

see the force of the objection made by the gentleman from Baltimore city (Mr. Stirling,) and knowing that the object I have in view is attained by the federal law, I withdraw the amendment that I offered.

Mr. SANDS. I will suggest that in its present form the amendment will not only exempt persons whose faith has always heretofore exempted them, but being in the disjunctive, "whose religious opinions or conscientious scruples forbid them to bear arms," it will take in all people all over the State who are conscientiously opposed to bearing arms.

Mr. STIRLING. They have got to prove it.

Mr. SANDS. I saw a case of this sort in the court room. A gentleman came in and was put upon the witness' stand. The judge said, "Swear him." "No, sir; I do not swear; I affirm." "Are you a Quaker?" Well, he laughed and said he was a kind of one. "Are you in full standing in the Quaker church?" "No, sir." He had married a Catholic lady and could not say he was. "Swear him," said the judge. I am perfectly willing that those belonging to religious societies, who have professed and whose fathers before them professed conscientious scruples against bearing arms, should be exempted; but I think it would better be done by name. If you put in this amendment "religious opinions or conscientious scruples" you will have nine-tenths—

Mr. STIRLING. If the gentleman will allow me, I move to strike out "or" and insert "and."

Mr. RUSSELL. I accept that amendment.

Mr. SANDS. I know that these people and their fathers have always held this faith and borne their testimony against arms-bearing; and I want to see them relieved; although I very much admired the spirit of the Quaker gentleman in a village store who was aiding in raising a cavalry company, and who, when reproached with violating his peace principles, said, "Well, brother, I have declined until after the war." I admired that Quaker.

Mr. ECKER. That story sounds very doubtful, because they do not generally call each other "brother." They do not use that term at all.

I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Harford will pass. The people up in our section are very much interested in the matter. We have some Friends there. We have a good many there who are conscientious in the matter; and we do not ask anything excepting of those who are really conscientious, and who can prove that fact before the proper authorities. I know a case that I will cite, as the gentleman has cited one. A young man, about the time the draft was going on, wanted to be exempted, and said, "I am conscientious about this; I belong to the Dunker church." "But you are not a mem-

ber of the Society of Friends; and we cannot do anything for you." He had been a full member of the Dunker church and was really conscientious; and there was an effort made to exempt him. If any member is not conscientious on the subject, of course it will be known to the society. It will be known by the society to which they belong whether they are conscientious or not. That is as far as we want to go. I have the honor of being a kind of birthright Friend myself, although I do not object to fighting in this war.

Mr. PUGH. The principal reason why I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Harford is because it makes a distinction between the members of the same religious body. There are a great many Quakers who are not conscientiously opposed to bearing arms, and I have no doubt it was for that reason that the gentleman from Harford drew up his amendment in this form. It might have been proper to exempt the whole class of people called Quakers, and the whole class of people called Dunkers; but there are whole regiments of men now in the armies, who have been Quakers, and who are Quakers in all other respects except so far as this war is concerned. They had no conscientious scruples about going into this fight. And there is no religious society better represented in this war, so far as Pennsylvania is concerned, than the religious society of Quakers. This amendment is only to exempt those who even in this war still feel it their duty to bear the testimony the society has always borne against all wars at all times.

Mr. AUDOUN. I should be perfectly willing to vote for the amendment offered by my friend from Harford, if he would insert this language:

"Persons whose religious opinions or conscientious scruples forbid them to bear arms, shall not be compelled to do so in time of war, but shall pay an equivalent for such personal service."

While these gentlemen do not desire to enter into military service, I should like to see them willing to do something to assist the government.

Mr. PUGH. Will the gentleman permit me to explain? If they were to pay an equivalent, it would only be a public acknowledgment of their cowardice. It is not because they are cowards. They have given positive evidence that they are not. It is not that being unwilling to expose their precious bodies they will pay for exemption. That would be an acknowledgment that they are cowards. It is not because they are afraid; but these men are conscientiously opposed to bearing arms; and if they were not they would certainly go and fight.

Mr. AUDOUN. Then I desire to ask the gentleman one question. Do they desire to be exempt from military service, and exempt from paying for carrying on this war, and