

The bill (H. R. 11560) to relieve Patrick J. Bench, alias Patrick Mc-Bench, from the charge of desertion, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ACCOUNTS OF JOHN I. DAVENPORT.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury is directed to send to the Senate copies of the accounts of John I. Davenport as a commissioner of the circuit court of the United States for the southern district of New York for the years 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, and in 1890, as the same are on file in any bureau of the Treasury Department.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m., Saturday, January 17) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 19, 1891, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 16, 1891.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. DINGLEY. I offer a privileged resolution.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MCOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

Mr. DINGLEY. Will the gentleman from Maryland permit me to have action taken on a resolution to further the business of the committee appointed yesterday?

Mr. MCOMAS. Very well.

SILVER-POOL INVESTIGATION.

Mr. DINGLEY. By instruction of the special committee appointed yesterday relating to the investigation of silver pools, I offer the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Special Committee to Investigate the Alleged Silver Pools be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House, and to pursue their investigations either by the entire committee or by a subcommittee at any place outside of Washington, as well as at the Capitol, in case they regard it desirable to further that investigation; and also to employ a clerk, if deemed necessary, at the same per diem compensation as session clerks.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman should have it provided that the clerk of the committee be paid out of the contingent fund.

Mr. DINGLEY. That amendment could be made.

The SPEAKER. That is fixed by law already.

Mr. RICHARDSON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. My inquiry is whether, if the House votes down the motion the gentleman from Maryland has made, it will then be in order to move to go into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. It will.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope, then, it will be done.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Do I understand the Chair to be submitting the motion of the gentleman from Maryland?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is submitting the motion of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MCOMAS. I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill for the free coinage of silver be ordered printed, so that every member can have a copy.

The SPEAKER. The bill is printed under the rules.

Mr. BLAND. Are Senate bills printed under the rules?

The SPEAKER. They are printed under the rules.

Mr. MCOMAS. I move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SPRINGER. I rise to a question of order on that motion. I make the point that the motion of the gentleman from Maryland is not in order.

The SPEAKER. It has repeatedly been decided that it was in order.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is true; but only after private business has been dispensed with, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. It has been decided on many occasions.

The question was put.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the Speaker entertain my point of order? This day was set apart for the consideration of private business, and until private business has been disposed of that motion is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it has been repeatedly decided that the motion of the gentleman from Maryland is in order.

Mr. SPRINGER. When was it decided?

The SPEAKER. It was decided last session.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then it is part of the Reed code. I did not know that it was part of the rules of the House.

Mr. MCOMAS. My motion is not debatable, Mr. Speaker.

The question was put; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MCOMAS. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 66, yeas 78.

Mr. MCOMAS. I ask for the yeas and nays. [Cries of "Oh, no!" on the Democratic side.]

The question was taken on ordering the yeas and nays; and the Speaker announced that fifty-eight gentlemen had risen in support of the demand—more than a sufficient number—and the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHEELER, of Alabama. The other side. [Laughter.]

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 121, nays 117, not voting 93; as follows:

YEAS—121.

Allen, Mich.	Darlington,	Liud,	Simonds,
Anderson, Kans.	Dingley,	Mason,	Smith, Ill.
Arnold,	Dolliver,	McComas,	Smith, W. Va.
Atkinson, Pa.	Dunnell,	McDuffie,	Smyser,
Baker,	Evans,	McKenna,	Spooner,
Banks,	Farquhar,	McKinley,	Stephenson,
Bartine,	Finley,	Miles,	Stivers,
Bayne,	Flick,	Moffitt,	Stookbridge,
Beekwith,	Flood,	Moore, N. H.	Stone, Pa.
Belknap,	Frank,	Morey,	Struble,
Bergen,	Funston,	Morrill,	Sweet,
Bliss,	Gear,	Morrow,	Taylor, E. B.
Boutelle,	Gest,	Morse,	Taylor, Ill.
Brewer,	Greenhalge,	Mudd,	Taylor, J. D.
Brosius,	Grosvenor,	Niedringhaus,	Taylor, Tenn.
Buchanan, N. J.	Grout,	Nute,	Townsend, Colo.
Burrows,	Hall,	O'Donnell,	Vandever,
Burton,	Haugen,	O'Neill, Pa.	Van Schaick,
Butterworth,	Henderson, Ill.	Payne,	Vaux,
Caldwell,	Hermann,	Perkins,	Wade,
Candler, Mass.	Hill,	Post,	Walker,
Cannon,	Hopkins,	Quackenbush,	Wallace, Mass.
Carter,	Kerr, Iowa	Randall,	Wallace, N. Y.
Caswell,	Ketcham,	Raines,	Wheeler, Mich.
Ceatham,	Kinsey,	Ray,	Williams, Ohio
Clark, Wis.	Lacey,	Reed, Iowa	Wilson, Ky.
Clark, Wyo.	Laidlaw,	Rockwell,	Wilson, Wash.
Cogswell,	Langston,	Rowell,	Wright.
Craig,	Lansing,	Sawyer,	
Culbertson, Pa.	Laws,	Scull,	
Cutcheon,	Lehibach,	Sherman,	

