of an employee therein unless the services of that employee are absolutely indispensable to the proper discharge of the work of such bureau. If so, let us write it in that language, but this does not do that. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LANGLEY. My information is that a good many employees who have been exempted upon the ground that they are indispensable to the work of the departments are people who have been in the service only two or three months. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not; but I can readily understand how this privilege can be abused, and I also can readily understand how a man with technical knowledge and experience may have been brought here but recently, who is of draft age, whose technical knowledge and experience make him indispensable to the proper discharge of the work of the office. I do know that in some of the bureaus they have carefully combed out and recombined out all of the men they thought they could dispense with. They have been very sensitive about it, and very properly so. I submit it would be inadvisable to adopt this amendment in its present form. Either it makes no change in existing law—and I do not think it does—or it prevents technical, skilled men from being utilized in branches of the Government service, men who are positively indispensable to the proper performance of the work of that service. It would be the height of folly to take from the Government service at this time such men as are indispensable to the efficiency of that service, men whose places can not be filled by others, and send them out into the field where their special qualifications are of no value. Again, I say, let judgment rule, and defeat this amendment.

Mr. STERLING of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. It seems to me that it would be most unfortunate to adopt this amendment to this bill. I am inclined to think that the amendment would produce the very inequality which my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] seeks to avoid. He stated in his remarks last evening that the purpose of this amendment was to put these persons in civil employment in the Government on an equality and on the same basis as employees of other institutions. Under the provisions of the bill as it now stands they are on the very same basis as the employees of other institutions. They may be exempted when in Government service only when their occupation or when the duties which they perform are necessary to the maintenance of the Military Establishment. That is true all over this country. Any man anywhere whose employment is necessary to the maintenance of the Military Establishment may be exempted from military duty. That is just where the civil Government employees stand, and if the gentleman's amendment is adopted it produces an inequality that does not give those Government employees, even though their duties are essential to the maintenance of the Military Establishment, the right or privilege of exemption. It has been stated on the floor here that some of the departments have exempted a great number of employees on account of favoritism. I do not know whether that is true or not. I presume my opportunity to know is just about the same as that of every other Member of this House, and personally I do not know of a single instance where a Government employee has been exempted on account of favoritism. Assume that that has been done, assume that the privilege has been abused, I assure you that it does not justify us in abolishing this privilege of exemption to certain Government employees. It is said that 2,130 men in the Agricultural Department have been ex-

empted. I do not know. I do know this. I know there is a vast number of men in the employ of the Agricultural Department whose work is essential, whose work is highly technical, whose places can not be readily filled by going out and calling on the labor of the country for men to take these places, and I submit to you that there is no department of this Government, the maintenance of which and the effectiveness of which is more essential to the maintenance of the Military Establishment of the Government than the Agricultural Department.

I, for my part, shall assume that if there were 2,130 men exempted from military duty in that department they were exempted in good faith, because I believe that the heads of the departments are better able to judge of the necessity of the services of these men in the particular line in which they are employed than I am, and I believe that they are better able to judge than you are. I submit we ought to approach this kind of legislation in a somewhat different spirit from that in which it has been approached, not upon the theory that the heads of the departments are not administering the law properly and that they are showing favoritism. I want to repeat that, in my opinion and my belief, their purpose and intentions are just the same as ours. If we should deny exemptions to these technically trained men in the Agricultural Department, we might, I fear, break down the work of that department. If we should take away all the professional men from the Department of Justice or from the Health Department we would destroy those departments. If we allowed no exemption to the experts in the Treasury Department we would create utter confusion in that department. We must allow the civil side of the Government to keep its experts, to keep the men whose service is essential, or we will render the Government inefficient. Never was a thorough, able civil government more necessary than now. We must look to it to raise an Army and provide for its maintenance and support. It never had a greater task, and we must not permit the experts in these departments to be taken away at this critical time. Government employees are liable now, and will be under this bill, to military duty the same as all other employees. We all know that the heads of departments have acted on that idea. In every department we see great service flags decorating the walls, showing a star for every man who has left for war duty. Thousands have gone out of civil service into the military service, and under this bill thousands more will go. It is only the technical men, the experts, the men essential to the proper maintenance of the Military Establishment that may be exempted under this provision of the bill. The proposed amendment will deprive the Government of their services. I am willing to trust to the heads of departments to exercise wisdom and fairness in the administration of the provision. If they fail it is not our fault. It is our duty to make wise laws, and we can only trust to the executive to administer them wisely. We can not correct the abuse of privileges granted in good laws by passing bad laws. We should vote this amendment down.

Mr. COX rose.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get some agreement in respect to closing this debate. It seems to me that the matter has been sufficiently debated and that we should close it at the end of five minutes. I make a request that we do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close at the end of five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to have five minutes.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have five minutes.

Mr. DENT. Then I will modify it by making it 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I want to earnestly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. If any Member of the House has taken the opportunity of reading the answers to the resolutions offered by the gentleman from Illinois made by the various heads of departments, I am at a loss to understand how he can oppose the amendment. I am not accusing the heads of departments as being unfair, but those reports speak for themselves. I have read not only the names of the men who have been exempted but I studied them. Tell me that a little stenographer is indispensable to the running of any of these departments? Tell me that a little clerk drawing a salary of \$1,200 to \$1,500 a year is indispensable to the running of that department, yet if you will read the 10 or 12 reports made by the various executive departments of this Government you will find scores of men who have

been exempted from military duty, and the report itself shows the only thing they do is to fill stenographic jobs or fill the position of a small clerk doing work that the wives of the soldiers who are now fighting in France ought to have. [Applause.] Doing work, gentlemen, that the disabled soldiers of this country ought to have. [Applause.] There are more slackers in the city of Washington this very moment than there are in the great city of New York, with ten times its population. [Applause.] You can scarcely get through a department down here but what you find men between the age of 21 and 31 filling little insignificant clerical positions. Read these reports—

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I have not got the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. COX. And ex-Members of this House who have served here 18 or 20 years, been here long enough to know how to pull the ropes, find where their boys are exempt, some of them filling the little, insignificant position of a deputy internal revenue traveling agent, and yet exempt because their work is indispensable to the running of that department. The place for those men and the place for those clerks is squarely in the Army. As the gentleman from Chicago [Mr. MADDEN] said yesterday, my nephews are fighting on the blood-soaked battle fields of France this morning if they have not been killed. They are no better than your nephews, no better than any other man's nephew. They were farm boys. They unhitched their teams, left their harvesters, and went straight in the Army or Navy, and yet you are told here by certain men—Oh, I wonder if there could possibly be anything behind the men who are warning us here, whether or not they have anybody down in these departments who is liable to be affected if this amendment goes through. I just wonder if that is true. You are told this will disorganize the whole business. Why, you remember this spring when Marshal Haig was fighting with his back to the wall, you all remember that famous message that Lloyd-George sent to comb the civil service of England, and the civil service of England was combed, and no doubt it was honeycombed, with a lot of infernal slackers like you find here in the city of Washington. From the time they combed the civil service in England and sent these men to the firing line the Germans have never made another foot of advance. Of all the righteous amendments offered here, it is this amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, when this amendment of my colleague was first presented, naturally, like all the rest of you, most of you, no doubt, I was heartily in favor of it until I got to thinking about the possible effects of the amendment, and now I have become thoroughly convinced, gentlemen, that it is absolutely impracticable and unwise and ought not to be adopted by this House. [Applause.] It is just as essential, gentlemen, that the arsenals and the shipyards of these United States be conducted as it is that the Army be filled up. This amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] if enacted into law will have the effect of repealing, at least by implication, any clause of the selective-service act by which these men who are now employed in the navy yards and arsenals of the United States are given deferred classifications. A mere inspection of the original selective-service act will convince you, gentlemen, this is true. The only provision there is in the original act I know of is found on page 4 of the printed act, which gives the President the right—

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 those liable to draft as in this act provided, persons of the following classes: County and municipal officials; custom-house clerks; persons employed by the United States in the transmission of the mails; artificers and workmen employed 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.

Now, the Madden amendment is:

And no person employed in any of the executive departments of the Government, Government establishments, boards, or commissions now or hereafter shall be exempt or given deferred classification by reason of such employment from military duty under the provisions of this act.

Does not that repeal the provisions of the original selective-service act giving the President the right to put these men in a deferred classification by special order? If it does not, I am in fault both in my logic and my legal reasoning. I have just returned from an inspection trip to a great arsenal in my district. I found there 700 men working at special bits of work in the arsenal who are given deferred classification on request of the commandant of that institution.

Mr. VARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I have not much time, but I yield. Mr. VARE. Would not this seriously interfere with the work of the Emergency Fleet Corporation in the building of ships?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Absolutely.

Mr. VARE. Will it not interfere with the manufacture of munitions in the arsenals?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Why, certainly; let me tell the gentleman—

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I will yield if it will not take too much of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman makes a statement that he ought not to be permitted to make without interruption.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. That may be the gentleman's idea about it, but not mine.

Mr. MADDEN. All manufacturing plants manufacturing ammunition have men exempted, have they not?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Well—

Mr. MADDEN. And this does not take any exemption rights away from any man who is working in a war plant, whether an arsenal or anywhere else. [Applause.]

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I say to you that this amendment, if it is enacted into law, will repeal the provision of the original act that permits these men in the arsenals and navy yards of this country to be exempted by special and deferred classes. There are men in these arsenals to-day who are doing such work as boring out the castings for guns and making carriages for 75-millimeter guns who are doing work the nicety of which requires it to be within one ten-thousandth of an inch in order to be correct. They are men who can not be replaced in these institutions. In the arsenal at Rock Island there are several hundred men in deferred classification, and if these men are drafted into the military service of the United States and put into the Army it will cripple and greatly embarrass the production of munitions in that Government arsenal. These men are making carriages for the 75-millimeter guns, a work which the French Government thought we could not do in this country, a work that requires the utmost nicety and exactness by the workmen employed to do it. Do you want to go into these Government establishments all over this country and, by adopting a foolish and radical amendment to this bill, put these men in the service when they are doing work absolutely indispensable to the winning of this war? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. REAVIS] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the House has succeeded in getting itself in a position of some absurdity. Last night, without debate and amid a wild hurrah, we passed an amendment removing the exemption which applies to Members of Congress, while this morning, with great seriousness and with due dignity, we debate the question of whether or not like treatment shall be accorded the clerks of departments. The deductions from the situation are somewhat shocking to one's self-respect, to say the least.

I trust that I will not be speaking more harshly than circumstances justify when I say that the amendment of my good friend from Texas [Mr. GREGG], placing, as it does, the legislative branch of the Government in absolute control of the Military Establishment is about the most unwise provision that I have ever seen adopted in this Chamber. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REAVIS. With pleasure.

Mr. CANNON. Does not the gentleman believe that that amendment will be rejected when it gets into the House?

Mr. REAVIS. I think we both may trust the wisdom of the House to defeat it when it is presented by a separate vote.

But it is not to the Gregg amendment that I desire to speak. The Madden amendment at first appealed to me very strongly. At first blush it seemed so fair and just that I was inclined to support it heartily. I took the reports of the heads of the various departments home with me last night and studied them carefully. I found many instances where men of draft age who had been in the departments but one month had been exempted. The inference is, of course, that such men were put in the departments for the purpose of evading military duty and that such purpose was accomplished by the Cabinet member's asking for an exemption. But the number of such men is comparatively very small. I would be glad indeed to reach them and to put them where they belong. But if to get them we have to take thousands of men out of positions in which they are performing services of inestimable value, I fear the evil we will do will far outbalance the good.

One of the great and pressing needs of America is chemists. The situation with reference to gas attacks abroad is very

serious. It was my privilege recently to spend a little time with Gen. Pershing. While the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BLAND] and I were talking with him a member of his staff reported from the front that German prisoners said that they had walked through American gas nine times without gas masks and without injury.

We visited the American gas section a few miles from Chaumont and the commanding officer stated that they needed chemists and were almost hopelessly undermanned.

The Germans have perfected mustard gas, the most frightful of gases, which dissolves the lung tissue and from which I have seen American soldiers die in the last six weeks, so that they produce it as a by-product, with little effort and small expense.

It is only within the past three months that the allied powers have discovered how to produce it, and then only at almost prohibitive expense. We have hundreds of chemists of draft age working in the Bureau of Standards and the Bureau of Mines on this proposition and with hopes of immediate success. Shall we by the Madden amendment take them away from this indispensable work and put them in the trenches as private soldiers?

It is the duty of Congress to see that every American citizen of draft age is put in the avenue where his contribution to the Nation's welfare will be greatest. [Applause.]

To do this we have to trust somebody. We can not presume that the members of the Cabinet are untrustworthy and dishonest. We can not believe that these men are going to use their high offices to violate law and to provide bullet-proof jobs for favorites. Even though we may believe that imposition has been practiced in a few isolated cases, we can not for this reason legislate so as to take from the Nation the benefit of scientific service of which it stands in such great need.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REAVIS. Gladly.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I have been informed that there are some 3,000 chemists now engaged directly or indirectly on Government work and that 70 per cent of them are within the present draft age. Their places will be impossible to fill.

Mr. REAVIS. Unquestionably. Let me relate an incident within my own knowledge. A young man who graduated from the University of Nebraska with high honors as a chemist was a very valuable employee of the chemistry department of the Department of Agriculture in Washington. He was drafted and refused to ask exemption or to ask his departmental head to exempt him. He is to-day a private soldier, with his country in sore need of his services as a scientific man. He ought to be over here in the gas division assisting in finding one of the greatest needs of the allied armies to-day.

Mr. NORTON. I agree with the last statement of the gentleman that that man should be in the chemical department, but is there any reason why he should not be in the military service of the Government and at the same time be in the chemical department of the Government? I understand now that they are taking drafted men and placing them in the chemical department, and that that is the policy of the Government, and there is no reason why they should not all be in the military service.

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

Mr. REAVIS. I regret that time prevents an answer to the question.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may so modify the pending amendment as to strike out the words "Government establishments," and I should like to ask unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes on the reasons why I ask this privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner which will be reported by the Clerk.

Mr. MADDEN. And I think that will cover all the objections.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MADDEN moves to modify his amendment by striking out the words "Government establishments."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—to the gentleman having five minutes in which to discuss his amendment, I will ask that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS], a member of the committee, be allowed two minutes in reply.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Chairman, can we have the amendment read as modified?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment, by unanimous consent, will be read after the Chair puts the request of the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Alabama, that the gentleman from Illinois may proceed for five minutes and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALDWELL. When the Clerk reads the amendment, may we not also have read the McKenzie amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The McKenzie amendment was voted on yesterday. The Clerk, without objection, will report the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 3, line 12, after the word "emergency," strike out the period, insert a comma, and add "and no person employed in any of the executive departments of the Government, boards, or commissions, now or hereafter, shall be exempt, or given deferred classification by reason of such employment from military duty under the provisions of this act."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I think there can be no question but that the amendment as now written can not be objectionable to anybody. If there was any doubt in any man's mind as to whether men employed in the arsenals or the shipyards would be prevented from engaging in such employment because of the amendment I have proposed, the language now stricken out takes away that doubt. The time has come when this Congress—

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

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. VARE. What about the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the Shipping Board?

Mr. MADDEN. That is the same thing.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman's amendment now retains the language, "Government boards." The Shipping Board is one.

Mr. MADDEN. I am trying to explain why we ought to pass this amendment. We have reached the stage in the progress of war legislation when we must say to the American people that we are opposed to any favoritism, no matter by whom practiced. [Applause.]

We must assure the American people that the Congress of the United States at least is in favor of giving every man an equal opportunity. We must say to the widow that her son shall have equal rights with the son of the millionaire. We must say to the farmer that his boy shall not be charged with greater responsibilities on account of war than the son of the governor of a State. We have men now on the pay rolls of the Government who have been placed there under recommendations of the governors of the various States, men who have been placed there by members of the Cabinet, and who have been exempted from military service because of the influence behind them.

The National Association of Agriculture, the National Grange, through their secretaries, called me up this morning and said that this one amendment is the thing that they shall insist upon to the extent of their ability.

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

Mr. MADDEN. They propose not to have the farmer class discriminated against.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. MADDEN. We propose—I propose—that a man engaged in a manufacturing institution shall not be compelled to fight while men engaged in Government departments are exempt from responsibility under the act.

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

Mr. MADDEN. No; I have not time to yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I can assure you gentlemen here that there are thousands of these men who have been exempted, walking over each other in various offices throughout the United States. In the city of New York alone, in the quartermaster stores, there are 210, all within the draft age, or nearly all, managing departments. This work before the war was done by civilians and by women, and it can be done by civilians now and by women, and men who are defective physically, but mentally fit, can be called into requisition to do the technical work for which these men have been exempted.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. I will say to the gentleman that hundreds of men who are now doing this chemical work, scientific men in the service, are detailed to do that work, now that they are once in the service.

Mr. MADDEN. Why, I have men in my own family, technical men, scientists, who have not claimed exemption. They are in the battle line. Why should they be in the battle line and these other men allowed to sit in an easy chair, wearing spurs, so that they may be able to keep their feet on the desks? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I want first to reply to the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox], who addressed the House a few moments ago, and who impugned the motives of the Members who have spoken in opposition to this amendment by attributing to them selfish motives by charging or intimating that they had sons in deferred positions in the executive departments.

I spoke against the amendment yesterday afternoon, and I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that I was not prompted to do so by selfish motives. I have not a relative that I know of in the Government service. The reports of the various heads of the departments show that there is only one man there from my district. I do not know him personally, neither do I know his people. I have two sons who have reached their majority and they have long since enlisted in the military service of their country. [Applause.] I have two nephews, and only two, who have reached their majority, and they also have long since enlisted in the military service of their country. I have a third nephew who is 18 years old, and three months ago he enlisted in the service of his country, and I resent the statement of the gentleman from Indiana.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there has been enough said on this amendment, but I want to add this: The War Department says that it will absolutely demoralize and create chaos in the department. There may have been abuses, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] has said, but there are abuses in other branches of the Government, which can not be helped. There will be abuses as long as these departments are handled by men. We must look at it from a broader viewpoint. We must not demoralize the service because some man has abused the authority given him. I hope that the amendment may be defeated. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired in the debate on the amendment. The question is on the adoption of the Madden amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MADDEN. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 115, yeas 142.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. DENT and Mr. MADDEN.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 128, yeas 140.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to come in after the Gregg amendment. I understand that to be the last amendment that was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK: After the last word in the Gregg amendment strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following proviso: "Provided, That when any person shall have been placed in a deferred or exempted class for any of the reasons in this paragraph set forth he shall not be entitled to remain therein unless he shall in good faith continue, while physically able so to do, to work at and follow such occupation, employment, or business, or some other productive occupation, employment, or business deemed necessary hereunder; and if he fails so to do he shall again become subject to the draft. The President shall make regulations for enforcing this provision."

