husband of Mrs. H. L. Smith, deceased, and Marguerite Smith and H. L. Smith, Jr., minor children of the aforesaid Mrs. H. L. Smith, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 2607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6409. A bill for the relief of J. A. Fowler and the estate of Ola Fowler; with amendment (Rept. No. 2608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WINTER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6653. A bill for the relief of William R. Ivey; with amendment (Rept. No. 2609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6695. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Esther Mann; with amendment (Rept. No. 2610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RUSSELL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7167. A bill for the relief of Elmore Lee Lane; with amendment (Rept. No. 2611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7168. A bill for the relief of Grover C. Wedgwood; with an amendment (Rept. No. 2612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 7742. A bill to establish an Office of War Mobilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7743. A bill to suspend until the termination of the present war the provisions of section 7 of the act of August 23, 1912, as amended, relating to certain telephone services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEHRMANN:

H. Res. 564. Resolution to investigate alleged discrimination against cooperatives and others by major broadcasting companies in the sale of radio time; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 15, 1942)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, new every morning is the love our waking and uprising prove. Again we turn unfilled to Thee. Take Thou the dimness of our souls away.

Facing the duties of the new day, we would first search our own souls. May Thy holy powers of renewal be felt in every heart, and may all that is withered and blighted in us be morally and spiritually restored. May our guilt be lost in the unfathomable sea of Thy everlasting mercy. May weights of despair be changed to wings of a new hope. May disappointments be changed into radiant expectations. May any bitterness or selfishness lurking in our hearts be transmuted into a love that thinketh no evil and seeketh not her own. Scorning expediency and cowardly compromise, may we be true to all truth the world denies, not tongue-tied by its gilded lies; not always right in all men's lives, but faithful to the light within.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, October 22, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on October 20, 1942, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2775) to amend the act of March 5, 1942, relating to the planting of guayule and other rubber-bearing plants.

THE LATE JESSE H. METCALF, OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, the Senate's time has lately been so taken up with war legislation that many other matters have been and are being postponed. However, I feel that I should not delay longer announcing formally to the Senate the death of former United States Senator Jesse H. Metcalf, of Rhode Island, who died in his home city of Providence on last October 9 He was a Republican Senator from 1924 to 1937.

In his death Rhode Island lost one of its most distinguished and public-spirited citizens, and lasting monuments to his public spirit stand in the form of buildings which he gave to Brown University, Rhode Island School of Design, Rhode Island Hospital, and other institutions in the State. He gave not only of his money, he gave also—and this is more important—of his time and thought to the service of the public, by serving as officer, trustee, director, and on committees of various educational and charitable institutions, and by holding public office.

In 1907 he was a member of the Rhode Island General Assembly. From 1924 to 1937 he represented Rhode Island in this august body as a Republican. In both legislative bodies he showed reluctance to speaking, although his occasional addresses were listened to with respectful attention. He was, however, always ready to do his share of the committee work on the various important committees to which he was appointed.

While here he formed many friendships which lasted after his term of service ended, and he is I know mourned by many of his old associates here. They and his large circle of personal friends elsewhere will miss in him a cheery, generous, and considerate companion. The State of Rhode Island will miss in him a patriotic, public-spirited citizen and generous benefactor.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the so-called anti-poll-tax bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of Street, Md., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, at the request of a number of very prominent citizens of Pennsylvania, and a delegation headed by Elizabeth A. Smart and consisting of citizens from Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and other cities in the State of Pennsylvania, I present petitions signed by about 5,000 persons, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, for the moral and physical welfare of the armed forces of the United States. I ask that the heading of one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD and that the petitions be returned to me.

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

The body of one of the petitions is as follows:

Senator JAMES J. DAVIS,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned citizens of Pennsylvania, request the passage of bill S. 860, knowing that all previous wars have lost battles because of liquor. We want the men and boys in the service of our country to be sober and at their best at all times. The soldiers in the German Army are prohibited to use any alcoholic beverages. Our Army and other branches of the service must be better and stronger than the enemy if we expect to win in this great fight.

REDUCTION OF DRAFT-AGE LIMIT—LETTER AND PETITION

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter and a petition which I have received from citizens of Connecticut referring to the pending legislation.

There being no objection, the letter and petition were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

MERIDEN, CONN., *October 20, 1942.*

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The attached photostats are self-explanator.

They represent the opinion of the average citizen of voting age. A check of the signers will reveal that in the great majority of cases personal families and political parties are not involved. In one case the signer is now ready for induction into the Army. In another case the signer's son is a flying officer in the Army air service. Many of them have sons or brothers in the service.

The few hours of work and limited time that was expended in the preparation of this petition establishes the fact that at least 80 percent of the people are in accord with the thoughts expressed.

Thanking you for your consideration of the statements contained in the petition and hoping that the Senate, which the American citizen recognizes to be the guardian of true democracy will hear the voice of the

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

people as well as that of the Secretary of War and General Marshall, we are,

Yours very truly,

M. E. ALDRICH

(And sundry other citizens of the State of Connecticut).

---

1. We the undersigned, citizens of the United States, are opposed to and condemn the principle of rushing important legislation through the Congress without permitting the American public to voice their opinion.

2. We are opposed to the drafting of boys of 18 or 19 for any other purpose except as National Guard men, Army, Navy, or aviation reservists. Such guardsmen or reservists to remain in the United States until they have attained a minimum age of 20 years.

3. We are opposed to sending any boy into foreign service until he has received one full year of military training.

4. We are opposed to any measure that does not permit any boy, prior to the time that his draft number is called, to enlist in any branch of the service.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7330) to provide for granting to the State of New Mexico the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in New Mexico, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1658) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on October 22, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1468. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish a fuel depot at Middle and Orchard Points, Wash.;

S. 2327. An act to provide for payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers and travel allowance of enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard;

S. 2369. An act for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California;

S. 2381. An act to provide that certain provisions of law relating to the Navy shall be held applicable to the personnel of the Coast Guard when that service is operating as a part of the Navy;

S. 2471. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act;

S. 2555. An act to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, in connection with pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the War and Navy Departments;

S. 2623. An act authorizing the construction of certain public works in the basin of the Connecticut River for flood control;

S. 2706. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), and "Title IV of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1941," approved September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 883); and

S. 2751. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States," approved May 14, 1942, to create the grade of field director in such corps, to provide for enrolled grades in such corps comparable to the enlisted grades in the Regular Army, to provide pay and allowances for all members of such corps at the same rates as those payable to members of the Regular Army in corresponding grades, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2872. A bill to suspend until the termination of the present war the provisions of section 7 of the act of August 23, 1912, as amended, relating to certain telephone services; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 2873. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Basil R. Otey; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 2874. A bill to prohibit certain contracts, agreements, conspiracies, and combinations which prevent the making of recordations for use by radio broadcasting stations and coin-operated phonographs; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 2875. A bill to provide priorities for certain material and equipment necessary to the continued production of agricultural products; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REDUCTION OF DRAFT-AGE LIMIT—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'DANIEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2748) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ALLEGED ASSESSMENT OF POSTMASTERS IN NORTH DAKOTA FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few days ago I produced on the floor of the Senate checks paid by the postmaster at La Moure, N. Dak. I now submit the following resolution:

Whereas concrete evidence has been presented to the Senate of the United States that postmasters, on threat of losing their positions, have been compelled to pay systematic tribute to a group of politicians in the State of North Dakota; and

Whereas taking of this money has been alleged to be in violation of law continually for the last 6 years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation of the assessment of postmasters in North Dakota for political purposes—or private graft.

The said committee or duly authorized subcommittee is authorized and directed to secure the assistance of other governmental agencies in the investigation hereby authorized, and to report to the Senate the facts ascertained in the course of the investigation and the recommendations therein.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production and impounding of books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, which shall not exceed $1,000 in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution (S. Res. 311) will be received, and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PREEMINENCE OF LYNCHBURG, VA., IN THE COLLECTION OF SCRAP METAL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have received the following telegram from my colleague the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who is detained by illness at his home in Virginia:

OCTOBER 16, 1942.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I hope you have noted that it was a Virginia city and none other than my home town of Lynchburg that leads all the cities of the United States in the amount of scrap collected per capita. Lynchburg contributed 13,555,646 pounds for an average of 304.3 pounds for each citizen which is far above the average for the country at large per capita. Of course, other cities and States have responded as patriotically as their conditions permit, but I hope that the country will appreciate the patriotism, energy, ingenuity and efficiency of the citizens of Lynchburg in responding so nobly to this call in the Nation's hour of peril.

CARTER GLASS.

Mr. President, I am very proud of the fact that a Virginia city leads all the cities of the United States in the amount of scrap collected per capita. This is but one evidence of the support the people of Virginia are giving to the war effort, and the patriotism with which they are willing to make every sacrifice so that the war will be won at the earliest possible moment.

I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, together with an article from the New York Times of October 16, 1942.

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

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch]

ACCOLADE TO LYNCHBURG

The final figures will change some of the rankings in the Nation-wide scrap drive, but Lynchburg is so far ahead of all the other cities in the United States as to be obviously No. 1. With an average of more than 304 pounds per capita, far in advance of Fairmont, Minn., the second city, which had 229, Lynchburg clearly deserves an accolade commensurate with this stunning accomplishment.

By leading all the cities of America in this crucially important drive, the Hill City has not only won great and well-merited distinction for itself, but the State of Virginia also is enjoying a vicarious glory. All of us in the Old Dominion can feel proud that a Virginia city showed the way to the Nation in so vital an undertaking.

[From the New York Times of October 16, 1942]

LYNCHBURG, VA., TOPS CITIES IN SCRAP DRIVE

Lynchburg, Va., became the country's first city yesterday to report a per capita average of more than 300 pounds in the scrap metal salvage campaign sponsored by the newspapers of the Nation. Lynchburg's figure is 304.3 pounds of metal contributed so far for every man, woman, and child. Its population, according to the last Federal census, is 44,541.

THE MANPOWER PROBLEM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address relating to the national manpower problem delivered by Senator TRUMAN before the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies at Kansas City, Mo., on October 21, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

EQUALITY OF ECONOMIC SACRIFICE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Need Equality of Economic Sacrifice," written by him and published in The Progressive of October 26, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

NORTH DAKOTA'S STAKE IN RECLAMATION—ADDRESS BY JOHN C. PAGE, COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. John C. Page, Commissioner of Reclamation, on October 6, 1942, at the convention of the North Dakota Reclamation Association, at Mandan, N. Dak., which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL LABOR SITUATION IN NORTH DAKOTA

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to Hon. Claude H. Wickard, Secretary of griculture, from J. J. Kehoe, with regard to the agricultural labor situation in the State of North Dakota, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2794) to provide for adjusting royalties for the use of inventions for the benefit of the United States, in aid of the prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

REDUCTION OF DRAFT AGE LIMIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2748) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I consider it to be a grave responsibility resting on my shoulders when I take part in compelling teen-age schoolboys to shoulder guns and go out and fight and perhaps die for our country when they have not yet finished school and have not yet reached the age when they can have a voice in our Government to the extent of voting, owning property, signing notes, buying whisky, marrying, and in some States even driving an automobile. Under these conditions I desire to make it perfectly clear in the RECORD exactly what my position is. We are told that the United States of America, with a population of over 131,000,000, at war less than 1 year, finds itself now so short of manpower that it is obliged to force our 18 and 19 teen-age schoolboys to shoulder arms and go out and fight this war. I believe that during wartime it is the duty of every American citizen to back up our chosen Commander in Chief with everything he requests for use in fighting the war. He has requested that these teen-age schoolboys be drafted. I intend to support this bill solely because our Commander in Chief says it is necessary. At the same time, in fairness to the teen-age boys and their mothers and fathers, I intend to point out some legislation now on our statute books which, in my opinion, has forced upon us the condition which makes it imperative that the teen-age boys be drafted. Not only do I intend to identify this outmoded legislation, Mr. President, but I intend to offer an amendment to the pending bill which, if adopted, will help us in our present predicament and help keep us out of predicaments in the future as distasteful or perhaps more so than our present sad plight.

Mr. President, a few years ago we had in this Nation a great unemployment problem. In order to help solve that serious unemployment problem and to alleviate suffering and hardships of many of our laboring people, we enacted legislation which would tend to force employers to divide the available work among a larger number of employees by limiting to 40 the number of hours each person could work a week, without employers having to pay a penalty for work performed beyond that limit of time. This penalty is usually referred to as time and one-half for overtime. During the period of unemployment that legislation, no doubt, performed a great service and benefited many of our laboring people. Our Nation now faces exactly the opposite position. We now have no unemployment problem, but, instead, our problem now is a shortage of manpower. We have more jobs than we have people to work, but we have not yet revoked that law. That law is still in effect, and it is operating to help increase our manpower shortage.

Even in our dire stress of war there are some employers who still like to practice economy and are still spreading out the work among a larger number of employees in order to avoid the payment of time and one-half for overtime. By so doing they are employing more men than is absolutely necessary, thus helping to create an unnecessary manpower shortage. I believe that there will be found among the rank and file of our good, honest, working people the urge to work any number of hours necessary during this war if they are given the opportunity. They are wholeheartedly back of the war effort and want to do everything they can to further our war program and hasten the winning of the war. Not only do many of them have this patriotic idea, but many of them also have the desire to work longer hours while work is plentiful so they can increase their weekly earnings. But so long as this law remains in effect, these good, honest, working people are deprived of this privilege to work longer hours and earn more money.

Mr. President, no doubt there may be some differences of opinion as to the length of the ideal workweek, but in our present serious predicament a discussion of the ideal length of the workweek should be postponed. The most potent thing to consider now is the winning of this war. If a man wants to work longer hours, he should be permitted to do so, for we cannot afford to lose a single hour in our effort to win this war, and win it at the earliest possible date.

It is not my purpose now to go into any long discussion about what is the ideal workweek, but I do state that it is absolutely unsound to have on our statute books at this time any law the effect of which is to help create a manpower shortage. I know, of course, that those who oppose me in this matter, will say that under the law as it now stands a man is free to work as many hours as he wants to work. I know they will say that under the law as it now stands an employer is free to operate his plant as many hours as he wants to, but the fact is that so long as the operation of a plant or of any line of business is made more expensive by requiring the payment of a premium wage of time and one-half after the first 40 hours has been worked, just that long we may be assured that industry will seek to employ more people, so as to avoid, if possible, the payment of the premium wage. Common, ordinary horse sense teaches that this will be done. Furthermore, any reference to the facts in the case will show that, generally speaking, industries throughout the country are trying to hold their workweek just as close to 40 hours as they can, and they are doing it for the obvious reason of avoiding the payment of time and one-half for time worked in excess of 40 hours. By so doing they are employing more people, and thus helping to create the present manpower shortage.

Mr. President, there is one angle to this matter which I think is generally overlooked. It may be urged, as it is urged by many people, that in most war industries the cost is being passed on to the Government, and, therefore, the man who is operating the industry is not concerned about paying time and one-half because it does not cost him anything; it is an expense he can pass on to the Government and the taxpayers. This is true in many of our large industries which are engaged exclusively in war work, but it is not true in a tremendous number of industries which are absolutely essential to the maintenance of our civilian economy and the winning of the war. These industries must actually pay the wages themselves, and they cannot pass the expense on to the Government. So, regardless of what the effect of the premium wage may be in industries operating on a cost plus basis to the Government, it is absolutely certain that the premium wage is an exceedingly important factor to employers who must keep the prices of their products to the public below Government ceiling prices.

I am assuming, for the purpose of this argument, that if we repealed the law

providing for time and one-half for all time worked in excess of 40 hours it would necessitate an immediate increase in wages so that weekly earnings would not fall below the schedule now established. In other words, I am not thinking in terms of the number of dollars which would be saved to employers throughout the country. That is an important factor, of course, but what I am now concerned about is removing the incentive for employers to hold the number of hours worked just as close to 40 hours as possible, for that is what is contributing to our manpower shortage.

I do not believe that we have the manpower in this country with which to operate both war and civilian industries under a 40-hour-week schedule and at the same time get the production and provide the goods necessary to win the war. I think that sooner or later we shall be forced to remove this incentive which we have set up by law to encourage employers to hold the number of hours worked down to 40 a week.

In order to make clear the picture how manpower hours can be increased by lengthening the workweek, I present some calculations based on statistics furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. It reports that for September this year there were 42,200,000 persons 14 years of age and over employed in nonagricultural labor. It reports that for August this year, which is its latest report, average hours worked a week in all manufacturing industries amounted to 42.8. If these 42,200,000 people should work 48 hours a week instead of 42.8, 4,571,667 of that number could be released for other service. If they worked 54 hours a week, 8,752,593 could be released for other service. If they worked 60 hours a week, 12,097,334 could be released. If they worked 66 hours a week, 14,833,940 could be released, and if they worked 12 hours a day, 6 days a week, 17,114,445 of the 42,200,000 people could be released for other service.

The amendment which I am offering does not attempt to provide that people sha" work 48 hours a week, 54 hours a week, or 60 hours a week, or any other number of hours; it simply provides that for the duration of the war the provision of the law which requires the payment of premium wages for overtime shall be set aside. It is my judgment that if this could be done, we would find that industry throughout the Nation would generally adopt either the 48-hour week or the 54-hour week, and, of course, in some cases they would work longer weeks. The adoption of this amendment would not result in the weekly earnings of anyone being reduced; it would simply remove a barrier which now exists to prevent the full and complete use of our national manpower. Certainly, if we face an emergency which causes our military leaders to deem it essential to take boys in the teen ages and place them in the Army, we have reached the point where it is desirable for us to utilize our existing manpower more efficiently than we have done heretofore.

This Nation today faces one of the gravest problems which it has ever faced, due to the shortage of labor on farms and ranches. Already word has gone out that it will be essential to limit meat and other vital food supplies; not because the Nation is not capable of producing the food, but because the manpower on our farms has been drained off into the cities and, of course, a part of it into the Army. I am impressed, however, by the fact that the great loss of manpower, which has most seriously disturbed our agricultural situation, has been brought about because of the desire of industry to have a labor force sufficiently large to do the job they are expected to do, and to do it without the necessity of paying overtime.

If in the very beginning we had removed from existing law the requirement which makes necessary the payment of penalty wages for all time in excess of 40 hours worked, my opinion is that the farm labor situation would be far better than it is today, and I do not believe that our manpower situation would be such that we would today be faced with the necessity of passing a law to supplement our manpower by taking into military service young boys just out of high school, and some of whom have not finished high school.

Mr. President, a day never passes now without those who are responsible for handling and providing manpower for our total war effect calling our attention to the necessity for utilizing labor to the point of maximum efficiency. If this is to be done, then it becomes necessary, I think, for us to realize that every business which exists in this country, at least every business which is allowed to continue to exist, must be classified as an essential war industry.

In measuring the effect of legislation, it seems to me we often forget that it is essential to maintain necessary industries which serve our civilian population. In other words, there are some vital, essential industries which must be carried on at home if our people at home and in the armed forces are to be fed and clothed, and if taxes are to be earned to pay the cost of this war.

If this be true, then it becomes absolutely essential that every clerk and every bookkeeper and every salesman in a department store be used to the point of maximum efficiency. It becomes necessary that every employee in a drug store, or one v ho works in any other industry deemed necessary to support our civilian economy, whether it be in the manufacture of goods, distribution of goods, or in providing services, shall work a full number of hours. In other words, we have reached the place where it is necessary for al. our people, regardless of the line of work in which they are engaged, to put forth the maximum effort. This will not be done so long as every employer in the country faces the payment of a penalty wage for all time worked in excess of 40 hours a week.

It is true that under the law some of our various lines of business are not subject to the wage-and-hour law, but, as the law has been construed, it takes in almost every kind of business and industry. It is therefore all the more important, if we are to have full use of the manpower of the Nation, that the penalty for working employees more than 40 hours a week be taken out of the law.

Let me refer again to a matter which I have already mentioned, namely, the contention of those who oppose any change in the present law, that if wages are to be increased so that employees will still receive the same pay they are now receiving nothing will be gained. This, of course, sounds like a plausible statement, but when we analyze it, we find it is not plausible. Suppose that under the present law one were operating a manufacturing plant and paying 50 cents an hour up to 40 hours. This would mean, of course, that after the worker had passed 40 hours the operator would have to pay 75 cents an hour. Let us suppose that it was determined by proper authority that if the penalty wage were abolished it would be necessary to increase the normal wage to 60 cents an hour, and suppose this were done, then under this procedure the employer would pay exactly the same for every hour worked under 40 hours that he would pay for the hours worked over and beyond 40. The result would be that, while he might pay in wages the same amount for the same number of hours worked that he is now paying, the incentive for him to hold the hours down to 40 a week would be destroyed and we would find employers all over the country lengthening the workweek to the number of hours which in their judgment would yield the highest return in production.

Personally, I feel confident that before another year passes we shall be forced by circumstances to do what I am recommending that the Congress do now, because we simply cannot furnish enough manpower in this Nation to have all the necessary work performed with each employee working only 42.8 hours a week, as the figures of the Department of Labor show we were doing in August of this year.

To amend the law by abolishing the premium pay for overtime during this period of manpower shortage is so fundamentally just and proper that to fail to do so at this time, while we are dipping into a new and unused pool of manpower of teen-age boys, can and possibly will cause the mothers and fathers of these teen-age boys to rise up in righteous wrath and condemn us severely.

In my opinion, the teen-age youth of America, upon whom we are calling to take up arms and fight the war, and their mothers and fathers, will bitterly resent our failure to utilize the manpower we could have by removing work-hour impediments before calling these schoolboys into the service.

My contention is that it would be far better, while we are engaged in the passage of what we designate emergency legislation which calls the teen-age boys of this country out of our schools into the Army, to remove those vital handicaps which tend to restrict the use of the Nation's manpower.

Our present unwise policy has helped to bring us face to face with the dire necessity of taking teen-age boys out of school to fight this war because many of our otherwise eligible men are not available for the armed service by rea-

son of the fact that they are falling over each other in crowded shops and offices. This is no criticism of the honest laboring people. It is not their fault that more people are hired than are necessary to do the job. They do not do the hiring. They work every hour their employers will permit them to work. It is no criticism of the employers in war industries, because they are duty-bound to effect every economy possible during this time of enormous expenditure of Government funds. It is no criticism of employers in essential domestic industries, because they are compelled to effect every economy possible in times of keen competition, price ceilings on their products, and high taxes. It is only the natural result of a condition which is brought about by the continuation of outmoded legislation which was enacted for the purpose of reducing unemployment in peacetime, but is unnecessary and detrimental to our war effort during wartime, when we have no unemployment problem. This condition has been brought about by legislative fences having been arbitrarily built to prevent a man from performing to his maximum capacity regardless of how much he might want to work longer hours during this crisis.

Mr. President, I think we should be realistic and face these problems squarely and honestly, especially in wartime. Because a foolish law is tending to cause 42,200,000 persons to work at jobs which could be performed by only 25,085,555, we cannot deprive our Army of its request for additional manpower. Inasmuch as others are not immediately available, we are compelled to call on the teen-age boys of this Nation to leave their schools and take up arms in order to have an army of sufficient size. Only as a last resort do I feel we should force the teen-age schoolboys out on the battle front to fight this war.

Our Commander in Chief says it is necessary to lower the draft age to include teen-age boys of 18 and 19 years; for that reason I shall vote for the pending measure, but I shall insist that the amendment which I am offering be adopted to improve the bill. When the war ends, the amendment will become inoperative. We can then discuss the matter of the ideal workweek for peacetime production.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill which I ask to have printed and lie on the table, for consideration at the proper time, and I shall request the yeas and nays when the amendment is considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. What is the pending business at the moment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. At this time I should like to take up the committee amendment, which begins in line 19 on page 2, and which would add two new paragraphs, (i) and (j). I do not believe the new paragraphs are controversial in any manner. I should like to take up the committee amendment in two parts; paragraph (i) in the committee amendment first, and then I have a committee substitute for the language of paragraph (j).

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Do any of the other amendments which have been printed and have been designated for subsequent presentation apply to the language of either of the paragraphs of the committee amendment which the Senator is now asking to have adopted?

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure there are no amendments which have been printed, or given notice of in the debate yesterday, which would in any way affect either of these paragraphs.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is about to ask for a vote on the committee amendment?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Reynolds
Ball	Gurney	Rosier
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Bone	Hill	Smathers
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bulow	La Follette	Spencer
Bunker	Langer	Taft
Burton	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tobey
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wagner
Danaher	Murdock	Wallgren
Davis	Norris	Walsh
Downey	Nye	Wheeler
Doxey	O'Daniel	White
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on official business in connection with the duties of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SCHWARTZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, in view of the wide interest exhibited generally throughout the country regarding the age of soldiers in the war which lies ahead of us, I took from my library some figures dealing with another very grim and bloody struggle in this country, the Civil War, which was the saddest struggle that any nation ever faced. It has been many years since that war was concluded, and most folks have forgotten its significance; but I should like to introduce these figures into the RECORD as a part of my remarks. Some were prepared by Mr. E. V. Durling, a columnist connected with King Features Syndicate in New York, and appeared in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of December 9, 1940. They show the number of officers and men lost in the Union and Confederate Armies during the Civil War.

Some 40 years ago a clerk in the War Department furnished a Colorado newspaper with the figures covering the boys who served in the Union Army during the Civil War. The records of the southern armies are probably lost. They were destroyed in the holocaust of war; but it is interesting, diverting, and saddening to read that 25 boys 10 years of age served in the Union Army—probably little drummer boys. There were 38 boys 11 years of age; 225 boys 12 years of age; 300 boys 13 years of age; 105,000 boys 14 and 15 years of age; 126,000 boys 16 years of age; 613,000 boys 17 years of age; 307,000 boys 18 years of age; and 1,009,000 boys from 18 to 21 years of age.

In referring to the record, Mr. Durling says:

> Of this half million men who met death in the Civil War 85 percent were under 21 years of age. It was a boys' war. The average age of participants was but 18 years.

I send these figures to the desk and ask that they be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

> In the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of December 9, 1940, E. V. Durling, a columnist, used these figures:
>
> At the end of our Civil War, the Union Army had 1,100,516 men in the field. The Confederates had 174,223.
>
> During the Civil War, the Union Army lost 9,584 officers and 349,944 men. The Confederates lost 4,626 officers and 129,695 men.
>
> The total loss on both sides was 493,349 men.
>
> Of this half million men who met death in the Civil War, 85 percent were under 21 years of age. It was a boys' war. The average age of participants was but 18 years.

Somewhere around 40 years ago, D. I. Woods, a clerk in the War Department in Washington, furnished the Durango (Colo.) Democrat with some interesting data on the Civil War. Woods apparently had combed the records of the Adjutant General's office to secure these figures. He found that the Civil War has been fought largely by boys.

On the Union side, 2,278,588 men were enlisted in all the various forces. Of this vast number, all but 118,000 were less than 21 years of age.

The list he compiled is as follows: 25 boys, 10 years of age; 33 boys, 11 years of age; 225 boys, 12 years of age; 300 boys, 13 years of age; 105,000 boys, 14 and 15 years of age; 126,000 boys, 16 years of age; 613,000 boys, 17 years of age; 307,000 boys, 18 years of age; 1,009,000 boys, 18 to 21 years of age.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the pending business at this time is section 4, being the committee amendments to the bill on page 2, after line 18. Subsection (i) is to make the provisions for enlistment the same as the provisions for induction. Testimony was given before the Military Affairs Committee by the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Robert Patterson.