NAYS—117.

Abbott,	Culberson, Tex.	Lee,	Richardson,
Alderson,	Cummings,	Lester, Ga.	Robertson,
Allen, Miss.	Davidson,	Lewis,	Rogers,
Anderson, Miss.	Dibble,	Martin, Ind.	Sayers,
Andrew,	Dickerson,	Martin, Tex.	Shively,
Barnes,	Dockery,	McAdoo,	Spinola,
Biggs,	Dunphy,	McClammy,	Springer,
Blanchard,	Edmunds,	McClellan,	Stewart, Ga.
Bland,	Ellis,	McCreary,	Stewart, Tex.
Boatner,	Enloe,	McMillin,	Stockdale,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Fitch,	McRae,	Stone, Ky.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Flower,	Milliken,	Stone, Mo.
Brickner,	Forman,	Montgomery,	Tarsney,
Brookshire,	Forney,	Moore, Tex.	Tillman,
Brown, J. B.	Geissenhainer,	Mutthler,	Tracey,
Buchanan, Va.	Grimes,	Norton,	Trucker,
Bynum,	Hatch,	Oates,	Turner, Ga.
Campbell,	Hayes, W. I.	O'Ferrall,	Washington,
Candler, Ga.	Haynes,	O'Neal, Ind.	Wheeler, Ala.
Caruth,	Heard,	O'Neil, Mass.	Whitelaw,
Catchings,	Hemphill,	Outhwaite,	Whiting,
Cheadle,	Henderson, N. C.	Owens, Ohio	Wike,
Chipman,	Herbert,	Parrett,	Willecox,
Clancy,	Holman,	Paynter,	Williams, Ill.
Clarke, Ala.	Hooker,	Peel,	Wilson, Mo.
Clements,	Kerr, Pa.	Pennington,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cobb,	Kilgore,	Perry,	Yoder.
Covert,	Lane,	Pierce,	
Crain,	Lanham,	Pindar,	
Crisp,	Lawler,	Quinn,	

NOT VOTING—93.

Adams,	Coleman,	Goodnight,	McCord,
Atkinson, W. Va.	Comstock,	Hansbrough,	McCormick,
Bankhead,	CConnell,	Hare,	Miller,
Barwig,	Cooper, Ind.	Harmer,	Mills,
Belden,	Cooper, Ohio	Hays, E. R.	Morgan,
Bingham,	Cothran,	Henderson, Iowa	Osborne,
Blount,	Cowles,	Hitt,	Owen, Ind.
Boothman,	Dalzell,	Houk,	Payson,
Bowden,	Dargan,	Kelley,	Peters,
Brower,	De Lano,	Kennedy,	Phelan,
Browne, T. M.	Dorsey,	Knapp,	Pickler,
Browne, Va.	Ewart,	La Follette,	Price,
Brunner,	Featherston,	Lester, Va.	Pugsley,
Buckalew,	Fithian,	Lodge,	Reilly,
Bullock,	Fowler,	Magner,	Reyburn,
Bunn,	Geary,	Malsh,	Rife,
Carlton,	Gibson,	Mansur,	Rowland,
Clunie,	Gifford,	McCarthy,	Rusk,