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have proposed to the section of the bill now under consideration reads as follows:

Provided, That when any person shall have been placed in a deferred or exempted class for any of the reasons in this paragraph set forth he shall not be entitled to remain therein unless he shall in good faith continue, while physically able so to do, to work at and follow such occupation, employment, or business, or some other productive occupation, employment, or business deemed necessary hereunder; and if he fails so to do he shall again become subject to the draft. The President shall make regulations for enforcing this provision.

Before discussing the amendment in detail I want to submit some general observations on the situation which obtains at this time. The world war, in which we are now one of the most powerful and aggressive belligerents, is the most stupendous clash of arms and struggle of peoples that the world has ever seen.

More and more we are beginning to realize its magnitude and comprehend its sacrifices and adapt ourselves to the changed conditions which it necessarily imposes, but there are some things which we have yet to fully understand.

One of these is that the ordinary rights and prerogatives of business and labor can not be maintained in their fullness and completeness in time of war. That some sacrifices of these things must be made for the benefit of the public good. It is a broad statement, yet a true one, that America's first great victory will be won when the personal advantage and the personal privilege of each of us have been submerged in unselfish devotion to the common cause.

America has the right to expect every man to do his duty. When I was a boy and attended the public school in the little town where I was born, I remember that our patriotic teacher adorned the walls of our schoolroom with mottoes gathered from the sayings of famous men. One of these mottoes contained the language of Lord Nelson, which he emblazoned upon his colors in the Battle of Trafalgar, "England this day expects each man to do his duty."

The great naval commander knew that if in that battle each man did his duty the victory would be complete, and if each fought for fame or his own selfish advantage the battle would be lost.

Conditions are not different now. If the man power of America loses sight of its own selfish advantage and concentrates its talent and energies on the one supreme task of bringing this fearful conflict to a successful and righteous conclusion, then there can be no doubt as to the ultimate outcome, and victory is certain to be ours in the end.

But if we, who remain at home, concern ourselves more with the desire to take advantage of every opportunity to improve our own situation and entrench ourselves in the enjoyment of what we fancy to be our own particular rights and privileges, then danger is surely ahead and the sooner we realize it the better it will be.

I can not believe, however, that any considerable number of our people, even if they are so inclined, will be allowed to pursue a course of that kind. Public opinion is demanding that every man shall do his duty, and public opinion is a court of power whose decrees will in the end be respected and enforced. Military discipline will not permit the soldier to be a slacker on the battle field, and public opinion is not going to permit the individual who remains at home to be a slacker either in business, public office, laborer in industry, farmer on the farm, or in any other vocation or employment. The Nation must have the benefit of the very best efforts of all of us and nothing short of that will fill the measure of demand. This is a war of peoples and not merely a war of armies who are contending for supremacy on the battle field.

The United States Government is sending great armies to the front to fight shoulder to shoulder with our allies, the French, the English, the Italians, and the Belgians.

Our Navy is patrolling the high seas day and night to strike down and defeat the treacherous submarine. Our merchant ships are carrying great loads of supplies for the use of our armies at the front and for the military and civilian population of our allies. All this is a great work and is such as should evoke our strong admiration, but in order for these efforts to continue and to expand to even greater efficiency, those who remain at home must put every ounce of loyalty, everything that we have in the crucible and rally as one man to the support of the Government.

It is your Government, it is my Government, it is the people's Government, and while none of us claim for it perfection, for no human institution is perfect, still it is the best Government in the world, and we must lose sight of every other consideration save and except its preservation and maintenance in this supreme hour of its peril. Do not let us make the mistake of minimizing the seriousness of the situation that confronts us.

The German military autocracy realize that it is now or never with them, and therefore they have determined to stake all in the great battles on the western front during this year. If they fail then, a sure and certain defeat awaits them in the end, and some day their embattled millions must retire to the other side of the Rhine and give up every foot of Belgium and every foot of northern France, and make reparation for their wanton destruction and devastation; and they know that, and that is why they are fighting so desperately in the present hour.

If they win—well, they must not win; they will not win; they can not win. I will not believe that they can win against brave men fighting under orders like those issued by Sir Douglas Haig some time ago to his men in France and Flanders, in which he said:

Every position must be held to the last man. There must be no retirement. With our backs to the wall and believing in the justice of our cause, each one of us must fight to the end. The safety of our homes and the freedom of mankind depend alike upon the conduct of each one of us at this critical moment.

I will not believe that they can win against brave men like the Belgians, who threw their handful of an army across the path of the invading Hun and suffered all but annihilation rather than submit to the conquering heel of a tyrant, and inspired their brave king to say:

A nation which fights to defend itself wins the respect of everyone, and will not perish.

I will not believe that they can win against brave men like the gallant French, who made their stand at the first Battle of the Marne and determined to die rather than to give back another foot, and whose heroism was well expressed in the words of a great Frenchman:

France prefers to die rather than to live in a degraded humanity, and humanity would be degraded if the savage beast who forms what to-day is called Germany could be victorious and rule the world. To fight Germany, France has already lost 1,000,000 men. We are ready to give more, and when there are no more men the women will rise up. When there are no more women the children will rise up, and when there are no more children the dead will rise up. France will live free or die free, and France will live.

I will not believe that they can win against brave men like those American crusaders under Gen. Pershing, who in the darkest hour of the allied cause crossed the ocean and in a land 3,000 miles away from their own firesides bravely stemmed the tide of onrushing Teutonic savagery and threw them back in confusion and defeat at the second battle of the Marne. No; the Germans will not win against men of that kind. The spirit of the allies is unconquerable and can not be intimidated or crushed. But in the hour of this tremendous struggle and sacrifice what are we going to do who are left at home? Are we going to stand behind them? Are we going to do our part? Are we willing to deny ourselves and to sacrifice?

Capital and labor must defer their quarrels for another day, if, indeed, it is ever necessary to again renew them with some of the bitterness that has existed in the past.

Mutual concessions must be made and crimonations and re-criminations must be abandoned in face of the common danger which threatens us. For, if Germany should win this war, none of the rights of capital would be secure, and the rights which labor now enjoys—the best and most liberal of any nation in the world—would be thrown in the scrap heap and industrial slavery dictated by Teuton policy would follow.

I have nowhere seen the true situation more graphically and eloquently put than in a speech by England's great premier, David Lloyd-George, made to 3,000 union officials at Glasgow, Scotland, on Christmas day, 1915. In that speech he said, "Either we must tell the soldiers that we are sorry we can not get the guns and shells to enable them to win in 1916, owing to the trade-union regulations, or we must tell them that if they manage to hold out for another year, perhaps American workmen will help us to get enough for 1917. Another alternative is that we might tell the Kaiser frankly that we can not go on."

"I can not return to Parliament and report through the House of Commons to the British Army that skilled workmen won't suspend their rules to save their fellow countrymen's lives on the battle field. Some of you seem to think that this war is a passing shower. It is the deluge! It is a convulsion of nature. It is a cyclone which is tearing up by its roots modern society and wrecking some of the flimsy structures of civilization."

"It is an earthquake, upheaving the very rocks of European life. It is one of those seismic disturbances in which nations leap forward or fall back generations in a single bound. All this chattering about relaxing a rule and suspending a custom is out of place. You can not haggle with an earthquake."

No, gentlemen of the House, neither can we afford to haggle with an earthquake. A supreme moment of history has come and upon the outcome depends, in a large measure, the future civilization of the world. The responsibility on every individual is plain, and the man who does not do his duty now and who lags back and sloths and sees how little work he can do for a day's pay or how small a value he can give the Government for what it purchases from him or his corporation is a mighty sorry citizen, whether he is a millionaire or a day laborer; whether he is a member of a labor union or never saw inside of one; whether he is in the factory, in the mine, on the farm, or a captain of industry in the marts of trade. There is no difference of obli-

tion, and the measure of duty is only limited by the ability and capacity to perform it.

The full comprehension of this obligation will mean much to the success of our cause, and the failure to grasp it will be one of the serious mistakes of the war.

DISCUSSION OF AMENDMENT IN DETAIL.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I will pass from these general observations to a more detailed discussion of the amendment which I have offered.

An amendment similar to this one has been reported favorably by the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate and has been referred to as the Reed-Thomas amendment, but the amendments are not identical and there is this difference between them. The amendment that has been reported favorably by the committee of the Senate reads as follows:

Provided, That when any person shall have been placed in a deferred or exempted class for any of the reasons in this paragraph set forth he shall not be entitled to remain therein unless he shall in good faith continue, while physically able so to do, to work at and follow such occupation, employment, or business.

My amendment is the same as the above, except I have made this modification: After the word "business" insert—
or some other productive occupation, employment, or business deemed necessary hereunder.

The difference between the two is very considerable. It has been contended that the Senate amendment in its original form would be capable of being used as an instrument to conscript labor, but no intelligent Member of Congress can contend for a moment that my amendment as modified will work any conscription of labor. I have no desire or purpose to do that. My amendment will leave the individual entire freedom of choice as to his employment and as to who his employer will be, provided that he works at an occupation, employment, or business necessary to the maintenance of the Military Establishment or the effective operation of the military forces or the maintenance of the national interest during the emergency. The Senate amendment says that whenever the registrant who has been deferred on industrial grounds shall cease to work at such employment, business, or occupation he shall lose his deferred classification. The words "such occupation, employment, or business" might be construed to mean that if he was an employee of the United States Steel Corporation, for instance, at the time he was granted the deferred classification and was engaged in war work and should cease his employment with such concern that he would lose his deferred classification notwithstanding he was ready and willing to engage in some other essential war work.

In other words, if a registrant was deferred as a shipyard worker, then a shipyard worker he would have to remain; if he was deferred as a coal miner, a coal miner he would have to remain. If he was deferred as a farmer, then a farmer he must remain or forfeit his deferred classification.

I do not think the country is prepared to go that far, unless the need for it should be very apparent and urgent, and so if the Senate amendment is really susceptible of that construction, as has been plausibly argued, it should be modified, and therefore I have added the words "or some other productive occupation, employment, or business deemed necessary hereunder," and with this addition no such possible construction can be placed upon the amendment as that to which I have just referred.

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

Mr. BLACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. Before I ask it I want to say that I am very heartily in favor of the principle that the gentleman is trying to write into the law; but if we do not put it in, is it the gentleman's opinion that the work or fight rule would not be operative?

Mr. BLACK. I will answer that question by stating that it is my understanding that the Secretary of War construes the present law as applying to individuals who are exempted, and who then cease to work, but he does not apply it to cessations in the aggregate. In other words, not to large bodies of men who go on an uncalled-for strike, and I think it is time that the United States Congress was writing into an affirmative law that when thousands of our bravest and best young men are at the front fighting for our liberties and for the protection of our homes and firesides, that no man ought to be permitted to stay at home in a deferred classification and not work at the occupation or business or employment for which he was deferred as long as he is physically able to do so. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS again rose.

Mr. BLACK. If the gentleman will permit me, I have only a few minutes more, and I would like to give the reasons why I favor the adoption of this amendment. I am very much interested in seeing that the spirit of this deferred-classification law is not repeatedly violated by unnecessary strikes in essential war industries and at a time when the Government of the

United States has furnished ample agencies for the settlement of all these labor disputes along lines of justice and fair play.

Why are these deferred classifications granted? Are they granted as a matter of personal right to the registrant? Are they granted because of any partiality or favoritism to the registrant? No. If they were granted on any such grounds as that, then the whole fabric of the selective-draft law would fall to the ground. They are granted because of a consideration for the interest of the whole country and the common welfare. The man who is exempted or granted deferred classification because of industrial or agricultural reasons and is placed in class 3 is not placed there because of any individual right or privilege of his own, but he is placed there because it is deemed that the needs of the country require it; and, therefore, when he is thus classified and afterwards ceases in good faith, while his health permits him to do so, to work at that essential industry or some other one that is essential, he ought to forfeit his deferred classification. I can not for the life of me see what right he would have to further claim it.

Now, I have heard it contended that this amendment would be a reflection or a blow aimed at organized labor. I deny that. I repudiate that assertion or that reflection. I deny that there is even the remotest purpose to make any fight against organized labor. There are 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 people in this country who labor with their hands at industries and employments that are more or less useful, and out of these 15,000,000 or 20,000,000 people less than 3,000,000 belong to organized labor. And are we to say that all the men who have been placed in these deferred classifications are members of organized labor, and that therefore it is a reflection or a slap at them? For some of the union labor leaders to contend that an amendment of this kind is directed against organized labor is about as sensible as the action of the three famous tailors of Tooley Street, who met and adopted resolutions beginning, "We, the people of England." The amendment would simply affect every man who failed to carry out in good faith the purpose of his deferred classification, and that wholly without reference to whether he was a member of any labor union or not.

I make no charge against the loyalty and patriotism of union labor. I freely concede that the great majority of them are loyal and patriotic, just as the great majority of all our citizens are loyal and patriotic; but because that is so is no reason that whatever small minority of them that there may be who do fail and refuse to discharge their duty and obligation to the country should not be made to do so.

The majority of the business men of the country are loyal and patriotic, and yet because that is true is no reason why, if one is caught profiteering and swindling the Government, he should not be punished for his acts. An argument of that kind, it seems to me, is absurd on its face. It is no more a reflection on organized labor to pass a law of this kind than an embezzlement statute would be a reflection on honest men. I will tell you what this amendment does and who it is directed against. It is directed against the slacker who is unwilling to work, whether he is a member of organized labor, or on the farm, or in a railroad shop, or in the mercantile establishment, or wherever he may be. That is who the amendment is meant for, and it certainly would have no application whatever to the man who does his duty and has a proper sense of obligation to the Nation in this hour of its greatest need.

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. Does not the gentleman know that the boards have the right to reclassify registrants?

Mr. BLACK. I answered a similar question propounded by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] a few moments ago, and pointed out that the Secretary of War has placed much too narrow an interpretation on the present law, according to my opinion.

Mr. FIELDS. I did not hear it.

Mr. BLACK. It is contended by some of the sponsors and spokesmen for the American Federation of Labor that an amendment of this kind would affect the ordinary right of labor to strike. They say that one of organized labor's most effective weapons is the right to call a strike whenever it pleases, and therefore it ought not to be interfered with. I will admit that the strike has been an effective weapon in the hands of organized labor. Sometimes it has been used wisely, sometimes very unwisely.

But we are not talking about peace conditions now. Far from it. These are extraordinary times. To use an expression of President Wilson upon one occasion, "The world is on fire."

It is no ordinary matter to draft 5,000,000 men into the military service of the United States and send them 3,000 miles across the sea to fight on foreign soil to protect American rights,

which include the rights of labor as well as every other group of citizens, and it is getting high time that every citizen realize that this is a time of universal obligation to service and is no time to hinder and impede the United States Government in its efforts to mobilize the strength of the Nation.

There are many things which we prize very highly in times of peace which we must subordinate to some extent in time of war. For instance, in times of peace the wheat farmer is allowed an open and free market for his product and is permitted to get whatever price it will bring, but under the pressure of war necessity he must now sell it at the price fixed by the Government.

The American household in time of peace is allowed to make its bread out of whatever kind of flour its purse will buy and the family taste prefers, but now, under the pressure of war necessity, the Government prescribes what percentage of wheat flour shall be used and what percentage shall be substitutes.

The experience of being allowed only 2 pounds of sugar to each person per month is a new one to the American people, and yet these restrictions are being everywhere cheerfully obeyed, because they are deemed for the public good and have been made necessary by war conditions. The great railroad systems of the country in time of peace have been permitted to manage their own affairs, except, of course, subject to certain reasonable restrictions imposed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the different State railroad commissions, but now they have been taken over by the Federal Government for the period of the war and they are no longer managed and directed by their owners but by the Director General of Railroads for the United States Government.

And only very recently the telegraph and telephone companies have been similarly dealt with and their direction and control for the period of the war committed to the hands of the Postmaster General. These things have been done upon the theory and principle that the public interest and national welfare is paramount and that the rights of the corporation and individual must be subordinated to the interest of the public good. And in this time of national peril is any group of citizens going to be continually clamoring for the right to strike and actually exercise it from day to day, to the great detriment and harm of our war preparations? And are they to continue to do this in the face of the fact that we have now in full operation a War Labor Policies Board to fix the policy of the Government toward labor and a National War Labor Board to put these policies into actual execution?

I referred a while ago to a speech which Premier Lloyd-George made to 3,000 union officials at Glasgow on Christmas Day, 1915. I want now to call your attention to another vigorous speech which he made along these same lines to the workers at Liverpool in 1915. Among other things, he said in that speech:

This is not a Government entering into negotiations with you. You have got an interest in this concern. It is yours as much as ours, and I want you to help us. Should Germany win, God help labor! It will come out of it worst of all.

I am not saying a word about trade-union regulations during a period of peace; I have no doubt they were essential safeguards to protect labor against interference with its rights and prospects. But many Government and business regulations have to be suspended during the war because they are inapplicable in the emergency, and the same thing applies to many union rules and practices.

And there must be no deliberate slowing down of work. I know of a skilled workman in an arsenal who worked very hard and was earning a great deal of money; he was doing his duty by the State. And he was warned that if he repeated the offense he would be driven out. Now, in war such things are intolerable. I urge that whatever rules, practices, or customs there are which interfere in the slightest degree with the increase of war material shall be suspended during the period of the war. We ask only for a suspension; the Government pledges that those safeguards established by the unions prior to the war will be restored when it is over.

This was in 1915. Since then the labor situation in Great Britain has grown a great deal better; in fact, there has been but very little subsequent trouble, due to the strong, virile, vigorous policy of Lloyd-George, wisely based upon fair and just treatment to labor and a firm and unyielding demand that labor reciprocate by holding the national welfare paramount to any of its preconceived notions as to its rights, and customs in times of peace.

SOME INFORMATION ABOUT STRIKES THAT HAVE OCCURRED.

