

8,250; and the amount appropriated that year was \$24,610,501. In 1915 the officers numbered 3,403, the naval cadets numbered 912, the enlisted men numbered 52,561, and the amount appropriated was \$145,734,163. In other words, we now have a little more than twice as many officers as in 1891, more than three times as many naval cadets, more than six times as many enlisted men, and nearly six times as large an appropriation. We have now the second strongest navy in the world, with no enemy in sight and nothing to do but waste powder in target practice, concoct war scares, and give tone and polish to our flamboyant Washington society. (Laughter and applause.) "In the name of the Great Jehovah and the Continental Congress," as Gen. Ethan Allen remarked at the gates of Fort Ticonderoga, what has become of that vital plank of the Baltimore national platform pledging the democratic party to economy and the abolition of useless offices? (Applause.)

What does the greatest living soldier in the United States think of this continental enlistment scheme recommended by the secretary of war? I refer to Gen. Nelson A. Miles, a soldier who commanded an army corps in the Army of the Potomac when only 25 years of age—not only a gallant and conspicuous general with a four years' battle service in our great Civil war, but noted as the most successful Indian fighter in the after-war period. Gen. Miles has visited and inspected the army of every one of the great powers of Europe and has more expert knowledge of war's machinery than any soldier or war specialist in the United States. Of course, Gen. Miles is against the scheme. He seems to think the scheme did not originate with the secretary of war, but was concocted in our so-called war college. The war college, as we remember, was the favorite militant child of Col. Roosevelt when he was president. Hence the scheme has a wild and woolly flavor. (Applause and laughter.)

The National Guard is almost unanimously opposed to this kind of preparedness. In the recent national convention of National Guard in San Francisco, after hearing a powerful letter read from the secretary of war, and hearing a fervid oration by the eloquent Assistant Secretary of War Breckenridge, the convention turned down the continental proposition. The same action was taken by the state convention of the Ohio National Guard held later in Cincinnati.

In further contention as to our ample preparedness for war, let me state that during the last 17 years 381,312 men have been enlisted, and these with the number in the army would make a total of more than 400,000 men that have passed through the drill, instruction, and discipline of the military service. Approximately the same number have received military instruction in the National Guard. Added to these figures, there are between two and three millions of men in our country that have passed through all the drill, discipline, and instruction of European armies, and who are now, in the main, earnest, patriotic citizens of the great republic. Approximately 25,000 young men are graduating every year from our colleges and institutions where military instruction is given. I am indebted to Gen. Miles for these vital statistics.

During the last 30 years the government has expended nearly \$176,000,000 on our seacoast defenses, and the result at Cairo, Port Arthur, and the Dardanelles is sufficient evidence that guns on board ship are no match for coast fortifications and submarine mines. Within the control of the national government and states there are at least 1,000,000 serviceable rifles. Our gun and ammunition factories are manufacturing daily at least 5,000,000 cartridges and will soon be capable of manufacturing 50,000 artillery shells. In fact, there is now being constructed in our country daily more war material than any two armies now warring against each other in Europe are using in the same time. Hence the alarming clamor about our unpreparedness is criminal foolishness. It should fool no grown-up person outside of an idiotic asylum. (Laughter and applause.)

#### HOW THE FARMERS STAND

The farmers in my district are everywhere reported against "preparedness." The State Grange of Ohio, recently in session at Elyria, declared against it. I noticed the Farmers' Union of North Carolina, 50,000 strong, declared against it. I am in receipt of the leading farm journal, the National Field, of December 2, the national organ of the Farmers' Alliance. It prints a very strong editorial, covering two en-

tire pages, giving cogent reasons why farmers everywhere should be against this unnecessary extravagance. I have numerous letters from representative farmers, from the middle west and far west, all against preparedness. A letter from A. M. Criswell, president Farmers' Alliance, Bidleton, state of Washington, says:

We held a large farmers union last night and took a vote on Wilson's "preparedness," or rather on the defense bill, and not a vote was in favor of that plan.

William Madison Hicks, Oologah, Okla., under date of November 23, writes.

I was at Coweta last Saturday and delivered an address on the plan of the President for "preparedness," and the whole country seemed to be aroused against the military scheme. The citizens, without regard to political preference, openly indorsed the stand taken by Hon. W. J. Bryan on this issue. The citizens at Chelsea, White Hill, Sperry, and Sageeyah have openly condemned, but the great dailies refuse to let the country know what we are doing. In southeast Kansas in the last 10 days and in southwest Kansas in the same time, 53 public mass meetings have been held condemning the President's plan, and yet not one of these resolutions have found its way into print.

Col. Frank G. Yoeman, a veteran soldier and leading democrat of Milledgeville, Ill., writes that his business has taken him over Carroll county, and finds that not 10 per cent of either party favor the so-called preparedness scheme. A. W. Lewis, of Berkeley, Cal., a student and writer on social and economic reform, writes as follows:

This is the hour when true men must arise and be numbered. Ascertain if this malign influence for a big military establishment emanates from the noble spirit of American manhood, or from those who are solely animated from the mean spirit of selfishness and greed.

#### THE LABOR UNIONS AGAINST

The labor unions in my district are against "preparedness." At a called meeting of the Central Labor Union of Toledo, representing 10,000 organized workers and 91 locals, a resolution was passed, without one dissenting vote, against the "preparedness" scheme. Here is a specimen resolution passed by the machinist union, the largest local in Toledo:

International Association of Machinists, Toledo, Ohio, November 16, 1915. At the last regular meeting of Lodge 105 the lodge, consisting of over 1,600 members, went on record as opposed to a larger army or navy, the vote being unanimous against it.—Earl H. Deane, Recording Secretary.