Russell, Stahlnecker, Townsend, Pa. Willey, Candler, Ga. Geissenhalner, McCreary, Sayers,
Sanford, Stewart, Vt. Turner, Kans. Caruth, Gibson, McMillin, Shively,
Scranton, Stump, Turner, N. Y. Catohings, Goodnight, McRae, Sprinola,
Seney, Sweney, Whittor, N. Y. Chipman, Miller, Spring, Springer,
Skinner, Thomas, Waddill, Haynes, W. I. Hatch, Milliken, Stewart, Ga.
Snider, Thompson, Wickham, Clemens, Clark, Ala. Haynes, W. I. Mills, Stockdale, Tex.
Stewart, Ga. Stone, Ky. Stump, Tarnsey, Tullman, Tracey, Tucker, Turner, Ga. Washington, Wheeler, Ala. Whitelaw, Whiting, Wilke, Wiley, Willcox, Williams, Ill. Wilson, Mo. Wilson, W. Va. Yoder.

So the motion of Mr. McCOMAS was agreed to.
Mr. WHEELER, of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to have my vote recorded. I did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. BURROWS). Was the gentleman in his seat when his name was called?

Mr. WHEELER, of Michigan. I was listening, but did not hear my name called.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The name of Mr. WHEELER, of Michigan, was called and his vote recorded.

The following-named members were announced as paired until further notice:

- Mr. GIFFORD with Mr. BUNN.
- Mr. EWART with Mr. MAGNER.
- Mr. KNAPP with Mr. WILKINSON.
- Mr. HOUK with Mr. RICHARDSON.
- Mr. DALZELL with Mr. PRICE.
- Mr. MCCORD with Mr. SENEY.
- Mr. COMSTOCK with Mr. STAHLNECKER.
- Mr. PUGSLEY with Mr. WHITTHORNE.
- Mr. DE LANO with Mr. ROWLAND.
- Mr. TOWNSEND, of Pennsylvania, with Mr. MORGAN.
- Mr. PETERS with Mr. BULLOCK.
- Mr. BROWNE, of Virginia, with Mr. FITHIAN.
- Mr. PICKLER with Mr. DARGAN.
- Mr. COLEMAN with Mr. TURNER, of New York.
- Mr. HARMER with Mr. REILLY.
- Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. GEISSENHAINER.
- Mr. BINGHAM with Mr. WILEY.

The following were paired on this vote:
Mr. ATKINSON, of West Virginia, with Mr. COOPER, of Indiana.

Mr. BOWDEN with Mr. RUSK.
Mr. ADAMS with Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia.

The following were paired until Tuesday next:
Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. SKINNER.

Mr. WADDILL with Mr. LESTER, of Virginia.
The following were paired for this day:

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa, with Mr. BUCKALEW.
Mr. DORSEY with Mr. BANKHEAD.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the vote recapitulated.

The Clerk recapitulated the names of members voting.
Mr. RICHARDSON changed his vote from nay to yea.

The result of the vote was then announced, as above recorded.
Mr. RICHARDSON. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. McCOMAS. I move to lay that motion on the table; and on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.
The question was taken; and there were—yeas 128, nays 123, not voting 80; as follows:

- | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| YEAS—128. | | |
| Adams, Mich. | Cutecheon, | Lansing, |
| Allen, Mich. | Darlington, | Laws, |
| Anderson, Kans. | Dingley, | Lehlbach, |
| Arnold, | Dolliver, | Lind, |
| Atkinson, Pa. | Dunnell, | McComas, |
| Atkinson, W. Va. | Evans, | McDuffie, |
| Baker, | Farquhar, | Miles, |
| Banks, | Featherston, | Mosflitt, |
| Bartine, | Finley, | Moore, N. H. |
| Beckwith, | Flick, | Morey, |
| Belden, | Flood, | Morrill, |
| Belknap, | Frank, | Morrow, |
| Bergen, | Funston, | Morse, |
| Bingham, | Gear, | Mudd, |
| Bliss, | Gest, | Niedringhaus, |
| Boothman, | Greenhalge, | O'Donnell, |
| Boutelle, | Grosvenor, | O'Neill, Pa. |
| Brewer, | Grout, | Osborne, |
| Brosius, | Hall, | Owen, Ind. |
| Buchanan, N. J. | Haugen, | Payne, |
| Burrows, | Hays, E. R. | Perkins, |
| Burton, | Henderson, Ill. | Post, |
| Butterworth, | Hermann, | Quackenbush, |
| Caldwell, | Hopkins, | Raines, |
| Candler, Mass. | Kelley, | Randall, |
| Cannon, | Kennedy, | Reed, Iowa |
| Caswell, | Kerr, Iowa | Rife, |
| Cheadle, | Ketcham, | Rockwell, |
| Cheatham, | Kinsey, | Rogers, |
| Clark, Wis. | Lacey, | Rowell, |
| Clark, Wyo. | Laidlaw, | Sawyer, |
| Culbertson, Pa. | Langston, | Scranton, |