Am I wrong in my belief that there have been many needless and uncalled-for strikes in the United States since the war began? I think not, and I do not believe that any impartial observer who has studied the situation can come to any other conclusion but that our war preparations have been greatly hindered and delayed by these unnecessary labor troubles. Have they been frequent? Well, I should say they have.

The Scientific American, one of the oldest and most highly regarded journals in the scientific, mechanical, and industrial field in the United States, said in an editorial on the shipping situation, in its issue of February 16, 1918, that during a period

of six months there have occurred over 3,500 strikes in the shipbuilding industry and in those industries which are contributory thereto.

And despite the fact that in many cases the wages in these shipyards have been doubled and trebled, I see in the papers of to-day, August 24, that skilled workers in the shipbuilding industry of the country have presented "friendly demands" to the labor adjustment board of the Shipping Board for increase in wages to \$1 an hour, double time for all over time, Saturday half holidays throughout the year, and 10 per cent bonus for all night shopwork. Their present wage is approximately 75 cents an hour. If these demands are granted it is safe to assume that they will satisfy for only a short time and that before very long other demands of a similar nature will be made and pressed just as hard for allowance.

This unending process can not continue to go on indefinitely without serious harm to our effective prosecution of the war. In some of these shipyards about as soon as one wage scale is agreed upon another is demanded. The brakes must be put on some time and it is getting about time it was done.

Research Report No. 3 of the National Industrial Conference Board makes an analysis of 1,156 strikes which occurred in the United States between April 6 to October 6, 1917, and this investigation shows that in the strikes in these 1,156 establishments that the number of employees made idle was 283,402, and the number of days of production lost was 6,285,519.

The magnitude of the production lost in these strikes would at any time be serious. In war time, when every day of production of essential materials has definite influence on the war situation, it is little short of appalling.

To visualize better the magnitude of the waste, it may be pointed out that it would require the labor of 251,400 persons for a whole month to make up for the reported loss of production, or that a manufacturing plant employing 1,000 workers would have to operate about 21 years of 300 workdays each in order to offset the time thus lost.

Soon after the sinking of the transport ship *Tuscania* last February I received a letter from a widowed mother who lives in one of the counties of my congressional district whose son was on the ill-fated ship. She inclosed with her letter a letter from her son, which was written from the port of embarkation in New Jersey, just before he boarded the ship to leave for France. And in that letter the young man said to his mother, among other things, this fine expression: "Mother, I do not know whether I will ever come back; but if I do not, remember this: That I died for my country." Well, the brave young man will never come back.

Soon after I received the letter from the anxious mother, I inquired of Gen. McCain at the Adjutant General's office of the War Department, and he gave me the information that the young man went down with the *Tuscania*.

I conveyed the information to the mother, and returned the letter from her son, which I knew she would prize above all earthly possessions, and wrote such words of sympathy and consolation as my own inadequate language could express.

In the breast of that boy dwelt the spirit that everywhere pervades our fighting forces in France and does honor to the American soldier, and will surely in the end bring victory to our cause.

And men like him, who are giving their lives as the price of liberty, deserve to be supported by every ounce of loyalty, every ounce of energy, every ounce of strength that our civilian population can summon to the service of the Nation.

But we all remember the unpleasant fact that at the very time that the country was mourning the lives of these young men who were lost on the *Tuscania* that the ship carpenters were striking in the Atlantic shipbuilding yards and tying up the building of ships which were so badly needed to transport our soldiers overseas and to supply them after they reached there.

The strike continued until President Wilson was forced to take a hand and send a stinging telegram of rebuke to William L. Hutcheson, of Indianapolis, president of the Brotherhood of Carpenters. And during the pendency of this strike Chairman Hurley, of the Shipping Board, sent the following telegram to this same president of the Brotherhood of Carpenters, which I think was particularly well timed and accurately expressed the sentiment of the American people as to the situation. The telegram read:

While the people of this country are mourning the loss of brave young Americans in the *Tuscania* horror—while thousands of American homes are anxiously watching the lists of survivors slowly coming in to make certain that another precious life has been snatched from the Atlantic Ocean—a telegram comes, and with it the grim announcement that the carpenters in shipyards are now on strike.

Before any Government agency is given an opportunity to act and despite the good record of our adjustment board's promptness and fairness in dealing with all labor matters, you attempt to paralyze the shipbuilding industry at the port of New York.

Do you realize that you are adding to the fearful danger our soldiers already face, the danger of starvation and the danger of starvation if food and ammunition are not sent over in ships and in many ships at once? Do you think the fathers and mothers whose sons are making this sacrifice will sit patiently by and permit this paralyzing of the life line between us and the western front to go on?

Will you take my friendly suggestion and go back to work at once? The machinery for dealing with all your demands and with the right of labor is at hand. You will be well advised to follow the methods of well-managed and patriotic labor organizations, at least until you have tested whether or not your Government, for which as shipbuilders you are now working, can be fair.

I advise you to end the paralyzing of the shipyard work now. I am sure you would not deliberately imperil the lives and safety of brave fellow citizens. I am sure you believe with me that those whose sons are now giving their blood that you and I and our children may be safe and free will not long permit either you or me to invite destruction of heroic lives and disaster to a great world cause.

It would be interesting to know what our soldiers at the front think about these strikes in essential war industries when the country is in such urgent need of its maximum production and when they themselves are undergoing such tremendous sacrifices and hardships on the battle field.

I imagine that their feeling in the matter is pretty well expressed in a letter which Senator UNDERWOOD, of Alabama, received from a young officer in France some time ago, and a clause in which letter read:

The other morning just at daybreak I came into a front trench and I saw one of our boys lying there, the rain pouring down on him, lying in the mud, the slime, the dirt, and the blood, with his rifle pointed at the German trenches watching for German snipers. He had probably laid there for three or four hours without moving for his country's cause. I can not understand when all these men are making this sacrifice how our people at home can consent to labor strikes in the shipyards when we need ships so vitally to win the war.

A letter like that needs no comment. It speaks for itself and in tones that should be heard by every Member of this House, and should arouse us to a full sense of our duty and responsibility and a determination to see to it that no man is permitted to remain in a deferred classification because of his occupation, employment, or business unless he shall in good faith while physically able so to do work at and follow such occupation, employment, or business, and when he fails to do it make him immediately subject to the draft.

That is all my amendment does. It does not in any way provide for any conscription of labor. It simply says to the registrant that you must not take advantage of your deferred classification to loaf, and if you do choose to make loafing your occupation you will not be permitted to follow it very long.

It is a just amendment—just to the registrant and just to the country at large—and ought to be adopted.

GOVERNMENT MACHINERY FOR SETTLING LABOR DISPUTES.

In this connection let me say that I would not favor an amendment of the kind which I have proposed if the slightest doubt existed as to whether or not the Government had set up adequate machinery to fully protect the rights of labor in all of these essential war industries.

But there is no doubt whatever on that subject. The War Labor Policies Board and the National War Labor Board are fully equipped and have ample authority to secure to labor all of its rights in any of these matters.

As an illustration of the work that it is doing let me quote from the Official Bulletin of August 20, 1918, dealing with a recent strike of 3,000 men in eight plants at Waynesboro, Pa. A decision on the matters at controversy was rendered by the National War Labor Board, and, among other things, the Bulletin says:

At Waynesboro, Pa., 3,000 men in eight plants struck for a minimum wage of 30 cents per hour. The lowest-paid men had been getting 22 cents. The board established a minimum of 40 cents, 10 cents more than the workers asked. The board is giving further consideration to this minimum and reserves the right to revise it on the basis of what is necessary to maintain the worker and his family in reasonable comfort.

And in the same way many other illustrations could be given of the fairness, yes, even generosity, of the National War Labor Board, to labor, and which forcibly impress us with the fact that there is an utter lack of any need for these strikes to go on and that some policy should be adopted by the Government to put a stop to it and force an obedience to the decisions of the National War Labor Board.

We who have voted to draft 5,000,000 men into the military service of the Nation, who have voted to place over 200,000 miles of railways under Federal control, who have voted autocratic powers, never dreamed of in times of peace, to the food administrator, who have voted to take over the vast

systems of telegraph and telephone lines for the period of the war, who have voted billions of dollars out of the public Treasury and are preparing to vote billions more, ought not to hesitate to vote for an amendment which simply provides that a registrant shall "work or fight." Only that and nothing more.

CONCLUSION.

To some Members it may seem that a policy of procrastination and delay in this important matter is wise, but I do not think so. Gen. Peyton C. March, our Chief of Staff, recently stated to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House that "eighty divisions of Americans should be able to bring the war to a successful conclusion in 1919."

Four million men at the front in France by June 30, 1919, and 1,000,000 men at home in training.

This policy, while unquestionably the best, is a policy of swift, sweating concentration and will demand our utmost strength and energy.

Can we do it? We can. Congress has passed the law that will give the man power, and it is now up to the civilian population who do not go into the Army to keep up production to the maximum limit behind the lines and see to it that the greatest army that the Nation has ever put into the field is fully supported with all war necessities.

But it will be no small task, be assured of that. We are facing the greatest undertaking the Nation has ever had. The farmer must bring into play all of his skill and experience and means of production in order that the harvests be maintained to their maximum capacity and our armies and civilian population be fed. The shipbuilder must work with more abounding energy than ever before, because 3,000 miles is a long way to transport a great army, and it takes ships, and then more ships, to do it; the railroad worker on train and in shop must devote himself with more fervid determination than ever before to his task, because these arteries of commerce have become the means for the transportation of the very lifeblood of the Nation.

Everywhere, all along the line in these industries and employments, there is essential, indispensable work to perform and a vital need to "carry on." Everybody together, one in heart and purpose, all of a single mind, and America wins!

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] seeks to carry out, in effect, an amendment offered in another branch of the Government and known as the Thomas amendment, and other amendments of that kind. These same amendments in different language were presented to the Military Affairs Committee. The Thomas amendment was discussed; the whole question was gone into as to whether there should be any amendment dealing with this particular matter. The committee decided, after having hearings, at which Mr. Frank Morrison, of the American Federation of Labor, the Secretary of War, and Gen. Crowder testified, that no such amendment was appropriate to this bill and therefore should not be included in this legislation.

Let me quote from the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs in reference to the Thomas amendment:

Chairman DENT. But that amendment was no part of the original program?

Secretary BAKER. It was not a part of the original program of the War Department.

The CHAIRMAN. And was included by the Senate Military Committee?

Secretary BAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LUNN. What would be the situation with the Thomas amendment in case there was some serious disagreement and a strike was called?

Secretary BAKER. I think it would be left to the President to determine whether the strike was in good faith, and if it was the President undoubtedly would not use this power to undertake to control the relation of employee and employer.

Mr. LUNN. In other words, you are opposed to trying to use the President's regulation to control that situation?

Secretary BAKER. If in good faith.

Mr. TILSON. Take an indispensable man, for instance; a toolmaker is exempted because he is a toolmaker; he decides that he will not make tools any more. Have you not the power under the law already provided to draft him?

Secretary BAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. TILSON. Then, what will the Thomas amendment add—what force does it add to the present law?

Secretary BAKER. I had not thought of that.

Gen. CROWDER. It is a declaration of a policy already being enforced, unless it looks toward the conscription of labor, and that is the interpretation a great many people have placed on it.

Mr. LUNN. Inasmuch as the regulations already in force deal with that, why is it necessary?

Gen. CROWDER. It is not, as the Secretary has defined the use he would make of it.

Mr. LUNN. Why insert something that is not necessary and that is subject to a great deal of misconstruction?

The CHAIRMAN. I think the Secretary has made it clear that this is no part of the military program.

There is no question whatever but that the War Department now has in force regulations to deal with every industrial slacker. They can immediately call them into the service. No Member of this House is more in favor of meting out drastic treatment to a slacker than am I. The present regulations can deal effectively with these cases.

Mr. OVERMYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OVERMYER. Is there any obligation under the present regulations requiring the employer to report to the proper board when an employee changes his occupation?

Mr. LUNN. I can not answer the gentleman.

Mr. SIMS. Is not the Shipping Board required to report when a man ceases work? My recollection is positive that it is being applied by the Shipping Board, and I understand it is of general application.

Mr. LUNN. Undoubtedly the gentleman is right, but I personally have no knowledge of this particular point. But, to proceed, this is no time, while we are dealing with the man-power bill, to inject a controversy over an unnecessary amendment. Already there is suspicion abroad that the legislative branch first suggesting this amendment has some subtle purpose in view; that it is aimed primarily to take away the right of the workers to strike no matter how just their cause. The question was put to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], in substance, as follows: "Will this amendment deal with strikes?" His answer, in substance, was: "It will include strikes." At the present time we have practically no strikes of any size in America. In the past there has been trouble, but the Government established regulatory departments that are doing magnificent work. The National War Labor Board, headed by ex-President Taft and Mr. Frank Walsh, has solved and is solving industrial disputes. Mr. Frank Morrison testified that organized workers will resent such legislation. Not that they will favor slackers but will resent that which would, by implication, place all men who are in industries in deferred classification in the position of being potential slackers, so much so that punitive law was necessary. There is no body of our citizenship, I do not care who they are, who are any more loyal and self-sacrificing and patriotic than the mass of our workers now producing war materials, munitions, ships, and other things essential to the prosecution of the war.

Thousands upon thousands of our young men are in deferred classification, not at their own request but because the Government through the various industries have determined that their best service could be rendered in the production of war materials. Many of them would prefer the active service on the front. The passage of this amendment would carry the distinct impression that these loyal men are in deferred classification by special privilege and that unless they continue in that special privilege they will be punished by being put on the firing line. In order adequately to punish real slackers, for which we now have regulations, this House can ill afford to cause the stigma of slacker and the suspicion of disloyalty to rest on the millions of patriotic men who are in deferred classification due to the determination of the Government that their greatest contribution to the war is in serving the Nation where they now are.

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

Mr. LUNN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Has the gentleman noticed in this morning's Post the fact that one organization is demanding \$1 an hour for its services?

Mr. LUNN. I did not notice it, although I noticed that there was a strike of conductors and conductorettes in London, England. Did the gentleman notice that?

Mr. JAMES. And if the steel people were to go before the President and say that it was necessary to have an increased price for steel, and it was granted, and then instead of raising the wages of the men they cut them down, and the men struck, would they not then be compelled to go to war, according to the Black amendment?

Mr. LUNN. They would. Their draft boards would be compelled immediately to cancel their deferred classification, no matter how just the cause of their dispute.

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

Mr. LUNN. I will.

Mr. BLACK. Is it not a fact that we now have a National War Labor Board to adjust such differences as those mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JAMES]?

Mr. JAMES. And if a man stayed out of work for five days he would be taken out of his deferred classification?

Mr. LUNN. Will the gentleman bear in mind that in our committee there was presented a case in respect to one branch of

the Steel Corporation, where the workers were willing to submit their grievance to the National War Labor Board, but the members of that particular part of the Steel Corporation would not submit to the Government? This concern could lock out all of these employees and we would lose valuable and efficient men for industry.

Mr. BLACK. Do we not now have on the statute books a law that permits the Government of the United States to take over such an industry as that.

Mr. LUNN. And the gentleman's solution of the problem would be for the Government to take it over immediately when there is trouble?

Mr. BLACK. Unless the matter could be settled by the National Labor Board.

Mr. LUNN. Would the gentleman have the Government take it over if the employers lock out the men?

Mr. BLACK. I would have both employees and employers obey the law of the Government and sustain essential production.

Mr. LUNN. Why not include in the gentleman's amendment employers as slackers who close their shops and lock out the men?

Mr. BLACK. If they are granted deferred classification upon that ground, the amendment would serve to include them, and they should be classed as slackers. The employer and the employee should be made to work or fight. That is my position.

Mr. LUNN. Here is the upshot of this entire matter: An amendment is before us declared wholly unnecessary by the Military Affairs Committee. The Secretary of War has stated that it was no part of the bill as framed by the War Department. Gen. Crowder has stated that it is not necessary. Then, why inject this controversial amendment in the man-power bill? There is a certain class of men who are antagonistic to the workers in general, who seem to cherish a prejudice against all workers, and they have consistently endeavored to secure conscription of labor. In the other branch of the legislature are men who seem determined to put into this bill some form of a camouflage labor conscription. It should not be done. This amendment and any other similar amendment ought not to be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment ought to be voted down regardless of what the motives of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], who offered it, may be. It is a disturbing question at this time, just as the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN] has said. Mr. Morrison, of the American Federation of Labor, appeared before the committee and stated his opposition to it, with his reasons. The Secretary of War has not asked for it. He has said that it is not necessary. Gen. Crowder has said that it is not necessary. Why does the gentleman from Texas want to bring in amendments that are practically in opposition to the Secretary of War and the Provost Marshal General? We should give them something that will help them out, not give them something that they do not want and will prove a disturbing factor.

Mr. BLACK. Did not the Secretary of War say in the hearings that he could see no objection to an amendment of this kind?

Mr. SIMS. I do not remember; I was quoting what the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN] has said; I did not attend the hearings only for a few minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. He did say it.

Mr. BLACK. I will say that he did say it.

Mr. SIMS. I am not a member of the Committee on Military Affairs; but here is a bill that has hardships enough in it without inserting a provision that will be regarded all over this country as something intended for intimidation purposes. This war can not be won by money or fighting men alone. It has got to be won by products and they must be produced by labor. Let us take the case of a contractor who has a contract to supply war material. If it is known to him that his laborers can not quit because they do not get the wages or treatment that they think they ought to have, then he will not give them what they demand, because they will come within the provisions of the Senate amendment or the Black amendment, should it prevail. We have enough of the spirit of intimidation. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] knows that we are always presumed to intend the natural result of what we are doing. One of the natural results of our act, if we pass this amendment, will be a disturbance, disharmony, uncertainty, experimentation, contentions, and controversy, and the Lord knows we have explosive situations enough now without unnecessarily injecting into this bill something that ought not to go into it. It was not in the bill as it was sent over from the Secretary of War. Let us not put in every imaginable thing that might suggest itself on the

spur of the moment. I hope the amendment will be voted down, just as I hope the Gregg amendment will be voted down, when we get into the House where we can vote upon it.