I ask for the adoption of subsection (i), through and including line 2 on page 3.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first branch of the committee amendment, on page 2, after line 18, being subsection (i) of section 4.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I wish to be heard generally upon the bill, and I shall take this opportunity to do so. I thought that certain arrangements had been made by which other Senators were to proceed; but that is neither here nor there. We ought to be ready to proceed at any time in relation to measures of this sort. I am ready to proceed now.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum? Obviously there is not a quorum present.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; I do not care for a quorum. There will be so few votes my way in this particular matter that I have no desire to demonstrate it by a quorum call. There will be four or five or six votes; and I am happy to say that those four or five or six votes are welcomed with open arms. However, I do not care for a quorum at this time.

Mr. President, the first question which meets us in dealing with this subject is with respect to the character of those who are to be drafted by the proposed amendment to the act. We are told that it is infinitely better to have men of 18 years of age; that it is infinitely better to take these young sinews and weld them into a warlike unit; that it is infinitely better to take boys of a tender age because, as has been said repeatedly, they are more adventurous, more daredevil. They pay little attention to consequences, and they are ready to do anything under any circumstances; and in that way they meet the desire and the design of the Nation.

Of course, they are willing to do anything that may be asked of them, and much that is not asked. Of course they are willing to fight at the drop of a hat. That is the way in which they have been brought up, perhaps. Of course, they are willing to do all that the older soldiers of the Republic demand that they shall do. That is the very reason why we should throw our protecting mantle about them, and see that they are not needlessly sacrificed.

Do we want a whole generation to be wiped out in this war, so that when peace comes there will be nobody to take charge of it? The very ones upon whom we rely to take charge of the peace, and to write it as it should be written, will be in such a situation that we shall hunt their graves. We shall pay them the great honor of hunting their graves in one part of the world or another—not in our own country, but in some other part of the world. We shall say "There he lies, the poor fellow. He was only 18 years old, and he knew no better. It was because of that that he was sent upon his wild adventure."

We may accept the words of the military at this juncture, and we may accept the words of those who control us as a Nation. We may accept the control of those men and take their word. In the language of a great ruler, our lads will be "liquidated," and there will remain to this great country of ours after we shall have finished with this war no generation which can build it up and send it again upon its way.

I do not want any man on earth to question my patriotism when I speak thus. I want no man here or outside to say aught concerning my desire to win this war. That desire is as great as any man's can be.

I wish to win this war and win it in the speediest possible manner. I wish that we shall go forward and do whatever is necessary in order to win the war; but I am not willing, in order to win the war, to say to 18-year-old youngsters, "You, who have had no chance in this life, and whose only prospect is death, fight our battles, and we will see that a fitting monument is erected to your memory."

Those who talk that way and those who insist that we shall take the words of the military and the military alone know little of the subject. Before I finish I expect to refer to the various nations of the earth that have draft laws. I expect to refer to documents of the late Civil War and to establish, if I can, that these children we are taking, these children we are asking to fight for us—these children—simply will go forth to their death in any attempt that is made to have them participate in this conflict.

Recently there was published in the New York Times a letter of T. H. Thomas which dealt with this subject. Because he dealt with it not alone within his recollection but by way of history, I take the trouble to read to the Senate some of the things he said:

In a spirit of sacrifice the country has resigned itself—

Oh, what a pity it is! This country has resigned itself—

to acquiescing in the demand for the drafting of the 18- and 19-year-old classes. In the end, however, it will not be to the advantage of anyone concerned if such a step is taken for false and misleading reasons. In the course of processing public opinion into this sacrificial attitude of mind, the press during the last few months has gradually built up the assumption that the calling out of these younger classes is a part of the normal procedure of military service based on conscription. It has also built up the belief that on the basis of experience these younger classes have proved particularly fit for active service in the field.

Both these assumptions are mistaken.

France and Germany alike had two or three generations of experience with conscription before 1914, and both countries learned that even for peacetime military service it did not pay to call out younger classes than those already in their twentieth year; on a 2-year basis, military service was performed by men ranging from 20 to 22.

Then he proceeds to discuss the French and the German method, but I leave on his bare assertion the fact that it was not successful nor was it called for by the particular affairs of their nations.

Then he proceeds:

Even in the buoyant appeals now made to Congress, our own authorities have revealed a not dissimilar estimate of these "undeveloped resources."

Good God! Senators, you are dealing with human beings, with your flesh and blood and my flesh and blood, and you are talking about the undeveloped resources that will be taken. Undeveloped resources of an army? Take them only as a last resource. The writer evidently takes the same view:

The reckonings offered by the highest official quarters indicate that it is expected that about half of these new classes must be struck off in advance as unfit for service.

Not so here; we listen to the soldiers who tell us that such men are the best soldiers in the world, that they can do more than any other soldiers. I deny that as a premise of any argument that is grounded upon this bill.

The reckonings offered by the highest official quarters indicate that it is expected that about half of these classes must be struck off in advance as unfit for service. If this is true, taking both classes together, how large a proportion of the 18-year class will prove up to the mark?

* * * * *

In all the countries at war the drafting of 18-year-old men for field service was put off until the last possible moment.

Not so here, because when it was suggested to those in charge of the matter that they give to these boys fair training of a year, ah, they fought that at once, and they would not give to the lads they are taking from the 18-year-old group the mere right to have a fair training before being put in the service.

I talk upon this subject with some feeling, not because I have youngsters who would be taken, not because I am affected by anything personal, but because as an old individual I see this thing more plainly perhaps than a younger man does; and I insist that we shall do by these younger men as we would have them do under other circumstances. It is a wicked thing to deal with these 18-year-olds as we have been taught to do by the military. Taught? In 1 day you hear it. It is taught with a picture taken—and it is flashed all over the land—of six or seven members of the Military Affairs Committee, and with the Chief of Staff talking before them. That

is the sort of hearing which was held. That is the sort of thing upon which rested the determination of the Military Affairs Committee in fixing this particular age limit.

I continue to read from the article:

Even in the extreme strain upon British manpower today, and with a carefully arranged system of gradual seasoning of younger troops, the British Army has found it sound policy not to send out of the country soldiers under 19½ years of age. This was formally stated, as a definite course of policy, in answer to a question in Parliament in July 1942.

Let me say that all the proceedings in Parliament from that time on have demonstrated that it was the expectation of the British to utilize such men only if they were absolutely essential. Who says these men are absolutely essential? Who claims it is absolutely essential, imperative, and necessary that we utilize 18-year-old boys? After they have been utilized, we shall be so sorry, and we shall say how much we regret—regret, indeed—that some of them were shot down in the desert, that some of them were shot down at this point of land, and some at that point of land, and that some of them were shot down elsewhere—that none of them ever returned. That will be the story of the 18-year-olds if this bill shall pass.

I continue to read from the article:

After the failure of voluntary recruiting at the end of 1861, the Confederacy was soon faced with the break-down of its improvised apparatus for conscription. To meet this, the age limit was extended upward and downward simultaneously, the downward extension reaching to the 18-year-old class. There answered a voice from the North which has not been forgotten: "Jeff Davis is robbing both the cradle and the grave." We have now begun robbing the cradle even before a single American division has come into action on a fighting front.

Mr. President, do you realize that even before a single division of our troops has come into action on a fighting front we are now engaged in snatching from the cradle boys who have yet to live their lives and have yet to have their part in this world's goods?

More than 80 divisions are now being organized; when the call comes for replacements shall we dip into the classes aged 17 and 16?

The voice from the North in 1862 expressed no inexpert civilian impression. The draft brought only an insignificant number of men into the Union armies; no whole class of any age was gathered into service. The minors enrolled in the first year of the war were what is sometimes called "the flower of our youth"—eager volunteers passed as fit for service by the medical examiners of that day. They represented the "exceptional soldiers" of the type now called for. Yet in November 1862, after more than a year of actual experience in camp and field, the surgeon general reported—

The reference, of course, is to the surgeon general of the United States. I recognize his authority cannot be so great as the authority that may be accorded to an English officer who wants our recruits; it cannot be so great and it cannot be so influential and so forceful as that of any of the foreigners who infest the city of Washington today. The voice of the Surgeon General of the United States in 1862 cannot be so influential and persuasive as the voice of any of those who today recommend that this step be taken.

The Committee on Military Affairs asked the representatives of the Army, "Why do you need these men?" The reply was, "We need them now." That is all. Senators stand on the floor and talk of following the recommendations of those who are in charge of our soldiers in particular matters of this sort, and give as a reason only that they have been subjected to the acid test in submitting their opinion—their opinion—as to the necessity for drafting youths of 18 and 19 at this time.

I return to the statement of the Surgeon General of 1862:

In regard to the age at which recruits are received into service, a change is imperatively demanded, both for the interests of the Army and the welfare of the individuals. The minimum is now fixed at 18 years, and it is not uncommon to find soldiers 16 years old.

That will answer some of the queries which have been made by various Senators regarding the age of soldiers in the Civil War.

Youths of these ages are not developed and are not fit to endure the fatigues and privations of the military life. They soon break down, become sick, and are thrown upon the hospitals. As a measure of economy I recommend that the minimum age of recruits be fixed by law at 20 years.

Mr. President, different rules are adopted by various countries in connection with military service. In Australia men are called into the service by proclamation, operating under a general law. In that country they are taken by age groups, beginning with ages 22 to 25. In December 1940, 19-year-olds were called and on July 21, 1941, 18-year-olds.

In New Zealand on July 22, 1942, 18-year-old boys were called, but they are not sent overseas until they are 21. They are kept in camps and trained until they are 21. What an outrage it would be, Mr. President, if we should put into effect here, in the great United States, a law which would keep our young boys in camp until they have been trained. The Secretary of War with a snap of his fingers dismissed the idea of training them before sending them away. Such an idea never occurred to some of our military authorities.

In Canada men between the ages of 19 and 45 are subject to service, but Canada is actually calling men only 19 to 40 and only single men. Nineteen-year-old men were not called until about the end of last September, and Canada is not now taking 18-year-old boys.

Well we are going to take them. We are going to say to these youths, "Come on; your schooling is of no value; your home surroundings are of no consequence." There is no difference between taking these youths from their homes and their firesides and taking older men. They shall be taken, say the military authorities of the United States, and they shall be swept into the whirlpool of war. That is the end.

I have before me the debates in Parliament which have extended over 2 years in determining what should be done in Great Britain about this matter. A law was enacted yesterday in that country which will enable Great Britain, if they proceed in the manner they desire, to send their 18-year-olds to battle; but it will be found from the debates up to yesterday, acquiesced in by all parties, that youths of 18 should not be sent to battle. It is a pretty scene the Parliament presents when a member may ask an officer of the government any question he sees fit and the reply is made in good faith and in good faith the promise is kept.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. No doubt the Senator has noticed in the announcement of Mr. Bevin, Minister of Labor and National Service of Great Britain, "that the younger recruits now to be called up will not immediately be posted for service overseas, for which the minimum age remains 19."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; it is 19½. We will send our boys 18, of course, and Great Britain will send hers of 19½. So we have a splendid example of following along, and of the United States doing its duty in this war and enabling the war to be won.

In that regard we have an example that is a perfectly potent one, and I am very glad the Senator from Ohio called my attention to it.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Is it not possible that the area of all England, of all the British Isles, is at the moment a battleground much more dangerous, possibly, than the front-line trenches in France were twenty-some years ago? Therefore those who are 18, who are supposed to stay on English soil, are undoubtedly now in the front-line trenches. Also undoubtedly a million of the best of England's soldiers should be kept at home to defend that island, which we are at the moment using as an operating base.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not see what the question of the operating base has to do with the matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Frequently World War I is referred to as a sort of a skirmish, and it is said that World War No. 2 is the big battle. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota that World War I was so much more gruesome, so much more devastating in the number of those killed and wounded, as compared with this war, that it is almost like comparing the Spanish-American War with the Civil War. Outside the Russian-German front, there have been practically no large casualties in this war at all. Most of those who have been casualties have been captured. In the 8 or 10 or 12 months in which the Germans stormed Verdun during World War No. 1, while I do not remember the figures exactly, as I recall, some 800,000 men were either killed or seriously wounded. That offensive lasted for many, many weeks. The front-line trenches in World War No. 1 were not

safe. There were a few quiet sectors; but I am becoming a little bit fed up on hearing that World War No. 1 was merely a breeze. It was a terrific conflict, and there were 20,000,000 casualties in killed, wounded, missing, dead of disease, and dead as a consequence of the war before it was over. Therefore, nothing in this war remotely compares with what happened in the other war, but always the war one is in, the battle he is in, becomes the greatest battle of all history.

Mr. GURNEY. I believe that is correct, because the battle we are in is the one we have to win at the present moment in order to keep alive.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. GURNEY. But the territory of England itself, I am sure the Senator will admit, is the front-line trench at the present moment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I admit there is an element of danger; there is likely to be bombing, of course, but I would not compare that with a battlefield in any way at all. I would much rather stay in London and be bombed, and have a chance of getting into a dugout, than to be jumping out of a trench and going up a hill in an attack with a number of machine guns in concrete emplacements raking the hill. I think anyone else would feel the same way.

Mr. GURNEY. But the potentialities of our front lines in England now, at the moment, are such that most any minute or hour they might become the front-line trenches.

Mr. TYDINGS. But I do not think that is an answer to the remarks of the Senator from California when he said that England was not allowing her men to go into the front-line trenches until they were 19 years old, or at least England was not calling them and using them in the war. I do not think it is any answer to say that they are in the British Isles, and therefore they are at the front.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not true that the actual civilian casualties in England have far exceeded the Army casualties up to this time?

Mr. TYDINGS. I have not the figures; but I assume that is probably correct, especially if we eliminate the prisoners of war.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Do Senators remember how at first it was thought the only thing to be fought by us was a defensive war? Do they remember the changes that were rung upon that theme? We were fighting a defensive war. Everything was for defense. Everything done under the lease-lend law was done for defense.

Next we heard of an offensive war. Now we hear of a global war. So we have gone ahead until we have reached a global war. Tell me what it is, and I will define it for you.

At the time the lend-lease bill was under discussion, no living soul thought our boys would be sent to Africa, China, or all over the globe. No one mentioned a global war.

Some people grow soft when we talk of training, but what is training? It is perhaps necessary to train soldiers, but the purpose of training is to teach them to kill and to hate. Are we sure we are not Hitlerizing this country? Hitler showed his exact measurements when he sent his country's children to war. I do not want to follow him in such a course.

These are our children. What is to be their heritage if they are massacred? Unless we leave them to carry on, we shall have fought in vain. I ask Senators not to pin the badge of blood upon their souls. It will not come off. Remember, these are our children, and they have a right to their little span of life, to their little bit of happiness, just as we have had ours, and we should not do anything which would in any degree militate against them.

I do not want to keep talking about this matter all day, although I could do so. It is an infamous thing to take 18-year-old children and require them to do the work of men.

If we had only the days of our youth, if we could only take the place of these youngsters, how readily we would do so, how quick would be our response. How happy we would be if we could just take the place of these youngsters, 18 years of age, and adventurous. We are told that they are adventurous, that they are better fighters because they do not count the cost, nor do they think of themselves. They are our children, after all.

A Senator has a right to come upon this floor and say a word in behalf of children. It is a terrible thing to contemplate a committee sitting in their seats and being beautifully photographed. Oh, yes; they had their photographs taken and the photographs appeared in various newspapers. It was a beautiful thing for them. And to have a man in front of them, one of the gentlemen who presides over our destinies, militarily speaking, saying to them, "These youngsters of 18 years of age are the best troops in the world." They are not the best troops in the world. The record shows they are not and every authority bears that out. They are more adventurous, perhaps, and they will do things which older men will not do, but they are actuated solely by the peculiar love of adventure which is characteristic of youth. Therefore we should not accept the views of our military leaders in this regard.

Someone said the other day, "Oh, if we could only have a referendum." I should like to have him see the letters which come to me in reference to a referendum. I do not know who writes them. I was not known as an active participant in the debate, and yet letters are sent to me. The writers of them want to know if there is not some way in which some help may be given to fathers and to mothers, some little aid or thought which we could give to them. Must I reply to them, must other Senators, that we cannot give a thought to these boys of ours, that we cannot give a thought to them? Oh, we will send them off to the wars, and to the wars they will go.

I repeat what I said a moment ago, and I ask those who hear me to do me the honor to listen. What are we to do after we have sent these 18-year-old boys to war? What shall we do when we look for another generation to build up this country? We cannot, of course, afford to be whipped. We shall not be whipped. We will continue this war until we are successful in it, but what shall we do when the class of 18-year-old boys is brought into the war and boys of 18 no longer exist? How will we build up this country then? "Oh," it will be said, "that does not make any difference. We have built up 40 other countries, so that is all right."

Mr. President, I have much material that I could read to the Senate, but I realize that it is unnecessary; I realize that it is useless for me to attempt to read it. But I cannot understand this effort to take boys 18 years old. Mr. President, I cannot understand it. I insist that the proposal is wicked, wicked in its conception, wicked in its execution, wicked in every way. It is wicked to carry out the plan to take boys 18 years old. It is a wicked thing. More I could not say.

New Zealand has a draft law which provides for the drafting of children 18 years of age, but it provides that they shall not be sent out of the country and that they shall be dealt with as soldiers only after a year of preparation.

Why is the provision inserted in the New Zealand law that children 18 years of age shall not be sent out of the country? Of course, it is because of the necessity that nations must fight for the protection of their own people, and the people of New Zealand have had the audacity to submit such a proposal, and that law is now being carried out in New Zealand. But, O Mr. President, we could not do such a thing Oh, no; oh, no; it does not occur to us to adopt a rule that we shall fight only upon our own shores. No; that would be the most absurd thing that was ever heard of; and as for any man who would stand here on the floor and talk about fighting only upon our own shores—he is gone, he is gone, he is gone. Yes; that is the truth, and we recognize it to be the truth. Those who are so ready with names and so eager with epithets will use them to the utmost in denouncing one who takes such a stand.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. A moment ago the Senator spoke of the law in New Zealand with respect to 18-year-olds. Does the Senator know what the law is in Canada?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. It begins at 19.

Mr. WILLIS. Are those 19 years old in Canada under orders? That is, can they be taken out of the country?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; they can be taken out of the country at 19.

Mr. TAFT. No, Mr. President; my impression is, if the Senator will yield, that

in Canada no man can be sent out of the country unless he volunteers for that purpose. A referendum was taken authorizing the Government to go ahead on that basis, but the actual legislation, as I understand, has not actually been passed at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I was a little confused about that, and did not make a statement about it because of my confusion.

Mr. TAFT. I was in French Canada recently, and I know that they are not considering sending any of the men overseas at this time, except those who volunteer for overseas duty. Of course, there was criticism of the Prime Minister because he took the referendum vote, and then did not go ahead with the compulsory drafting of men for foreign service.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the question asked by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] was with respect to the limit placed on the ages of those drafted in Canada; and, as I understand, it is 19 years.

Mr. TAFT. I believe so.

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe that in one part of Canada, Quebec, the French part of Canada, there is some opposition to sending the men who are drafted out of the country, but I do not believe there is any national law which forbids sending men out of the country. I do not speak with knowledge of the fact. That is my impression.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is very strong opposition in Quebec to sending men out of the country.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the distinguished Senator from California. As I understand, he feels that if the 18-year-olds are taken they should first be given a year of training, and that there should be a statutory provision against removing them from continental United States? Is that substantially the Senator's position?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Substantially.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, recently a letter from several doctors was published in the New York Times. It was a letter protesting the drafting of youths. I presume the statement contained in the letter is familiar to all of us and need not be repeated by me. The letter is from certain gentlemen who profess to see great harm in the Army plan as it is now attempted to be pursued. They are medical men, professional men, and they give their professional opinion. Note how careful they are. They say in their letter:

Boys of 18 and 19 years of age are, in a large percentage of cases, emotionally immature. They have had fewer years in which to show clues to their instabilities and disqualifications. In fact, it is these particular years that have proved especially important in the evaluation of older groups. Consequently there is bound to be an undue proportion of unfit men taken into the service from the 18- and 19-year-olds and a much greater likelihood of mental break-down under stress than would be the case if they are permitted to develop until they are at least 20 years old.

The letter is signed by David Beck, M. D., Mount Sinai Hospital; Leland E. Hinsie, M. D., Columbia University Medical School; Gerald R. Jamieson, M. D., and George S. Stevenson, M. D., Medical Directors, National Committee for Mental Hygiene; Thomas V. Moore, M. D., Department of Psychology and Psychiatry, Catholic University of America; Frank J. O'Brien, M. D., Associate Superintendent of Schools, New York, and William L. Russell, M. D., New York State Psychiatric Institute and Hospital.

It is a very powerful statement. It enters into a discussion of the entire matter we are now considering. I do not like to take time to read the letter, but will submit it for printing in the RECORD as part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

[From the New York Times of October 16, 1942]

YOUTHFUL DRAFT PROTESTED—GROUP OF PHYSICIANS SEES GREAT HARM IN 18–19 ARMY PLAN

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Your readers are doubtless somewhat familiar with the contents of the bills that have been introduced in Congress which would amend the Selective Service Act to include 18- and 19-year-olds on the same basis as men of 20–45. This proposal raises a serious issue, on which many psychiatrists and other medical men will want to be heard before a decision is made.

We wish at the outset to make it crystal clear that it is not our purpose to obstruct in any way our Nation's war effort. We recognize the increasing pressures of war requirements, to which the President alluded so feelingly in his address to the Nation last Monday evening. Nevertheless, we should not be true to ourselves if we neglect to call attention to certain medical and social consequences that are involved in the indiscriminate drafting of this lower-age group. We are deeply concerned, from the medical point of view, with its effect both on the individual and on society.

Although the time may come when the drafting of this group will be unavoidable, we believe that they should be reserved as long as possible and employed on the farms and in other alternative service until they are absolutely required for combat service.

EMOTIONALLY IMMATURE

Boys of 18 and 19 years of age are, in a large percentage of cases, emotionally immature. They have had fewer years in which to show clues to their instabiliti and disqualifications. In fact, it is these particular years that have proved especially important in the evaluation of older groups. Consequently there is bound to be an undue proportion of unfit men taken into the service from the 18- and 19-year-olds and a much greater likelihood of mental break-down under stress than would be the case if they are permitted to develop until they are at least 20 years old.

When it is argued that they can be protected adequately by giving them more thorough medical examinations than older men get, and that these examinations shall include a psychiatric study, the answer is that this precaution is in reality not going to be taken. There was the same intention originally to make a thorough medical evaluation of the men admitted to the Army, but their examinations have become most hasty and inadequate, not by intent, but primarily because of the insufficient number of medical examiners available.

As a result of the lack of medical examiners the mental casualties are enormous. Military discretion prohibits our stating figures. More and more, as physicians leave their civilian posts, local facilities for examinations will be lessened. As we enter more extensive combat fewer qualified psychiatrists will be available at induction stations.

MILITARY IDEA DISPUTED

There is no sound basis for the claim that youth of this age make better soldiers. We say this without hesitation, even though we are not authorities in the military field. There is a very serious fault in the reasoning that has led to this conclusion. Presumably the conclusion grows out of the experience military leaders have had thus far with volunteers from these age groups. But actually our Army has not had experience with the sort of boys they would get in a draft. Their experience has been with volunteers only, the most matured part of this age group, as evidenced by their capacity to arrive at independent decisions and break ties with family and community. Some 18-year-olds are like 20, others more like 16. The draft of this age group will bring the whole range into the Army. The more immature will find themselves in a terrible situation, and so will the Army. The Army has had experience only with a small percentage of this age group. Our conclusions as medical men are based upon knowledge of the 2,000,000 or more which trail them.

NAZI PLAN NOT FOR US

One of the arguments for the immediate drafting of this lower age group will be that Germany considers this group valuable from a military viewpoint—even down to the age of 16. We should remember, however, that there is a difference between the boy of this age in Germany and the boy of this age in the United States. Our adversaries, the Fascists, find the drafting of youth quite harmonious with their purposes, for it prepares youth to fit in with their philosophy. The aim of the German system has been to mature—or premature—the youth at an early age to equip them physically through hard labor and mentally through early regimentation for army life and combat service. This is in marked contrast with the preparation which our youth have had.

Even England, which has been pressed to the wall in the search for manpower, does not treat her 18- and 19-year-olds with the lack of discrimination which is proposed in the bills now before Congress. While all men in England are registered at 18, they are not called for military service until 6 months later. Then they are given a thorough physical examination, and if they pass they are permitted to join the branch of service they prefer or, if highly skilled, they may be ordered back to the jobs they have left. If they do not pass their physical examinations, they may be given some sedentary job with the armed forces or, if needed in agriculture, may be allocated to a farm.

In other words, England, in spite of greater pressure for manpower than we have yet felt, treats its 18-year-olds differently, at least, from the way it deals with other draftees. The bills before us make no discrimination between the age groups.

Looking at the problem from the standpoint of society, the fact should be remembered that the years between 18 and 20 are years when young men are finding themselves, emancipating themselves, developing personal strength by being on their own. If this proposal to draft the youths is carried out, they will step out of the state of dependence on their parents to a state of dependence on an authoritarian organization, the Army, and,

following the war, they will have no pattern of individual civilian responsibility to return to as a guide to their future living. They will be the best sort of material for the support of a totalitarian ideology, but not for the democracy for which they have fought. In our anxiety to win the war we must not lose sight of the necessity of creating a free world after the war.

FATHERS SIMPLER PROBLEM

We believe we have given full consideration to the fact that it is a great hardship for a child to be deprived of his father or a wife of her husband, but we regard even this as not so serious as subjecting the 18- and 19-year-old group prematurely to combat experience. It seems to us that this age group is our most important reserve of manpower and should be safeguarded to the last. If the Government is preparing for a long war, they might be placed in a quasi-military status now and conscripted for military service later. If it proves to be a short war, they will be equally needed in building the post-war world.

Should not such alternatives be considered, therefore, as will prepare them physically and emotionally for later service? Many of them should be given all possible opportunity to complete the technical and professional training that will replenish the Nation's exhausted skills for use both in the war and in the post-war period. This kind of training is particularly applicable to the boy with city background and to the boy who would normally go to college.

Many others with agriculture backgrounds are going to be needed on farms, from which they can pass into military life far better qualified for rendering useful service than they otherwise would have been.

We would particularly protest against conscripting this age group for combat service merely because it seems to be the line of least resistance or because they in their ignorance and inexperience will be more reckless soldiers than older men. We shall have a large enough proportion of mentally broken men from the older groups without unnecessarily ruining these youths.

Summing up our argument, it is our best judgment that the 18-19-year-olds must be regarded as our national reserve, and therefore as the last to be conscripted for military service; that drafting them now would be fraught with serious hazards to the Army, to the youths themselves, and to the future welfare of our country.

DAVID BECK, M. D.,
Mount Sinai Hospital.
LELAND E. HINSIE, M. D.,
Columbia University Medical School.
GERALD R. JAMIESON, M. D.,
GEORGE S. STEVENSON, M. D.,
Medical Directors, National Committee for Mental Hygiene.
THOMAS V. MOORE, M. D.,
Department of Psychology and Psychiatry, Catholic University of America.
FRANK J. O'BRIEN, M. D.,
Associate Superintendent of Schools, New York.
WILLIAM L. RUSSELL, M. D.,
New York State Psychiatric Institute and Hospital.
NEW YORK, *October 14, 1942.*

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, the arguments made by the distinguished gentlemen who advocate the taking of these younger classes would seem to give an appearance of verisimilitude to a bald and unconvincing statement of fact. That is the nearest approach I can think of at the moment to a real definition of the arguments which have been made. Gentlemen came before the Military Affairs Committee and hypnotized its members—pardon the remark. They were asked:

"Do you want this proposal made a part of the law?

"Yes, sir.

"Is it imperatively necessary?

"Yes, sir."