Here let me quote an extract from a signed statement made by our able, experienced, and alert leader, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. Kitchin):

In the face of the fact that we have a navy superior to that of Germany or any other nation, except that of Great Britain; in the face of the fact that our navy is growing larger, stronger, and better equipped than ever before; in the face of the fact, as the President declared both in his message to congress December last and in his recent Manhattan club speech, "We are threatened from no quarter," the proposed "preparedness" program at one bound—one year—increases our already immensely large large naval appropriations more than our total increase for the last 14 years, more than the increase by Germany the whole 15 years preceding the European war, and more than the combined increase of all the nations of the world for the five years preceding the European war, and over \$50,000,000 more than the combined increase of all the nations in the world for the whole period of 10 years immediately preceding the European war. Add to this the fact that prior to the beginning of the European war we were expending annually on our navy from \$20,000,000 to \$30,000,000 more than Germany or any other nation, except Great Britain.

Evidently the average citizen, who has been scared into the advocacy of so-called "preparedness," has been misled by reading in the war scare newspapers and armor-plate magazines that we are utterly unprepared. This is a slander on both our army and our navy. And it is untrue, unfair, and unpatriotic. We have the strongest navy in the world for all defensive purposes in our own waters; and in education, in deportment, in discipline and efficiency, we have the best naval officers in the world. And our army officers in discipline and deportment and efficiency will compare favorably with the officers of any army anywhere on either continent.

I have no criticism of either the army or the navy. My objection is not to quality or efficiency, but to quantity. We need no big military establishment in this republic. As Cardinal Gibbons very wisely says, we are protected east and west by two great oceans, a protection far more formidable than forts or cannon or navies; and our people, already overtaxed, can not stand the

burden of an increased military establishment already too costly.

At the beginning of the European war Germany was expending for past wars and preparations for wars—on its army and navy—55 per cent of the total amount of revenues collected; Japan, 45 per cent; Great Britain, 37 per cent; France, 35 per cent; the United States, over 60 per cent. With the proposed military and naval program enacted into law the United States will be expending over 70 per cent of its total revenues; that is, out of every \$100 collected from the people over \$70 will go into militarism and navalism and vampirism to mark the ruin of the republic of George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln.

On the question of national armament I take my stand with Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence and father of the democratic party. (Applause.) In 1799 Thomas Jefferson wrote Elbridge Gerry as follows:

I am for relying for internal defense on our militia solely till actual invasion, and for such a naval force only as will protect our coast harbors from depredations, and not for a standing army in time of peace which may overcome the public sentiment, nor a navy which by its own expenses and the external wars in which it may implicate us will grind us with public burdens and sink us under them.

Here is a fateful admonition for this hour. Jefferson made the protest against the standing army of England the most vital paragraph in the Declaration of Independence. In all the grievances protested against in that immortal document the standing army, as a menace to the peace and prosperity of the Colonies, was mentioned in three separate paragraphs, while every other grievance was mentioned but once.

Let me cite some illuminating history on the preparedness of 95 years ago. In December, 1823, President Monroe issued his memorable message embodying what is now known as the Monroe doctrine. This message was a bold deft and challenge to the three great powers of Europe, known as the Holy Alliance. This Holy Alliance was a league formed in September, 1815, after the Battle of Waterloo had sent Napoleon into exile. It was formed by Alexander the First of Russia, Emperor Francis of Austria, William the Third of Prussia, and indorsed by nearly all the second-class powers of Europe. This Holy Alliance was formed to preserve monarchical absolutism in Europe, and secondarily to see to it that no member of the Bonaparte family should ever occupy any throne in Europe. That President Monroe issued his famous message embodying the Monroe doctrine against any interference by this alliance is a well-established fact. Prof. Peck, in his new International Encyclopedia, says:

The most noteworthy attempt of this Holy Alliance was to extend its operation to the New World by the coercion of Spain's revolting colonies.

President Monroe's message was a challenge to the whole formidable array of Old World monarchies, far more defiant and sweeping than Jefferson's deft to Great Britain July 4, 1776. How about our preparedness then? We had only 10,000 soldiers in the regular army, including infantry, artillery, and riflemen. And how about our Navy? We had 7 wooden battleships, 9 small frigates, 2 coverts—low sloops with one tier of guns—5 sloops, 2 brigs, and 5 small schooners, 30 war craft all told. And how many sea dogs of war did we have then? Let us see. We had 30 captains, 30 master commanders, 9 chaplains, 356 midshipmen, 53 sailing masters, 16 boat-swains, and 18 gunners—all told 512, besides the lieutenants, quartermasters, and army surgeons. What was the entire population of the United States at that critical period—1823? By the census of 1820 we had, including Indians, 9,633,322. How much did our navy cost us in 1823? Nine hundred and twenty-nine thousand five hundred and three dollars all told. Did the Monroe doctrine precipitate war? No. We had 3,000 miles of deep ocean between us and any possible enemy in the Old World. That same ocean still rolls between, and we have now 100,000,000; instead of less than 10,000,000 in 1820. Who is afraid? No one with self-poise or ordinary horse sense or courage sufficient to be a citizen of America. (Applause.)

I desire to call the attention of the advocates of "preparedness" to a very valuable pamphlet just issued by Anson Phelps Stokes, secretary of the Yale university. Let me quote from the closing paragraph:

If the United States tries to frighten Europe by her armaments, her distrust of us and her misinterpreting of our motives will lead to deep suspicions and hatred, and these are the things that surely breed war. Knowing that "armed peace" has proved a sham and a delusion in Europe, why