Mr. CANNON rose.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto shall close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. I think I may want 10 minutes, though I think I shall get through in 5.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the men in the Army and the Navy in the military service of the United States are not discriminated against when you draft them, whether they want to go or not. If their feelings are hurt there, they might be hurt. It is true some of them are unorganized and some are in organized labor. Organized labor, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] well said, does not exceed 3,000,000 men. I doubt if it numbers that amount. Now, I just want to put in a protest here and now against the self-constituted defenders of labor. [Applause.] My God, I have followed in the early part of my life until pretty well up toward the middle every path that labor treads. I have been supported by labor, organized and unorganized, in my long service in this House against the objections of gentlemen whom I might designate who have discussed, and gentlemen like unto them, this question of labor during this session of Congress. I will not grow personal. Now, gentlemen, the gentleman has well said perhaps that already the power exists, and, as I understand, it will exist when this draft bill passes from 18 to 45—already the President has in what is known as the Chamberlain law the authority to call into the military service of the United States men engaged in labor, and that includes organized labor. So there it stands. He can do it to-morrow. I voted for the law. No objection was made to it in the House or Senate. I think it is barely possible that the gentleman from New York, who is so eloquent and plausible, possibly may have been asleep at the switch. I do not know whether he was or not. I would like to know whether he indorses that law now.

Mr. LUNN. I am sure that I was not asleep at the switch, because I never sleep at the switch.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman indorse the law now that enables the President to draft into the military service of the United States any man or men engaged in an industry or agriculture and take them from the dollar an hour, or whatever compensation they may receive, and put them on the \$30 a month, or put them into the shipyards and put them upon the railroads or anywhere else that is as necessary? Does the gentleman indorse that kind of power?

Mr. LUNN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. LUNN. I would certainly in time of war favor that power if applied equitably and absolutely and universally over the entire Nation, whether to men or property.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, over the entire Nation. If the men in the shipyards strike in that great employment to transport our soldiers and food across the sea or to operate the railroads is it necessary to conscript everybody else that are not striking and are not refusing? Oh, the gentleman is not consistent. [Applause.] I was going to say he was "demagoging," but I will not speak disrespectfully. In my judgment, the gentleman camouflages. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LUNN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. LUNN. I have consistently taken the stand that our legislation should apply equally and equitably, so far as possible, on our entire population. If we are compelled to conscript men, then go to it and conscript all men, employees and employers alike. What the gentleman wants is to leave free the dollar, but put in bondage the man.

Mr. CANNON. Good God, the President can seize any industrial establishment, and has already been seizing them by the wholesale. If any proprietor in an industry anywhere in the United States should act unpatriotically, the President can take it over in the twink of an eye. [Applause.]

Mr. LUNN. But he does not put the owners in uniform, the older men, as you evidently want the workers treated.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; I say, you catch them at the age of 45. We are about to amend the law and the law already on the statute books will apply to them. Let us be honest with each other. I am a better friend of labor, in my judgment, than is the gentleman from New York. I stand for the equality of opportunity everywhere. [Applause.]

Now, I just wanted to say that much. I think that already the President of the United States has the power to take any

man in union labor or any man on the farm or in industry and draft him into the military service at \$30 a month. It is up to the administration. I am not going now to criticize the administration. I am merely speaking of what the law is. Therefore, I do not know that I shall grieve if this amendment is not agreed to, because, as I understand the law already, the power rests in the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy as the occasion arises to conscript any laborer in industry, any laborer on the farm, and that includes the whole shooting match, industry and farm. [Applause.]

Mr. LONDON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to make a statement. The Chair has not been furnished under this unanimous-consent agreement with the name of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SMALL. I think the gentleman from New York is one of those included in that agreement.

Mr. FIELDS. I will state in the absence of the chairman, it is my understanding the gentleman from New York was included.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stands corrected. The gentleman's name is on the list.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, there is always a great deal of wisdom in the things that the former Speaker of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, has to say. There is not the slightest doubt that if the bill passes in the form in which it has been presented the military arm of the country will be able to reach every male person between the ages of 18 and 45. All this argument about an amendment being necessary to prevent strikes or to obtain conscription of labor is a mere waste of time. Under the law as it is before us the Commander in Chief may call upon all male persons between the ages of 18 and 45 and draft them into the service.

It is merely a matter of regulation. And those who support the bill and who claim that they are special friends of organized labor because they oppose this amendment do not quite understand the situation. It is as clear as day that the President has that power. Until now it was the young man between the ages of 21 and 31. With the adoption of the bill it is every male person between the ages of 18 and 45 that becomes subject to the call of the President. He need not put them in uniform. He can give them a badge of service. He need not even do that. He simply calls them into the service, and that is all there is to it. The great question overlooked through the entire discussion on this bill was whether the Congress of the United States shall take 24,000,000 people and subject them to military authority. That was the great question. And after you have overlooked that great big question and have adopted a bill which permits the conscription of labor you seek to pour sand into the eyes of the workers by raising the question whether it is necessary to adopt an amendment authorizing in specific terms the withdrawal of deferred classification for certain industrial workers. As I said before, it is all a matter of regulation.

The President has adopted the policy, the Secretary of War and the Labor Department cooperating, of dealing with the relations of capital and labor in a humane way and not in a military way; but they are not bound to do so under the law.

This country must not be put in a strait-jacket of militarism. There must be some room left for voluntary patriotism. There must be some room left for voluntary sacrifices. There must be some room left for the expression of genuine devotion. The great mistake that wise men, like the former Speaker, commit when they talk about prohibiting strikes is that they compare the industrial situation to the situation in the trenches. In the trenches the officer bares his breast in advance of the men whom he leads. He shares with them a common danger and risks his life with his comrades. That is not true in industry. In the trenches the officer does not go into the pockets of the private and pick the pockets. But the leaders and the rulers of industry pick the pockets of the men who are private in industry. That is the difference. If we had industry conducted and governed for the Nation and by the Nation, the situation would be different. Then the Commander in Chief could say to every man, rich or poor, "You are to-day a part of the fighting force of the country; just now you are not in the trenches; you are in the factories and in the mines, but all on the same footing." If we would introduce the principle that there shall be no profits in war while the Nation bleeds and while men die, that all we produce shall go for the common good, with that condition in industry I would not object to the conscription of every man and every woman capable of rendering service. But as long as the private in industry is exploited by the generals in industry we can not apply the same principle to the economic life of the country which we apply to the trenches. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] is recognized.

Mr. SMALL. Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to discuss this amendment because of the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN] that there were no more patriotic men in the United States than those engaged in labor, and the remark made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] that the employers of labor were picking the pockets of labor.

Let us understand what this amendment is. The bill contains a provision that "persons engaged in occupations or employments 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" may be put in deferred classes. This amendment simply provides that persons having been placed in such deferred classes shall work in the occupation on account of which they were deferred, and if they do not work then they shall be selected for military service.

Mr. BLACK. It permits them to change to any other occupation of a similar nature.

Mr. SMALL. Yes. I read in the Washington Times of this afternoon, which happens to be on the desk before me, this paragraph:

PORT M'HENRY TROOPS ANGERED BY STRIKE.

BALTIMORE, August 25.

Soldiers at United States General Hospital No. 2, Fort McHenry, were enraged when 54 bricklayers employed on hospital buildings walked out because their demands for increased pay had not been granted.

The men are now being paid 73 cents an hour, and some time ago asked for an increase to \$1 an hour.

The soldiers were of the opinion that these men should be immediately drafted and put to work again at \$1 a day instead of a dollar an hour.

The foreman explained that they would not get the increase any sooner by striking and it might result in their losing their positions.

[Applause.]

I began six or eight months ago to clip from newspapers accounts of demands of labor and strikes and other activities upon the part of labor which seemed in my humble judgment to be unjustified and unpatriotic. The envelope in which I was keeping them became so full that I finally abandoned it. Does the gentleman from New York say that these men in Baltimore are the most patriotic of the citizenship of the country? Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON], who declaims about the robbery being committed by employers of labor upon labor, organized or unorganized, say that these laborers in Baltimore are having their pockets picked?

Mr. Chairman, it is a thought way down in the consciences and memories of many Members of this House, and it can be corroborated, that since we entered this war in April, 1917, there has been a disposition upon the part of labor—a portion of labor—to take advantage of the demand which has come for labor and seek unwarranted prices and the adoption of unwarranted conditions, and that with increased pay there has come decreased efficiency.

I am not opposed to organized labor. I desire that every man who labors, and we are all laborers, shall receive a compensation adequate to sustain himself and his family. I would not if I could impair the right to strike. I believe in the right of organized labor to strike. But in this hour of emergency, when we have selected for military service over 2,000,000 American citizens, which number we propose to increase to more than 4,000,000, to whom we pay a pittance of \$30 a month, when every intelligent citizen recognizes that at the same time we must speed up in production of all the things necessary for the maintenance of our soldiers and for the proper conduct of the war, I submit that it is the duty of every man engaged in labor, whether with his hands or otherwise, to deal fairly and justly with his Government. I regret to state that there have been instances of men engaged in labor who have not been patriotic. And there is not the slightest foundation for the statement of the lone Socialist in this body that employers are picking the pockets of labor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. NOLAN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SMALL] seems to take a newspaper statement covering the action of 54 men to determine his judgment on this very important question. He seems to forget that the Government of the United States in the conduct of the war has given the labor problem some serious attention. We have here in Washington a Wage Adjustment Board that takes care of the wage question and the conditions of employment of the men in the shipyards. The Navy Department takes care of the questions of conditions and wages in the navy yards, and is largely

guided by the findings of the Wage Adjustment Board. Since taking over the railroads the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Director General of Railroads, has seen fit to create a board of adjustment on wages and conditions on the railroads of the country. Some time ago the Lane Commission handed down a decision which was unsatisfactory. This new wage board took the matter up for adjudication, and it has recently handed down an award, and even though the decision is not entirely satisfactory, the men are working and will continue to work without resorting to a strike.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] here referred to the fact that there was another newspaper statement regarding a demand made for payment of a dollar an hour by some workmen. A few days ago the same newspaper made the statement that these men made that demand under threat of a strike. That is an absolutely unfounded statement. I am talking from personal knowledge, because I participated in those deliberations.

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

Mr. NOLAN. No; I can not yield. I sat with those men and I heard them present their case. They presented a case for different rates of wages, and they are going to abide by the decision of the wage board. There will not be any strike nor has there been any threat of a strike either during the hearings or at any other time or place.

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

Mr. NOLAN. No; I can not yield. The gentleman was not fair in making that statement. There is not going to be a strike. There would not be any strike if the employers were as fair to the Government as the employees are. There has not been an instance where the employees engaged in any industry relating to the war would have struck if the employers had been as fair to the Government as labor is. There is not an instance where men have refused to return to work at the request of the War Labor Board or the Department of Labor. I can refer you to innumerable instances where the employer has refused to deal fairly or to abide by the declaration of principles adopted in creating the War Labor Board; in the first instance, the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co.; in the next instance, the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the Western Union Telegraph Co.; and you can go down the list, and it will show that practically every corporation in this country that has big interests and is making war profits by the tens of millions, and in some instances by the hundreds of millions, has refused to consider this question as fairly as labor has done. They have in many instances locked out and discharged their workers and have refused to arbitrate their differences when governmental agencies created to deal with these questions offered their services.

The former Speaker of this House [Mr. CANNON] can tell you how fair he has been to labor in the past, but his attitude toward organized labor has always been one of hostility. In the bill that was before us some months ago to prevent sabotage in munition plants, despite the fact that no one ever asked for it, he injected by amendment the conspiracy section of the old Clayton antitrust law, which would prevent legitimate strikes in private plants on war work, no matter what the employees' grievance might be; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LUNN] submitted an amendment which took the teeth out of it, and it afterwards went out in conference. We should deal with this labor question just as we deal with the handling of our soldiers in France. Men who are qualified to handle this question are handling it, and handling it satisfactorily. Let these men alone. This House does not understand the labor problem. I do not understand the question in all its ramifications, and I do not claim to understand it. There are men peculiarly fitted to take care of this industrial question, just as other men are peculiarly fitted to take care of the Army. Let the President of the United States and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Labor come before this Congress and ask us for this legislation, and then I will vote to conscript every man and woman in this country if they say it is necessary to win this war. That is how far I will go. But they have not asked for this. You have injected into this bill from the floor a proposition that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House would not adopt. Of course, there is going to be some industrial disturbance in this country, but who is responsible for it? If you dig deep down into the facts you will find that the commission presided over by former President Taft will give you causes of it, and I think you will find the employers more at fault than the workers.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. NOLAN. No; I have not the time. I have only 5 minutes, while the gentleman had 10 minutes. If the committee wishes to introduce this matter, it can do it in an intelligent manner. The War Department and the Department of Labor and every

other agency handling the question will give you the facts, and then, with the facts, you can handle it intelligently. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I believe that every Member of this House is actuated by one single desire, and that is to write into the statutes of his country those provisions of law that will most speedily bring this war to a successful conclusion with the least possible sacrifice. That, I take it, ought to be and is the desire of us all. We have enacted a law authorizing that certain men engaged in industry and agriculture shall be placed in deferred classifications, because, as Mr. Hurley said, one man in a shipyard to-day is worth more than three men in the trenches. And because of this great need for skilled mechanics they should be kept at work. And so these men, engaged in these industries by the hundreds of thousands, have been placed in deferred classifications. As long as they are needed there and will continue to work, no one should object.

What is the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]? It only provides that so long as these men are engaged in these industries or in like employment they shall not be disturbed, but when they quit working, when they commence to loaf, their privileged status shall be removed and they shall be placed in the military service like all other men who have not been given a privileged status.

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

Mr. GOOD. No; I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa declines to yield.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, is there a man in this House, in this great emergency, when we realize that we must make great sacrifices, when we are drafting the boys of 18, who among us in this great emergency is not willing himself to work or to fight? It is un-American, it is disloyal for any able-bodied man in this great emergency to refuse to work or to fight; and that is all there is to the amendment. [Applause.] On this proposition every man ought to be made to answer the question, Will you work or will you fight? Then we should see to it that he follows the occupation of his choice.

I favor the Black amendment because it is bottomed upon the principle of universal liability to service. I did not know before that that principle permitted a special privilege to loaf.

Mr. Chairman, we improved upon the English system when we entered this war. England at the outbreak of the war enlisted her skilled employees. We placed our skilled employees that were necessary for winning the war in deferred classifications, but we insist that while they enjoy that privilege they must work. What is the situation in England and France to-day?

England and France are furnishing the field artillery for their own troops and also for the American troops, and will continue to do so for the next two and one-half months. I have here a copy of a publication of the Patriotic Education Society, from which I read of the industrial situation in England.

One factory on light shells employs about 94 per cent women. Taking shell, fuse, and grenade work as a whole, the average number of women employed is about 80 per cent. On the skilled operations, such as howitzer work, the averages are not so high, but there are individual cases which show just as high a percentage of women employees. In the largest English explosive factory there are 15,000 hands, and of these 11,000 are women. On trinitrotoluol manufacture the average is about 80 per cent women, and on the picric acid the average is about 40 per cent women. On filling fuses and that class of work the average is generally well over 90 per cent. In America we have exempted our men to do the work that the women are doing in England, and this amendment only compels them to do the work they said they would do when they were exempted from military service. When they refuse to work, send them into the war with your boy, and let a patriotic American woman fill the place. What English women can do American women can and will do.

Yet it is earnestly contended here that the industrial slacker shall be exempted and the boy of 18 from the farm shall be made to take his place in the trenches. I want the Members like the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS], when they face this fall the mothers and fathers of those boys, to say, "Yes; I voted to put them there at once, and I voted against putting the industrial slackers of the country into the trenches." [Applause.]

Gentlemen, that is the issue presented by this amendment. There is no other issue. Let us get into this war with all our man power. Let us not recognize the slacker anywhere, whether he is a millionaire or a pauper, whether he is able to buy a king's ransom or only contribute a widow's mite. Let all the

man and woman power of the Nation be applied to this great emergency. Let us all do our best, and the best in America will win this war. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] is recognized for two minutes and a half.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I see no reason in the world why the committee should get excited over this amendment. This proposition was considered very thoroughly by the Committee on Military Affairs. We had the Secretary of War before us to discuss it. We also had a representative of the American Federation of Labor. The Secretary of War, in response to my question, emphatically stated that the Thomas amendment as put on the bill in the Senate—which is substantially the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK]—was no part of the program of the War Department and was unnecessary. Now, why should we go to the trouble of putting on legislation that the War Department has not asked for, that the Secretary of War himself says is absolutely unnecessary, and when he goes further and states that he can take care of the situation under the law as it now exists?

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman asks the question, "Why should we enact legislation that the War Department has not asked for?" Does the gentleman think that the Congress of the United States ought to enact only that legislation that the War Department asks?

Mr. DENT. No. The gentleman from Texas is fully aware of the fact that I have exercised some independence of judgment myself on matters of this kind.

Mr. BLACK. Here too.

Mr. DENT. But the point I am making is that the War Department says it is no part of its program, that it is unnecessary legislation, and that this can be taken care of under the present law. So, why load down this bill with unnecessary legislation?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The so-called present law exists in the form of departmental regulations, does it not?

Mr. DENT. But the regulations, of course, are made under the authority of the present law.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly, and they continue to be law as long as they exist.

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. But they can be changed by the same power that made them at any time it wants to?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. And it can enforce them as a matter of its own policy, but a statute is a mandate.

Mr. DENT. And it has been the policy of my friend from Vermont, who is a very distinguished, very able, and helpful member of the Military Affairs Committee, not to tie the hands of the War Department by statute instead of regulations. [Applause.]

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. That is a generality which I can not summon all the records of several years to disprove, but the fact is I have tried to use my own judgment quite as much as some other gentlemen have used theirs.

Mr. DENT. But that is the general practice which the gentleman has followed.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. In each particular case I have tried to act in the way which my judgment told me was best.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the adoption of the Black amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLACK) there were—ayes 52, noes 91.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TREADWAY: At the end of section 3, page 3, add the following new section, to read as follows:

"The Provost Marshal General is authorized to appoint special examiners, to act under such regulations as may be approved by the Secretary of War, for the purpose of reexamining in local districts all men of deferred classifications. When the findings and recommendations of the examiners are approved by the Provost Marshal General, local boards may reclassify men so reexamined. Examinations may be repeated within such periods as the Provost Marshal General may deem necessary. The same right of appeal from the reclassification, either by the Government or by a registrant, as is provided in the act of May 18, 1917, shall apply to men reclassified under this section."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, in the very able address made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CRAIG] yesterday, I find these words:

I will agree to any legislation that can be enacted that will comb every classification, and deferred classifications especially, and put into the ranks men who really belong there.