That was all. Thereupon it was unanimously decreed. Did it not occur to any of the committee at any time that there might be some Member of this body who had sufficient sympathy to speak for little boys? Did it not occur to the committee that there might be some Member of the older tribe who would speak a word for lads? It did not occur to anybody. No one was given any time. So it was decreed that 18 years should be the minimum age for the draft.

Youth, O youth! There is only one time in our lives when we can feel it. We have all experienced the happiness of youth. We have all loved the youth that dared great things in its ambition and love of adventure. Youth gives us a little of the love of life which is in our young. Youth comes along with us day in and day out, year in and year out, as we tug at its hand and as it walks by our side. Youth is everything to us. It is youth that we pray for in this particular time.

Do what you please, Senators. You may take the youth of the land and throw it to the dogs. You may do with it whatever you see fit. Some of us pray for youth, and beg you to pay a little heed to its cry and its interest. That is all. It is youth that we plead for. It has gone from me. It has gone from many who are here. It is gone forever, but the recollections of it are the keenest and most ardent we can have. Youth is everything. We are told that we must take youth and give it to the arbitrament of war. Give it some other opportunity than merely to die. That is all I ask. Give youth an opportunity, and youth will always pay back a thousandfold what we do for it.

Mr. GILLETTE obtained the floor.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska if he merely wishes to make a brief statement.

Mr. NORRIS. I was about to offer an amendment. For that purpose I probably should have the floor in my own right.

Mr. GILLETTE. I shall not consume more than 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. President, the Senate did a very unusual thing—and in my opinion a very improper thing—in agreeing to the motion of the distinguished majority leader to refer the Lee amendment to one of the standing committees of the Senate. I have no intention of reopening the subject matter of the Lee amendment to discuss its merits or demerits. Neither do I intend to move for a reconsideration of the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Kentucky was agreed to.

Nothing I shall say will be in criticism of the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Kentucky, or the Parliamentarian of this body.

There is no element in representative government which ought to be more jealously guarded than the right of amendment of a pending proposal. When the right of amendment is destroyed, the very heart of parliamentary action is destroyed. The action taken yesterday did exactly that. I admit that I am to be criticized because I was not alert. I did not reach the Chamber until about the time the roll call started, or I should have raised a point of order.

The Lee amendment, or any amendment of that kind, has no substance, no being, and no excuse for being, except for consideration in connection with the proposal which it seeks to modify. In this body we do not raise the question of germaneness. When an amendment is presented by a Member of the Senate to a pending proposal he has the right to have it considered in connection with the proposal. In my opinion no more destructive action can be taken than to take an amendment away from the substantive proposal which it seeks to modify, and refer it to one of the committees of the Senate, even with instructions to bring it back as a separate bill.

Many amendments which are proposed could be made the subject matter of separate bills if the Senators sponsoring them chose to do so; but the Senator from Oklahoma sought to have his amendment considered in connection with the conditions surrounding the service of 18- and 19-year-old men. To prevent its consideration and deprive him of the right to have his amendment acted on is to establish a precedent which might enable the Senate to consider a motion to send to some committee any amendment which might be offered to a pending proposal, thus depriving the sponsoring Senator of the right to have it considered in connection with the measure to which it is offered.

As I say, I have no intention of moving to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from Kentucky was agreed to. I was not present in time to raise the point of order; but I did not want the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to show an account of a proceeding which could be pointed to in the future as a precedent to sustain the action of a parliamentary body in depriving members of the body of their right to present amendments and have them considered in connection with the pending proposal. Such action would destroy what I believe to be a fundamental of parliamentary rule as applied to representative government.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I propose. I wish to read it. The amendment would add a new section to the bill, section 5. It reads as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the sending of troops inducted into military service by this act into combat service who are less than 19 years of age unless such troops have had at least 1 year of training.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). The amendment of the Senator is not in order at this time.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood that the committee amendments had already been acted upon. I am informed that I am in error about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments have not been acted upon.

Mr. NORRIS. So my amendment is not in order at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first branch of the committee amendment, on page 2, after line 18, being subsection (i) of section 4.

CORPORAL WILLKIE AND PRIVATE LUCE LAY DOWN THE STRATEGY

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I hesitate to take a moment when the Senate is pressing for final consideration of the proposal to draft 18- and 19-year-old boys; yet I know of no other time which might be mine. A little later I shall desire to address myself briefly to the pending subject. For the moment I am departing entirely from it, in order that I may address myself to another subject, which it seems to me is as challenging as any before us.

Mr. President, Wendell Willkie may have had a great many votes recorded for him in 1940; but I hope the world, and particularly our allies, realize how largely these votes were not so much votes for Willkie as they were votes against an order, votes against a cause, and that Willkie got those votes in spite of himself. Life magazine to the contrary notwithstanding, Mr. Willkie does not speak for too many Americans. If he made his recent trip abroad as a special-delivery-letter messenger, let it be said that there are numberless Americans, including many who voted for him, who will protest his being paid more than the standard 10 cents special-delivery fee which prevails for service of this kind.

Like many others, I feel that it was a grievous blunder to have sent Corporal Willkie abroad or to have let him go with any seeming authority. Our allies and our enemies perhaps do not know the Corporal as we do. We know he loves to talk, even when he says things he does not mean. He has a quaint way, a way hitherto unknown to men who have honorably aspired to the Presidency of the United State—a quaint way of explaining his free talk when it catches up with him. He merely says, as he once said to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, "It was a bit of campaign oratory." After all, in Moscow, Chungking, and London, in Tokyo, Rome, and Berlin, they might not understand the Willkie baloney, however prominent might be the campaign oratory label upon it.

Then, too, let us hope that abroad they are not taking Private Henry Luce too seriously, even though he is the publisher of Life, the March of Time, and another publication or two.

He is one of the boys and girls who helped make Willkie look like Presidential timber for a time. He was a prime figure, long before Pearl Harbor, in selling America the notion that Britain was fighting our war, that it was our job to fight the things, including Hitler, among other things, that were making life difficult for Britain. Now in his Life magazine of October 12, the same Luce, pretending to "speak for a large portion of our 134,000,000 fellow citizens," threatens the people of England with our withdrawal from the war unless England changes her cause and makes her cause different from our cause in this war. Definitely, Mr. Luce and Life, combined or separately, do not speak for a large portion of the American people when they contribute to the break-down or injury of the unity of our country and our allies in the prosecution of the cause which holds our very existence as a nation in its lap.

The quicker our allies and our enemies know these Willkie and Luce birds, the quicker will they understand that their scolding and their screaming does not emanate from the American eagle. It seems to me that we should cause both allies and foes to know that there is unity here in America; that the Willkies, the Luces, and the Winchells may spout their very heads off and not destroy the unity to win which exists here and which we want continuous sharing of by our allies. Let those self-exaggerated individuals do what they will, our allies should be made to know that we are a patient 134,000,000 of people who did not all let themselves in on the Willkie-Luce-Winchell seeming theory that we could whip the world in 6 days and spend every night of that week enjoying the dangerous explosions and sharp, rifle-like reports emanating from photographers' light bulbs and forced champagne bottle corks in the famous halls of Stork clubs.

Frankly, we ought to let England know that the campaign oratory disciple, the publisher with the exaggerated opinion of himself, and the keyhole artist do not reflect American opinion when they make their effort seem to indicate that we are not united here at home, that we demand a second front before we can make it last and count in winning the war, or that we are demanding of England something other than a continual helping hand in this titanic task of preserving our lives as nations.

Mr. Luce, in writing his Life editorial, addressed to the people of England, has committed an act fraught with more trouble than all that the fifth columnists in the land afford. Berlin and Tokyo glow in the opportunity the editorial has afforded them to sell to their people their propaganda of a split in the Allied cause. The editorial has not helped to win any new or better understanding in the land of that ally whose cooperation is so essential to our success in these dark and difficult hours.

With our country at war with the mightiest foes we have ever had to face, a mighty one to the east and a mightier one to the west; with our country struggling with difficult production problems, agriculturally and industrially, with a threat of a new and modern draft of the whole manpower of the Nation that could reach every individual in our land; with a prospect that by July next there will be 300,000 of the smaller business enterprises dead, as prophesied by Wayne Taylor of the Commerce Department; with a burden of tax greater than ever before, a tax going even to the individual with so little income as $12 per week; with the great prospect that our own Government will be reaching into the high schools and colleges for the boys to be sent across oceans to fight brutal foes; with our country facing complete reformation of our economy, and, if not bankruptcy, then a per capita debt of $1,500, $3,000 or more upon every man, woman, and child in America; with an annual governmental expenditure already greater than the total expenditure by our Government from 1789 to 1933; with our own American way challenged by a system that already has over 2,000,000 people, exclusive of the numbers of fighters in the Army and Navy, upon the Federal pay roll, and with a civilian pay roll of 1,100,000 people in the War Department that costs more than does the pay roll of the entire Army; with our very life as a nation depending upon ability to deny victory to the Axis Powers—with all these challenges at our door, I submit that this is definitely not the time to be making the slightest degree of war against such Allies as we have and desperately need. Yet, there are those who bear reputations of American leadership, who have played a part in shaping American policy, who have a large hearing however small their following—there are those who are harshly criticizing, severely prodding, bluntly and ungenerously threatening an ally in a way that could destroy their will to win with us, in a way that could force that ally to question our good faith in this war effort. In spite of our precarious position, there are those who seem to have been quick to forget what they once preached concerning how largely our future was dependent upon the continued effort of this ally.

Take a look at the Life editorial of which I speak, an editorial which seems to speak for Mr. Willkie as well as its writer, Mr. Luce. Says Mr. Luce in the editorial addressed as an open letter to the people of England:

> We assure you that we do speak for a large portion of our 134,000,000 fellow citizens. * * * If your strategists are planning a war to hold the British Empire together, they will * * * find themselves strategizing all alone. Take this matter of the second front. * * * It does seem to be most dreadfully urgent. * * * Before he left on his present trip, Wendell Willkie had refused to commit himself on the second front. But after he had * * * talked to Josef Stalin * * * he did commit himself and even urged us to "prod" our experts. From a United Nations standpoint it begins to look as if there should have been a second front long ago.

Nice going, is it not, for those two great strategists, those two great military experts, Willkie and Luce. But that was not all. Mr. Luce further says in his editorial:

> So here is one concrete concession that we demand of you. Quit fighting a war to hold the Empire together and join with us and Russia and your other allies to fight a war to win by whatever strategy is best for all of us. * * * If you cling to the Empire at the expense of a United Nations victory you will lose the war. Because you will lose us.

Let us try to analyze all that scolding. When, Mr. Luce, was there any considerable American thought, before or after Pearl Harbor, before or after we became a British ally, that Britain was not fighting to save her empire? There was never any secret about that. You who

held brief for the British long before we got into this war did tell us there were some additional causes for which Britain fought, but you never maintained that the British were ready to abandon their empire.

And, Mr. Luce, what is so unreasonable and so unexpected about a British desire to maintain her empire? Certainly if she keeps her empire, Britain will have helped us to win the war in order to keep it, will she not? Britain trying to save herself, her empire. Why, Mr. Luce, is that any different than our own will and desire to save our own country from the Axis? Why do you expect the English to approach this war task in any different manner or for any different purpose than those that move us? Britain fights for her life, just as America fights for her life.

Let us analyze the Luce-Willkie play as represented by the editorial in question. We can forget that line about Willkie urging Life to prod our experts. That is expected of those who work as closely together as Luce and Willkie have worked. But we cannot forget the heartless, bitter thing that might be produced by these prodding pretenders.

We have trained men, and Britain has trained men, men who chose and consented to make it their business to know how to win wars, how to make blows count, how to bring victory with least waste of lives and fortunes.

We all are impatient for that hour which will bring victories. But you, Mr. Luce, and you, Mr. Willkie, have no faith in those military leaders in whose hands the present terrible task is placed. You seem to think that you know how a war ought to be fought and won. You would prod these leaders to the use of these 18- and 19-year-old boys in an awful adventure before they, the leaders, knew they were ready. You would prod them into perhaps another Dunkerque, or another Dieppe just because one of you had been delegated to carry a message to Moscow and Chungking. You would not even think of counseling with the fine Canadian fathers and mothers, who might have something to say about another Dieppe. Great generals, you two.

The Willkie-Luce challenge ought to have angered our allies, as it did; and it ought to anger everyone of us who has any responsibility in the conduct of the war. May God and the fathers, mothers, sons, and daughters of both America and Britain have mercy upon such as would succeed in prodding our military leaders and strategists into pouring lives onto a futile second front one second before such a move can win, and a blow can be struck that can be made really to count. Where, oh where, is the conscience of men, uneducated in military planning, who would take so vital a responsibility out of the hands of trained, courageous military leaders, and themselves determine the course that could be the bloodiest and at the same time the most futile move in all the history of the world? What is to be said of the responsibility of men who would seem to say to the people of England "Now you open a second front or we Americans quit." That is what the Life editorial seemed to say.

The editorial said more than that. It said in effect that we did not have enough second fronts now, with American boys fighting, bleeding, and dying on fronts farther from home than we have ever previously sent American fighters. Do not stop to know how adequately prepared we are for more fronts; let us have another! That seems to be the tenor of the Life editorial, obviously inspired by that "great" campaign orator Wendell Willkie.

Let others speak up! Leave no reason for the English and for our American military leaders to believe that this Life editorial speaks for the American people. In their leadership we place our confidence. With them we want no more second fronts until we are prepared to make the blows these boys of ours strike fully worth every sacrifice called for. No son ought to be asked to offer the supreme sacrifice until there is far better preparation for the battle than prevailed at certain European fronts or than was had for at least a time on the Pacific front where our men have died and our ships have been sunk while the brave fought for time, to the end that others might be made better prepared for the mighty and we hope final blows to be struck.

It is so easy to sit in the gallery of scolds, where sit Willkie and Luce, telling our own generals and our allies without further delay, to send more Australians, more South Africans, more of our own neighbor Canadians, more of British sons to more of such slaughter as they have already suffered. But for my part I am ready to let our ally, Britain, have the full benefit of every doubt, give them credit for perhaps concentrating allied forces and making ready to strike a solid blow rather than splitting and spreading themselves so thinly upon many fronts that they cannot hope to be truly effective anywhere. We ought to have learned by this time the great disadvantage of spreading as thinly as we did our limited forces around the face of the globe and not being prepared to strike as forcefully anywhere as we shall do when men and machines are ready in larger numbers.

Mr. President, some would put me in the light of a pretender for what I say today. My utterances will be represented as those of a hypocrite seeking to get onto what he believes is a popular wagon. I lay no claim to having been other than a sincere critic of an alliance for our country in this war. Until Britain became our ally last December, I criticized British purpose, her empire building, her distance from the things her spokesmen preached as causes for the purpose of inviting our cooperation in another war. I wanted to keep our country out of the awful tide which now engulfs the world. I shall probably criticize Britain again when we are free to plan and shape our place in a world that shall have finished with this war. I do not like empires. I do not like the idea of permanent union with empires; but since we became allied with Britain, in the cause of saving our own country and others from Axis domination, I have wanted only to aid Britain because aid for her was aid for ourselves in the most difficult and critical cause ever faced by my country. The Luce-Willkie policy, on the other hand, seems now to have been that of praising and helping Britain before we became her ally, and condemning and prodding her after accomplishing our alliance with her.

I am frankly angered by the kind of pranks we see played by the Luces. They did not like noninterventionists—isolationists they called us. They placed us in the worst possible light their publications would permit, because we wanted to alliance with Europe and her jealousies and hates. But, having witnessed the abandonment of nonintervention, and our country having become involved in the most terrible war of all time, now come the same Luces with attacks upon those whose alliance we must have if we are to endure and save our own American face. Who could be other than angry? I but hope our ally will not believe that Luce reflects American thought in his effort to undermine that ally.

During the campaign—some called it a crusade—of 1940 and 1941, when we were putting all our eggs in or taking all our eggs out of intervention or nonintervention baskets, representations were sometimes made which in the light of later developments appear to have been poorly founded. I know that developments have made some of my own representations appear in that light. I gladly acknowledge this, though insisting that on the whole my contentions offered in support of a policy less challenging than the one our country pursued are not without large substantiation through day by day experiences.

But these things are hardly of consequence today, when we have on our hands the very positive obligation of winning this war. It definitely is not the time to be throwing "I told you so's" in this or the international arena. Nor is it the time to be reflecting upon our allies. Whatever we may have thought and said of our allies-to-be prior to last December, today they are a part and parcel of our own cause, the most critical cause of all time. If ever we needed allies, that time is now. For that reason, I resent the attitude of some presumably responsible Americans who would now jeopardize our own security by damning our allies.

I said time and again before our involvement that the war then being fought in Europe, Asia, and Africa was not our war, and that the preservation of the British Empire was in no sense our task. I offer no apology for such utterances. Were we not involved in the war, I would still be saying these things which I felt highly justified. But, for the life of me, I cannot appreciate the advantage or good sense of even intimating these thoughts, as Henry Luce and his Life magazine have done, in an hour when we know this war is ours, in a time when certainly the preservation of the British Empire in the minds of some of our allies is quite as important a cause as is the cause of preserving America in our American minds.

I have said upon many occasions that if we got into this war we could expect our allies would take every possible ad-

vantage of our alliance, place every possible burden upon us. But this is not the time to be attacking our allies with charges of bad faith and cowardice, and giving the enemy the chance to build home morale through the "break among the Allies," as represented by the great Luce and the self-appointed generalissimo of the great minority party.

Surely I said as early as August 10, 1937, here on the Senate floor, that if we did not put a stop to the business of sending scrap iron to Japan we would one day find ourselves sending our sons into the Pacific to collect this scrap in their own bodies for return for American burial. But I would resent it if any of our allies were now to charge my country with bad faith because of that. Our allies, not even China, are not so charging, because I expect they realize that all of us have just one job to do—a job that is not going to be other than jeopardized if we permit ourselves to be involved in interallied skirmishes. Why do not such spokesmen as Luce practice toward our allies what we expect them to practice toward us?

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in my remarks at this point an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post entitled "Japan Needed No Agents."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). Is there objection?

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

[From the Saturday Evening Post of October 17, 1942]

JAPAN NEEDED NO AGENTS

A few weeks ago the FBI tossed out a dragnet and hauled in two bizarre characters charged with acting as Japanese agents without registering as such with the State Department—all this, of course, before Pearl Harbor. One of their assignments was to buy the moribund Living Age as a means of distributing articles favorable to Japan.

Since the men were paid by the Japanese, it is obvious that they should have registered as agents. But, now that it is not unneutral to bring it up, attention might profitably be directed to the aid given, entirely within the law, to Japan in ways far more profitable to that aggressive nation than anything that seems to have been accomplished by the two journalists mentioned above. Shipments of oil, scrap iron, planes, and machine tools continued when it should have been obvious that Japanese policy toward China was certain to lead to war.

More unpleasant to recall is the fact that, when the State Department finally got round to a "moral embargo" on war planes, American designers and engineers were sent to Japan to instruct Japanese manufacturers in the art of making war planes. As Ray Cromley put it in the Wall Street Journal recently, "It is probably not far from the truth to say that every airplane which Japan has on the front lines today was produced in part—and a critical part at that—with the aid of American machine tools" and "under the supervision of American engineers." A year before the war, Mr. Cromley reports, a Japanese businessman told him that Japan's aviation industry was dependent on American machine tools. That was more than a year after Japan had broken off the commercial treaty of 1911 with the United States, 2 years after Mr. Hull had warned American manufacturers to cease supplying Japan with weapons.

All this is water over the dam, and the subject is mentioned merely to remind us that the humanitarians and friends of China who protested the arming of Japan from American resources were not such crackpots as they were thought to be. In those days Japan needed no agents, registered or otherwise. She was doing quite well with the constituted authorities.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, before we were allied in this war I said the British were largely responsible for the war, quoted British leaders like Lord Lothian as my authority for such declarations. But in this war, so directly involving the survival of our own country, I am not pulling a "Luce" and fighting an ally so essential to our success as is Britain.

Before America became involved in this war I entertained sincerest conviction that we were in no degree dependent upon Britain or her Navy if we but provided our country with the modern defensive weapons. I quoted freely men who were saying: "The whole business of invasion across the sea against ample land-based air power no longer is in the book of possibilities; the bomber has made the American coast impregnable to invasion," as Lt. Col. Thomas R. Phillips expressed it in the publication Army Ordnance. But with our energies spread over the entire globe, with war on many fronts far from our shores, I am hardly so dumb as to feel that we can do the job now before us and alone save our own shores without allied help, at least on distant fronts.

Oh, yes; I freely criticized Britain for the play that moved us into the preceding war. I marshaled and portrayed the parts played by the British Vickers Co., the boasting of Churchill on what would happen if only America could be made to shed a bit of blood on fields of battle. I did all in my power to avoid affiliation by America in more foreign wars, and helped develop the sordid story of munitions companies and profit appetites getting the world to war—a story so complete that President Roosevelt was once caused to say in a message to Congress:

The private and uncontrolled manufacture of arms and munitions, and the traffic therein has become a serious source of international discord and strife. * * * This grave menace to the peace of the world is due in no small measure to the uncontrolled activities of the manufacturers and merchants of engines of destruction.

But I cannot be so magnificent a dunderhead as to ignore the utter need for the highest degree of unity among the Allied Nations in this hour, a unity hardly attained by the kind of blowing the Willkies and the Luces are affording.

To be sure, before we were in the war I fought and voted against what I thought was the madness of the gigantic appropriations being asked for the huge battleships. There would be some cause for my going back now to those votes and justifying them, in light of late decisions dictated by the experience of this war against the continued building of the big ships. But that kind of action wins no wars. I have been ready to abandon that whole argument while my country was fighting for its life. Mr. Luce would open new avenues for controversy and keep pulling on strings of disharmony.

Today there are those—and they have not been discouraged or hindered by Mr. Willkie or Mr. Luce—who would have our allies believe that we Americans were a frightfully divided people, with the leaders of the pre-war nonintervention cause playing to, and hoping for, a Nazi victory, riding with and encouraging the bund. The fact that I, 4 and 5 years ago, sought for legislation that would put the bund out of business does not enter into their consideration when this willful crowd sets out to prevent the attainment of unity. Yet that same crowd, not content with its stirring of disunity at home, reaches out to stir disunity among our allies.

I, too, may and do believe that the British make a terrible mistake when they fail to recognize the claims of India, but I am not slyly suggesting to England that if she does not do thus and so about India, the people of America are going to quit the war and leave our allies out on a limb.

I urged and helped to write the laws of neutrality while the move was popular, while the administration was for it, at a time when there could be cool deliberation. And then, in hours of less will to deliberate, hours when passion and hate were being tossed at us by the Luces, then bent upon getting us in the war, in hours when neutrality was being made unpopular by reason of failure to invoke the laws, I stood by and fought every play to wear away these laws intended to help us keep out of war. I fought the lifting of the arms embargo, the destruction of the cash-and-carry feature of the law, the whittling here and there of the law, and finally the lend-lease play, and the outright repeal of whatever remained of the law of neutrality. I charged British agents and British propaganda with responsibility in part for the destruction of these laws, written in sober days when we dared to do things for our own country and its future. I did these things because I wanted to keep my country out of another war if there were ways of doing it. The Luces and the Willkies thought such a course criminal, unpatriotic, un-American, dictated by hatred of Britain. But with the coming of war to us, with our alliance with Britain in a common cause of self-preservation and victory, I was ready to forget all about why neutrality failed and who contributed to its failure. Luce, on the other hand, who in those days of undertaken neutrality was telling us Britain was fighting our war, now attacks Britain, our ally, when allies are scarce, to say the least. Luce no longer is ready to hold that Britain might be fighting our war.

I fought, before we were at war, the Union Now propaganda, the motion-picture propaganda, and the control of the picture industry by foreign-born executives. I fought every influence that was striving to take us to war. Luce and his Life and Time magazines were then attacking me and all others engaged in like purpose, charging sabotage and pro-Axis sympathies to one and all who would not come all out for Fngland.

With our entry into the war we saw that these things were no longer to be an influence in our thinking if we were to win the war, and gladly abandoned any and all solicitation on the subjects. Luce and his magazines, on the other hand, seem bent now upon doing what they can to reflect upon such allies as we have and need in the gigantic task before us.

For no reason would I strive to dodge responsibility for the fact that I carried my opposition to involvement in the war up to the very moment of our being brought into it on December 7. On that afternoon I was addressing an America First rally at Pittsburgh, had been speaking of how diligently some people and forces had been striving to get us into the war, and was in the midst of recounting how Liddell Hart and other British authorities had published the word that perhaps the only way they, the British, could get us into another European war was through a war with Japan, when a newspaperman laid before me the slip I hold in my hand, with the message scrawled upon it:

> The Japanese Imperial Government in Tokyo at 4 p. m. announced a state of war against the United States and Great Britain.

A reporter, and Mr. Luce's Time magazine, afforded the falsest kind of report of this meeting and my own part in it. I did not even fight that report as published, we had a bigger job before us. But Mr. Luce now does not think the job so large that we cannot do it alone if necessary, and he goes forward now jabbing and prodding our allies, at a time when the great portion of Americans are not caring how we got into this thing, caring only that we, plus our allies, can get out of it with credit and honor to ourselves.

What is this Willkie-Luce-Winchell combination up to, anyway? Are they just plain blind? Or are they playing with a troublous mind that finds them remembering how they preached about the ease with which we could bring order to the world if only America would pitch her might into the British cause? Do they seek to justify that position, now that the task is proven less simple than they thought, by charging shortcomings to our allies and our military leaders? They would do the allied cause a great service if they would settle down to their normal operation, as in Willkie's case, of running after-election inheritances of banking, moving picture, insurance, and shipbuilding positions.

It would seem to me that there was plenty for us Americans to be doing here at home in putting our ship in shape to win this war; so much, in fact, that we could well afford to refrain from practices toward our allies so harsh as to invite their bitter anger. There is plenty to do here at home, plenty of room, especially for those critics who once thought our hand in this war would end it in a day, wipe out Tokyo in 20 minutes. Let those critics devote their energies to the manpower problem, a problem which was overlooked when they contemplated our entry in the war, a problem involving a war which needs twice as great a population as we have, according to some spoken plans. There are plenty of problems here at home. Let Mr. Willkie, for example, as an executive of a great moving-picture production firm, give a little of his energy to determining just how the movie and radio stars are being treated under the draft.

Maybe this is not the place to speak of it, but it should be noted that great effort is being extended to win a deferred status for certain stars. Here is Kay Kyser, for example, a great leader of a great band, explaining that his Government needs him more in his task of entertaining, and selling bonds, than in the military ranks. All of which may be quite true, but it does not seem to be the Government that initiated keeping Kyser at home. A theatrical bocking agency office in Hollywood on August 31 received from Mr. C. J. La Roche, its New York agent, a long teletype message telling of how it had already handled a list of stars, including Kay Kyser. In addition to smugly claiming responsibility for the classification of Kyser and others as being more essential at home, that agency recited others of their clients for whom a like classification was being sought.

Mr. President, I have no war with Mr. Kyser. He may have, and probably does have, every cause on his side. But I do object to the obviously organized effort by pressure groups to bring preferred status to artists.

Returning now to a conclusion of the subject matter I was dealing with, I wish to say only that I hold no brief for other than a united front on the part of the allied cause. I want no stone placed in the path of those in whose hands rests the responsibility for the war's conduct. Both President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill have asserted that decision in the conduct of the war is placed with trained military leaders who have made conduct of war their life-long business. The Luces and Willkies ought to be made to know that their campaign oratory is not the kind of ammunition these military leaders need, however explosive their words may sometimes appear to be The Luces and the Willkies should be stopped from making any seeming charge that these Allied military leaders are lacking in courage or associated with cowardice. Do Mr. Luce and Mr. Willkie count themselves better qualified than the military leaders to determine the ability, the readiness, and the strategy of our forces in the military field? Men are bound to be accused of rotten bad faith when they deal loosely with spoken and printed words at a time like this. I for one resent the audacity which has invited the strong resentment of the English people toward not only Mr. Luce and the magazine Life, but toward the American people for whom Mr. Luce pretends to speak.