- | | | |
|-----------------|------------|---------------|
| NAYS—123. | | |
| Abbott, | Barnes, | Blount, |
| Alderson, | Boatner, | Brunner, |
| Allen, Miss. | Biggs, | Buchanan, Va. |
| Anderson, Miss. | Blanchard, | Bynum, |
| Andrew, | Bland, | Campbell, |

Candler, Ga. Geissenhalner, McCreary, Sayers,
Caruth, Gibson, McMillin, Shively,
Goodnight, McRae, Sprinola,
Chipman, Miller, Spring, Springer,
Haynes, W. I. Hatch, Milliken, Stewart, Ga.
Clemens, Clark, Ala. Haynes, W. I. Mills, Stockdale, Tex.
Cobb, Henderson, N. C. Mutchler, Stone, Ky. Stump, Tarnsey, Tullman, Tracey, Tucker, Turner, Ga. Washington, Wheeler, Ala. Whitelaw, Whiting, Wilke, Wiley, Willcox, Williams, Ill. Wilson, Mo. Wilson, W. Va. Yoder.

NOT VOTING—80.

Bankhead,	Craig,	La Follette,	Reyburn,
Bayne,	Crahn,	Lester, Va.	Rowland,
Bowden,	Daizell,	Lodge,	Rusk,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Dargan,	Magner,	Russell,
Brower,	De Lano,	Mason,	Sanford,
Browne, T. M.	Dorsey,	McCarthy,	Seney,
Browne, Va.	Ewart,	McCord,	Skinner,
Buckalew,	Fithian,	McCormick,	Snider,
Bullock,	Flower,	McKenna,	Stahlnecker,
Bunn,	Gifford,	McKinley,	Stone, Mo.
Carlton,	Grimes,	Morgan,	Sweney,
Carter,	Hansbrough,	Nute,	Thompson,
Clancy,	Hare,	Payson,	Townsend, Pa.
Clunie,	Harmer,	Peters,	Turner, N. Y.
Cogswell,	Heard,	Phelan,	Waddill,
Coleman,	Henderson, Iowa	Pickler,	Whitthorne,
Comstock,	Hill,	Price,	Wickham,
Connell,	Hitt,	Pugsley,	Wilkinson,
Cooper, Ohio	Houk,	Ray,	Wright,
Cowles,	Knapp,	Reilly,	Yardley.

So the motion to lay the motion to reconsider on the table was agreed to.

The following additional pairs were announced on this vote:
Mr. BROWNE, of Virginia, with Mr. COTHRAN.

Mr. McCORMICK with Mr. COWLES.
Mr. BOWDEN with Mr. RUSK.

Mr. PAYSON and Mr. HEARD were announced as paired for this day.
Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the vote recapitulated.

The Clerk recapitulated the names of members voting.
The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The House then, in pursuance of the motion of Mr. McCOMAS previously agreed to, resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan, in the chair.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

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

The Clerk read as follows:
A bill (H. R. 12729) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS].

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee very briefly to a comparison of the revenues and expenditures of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1892 with those for the fiscal year 1890.

The net expenditures of the District of Columbia, as shown by the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, for 1890 were \$5,677,419.52, and the net revenues deposited in the Treasury amounted to \$2,809,130.93. So that we find there was an excess of expenditures over receipts during that year amounting to \$29,578.83. In order to meet this deficiency there was issued during that year \$28,450 of the 3.65 per cent. bonds. The present bill contains appropriations which, in my judgment, will far exceed the revenues for the next fiscal year. The estimated revenue for the year 1892 is \$2,539,563.21. The report of the committee shows that in addition to these revenues there will be receipts from other sources amounting to \$100,471.87, making the total revenues as estimated by the Committee on Appropriations \$2,640,035.08.