All day yesterday and this morning the same thought has been reiterated, namely, that the deferred classifications should be combed for men not entitled to deferred classification and that they should be put into class 1 and into the fighting ranks. On inquiry of the Provost Marshal General's office I find that under the regulations in vogue a certain authority rests in the hands of the Provost Marshal General to appoint such examiners as this amendment refers to, but the authority is exercised to a very limited extent. I understand there are but 18 such examiners at work at the present time. Now, the situation is this: We have nearly 5,000 local boards in this country. Those local boards are made up each of three men active in the community work, of high standing, likely to be district judges or men holding various prominent positions. During the year or year and a half that the selective-draft act has been in effect those men have devoted practically their entire time to the work of these local boards. We are giving them more work all the time. As a result, when these local boards have classified men in deferred classifications, it is the most natural thing in the world that they will leave them there, in view of the fact that they are already overburdened with the department's work. There is no systematic effort to reclassify men who are in the deferred classifications. Consequently it seems to me that we should place in the hands of the Provost Marshal General an authority additional to that which he may have already, to employ such examiners as may be necessary to comb the deferred classifications. That is the object of the amendment which I have offered. It is entirely in the hands of the Provost Marshal General to employ such number as he may see fit—one or a thousand—and it will result in finding these men that you want to comb out of the deferred classification. If there is objection to such an amendment I can not see it; but if adopted it will most assuredly place in the hands of the Provost Marshal General the machinery with which to accomplish the very objects which we have been discussing here for two days, namely, the reclassifying of men and making sure that they are in the classes where they rightly belong. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LAZARO. A question for information.

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAZARO. The gentleman said that the Provost Marshal General had 18 of these examiners in the service now.

Mr. TREADWAY. I understood by communication with him yesterday over the telephone that he was putting out into the field 18 such men.

Mr. LAZARO. If he can employ 18, why can he not employ more?

Mr. TREADWAY. It is probable that he can. I will not say that he can not employ them, but under no direct application of law. I ask the House to give him the direct authority of law so that he may so employ them.

Mr. DENISON. I am much in favor of the gentleman's amendment, but I will ask if this would not help secure a greater uniformity in the administration of the draft law?

Mr. TREADWAY. It certainly would, because it would give a method of bringing the act up to date. There are no end of instances where the reasons for the deferred classification have changed during the period of the year, and there is no machinery to bring it up to date. It is perfectly apparent that conditions under which deferred classification may have properly been secured a year ago do not now exist.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Why could not the examination be conducted by the local boards?

Mr. TREADWAY. For the reason that the local boards have devoted so much time and attention to the work under the present act that they ought not to be expected to do more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DENT. Let me say to the gentleman that the only possible objection I could have or that any member of the committee could have to his amendment is that they are doing this thing now. I do not know that it is necessary to put it into law, but, so far as the principle is concerned, I have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That section 4 of said act be amended by adding at the end thereof the following proviso:

"Provided, That nothing in this section contained shall prevent the President, if he deems it advisable, from appointing as a member of a local board any person residing outside the subdivision or area in which such local board has jurisdiction, or from transferring a member of one local board to another local board outside the subdivision or area in which such person resides."

The following committee amendment was read:
Strike out all of lines 13 to 21, inclusive.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have read at the Clerk's desk a letter which I received from the Secretary of War this morning relative to the McKenzie amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, August 23, 1918.

Hon. S. H. DENT,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. DENT: I have been asked by a number of Members of Congress to state definitely the attitude of the War Department on the so-called McKenzie amendment to the man-power bill, which Gen. March, Gen. Crowder, and I discussed before the committee some days ago.

The McKenzie amendment provided that men of 18 to 19 and 19 to 20 years, when registered, shall be put in a separate class to be called into the Army only after men between the ages of 20 and 45 years made available in class 1 shall have been exhausted by draft.

I believe this amendment unwise, and that it would seriously impair the ability of the War Department to get the men needed in accordance with the military program. I stated to the committee that the War Department intended, as a matter of regulation, so far as practicable, to defer the call of registered men from 18 to 19 years of age, and pointed out that any less elastic provision than this would require the War Department to be able to certify the complete exhaustion of the older classes before the men from 18 to 19 would be available. The McKenzie amendment is obviously much wider and more inelastic, and would be embarrassing to the department in securing speedily the number of men required by the program.

The object of this law is to increase the Army rapidly for early use. I hope it will be found possible by the House of Representatives to leave the bill in this particular unamended, and to rely upon the War Department by regulation to defer the younger men so far as such deferment is possible without interfering with the primary and urgent purpose of the bill, which is to raise the Army to the desired size, train it, and send it abroad by a definite time.

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER, Secretary of War.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a letter from the law librarian of the Library of Congress, stating the age limits in Germany, Great Britain, France, and Canada. [Cries of "Read it!"]

Mr. DENT. I will ask, Mr. Chairman, that the Clerk read it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, August 22, 1918.

Hon. S. H. DENT, Jr.,
Chairman House Military Affairs Committee,
451 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In further response to the request from your office on the 20th instant for material relating to the draft ages in other countries, I am inclosing herewith three memoranda which have been prepared in the Legislative Reference Division relating to drafting of young men in Great Britain, France, and Germany, respectively.

Very truly, yours,

J. DAVID THOMPSON, Law Librarian.

DRAFTING OF YOUNG MEN IN GREAT BRITAIN DURING THE EUROPEAN WAR.

Under the provisions of the military-service act, 1916 (5 and 6 Geo. 5, ch. 104), which went into effect February 10, 1916, every male British subject, a resident of Great Britain, who had reached the age of 18 and was under 41 and was unmarried or a widower without children was deemed to have been duly enlisted in the regular army for general service with the colors or in the reserves for the period of the war.

The Statesman's Yearbook, 1918, page 50, states that all the groups of unmarried men were called out by March 18, 1916.

The military-service act, 1916, session 2 (6 and 7 Geo. 5, ch. 15), which became law May 25, 1916, extended the liability to service to married men within the same age limits. Section 1 (1) of this act contains the following proviso:

"Provided, That steps shall be taken to prevent, so far as possible, the sending of men to serve abroad before they attain the age of 19."

Premier Lloyd-George, in presenting to the House of Commons on April 9, 1918, the Government's bill raising the military age to 50, referred to this proviso, as follows:

"There was an understanding that boys under 19 years would only be used in case of emergency. We felt that the emergency had arisen, and, in so far as those who were over 18 were concerned, those who had already received six months' training, we felt it necessary that they should be sent to France."

By the terms of the recent treaty between the United States and Great Britain young men of British nationality may be drafted under the laws of the United States after they have reached the age of 20.

DRAFTING OF YOUNG MEN IN FRANCE.

I. BEFORE THE EUROPEAN WAR.

Under the military-service law in force before the outbreak of the European war, namely, the act of August 7, 1913, young men were called to military service during the year following that in which they reached 19 years of age, and the class to which they belonged was designated by the calendar year in which service under this law began—that is, the year in which the twentieth birthday occurred.

II. DURING THE EUROPEAN WAR.

This draft age for beginning compulsory military service was not lowered until March 15, 1915, when an act was passed providing that—"The class of 1916 shall be called to the colors in advance of the regular time, at such date as may be fixed by order of the minister of war." (Journal Officiel, 1915, p. 1387.)

The class of 1916 consisted of young men who became 19 in 1915.

By the acts of December 30, 1915, March 31, 1917, and March 29, 1918 (Journal Officiel, 1915, p. 9663; 1917, p. 2557; 1918, p. 2831), the same authority was conferred upon the minister of war to call out the classes of 1917, 1918, and 1919, respectively, in the year in which they became 19.

Circulars of the minister of war, dated January 22, 1917, and September 30, 1917 (Journal Officiel, 1917, pp. 738, 7844), show that this authority had been exercised with respect to the class of 1917 before October 1, 1916, and, with respect to the class of 1918, before October 1, 1917. (A. Bernard, Aug. 21, 1918.)

DRAFTING YOUNG MEN IN GERMANY.

I. BEFORE THE EUROPEAN WAR.

Liability to military service in Germany commences with the completion of the seventeenth year. Such service is compulsory and universal, but does not actually begin until the age of 20. Every young man is enrolled in the military register during January of the year in which he completes his twentieth year. Prior to this—that is, from the seventeenth to the twentieth year, unless he has volunteered for actual service—the young man belongs to the landsturm, a home-defense force consisting of two classes, namely, the first including all men from 17 to 39 who for one reason or another have received no military training, the second class including all men over 39 up to 45, whether trained or untrained. (Constitution of the German Empire, Apr. 16, 1871, art. 59; law relating to military service, Feb. 11, 1888, secs. 23-24; Reichsgesetzblatt, 1888, p. 18.)

II. DURING THE EUROPEAN WAR.

The landsturm was called out for purposes of registration on August 1, 1914 (Reichsgesetzblatt, 1914, p. 273). Whether or not young men below the age of 20, except volunteers, were actually put into the military service at that time or later is not ascertainable from any official documents available in the Library of Congress. The following statement is given in Information Annual, 1916, page 259:

"According to the Lokal Anzeiger, of Berlin, June 18, all the 17-year-old boys in Germany had been ordered to report themselves to the military authorities. In Germany liability for military service begins at the age of 17 years, but in peace time actual service begins at 20."

The 1918 Statesman's Yearbook, at page 898, states that—

"By December, 1916, the whole of the 1917 class of recruits had been incorporated in the army, and by May, 1917, lads entering their seventeenth year."

The latter statement is ambiguous and does not indicate whether the 1917 class means those who completed their twentieth year or those who had completed their seventeenth year in 1917.

Nothing has been found in official sources to show that this service below the age of 20 was compulsory and not volunteer. The Berliner Tageblatt, August 22, 1914 (evening edition), page 4, contains an order of the military commander of Berlin to the effect that boys who have completed their sixteenth year may enroll for a course of military training under the instruction of retired army officers.

In a dispatch dated Paris, August 20, 1918, printed in the Washington Times on the same evening, it is stated that a number of boys of the 1919 class have been found among the latest prisoners, and that the proportion of boys taken in recent hauls indicates that practically all of the class of 1919 have been sent to the front. (T. H. Thiesing, Aug. 21, 1918.)

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 4. That section 5 of said act be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"That all male persons between the ages of 18 and 45, both inclusive, 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 or times and place or places of any such registration, it shall be the duty of all persons of the designated ages, except officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army, the Navy, and the National Guard and Naval Militia while in the service of the United States, to present themselves for and submit to registration under the provisions of this act; and every such person shall be deemed to have notice of the requirements of this act upon the publication of any such proclamation or any such other public notice as aforesaid given by his direction; and any person who shall willfully fail or refuse to present himself for registration or to submit thereto as herein provided shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall, upon conviction in a district court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof, be punished by imprisonment for not more than one year, and shall thereupon be duly registered: *Provided*, That in the call of the docket precedence shall be given in courts trying the same to the trial of criminal proceedings under this act: *Provided further*, That persons shall be subject to registration as herein provided who shall have attained their eighteenth birthday and who shall not have attained their forty-sixth birthday on or before the day set for the registration in any such proclamation by the President or any such other public notice given by him or by his direction; and all persons so registered shall be and remain subject to draft into the forces hereby authorized unless exempted or excused therefrom as in this act provided: *Provided further*, That the President may at such intervals as he may desire from time to time require all male persons who have attained the age of 18 years since the last preceding date of registration and on or before the next date set for registration by proclamation by the President, except such persons as are exempt from registration hereunder, to register in the same manner and subject to the same requirements and liabilities as those previously registered under the terms hereof: *And provided further*, That in the case of temporary absence from actual place of legal residence of any person liable to registration as provided herein, such registration may be made by mail under regulations to be prescribed by the President."

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

Page 5, line 16, after the word "President," add the following:

"*Provided*, That men registered under the provisions of this act who have served in the Navy of the United States shall, upon their own application, be permitted to reenlist in the naval service of the United States with and by the approval of the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, the reason I did not offer this amendment in committee was because it did not occur to me until I received a letter from a naval officer calling attention to the fact that if the law was enacted as drafted it would be

impossible for a man who had heretofore served in the Navy and who would be valuable to the Navy, probably more valuable to the Navy than to the Army, to reenlist in the Navy, and that the men whose terms of enlistment in the Navy may hereafter expire who desire to reenlist could not taken even a 30 days' vacation before doing so. The only way they could reenlist would be to reenlist immediately before the draft, which they would have to do upon the completion of their service or run the risk of being immediately drafted into the military service.

I have no pride of opinion in the matter; I am offering it at the suggestion of a naval officer, and I think it is a splendid suggestion.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. Under this law all men who had reached the ages between 18 and 45 will be within the draft ages, and therefore they could not enlist, but can only be taken into the Navy or a branch of the Army by induction. Is it not true that the Secretary of War, when I asked him the question whether he did not think the draft ought to apply to the Navy, said he was not prepared to say whether it should or not, but he was satisfied that he and the Secretary of the Navy could work out a satisfactory plan?

Mr. FIELDS. The gentleman will understand that this is not drafting anybody into the Navy; it is giving a man the option to reenlist in the Navy. For instance, the man serving in the Navy to-day who is within a few months of the expiration of his term of enlistment and who may have served there for a number of years, may desire to reenlist, but may also desire to take a brief vacation, say, of 30 days before doing so; and if some protection is not given him he will have to register immediately upon retirement from the Navy, which may make it impossible for him to reenlist, notwithstanding the fact that he may be a most valuable man in the Navy.

If they should register and draft him into the military service it would be almost impossible for him to get back to the Navy, for the gentleman knows that hard-and-fast rule in the War Department that no man can be transferred without the approval of his commanding officer. So they get him in the Military Establishment. He may apply for permission to be transferred into the Navy, but he is a good man and his commanding officer says no, that he is a good-looking fellow and that he wants him, and therefore will not approve his application for transfer to the Navy, and he is estopped. This amendment will make it possible for him to be transferred to the Navy. I have provided that it shall only be done, of course, with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy. Therefore, if the Navy shall not need him, or if he is not eligible, is not physically fit, the Secretary of the Navy would not approve his application for reenlistment into the naval service, and any objection that might arise from that quarter is removed by the fact that he can only enter the Navy by and with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, and I hope the gentleman will not oppose the amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE. I simply desire to ask the gentleman, What will be the status of the men discharged from the Navy under his amendment? Suppose there are 2,000 men discharged from the Navy on the 1st day of September who are within the provisions of this draft law. Are these men immune from service?

Mr. FIELDS. Not at all.

Mr. McKENZIE. Suppose the Secretary of the Navy says that he has all the men he needs and he does not need any more men?

Mr. FIELDS. Then they would not get the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, and they would have to go into the new draft, of course.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman understand that there is any such thing as a transfer from the Army to the Navy?

Mr. FIELDS. Yes; once in a while; but it is very hard to get through.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think there is any such thing. A man must be discharged from the Army, and then he enlists in the Navy.

Mr. FIELDS. Technically, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. CLARK of Florida to the amendment offered by Mr. FIELDS:

"That for a period of 30 days after the passage and approval of this act any person who is within the draft age as specified herein shall be permitted to enlist in the Marine Corps, the Navy, or the

Army of the United States, notwithstanding any existing law or regulation of any department or Executive order now in force or hereafter issued."

[Cries of "Vote! Vote!"]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, no; I think you will be quiet for a moment or two. It is all well enough for gentlemen to cry "Vote! Vote!" Of course, I know they are in a hurry. The edict has been issued, the decree has gone forth, the sacrifice must be made and made in a hurry. It is well known that the War Department issued orders which absolutely prohibited any American citizen from enlisting in the naval service or in the Marine Corps if he desired to do so. Every man and every boy between the ages of 18 and 45 is to be drafted into the Army. What are you going to do for men in the Navy? How are you going to fill up the Marine Corps? How are you going to take care of these two important branches of the service, and, if we are to believe the newspaper reports, one of them, the most important branch when it comes to the real work on the battle field—the Marine Corps. It seems to me that these men ought to be given the privilege of tendering their service, if they desire to do so, to the Government of the United States in that branch of our fighting forces in which they feel they can render better service to the Government. I heard the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] say the other day that the volunteer system had departed from America forever. That may be true.

Mr. KAHN. I did not say that, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I beg the gentleman's pardon—

Mr. KAHN. I said I hoped it had gone forever.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia). The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from California that he should get permission of the gentleman who has the floor before interrupting him.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Of course I yield.

Mr. KAHN. I said I hoped that the volunteer system had been displaced forever. I did not say it had been.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will accept the gentleman's statement. I understood him the other way. Of course if he did not say it, he did not say it, but he said he hoped it would be. I want to say that, although we have adopted the draft system and we are supporting it, the fact remains, and it can not be denied, that it is objectionable to hundreds of thousands of American citizens who desire the privilege of volunteering to serve their country under the flag. To be drafted, sugar-coat it as you please, talk about its being "selective" as you please, is distasteful to a great many people in this country, people who prefer to go voluntarily and tender their services in the branch of the service where they are better fitted in their own judgment to serve. Why not give these men the privilege of doing that? Why not for 30 days let down the bars and say, "If you want to enlist, and you come within the age, tender yourself at a recruiting station and offer your services to the Government." What is the objection to that? It certainly does not delay the proceedings. It is not going to delay the Army for a moment to have these men come up voluntarily and offer to enlist.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For a question.

Mr. GREGG. If this law passes, every boy that is large enough to be out of short breeches and every man up to 45 will be in the Army.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. All except these preferred clerks in the Government departments here in Washington.

Mr. GREGG. What are we going to do for the Navy and the Marine Corps if something like the gentleman's amendment does not pass?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have just asked that. Where are you going to replenish them, where are you going to get them?

Mr. GREGG. I understand they need 300,000 men by the first of the year.

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

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for two minutes more.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that he be given five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I would like to make a suggestion. We recently passed a statute authorizing the Marine Corps to increase by voluntary enlistment up to 80,500.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. MONTAGUE. If this draft act passes with no exception or limitation upon its regulation what are you going to do with the Marine Corps? Change that law?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. You can not do it.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Does not the gentleman believe the volunteer system so far as it applies to the Marine Corps has been the life, the blood, and the glory of the Marine Corps?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Absolutely, and has made it a glorious success. [Applause.]

Mr. FIELDS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For a question; I have not much time.