We win or we lose this war together, we Allies. We will never win it by tearing at our allies and seeking to hurry them or to prod them and our own leaders, before we are, in the estimation of those leaders, ready, fully ready, to make our costly blows count. We swim together or we sink together. The Luces and the Willkies would seem to be trying to destroy the only chance we have to win. If there is no way for democracy to muzzle them, then at least those who will can make it clear that they are not speaking for all of us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first branch of the committee amendment beginning in line 19, page 2.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Austin	Green	Reed
Bailey	Guffey	Reynolds
Ball	Gurney	Rosier
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Shipstead
Bone	Hill	Smathers
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bulow	La Follette	Spencer
Bunker	Langer	Taft
Burton	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tobey
Caraway	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McNary	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Van Nuys
Connally	Mead	Wagner
Danaher	Murdock	Wallgren
Davis	Norris	Walsh
Downey	Nye	Wheeler
Doxey	O'Daniel	White
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Wiley
George	Overton	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the first branch of the amendment.

The first branch of the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the second branch of the committee amendment, on page 3, after line 2, being subsection (j) of section 4.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this branch of the committee amendment refers to the liability for training and service of persons convicted of crime. It reads as follows:

> No individual shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this act, or held not to be acceptable to the land or naval forces for such training and service, solely on the ground of his having been convicted of any crime which is not a felony at common law, if the local board having jurisdiction determines that such individual is, notwithstanding such conviction, morally fit for military service.

It will be noted from the language of the amendment that it eliminates only those persons who have been convicted of a felony at common law. Consequently, many statutory felonies are not excluded. Some examples of these are embezzlement, forgery, kidnapping, and traffic in and use of narcotics. It is believed by the War Department that persons convicted of these and other statutory felonies should not at this time be included as a class made mandatory for acceptance for military service. Inasmuch as the present legislation involves military employment of young men 18 and 19 years of age, it is believed that the War Department should not be required by statute to accept persons convicted of statutory felonies until after

careful examination has been made of the facts in each case. Although the proposed amendment qualifies the acceptance by placing the determination in the local board to see that the individual is morally fit for military service, it is believed more appropriate to eliminate from consideration any person who has been convicted of a felony denounced by statute. The War Department recommends, therefore, that the amendment be changed to read in accordance with the wording which I have already given to the clerk, and which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of subsection (j) of section 4 it is proposed to insert the following:

(j) No individual shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this act, or held not to be acceptable to the land or naval forces for such training and service, solely on the ground of his having been convicted of any crime which may not be punishable by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year, if the local board having jurisdiction determines that such individual is, notwithstanding such conviction, morally fit for military service.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I am rather curious about one aspect of this question. It probably has no immediate bearing on the question at issue, but suppose a man were serving a sentence of 2 or 3 years. It the amendment covers such a case what would happen to the sentence legally? Would it be in abeyance or suspended? Suppose a man were released from the penitentiary and served in the Army. What would happen when he got out of the Army? Would it be necessary to make some provision in the statute for a resumption of the sentence, or would the suggested provision automatically parole him or pardon him? What would happen to him?

Mr. GURNEY. It would not automatically parole or pardon him. It does not go into that matter at all. If the Senator will look closely he will see that discretionary powers would still be left with the local board.

Mr. BONE. Would the local board have the power to say to the man, "When you come out of the Army, if you come out alive, you will then finish the remainder of your sentence."

Mr. GURNEY. It is not so written in the language.

Mr. BONE. I am wondering what the law in such a case would be.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not think that a prisoner serving a sentence of more than a year is within the reach of this proposal.

Mr. BONE. I heard it read for the first time just now.

Mr. AUSTIN. The amendment merely places the definition of the class within the present definition of what is a felony. The language in the original committee amendment was:

No individual shall be relieved from liability for training and service under this act, or held not to be acceptable to the land or naval forces for such training and service, solely on the ground of his having been convicted of any crime which is not a felony at common law, if the local board having jurisdiction determines that such individuals, notwithstanding such conviction, are morally fit for military service.

At common law the test of whether an offense was a felony or misdemeanor lay in the extent of the punishment provided. At common law a felony was an offense punishable by death or imprisonment in the penitentiary. The Federal Criminal Code, which governs all such offenses tried in the United States courts, provides:

All offenses which may be punished by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year shall be deemed felonies. All other offenses shall be deemed misdemeanors.

As I understand the amendment to the committee amendment, it is to change the words "which is not a felony at common law" to the words "which may not be punished by death or imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year." So all those who are in the category of imprisonment for a term exceeding 1 year would be outside.

Mr. BONE. What does the Senator mean by "outside"? Does he mean that they would not be subject to the draft?

Mr. AUSTIN. They would not be liable for service and training.

Mr. BONE. But they could be taken into service, as I understand.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. BONE. Let me pose the question somewhat differently. I believe the Federal statute provides that if a man takes a stolen automobile or other property across a State line he violates a Federal statute. Let us suppose the case of a young man who takes a stolen car across a State line. The Federal judge gives him a year and a day in the penitentiary. Thereafter the draft board calls him into service. Let us assume that he has served only 1 month of the sentence of 1 year and a day. What becomes of the 11 months and 1 day still unserved in his sentence? I am not suggesting that the provision be changed, but I am rather curious as to precisely what would happen in such a case.

Mr. AUSTIN. He never would get into the armed forces, because he could not get out of the penitentiary.

Mr. BONE. As I understand, it is desired to authorize the draft board to utilize his services if there is no other moral disqualification, aside from conviction of property theft.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; the language would expressly prohibit such service. If the amendment should become law, it would provide that:

No individual shall be relieved from liability for training and service—

And so forth.

Mr. BONE. That is precisely it. We would not relieve him of liability. Stating it conversely, as I listened to the language, he would be liable for service.

Mr. AUSTIN. Conversely, his incarceration in the penitentiary would not be a sole ground for relieving him; but the amendment would not grant authority to a local board to take him out of the penitentiary and put him into the Army.

Mr. BONE. I was constrained to ask the question because I know that local boards would run up against that sort of thing. Perhaps this inquiry may be helpful to them in trying to locate themselves in this field of law. I have found myself wondering what would happen to young men who were in jail or in the penitentiary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to the second branch of the committee amendment, on page 3, after line 2, being subsection (j) of section 4.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it now in order to offer an amendment to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. DANAHER. I invite the attention of the Senator in charge of the bill to page 2, line 2. I wish to offer an amendment, after the name "United States" and before the period, to insert the following language:

Provided, That this section shall not apply to any such male who served in the armed forces of the United States between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918.

Mr. President, I have canvassed the import as well as the impact of the proposed language with many members of the Committee on Military Affairs who are familiar with the problem which this amendment would resolve. I have discussed the matter with various Army authorities, who in turn voice their approval.

Simply stated, the idea is that since under the proposed language section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is being rewritten, we would now provide that males, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 years of age at the time, who volunteered during the last war shall not now again, having then served in the armed forces of the United States, be liable ipso facto to the operations of the pending bill when it in turn becomes law.

Thus, Mr. President, a very grave injustice, a very real inequity as against many patriotic citizens, can be prevented. I think the objective of the proposed amendment finds favor in all quarters.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Connecticut if the amendment would automatically remove from the draft all members of the American Army of 1917 and 1918?

Mr. DANAHER. It would not.

Mr. BONE. What distinction is drawn? I am not certain. Of course, I heard the language read.

Mr. DANAHER. In the first place, if we add the number of years which have elapsed since November 11, 1918, to the then age of a given individual who, let us say, then was 21, we find that, automatically, obviously today he would be 45 years of age or older.

Mr. BONE. I can understand that.

Mr. DANAHER. If he were 22 years of age at that time, he would be 46 today, and hence beyond liability for service under this act.

Mr. BONE. I can understand that he would be beyond the period when the Army would regard him as desirable as a soldier, for physical reasons.

Mr. DANAHER. But also he would not be desirable, anyway, if he were 21 years of age or older when he entered the service in the last war.

Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. BONE. I think I understand the point; yes.

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

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I know that the Senator from Connecticut has talked with many members of the Committee on Military Affairs. Of course, I cannot speak for the committee; but I have conferred with as many of its members as possible. They see no objection, except some of them say—and I agree quite completely with them—that the amendment to some extent provides a class deferment. I want to call that point to the attention of the Senate. Personally, I am inclined to believe that the amendment is a worth while and fair one. Personally, I should like to accept it.

Speaking in behalf of those who will be affected, those who served in the last war at a very young age, let me say that it may be that they themselves would not want to be put in the category of having received class deferment. In other words, as I take it, those who volunteered in the last war were extremely patriotic young men and undoubtedly they retain their patriotism. They might not want to be put in a deferred class.

However, I feel that there is so much merit to the amendment that if the Senate felt inclined to accept it, I feel that it would be well to have it in the bill so that it could be considered thoroughly in conference.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask to have my amendment stated at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 2, after the word "States", it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any such male who served in the armed forces of the United States between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a moment about the proposed amendment. In speaking about it I realize that a man may be greatly misunderstood. I think everyone feels that enough service is enough service; and service which has already been given at great sacrifice should be accepted as enough by the people of our country so long as there are great pools of men who have not served.

The sentimental aspects of the amendment are, therefore, to be commended. However, Mr. President, there are some practical aspects in regard to the amendment which I think indicate that the amendment would cause us to add to a breaking down of the great fundamental upon which the Selective Training and Service Act rests.

Originally, the theory of selective service, as it same out of the committee when it was first presented to the country, rested upon the notion, first, that every man should serve his country in the way in which he could best serve it; second, that when it came to choosing the men, the hazard should first of all be imposed by law; and, third, that when persons were being drafted and brought into the service, each individual should stand as an individual in front of his draft board, with no class distinction, no general deferment at all. The point was that every man should stand face to face with his Government, and should take his chances in regard to deferment entirely on the basis of individual merit, rather than on the basis of class.

Now we have broken down some class distinctions. We have been running our draft arrangements for over 2 years. So far as the 45-year-old men are concerned, and those men who came in the service as the result of the last amendment of the act, they are the men who would be affected by the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut. Most of those men have already responded to registration, and some of them have been called.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet, speaking against an amendment which should be commended because of its fine spirit, I want to make a plea not to add restrictions in the administration of the law, and, above all, not to add restrictions on those who are in charge of our troops, to limit them in being able to fight the war in the most effective way.

Amendments which have been suggested may result in not being able to move troops as easily as troops should be moved. That point does not apply to the pending amendment, because if the amendment were agreed to, the persons covered by it would not be brought into the service. The point I have made is valid only to the extent that we are talking against general deferments, against general restrictions, and in favor of leaving as it is the system which has operated fairly well during the last 2 years and to which the people of our country have generously responded.

Mr. President, since I am speaking about the sentimental aspects of the amendment, I shall, while I am on my feet, speak about the bill in general entirely in a sentimental way.

On the question of drafting 18- and 19-year-olds there is little that one could add to the words of the President, the Secretary of War, and the Chief of Staff. None of those gentlemen is happy over the prospect. I think all of us should keep that point in mind. It is hard to draft anyone; and, therefore, it is hard to draft youths; and it is especially hard for me to talk against an amendment which would exempt a group that in all justice is entitled to be exempted, except to be exempted by class.

Any man over 20 would rather take a beating than to join in the drafting of any man under 20 for combat service. The whole proposal strikes at every fireside in America. It is almost as shocking as war itself. Perhaps now we shall—everyone of us—raise our heads to see that this war is upon us, and shall take full steps to get it over with victoriously as soon as we possibly can.

Some of us have been asleep. The sweet dream will be affected by the new muster rolls.

The President, Mr. Stimson, the General Staff, and now Congress are faced with the hardest decision of this generation. Put bluntly it is whether we shall compete with our enemies or whether we shall lose the war.

What the 18-year-old youth thinks about it is an interesting consideration, certainly a factor. His thoughts are on the credit side of the proposal to lower the draft age. Youth is idealistic. Youth is incautious. Youth is daring. Youth is patriotic.

Perhaps we should look further. What does America at large, what do those already affected, and those who will be affected, think of the proposal?

To begin with, no one is happy over it. It is an ugly thought; but just what is there about war that is pretty? Not a solitary thing. No one was happy over war or over voluntary enlistments, and a mother screamed out in the very halls where the drawing took place when the first number in the first draft lottery was drawn. No one was happy over Bataan or Corregidor. There was nothing elating over the casualty list at Dieppe Wars sink more grimly into human consciousness with each passing hour until they are over. We, this Nation, and each member of it, cannot escape, but must meet it head on.

When I was little, an 18-year-old boy was a man, more often than not doing a man's work and bearing tremendous personal responsibilities. A generation later such a one was a boy. Now he seems even less than that—or shall I say younger? He is taller, broader, stronger, better educated than his prototype, but all men live longer today, and this youth is relatively so young.

We heard from the greatest authorities on mental hygiene testimony which we cannot ignore. They pointed out that calling into service 18-year-old boys might interfere with their individual stability, and it will, because they have not reached the place where they can make stable decisions. But, Mr. President, the fact remains that not only in our forces but in the forces of our enemies the Army is young. The average age for the Navy is very close to 18 years and the average age of the marines is about 19 years. So, we can see that the response of youth has been very general or else these figures would not be possible.

Enigmatically, it is youth which, if we are realists, we must have and must use. It is that excellence of fitness which differentiates the enemies' armies from

ours. It is a paradox of war that the human equation most valued and most valuable in peace, intrinsically and sentimentally, is most valued and most valuable in war. Curse our enemies if we must curse. They have set all the examples, and they are all, most confessedly, horrible. Fashions of war are decreed by the victorious, and until very recently our enemies' victories were sweeping. The enemy gets its manpower where manpower is strongest, from its young, alert, strong, and courageous men, its Fascist zealots who from babyhood have been taught that Germany is to rule the world. With a catch in our throats, we discover that these enemies cannot be met with slow-moving plodders of 40 and 45 years of age, men who never in the world could beat them to the draw in any form of combat. The gantlet we have had laid down to us is manpower, energetic, quick-witted, clear-eyed, fast-moving manpower, delivering fire power into our ranks, into our outlying possessions, and toward our continental ports.

Mr. President, let us never lose sight of the fact that the efficiency of the German Army from the beginning of the war came about as a result of a changed attitude in regard to the education of the German Army. The marvel of all times, so far as raising armies is concerned, was performed by Germany. The old treaty army permitted Germany to have only 100,000 men, and each of those 100,000 men was required to serve 13 years, the idea being to protect the career of any man who entered into the army, so that there could not be a rapid turn-over in the training of majors, colonels, and other senior officers. Germany met that situation by changing her whole fundamental military educational concept and so in the treaty army of 100,000 men every man was trained to his potential ability. If a boy had the ability to take the training of a brigadier, he may have marched for 13 years as a private, but he got the training of a brigadier.

What was the result? Within less than a year Hitler was able to expand his army from 100,000 to 4,000,000 men, lacking only in noncommissioned officers. The predominant characteristic of those men when they started fighting was that they had speed, they had ability. The German Army probably was not so effective, in the long run, in going through France, for example, and the German Army probably was not so effective in crushing the British at Dunkerque, for the simple reason that youth has an impulse to fight so fast and so rapidly that the Germans were found without support when they made the final effort. That we do not know for sure; it is merely a surmise; but it seems to be true from what we have read and what we have heard.

The German Army is made up of zealots; they are young. So far as the Japanese, our other great enemy on the other side, are concerned, the men in their army have been trained from their very youth. If we are going to meet youth, sad as it is to say it, we have got to meet them with youth.

Mr. President, we did not ask for Pearl Harbor. We did not ask for Bataan. We did not ask for Corregidor. We did not ask for reduction of the age for selective service. They came to us, one not more nor less than the other, from the outside as grim messages to defend or die. There is now no alternative but to defend.

Unless there is a drastic turn of events, our new 18-year-old selectees will spend at least 1 year in training. There is no provision in the bill about it, but that is the course the selective service is following, and it is better to let it proceed in its natural way than to have a provision requiring it. At any rate, that is the plan, and it will undoubtedly be followed, because it has worked, and, in the logic of events, it will be adhered to as strictly as the situation permits.

Mr. President, no one can predict the turn of war. For example, if the homeland were invaded, not only the 18-year-old boys in training but the whole civilian population, men and women of miscellaneous ages and states of health, even children, would defend their cities, their cities' streets, and their homes. A nation which would do less has no business responding to acts of aggression with war declarations of its own. It would seem likely, then, that any emergency which would divert the War Department from its resolve to withhold 18-year-old boys from battle would divert us all. It, then, is reasonable to presume them in that intervening year, not as being endangered but actually as being protected from danger by learning how to take care of themselves, by toughening up, by becoming physically fit. If all they are destined to get out of this war is training, by any stroke of good fortune, the net result will be to add 10 years to their lives, to have the social benefits of group and team living, and so to order their eating and sleeping habits at an impressionable age as to regulate their health for all time to come.

That is the bright side of the picture. It is my belief that, unfortunately, the war will last much more than a year; yes, several years. It would be mental blindness for me, as a legislator, to presume that the vote about to be taken is actually for the purpose of conferring individual benefits upon these young men. On the contrary, the proposal, in large, is very painful to me. But as a matter of straight training, without combat, the experience will be seen to be on the credit side of the ledger.

And let us look at another point. I am convinced that a year from now we will have to call upon this year's 18-year-olds, who are next year's 19-year-olds, for service in the armed forces. If we have given them a year's training, meanwhile, then it will at least not be unkind to them to place them in competition with their no-better-trained enemies. But if we deny them this training and suddenly call them up for instant service, we ourselves will be guilty of participation in their slaughter.

I am one who believes a 24- or a 28-year-old youth is a precious national possession, with a long-life expectancy, and decades of joy and service before him. I feel no different toward a 19-year-old boy. They are all boys to me. There is little relative difference, in the long run, between their prospective peaceful futures. It is as abhorrent to nip one of their careers in the bud as another. As a matter of fact, the 19-year-old youth is more likely to survive an assault—he can see better, shoot straighter, move faster. It is harder to see them go because they look so young. What a pity, in the very large picture, however, what a pity it is that it is a war fought by such young men. It would be better, if someone had to fall, if it were someone who had largely lived out his life, had enjoyed American bounties to the full, had used his freedom over and over again for decades, and who, having had the benefits, felt some degree of urge to pay back. But war is never ideal. It is, in our case, one of the heaviest tolls we have to pay for continuing an eternal liberty.

Congress, in summary, has a heart, indeed, and will not go further than the necessities require, and will go even that far with reluctance, but we are faced by the facts of war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER].

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. As I understand, his amendment would eliminate veterans of the World War, members of the American Legion, who had volunteered.

Mr. DANAHER. Only at their option. In other words, actually it would apply to a very small class. There are those who, by virtue of their family situation or what not, perhaps influenced by a feeling as to their own state of health, today are unable to render the type of service which would be called for under section 3 (a) as amended. Indeed it applies in favor of the older men whom the Army authorities themselves say they do not want. The proviso merely says that the liability for service under section 3 (a) shall not apply to such individuals. However, they would have a perfect right to waive their exemption if they chose to do so, and if they wish to serve and are able to do so, as they did before. But we know that there are cases of truly patriotic young men who responded to the urge, in the zeal of youth, and went into service and served 27 or 30 or 33 months in France during the last war, who now, having reached the age of 43 or 44, find themselves in a peculiar situation. They are amenable to a draft which takes them as privates, no matter what rank they once held, and reduces them to the level of the merest tyro so far as their status or rank may be concerned. As to that type and that group of persons, the amendment would afford a degree of protection, at their option.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Let me inquire of the Senator whether the amendment which he has offered and now sponsors has been presented at the request of the American Legion itself.

Mr. DANAHER. Oh, no; no organization requested me to offer it. I have had no communication at all one way or the other from the American Legion on the pending bill, so far as I know.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I understand. I am going to assume the very laudable position which has been taken by my eminent colleague the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I very much appreciate what the Senator has said in regard to the matter, and I deeply appreciate the efforts of men who participated in the last World War. I have always felt that we won the war. In other words, if it had not been for the veterans of the United States of America, the Allies would have lost the last war. A lot of people do not agree with me on that subject, but I still contend, and shall always contend, that the last war was won by the Allies on account of American heroes.

In this connection let me say that I appreciate the efforts which were put forth by every American in the last war to bring about a victory for the Allies. I have voted here for every measure intended to be of benefit to the veterans of the last war. I shall always be found voting for the benefit of the veterans of the present war, because I know that when the war is won victory will come only as the result of the spending of American dollars and the spilling of American blood.

I think the gesture on the part of the Senator from Connecticut is a fine one and actuated by a commendable thought. However, the able Senator has told us that his amendment has not been introduced at the request of the American Legion, or any other organization, or any individual member of the American Legion who courageously volunteered in the last war to save democracy and to stop all wars for all time. In the present instance, if we are to permit any amendment to be offered to the pending bill, regardless of how commendable it may be, we might as well accept the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and a great many other amendments which have here been offered.

Mr. McNARY Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I have just returned to the Chamber What is the particular objection to offering amendments to the bill and having them adopted? I am merely curious to know what position the Senator is taking.

Mr. REYNOLDS. The position I am taking is this: The able Senator who presented the pending amendment told us that he is personally responsible for the amendment, that it was not offered at the request of the American Legion, or at the individual personal request of any member of the American Legion, and we do not know whether any of the members of the American Legion who volunteered during the last war would wish to be exempted. I am objecting to the adoption of any amendment to the bill, on the ground that, as I understand it, the position of the War Department is that they do not want any strings tied to the proposed amendment to the Selective Service Act which is now under consideration.

Mr. McNARY. That may be; but that is a question of policy. I thought the Senator was discussing the delay which might be caused by the Senate writing an amendment into the bill. In its present form the bill must go to conference. It contains language which was not included in the House bill. If no further amendment whatsoever should be written into the bill by the Senate, it would have to go back to the House for action, either on the floor, or by reference to conference committee. So the question of delay is not at all involved from a parliamentary standpoint. I have seen in the press it would involve delay, but it would not in any way effect any delay, because affirmative action must be taken by the House upon the bill as it is presented to the Senate by the Military Affairs Committee, and with respect to the bill as it passed the House.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Oregon is correct in part, except that any technical amendment which the committee of the Senate might suggest, or which the Senate might adopt, which would not be ground for a fundamental controversy, such as the amendment we considered yesterday, or others that we might consider, would not delay the legislation. The House could agree to the amendment, or, if it went to conference, it might not cause a delay. But any controversial amendment which would have to be debated in conference, or upon which a vote had to be taken in the House, would necessarily throw the final action over to some time next month.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, that, as well, is partially correct and partially incorrect. I am speaking of the parliamentary situation, which has been misunderstood by many of those who have discussed the matter on the floor, and written articles about it. The bill as proposed and reported by the Senate Military Affairs Committee contained two provisions which are strangers to the bill as it passed the House. If the bill now before us for consideration is accepted in its present form, in the virgin form in which it was brought out by the committee, it will have to go back to the House for action. That is what I am discussing. The House presumably must have a quorum in order to transact business, under their rules, as we must have. However, there are two alternatives. The House may agree on the floor in open session to accept the Senate amendments, but that is action; or the bill must be sent to conference, and that is action. The House must speak, and speak through a quorum of its membership, if we pass the bill today in just the form in which it is introduced. That is the point I am making. I am not arguing in favor of the acceptance of any amendments; only in favor of the rule. If we write any other amendments into the bill, they will not at all affect the parliamentary situation. However, such action may, as the able and distinguished majority leader has said, cause more controversy and argument in the House than otherwise. I simply wished to make that observation. I thank the able Senator from North Carolina for yielding to me. As I stepped in, I thought he was arguing against any amendments because acceptance of them would create a little havoc from the parliamentary standpoint.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I am very glad to have been able to yield to the distinguished minority leader, and I agree with him that the acceptance of the amendment probably would not result in the consumption of any more time than otherwise would be consumed, but at the same time I want to let the Members of this body know that I individually oppose the adoption of the amendment and shall oppose the adoption of any other amendment to the bill.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina what possible objection there can be to the amendment? The amendment would give the heroes of the last war the right to volunteer and not be drafted. It would in effect say to them, "You can come in without being drafted." Does the Senator want to put a hook in the nose of such a man and drag him in?

I think it is a very good thing to place a hero of the last war in a position where he can assert his patriotism. I hope that word will be spelt p-a-t-r-i-o-t-i-s-m and not p-a-y-t-r-i-o-t-i-s-m. There seems to be some of the counterfeit kind in existence. I think the amendment is a good one. I think it is right to give the men, in effect, the privilege to volunteer rather than to be drafted. The amendment says to them, "We recognize what you have done for us heretofore. If you want to do it again, it is up to you." We should say that rather than say, "You shall do it."

Mr. President, I favor the amendment. I am sick of some of us asking, "What do you want, boss?" We had just as well adjourn and go home if we must take the ipse dixit of a band at the other end of the Avenue. I thought we cooperated, but we "co" and they "operate." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have sat in my seat and had very little to say with respect to this matter, but when men who look as if they are of age physically, though not mentally, come here and begin to exhort me to shut my mouth and to abrogate every element of manhood, and simply bow down to the ipse dixit of a little band of men, I say, "No; I shall not do it."

I think there should be no objection whatever to the amendment. I am not willing to accept the statement, "You must not touch the holy of holies which has been baptized by the grace of those who have us in their hands."

Mr. President, I am surprised that the Senator from North Carolina, the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, should take the position he does. I say

it is time for us to begin to exercise the vacuum which some of us call the brain. Let us exercise it and act like men. We simply receive our orders.

The other day I went to a department and found the officials in profound conference. I could hardly get a hearing from the head of the bureau. I knew then that the officials were cooking up an order for the rubber stamps to accept and say "Yes, sir" to. That is all we are doing. If we could convert into actual rubber the artificial expression of rubber stamps here [laughter] and convert all this gas into actual gas there would be no shortage of gasoline or rubber. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, it is time for us, if we are men, to act like men. If we are not men, let us adjourn sine die and go home.

Mr. President, I have not taken up much of the time of the Senate. I did not feel disposed to enter into the profound, statesmanlike debate which I have heard, and which is floating about in this body. I used to be proud of being a Senator, but I do not know that the bristles of my pride are very high now.

Mr. President, if I continue I may say too much. So I will quit. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question of the Senator from South Dakota. The amendment seems to exempt from the first section of the bill all those who have served in World War No. 1. That seems to be the object of it.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct. That is what the language does do.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not received from any of those men any request that they be exempted.

Mr. GURNEY. Neither have I. I made the statement——

Mr. BARKLEY. I think they would be more apt to resent the proposed action on our part than they would to approve it.

Mr. GURNEY. That is the statement I have already made, if I may interject.

Mr. BARKLEY. The American Legion, and all the organizations which represent the men who served in the last war, have been outstanding in their advocacy of the policy of the Government in respect to the war, and I certainly would not want to vote for an amendment which would put them in a separate class, in which they do not wish to be put.