This bill carries, exclusive of the water department, \$5,083,227.97, one-half of which, that is \$2,541,613.98, is to be borne by the District of Columbia. As the bill now stands and should the estimate of the revenues of the District of Columbia prove to be correct, there will be an excess of revenue as compared with appropriations made in this bill, amounting to \$98,421.10. But, sir, it must be borne in mind that the bill does not include the cost of maintaining the Zoological Park for 1892. The appropriation for that purpose is borne in the sundry civil bill; one-half of which is chargeable against the revenues of the District

of Columbia; so that if we further deduct the sum of \$51,000, we have remaining \$47,421.10 as an excess of revenue over expenditure, provided the estimate as to receipts proves true and the present bill be not increased.

But, as was stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS] last evening, there will fall due against the District of Columbia the first installment of \$600,000 for the establishment of a national park. It will be remembered that during the last session a bill passed both Houses of Congress appropriating \$1,200,000, all of which was to be paid out of the revenues of the Federal Government, but the District of Columbia is to reimburse the Government by the payment of four annual installments of \$150,000 each with interest added. So that if the first installment of \$150,000 and interest thereon fall due in the fiscal year 1892, as we believe it will, there will be a deficit of more than \$102,578.90. Now, I ask the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS], when he proceeds to explain the bill, to inform the committee particularly as to the question of the excess of expenditures over receipts.

But there is another matter connected with the expenditures for the District of Columbia to which I wish to call the attention of this committee. According to the report of the commissioners of the District of Columbia for 1890 the funded indebtedness of the District amounted to \$20,142,050 on the 1st day of July, 1890. Of that indebtedness \$3,330,550 will fall due on the 1st day of July, 1891, and \$904,400 on the 1st day of July, 1892. There is no provision in this or in any other bill, so far as I am informed, to meet this indebtedness when it shall fall due.

I again ask my friend who has charge of this bill to explain fully and satisfactorily to this committee the condition of the bonded indebtedness of the District of Columbia, the amount that will fall due in 1891 and 1892, and to show if he can where in this bill or in any other measure emanating from any committee any provision has ever been made for taking care of this bonded indebtedness, and especially of that portion which will fall due during the present and the next years.

Before taking my seat, Mr. Chairman, I desire to refer very briefly to two features of this bill. The government of the District of Columbia was met with a deficiency during the fiscal year 1890, and it will be met with a deficiency during the fiscal year 1891. But, in order to avoid a deficiency during 1892, the committee have reported a reduction of \$285,000 in the item for the repair and improvement of streets alone. Turning to that portion of the bill which refers to the improvement and repairs of county roads, we find there is also a reduction of about \$82,950. These items are very important, indeed. They concern the convenience, the prosperity, and the health of the people of the District. The streets in certain portions of this city are in a very bad condition; some streets have had large expenditures upon them, while others have been altogether neglected. It is no answer to say that these important improvements must be in a great measure abandoned in order that a zoological garden may be maintained and a national park may be established. The health, convenience, and prosperity of the people should be first considered.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUTCHLER].

Mr. MUTCHLER. Mr. Chairman, after the full and clear statement made yesterday by my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS], I can add very little concerning the provisions of this bill. I simply wish to call attention to the fact that when at the last session the bill for the current fiscal year was under discussion, I made a statement that there would be a deficiency of between \$300,000 and \$400,000.

My authority for making that statement was a letter addressed to the committee by the commissioners after the bill had been completed in the committee. That letter was based upon an estimate made by the able auditor of this District, Mr. Petty, which I believed to be correct. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS], the chairman of the subcommittee, took issue with me at that time with respect to the matter, and said that inasmuch as I was a young member of the committee I probably had not made as thorough an investigation of the subject as older members had and might therefore be excused for my ignorance. I now rise to show that instead of my having stated an amount larger than the fact (the gentleman from Maryland claimed that there would be no deficiency at all) I really understated the amount of the deficiency.