Mr. FIELDS. I want to ask the gentleman or the gentleman from Virginia—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; I can not yield time for the gentleman to interrogate the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FIELDS. Does the gentleman believe the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy would make it impossible for men to enlist in the Navy if it was necessary?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am getting sick and tired of taking things on faith. Every time when these gentlemen are driven into a hole they say, "Have not you got confidence in the President and in the Secretary of War?" [Applause.] My God, we are here to legislate, are we not? We are here as Representatives to exercise our own judgment with what little gray matter God Almighty gives us, if he gave us any, and yet whenever you get into a hole somewhere you fall back upon the proposition that the President as Commander in Chief must be trusted. Yes; a whole lot of other people can be trusted. Let me tell you an Executive order was issued on the 8th of this month absolutely prohibiting further enlistment in any service, and I went to the department down here to see Gen. Barnett about a young man being taken into the Marine Corps who had made application in April or June, whose papers were filed, who had been accepted by Gen. Barnett to be called when needed, and whose services Gen. Barnett very much desired, because his papers showed that he was a competent man and a man who would render very effective service there; and when we went up to the War Department to get their consent they said, "No," and now they propose to take them all. We sit here and propose to allow the department not only to execute the law but absolutely to make it, and you know it, you know it.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho rose.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; I can not yield. I am getting tired of it myself. I know that I am not going to change anybody's opinion. I know that I can not affect a single solitary human being on the floor of this House, because the cards have been fixed, the decree has been issued, and the head is bowed to the yoke, and you know it as well as I do. There is no use in camouflaging about this business. I want to say that, so far as I am concerned myself, I do not criticize anybody else. I am not questioning the motives of a single human being on earth. God knows I love my brethren in this House. Oh, it is delightful to be with them and see and associate with the most magnificent lot of gentlemen I ever saw. I am simply the keeper of my own conscience, and I am not going to bed at night with any quarrel with my own conscience. I am going to vote on every one of these propositions as I see it, regardless of all the letters that ever were written or that will be written. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will not the gentleman from Florida modify his amendment striking out the provision for enlistment in the Army and leaving it the Marine Corps and Navy—

Mr. GALLIVAN. And Naval Reserve.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to so modify it as to leave the Army out and leave in the Navy and Marine Corps and add Naval Reserve.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to leave out that portion relating to the Army and add to it the Naval Reserve. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I did not hear the first part of the gentleman's speech and I would like to ask why this modification?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, I am not responsible for that.

Mr. LANGLEY. Of course not, but neither am I. I was called out of the Chamber by a constituent and the gentleman had offered his amendment and had begun his remarks before my return. What I desire to ask the gentleman from Florida is, Why does he propose to exclude the Army from his amendment?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I was requested by some gentlemen who think it probably best to do that and let the Army regulate their own affairs.

Mr. LANGLEY. I am not going to object to the gentleman's request, in view of his explanation, but I would like to make a brief statement, if it will not interrupt the course of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I shall be glad to yield a moment or two to my friend from Kentucky if I have the time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Just an observation or two. I conferred with my friend from Florida in the preparation of this amendment and he knows, of course, that I heartily favor its purpose. I agree with what the gentleman has said and I had intended to speak in favor of the amendment, seeking recognition in my own right under the rules; but since the House seems impatient for a vote and since my friend has kindly given me this opportunity to go on record in support of the amendment, I shall not seek such recognition. I know personally that what the gentleman has said about men preferring to enlist rather than to be drafted is absolutely true, and when men feel that way about it I can not understand why they are denied the privilege of voluntary enlistment. Men above 40 years of age who are covered by this bill have not had a chance to volunteer, while others have, and I think they ought to have that opportunity. I know personally many men above 40 who tried to enlist but were not permitted to do so, and yet they are put in the attitude, by this bill, of being forced into the service, when as a matter of fact they would have gone in long ago if they had had the chance. Indeed, I think it would be well to go even further than this amendment proposes, and allow men, even though they have reached 50 years of age, to enlist if they are physically fit for service, as many of them are. I know, as the gentleman from Florida has said, that the cards are stacked, that the door for volunteers is closed, and that this argument as well as his is useless, but I want to go on record as advocating what I believe to be just and fair to all, and I thank my friend for giving me this opportunity of doing so.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do want to give the American citizen the right to enlist in the Marine Corps and in the Naval Reserve Force and the Navy if he sees fit to do so.

Mr. Chairman, it is seldom that I take up the time to make a speech on this floor, and much more seldom that I avail myself of the privilege graciously granted by the House to extend my remarks in the Record and print as a part of my speech a lot of things not uttered by me on the floor, and I will gladly vote at any time to allow nothing printed in the Record except the actual proceedings of the House. However, as permission has been granted me in this instance, and as I could not secure sufficient time to give oral expression to my views on this very important bill, affecting as it does the future of the youth of my country, I intend to add a few thoughts to what I have been able to say in the eight minutes I have actually used.

Certain newspapers, certain gentlemen upon this floor, and numbers of men occupying bomb-proof positions, who, in all probability, no matter how long this war may last, will never smell gunpowder, have acquired the habit of attempting to brand as traitors to our country any public official or citizen who dares to entertain and express any opinion of his own on any proposed question of public policy. So far as I am concerned, I do not believe there is a single Member of this House who does not desire with all his heart and soul to win this war against Germany and her allies in the shortest possible time. I am sure that every Member of this House will cheerfully vote to expend every dollar and sacrifice every male inhabitant of the Republic necessary to carry Old Glory to victory or the battle fields of Europe. But each of us has taken a solemn oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States and to discharge our duties as Representatives of a free people as God Almighty has given us the brain and the light to comprehend and see those duties and not as some one else, charged with other duties and responsibilities, may see and understand them.

As a Representative in this great body when my country is involved in war, I am perfectly willing to make my judgment subservient to the judgment of those trained in military affairs in all questions of purely a military nature, or in all matters the solution of which requires expert military knowledge, but when it comes to determine whether the battles of the war shall be fought and won by the matured men or the young boys of the land, I respectfully, but firmly, decline to allow these military gentlemen to settle that question for me. I am utterly and unalterably opposed to drafting into the Army and sending to the front any youth under the age of 21 years until the man power of the country has been depleted to a point which makes this step necessary. When that time shall arrive (and God grant it never may) I shall cheerfully and promptly vote to send every boy and every old man who is able to carry a gun. Can any reasonable man object to this position? Does the taking of this position indicate any lack of patriotism or loyalty to country?

I desire to say to gentlemen who are given to aspersing, at least by insinuation, the patriotic spirit of others that the same blood which courses through my veins has answered the call to battle in every foreign war in which this country has been engaged, beginning with that of the Revolution. Can these self-appointed critics point to a prouder record of patriotic devotion to country than that? I have voted for every dollar of appropriation which the administration has asked to carry on this war; I voted for the declaration of war against Germany and against Austria-Hungary, and I have been fully convinced for some time that we should declare war against Bulgaria and Turkey and every power with which any one of our devoted allies is at war. I have voted for every measure which the President has requested to aid in bringing success to our arms save the original draft law alone, and in that case I would have done violence to my conscience under my oath of office had I voted differently, denying my fellow citizens the time-honored American privilege of volunteering to defend their country.

Although conscientiously and unalterably opposed to sending minors to fight the battles of the country until the depletion of the man power was such as to make such action necessary I voted for this bill solely because I did not propose to be put in the attitude of apparent objection to the increase of our fighting forces beyond the seas. While the advocates of drafting the 18, 19, and 20 year old boys solemnly assure us that these will be called last, and not then until actually needed, that the purpose is to train and educate them, we should not deceive ourselves. These tender boys will be called first or along with the others, and will be on the firing line in Europe by the early summer of next year.

Only two classes of people in this country can be benefited by this early impressment of these youths in the military service.

Those two classes are the manufacturers and other employers of labor who are vitally interested in keeping their employees out of the service, and a certain class of workers who have shown their patriotism during this gigantic struggle, in which the very life of the Nation is at stake, by threatening to go on strikes, although receiving the highest wages ever before paid in the history of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for any and every measure intended to hasten a victorious conclusion of this war. Autocracy must perish from among men, and it devolves upon America to carry the flag of democracy to triumph. This is the one great object all of us should keep constantly in mind; but we should in all things remember the brave boys across the seas who are willingly giving their lives to perpetuate the principles of democracy and who have demonstrated to all the world that America is unselfish and her sons are unconquerable.

While the soldiery of this Republic is so gloriously upholding the honor of the flag on foreign soil the "holier than thou" gang, living safely and securely at home, might find better employment than questioning the patriotism of those among us who believe that under the Constitution they have the right to entertain some opinions of their own, and who dare to have the courage to express them. America is in this war to win, and there should be no peace until the allied flags shall float over the palace of the Kaiser at Berlin. When complete and overwhelming victory is ours, we should dictate the terms of peace free from any suggestion from any of the defenders of autocracy, and this we will do; but to reach this glorious end our course must be guided by reason, we must think, we must deliberate, we must confer together as freemen bound together in a common cause. In this crucial period in the history of the Nation all bickering should cease, suspicion should be banished, insinuation should hide its infamous head, and all real Americans should say to one another, "Come and let us reason together."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WALSH. I seek recognition when the gentleman from Florida has concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was going to have the amendment as modified read. The Clerk will now read the amendment as modified by the request of the gentleman from Florida.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute offered by Mr. CLARK of Florida for the amendment offered by Mr. FIELDS: At the end of line 16, on page 5, add the following: "That for a period of 30 days after the passage and approval of this act any person who is within the draft age as specified herein shall be permitted to enlist in the Marine Corps, Navy, or Naval Reserve of the United States, notwithstanding any existing law or regulation of any department or Executive order now in force or hereafter issued."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida has made a few very interesting observations upon what the terms of the draft law are. He is always interesting in his remarks and always displays a high degree of courage. It may be possible that the draft law is distasteful and unsatisfactory to

hundreds of thousands of people in this country, although I doubt it, and it may be that in the gentleman's community they have not yet finished sulking and trying to throw discredit upon the action of this Congress in passing this sort of law.

But, sir, I think I voice the general opinion of the people of the United States when I say that they are not only satisfied with the law and the manner in which it has been administered, but that it has been a marvel not only to our own people but to the people of the entire world [applause] in that we have been able to raise and put into the field—yes, and to put upon the field of Europe even—over 1,000,000 of men armed and equipped. It may be that those who were against the war in the beginning, who believed we were not justified in entering this struggle, are still of that opinion, and if that be so in the gentleman's section of the country, of course they will still oppose the draft law and grumble and complain at the manner in which it has been executed and administered.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I hope the gentleman will not undertake to say that the people in my section or myself are opposing the draft law.

Mr. WALSH. I do not say that the people of the gentleman's section are opposing it, but the gentleman here upon the floor stands as spokesman of those who were opposed to the draft law—unwittingly, I am content to assume—and who now say that it is unsatisfactory and distasteful.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say to the gentleman that I bow with all due propriety and humility to Congress in the adoption of the draft law, and I have stood by it. My people have responded just as fully and completely as the gentleman's, and, although much older than he, I am ready to respond with the gentleman any time when our services are needed or when they may be taken.

Mr. WALSH. I stated at the beginning that I admire the gentleman's courage; but, sir, this is no time in the Congress for anybody to stand here and express views that are held by those who are not with the country in this struggle and who are not seeking to uphold us and further the prosecution of this war. [Applause.] And to complain and say that the draft law is distasteful and unsatisfactory to hundreds of thousands of our people can only give comfort and satisfaction to that class of people.

Now, as to the gentleman's proposed amendment. He would seek for a period of 30 days to permit enlistments by volunteering in the Marine Corps and the Navy. Now, I do not know whether the Secretary of the Navy has asked for this legislation or whether it was considered by the Military Affairs Committee or not. But it would seem to me that the Commander in Chief, that the military authorities, and the Secretary of the Navy, knowing that this legislation was under consideration, would hardly have permitted it to approach this stage of proceeding unless they had given expression to their views and unless they were satisfied that it would obstruct filling up the ranks of the Navy and the Marine Corps. I believe that the Commander in Chief knows the condition with reference to those branches of the service, and that if there be need for further enlistment they must have some plan in mind, even under the operation of this law which it is proposed to enact, whereby they can secure, under regulations or otherwise, the men needed in the Marine Corps and the Navy. So, sir, I think without that consideration by those departments we ought to go a little slow before we amend this measure in the manner proposed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

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

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say a word.

Mr. DENT. How much time does the gentleman wish?

Mr. CALDWELL. Not over a minute; two minutes at the outside.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask that at the conclusion of one minute of discussion by the gentleman from New York all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto be concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that at the termination of one minute of discussion by the gentleman from New York all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto be concluded. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, before this bill was proposed we had a draft statute, and under that a regulation was established by which men in the draft age were permitted to enlist in the Navy and the Marine Corps with the consent of their local board. It is the policy and intention of the War Department to apply the same regulations to the new draft ages,

and the only reason why the door was shut for a few days was to prevent the scandal of men trying to get from under. That is all. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. FIELDS. Division, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, can not the amendment be read?

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Chairman, I think many Members do not know what they are voting on, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the amendment may be read again at the desk. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 96, yeas 44.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I would like to submit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report from the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH: On page 4, line 8, after the word "States," insert the following: "and officers and members of the uniformed police forces who are now employed as such in and by cities having 500,000 inhabitants or more."

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH] be given 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] asks unanimous consent that his colleague may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment, as its tenor denotes, is to prevent the further depletion and disruption of the trained and experienced police forces in those cities where the population is very large and conspicuously mixed in character.

The truth is that in the cities covered by this amendment there are hundreds of thousands of enemy aliens and unscrupulous adventurers, ever ready in a critical time like this to incite trouble and disorder, especially when they know that the protective force has been reduced and weakened.

In a great city like New York, which is renowned for the splendid efficiency of its police force, should the draft age be raised to 45, and this amendment rejected, over 50 per cent, or 6,000 policemen, would be put into the Army. This would mean not only a grave reduction in the protection of life and property in a city of 6,000,000 inhabitants, but it would mean that the city would have to pay about \$7,000,000 a year to the policemen inducted into the military service, because of a State law which provides that city and State employees must be paid the difference between their Army or Navy pay and their other pay.

The seriousness of this police situation can not be exaggerated. It is one that does not only affect the interests of the city of New York but it also affects the interests of the Nation and the prosecution of the war.

Imagine what the effect would be—world-wide—if in the city of New York, the first city in the land, the gateway to the Nation, there should be an uprising resulting in violence, and destruction of life and property, and the police should be unable, because of numerical weakness, promptly to suppress it. It would be a national disaster, and one that would gladden the hearts of our enemies and injure the morale of our splendid Army across the sea.

There are those who believe—and they are many—that the existing trained and efficient police forces who are protecting the lives and properties of our citizens throughout the country are rendering as great and as necessary a service in their respective fields to the Government, the Nation, and the people as if they were put into the Army.

After all is said and done, neither the Army nor the Navy alone can win this war. This war will be won because of the patriotic zeal and devotion, the unselfish and constant coopera-

tion of the men, women, and children, who sense the issues involved and who gratefully appreciate the blessings, bounties, and opportunities of this free land of ours. In the language of Kipling:

It ain't the guns nor armament nor the funds they can pay,
But the close cooperation that makes them win the day.
It ain't the individuals nor the army as a whole,
But the everlasting teamwork of every bloomin' soul.

[Applause.]

If I do not exhaust your patience, I shall read a letter from the mayor of the city of New York:

CITY OF NEW YORK, OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
August 9, 1918.

HON. THOMAS F. SMITH,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have the honor to invite your attention to conditions now confronting the administration of police affairs in the city of New York by reason of the drafts upon members of the police force under existing and proposed military draft laws. The existing law calls all members of the police force from 21 to 31 to the colors. All the men on the existing civil service list are of conscription age, and, consequently, should they be appointed, they become almost immediately a liability upon the city, without having rendered any appreciable service.

Already more than 700 men have been drafted, and before the end of this year at least 1,000 will have been drafted into the military service, and ultimately 28 per cent of the entire force, or 3,000 men, will be called.

Should the Government raise the draft age to 45 years virtually every able-bodied policeman in this city will be, sooner or later, taken into the Army. Policemen of this city physically fit will be called before civilians with dependents, because they can not claim exemption from a monetary standpoint, since under the provisions of the Fenner law the city pays them the difference between the salary they get as policemen and the salary they get as members of the Army.

An efficient policeman can not be made in a brief period; a year or two is required to bring about this result. If we are to be compelled to recruit the police force of this city in this most trying period of its history from the utterly green, and perhaps thoroughly undesirable, material left over from the draft we are courting disaster.

The possibility of disorder, due to labor unrest; the fomenting of disturbance by enemy alien elements; possible uprising against authority, due to dissatisfaction with the war or the Government by reason of insufficient, improper, or unacceptable food, or due to the high cost of food and clothing, or increased burdens, may, under certain circumstances, burst into an appalling reality.

The arguments advanced that no exception can be made in New York City regarding drafting of policemen, because to do so would mean that every other city in the country would be justified in making similar demands, should have no weight. New York City is in a class by itself. It is the financial center of the world; from it radiates all activities looking toward the speedy and satisfactory conclusion of the war. This is not true of any other city in this country. Riots or disturbances in this city, improperly handled and ineffectively quelled, would be a national disaster that would be pleasing to the enemy and would certainly demand the attention of the Government.

New York is the gateway of American commerce; it is the pulse of this hemisphere and from it is judged the Nation's vigor and determination. It is unthinkable that the police force of this city should be otherwise than up to the highest standard in these momentous times, when unprecedented emergencies are bound to arise.

Moreover, the city of New York is made up of many foreign elements. At least 75,000 enemy aliens, male and female, and hundreds of thousands of citizens of the Teutonic race, against whom demonstrations may be expected under certain conditions, make up a considerable part of our cosmopolitan population.

The war activities in this city and our cooperation with the Federal Government has made unusual demands upon the police force of this city. To make further inroads upon this very much depleted force, which may not be recruited with proper material, is a matter worthy of serious consideration.

I therefore feel it is my duty to request the Representatives of this city and State in Congress to secure such modification of the existing statutes as will meet this very important and dangerous condition, for I am certain it can not be to the best interest of the Government, considering all New York City means to the Nation, to destroy, or seriously restrict, the efficiency of the police force of this city. A policeman can render much better service to the Government by good police duty in this city than he can by entering the military service.