Mr. GURNEY. I made the statement when the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] submitted the amendment, that I was quite sure that the men affected themselves would be the first ones to resent having the amendment placed in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], on page 2, line 2. [Putting the question.] The "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 5. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the sending of troops inducted into military service by this act into combat service who are less than 19 years of age unless such troops have had at least 1 year of training.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not intend to take up much of the time of the Senate to discuss the amendment. Much of yesterday was devoted to discussing certain phases of the amendment, and I have an idea that the majority of the Members of the Senate have reached a decision with respect to it. I have not submitted the amendment in the form that would suit me best. I would have preferred to have put the age at 20 years instead of 19 years.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. In connection with the Senator's amendment I wish to say that I also submitted an amendment several days ago, which has been printed and lies on the table, which covers practically the same matter. I shall first ask that the amendment which I submitted be read at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield for that purpose?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] will be read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. —. Section 3 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That no man under 20 years of age who is inducted into the land or naval forces under the provisions of this act shall be ordered into actual combat service until after he has been given at least 12 months of military training."

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I wish to state in connection with my amendment, that so far as the drafting of the 18- and 19-year-olds is concerned I, of course, regret very much to have to vote to draft those boys. So I conceived the idea of the amendment which I submitted.

I want it distinctly understood that I am in favor of, and expect to favor by my vote, the war program. The President of the United States has gone on record as asking for this measure, the Chief of Staff of the Army and other Army officials have also insisted that they must have it in order to prosecute a successful war, and, of course, I am not going to quarrel with their position. I shall accept it and go along.

It seems to me, however, Mr. President, that at the present time there is no immediate demand for these boys. There is time to give them the necessary training. As a matter of fact it will take 12 months before they can be gotten into the Army anyway. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Nebraska replaces the subject matter of my amendment, and I shall not press my amendment, but shall support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Idaho. I think I had said when I was interrupted, that when providing that the boys should have 1 year of training before they could be taken into combat service, I had placed the age at 19 years. My amendment would apply to those under 19 years of age. I myself would rather place the age at 20 years. I placed it at 19 years, however, after consulting with a large number of Senators who are of the opinion, as I am myself, that the amendment, in order to stand any chance of adoption would have to provide that the age be 19 instead of 20. That is the reason I phrased it in that way.

Mr. President, I have listened with the greatest of interest to the discusison which has taken place yesterday and today regarding our Army. I have read, and have heard read, testimony from so-called experts and leaders in our Army, as to the quality of soldiers when we consider their ages. From all that evidence I have reached the conclusion that soldiers from 18 to 20 would improve our Army or any army. An army of 18- and 19-year-old men would be the best army on earth. Therefore, when we are considering the one thing we wish to do, which is to do everything we can to win the war, it seems to me that we must surrender our belief that boys of 18 to 19 are not old enough to be taken into the Army.

It is difficult for me to surrender that belief, and no doubt it is difficult for many other Senators to do so. I have reached the conclusion from the evidence and from history—and I believe it is a fair conclusion—that by taking these boys into the Army, thus lowering the average age of our Army, we can improve the quality and the degree of invincibility of our Army. It is true in the case of other nations. We have been told by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and also by the Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. GURNEY] that the committee reached the conclusion, from the evidence before it—and I do not believe it can be successfully denied—that these boys will make our Army more efficient than it would be without them.

We are talking about winning the war. We are talking about getting an army best equipped to win the war. Of course we want to make it as nearly invincible as possible. We want to improve its quality. Reluctantly though we may reach the conclusion, it seems to me that we must reach the conclusion that younger blood coming into the Army will improve the Army, and that we can do a

better job and win the war more quickly than we otherwise could. It seems to me that that ought to be sufficient to cause us to vote for the principles involved in the bill. It has moved me very greatly in favor of the bill.

Yesterday I called attention to one thing which it seems to me we ought to meet on the floor of the Senate if we can. Our military men have been telling us for years—and we all believe it; I think it is apparent to the layman—that in order to get a good Army we must have one which is well-trained. While the period of training is indefinite, it has usually been said that a year's training is the minimum. It ought to be more. Military men have so stated. Our hearings are full of such evidence. There is no dispute about it.

Immediately after the bill was introduced to take boys of 18 and 19 there came the cry from the country—perhaps mostly from the mothers of the boys—"My boy is too young." History is full of testimony from experts that a soldier ought to be trained for at least 1 year. We ought not to take an 18-year-old boy and put him into combat without adequate training. So the suggestion was made to amend the bill so as to make sure that he would not be put into combat service until after he had been trained for a year.

There immediately arose a cry, which has gone all over the country, from the same men who have been telling us all along that a year's training is necessary, "We do not want that amendment in the bill. We do not want any restriction."

As I said yesterday, what conclusion must follow? The people of the country, and especially the mothers of the boys, immediately say, "Such a provision would only do what you have always said was necessary with soldiers of all ages." I wonder why there is any objection to following that plan and putting it in the law.

Probably our leaders intend to give the boys a year or more of training before they are put into combat service. The conclusion that is drawn all over the country, that it is proposed to put men into combat service without a year's training, may be unjustified; but I submit that it is a universal feeling. Rightly or wrongly, the mothers of the boys have the idea that their boys are to be put into combat service before they have had a year's training.

So far as the 18-year-old boys are concerned, we can relieve that anguish by adopting this amendment. It is exactly in line with what the military authorities have always said ought to be done with every army. Why not do it? Why not relieve the anxiety of mothers and other relatives of these boys by assuring them that the boys will not be rushed into combat service until they are adequately trained? That would not fully compensate many of them. It would not alleviate all the agony and heartbreak, but it would probably go as far as we can go.

As the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has so well pointed today, our sentiments, our sympathies, and our hearts revolt against taking these boys. However, we are confronted with the proposition that by taking them we can improve our Army, and probably shorten the period of the war. We can make our Army better. We can put our Army at least on an equality with the armies of our enemies, because they have 18- and 19-year-old boys, and they are trained. Why not say to the relatives of our boys that they will not be put into combat service until after they have had a year's training?

Mr. President, I do not want anyone to get the idea that this amendment is in any way motivated by anyone anywhere who does not want to make our Army as nearly perfect as it can be made. I believe that is the feeling of the Senate. Under ordinary circumstances we would not want to take these boys; but we feel that if we can make the Army better by taking them we can lessen the pain, suffering, and agony which must come in the aggregate from this great catastrophe.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many years of training are required of the cadets at Annapolis and West Point before they are allowed to go into combat service?

Mr. NORRIS. I think in each case the period is 4 years.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, it ought to be pointed out that the cadets at Annapolis and West Point are being trained as officers, to command troops.

Mr. NORRIS. I realize that.

Mr. BARKLEY. That training, of course, is necessary. The same course is pursued in time of peace as in time of war. If there is any difference at all, the period of training is reduced in wartime. It was reduced in the last war.

Mr. NORRIS. Probably because of the need for more officers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. So the illustration is hardly an analogy.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not offering it as an analogy. I merely answered the question which the Senator from Florida asked me. I think it is perfectly proper to bring up such a question in this discussion. I am not complaining about it.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I heard the distinguished Senator's amendment read. I wonder whether such an absolutely mandatory provision might operate in such a way as to embarrass us. Suppose that 9 months from now, after the boys shall have had 9 months' training, there should be necessity for replacements in a certain part of the Army—for example, those manning antiaircraft guns. Would it be impossible to make such replacements from among these boys?

Mr. NORRIS. I doubt very much whether such a situation would apply. This amendment applies only to soldiers who are taken into military combat service through the instrumentality of the act. I am inclined to think that the soldiers to whom the Senator is referring are not taken in under this act.

Mr. WILEY. I heard the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and also the Senator from Nebraska state that a year is required to prepare an unseasoned man for combat. Replacements might become necessary in certain branches of the service. For example, a boy who is taken into the Army might have 6 man for combat. Replacements might be needed on some front. If I correctly understand the Senator's amendment, he could not be taken to that front.

Mr. NORRIS. There might be such instances which would apply to boys taken in under this act; but there would not be one chance in a million of that condition coming about. There would always be a way of sending somebody else.

Our fighting in this war is not in our country or on our shores—at least up to the present time. We do not conceive that it will be for some time, if ever. Most of us believe it never will reach our shores; but assuming that it might, certainly it will not happen soon.

We cannot send a boy to the Solomon Islands the first day after he is inducted into the service. I do not think any difficulty ever would arise in enforcing the amendment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska has made such an eloquent plea that I should like to commend him for his remarks. I would inquire whether his amendment applies only to 18-year-old boys or whether it applies to 18- and 19-year-old boys.

Mr. NORRIS. I shall read the amendment as I first wrote it:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the sending of troops inducted into military service by this act into combat service who are less than 19 years of age unless such troops have had at least 1 year of training.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Would the Senator be willing to change the amendment to include——

Mr. NORRIS. Twenty-year-olds, instead of 19-year-olds?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know whether the Senator was in the Chamber at the time when I commenced my remarks. I stated that I should prefer to have the amendment in that form; but I put the age at 19 because from the votes we have had and from the debates we have heard and also after consulting with a great many other Senators, I thought that the amendment probably would not be agreed to by the Senate if I put the limit at 20 years of age, and that the ones for whom it would do the most good would be the younger soldiers.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I should like to offer a substitute making the amendment the same as it was when offered by the Senator from Nebraska, except changing the age from 19 to 20.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will offer an amendment to the amendment, to strike out "19" and insert "20", I shall vote for it. I should prefer to have the law read that way; and if the Senator's amendment to my amendment should prevail, such a provision would be in my amendment.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I shall offer such an amendment.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. I desire to ask the Senator if he does not think that under the present language of his amendment only the boys 18 years old would be exempted, but those 19 years old would not be exempted?

Mr. NORRIS. That is true. That is what the Senator from Texas was talking about.

Mr. SMITH. I think the amendment would be stronger if it provided that the 18- and 19-year-old boys contemplated to be drafted under the terms of the pending bill should be given a year's training.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is the substitute amendment I wish to offer.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I am deeply in sympathy with the objectives and purposes of the Senator's amendment, but as I read it hastily it seems to me that a boy might be inducted into the service when he was 18 years, 11 months, and 3 weeks old, and under the terms of the amendment he could still be sent overseas a week later when he became 19 years of age.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that is true.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems to me that we should guard against sending the boys overseas until they have had a year's training. I know of cases in the last war of boys who were in the front lines before the armistice, boys who had been inducted only 6 or 7 weeks previously, and I happen to know that some of them had never fired a rifle in their lives. I thought of this great country with its tremendous reservoir of manpower, and I thought then and I think now that that was a disgraceful situation. I do not believe we should permit anything of the sort.

I have great respect for the views of the Army leaders on any military matter, but we all know that the Army has announced its policy against sending boys into combat before they have had a year's training. It seems to me that unless we write into the law the policy which they said they would follow, a premium will be put on carelessness and lack of industry in ascertaining the status of the boys, and we should have a great many 18- or 19-year-old boys sent abroad in 6, 8, or 10 weeks after they were inducted—boys who never had had the opportunity of any training at all, and, as I say, in some cases had never even fired a rifle.

It seems to me that if we are to take this action at all we should take it in such a way as to make sure that the boys have had a year's training.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I generally agree with the observations of the Senator from Missouri, and I appreciate the observations of the Senator from Nebraska. I may add that, instead of keeping books in the war as to who is doing most, it seems to me that if Great Britain, which has been in the greatest danger and, it might be said, in the front line, cannot use her men until they are 18 years of age, this country would be more than generous in doing its part if we adopted whatever language is necessary to accomplish the result suggested by the Senator from Nebraska.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator remembers the short conversation we had last evening, at which time I discussed with him the fact that the Chief of Staff had sent us some information on this very question.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator yield while I proceed to state a little other information?

Mr. NORRIS. I think every Senator should have ample opportunity to discuss the matter. I am about to yield the floor. Of course, the Senator will have all the time he needs. I should be very glad to have him present the information which he has, but I desire to conclude my remarks.

Mr. President, I desire to yield the floor in order that the Senator from Texas may offer his amendment. I shall vote for it if he offers it. I think his amendment will improve the language.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator's amendment reads:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the sending of troops inducted into the military service by this act into combat service who are less than 19 years of age unless such troops have had at least 1 year of training.

It seems to me that the language there used is somewhat ambiguous, in that it provides that—

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize—

The Army could send the boys, could it not, if there were nothing in the act to authorize it?

Mr. NORRIS. Probably.

Mr. WHEELER. Why not say directly that they shall not do it, instead of simply saying, "Nothing in this act shall authorize it."

Mr. NORRIS. I think probably that would be an improvement.

Let us see how this would be:

> Nothing in this act shall authorize.

Strike out "Nothing in this act shall be construed."

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I modify my amendment in that respect, so that it will read:

> Nothing in this act shall authorize.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that would not cover the matter at all. I think the language should be put in the prohibitive form.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; I, too, think that the language should be put in the prohibitive form. In the amendment the Senator provides that "Nothing in this act shall authorize," but even then the Army could take the young boys regardless of the provisions of the act.

Mr. NORRIS. The language would apply only to soldiers who come under the terms of the act. So far as I know, it is the only law that authorizes the induction of 18- and 19-year-old men.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let us consider the language—

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the sending of troops inducted into the military service by this act into combat service.

Mr. NORRIS. Let us see if the point would not be covered if we modified the amendment so that it would read:

> Nothing in this act shall authorize the sending of troops inducted in the military service by this act into combat service who are less than 19 years of age unless such troops have had at least 1 year of training.

Would that language meet the objection?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not think it meets the objection.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator can offer an amendment which would meet the objection, I should be glad to have him do so.

Mr. WHEELER. I say that the language suggested by the Senator would not prevent what we seek to prevent. What we seek to prevent could still be done notwithstanding the language the Senator has suggested; but I think that satisfactory language can be worked out.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may make a suggestion?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator had used the numerals "19½," instead of "19," the following situation would have evolved: Anyone 18 years of age, even if he had been drafted on the very last day when he was 18, and the next day was 19, could not be sent abroad until he had had at least 6 months' training. There would be so few boys in that extreme category that almost all of them would have had 9, 10, or even 18 months' training, if the figure were fixed at 19½, so that the yearly provision would apply to boys 19½ years old.

Do I make my point clear to the Senator?

Mr. NORRIS. No; I do not quite understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will hand me his amendment, while he is yielding to some other Senator I shall attempt to frame the amendment to cover the point.

Mr NORRIS. Very well.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The purpose of the amendment, as I understand it, is to make certain that no soldier inducted shall go into combat unless he has had 1 year's training.

Mr. NORRIS. I would not say that in such broad terms. I should like to have it that way, but I have said 19 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why should it not apply with equal force to anybody inducted, whether 18, 19, or 25?

Mr. NORRIS. It might apply to the whole Army, but we are legislating today for two classes of soldiers, the boys who are 18 and 19 years old. They are affected by this proposed legislation. If the Senator wants an amendment which shall apply to everyone in the Army, that is a different matter.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. That purpose could be accomplished by striking out from the Senator's amendment the words "who are less than 19 years of age." By so doing the amendment would then read:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the sending of troops inducted into military service by this act into combat service unless such troops shall have had at least 1 year of training.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator would accomplish what he has in mind if his amendment were made to read as follows:

That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the sending of troops into combat service who were less than 19 years of age at the time of induction unless such troops have had at least 1 year of training.

If the words "at the time of induction" were inserted the amendment would include everyone under 19 down and would require that they have at least a year's training. I think that is what the Senator has in mind if I understand him correctly.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator, and I yield the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in view of the conversation I had with the Senator from Nebraska last evening and before the discussion proceeds longer on the 12-month training proposal, I should like to call the attention of the Senate not only to the definite views of the military authorities as presented by the Chief of Staff but I also have some other important information. I hope all Members of the Senate will listen as I read the letter addressed to the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the Honorable ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, dated October 23, 1942, and signed by the Chief of Staff. The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, October 23, 1942.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: In the discussion of the proposed legislation to lower the selective service age, the proposal has frequently been made that a provision be written into the law that would make 12 months' training mandatory before any individual under 20 years of age could be sent to a theater of operations.

I believe that this originates partly from a desire to avoid the unfortunate instances of the First World War, in which many men were sent to front-line combat before they had had any reasonable amount of training; and second, on the assumption that, since the War Department has frequently stated that it takes 12 months to train a division, there should be no objection to guaranteeing 12 months' training for each enlisted man.

Such a limitation would impose an almost impossible administrative problem for the War Department. There is a marked difference between the training of an individual soldier and the training of a complicated machine like a division. Every soldier receives approximately 3 months' basic training. In this period he is hardened physically and trained technically, as well as given an understanding of discipline. He is taught how to care for himself in the field; how to employ both his primary and secondary weapons; and how he and his weapons fit into the squad and platoon. Upon completion of this course, he is a qualified rifleman, machine gunner, mortarman, etc., depending upon which course he pursued in the replacement center.

Upon completion of his basic training the soldier is assigned to a tactical unit. If the unit is new (that is, recently organized) there then begins the team training that every unit must have before it can be considered an efficient combat organization. The length of time required for this team training varies, of course, with the type and size of the unit. A squad of 12 men who have had proper basic training can be trained as a team in a relatively short period of time. A battalion takes considerably longer. A division, which is a complicated organization involving the combined use of many arms, must have a long training period before it becomes a real combat organization. For this, 12 months is the minimum, and during this 12 months' period units that make up the divisions go through periods of small unit training, advanced unit training, training with the combined arms, and then extensive field maneuvers with the division acting alone and in combination with other divisions, and corps and army troops.

To get back to the training of an individual soldier, the length of his training before he can be fitted into an experienced tactical unit varies according to the type of unit and the duties for which he is trained. A few examples will illustrate what I mean by this:

In the Air Corps, a soldier selected for ground crew (mechanics) training, first receives a period of basic military training. He then goes to an Air Corps technical school, and the length of his training there depends upon the specific specialty in which he is being trained. The period may vary from 18 to 36 weeks, and when he graduates he is, for example, a finished airplane engine mechanic, and can be immediately assigned to and used in a bombardment group as a mechanic, whether it is still itself in training or is in a combat theater.

A radio operator receives his basic training and his training as an operator simultaneously. In from 3 to 5 months he is an effective operator, trained in Army radio procedure and, as in the case of the airplane mechanic, can take his place in a signal company of a combat division, whether that division is still in training or is being committed to combat.

A rifleman, when he finishes his 13 weeks basic training, is prepared to take his place in an experienced squad at any time. If 8 or 10 men in the squad have had "team" training, the trained basic rifleman can be inserted in the squad without detriment either to himself or his unit.

I could give you many other examples where it would be unnecessary and undesirable to hold a man out of a combat theater for 12 months. It would be almost impossible for the Army to operate under any such mandate. We would, in effect, have to put thousands upon thousands of men "on the shelf" after their essential training had been completed before we could use them. In the Air Corps alone possibly 500,000 such men would be involved. Incidentally, the Navy and the Marine Corps enlist men of 17, and I am told that the average age of the entire Corps is below 20.

The proposal would create so many obstacles of this nature that I cannot too strongly emphasize the importance of giving us this legislation without crippling limitations. Trust our judgment and our own insistence that we fight only with properly trained units, to see that each soldier has adequate training before he enters combat. I am certain Members of Congress do not wish to hamper the War Department in the execution of the tremendous task we have before us. These proposals, I am sure, arise through a lack of understanding of the problem presented. Our enemies are desperate and implacable. Our task is extremely difficult.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I will yield in a moment if the Senator will permit me.

Yesterday I made the request that no amendment of a controversial nature be adopted by the Senate because it is very important and imperative, using the words of the Secretary of War, that this force be brought in as early as possible. Since then the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the majority leader, has made the statement that with controversial amendments added by the Senate which would require explanation on the floor of the House, the enactment of the proposed legislation might be delayed until after election day, when the House Members would be willing to return and pass on the additions which the Senate had made.

For the information of the Senate, I wish to say that within the last 10 or 15 minutes, while the senior Senator from Nebraska was speaking, I have received a letter from the White House, dated October 23, 1942, signed by Franklin D. Roosevelt, reading as follows:

Hon. CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Concerning the proposed legislation to lower the selective-service age now before the Senate, I have been told that several limitations will be proposed in the form of amendments. It appears to me that the complicated administration necessarily involved in the handling of large numbers of men by the Army, as well as the urgent necessity for correcting the present deficiencies as to age, make it important that limitations other than those now included in the bill be avoided.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I find it quite difficult to vote for a bill approving the drafting of boys 18 and 19 years of age for military service. I stated some time ago that the Army authorities had a plan, and that I was going to follow them, and I shall be compelled to do so, in view of the situation which confronts our country today. So I shall vote for the bill, although I dislike to do so, when I know there are almost countless thousands between the ages of 20 and 30 now escaping service, many of them in the departments here.

The sending of boys 18 and 19 years of age into foreign countries under the circumstances which surround them is, indeed, a weighty, important, and an unpleasant task to me. I regret that I must vote to do so. My regret is all the keener because every day I see young men of draft age in this city in the departments of our Government; we meet them daily; we know they are here, and they have not been called into the armed forces. Some of them are married, and in many cases their wives are working. Personally I would a great deal rather send these older ones to fight in foreign countries than to send boys 18 and 19 years of age.

I am not a military man. I do not claim to be. I have no desire to attempt to give advice in military affairs, but just as a plain, ordinary, everyday citizen it seems to me that our draft lists should be gone over, and we should select more men who are older than 20 years and are now somehow, in some way, escaping service in the Army. If there is a Senator on this floor who does not know that there is in Washington almost an infinite number of such men who are over 20 years of age and who are not going into the service, let him say so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is the Senator from Tennessee offering a challenge?

Mr. McKELLAR. I am offering a challenge. Does not the Senator from Kentucky know that in the city of Washington, in various departments of the Government, there are young men between 20 and 25 years of age who are eligible for military service, but who have been deferred for one reason or another?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not happen to know that. I do not frequent the departments in Washington, and I do not see men in the various departments. I do not think it is quite fair to make such a charge against all men above the age of 20. Does the Senator from Tennessee know how many of those men have been called for examination and rejected, and therefore are not eligible to enter the Army, and does the Senator know how many all over the country who are above 20 years of age have been examined and rejected for military service?

Mr. McKELLAR. I know there are a great many.

Mr. BARKLEY. No Senator in this body could take a census of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I realize no Senator could take a census, but I know there are many young men in the departments of the Government who are in the categories to which I refer, and I examined some of them when they appeared before me as witnesses. Mr. President, and Senators, I would rather send them than to send boys who are 18 and 19 years of age. But our military authorities, who I am sure know a great deal more about the subject than do I or any of us, have said that 18- and 19-year-old boys are necessary, and I shall vote for the bill, with many regrets. However, Mr. President, I do not propose to vote to send these boys into foreign countries without having them prepared. If there ever was a war in which boys should be trained before they go into combat, it is the present war. And why? We can supply the answer by applying plain, everyday, common sense. We are sending some boys to Iceland, where it is intensely cold. We are sending some boys to milder climates, where it is very pleasant. We are sending some boys to some of the hottest climates in all the world. We are sending boys to almost every part of the world, to places with which they are unfamiliar. This is a strange war. The expression "all out" war is frequently used and frequently abused, but it seems to cover the entire globe.

These boys should be trained before they are sent away. Representatives of the Army have told us they should be trained. We made preparation for their training, and have appropriated vast sums for that purpose. We are furnishing all kinds of materials, such as airplanes. We have spent millions of dollars, perhaps billions, for training planes, in which those who are engaged in aviation may be trained. Why should they not receive the training? There is a large number of men who are already in the service. Surely we should not send untrained boys to all parts of the world, to places about which they know nothing, frequently boys but 18 years of age. That they should be sent without training is unthinkable and indefensible. They should be trained.

Mr. ROSIER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. ROSIER. Like the Senator from Tennessee, I very reluctantly support the bill to draft 18- and 19-year-old boys. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the argument advanced that young boys make better soldiers than do older men. Yesterday I heard stories about older men being frequently found in the hospitals. As this debate has proceeded, and argument has been made concerning the young men, and about how this is their war, it has occurred to me, though I may be rather illogical in my thinking, that if youthful vigor, enthusiasm, courage, and daring are so essential in the ranks of the Army and among fighters, that it might be desirable to have a little youth, vigor, daring, courage, enthusiasm, and good physical strength among the people who are running the war. Had the able Senator ever thought about that?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I had thought about it. The Senator puts it very strongly, and it is submitted to the Senate for that purpose.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the matter does not concern me personally, because all of my large number of nephews—I have no children—are in the Army, or in the Navy, or the Marine Corps, and I am very proud they are there. So that the question does not concern me directly. But I ask the question, How can we ever defend ourselves if we send boys 18 and 19 years old into foreign lands, all over the world, without training? They cannot make good soldiers without being trained. Their youthful vigor will mean little in foreign countries unless they are trained. They ought to be trained; they must be trained in order to do their work. Everyone admits that; the Army admits it; we all admit it. Then why not do what we ought to do?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The letter sent by General Marshall telling how difficult it would be to carry out the provisions of the bill if the amendment were included in it is not dissimilar to other department letters which come here at times when we try to amend measures affecting them so as perhaps to make it a little more difficult for them to operate. Every department wants us to turn over to it carte blanche power so it will be able to manipulate the law and make it easier for itself. But, after all, the responsibility is ours, and not that of the head of any department.

Mr. President, I have great respect for General Marshall, but General Marshall is not infallible. He has on several occasions previously made statements as to what was necessary to be done for the Army, and he has had to contradict them later. Neither is the head of the War Department infallible. Neither is the head of the Navy Department infallible. But we in the Congress have a responsibility to see that these boys are trained before they are sent to every country in the world. That responsibility is ours, and we ought to have the courage to stand up and say whether we want the boys to have what we consider to be sufficient training.

I have hesitated for some time with respect to what my course should be. I do not have any boys who will be affected by the 18-year-old provision. But when a Senator stands on the floor of the Senate and says that every boy 18 years of age will make a better soldier than one who is older, I say that I have raised a family of boys, and I know that there is just as much difference between some boys 18 years of age and some boys 19 years of age as there is between daylight and darkness. Some boys have not matured when they have reached 18 years of age. Some boys have matured when they have reached 18 years of age. One cannot say that a boy 18 years of age is mature and will make a better fighter than an older soldier, because many boys of 18 are mere children, mere babes in the woods. Let us give them a year's training. We ought to insist on that. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, if the provision giving these boys a year's training is not written into the bill, I shall not vote for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall not criticize anyone. I shall not criticize our leaders. I shall not criticize any of our generals. I know they are all doing the very best they can. I know that they are tremendously interested in winning the war. I know how they feel about it; I know they are doing what they

think is right; but I simply cannot find it in my conscience to turn over young boys 18 and 19 years of age, to be sent at will to any part of the world, without a guaranty that they shall be trained. If they should be sent away without training, that would be our responsibility, because it is in our power to provide for their training. I feel that the least we can do is to assure training for them before they are sent to foreign fields.

Mr. President, it was said in a letter from General Marshall read awhile ago that there would be trouble in enforcing such a provision. There would be no more trouble in enforcing a draft law containing such a provision than there would be in enforcing other measures. If they were to say that they intended to send such boys as they like to foreign countries without training, we would not pass this bill. We all know that to be so. The Army officials have testified time and again that the men ought to be trained. Why not put such a provision in the bill? How can there be any dishonesty, or misunderstanding, or misconstruction, or misconception about it if we put such a provision in the bill? Every one of us here knows what the issue is. It is purely a question of training these young boys before we put them in the Army, and we ought to do our duty and require training to be given. We ought to do it in the interest of the Army, because we know that if untrained boys are put in the Army we will not have a good Army. That is all there is to it. It will not be because of any fault on the part of the boys, no, but because of the lack of training. * * *

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have prepared a substitute for the Norris amendment, which I believe is plain and understandable and carries out my wishes. It reads as follows:

> No person under 20 years of age inducted under this act shall be placed in actual combat duty beyond the territorial boundaries of continental United States until after he has had at least 1 year's military training following his induction.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Texas to wait. I shall be through in a moment. I prefer his proposed substitute, I will say, and I think the Senator from Nebraska prefers the substitute.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I will say that I do prefer it. I told the Senator from Texas that I preferred his substitute, and that I shall support it and vote for it. I do not want to modif. my own amendment to that effect, however, because the parliamentary situation is such that if the substitute is defeated we may still have my amendment acted upon favorably. The substitute offered by the Senator from Texas goes further than mine, but does not go any further than I think it ought to go.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall vote for the substitute, and if we cannot obtain favorable action upon it, then I shall vote for the Norris amendment, because I think it is our duty to do so.