I have here a statement made by the same official which clearly demonstrates what the deficiency is likely to be for the current fiscal year. The entire amount of the revenues for the year 1890-'91 is \$2,655,474.26, and is made up as follows: Surplus on July 1, 1890, \$105,512.53; estimated receipts for 1891, taken from the report of the chairman of the subcommittee, \$2,473,461.73; balance from new buildings, \$60,000, less 10 per cent. for collection, \$54,000 in all; estimated receipts from the sale of the Columbia schoolhouse, \$5,000; one-half to the District of Columbia, \$2,500; appropriations not used and covered back, \$20,000; showing the total estimates of the resources of the District to be \$2,655,474.26. Now, the appropriations amount, ex-

cluding the \$150,000 spoken of by the gentleman from Texas, to \$2,691,757.53.

Mr. SAYERS. You do not take into consideration the amount carried in the sundry civil bill?

Mr. MUTCHLER. No, sir. This leaves a deficiency of \$186,283.27.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman allow me right there to state that he should add to that the estimate of one-half of the cost of maintaining the Zoological Garden, which amounts to \$51,000, the total cost being \$102,000?

Mr. MUTCHLER. I was going to remark that the District's share of the appropriation for Rock Creek Park is \$150,000; that is, the first installment is payable in the current year. Twice that amount, or the total amount due by the District, is \$300,000. Now, if we add that, the total deficiency will be \$672,566.54. If, however, we are not called upon during the present fiscal year to pay the \$150,000, and we may not be, I am not sure, but I think next year we will be called upon in all probability to pay both installments, amounting to \$300,000.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let me ask the gentleman then, if I understand correctly. The first installment is due this year and we may be called upon to pay it?

Mr. MUTCHLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. McMILLIN. And, therefore, should constitute a part of the liabilities of the District for the current year.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Yes. But, as I have said, if we should be called upon to pay the \$150,000 this year, that is, the District's half of the total cost, and the United States pays the other half, if we add that to the deficiency already given, \$186,000, which must be doubled, making \$372,000, and \$150,000 also doubled, being the total amount due on that account, we have the exact amount of the deficiencies at \$672,566.54.

Now, it may be said that we are not sure as to what the total receipts for the current fiscal year will be. My friend from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS] may argue that they may be greater than the amounts I have stated. I do not think they will be greater.

The amount collected for the first six months of the fiscal year is \$2,648,181.20. Now, taking it for granted that we shall collect in the next six months an equal amount, the deficiency will still be the amount I have named. But I do not believe we shall collect as large a sum in the next six months as in the past six months; and I will show, with the exception of the year 1890, the second half of the year in each case has produced less than the first half.

In 1887 we collected, in the first six months of the year, \$1,134,142; but in the second half of the year we collected but \$971,621. In 1888 the amount collected in the first six months was \$1,495,894, whereas in the next six months it reached only the sum of \$912,685. In 1889 in the first six months of the year the amount collected was \$1,262,151.91, while in the next six months the amount collected was but \$1,002,777.97. But, in 1890, in the first six months we collected \$1,264,627.54, while in the next six months we collected \$1,337,462.62. The reason why there was more money in the year 1890 in the latter half of the fiscal year than in the first part was because of the passage by Congress of an act allowing a rebate upon all back taxes that should be paid within that time. The rebate, or discount, was 6 per cent., but that was increased by act of Congress to 10 per cent., the result of which was that a much larger sum was collected in the last six months than in the prior six months, because the taxpayers took advantage of the privilege they had of having 10 per cent. taken from their taxes instead of 6 per cent.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CLEMENTS. I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday morning, when the Speaker was presiding over the House, I felt called upon, in view of what had happened the day before, and I so announced, that when I should again get the privilege of addressing the House I did not want the presiding officer to take me off the floor because of any imaginary pantomimic performances in which he might think I had unwittingly indulged. Since that time I have been extending my studies somewhat into the domain of pantomime, this new evolution of general parliamentary law, and I have discovered a new field into which I was a little apprehensive this general parliamentary pantomime had possibly merged. It is what is known, I believe, in the most learned and scientific circles of the country as "hypnotism." It is known, or perhaps approximates in its characteristics at least to some extent what is known out among the Northwest Indians as the "ghost dance" and among certain inferior classes of negroes in the South as "conjuring."