Very truly, yours,

JOHN F. HYLAN, Mayor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH. I think I can conclude in three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH. This letter is from the chamber of commerce:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
New York, August 21, 1918.

DEAR SIR: The city of New York is a pivotal point, both in manufacturing and in the shipment of men, munitions, and Army supplies of all kinds.

Its preservation from disturbances, outbreaks of violence, of outrages by enemy aliens, of fire or other disaster is of vital importance to the war efforts of the Nation.

Because of its size, its activities, and its importance, and the heterogeneous character of its population and because it is the biggest labor market in the United States it is the center to which adventurous spirits of all kinds resort.

All of this makes it one of the most difficult, as it is one of the most necessary, places to which to give the very best possible security and protection.

The police force of this city is renowned for its efficiency in the protection of life and property. It has acquired that reputation as the result of long training and a remarkable esprit de corps among its men.

This force has been already seriously depleted by the draft. Eight hundred of its membership have gone into military service, or about 8 per cent of the number.

Unless provisions are made in the new draft act to exempt the trained police force it may easily lose 50 per cent of its personnel.

The seriousness of this can not be magnified, not so much to the city of New York per se as to the vital interests of the Nation in the conduct of the war.

Men can not be trained quickly to a knowledge of the laws under which the police have to act and to their duties. Green men can be much more quickly trained to be efficient soldiers of the line than to be trained and efficient policemen.

The value of the existing trained force of police in their present position and carrying on their present duties is worth vastly more to the interests of the Government and the country while at war than the military value would be of the entire trained force if it was put into the Army as a unit. Indeed this force is worth immensely more to the Government where it is in the protection of the vast industries and functions being performed here than many times their numerical number as soldiers of the line.

We do not hesitate to urge upon you the most earnest consideration of these views and the adoption of a provision in the draft act which will exempt this force.

If it is taken away or largely depleted by the draft, it can only be recruited from men past middle age not then fitted by adaptability or physical qualities for the responsible and strenuous life of a policeman. To so deteriorate the protective force of this important war base would be taking a hazard which we believe a careful military commander would not consider justified.

We are,

Yours, very respectfully,

WELDING RING, Chairman,
CLEVELAND H. DODGE,
E. H. OUTERBRIDGE,
CHARLES L. BERNHEIMER,
HENRY A. CAESAR,
SAMUEL W. FAIRCHILD,
LEONOR F. LOREE,
Of the Executive Committee.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. I would like to know from the gentleman from New York what cities are included in his amendment?

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH. There are about 12, with a total population of 16,000,000, and a total police force of 32,000.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Is it possible to name those cities now?

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH. Yes. They are Baltimore, Boston, Buffalo, Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, St. Louis, San Francisco, and New York.

Mr. CANNON. Can you not put in Danville? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. CALDWELL. I do so for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the police situation here in the city of Washington. By reason of the draft, the police force here has been depleted to such an extent that it has been necessary to send to the adjoining camps and get inexperienced men there to come here and do soldiers' duty as policemen, and they are paying them out of the Washington city treasury. Under the circumstances it is only right and fair that the great centers of industry in this country should be protected by relieving them with respect to the police force.

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

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Is it not true that we are losing the police force in Washington because of a failure to give any increase in their salaries?

Mr. CALDWELL. Possibly so. They ought to have all the salary they want.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the "noes" appeared to have it.

Mr. CALDWELL. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 54, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, after line 16, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 4. That during the present emergency the minimum age limit of officers of the Army of the United States, not above the rank of captain, shall be 18 years."

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. GREGG. I thought that was a section by itself.

The CHAIRMAN. This is an amendment of the committee.

Mr. GREGG. It is an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GREGG: Amend section 4 by inserting after the words "United States," at the end of line 18, page 5, the following: "and of the Marine Corps."

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that is simply to make uniform the age limit of the officers in the Army and the officers in the Marine Corps.

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

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman give us the information of what the age limit is in the Navy?

Mr. GREGG. I could not say that. You see the officers of the Navy are specially trained, technical men.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Marine Corps is part of the naval force.

Mr. GREGG. I know; but the Navy is technically trained.

Mr. STAFFORD. If we are going to have captains of 18 in the Marine Corps, in the Navy they would not be eligible.

Mr. BLACK. It is 20 years in the Navy.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Under the existing law with respect to the Marine Corps it is 20 years.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GREGG. Yes.

Mr. DENT. I hope that amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I defer to the chairman, but I thought the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG] had the floor. Has the gentleman from Texas any suggestion from people in authority in the Navy Department recommending this change and giving any reason?

Mr. GREGG. I have none at all. It was my own suggestion. I wanted to make uniform the age limit of the men in the Marine Corps and that of the men in the Army. They are both the land fighting forces in our Military Establishment.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Exactly. I did not want to impugn the character of the gentleman's amendment, but the amount of information he brought in with it. That is all. [Laughter.]

Mr. GREGG. No; it was simply a matter of my own suggestion.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. You are not quite certain that by making the ages uniform you make the effect uniform?

Mr. GREGG. I do not see why in two fighting corps the age limit should be different—that is, that they should be a certain age in one and a different age in the other—and they are the two fighting corps.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It all depends upon the character of the organization, and the particular part of the fighting that they are called on to do.

Mr. GREGG. They are doing the same fighting that the Army is doing.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. I do not so understand it. I understand they have also a quasi aquatic experience.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREGG].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment which has been reported as section 4.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to come in as a new section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. HAYDEN: Page 5, after line 19, insert as a new section the following:

"The wife of a soldier or sailor serving in the present war shall not be disqualified for any position or appointment under the Government because she is a married woman."

Mr. MADDEN. She is not now.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the necessity for the amendment that I have just offered was brought to my attention by Hon. Sam F. Webb, of Phoenix, Ariz., who wrote me the following letter:

OFFICE OF COUNTY TREASURER AND TAX COLLECTOR,
MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZ.,
Phoenix, Ariz., July 23, 1918.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

FRIEND CARL: Last spring my daughter, Miss Emma, took the civil-service examination with 18 other applicants, and her rating, as shown, was third on the list of those who passed the examination. On June 7 she married Chester Sylvester, to whom she had been engaged for over one year and one-half. Mr. Sylvester enlisted here in Phoenix last April a year ago as a private in the United States Army, choosing the Signal Service for employment. By careful and diligent service he has been promoted from the private ranks to the position of sergeant-major in the Fifty-first Telephone Battalion, Signal Corps, recently at Fort Sam Houston, Tex.; I say recently for the reason that his company and associates were undergoing quarantine last Friday preparatory for going "Somewhere." My daughter returned here on Sunday morning to remain until victory crowns our arms in Europe and her husband either returns as a hero or passes over to the home of our illustrious dead who faced death on the field of battle that freedom should not perish from this earth.

After my daughter's marriage she was requested to inform the postal authorities when it would be convenient for her to enter the service. Her reply was about August 1, signing her name as she should, Mrs. Chester Sylvester. In reply to her letter, she received the inclosed document, which you will observe appears to be a civil-service statement. I, however, term it an uncivil service, if it persists in prohibiting the employment of married women in the United States Postal Service whose husbands are in the United States Army willing, if duty requires, to lay down their lives in defense of this land of equal opportunities and equal privileges.

I wired you recently in regard to the impropriety of such regulations and now inclose the document upon which I based my telegram.

After you have digested the contents of this remarkable document, kindly return it to me, as I would like to preserve the same for future use.

By giving this matter your early attention, I trust the name of Mrs. Chester H. Sylvester, nee Miss Emma A. Webb, will be restored to the list of eligibles for appointment in the United States Postal Service.

Very respectfully,

SAM F. WEBB.

On receipt of this complaint from my constituent I investigated the matter and found that the postal regulations forbade the appointment of married women as employees in that department.

Mr. MADDEN. That may be so in the Post Office Department, but they are putting them in every day in all the branches of the Government here. There are 10,000 wives of soldiers in the departments.

Mr. HAYDEN. The gentleman from Illinois may be right, but this is section 157 of the Postal Regulations. I shall read it to the committee:

A married woman will not be appointed to a classified position in the Postal Service, and a classified woman employee in the Postal Service who shall change her name by marriage will not be reappointed.

I then wrote to the Post Office Department and received the following reply:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 24, 1918.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HAYDEN: I have your letter of the 20th instant, with inclosure, from Hon. Sam F. Webb, relative to the employment of the wives of soldiers in the Postal Service.

In reply I wish to advise you that a woman employee in the Postal Service who marries a man in the Army or Navy may retain her position until her husband receives his honorable discharge. In view of this fact and the present conditions in post offices, the Civil Service Commission has been informed that the department will modify the provisions of section 157 of the Postal Laws and Regulations for the duration of the war in order to allow women whose husbands or sons are in the military or naval service of the United States to take the clerk-carrier examination.

The inclosure is returned herewith.

Very truly, yours,

J. C. KOONS,
First Assistant Postmaster General.

With this assurance from the First Assistant Postmaster General, I felt sure that Mrs. Sylvester would be able to obtain the position for which she had qualified, but, to be certain about it, I wrote a letter to the Civil Service Commission. The following reply from the president of the commission gives the reasons why the recommendation of the Post Office Department was not approved:

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 7, 1918.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. HAYDEN: I am in receipt of your letter of July 29, inclosing a telegram and letter from Hon. Samuel F. Webb, of Phoenix, Ariz., together with a copy of a letter from the First Assistant Postmaster General relative to the employment in the Post Office Service of married women who have either husbands or sons in the military or naval service of the United States, with particular reference to the eligibility of Mr. Webb's daughter, Mrs. Emma Webb Sylvester, who passed an examination for the Phoenix, Ariz., post office last March, and who subsequently married Chester Sylvester, who has enlisted in the military service and is now a sergeant major in the Signal Service.

Mr. Webb complains of the fact that his daughter is in receipt of a document which appears to be a civil-service statement prohibiting the employment of married women in the Postal Service, which he believes to be unjust with respect to women whose husbands are in the military service. He therefore requests that an effort be made to modify the regulation, and that the name of Mrs. Sylvester be restored to the eligible register.

In reply I have to advise you that the regulation prohibiting the appointment of married women to a classified position in the Postal Service is a departmental regulation of long standing, but a communication under date of July 12 has been received from the Postmaster General in which the commission is advised that owing to present conditions the department has decided to allow women employees who marry men in the Army to retain their positions until their husbands return from military duty, and therefore it has been decided that during the present war the provisions of section 157 of the postal laws and regulations shall not apply to married women who have either husbands or sons in the military or naval service of the United States, and it is desired in such cases that married women be allowed to take the examination for post-office clerk or city letter carrier.

The commission, however, has advised the department that its policy above outlined would establish a preferred class of the persons indicated, and would work a restriction against the admission of married women in general to the examinations—the legality of which course is questionable—and that therefore the action proposed by the department is not approved by the commission.

Very truly,

JOHN A. MCILHENNY.

In view of the position taken by the Civil Service Commission, it is evident that there must be action by Congress if the wives of our soldiers and sailors are to be permitted to obtain employment in the Postal Service. No good reason can be advanced against the passage of this legislation, and I believe that it is a proper amendment to the pending bill. I might add that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs in reporting the manpower bill to the Senate recommended the adoption of a similar amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 5, after line 19, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 5. That the Secretary of War is authorized to assign to educational institutions, for special and technical training, soldiers who enter the military service under the provisions of this act in such numbers and under such regulations as he may prescribe; and is authorized to contract with such educational institutions for the subsistence, quarters, and military and academic instruction of such soldiers.

Funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for quarters and subsistence of the Army shall be available for payments to educational institutions under the contracts above authorized, including the cost of military and academic instruction."

Mr. LUNN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. On yesterday, in my address before the House I made the statement that the young man of 16 could not go to war until he was 18. That statement of fact was denied by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORNON], I think, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILSON]. These gentlemen insisted that a boy 16 or 17 could join the Army with the parents' consent. I insisted that no one under 18 years of age could be enlisted in the Army. I requested from The Adjutant General a citation of the law, and he has given this in a memorandum for the Secretary of War. I wish to include this correspondence as a part of my remarks without reading, unless some one desires to have them read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to insert in the Record a communication from The Adjutant General. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The correspondence is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, August 23, 1918.

HON. GEORGE R. LUNN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. LUNN: In accordance with your telephonic request, I inclose you herewith memorandum from The Adjutant General relating to the ages at which men are permitted to enter the military service. Your interest, as I understand it, was primarily in the minimum age, so this memorandum has failed to make mention of the fact that under recent legislation the Staff Corps of the Army are permitted to take men up to 55 years of age, thus increasing the maximum for certain corps of the Army, but not reducing the minimum.

Cordially, yours,

STANLEY KING,
Private Secretary.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
August 23, 1918.

Memorandum for the Secretary of War:

Prior to the enactment of the national-defense act the law governing the ages of recruits for enlistment was embodied in sections 1116 and 1118, Revised Statutes, the former providing that recruits enlisting in the Army must be between the ages of 18 and 35 years at the time of

their enlistment, this limitation as to ages not applying to soldiers re-enlisting. Section 1118 provides that no minor under the age of 16 years shall be enlisted into the military service. The national-defense act of June 3, 1916 (Public No. 85, Sixty-fourth Congress, H. R. 12766), provides in section 27 that no person under the age of 18 years shall be enlisted into the military service without the written consent of his parents or guardians, provided that such minor has such parents or guardians entitled to his custody and control. The act of May 18, 1917 (Public No. 12, Sixty-fifth Congress, H. R. 3545), provides in section 7 that the qualifications and conditions of 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, both inclusive, at the time of their enlistment. Section 2 of the same act provides that 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 etc. These two sections taken together require that all voluntary enlistments in the Regular Army, except in cases of men of prior service, shall be of applicants between the ages of 18 and 40 years, both inclusive. Since the date of the approval of this act, May 18, 1917 no recruits have been enlisted in the Regular Army under 18 years of age unless the applicant has falsely represented his age to be 18 when he was in fact under that age.

P. C. HARRIS,
Acting The Adjutant General.

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. FULLER of Illinois: At the end of line 2, page 6, strike out the period and insert a comma and add the following: "and the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to cause any honorably discharged soldier of the Army of the United States who was or shall have been under the age of 21 years at the date of his enrollment or the beginning of his service, to be educated in a university, college, or in a vocational or technical school, at the expense of the Government of the United States, with the object of rendering such honorably discharged soldier self-supporting. Such privilege shall be granted under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the President."

Mr. FULLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, all I have to say as to that is that if we are to take the boys under 21 out of the schools and put them into the trenches we ought to provide for their education when they come home.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GOOD: Page 6, line 14, after the word "available," insert "for expenses incurred in laundering the clothing of enlisted men in Government plants, and no part of the pay of such men shall be taken for such laundry work."

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, under the present arrangement at our various cantonments, or at least in most of them, the Government has established laundries to do the laundry work of the boys who are in training there. One dollar per month is being deducted from the pay of the enlisted men for doing this work. This is contrary to the advertisements of the War Department. One of the arguments that has always been made for securing enlistments in the Army is that the Government furnishes clothing, provisions, and everything, and that the enlisted man was not permitted to pay for any portion of his subsistence. Now, in all these places where these Government laundries have been established they are deducting \$1 per month from the pay of enlisted men. I do not believe that the House or the country would for one minute countenance such small practices, and it seems to me that we ought to correct it. We should prevent it. That is the purpose of this amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GOOD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOOD) there were 85 ayes and 34 noes.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee determined to rise; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HAMLIN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R.

12731) amending the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. SIMS. I demand a separate vote on the Gregg amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment; if not, the Chair will put the balance in gross.

There was no demand for a separate vote on any other amendment.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the Gregg amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendment be reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, by adding after the word "emergency," line 12, page 3, the following: "Nothing herein contained shall be construed to exempt from draft into the Army under this act or under any act heretofore passed the officers, legislative and executive, of the United States or of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, and section 4 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States,' approved May 18, 1917, be so amended as to eliminate after the words 'That the Vice President of the United States' the words 'the officers, legislative and executive, of the United States and of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia.'"

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the yeas and nays.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. Thirty-five Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the other side.

The other side was taken.

The SPEAKER. One hundred and ninety-one Members have arisen. Thirty-five is not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused. The question is on agreeing to the Gregg amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GREGG) there were 89 ayes and 143 noes.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

The question of ordering tellers was taken.

The SPEAKER. Nineteen Members have arisen, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit.

Mr. GILLETT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GILLETT. Is the gentleman from Alabama opposed to the bill?

Mr. DENT. I am not opposed to the bill. I do not know of anybody that is opposed to the bill who desires to offer a motion to recommit, and under the rule I am entitled to offer it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I suggest that the gentleman from Alabama is qualified to offer it unless somebody who is opposed to the bill wishes to offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct. The Chair laid down the rule four or five years ago about motions to recommit; that in the first place it should go to somebody opposed to the bill; and second, that a member of the committee should have preference. Now, if there is any gentleman in the House who wishes to offer a motion to recommit who is opposed to the bill and will stand up and say so, the Chair will recognize him in preference to the gentleman from Alabama, otherwise the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DENT moves to recommit the bill H. R. 12731 to the Committee on Military Affairs with instruction to report back the same immediately with the following amendment: Insert after the word "prescribe," in line 7, on page 2, of the printed bill, the following: "Provided however, That registrants who on the date fixed by the President for registration are of the age of 18 years and not over 19 years shall be designated as the 18 class and shall be drafted for service subsequent to registrants in class 1 of the age of 19 years and over 19 years."

Mr. DENT. On that I demand the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, nays 194, answered "present" 1, not voting 88, as follows:

YEAS—147.