Mr. President, I have no interest in the matter other than the success of our arms. We want to win this war. In order to win we must train our soldiers. I shall appeal to my colleagues, in the interest of the safety of our boys who, by this act, we are sending into the armies of the United States, to stand together and unanimously—I wish it could be so—as one man adopt the amendment, so there cannot be any question about the training of our boys before they are sent into the Army abroad. Training is also necessary to keep up the morale.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am sure that no Member of the Senate looks with any equanimity at all upon the necessity of voting upon this issue of drafting boys under 20 years of age. It is only because of the imperative necessities of the war, in what appears to be the Nation's extremity, that Congress ventures to make the extension of the draft at all.

When it comes to providing as does the amendment of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], printed yesterday and available upon the floor, for a year's training, as the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] offered from the floor today does, and as the substitute now offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] does, I can tell, from what has been said here upon the floor both publicly and in private conversation, that a substantial number, indeed I think a majority, of the Members of the Senate, believe that some provision of this kind should be written into the bill to protect the boys. I know that is my feeling, Mr. President, and yet I am perfectly well aware of the arguments which can be made and are being made by the War Department against it.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Does the Senator have any information that any of our troops now in combat zones were not thoroughly trained before they were sent to such zones?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly not, and it is precisely because of that fact that I believe we should continue to follow that policy.

I was about to say, Mr. President, that because of my deep concern about this problem, 2 or 3 days after the Committee on Military Affairs had acted, I invited the Chief of Staff to come to the Capitol to discuss the bill with a group of Senators. He was good enough to come, and he explained to us, in the most persuasive manner, the reasons which have impelled the War Department to ask that there be no restriction upon the utilization of these boys.

He gave two reasons. He pointed out that the United States is now engaged in a double effort, as it were, to build a new Army upon the one hand, and to maintain the old Army on the other hand. With respect to the building of the new Army, there was no thought in his mind that draftees with less than a year's training would be sent into combat. With respect, however, to the maintenance of the Army already in being, as I understood General Marshall, his opinion was that no restriction should be placed by the Congress, through an amendment of this character, upon the legal power of the commanding officers to use draftees of less than a year's training to fill vacancies which may occur in the already trained armies. No one can listen to General Marshall without being impressed by both his character and his ability. He is, I believe, extremely well fitted for his great responsibilities, but able as he is, I cannot escape the conclusion that a year's training should be required for these boys.

As I read the amendment, it would bar the use of these boys only in actual combat service. That means that they could be used in all other tasks.

It is said that the average age of the Navy is under 21. That is correct. It is said that the average age of the Marine Corps is under 20. That is correct. However, we must not forget that the fact is that most of the boys in the Navy, which is a mechanized organization, have had a full year's training. That is the testimony of naval officers to me in personal conference. Naval equipment is such that long training is unavoidable.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President——

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not a fact that before any officer is commissioned in the Army or the Navy he is obliged to go through a physical and mental training, and for weeks—and in some cases months—study, prepare, and fit himself for the service which he is to perform as an officer?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. WALSH. If that be so, is there not equal reason why youth 18 years of age should receive such training? The youths who will be obtained under this draft will be among those who are least matured, because the physically strong and healthy boys, the athletes, are already enlisting in the Army and Navy. Are not youths of 18 entitled to weeks and months of physical and mental preparedness for service in the Army?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. From my examination of the testimony and from inquiries which I have diligently made, I can come to no other conclusion.

Mr. WALSH. May I make a further suggestion? Ever since the war began I have had called to my attention repeatedly some reasons for the superiority of the German Army. I do not know whether those reasons are sound; but it is alleged that strenuous mental training is one of the reasons for the success of the German Army. The Germans consider mental training a part of physical training. A man should know how to act under particular circumstances, and exercise his judgment. I have no evidence or proof of that, except that much has been written and stated on the subject.

It seems to me that the fathers and mothers of these boys, and we who are asked to vote for this measure, should have some assurance that the boys will receive some minimum of physical and mental training, and education in the use of munitions of war, before they are sent into combat zones.

While I am on my feet, I should like to make another suggestion, with the permission of the Senator. I am sure the Senator will agree with what I am about to say.

The sad thing about the proceeding in this Chamber today is that nobody can give assurance to us or to the people of the country that we have exhausted the manpower over 20 years of age. If such assurance were forthcoming we should be passing this bill through this body with cheers instead of getting up and beating our breasts and saying that we are reluctant to do it. We should have no hesitancy in saying, "Everybody else has done his part. Now it is up to the boys of 18 and 19."

The people of the country do not believe that our manpower has been combed, and that there has been an honest-to-God effort to get into the Army the fit and capable manpower above the age of 20 years. It is now proposed to take boys away from their mothers' apron strings. Let me repeat, it will be largely the weak and tender boys of these ages, because I know from the enlistments in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, that the athletic, vigorous-minded boys who are physically fit have already enlisted. It is proposed to take boys, giving them no assurance of months of training for their protection.

The Senator will forgive me for taking up his time, but I should like to have his views as to whether or not we should be in a better position to pass the bill had we assurance from some source that it is essential because all the other manpower has already been taken into the Army.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to analyze some of the explanations which have been made to me on behalf of the War Department to support the all-out authority to utilize boys under 20 wherever they may be desired. I have pointed out that the Navy is a mechanized organization, and that in the Navy it is practically impossible to use any youth without a full year's training. On the other hand, in the Marine Corps we have an organization which is not as completely mechanized as is the Navy. In the Marine Corps we have young men who are assigned to carry out the so-called commando warfare—raids, attacks, and landings—the most dangerous and hazardous of all war work. It is true that for the most part they are young men, but, Mr. President, they are volunteers. They are men who by their own physical attainments are fitted for that sort of work. The young men in both these branches are selected fine specimens.

I am sure that none of us has had the opportunity of witnessing athletics among high school and college boys without knowing that there is a tremendous difference in the physical equipment of boys of 18 and 19 years of age. I have known boys of 18 and 19 in college who were perfectly sound and fit so far as any doctor's examination would disclose. They were athletically inclined; and yet they could not for a moment play football with the other boys in their class. They were physically unfitted for that. If we read the sporting pages we know that during the football season even the best of the college teams, made up of fine young men of 19, 20, and 21, are absolutely out of their element when they undertake to match strength with the professional teams of 23 to 27 and 28.

We are being asked to defeat this amendment and to allow the War Department to make the choice. It is said that if this amendment is adopted, in some instances it will be impossible for the War Department to send into the Air Corps or the mechanical units young men who are fully trained as machinists. The language of the amendment makes it clear that it is intended as a ban against utilizing boys in combat service.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is difficult to differentiate between those who are and those who are not in combat service. The mechanic on an airplane up in the front lines is in combat service. He may not be doing the actual shooting, but he is in just as much danger as those who are. Many of the large bombers carry mechanics to service them while they are flying. The training of such mechanics requires only 4 or 5 months. The same statement applies to mechanics on trucks and automobiles up at the front lines. They are regarded by the War Department as line soldiers; they are in the line. They are a part of the combat forces. They do not have to have as much training as do the men who are firing the guns, but they are in as great danger, and they are just as necessary.

Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska it would be impossible to send into combat a mechanic required to care for an airplane—a mechanic who was essential—unless he had had 12 months' training—which might be twice as much as he needed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator raised that point, because it brings me to a subject I wanted to discuss.

The Senator from Nebraska has left the floor. The Senator from Texas is on the floor; and if I may have his attention for a moment, it may be possible to develop my thought with respect to what the Senator from Kentucky has said. Numerous Senators have been talking about another modification of the amendment, one which would make it possible for the War Department to use 18- and 19-year-old draftees who desire to volunteer for combat service without full 12 months' training. I spoke to the Senator from Nebraska about that matter.

I ask the Senator from Texas if he has any objection to adding to his amendment a provision which would have the effect of saying that, "Those draftees who volunteer for combat service may be accepted."

The reason why I suggest that—and the suggestion is not mine; other Senators have made it in private conversation—is because it seems to me it would completely answer the only real objection which has been raised by the Department to the amendment, because then it would make it possible for those boys who are physically fit to be used in active service as replacements, without a year's training.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri and Mr. TYDINGS addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Missouri, who was first on his feet.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in view of what the Senator from Wyoming has just said, I have a draft of an amendment—I am not wedded to its particular provisions, and I do not care what amendment is acted on—which meets somewhat the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming.

My amendment would provide:

> No person inducted into the military service under the provisions of this act shall be assigned to combat service outside the continental limits of the United States—

I insert that provision because we have no way of knowing whether, as the war continues, it may be necessary to use large numbers of troops within the continental limits of the United States—

> unless he shall have reached the age of 20 years, or unless he shall have volunteered for such service, or unless he shall have had 1 year's training.

That would seem to me to meet every possible contingency which has been suggested.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know that what the Senator has suggested is constructive, and under normal conditions it would follow that his logic would be almost unanswerable. However, I want to submit this suggestion to him: Let us suppose that a boy 18 or 19 years of age is in the Army, and that someone comes around and says, "The outfit is going abroad, but we cannot take you unless you volunteer."

It seems to me that the position in which that boy would be placed would be such that if he had any pride, even though his mother and father had written to him not to volunteer, he would feel that he was being humiliated in the eyes of his fellows, and he would be forced to volunteer.

I respectfully suggest that I believe the amendment would be much stronger without the inclusion of the volunteer provision; because if it were inserted, logical though it would be in normal circumstances, the result would be to make involuntary acquiescence in the request to volunteer.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, what the Senator has said would be perfectly logical if it were not for the factors which have been described by the Army: First, the Army wants to train boys for

not less than 12 months insofar as they are used to make new units. So we are not bothered about that situation.

Second, the Army does not want to be debarred from sending the young men as replacements into old units.

That being the case, it seems to me that the situation the Senator has described would seldom, if ever, arise; because the new units would not be sent out. The ones sent out would be the volunteers to go as replacements into the old units.

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

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not believe it would work in that way. Let us take a division—we shall call it the 88th Division, just for the sake of giving it a name—a division of 15,000 men; and in that division there is a company B, let us say, consisting of 250 men. Among the 250 men are 10 boys 19 years of age. The unit is ordered to go abroad; and the question arises, under the volunteer proposition, whether the boys want to go along with the unit with which they have been training. One of the boys is in a squad with 8 or 10 older men. They sit in the tent, and they say, "Bill, you know you don't have to go over there if you don't want to, under the law passed by Congress. Because of your age, they can make you go only if you volunteer. How about it?"

What is the poor fellow 18 or 19 years old going to say even if he has in his pocket a letter from his mother and father saying, "Don't you dare volunteer"?

If I see the situation aright, and I believe I do, what would happen would be that, in the very nature of things, the boy would practically be compelled to go.

I shall suggest an alternative. The Senator from South Dakota read a very fine letter from General Marshall. In it the General said it took 3 months to complete a certain part of a soldier's training, and that in 3 more months—6 months altogether—certain other phases of the soldier's training were completed.

In the normal situation envisaged by General Marshall, at the end of 6 months the man would be a fairly well trained infantry soldier. If he went into some sort of mechanical work, such as airplane repair, and so on, more time would be required for his training; but for the normal machine gun, infantry, or trench mortar operations, as I understood the General's letter, approximately 6 months would do the job.

So, if the Senator wants to make these men available when they have had 6 months' training, that would be in line with the Army's request.

However, in my judgment, the age provision should not be left in a voluntary or involuntary status. It should be defined clearly so that the individual equation would not exist when the situation was presented in any particular camp.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may make some remarks along that line?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to yield the floor, because I have no intention to prolong the debate. I think the issue is perfectly clear. I sought only to express my opinion. I have not offered the proposed amendment which has been under discussion, because I do not want to trespass upon the preserves, as it were, of other Senators who have been debating this suggestion, and some of whom, like the Senator from Missouri, have drafted language.

However, I should say that if such a limitation is proposed, I shall support it; but, regardless of whether it is proposed, I believe that a year's training for boys under 19 years of age should be declared as necessary by the Congress of the United States.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I wish to make merely a brief observation. Alluding to the example stated by the Senator from Maryland, who referred to a company of 250 men, and who said that perhaps 10 or more of them might be under the age limit, so that they would have to volunteer, let me say that he did not take the matter to its final conclusion. The final conclusion is that if the boys did not volunteer, the particular company could not be sent overseas or into combat. It would have to go back into training and get replacements to bring it up to full strength, making it entirely impossible for the Army to operate at all—just as is stated by General Marshall in his letter which I have before me.

Let me say that it might not be only 10 men, amounting to only 3 or 4 percent, but in some companies the percentage might be greater than that, as the Senator well knows.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have long had the view that we should have to draft boys 19 years of age. I am equally convinced that we should not draft boys 18 years of age, and that today there is no necessity to draft such boys, despite the testimony which has been presented to both the Senate and House committees.

On June 18, I submitted an analysis of the available manpower. The analysis appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date. From the testimony given by the representatives of the Selective Service System at the hearing, I see no particular reason to change the opinion which was formed at that time—that we shall have plenty of men available if we draft the 19-year-old boys, without drafting the 18-year-old boys. I should vote to exempt the 18-year-old boys from the draft if an amendment to that effect were presented.

Since such an amendment does not seem likely to carry, I believe we should do the next best thing, and that is to defer boys of that age from going into combat service until they are more mature.

I think we should face the fact that while there is a good deal of talk about a year's training, there is not the slightest intention on the part of the Army to give these boys a year's training before they go abroad, and they will not have a year's training unless we impose by law a provision requiring it.

The testimony is certainly clear that the Army considers the present soldiers too old. In the first place, they intend immediately to turn to drafting the 18- and 19-year-old boys. If Senators will look at page 97 of the House hearings, they will see that General Hershey said frankly:

> Unless we direct otherwise, the System as now operating will take them first—

That is, the 18- and 19-year-olds—

> because our local draft boards have been told that because it was the intent of Congress not to take a man with a wife as long as they have a man without a wife, they will have to take them.

So the result will be to take a million and a half boys of 18 and 19 years of age. Those boys are coming into the service, and I think it is reasonable to conclude from the testimony of the Secretary of War on page 24 of the hearings, and from the testimony of General White on page 33, that probably half of those boys would be fed directly into the older divisions.

General White says very frankly that they do not want to form new divisions of boys of that age. He says, on page 33:

> It would be very undesirable. We would lose a great deal of the advantage that we hope to gain. We would have a great many divisions with a very high age average. We would have one or two, or a few, with a very low age bracket. We don't want a division of 18- and 19-year-old men at all. We want to mix those men with some older men, men of more mature judgment, and it is the combination that gives you the good fighting organization. It is not solely the young men; it is the mixture that you want, a broad base in your organization.

Therefore, what they are going to do, as is perfectly obvious, is to take the million and a half men who are going to come in immediately, and feed at least half of them into the old divisions which have been trained or substantially trained. There is no question, in my mind, that the reason the Army is opposed to this provision is not inconvenience, but is the fact that they actually want to use these men long before the 12 months' training is up. I think the Secretary of War practically says the same thing. On page 24 of the House hearings, in answer to a question whether it was contemplated to put these young men in a common pool of men available for military service, he says:

> Secretary STIMSON. I can only answer that as I have already: We have a plan for the development of these units which are being activated every month. As you know, we have been activating four new divisions practically each month for the past summer. We have deferred two or three groups, but other than that, that is going on. That requires a steady stream flow of men into the units which are very carefully and under a very careful system put on foot and trained, first in the higher brackets of officers, then in the noncommissioned officers, and then in the cadres, and finally in the entire division. It is a very delicate and complicated system which has worked better than anything we have ever had in this Nation before, and into that stream of organization and movement of machinery the new flood of young manpower will go.

So I do not think there is any doubt, regardless of the talk about a year's training, that, after all, these men are going to get 3 months' or 6 months' training, because the Army thinks if they are in older units that is enough training

for them. I have no question that what we now face is the drafting of these men into active service. If we want to prevent that, if we think that a boy should not go abroad before he is 19, I think we should adopt the Norris amendment.

Unless there is the greatest necessity—and the necessity may arise to draft boys of 18 sooner or later—why should we draft them both at once. They did not do that in England. In England they started with age 20, and, a little later, they called boys of 19—that was last December—and then they put it down to 18½, and only yesterday they lowered the age to 18. They are not particularly bothered by any inconvenience of making some special provision for boys 18 years old, as evidenced by an article in the New York Herald Tribune of this morning from which I quote the following:

In his announcement Bevin said that the younger recruits now to be called up will not immediately be posted for service overseas, for which the minimum age remains 19.

They are not concerned about the inconvenience of handling boys under 18.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator realizes, of course, that there is some difference in the situation of England and that of this country. They have to keep within the confines of England at least a million men for defense purposes.

Mr. TAFT. They have an army of some 3,000,000 men, and we must keep, according to the Secretary of War, at least, a million men in the service of supply and at least a million men training in this country. Of the seven and a half million men 2,000,000 are not to be sent abroad, or only to a limited extent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that, but what I am talking about is the men trained for war combat service. They have got to keep a million of those men in England, in addition to the other men in what is called the service of supply, who, whether receiving the same training or a shorter period of training, will be the men who are kept at home whenever the time comes when it is necessary, expedient, or wise to send men across the channel to fight somewhere in Europe.

Mr. TAFT. If the second front should be set up, I assume it will be at least half British and half American, and I do not see but that the situation is exactly the same. They are not going to send boys of 19 to fight on continental soil, and I do not know why the United States should send them, because the British have had much more experience and judgment in dealing with boys of 18 and 19. Surely their judgment is better than that of men who have not actually engaged in the fighting in Europe and who have not had actual fighting experience in modern warfare. I see no real distinction between the British situation and our own, and I see no reason why we should not follow their example.

The Minister also pointed out that while 18 was the age set for enrollment by the National Service Acts in practice, the minimum age was originally 20. This was later reduced to 19, and last December to 18½.

I hesitate to say it with any certainty, but it looks to me as if, in order to encourage the passage of the pending bill, the King of England yesterday reduced the age in Great Britain to 18, so that no criticism could be made of the fact that the English had a higher age than we had. I cannot say that that is positively the reason, but certainly it is a strange coincidence that it should have been reduced yesterday when this bill was under consideration in the Senate.

Mr. President, I feel that, on the average, boys of 18 are not nearly so mature as are boys of 19. Probably it is the period of life in which there is the greatest change. Boys of 18 are, in effect, freshmen in college. After his freshman year a boy is usually very different and more mature than when he graduated from high school. One year makes a tremendous difference and unless we can see a great necessity for it, I do not believe those boys ought to be drafted or, at least, they ought not to be sent into actual combat service.

I had a call on Monday from a man in Cincinnati who came to see me because he said he had enlisted in the First World War at the age of 17, and that he was 18 when his unit went abroad. He served during the World War in the unit in France. He said to me that there were two other boys in that unit who were 18 years of age, and "do not let anyone tell you that we were good soldiers or that we were the best soldiers in the unit." He said, "We knew we were not and the other men knew we were not, and, so far as our service is concerned, we were, in effect, mascots and water boys for the company." He said, "My own experience is not suited to encourage the idea that boys of 18 should join a unit which is to engage in active combat service." Of course, there may be a difference of opinion. Many boys are older at 18 than are other boys, but that testimony was very convincing, at least to me.

There is one other reason why it is not very fair to send boys of 18 abroad. Older boys of intelligence and ability and personality, have an opportunity of becoming officers. A boy of 18 is practically barred from that opportunity. He is so young that most of the men will say, "No, you will have to serve a couple of years as a private before you can go to an officer's training camp and become an officer." So it is a good deal harder, it seems to me, on the boy of 18 to make him go into the Army and serve as a private than it is on the boy who is older and who can gradually get a commission.

Mr. President, is it necessary to draft boys of 18? The figures, of course, are conflicting, but, it seems to me, even as I read the testimony of General Hershey, that what we are going to decide is, Shall we take boys of 18 before married men up to about 30? I have been very much in favor of postponing the drafting of married men over 30 years of age with families, and finally, by constant pressure, I think I had something to do with getting the Selective Service System to defer married men with children beyond that age. But I have never been able to get General Hershey to make a classification on the basis of age, and he should long ago have done so.

In the last bill we gave him authority to say, if he chose to do so, "I will first take men under 30 years, and then men over 30. I will take men of 20, then I will call men of 19 and 18, if necessary." That is what the foreign countries do. They call up a new class after they have exhausted the previous class. But General Hershey has never been willing to exercise that power, to make any distinction whatever between men at the lowest age, 20, and now 18, and those at the top, 45, and when the Army says, "Our divisions are too old, they average 27 or 28," it is so because of what the Army asked us to do. I did not want to include the older men. The Army wanted to, and now they say the result of their policy is to get too old an Army. In my opinion, men from 35 up never should have been drafted, and, after they were drafted, General Hershey should have deferred them beyond all the younger men.

It seems to me to be very clear that it would be better to take men under 30 who are married than to go down to the boys of 18, and if we are willing to take married men under 30, according to the figures I have, I do not believe it will be necessary to take boys of 18.

There are a great many reasons for taking married men under 30 which do not apply to older men. In the first place, the men over 30 are in much more essential positions and they have reached such positions in life that they will have more difficulty in getting back to them if they are away over 3 years.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I was very much interested in what the Senator from Ohio said about giving the Selective Service System the right to classify these men in the previous law, about which I had forgotten. I think the Senator from Ohio is correct when he says that General Hershey should have taken advantage of that; but he has never done so. In the judgment of the Senator, does that not provide us a precedent, when they say, "We are going to train these boys just the same," under which we might conclude that when they should do something, when they are given discretion, they may not do it? It seems to me this furnishes an additional reason why we should include in the law a provision about the service of these younger soldiers, and not leave it to the discretion of the military authorities.

Mr. TAFT. I agree entirely with the Senator; and unless we put it in the law, it will not be a discretion which will be exercised.

Mr. President, the men over 30 obviously are not as physically qualified as are married men under 30. I do not think married men under 30 will be comfortable remaining at home when the other men of their age go to war. I think most of them will prefer to be included in the armed services. Certainly that was true during the World War, and I believe it to be true today.

Men under 30 have not built up the standards of living which the men over 30 have built up. It does not cost so

much to support their wives and families. The wife of such a man is much more likely to have a family of her own to which she can return, and her father and mother are much more likely to have a home, and she can be taken care of much more easily than the older wife. Furthermore, the wife under 30 is much more able to get a job than the one over 30.

It seems to me the result is that there is a very marked line, and I believe that we should draft the men under 30 who are married, even though they have children, before we resort to the boys of 18. General Hershey could do that, but there is not the slightest intention of doing it unless we adopt such an amendment as is proposed, and there will not be any inclination to do it.

It is said that it will be most inconvenient if we adopt the restriction that boys of 18 must be trained. If that is so, it will not be necessary to call boys of 18. The Administrator has power to defer these boys until after all the 19-year-old boys are taken, or he can defer them down to 18½ if he wishes to do so.

Mr. President, I do not like to discuss figures, but so far as I can estimate, and bearing out what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] stated some time ago, about the number of men between 20 and 30 who still are not drafted, my estimate is that if we take the boys of 19 we will have over 15,000,000 men up to the age of 30. Exempting everyone over 30, there would be 15,000,000 men available. Out of those 15,000,000 men it seems to me we should be able to find seven and a half million men without drafting boys of 18.

So far as I can see, even according to the figures of General Hershey, if we add the boys who become 19 years of age during 1942, there will be nearly 9,000,000 men available for the armed forces, including the Navy, which means, of course, about 8,000,000 from which to draw the 7,500,000 army which is required for the year 1943. I do not question the need of an army of that size. That may be the proper size, but I maintain that if we take married men under 30 years of age, and give regard to proper exemptions for civilian occupations as well as physical disqualification, we still can obtain the number of men necessary without drafting boys 18 years of age. Certainly, if we find that to be impossible by next July, we can pass another law and include the larger group.

Mr. President, under the circumstances it seems to me that we should establish a special classification of the boys who are 18 years of age, and be certain that they are not taken until all other groups are drafted, at least up to the age of 30. Holding that view, I necessarily believe that we should support the Norris amendment, and make sure that these boys are in effect deferred from combat service until they become at least 19 years of age.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have offered an amendment to the pending bill which covers somewhat the same ground as that covered by the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. I think the amendment as revised by the Senator from Nebraska will accomplish what I had in mind. I want to place the age limit at 19 years and also require that the boys have a year's military training before going into combat service.

Mr. President, the pending bill in the form in which it was introduced will, I fear, make the farm situation worse at a time when the need for labor on farms is as grave as any issue before the country. The farmer is slaughtering his cows because he has insufficient help in milking; he has not enough help in the fields, his crops are rotting there; his hay and corn and wheat and fruit are spoiling; now we are threatening to take his sons. Farm boys have always helped their fathers. At 18 and 19 years of age they are beginning to be at their most useful period. If we take them away, many will never return. Even those youngsters who come back from the war alive, many will not be returning to the farms; at that age they will have been made restless and unsettled and unbalanced, immature boys spoiled for life.

This farm problem comes just when the need to produce more food is greatest, here and abroad. Starvation threatens. It is reported that 5,000,000 Russians will probably die of starvation this winter. Belgium and Greece are starving. And what results from starvation? Plague, illness from undernourishment, epidemic which knows no boundaries, and the breaking of morale among our allies and potential allies. America is going to have to feed the world. It is going to have to produce more, not less.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a letter I have received from a Kansas farm woman. It is as follows:

PECK, KANS., *September 30, 1942.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: * * * America is in danger of a food shortage because of indiscriminate drafting of farm boys.

It is an utter impossibility for school children to help on our farm. The technical training needed to run our various tractors, hay balers, combines, etc., is found only in skilled workers.

We farm 1,000 acres near Wichita, Kans. Our oldest son is in the Army and if our 18-year-old boy is taken we will be compelled to do what numerous families are doing—have an auction sale, move to town, and go into war work. Then where will the thousands of pounds of pork, beef, dairy, and poultry products be which we produce? Like any business, it takes many years to become established in farming and go into maximum production.

I should be glad for you to place this letter in General Hershey's hands and inform him that in Kansas, at least, the real foundation of the American way of life is the rural population.

MRS. W. L. WALTON.

Mr. President, here is another letter from a fine farmer in western Kansas:

FORD, KANS., *October 3, 1942.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have read some of your speeches and am glad for the stand you have taken for the farmer. * * *

They are crying all the time for more production and yet they take all of our young men to war. Help is almost impossible to get on the farm any more at any price. They won't let us have tires and now they are going to refuse us gas as well as farm machinery. I have lived on this farm for 30 years and have had a time to live the last 10 years on account of drought and dust and low prices. My only boy is gone.

I milked from 10 to 16 cows the past year and shipped cream. I have to go 18 miles to Dodge City for repairs of any kind and had to make 2 or 3 trips to town all summer with cream and eggs. This is an absolute impossibility with 4 gallons of gas a week, so, like hundreds of others, there is just one thing to do and that is quit, and quit I must on 4 gallons of gas.

* * * * *

GUY WOOTIN.

Mr. President, the folly and inefficiency of putting these youths immediately into combat service are points that are emphasized by many medical leaders.

Let me read excerpts from statements of eminent medical men and educators relative to the drafting of 18- and 19-year-old youths:

SHOULD WORK ON FARMS UNTIL MATURE, SAYS EMINENT MEDICAL MAN

I believe that the 18- to 19-year-old boys should be the last group to be drafted. No other age group would be so seriously damaged as this one by its disarrangement and disorganization and would become so maladjusted not only immediately but throughout its future. If these boys are given 2 more years in which to grow up, with perhaps part-time work on farms, where labor is evidently needed, they will be of more value, both in the war and in the post-war world.

Dr. EDWARD A. STRECKER,
President-elect, American Psychiatric Association, Philadelphia.

DON'T SACRIFICE OUR BOY POWER YET, SAYS JOHN DEWEY

We have in this vast land great reserves of manpower without sacrificing our boy power. All of us know many men in their twenties and thirties who have not gone into military service. They should be called first; the young boys should be the last to go. Those boys who are entering college should be permitted to continue their education. Unless we have boys with a basic college education, the country will be depleted of trained men in the future, when they will be so vitally needed. Being forced into the war machine will prevent their growth and development. Other boys who are not headed for college could replace unskilled labor on farms, in factories, etc., thus having a chance to grow up before going, fresh from school, to war.

Dr. JOHN DEWEY,
Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.

EIGHTEEN-YEAR-OLDS NOT ALWAYS 16 IN DEVELOPMENT

The age at which the character of young men matures is a variable quantity. A number of boys of 18 have not the maturity of the normal boy of 16. A somewhat lesser percentage of 19-year-olds will belong to the group of immature characters.

It would seem to be a more rational procedure to provide for the further education of all boys of 18 to 19 of average normal intelligence. If they are drafted into the ordinary military services their education will cease and we shall not have a body of men from whom to draw the officers of the future.

Dr. THOMAS V. MOORE,
Department of Psychology and Psychiatry, the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Mr. President, there are other statements by important physicians and educators which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD without reading.

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

OPINIONS OF EMINENT MEDICAL MEN AND EDUCATORS RELATIVE TO THE DRAFTING OF YOUTHS UNDER 20 YEARS OF AGE

I believe that the 18–19-year-old boys should be the last group to be drafted. No other age group would be so seriously damaged as this one by its disarrangement and disorganization and would become so maladjusted not only immediately but throughout its future. If these boys are given 2 more years in which to grow up with perhaps part-time work on farms, where labor is evidently needed, they will be of more value, both in the war and in the post-war world.

Dr. EDWARD A. STRECKER,
President-elect, American Psychiatric Association, Philadelphia.

DR. GEORGE S. STEVENSON: Many of us who are close to the problems of youth are deeply concerned over the possibility of drafting 18- and 19-year-old boys. We realize how grave are the psychological dangers of war to boys of this age. I am writing to urge you to use your influence to the end that every other source of manpower be used before these boys are called.

Dr. CAROLINE B. ZACHRY,
Director, Child Guidance Bureau, Board of Education, New York City.

DR. STEVENSON: With the hope that my opinion may help a little in preventing the making of a serious mistake, I should like to say that any proposal to induct boys of the 18–19-year level into our armed services at the present time is an unfortunate one. During this period of years the young boy is either in the midst of that formal education so necessary for the promotion of the best interests of society and civilization, or if not in school, is along with the others, just learning to adjust in the complexities of our social and economic system. Any measure taken to interrupt this course of events should be very seriously scrutinized. The majority of interruptions in these life factors will result in a permanent end or an irreparable deviation of the life plan that is so much needed to constitute a sound basis for reconstruction here at home after the war. These persons should constitute the trained minds of the future. Those hardly out of adolescence are comparatively immature emotionally and intellectually, and many of them are as yet unstable constitutionally, and are thus unfit for the regimented camp life or for active field service. Certainly, the older groups including the married men and those married men with children, should be utilized first, until the supply is exhausted, before considering the adolescents for service.

NOLAN D. C. LEWIS, M. D.,
New York State Psychiatric Institute and Hospital.

The morale and mental health of this country would be undermined by drafting the young boys of 18–19. These boys are inexperienced, impressionable, and have never yet had an opportunity to live independently; they have not the stability and preparation of the older soldier. When they reach the age of 20 they will still be available for military service and they will be better equipped physically, mentally, and emotionally to withstand the shock of war. They will be better either as soldiers or as civilians.

We have in this vast land great reserves of manpower without sacrificing our boy power. All of us know many men in their twenties and thirties who have not gone into military service. They should be called first; the young boys should be the last to go. Those boys who are entering college should be permitted to continue their education. Unless we have boys with a basic college education, the country will be depleted of trained men in the future, when they will be so vitally needed. Being forced into the war machine will prevent their growth and development. Other boys who are not headed for college could replace unskilled labor on farms, in factories, and so forth, thus having a chance to grow up before going, fresh from school, to war.

Prof. JOHN DEWEY.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, there is also our own experience in the World War. This quotation comes from the Army's own medical records:

EXCERPT FROM VOLUME X, SECTION II, CHAPTER VIII, PAGE 430, IN SERIES OF STUDIES OF THE MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY IN THE WORLD WAR, VOLUME ON NEUROPSYCHIATRY

These figures reveal a marked disproportion between the admissions to the hospital of men under 21 and their number in the Army at large, 77 percent more men from this group being admitted to the hospital than their proportion in the Army would lead us to expect. That is, there was a marked tendency for men under 21 to develop neurosis in greater numbers than their proportion in the Army would warrant.

We cannot ignore this serious evidence. It is too costly, actually too costly to the Army, as well as too costly in terms of human life. There is a waste of power that would be better utilized if the youth were held in reserve and developed.

Mr. President, what about education? If we call out high-school and college boys, where are we going to find trained minds for the future, skills to rehabilitate the world? We do not need only physicists and chemists—that is a short view. Civilization will go on needing teachers, economists, Government experts, political leaders. We cannot shut down all educational institutions at a stroke of the pen. This bill is a blueprint of destruction for education. We must keep the college student at his studies. We need him.

Mr. President, there are millions of other men available, as we all know. More than 27,000,000 were originally registered between the ages of 20 and 45. Millions have not yet even been classified, other millions deferred often for trivial and inadequate reasons. Over a million new reserves reach the age of 20 each year. Industry is taking in more and more women to replace draft-eligible men. When people say that fathers will be taken from young children they are forgetting those millions of married men without children, many of them married since Pearl Harbor. Furthermore, in the case of many marriages, husbands and wives are both working and the wives support themselves. In a recent letter to the New York Times, outstanding educators and medical men said that it was their judgment that less damage would be done to the country if husbands, and even fathers of children, were drafted than the damage that would be done to our young boys. I quote this paragraph from the New York Times' letter of October 16:

We believe we have given full consideration to the fact that it is a great hardship for a child to be deprived of his father or a wife of her husband, but we regard even this as not so serious as subjecting the 18- and 19-year-old group prematurely to combat experience. It seems to us that this age group is our most important reserve of manpower and should be safeguarded to the last. If the Government is preparing for a long war, they might be placed in a quasi-military status now and conscripted for military service later. If it proves to be a short war, they will be equally needed in building the post-war world.

General Hershey testified before the Senate Military Affairs Committee that to draft immature youth would only postpone the draft of married men by 2 or 3 months. Remember, too, Mr. President, that the Army has not promised that these boys will be given a year, or even 6 months, of training in this country. Boys fresh from home and school may soon be sent abroad into combat service. Need any more be said? The Nation needs men. Will these boys not be needed at their peak, instead of now?

Mr. President, the business of Congress is to examine all proposals that come before it, not to follow anybody blindly. The country does not want us to be rubber stamps. We follow, and rightly, the recommendations of the Army on military planning and tactics. However, we cannot blindly follow the Army in the matter of manpower and discharge our full responsibility. The Army is not in exclusive possession of this sphere of our national economy. We are not doing our duty by the Army and by the country if we do not help them in interpreting human needs and conditions. Industrialists may demand a large labor supply from time to time. Nevertheless, it has been the business of Congress to see to it that they did not tap for this supply child labor or place in the injurious trades potential mothers. The record shows that industry as such has been primarily concerned in getting supplies of labor and not in the effects on the race. Therefore, the Congress, rightly, has had to enact laws to provide such protection. In the same way it is now the primary duty of the Congress to explore the whole field and to examine the problem of manpower as it does the labor market.

Let us remember these are youths, not men. We do not consider them mature enough to vote for us. How dare we consider them mature enough to die for us?

The War Department has been vigilant in securing the most efficient and effective matériel for war, such as tanks, planes, and guns. It is the business of the Congress to see to it that only the most effective and efficient material in manpower is used.

I therefore offer my amendment, which discriminates between these boys and adult men.

Mr. President, I have received more than a thousand telegrams and letters in the last few days from men and women of Kansas, protesting against the taking of untrained boys for combat service. I ask that a few of these communications be printed in the RECORD. One is from T. A. James, superintendent, Atlanta Rural High School, Atlanta, Kans.; one is from Mr. and Mrs. Elmer

A. Thomas, of Medicine Lodge, Kans.; one is a telegram from a group of Hutchinson, Kans., mothers and fathers who demand that the 1-year training clause be included in the draft bill if the age is lowered to 18 years; and there are a number of others. I ask that these letters and telegram be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

ATLANTA, KANS., *October 20, 1942.*
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: I hope you oppose the drafting of 18- and 19-year-old boys. According to the papers it appears that some people wish to draft 18- and 19-year-old boys before they draft the stronger and more mature young men who are married. If we must draft workers, it seems that we could use 18- and 19-year-old boys to work and thus release older young men for the Army; and in this community most of the help that farmers have are boys—a number of them in high school.

Sincerely yours,
T. A. JAMES,
Superintendent, Atlanta Rural High School.

MEDICINE LODGE, KANS., *October 19, 1942.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: If you just must vote for the 18- to 19-year-old boys being inducted into the Army, we are urging that they be required to have at least 1 year's training before being put into actual service.

We knew boys in World War No. 1 who were in France less than 30 days after being inducted, which is plain murder.

Also, our Government has three branches. The people as a whole would like to see Congress perform their legislative duties instead of willing their rights to the executive branch.

Farm labor is really getting serious in Barber county. If men were drafted to stay on the farms, the tremendous criticism on agricultural deferments would cease to some extent.

Our Farm Bureau workers want to know who to contact to urge that a ban be put around the Army camps to keep bad women and liquor out. Our young boys' lives and souls are at stake. We are much disturbed. Our information came from very reliable sources.

Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. ELMER A. THOMAS.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *October 17, 1942.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Hutchinson mothers and fathers demand at least 1 year training clause be included in draft bill if age lowered to 18 years.

Mr. and Mrs. E. D. HAROLD.
Mr. and Mrs. HARRY S. KING.
Mr. and Mrs. ROY CHRISTENSON.
Mr. and Mrs. H. S. LUDWIG.
Mr. and Mrs. ARTHUR H. LEWIS.
Mr. and Mrs. WALTER R. PACE.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *October 17, 1942.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Without 1 year of training before combat duty drafting of 18- and 19-year-old boys is murder. Insist on 1 year of training.

Dr. and Mrs. BOYD GREEVER.

HUTCHINSON, KANS., *October 14, 1942.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We want to know that many citizens of Hutchinson, Kans., do not approve of lowering the draft age to include 18-year-old boys—in fact, we know of no one who approves the lowering of the draft age to 18 years.

We abhor the thought of sending our half-grown innocent boys out to fight the war planned and proclaimed by men of mature years. These boys are not developed either in mind or body to pitch their lives against the hellish machinations of militarists, of war lords, and organized interests gaining profit in time of war.

We wish to protest the lowering of the draft age to include boys of 18 years. We want to give our boys a chance to grow up.

You are our voice in our Government. We want you to know how we feel about this. We would appreciate it greatly if you could take a stand against lowering the draft age to 18 years.

Very truly yours,
Mr. and Mrs. MAX WYMAN
(And sundry other citizens of Hutchinson, Kans.).

STATE OF KANSAS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Russell, Kans., October 19, 1942.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: Along with the other parents of our great Nation, I voice my protest to the drafting of boys in their 'teen ages, mere children still growing, and needing the protection of a home. instead of being placed in Army camps in a man's Army.

Surely our country hasn't fallen to the Hitler tactics of sacrificing the youth of our land on the altar of greed and lust, created by the war lords of other lands.

I am merely a mother, pouring out to you a mother's heart in protection of the young sons of our Nation.

Sincerely,
Mrs. W. H. SELLENS.

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Topeka, Kans., October 20, 1942.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you relative to the bill soon to appear in the Senate, drafting 18- and 19-year-old boys for service.

Last spring I wrote you on this same subject, and I again want to protest this proposed step. We people interested in the education of American youth do not favor taking these boys at the ages of 18 and 19 years out of school and throwing them into the Army. The Army with their propaganda are endeavoring to show this to be a necessity, but these same youths, taken at 20 years of age for military service, will be much better soldiers and know how to take care of themselves, to the advantage of the armed forces.

It is to be deplored that the heads of the Government do not look at this question from a broad point of view. A youth of 18 years is still a grown-up child, and will develop in the next 2 years in school to the point where he will be a real asset to his country and of some value in a military way. We people interestd in schools are anxious to cooperate 100 percent in building up any program suggested to fit American youth to take his part, when he reaches an age capable of doing so, but that age is not 18 or 19 years, and I sincerely hope you will do your part in holding this proposed legislation to the original draft age of 20 years.

With kindest personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,
KELSEY H. PETRO.

CHANUTE, KANS., *October 22, 1942.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Drafting of boys 18 years old is almost a crime. They should be at least 19, with a full year's training before combat service. This is practically the unanimous opinion of hundreds we have talked with. Won't you please use your influence along the above lines.

Mr. and Mrs. E. M. COOPER.

KANSAS CITY, KANS., *October 21, 1942.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

Please vote "no" on draft legislation. We feel that America should not break down the schoolroom doors and drag forth our schoolboys for soldiers. They are not the proper material. Surely they have some rights and should not be rushed into war. It is within your power to save them.

COUNCIL OF DEMOCRATIC WOMEN'S
CLUBS OF KANSAS CITY, KANS.

WICHITA, KANS., *October 15, 1942.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Care, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I believe you should oppose draft of 18-year-olds. Nineteen-year-old boys are good soldiers, but from 18 to 19, I have found, as an infantry company commander, they are not good material.

CARL I. WINSOR.

SMITH COUNTY REVIEW,
Smith Center, Kans., October 12, 1942.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Smith County now has approximately 350 boys in the armed forces and another 60 to leave this month. A large percent of these lads have been taken from the farms of this county, and you know the result; in many cases it has left the farm with no one to do the work.

I am writing you as an interested businessman from this county farvoring instructions being given draft boards to make deferments where necessary to carry on farm work. You know the story as well as I, so I am not going into a lengthy explanation. I personally will appreciate anything that you may be able to do in connection with this matter.

Very truly yours,
HAROLD P. BEASON.

JUNCTION CITY, KANS., *October 22, 1942.*
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator, Washington, D. C.:

Your consideration in the drafting of our young boys will be appreciated. They should be given opportunity to prepare themselves. When other groups are being deferred, college boys, able to complete college along with R. O. T. C. at the age of 20 years can do more and should be allowed to complete their work.

E. W. ROLFS.

MULLINVILLE, KANS., *October 16, 1942.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is to protest against the drafting of teen-age boys before the childless married men are taken. In our county, there are quite a few married men, with no children, whose wives are working and they have not been called. They are engaged in occupations such as these: Drug-store clerk, variety store, restaurant, poultry dealer, oil station operator, and booster plant workers. These jobs can be filled by older men who have been working on Works Progress Administration, or women. Their home ties are

no stronger than those of the 18-year-old boys. Their work is not essential to the war * * *.

The 18-year-olds have been doing the harvesting, feed shocking, and farm work in our community. Our 18-year-old boys are still going to high school and belong to the 4-H. Why take these 4-H boys and let these young married men stay behind? It is not fair or just to the boys or to the other married men that have already been taken. Any man of 35 or 40 is in the prime of life, and when he hides behind a teen-age boy, he doesn't deserve a country. Let the boys go when their turn comes, but we are just as bad as Hitler, if we take them before it is necessary. They are not old enough to vote and let us not push them out in front to win this war, the most ruthless ever fought.

Yours sincerely,

LLOYD ELLER.

LAWRENCE, KANS.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER:

* * * * *

Most of the farm boys around here are in the Army. Labor on the farm is costing almost twice as much as last year. Labor works 10 hours on the farm. Farmers and their families put in a good many more than that.

* * * * *

It's to be hoped that Congress gets a little starch in their backbones and does something. Because if they don't, and let one man with a bunch of bunglers run the whole show. Congress just as well come home and go to work.

Very truly yours,

GUY SHULTZ.

WHITEWATER, KANS., *October 17, 1942.*

SENATOR CAPPER: We hereby make vigorous protest against drafting undeveloped, uneducated, 18- and 19-year-old boys; give the boys a chance. We want no Hitler regime.

Mr. and Mrs. L. M. PACE.

BRONSON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Bronson, Kans., October 17, 1942.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,

DEAR SENATOR: * * *

When Army officials first urged that it be enacted, they argued that it was best so as to assure the boys a maximum training period of at least a year. They said that short training was responsible for the great number of casualties. Now they seem to reverse themselves, and are wanting to take our boys right out of high school and rush them into combat. Boys with adolescent pimples—who don't even shave yet. Don't say it isn't done—one from our home county was in Ireland less than 3 months after his induction. Is this right? The boys don't even know what its all about yet, but are expected to blindly rush in and die for the selfish mistakes made by our leaders in past years.

Please give our boys a chance.

Kansas is counting on you to do the right thing now, as you have so consistently in the past.

Sincerely,

(Mrs. H. R.) FRANCES STOVER,
Bronson, Kans.

OSBORNE, KANS., *October 20, 1942.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is in vehement protest against this inhuman bill taking our young boys for combat service and sure slaughter. We mothers understand that there would be no commissions and "safe" service for this group.

The suggestion giving them the right to vote may salve the consciences of some Congress Members, but it makes the parents only the more bitter. These little boys haven't the least desire to vote for they haven't had a chance to think yet, let alone grow up.

My husband is a World War veteran, having served in France in actual combat with the Thirty-fifth Division, and we understand this war has to be fought, but we wonder if we, as a nation, are worth saving if we are barbaric enough to send these young, unthinking boys to do the messy, bloody work that our older boys and men should do.

Very truly yours,

ESTHER MEYER.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I favor the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. I think it covers the ground satisfactorily.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I shall vote for the pending amendment. However, I wish to say that I have an amendment which I shall offer after action shall have been taken on the pending amendment. I believe my amendment covers the situation more thoroughly. The pending amendment overlooks entirely the question of further education of the 18- and 19-year-old boys. It provides merely for military training. I think the further education of these boys is vitally important, both in making them good soldiers and preparing them for the responsibilities of citizenship after the war is over.

I have an amendment which I shall offer after action is taken on the Norris amendment, in connection with which I should like the indulgence of the Senate for at least an hour. It provides that the boys shall be given educational training and at the same time given basic military training. The scheme is to draft the boys, classify them, and send them to the colleges, high schools, and universities which shall be designated by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and that the Army shall furnish retired officers—there are plenty of them and there ought to be more—to conduct the basic military training of these boys until they shall have reached the age of 20. In that way they will be ready for the Army quickly to whip into line, and they will have the necessary training and will have reached the degree of maturity in thought and in mind which will make them good soldiers.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the bill as it is written, but I shall do my best to help amend it, because I realize it is going to pass unless there is a revulsion of sentiment. It seems to me that not only the Congress but the country and the newspapers and broadcasters have become stampeded on the idea of rushing 18- and 19-year-old boys into this slaughter, when England, which has been in war for several years, is still providing for the education of her boys before she puts them into combat service. Australia, which is an important part of the war machine, refuses to let a boy into the combat service until he reaches 19 years of age. I see no reason why we should be in such a hurry to dispose of this matter. I think we had better take time to discuss the importance of providing educational training along with basic military training.

Mr. President, I will say in this connection that I am now and have always been in favor of universal military training. We certainly can afford to give the boys military training, which will make them ready for the Army along with their ordinary educational training while they are 18 and 19 years old. I shall offer the amendment and I want the floor after the Norris amendment is acted on.

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. What are we voting on now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], as modified.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask that the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, as modified, be read?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] had offered a substitute.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I understood that I had offered a substitute and sent it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the amendment of the Senator from Texas never had been formally offered.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I offer the substitute amendment now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska, as modified, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lieu of the amendment of Mr. NORRIS, it is proposed to insert the following:

No person under 20 years of age inducted under this act shall be placed in actual combat duty beyond the territorial boundaries of continental United States until after he has had at least 1 year's military training following his induction.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question. Am I to understand that under the amendment which is offered by the Senator from Texas as a substitute for the amendment offered by the able Senator from Nebraska, if a boy is 19 years, 11 months, and 25 days old, he will have to have 1 year's training before he can be sent into combat duty? Is that correct?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should think that would follow if the substitute amendment we have just heard read were agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, if the substitute shall be agreed to, then any boys who are inducted under the proposed legislation who are 19 years, 9, 10, or 11 months old, will have the privilege of staying 1 year in this country before they can be ordered into combat duty of any kind or character? On the other hand, the boy who is 2 or 3 months older than the others—in other words, any boy who is over 20 years of age, whether it be 3 days, or 3 weeks, or 3 months—is subject to combat duty overseas immediately.

Mr. President, that seems to me to be the unfairness of the substitute amendment and the discrimination which will result insofar as boys of 19 and 20 years of age are concerned. There is a 6 or 8 or 10 months' period when one boy will

derive a tremendous benefit, so far as staying on this side is concerned and so far as any combat duty is concerned. On the other hand, the boy who is just a few days or a few months older will be discriminated against. Thousands upon thousands of such boys will be affected by the proposal. I doubt if the adoption of such type of discrimination will lift the morale of the Army. That is the serious objection, as I see it, to the proposal. It seems to me that if the measure is to be modified in any way at all, it should be done in such a way as to give the boys 18 or 19 years old at least 6 months' training in this country before they are sent into combat duty. That would come nearer to eliminating the discrimination to which I referred a moment ago.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield, because all I am doing is trying to get the facts.

Mr. NORRIS. That is also what I am trying to do. I do not believe we can by a statute avoid all discrimination. If we limit the induction into service at a particular age, it would naturally bring about some discrepancies which might be important. But how can we avoid that?

Mr. LUCAS. We probably cannot avoid it if we adopt this amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. How can we modify the amendment so as to avoid it?

Mr. LUCAS. I think we are all interested in making certain that these boys have adequate training before they are sent into service. There may be one boy 18 years old who has the physical and mental stability which qualifies him to go along with the boy who is 21 years of age. On the other hand, there may be a boy who ought to stay in this country a year or a year and a half. No one knows about such things until the boys get into the service, and their qualifications are closely ascertained by those who are over them.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not believe it will be possible to avoid some discrimination and inequality. Perhaps I may be wrong, and if I am I shall be glad to be corrected. For instance, as the Senator from Illinois has said, if a boy is 1 day past 18 years of age, and another one is 18 years and 11 months old, of course, if we classify them by age they both come within the limit of 18 years. Yet one is practically a year older than the other. Unless we can remove the arbitrary restrictions which seem to be necessary, I do not see how we can avoid discrimination. As the Senator said, the boy who is 18 years and 9 or 10 or 11 months old, will, when he is trained a year, be nearly 20 years old. But if we do not have some kind of limitation as to age they would both be left out entirely.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think many of us are trying to arrive at a common solution of a very difficult problem to which the Senator from Illinois has addressed himself by his question. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is as follows:

> Nothing in this act shall authorize the sending of troops inducted into military service by this act into combat service who are less than 19 years of age unless such troops have had at least 1 year of training.

We could not induct a man under the act until he had reached the age of 18, could we?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. After he had had 1 year's training, he would be over 19. It seems to me that a great deal of the confusion might be eliminated by the simple expedient of providing that no one inducted under this act shall be sent into combat service outside the United States until after he shall have passed his nineteenth birthday.

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

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me that that would still leave us in a situation in which we should meet the difference between the two boys, which would represent practically a year. As I see it, we should not be avoiding that difficulty.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska, with the permission of the Senator from Illinois, that if a boy is 18 years and 11 months old at the time of induction, and becomes 19 within a month, the minute he becomes 19 years of age he would not have to have the year's training, because the amendment says that no one under the age of 19 may be sent into the combat zone unless he has had a year's training.

Mr. NORRIS. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we cannot get them in until they are 18, why not take the bull by the horns and say that no one may be sent out of the country until he is 19 years of age? The same result would be obtained, and, at the same time, the possibility of sending them into combat after 10½, 11½, or 25 days' training would be eliminated.

Mr. NORRIS. If a boy went in when he was 18 years and 11 months' old, after he had been in for a month, he would be entirely out of the picture. That would be true in either case.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to avoid that difficulty if possible.

Mr. TYDINGS. So should I; but frankly, I do not know how. It seems to me that if the amendment were couched in those words we could establish a direct policy, because we could then say, as the English have said, that boys who are under 19 years of age shall not be sent into the combat zones.

It seems to me that we must rely somewhat on the Army. I do not believe that the Army would send boys into combat unless they were pretty well trained. Now, if we provide a preliminary period, and should adopt the 19-year provision as a matter of policy in connection with sending men abroad to combat areas, we could meet, so far as possible, the objections raised by the Senator from Illinois without defeating the philosophy of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will again yield, I think the substitute is an improvement over the amendment offered by me, because it takes in a larger scope. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I should be glad to take in boys of 19 as well as boys of 18; but I was afraid that such a provision could not be adopted. As a matter of policy, after consulting with quite a number of Senators who agreed with me, we decided that we had better take care of the 18-year-old boys.

Suppose the substitute were adopted. We should still have a great discrepancy, because the substitute would apply to the boy who is 1 day over 18 years of age, and it would apply to the boy who is 19 years and 11 months old—practically 2 years apart. It would still leave a discrepancy, which I think any amendment which has been suggested so far would leave. I do not see how to avoid it.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely rose to seek information as to the interpretation of the substitute offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

What the Senator from Illinois would like to see is unity in the Senate. I do not suppose that can be accomplished. I believe that this measure is sufficiently important, so far as the country is concerned, for us to achieve unity in the Senate if we can possibly do so. The more unity we can have upon measures of this kind, even if we must give and take a little, the better off we shall be, so far as the morale of the people is concerned—and their morale is ultimately transmitted to the troops.

My thought was that perhaps something in the way of a compromise might be arranged. I do not know whether it can be done. I am willing to vote now on the amendment. Frankly, I shall support the position of the Senator from South Dakota.

I cannot bring myself into the frame of mind to discriminate against boys around the 19- or 20-year age limit. I do not know whether anything better can be worked out. If there was ever a time when we ought to have unity on a question of this kind, it is now. We are in the throes of a terrible war. We all know the dangers which exist. We must have the support of the people on a policy of this kind. When the Senate divides upon a matter of such importance, obviously the country is divided; and the moment the Senate is united, the country is united.

I hope the leaders may be able to work out something upon which we can all agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] for the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS].

Mr. O'DANIEL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope the yeas and nays will not be ordered now, because if they are ordered, the amendment cannot be modified except by unanimous consent. The Senator will get the yeas and nays, anyway. Why

order them now? It is not possible to obtain a vote now, because other Senators wish to discuss the question further. So there is no need to be in a hurry about the yeas and nays.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I feel that a little information as to how this matter was handled some 24 years ago might bring the question more clearly before us, at a time when dangers threaten our country's existence.

Yesterday I made a statement to the effect that if there is complacency anywhere in the United States it is here in Washington. I wish to reiterate that statement in as strong language as possible.