Alexander	Fairchild, B. L.	Larsen	Saunders, Va.
Almon	Fairfield	Lea, Cal.	Sears
Austin	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Sells
Ayres	Focht	Leshner	Shallenberger
Bankhead	Fuller, Ill.	Little	Sherwood
Barnhart	Gallivan	London	Sisson
Bell	Garland	McClintic	Small
Black	Garrett, Tenn.	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Blackmon	Godwin, N. C.	McKeown	Snook
Blanton	Good	Mason	Stafford
Bowers	Gordon	Meeker	Stegall
Brand	Graham, Ill.	Mondell	Stedman
Brodbeck	Green, Iowa	Montague	Stephens, Miss.
Burnett	Hamilton, Mich.	Morgan	Stephens, Nebr.
Byrns, Tenn.	Hardy	Nicholls, S. C.	Sterling, Ill.
Campbell, Kans.	Hastings	Norton	Sterling, Pa.
Carlin	Haugen	Overmyer	Taylor, Colo.
Cary	Hayden	Overstreet	Thomas
Chandler, N. Y.	Heaton	Park	Thompson
Chandler, Okla.	Heflin	Porter	Towner
Church	Helm	Price	Van Dyke
Clark, Fla.	Helvering	Hersey	Voigt
Claypool	Hilliard	Rainey, H. T.	Volstead
Collier	Houston	Ramseyer	Walker
Connally, Tex.	Hull, Iowa	Rayburn	Walton
Cooper, W. Va.	Hull, Tenn.	Reavis	Watson, Va.
Cox	Humphreys	Reed	Weaver
Crisp	Johnson, Ky.	Robbins	Webb
Curry, Cal.	Kehoe	Roberts	Wheeler
Davis	Kelley, Mich.	Robinson	White, Ohio
Denison	King	Rodenberg	Williams
Dent	Kinkaid	Romjue	Wilson, Ill.
Dewalt	Kitchin	Rose	Wood, Ind.
Dickinson	Kreider	Ruby	Woodyard
Doolittle	La Follette	Rucker	Wright
Doughton	Langley	Sanders, N. Y.	Zihlman
Drane			

NAYS—194.

Anderson	Estopinal	Key, Ohio	Raker
Anthony	Evans	Kieess, Pa.	Ramsey
Ashbrook	Fairchild, G. W.	Kincheloe	Rogers
Bacharach	Ferris	Knutson	Rouse
Baer	Fess	Kraus	Rowe
Beakes	Fisher	Lazaro	Sanders, Ind.
Beshlin	Flood	Lehbach	Sanford
Bland, Ind.	Fordney	Lever	Scott, Mich.
Bland, Va.	Foster	Littlepage	Scott, Pa.
Brumbaugh	Francis	Lobeck	Scully
Buchanan	Freeman	Lonerger	Shouse
Burroughs	French	Longworth	Sims
Caldwell	Fuller, Mass.	Lufkin	Sinnott
Campbell, Pa.	Gallagher	Lunn	Slemp
Cannon	Gandy	McAndrews	Smith, Mich.
Cantrill	Gard	McArthur	Smith, C. B.
Carter, Mass.	Garner	McCulloch	Smith, T. F.
Clark, Pa.	Garrett, Tex.	McFadden	Snyder
Classon	Gillett	McLaughlin, Mich.	Steele
Cleary	Glass	McLaughlin, Pa.	Stiness
Coady	Glynn	McLemore	Strong
Cooper, Ohio	Goodall	Madden	Sullivan
Costello	Goodwin, Ark.	Magee	Sweet
Crago	Gould	Maher	Swift
Currie, Mich.	Gray, N. J.	Mansfield	Tague
Dale, N. Y.	Greene, Mass.	Mapes	Taylor, Ark.
Dale, Vt.	Greene, Vt.	Martin	Temple
Dallinger	Gregg	Merritt	Tillman
Darrow	Griest	Miller, Minn.	Tilson
Decker	Griffin	Miller, Wash.	Timberlake
Dempsey	Hadley	Moore, Pa.	Tinkham
Denton	Hamill	Moore, Ind.	Treadway
Dillon	Hamilton, N. Y.	Morin	Vare
Donovan	Hamlin	Neely	Vestal
Dooling	Harrison, Va.	Nichols, Mich.	Waldow
Doremus	Haskell	Nolan	Walsh
Dowell	Hawley	Oldfield	Ward
Dunn	Holland	Oliver, N. Y.	Wason
Dupré	Husted	Olney	Watson, Pa.
Dyer	Hutchinson	Osborne	Welty
Eagan	Igoe	O'Shaunessy	Whaley
Eagle	Ireland	Paige	White, Me.
Edmonds	James	Parker, N. J.	Wilson, La.
Elliott	Johnson, Wash.	Parker, N. Y.	Wingo
Ellsworth	Kahn	Phelan	Winslow
Elston	Kearns	Platt	Young, N. Dak.
Emerson	Kennedy, Iowa	Polk	Young, Tex.
Esch	Kennedy, R. I.	Purnell	
	Kettner	Quin	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Slayden

NOT VOTING—88.

Aswell	Caraway	Dillon	Hayes
Barkley	Carew	Dominick	Heintz
Boomer	Carter, Okla.	Drukker	Hensley
Borland	Connelly, Kans.	Farr	Hicks
Britten	Cooper, Wis.	Flynn	Hollingsworth
Browne	Copley	Foss	Hood
Browning	Cramton	Frear	Howard
Butler	Crosser	Graham, Pa.	Huddleston
Byrnes, S. C.	Delaney	Gray, Ala.	Jacoway
Candier, Miss.	Dies	Harrison, Miss.	Johnson, S. Dak.

Jones	Mudd	Rowland	Stevenson
Juul	Nelson	Russell	Sumners
Keating	Oliver, Ala.	Sabath	Switzer
Kelly, Pa.	Padgett	Sanders, La.	Talbott
LaGuardia	Peters	Schall	Templeton
Linthicum	Powers	Scott, Iowa	Venable
Lundeen	Pratt	Shackelford	Vinson
McCormick	Ragsdale	Sherley	Watkins
McKinley	Rainey, J. W.	Siegel	Wellington
Mann	Randall	Sloan	Wilson, Tex.
Mays	Rankin	Snell	Wise
Mott	Riordan	Steenerson	Woods, Iowa

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. JOHN W. RAINY with Mr. HAUGEN.

On this vote:

Mr. STEENERSON (to recommit) with Mr. SNELL (against).

Mr. STEVENSON (to recommit) with Mr. MOTT (against).

Mr. RAGSDALE (to recommit) with Mr. LINTHICUM (against).

Mr. RANDALL (to recommit) with Mr. SABATH (against).

Mr. BROWNE (to recommit) with Mr. BRITTEN (against).

Mr. HAYES (to recommit) with Mr. ASWELL (against).

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKINLEY] vote?

The SPEAKER. He is not recorded.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I desire to withdraw my vote of ye and answer "present," as I am paired with the gentleman.

The name of Mr. SLAYDEN was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 336, nays 2, not voting 92, as follows:

YEAS—336.

Alexander	Dooling	Haskell	Magee
Almon	Doolittle	Hastings	Maher
Anderson	Doremus	Haugen	Mansfield
Anthony	Doughton	Hawley	Mapes
Ashbrook	Dowell	Hayden	Martin
Austin	Drane	Heaton	Mason
Ayres	Dunn	Heflin	Meeker
Bacharach	Dupré	Helm	Merritt
Bankhead	Dyer	Helvering	Miller, Minn.
Barnhart	Eagan	Hersey	Miller, Wash.
Beakes	Eagle	Hilliard	Mondell
Bell	Edmonds	Holland	Montague
Beshlin	Elliott	Houston	Moon
Blackmon	Ellsworth	Hull, Iowa	Moore, Pa.
Bland, Ind.	Elston	Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Ind.
Bland, Va.	Emerson	Humphreys	Morgan
Blanton	Esch	Husted	Morin
Bowers	Estopinal	Hutchinson	Neely
Brookbeck	Evans	Igoe	Nicholls, S. C.
Brumbaugh	Fairchild, B. L.	Ireland	Nichols, Mich.
Buchanan	Fairchild, G. W.	James	Nolan
Burnett	Fairfield	Johnson, Ky.	Norton
Burroughs	Ferris	Johnson, Wash.	Oldfield
Byrns, Tenn.	Fess	Kahn	Oliver, N. Y.
Caldwell	Fields	Kearns	Olney
Campbell, Kans.	Fisher	Kehoe	Osborne
Campbell, Pa.	Flood	Kelley, Mich.	O'Shaunessy
Cannon	Focht	Kennedy, Iowa	Overmyer
Cantrill	Fordney	Kennedy, R. I.	Overstreet
Carlin	Foster	Kettner	Paige
Carter, Mass.	Francis	Key, Ohio	Park
Cary	Freeman	Kieess, Pa.	Parker, N. J.
Chandler, N. Y.	French	Kincheloe	Parker, N. Y.
Chandler, Okla.	Fuller, Ill.	King	Phelan
Clark, Fla.	Fuller, Mass.	Kinkaid	Platt
Clark, Pa.	Gallagher	Kitchin	Polk
Classon	Gallivan	Knutson	Porter
Claypool	Gandy	Kraus	Pou
Cleary	Gard	Kreider	Price
Coady	Garland	La Follette	Purnell
Connally, Tex.	Garner	Langley	Quin
Cooper, Ohio	Garrett, Tenn.	Larsen	Rainey, H. T.
Cooper, W. Va.	Garrett, Tex.	Lazaro	Rainey, J. W.
Costello	Gillett	Lee, Cal.	Raker
Cox	Glynn	Lee, Ga.	Ramsey
Crago	Godwin, N. C.	Lehbach	Ramseyer
Crisp	Good	Leshner	Reavis
Currie, Mich.	Goodall	Lever	Reed
Curry, Cal.	Goodwin, Ark.	Little	Robbins
Dale, N. Y.	Gould	Littlepage	Roberts
Dale, Vt.	Graham, Ill.	Lobeck	Robinson
Dallinger	Gray, N. J.	Lonerger	Rodenberg
Darrow	Green, Iowa	Longworth	Rogers
Davis	Greene, Mass.	Lufkin	Romjue
Decker	Greene, Vt.	Lunn	Rose
Dempsey	Gregg	McAndrews	Rouse
Denison	Griest	McArthur	Rowe
Dent	Griffin	McClintic	Ruby
Denton	Hadley	McCulloch	Rucker
Dewalt	Hamilton, Mich.	McFadden	Sanders, Ind.
Dickinson	Hamilton, N. Y.	McKenzie	Sanders, N. Y.
Dill	Hamlin	McKeown	Sanford
Dixon	Hardy	McLaughlin, Mich.	Saunders, Va.
Donovan	Harrison, Va.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Scott, Mich.
		McLemore	Scott, Pa.
		Madden	Scully

Sears	Steagall	Tilson	Weaver
Sells	Stedman	Timberlake	Webb
Shallenberger	Steele	Tinkham	Welty
Sherwood	Stephens, Nebr.	Towner	Whaley
Shouse	Sterling, Ill.	Treadway	Wheeler
Sims	Sterling, Pa.	Van Dyke	White, Me.
Sinnott	Stiness	Vare	White, Ohio
Sisson	Strong	Vestal	Williams
Slayden	Sullivan	Voigt	Wilson, Ill.
Slemp	Sweet	Volstead	Wilson, La.
Small	Swift	Waldow	Wingo
Smith, Idaho	Tague	Walker	Winslow
Smith, Mich.	Taylor, Ark.	Walsh	Wood, Ind.
Smith, C. B.	Taylor, Colo.	Walton	Woodward
Smith, T. F.	Temple	Ward	Wright
Snook	Thomas	Wason	Young, N. Dak.
Snyder	Thompson	Watson, Pa.	Young, Tex.
Stafford	Tillman	Watson, Va.	Zihlman

NAYS—2.

Gordon

London

NOT VOTING—92.

Aswell	Dillon	Kelly, Pa.	Sabath
Baer	Dominick	LaGuardia	Sanders, La.
Barkley	Drukker	Linthicum	Schall
Black	Farr	Lundeen	Scott, Iowa
Booher	Flynn	McCormick	Shackelford
Borland	Foss	McKinley	Sherley
Britten	Fres	Mann	Siegel
Browne	Graham, Pa.	Mays	Sloan
Browning	Gray, Ala.	Mott	Snell
Butler	Harrison, Miss.	Mudd	Steenerson
Byrnes, S. C.	Hayes	Nelson	Stephens, Miss.
Candler, Miss.	Heintz	Oliver, Ala.	Stevenson
Caraway	Hensley	Padgett	Summers
Carew	Hicks	Peters	Switzer
Carter, Okla.	Hollingsworth	Powers	Talbott
Church	Hood	Pratt	Templeton
Connelly, Kans.	Howard	Ragsdale	Venable
Cooper, Wis.	Huddleston	Randall	Vinson
Copley	Jacoway	Rankin	Watkins
Cramton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rayburn	Welling
Crosser	Jones	Riordan	Wilson, Tex.
Delaney	Juul	Rowland	Wise
Dies	Keating	Russell	Woods, Iowa

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. BLACK with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma with Mr. STEENERSON.

Mr. CHURCH with Mr. BAER.

Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. KEATING with Mr. BROWNE.

Mr. VINSON with Mr. HAYES.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. SNELL and Mr. MOTT, of New York, and Mr. BRITTEN, of Illinois, have telegraphed that it is impossible for them to be here, but if here they would vote in favor of the bill.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an announcement. I am paired with Mr. MCKINLEY, of Illinois, who did not vote, but I have been reliably informed that if present he would vote for the bill, and therefore I let my vote stand. I voted in favor of the passage of the bill.

On motion of Mr. DENT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid upon the table.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject matter of the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks that all gentlemen be permitted within five legislative days to extend their remarks on this bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ORDER OF BUSINESS ON MONDAY.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that next Monday is District day, and therefore the water-power bill will not be taken up.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that next Tuesday, after the reading of the Journal and disposition of the business on the Speaker's table, he be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask at the same time that I be permitted, at the close of the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri, to address the House for 20 minutes on the relation of Government commissions to the business public of the United States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks that on next Tuesday, after the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN] concludes, and if he gets permission to make a

speech, that he be permitted to proceed for 20 minutes on the subject of the relation of Government commissions to the business public of the United States. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN]?

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the subject on which the gentleman intends to speak.

Mr. HAMLIN. I want to address the House on the subject of the character and patriotism of the membership of this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech made by Representative KAHN, of California, at Cleveland, Ohio, on July 27, 1918.

Mr. LANGLEY. On what subject?

Mr. EMERSON. On patriotism and matters of that kind.

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

CORRECTION OF PAIRS.

Mr. CHANDLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have the RECORD corrected. Both the gentleman from New York, Mr. CALDWELL, and I have discovered that we were paired, seemingly against each other, though we favored the increase in the postal employees' salary. I ask unanimous consent to have the RECORD corrected to show that Mr. CALDWELL and I both favored the increase in salary.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that is one of these pairs that go into the RECORD without the consent of the Members, and I desire to again call the Speaker's attention to the fact that he promised some time ago that he would write a letter or give directions that this should not occur again. Here is one of these universal pairs put up by the gentleman from New York, Mr. CALDWELL, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. CHANDLER, on the opposite side. Now, I insist that this matter ought to be corrected, because it is putting gentlemen in a wrong attitude. It is poor business and ought to be stopped, and I do hope the Speaker will give directions accordingly.

The SPEAKER. The Chair doubts very much whether he has the right to do it or not. I have announced here three or four times, and will announce again, that neither the House nor the Speaker has anything to do with this pair business. It is an excrescence that has grown up on the body politic. If gentlemen want to find out the philosophy of the thing, they ought to read Benton's Thirty Years in Congress.

Mr. GARNER. I ask unanimous consent that in the future no pairs be put up unless signed by the Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that in the future no pairs be put up unless actually signed by the Members.

Mr. LANGLEY. Reserving the right to object, suppose some gentleman would wire here in order to get a pair?

The SPEAKER. I do not know.

Mr. LANGLEY. I object.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in the case of Mr. CHANDLER of New York and Mr. CALDWELL, I happen to know from conversation that they were both in favor of the legislation on which they were paired.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CHANDLER] will be granted.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 4527. An act to authorize the payment of indemnities to the Government of Greece for injuries inflicted on its nationals during riots occurring in South Omaha, Nebr., February 21, 1909.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, August 26, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a proposed draft of a bill to give warrant officers on shore duty beyond the continental limits of the United

States the same pay as they now receive while on sea duty (H. Doc. No. 1263), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 12812) to provide further for the national security and defense by authorizing the President to control rental charges in certain areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WALDOW: A bill (H. R. 12813) prohibiting the advertisement by mail and the interstate shipment of firearms except for authorized and lawful use; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLAND of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12814) increasing rates of certain pensions under the general law; to the Committee on Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRODBECK: A bill (H. R. 12815) to correct the military record of Daniel M. Witmyer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12816) for the relief of William Fouts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Churches of Mount Moriah, Akron, and Glaxe, in Harrison County, Mo., for legislation prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for the period of the war and demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petition of D. R. Taggart and others favoring a bill to provide for the substitution of the oath required of enlisted men for the oath required of officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: Petition of the Pemberton (N. J.) Methodist Episcopal Church in re war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Petitions favoring war-time prohibition by the following organizations in the State of Pennsylvania: Trinity Reformed Church, Glen Rock, 44 signatures; Christ Lutheran Church, of Gettysburg, 67 signatures; Bethany Reformed Church, of York, 87 signatures; St. Stephen's Reformed

Church, of York, 35 signatures; Emmanuel Reformed Church, of York, 31 names; the Womans Christian Temperance Union, of Gettysburg, 38 signatures; 90 citizens of New Freedom and Shrewsbury; and the Canandochly Reformed Church, York, 62 signatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: Petition of Rev. George A. Beacock and various other citizens of Bay City, Mich., requesting the enactment of a law providing for absolute prohibition of liquor traffic during the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Resolution of the American Federation of Labor indorsing the McKellar-Keating bill to provide retirement for superannuated Government employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the American Federation of Labor favoring the passage of the McKellar-Keating bill to retire superannuated Government employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ESCH: Memorial of the American Federation of Labor urging the passage of the McKellar-Keating bill to provide for the retirement of superannuated Government employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the Haddoeff Piano Co., of Rockford, Ill., concerning the proposed tax on denatured alcohol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON: Letter from Rev. Paul Martin, registrar and secretary to the faculty of the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church of Princeton, N. J., expressing interest in and favoring the passage of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Petition of J. E. Herbert and 25 other citizens of Chapin, Ill., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of citizens of Chili, Monroe County, N. Y., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of members of Baptist Church, Cowlesville, N. Y., favoring war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of 1,500 citizens of Canton, N. Y., favoring national war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of G. Clifford Foote and others in favor of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWNER: Petition of ministers and churches of Seymour, Iowa, asking for the passage of a prohibitory law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Rev. A. E. Hull and 60 other residents of Cavalier, N. Dak., urging the enactment of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.