I do not believe we can compare the situation in which our country finds itself today with the situation in which we were some 24 years ago. The other day an article in Time magazine stated that no general had ever been given the problem now confronting General Marshall—that of conducting a war on six continents. Think of it!

We must remember that we do not now have the allies we had in 1917 and 1918. Some of them are now our enemies, or are working as slaves for our enemies of 24 years ago. We are really in a serious situation, which is not comparable with that of 24 years ago. It is in direct contrast.

To bring the situation to the attention of the Senate, I wish to read a story which strikes home. It was printed in the Washington Post of September 17, 1942. I wish to read it in its entirety. It gives both sides of the question. I hope Senators will listen to it. In view of its length Senators may not have read it at the time. The article is by Edward T. Folliard. I read:

[From the Washington Post of September 17, 1942]

THE 18-19 DRAFT BELIEVED AS GOOD AS PASSED—FROTHY ORATORY ON SAME QUESTION IN CONGRESS DURING FAMOUS DEBATES OF 1918 IS RECALLED

(By Edward T. Folliard)

If the experience of 1918 is any guide, the forthcoming debate in Congress on the question of drafting 18- and 19-year-old youths will be a dramatic one, marked by much passion and many lofty flights of oratory. This over the youngsters will be brought into the selective service.

It was in mid-August 1918 that the proposal to lower the draft age came before the second session of the Sixty-fifth Congress.

Foes of the legislation asserted that Congress was "robbing the cradle," that it was snatching "tender buds" from their mothers' knees. One House Member demanded that the fathers of 18- and 19-year-old boys be sent in their stead, or else stand revealed as cowards and slackers.

Proponents argued that 18- and 19-year-old youngsters had fought in all of America's wars, and that a million or so were even then serving as volunteers. They argued that young men were tougher than older men, and that, anyway, it was not a question of what Congress desired to do, but of what Congress had to do if the Nation's arms were to be triumphant.

PASSED AUGUST 31, 1918

The legislation, which had been requested by the War Department, was passed on August 31, 1918, and President Woodrow Wilson signed it the same day. It made subject to military service all male citizens "between the ages of 18 and 45, both inclusive."

As it turned out, the men involved in this all-out mobilization were just being classified when Germany caved in and asked for an armistice. Still nobody could safely say that Congress had erred. By extending the draft, Congress had provided "a supply of fighting men sufficient to meet every military necessity," a supply equal to the manpower of Britain and France combined. Undoubtedly that was an important consideration in the minds of the German military leaders when they decided to quit.

When Senator Curley (Republican) of South Dakota recently introduced a bill to draft 18- and 19-year-old youths, Senator BILBO (Democrat) of Mississippi quickly protested.

BILBO said that "the idea of sending tender boys into combat" was "abhorrent" to him.

SPARE OUR SONS

So it was, too, to many of the Senators and Representatives in the Sixty-fifth Congress. For weeks these Members were bombarded with letters and telegrams from fathers and mothers, urging them to spare their sons.

In the debates that took place in the House and Senate, most of the arguments had to do with the question of necessity. Occasionally, however, the oratory became emotional in the extreme.

"Who is this 18-year-old boy that you will consign to war while mature men remain at peace?" asked Representative Leonidas Dyer (Republican) of Missouri.

"He is only a child yet, clinging to the knees of that mother who taught him his prayers; a tender bud blooming into manhood * * *."

Representative Albert Johnson (Republican) of Washington put a House page boy of 18 on exhibition and asked the Members how they would like to see him face a German gas attack and be blinded for life. The page, incidentally, was eager to go to war.

Representative E. C. Little (Republican) of Kansas said both Rome and Greece had fallen because they had sent too many of their young men to the wars. He said he was opposed to taking a boy of 18 out of school.

"He should be in school and his father should be out fighting," cried Little. "Is there any man of 45 that wants to stay at home while his boy goes to the war? God have pity on him if he does.

"Come out of the brush, brave men! Come out of the brush, cowards and slackers! Go yourselves and register and be shipped to Europe, and let your boy stay in school where he belongs, and with his mother. He is to furnish the intelligent voter of the future."

Then the reverent grandfather of our colleague from Massachusetts is referred to: Senator Henry Cabot Lodge (Republican), of Massachusetts, speaking on the other side of the Capitol, had something to say that was indirectly an answer to Representative Little's solicitude for the "intelligent voter of the future."

"We must remember," said Lodge, "that our object in all this legislation is getting victories and not getting votes."

The man who carried most of the burden of the Senate debate was one of that Chamber's most gifted orators—Senator James A. Reed (Democrat), of Missouri. He started out by saying that the mere suggestion of sending boys to war wrung the heart of every humane, decent man. Then he reminded the Senate that a million and a half Americans already were in France and that another million were headed there.

STERN CALL OF DUTY

He continued:

"Shall they be sacrificed by being constantly thrown against an equal or a greater force until little by little they are cut down or a vast percentage of them have gone to their death, or shall we now make one herculean effort and put in the field a resistless force that will break the German line at will?

"God, who made the universe, knows that no man in this body will vote to take these boys except it be in response to the stern call of duty.

"We can only say that it is because we are at war, ghastly, horrible war. And in war we must inflict pain to escape a greater agony."

At the time of this debate Germany had been stopped in the second battle of the Marne. Nevertheless, she still appeared to be a powerful and dangerous foe. Russia had collapsed. The Italians had suffered severe reverses, Rumania had been conquered by Germany, and Britain and France had lost heavily of their manpower.

Moreover, the Members of Congress were thinking in terms of a "complete and utter" victory over Germany, and were proceeding on the theory that to achieve this another year or two of fighting would ensue.

WE MUST GO TO BERLIN

Senator Lodge, in talking about peace, said:

"The victory bringing such a peace must be won inside, not outside, the German frontier. It must be won finally and thoroughly in Germany, and can be won nowhere else. * * * In one word we must go to Berlin and there dictate the peace."

* * * * *

The chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee in 1918 was Senator George E. Chamberlain (Democrat) of Oregon. In urging passage of the bill to lower the draft age, he recalled that in the early days of the Republic, President Washington had asked Congress to establish compulsory military training and had recommended that the age range be 18 to 45.

"Still," said Chamberlain, "those of us who have been insisting on the ages of 18 and 45 here have been charged with undertaking to enact revolutionary a statute which will drive the children and old men of the country to slaughter."

GIVES CIVIL WAR FIGURES

Senator Reed chimed in to remind his colleagues that in the Civil War the Federal Army had a million and a half boys under 18.

"The fact is," he said, "the War of the Rebellion on the Federal side was fought by men under 21 years of age, and the majority of them were under 18."

Senator William F. Kirby (Democrat) of Arkansas could not resist the temptation to say:

"That may have been the reason why the South whipped the North for 3 years, because there was nothing but boys in the Northern Army."

JAMES W. WADSWORTH, now a Republican Member of the House from New York, then a Member of the Senate, argued that youngsters were tougher and more resilient than older men.

"There are exceptions, of course," he said, "but, generally speaking, a younger army will whip an older army in any long war, other things being equal."

Senator Reed, answering those who talked about "taking babes from their mothers' arms," told the Senate he would like to describe a few of those babes. He then launched into a eulogy of the United States Marines, whose ferocity of attack at Belleau Wood had caused the Germans to call them Devil Dogs.

"The Marines are 70 percent composed of these 'babes'," the Missouri statesman said. "Splendid, gallant babes they have proven themselves to be."

Something like an echo of that statement came recently in a dispatch from the Solomon Islands. The correspondent, who saw the Leathernecks of 1942 charge up the beaches at Tulagi, said their average age appeared to be about 19.

How many 18- and 19-year-old youths have volunteered for the Marine Corps, the Navy and the Army is not known, but the figure must be a large one, just as it was in 1917-18.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. According to the information given me by the Navy Department in a document which they sent to me, the average age of the enlisted men in the Navy is 19½ years, which, of course, means that many of the men are under 19, and many of them are under 18.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Marines in the Solomon Islands are even younger than the men of the Navy. The Congress of our country backed up the boys in 1917 and 1918. They helped them win that war. I believe the Members of this Congress want to do just as good a job as that which our predecessors did 24 years ago.

It is not that we do not have men on the fronts. There are going to be more of them, and there will be more fronts—terrible fronts—quite soon. There is no doubt about that. It is up to the present Members of Congress to back the boys who must be in the field, not because we sent them there because we declared war on other countries, but because quite a few other countries have declared war on us. If we do not send elsewhere our boys who are the best fighting material, we are quite liable to have the battle fronts a great deal closer to us than they now are.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to yield the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was merely going to remark that the Senator made a very able presentation of that side of the case; and while, as I said before, we do not want to "keep books" with our allies, and this war cannot be kept on the basis of having everyone do an exactly equal part, nevertheless it seemed to me rather odd that Great Britain, which is right at the very front door of danger, would have a policy of not letting her young men go into the combat areas until they are over 19 years of age, and that New Zealand, which lies at the front door of danger, has a policy that her men cannot go into the combat areas until they are over 19 years of age.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Has the Senator noticed in the hearings quite a few places at which General Marshall made statements off the record?

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand that he did talk off the record, but I did not hear what he had to say.

Mr. GURNEY. If the Senator will read the hearings he will notice that at many points testimony was given off the record.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. GURNEY. The Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs have had much information given off the record. I can give the Senator information along the line that our fine allies—Englanders, New Zealanders, Australians, and Canadians, all of them—are making an all-out effort; and it behooves the United States of America to make an all-out effort before our brave, fine allies are cut down.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I do not want to be led astray by the last remark; but I think the conditions today in this war are vastly superior to what they were a year or two ago. When the English Army was driven from Dunkerque, when France collapsed, and when Russia was even then tentatively an ally or neutral of Hitler's, it looked to me as if we might lose the British Navy, and that we might have Hitler sending his forces over here, with a force equal to ours on the sea, and one much superior to ours in the air.

The Russian Army has bled the German Army white. England has had the chance to revitalize her forces. Her air force has taken dominance over the Germans, and with the great Russian Army—and it is a great one—on the Far East and the English Army on the west, I think we should be a little realistic and not have every passing hour the darkest hour in the war, as has been the tendency from the first hour down to the present.

Mr. President, I myself am not a bit scared about Hitler coming here. We are going to lick him, make no mistake about it.

Mr. GURNEY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. But I do not want to see the United States doing too much of the licking. I want to see the others bearing their fair share of the burden.

Mr. GURNEY. I agree with the Senator, and I make the further statement that I am sure that the people of the United States of America are not expecting the men of other countries to do our fighting for us.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield for a question.

Mr. WALSH. I received a telegram today from the principal of a high school in Massachusetts.

Mr. GURNEY. I, too, have received some telegrams.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to have this telegram answered for the RECORD. It reads:

Are we going to draft 18-year-olds for foreign service while Britain promises her 18-year-olds 1 year of home service?

Is that a fact, or not?

Mr. GURNEY. The fact is that all of England and the British Isles are the front line, so to speak. They are being bombed every day.

Mr. WALSH. So this statement is not correct?

Mr. GURNEY. The statement was read into the RECORD a little while ago that England is now drafting her 18-year-old youths.

Mr. WALSH. Is it true that they are retained 1 year for home service?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct, but the home service is right on the battle front at the moment.

Mr. WALSH. That does not answer the question.

Mr. GURNEY. I shall be glad to answer the question.

Mr. WALSH. Is what this man says a fact or not? I am asking the Senator from South Dakota because he is in charge of the bill. Is it a fact, as this man says, that in Britain the 18-year-olds are held 1 year for home service?

Mr. GURNEY. If the Senator had been present in the Chamber he would have heard the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] read the article from the paper which said exactly that, that they are holding the 18-year-olds on the home front for 1 year.

Mr. WALSH. There is no reason why it should not be repeated, even if I did not happen to be present, is there?

Mr. GURNEY. Oh, no.

Mr. WALSH. So this man's telegram stated a fact?

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. WALSH. The answer is "Yes," of course, and there should be no hesitancy in making the answer.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, let me make an inquiry of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. BONE. It is my understanding that we have in the neighborhood of four and a half million men in the Army at the present time.

Mr. GURNEY. My information is that we have more than that, that it will be approximately 5,000,000, or a little above that by the first of the year.

Mr. BONE. Taking the Army as it is presently constituted how many of that particular group have had training of at least a year?

Mr. GURNEY. A large percentage of them.

Mr. BONE. Would it be in the neighborhood of 90 percent?

Mr. GURNEY. Oh, no. The Senator knows about how many have been inducted each month.

Mr. BONE. We have been creating an army for a year and a half or two years.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. We certainly must have a large number of men, perhaps at least 2,000,000, who have had training of a year or a year and a half.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. Is it possible we have sufficient shipping now so that we could send that many men abroad? If so, we would have an army abroad as large as the army we had in Europe during the great German offensive in the latter part of 1918, or larger. Certainly the crisis is not so great that we could not take time to train these boys for a year.

Mr. GURNEY. If the Senator remembers, General Marshall said he was giving them all the training possible, and in the last paragraph he said, "Trust us to continue doing a good job." That is not an exact quotation, but it is in effect what he said.

Mr. BONE. If we have two or three million boys in the Army who have had training for a year or a year and a half, we certainly have a very formidable force of men.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. BONE. Who could change the whole course of history if they were properly employed.

Mr. GURNEY. I am sure it is not the intention of the Army to make new divisions entirely out of 18-year-old boys, train them a few months, and send them overseas. The Senator knows that would not work, and it is not the intention of the Army.

Mr. BONE. If men who have had little or no training, or men with training of only a few weeks, were filtered in, they would be almost helpless in battle. I have talked with a great many veterans of the last war, and one of the things that seemed to impress them most was the fact that during the last war so many men were sent into active combat service without proper training. They regarded it as a supreme tragedy. The argument has been advanced for 20 years that no greater blunder could be made in war than to send untrained men into battle. I suspect that is the basis of much of the inquiry that has been made on the floor concerning the matter suggested by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I believe it is appropriate in connection with the consideration of the pending bill proposing to lower the age limit for selective service, to make a few observations on the over-all manpower mobilization problem which today is facing our Nation.

I am a member of a subcommittee of the Truman Investigating Committee, which has been studying this over-all problem for several weeks. What I say here today represents my individual views, but I believe those views are shared by a majority of both the subcommittee and the full Truman Committee, and will be reflected in our report when it is made.

The War Manpower Commission was created by Executive order of the President on April 18, 1942, with the Federal Security Administrator as chairman. Its prime task, as set forth in the order, was—

> To formulate plans and programs and establish basic national policies to assure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the prosecution of the war; and issue such policy and operating directions as may be necessary thereto.

That was 6 months ago. The studies apparently are still incomplete, and no basic national manpower policy or program has been formulated. There have been scores and hundreds of public utterances from Washington telling about the manpower problem, criticizing the public for failure to cooperate in a nonexistent program to solve it, and threatening various kinds of drastic compulsory legislation. But there has been no over-all program or policy. I believe that such an over-all policy and program for the Nation is basically and fundamentally necessary. Until we have such a program and until such a program has been tried out within the framework of existing executive powers, it is impossible to determine what legislation is necessary, if any, to make the program fully effective.

There are now pending in the Congress several rather drastic bills, unprecedented in the control which they would give to Government over individual lives. The chairman of the Manpower Commission, Mr. McNutt, has announced that he is drafting a bill which will give him authority to apply the compulsion which he apparently feels is necessary. I believe most strongly that it would be a mistake for Congress even to consider passage of any drastic compulsory legislation in the absence of any over-all national policy and program for the mobilization of our manpower.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should be very happy to have the Senator's view about what length of time Congress should wait for an over-all plan to come from somewhere, and then after waiting that time, what Congress should do, if there is a total failure to agree on a plan? Up to date we are informed that a plan has not been agreed upon because it could not be agreed upon. There does not seem to be any reason to believe that conditions will be any better for agreement on a plan 6 months from now, if we depend upon the same men who are now trying to make the agreement. That situation raises in my mind a question on which I should like to have the Senator's view. How long ought we to wait—by "we" meaning Congress—for such a plan?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has made a very pertinent observation, and I think it goes to the heart of the problem facing us, namely, the men who have been made responsible for drafting a program and apparently have not done anything about it. But I think I will cover the points the Senator raised in the course of my very brief remarks.

Compulsion in this field should be the very last resort in a democracy such as ours, and then should be used only in very specific and well-defined areas where voluntary methods and controls now available under existing law have proven inadequate. I believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people, including both employers and their employees, will cooperate willingly in whatever program of manpower is necessary to win this war, but it is futile to ask the people to cooperate voluntarily to carry out a program which does not exist.

During the debate here yesterday the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] attempted to find out how many persons are required in war production to support each man in the armed services. He did not obtain a satisfactory answer. Our subcommittee has sought the same information and so far has not been able to obtain it. So far as we have been able to learn, accurate figures on the number of individuals required in war production to produce equipment and supplies for an armed force of a given size are not available. They have not been developed.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield for a question?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Did the Senator's committee in the taking of testimony obtain any ratio of civilian workers to the number of men in the service that had been agreed upon or estimated?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, we tried to get a ratio, and we could not get one that meant anything.

Mr. President, it is apparent that any program for the complete mobilization of our manpower cannot be effective unless the various demands—for the armed services, for production of military equipment and supplies and for essential civilian requirements—are in proper balance both to one another and to our total manpower resources. Obviously, it would be a tragedy to draft a huge army and then find that we lacked sufficient manpower properly to equip that army.

In the testimony our committee has received so far, there is no evidence that such an over-all job of planning has been done. Our subcommittee hearings have left me with the very definite impression that the Army and Navy have gone ahead with their plans for manpower and the various procurement agencies have placed their contracts for production without ever fitting their various programs into an over-all master plan for full utilization of the Nation's manpower. In fact the directive creating the War Manpower Commission specifically provided that it should have no voice whatever in determining the military manpower requirements or the rate at which they shall be met. I believe it is imperative that this defect in our handling of the manpower problem be remedied immediately. The manpower agency must have a voice in determining military manpower requirements if it is to formulate or carry out any kind of effective over-all policy.

It is very clear from public statements regarding our production program and the anticipated strength of our armed services that we must add several million new workers, most of whom will be women, to our total labor force in the next year, and that in addition we must make our present labor force more productive if we are to avoid labor bottlenecks as hurtful to the war program as material bottlenecks have been.

There are many specific things which could be done now within existing powers of the executive branch to ease the present critical manpower problem and to prepare for the impact on our industry of the withdrawals by selective service during the next year.

One immediate action which could be taken is to end recruiting by both the Army and Navy. The subcommittee has been told of numerous instances where recruiting and volunteering of key skilled workers has disrupted production in plants making vital war materials. Apparently it sometimes happens that the Navy does not let its left hand know what its right hand is doing, because Navy recruiting officers have gone into

plants producing for the Navy and taken out their key workers and wrecked their production schedules.

It will not be possible to plan the withdrawals of manpower for the military forces from industry during the next year so as to minimize the injury to production unless those withdrawals are controlled and made in orderly fashion. That can be done only if the withdrawals are controlled by a single agency. That agency should be the Selective Service System working in close coordination with the Employment Service and the Manpower Commission.

Another field in which immediate action is possible without legislation is in those industries and occupations where critical shortages are even now injuring production. Workers in such critical industries or areas could be deferred under Selective Service, with the deferments to be revoked immediately if the workers leave the industry or area. I am very happy to note in the newspapers that the War Manpower Commission is now considering such action as regards skilled help on dairy and livestock farms.

A third action which could be undertaken immediately is a campaign to stop labor hoarding by war contractors. Because of the impending labor shortage and because of the fact that under cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts the practice does not cost the contractor anything, many war contractors have built up their labor forces ahead of their needs and in excess of their needs. This practice has been especially prevalent in the construction industry. A few days ago the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] called attention to the construction of a naval base in Idaho where 20,000 men are employed. He had received many reports, as I had from the men who went from my State, to the effect that there was not enough work to go around for that many men. The contractor had hired them because he could get them and because he might need them in order to finish his contract on schedule.

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

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I have received a letter from a man in one of the shipyards in San Francisco. He went there from my home town in Montana. I know him very well. He was formerly in business in my home city. He tells me that many of the men there have been standing around simply because they did not have the material with which to go to work. He says that conditions ought to be investigated, because men have nothing to do, yet are drawing their pay.

Mr. BALL. I think it is very true that contractors on construction projects are so anxious to be sure that they finish on schedule that they grab all the labor they can get, whether they can use it immediately or not. That particular practice, which cuts down the productive value of our present labor force, can be stopped very easily. The contracting agencies of the War and Navy Departments, the Maritime Commission, and the Defense Plant Corporation can stop it immediately if they will simply issue orders to their auditors in the field to disallow any expenditure by a contractor for labor which is not used effectively. That would stop the practice overnight.

A fourth program which could be undertaken immediately is to cut down absenteeism in industry. The subcommittee was told that absenteeism is reducing production in some industries as much as 10 percent. I believe that a vigorous publicity campaign enlisting the support of employees and labor could materially reduce this loss. To implement that particular program we could also use the selective-service powers by providing for the revocation of deferments in cases of chronic absenteeism.

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

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Did the committee find evidence of the prevalence of absenteeism for the purpose of looking for jobs which would pay still higher wages?

Mr. BALL. That is true to some extent. However, most of it is due to the fact that the men are earning much more than they ever earned before, and they sometimes feel that they do not have to work as many days in the week as they would otherwise work.

These are only a few of the things which can and should be done immediately within existing powers and without any new legislation. There are many other things which could and should be done under an over-all program.

I am convinced that the key to the solution of our manpower problem lies in the adoption of proper hiring policies by industry, both war industry and civilian industry, rather than in undemocratic compulsion applied to the individual workmen. All discrimination practiced by employers in their hiring, whether relating to age, sex, or race, must be eliminated to do this job. The overwhelming majority of employers will go along voluntarily with the Manpower Commission on an over-all policy. If and when compulsion is needed to make a recalcitrant minority conform, the legislation should be restricted in its application to that minority.

In conclusion, let me emphasize again that there are many actions to meet our manpower problem which can and should be taken under existing powers of the Executive. An over-all program and policy has not yet been formulated. There does not appear to be the necessary balance between military and industrial requirements for manpower. Until these things have been corrected, the Congress should not consider legislation granting to the Government drastic and undemocratic power to regulate the lives of individual citizens.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, at this point I desire to read a communication which I have received from the chairman of a draft board in my State. I think it is very important in connection with the proposed legislation now under consideration. I shall withhold the name of the writer of the letter. I do not think it is quite appropriate to use his name, but I shall be glad to give the name to any Senator. The letter is brief, and I should like to impose upon the time of the Senate to read it now. It is addressed to me:

OCTOBER 17, 1942.

HON. FRANCIS T. MALONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This letter is to register my disapproval of the so-called Kilday amendment of the House bill by which it is proposed to take all 1-A men wherever available before calling up men classified in 3-A, 2-B, or 3-B.

As chairman of one of the draft boards I have had a pretty good opportunity to understand the working of the draft and it has come to my attention that many boards are much more liberal in the matter of deferments than others. Our particular board, ——— ——— has endeavored to adopt a half-way policy and I believe is not regarded as being too tough or too liberal. However, instances of classifications in other boards have come to my attention which are rather unsavory if true. For example, I have been reliably informed that one board has been very liberal in its classification of registrants, with the result that liquor dealers, taxi drivers, and plumbers' helpers enjoy classifications in 3-B. The result of this unwise construction of the Draft Act by such a board is that that board has very few 1-A men available. Under the Kilday amendment the burden, therefore, falls upon registrants in boards which have correctly interpreted the Draft Act to provide more than their share of men for the Army. This seems to me unfair and undemocratic so that I feel the Kilday amendment is very unjust.

It strikes me that the intent of the Draft Act is to subdivide the districts of the various States into substantially equal numbers of registrants and it seems to me that equitable proportionate quotas should be assigned to each of these districts and that it should be the duty of the boards in the various districts to produce substantially an equal number of men for the Army.

Very truly yours.

——— ———.

Mr. President, I offer the letter now because, as I understand, the so-called Kilday amendment is in the House bill and will be in conference. In that respect I believe the letter is important.

Furthermore, I think it is extremely important in connection with the entire matter, and more particularly in connection with the pending amendment offered by the able senior Senator from Nebraska. I think it is outrageously unfair, in the instances where true, that men outside the draft are walking the streets while the Congress of the United States contemplates sending 18- and 19-year-old boys into the military service.

I do not expect that we can do much about this particular matter in connection with the pending bill, but I think it should come to the attention of the draft authorities, so that it may have their immediate consideration, and certainly the consideration of the Senate as we further take up the question of selective-service legislation.

I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

ARMY SPECIALIST CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hugh McKittrick Jones to be principal personnel procurement officer, field service, Seventh Service Command, Army Specialist Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Melvin James Snyder to be principal administrative officer, Engineer Corps, Services of Supply, New York, N. Y.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dale E. Sturmer to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Fair J. Bryant to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles W. Clark to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Saturday, October 24, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 23 (legislative day of October 15), 1942:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Toxey Hall, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired January 19, 1942.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

John Randolph, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Joseph W. Stirni to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with rank of lieutenant, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 24th day of November 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 23 (legislative day of October 15), 1942:

ARMY SPECIALIST CORPS

APPOINTMENTS

Hugh McKittrick Jones to be principal personnel procurement officer, field service, Seventh Service Command, Army Specialist Corps, at a salary of $5,600 per annum.

Melvin James Snyder to be principal administrative officer, Engineer Corps, Services of Supply, New York, N. Y., at a salary of $5,600 per annum.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEER WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Dale E. Sturmer
Fair J. Bryant
Charles W. Clark

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Captain Champlin Fletcher Buck, Jr., to Ordnance Department.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Harold Roe Bull et al.

(NOTE.—A full list of the names of the persons whose nominations for promotion in the Regular Army were confirmed today may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for October 19, 1942, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Harold Roe Bull, on page 8368 and ending with the name of Norman Gregg Long on p. 8370.)

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Edward M. Doyle, Bantam.
Ralph W. Bull, Kent.
Elizabeth J. Carris, Stepney Depot.

IDAHO

Thomas B. Hargis, Ashton.

MICHIGAN

Frank J. Nothelfer, Hemlock.

TEXAS

Marguerite A. Mullen, Alice.

WISCONSIN

Matthew J. Hart, Glidden.
Robert J. Reiland, Port Edwards.
Irene R. Sprangers, Waldo.

SENATE

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 15, 1942)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who changest not, the mournful requiem of sighing autumn winds and falling leaves, dead and driven, remind us that we all do fade as a leaf. Change and decay in all around we see. We, Thy transient children upon this spinning island in the sky, would set our little lives against the background of Thy everlastingness, there to learn humility, quietude, and the patience which is power.

Take from our fearful, feverish souls the stress and strain, and let our ordered lives confess the beauty of Thy peace. So with inner calm and courage may all our deliberations this day within this white-domed shrine of each patriot's devotion be begun, continued, and ended in Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, October 23, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM MAINE—CREDENTIALS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the State of Maine, with Yankee prudence, has disposed of its election problems for this year, and I now present the credentials of my colleague the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] for another 6-year term. He is now approaching 26 years of service in the Senate and the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the credentials.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

STATE OF MAINE.

To All Who Shall See These Presents, Greeting:

Know ye that WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr., of Auburn, in the county of Androscoggin, on the 14th day of September, in the year of our Lord, 1942, was chosen by the electors of this State, a United States Senator to represent the State of Maine in the United States Senate, for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1943.

In testimony whereof I have caused the seal of state to be hereunto affixed.

Given under my hand on August, the 15th day of October in the year of our Lord 1942,