Now, I felt this morning impelled by this recent investigation of mine to suggest to the present chairman, knowing as I did his great versatility and learning, his aptitude in difficulties, and in the disentanglement of parliamentary questions during the present session of Congress, as well as his eminent success in extricating the House from the great difficulties into which political exigencies had occasionally involved it, that I be not taken off of the floor this morning until I get through, because of any supposed hypnotic phenomena that he may imagine I had displayed during the period that I occupy the floor in what I now have to say.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I was just suggesting that when I got ready to yield I would do so by oral announcement. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I was simply going to ask you if you were afraid of being hypnotized.

Mr. ROGERS. I announced yesterday that so far as I was concerned I did not know a great deal about general parliamentary pantomime. Immediately after that I had occasion to visit the post office in search of my mail and I found in my box, through the courteous and kindly consideration of some sympathizing friend, what I suppose to be the last compilation of General Parliamentary Pantomime and Hypnotism. It is denominated as "The Constitution, Manual and Digest, Rules and Practice of the House of Representatives, second session, Fifty-first Congress."

I have assumed that that is what this book is, because of its name. I knew of course that these unexplored fields of pantomime and hypnotism were almost unknown to the civilized world, being confined within close scientific circles, and I have been frequently impressed also during the term of eight years of service here that a large majority of those who practice parliamentary pantomime have very little knowledge of what is contained in the book the name of which I have just announced, and therefore, though I may be mistaken as to what this book is, I have assumed that to be the fact, simply from the coincidence suggested.

Mr. Chairman, some two or three weeks ago, taking the hint from my distinguished friend from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON], in a purported interview which I found in the papers, to the effect that in view of the recent election he thought the best thing the Republican party could do was to pass the appropriation bills and adjourn—taking that hint, I advised these gentlemen some time ago of the importance of laying aside unimportant matters and taking up the great leading questions which are now agitating the public mind, and which are demanded by the great political forces now at work, and working a revolution too, throughout the length and breadth of our land.

I congratulate the country that the majority, even at this late day, evince some premonition of a true insight into what the November elections meant. But I am compelled to confess my disappointment at the method in which this debate on this important legislation has been conducted. On the day when the bill was taken up for consideration I listened to a most interesting colloquy between the distinguished gentleman from New York, the chairman of the late campaign Republican committee of the House of Representatives [Mr. BELDEN], and the distinguished and accomplished and elegant gentleman from Maryland in charge of the bill [Mr. MCCOMAS]. When those questions were put by my friend from New York, who is not only not a theorist, but who is vouched for by distinguished gentlemen upon the floor as an eminently practical man in the affairs of this world, it occurred to me that they were important and such as ought to elicit a most complete and thorough and elaborate explanation to the House.

I know that I may congratulate the House upon the satisfactory answer which was made by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] in this regard. And after that elaborate answer thus made, so clear, so lucid, so forceful, so thoroughly vindicating the committee that framed this bill, it seemed to me that it was a useless waste and consumption of the time of the public for us to take up five hours in debate on the merits of this controversy. That important time, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, should have been employed in the discussion of that great bill of the people which yesterday came over from the Senate, known as the bill for the free coinage of silver.

Mr. Chairman, these facts which I have now rehearsed in this great presence show the impropriety of continuing in that vicious habit—whence it came I do not know—of limiting debate upon general appropriation bills, in advance of any sort of explanation or debate in regard to them. We ought to have saved, of the five hours, four hours and forty minutes, in view of the splendid explanation of the bill made by the gentleman from Maryland, which time we could have devoted to the discussion of the silver bill. And that leads me to the suggestion that forces itself upon my consideration, and I have felt that I ought to invite the attention of the country to it.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, and I appeal to the Republican majority of this House, that the time has arrived when, with reference to silver, you ought not again to ask the Speaker of the House of Representatives to assume any further responsibility—

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. Now, there it is again. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I make the point of order that the silver bill is not under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The gentleman from Arkansas will proceed in order.

Mr. ROGERS. It seems to me, and I appeal again to the House, that the time has arrived when the Republican majority ought not again to ask the Speaker of the House to assume any further responsibility in regard to the free coinage of silver. When, Mr. Chairman, in all the

history of this great country, has any Speaker ever faced and met the demands of the party organization in this House more bravely, more courageously than the present Speaker of the House, with reference to this great measure?

Mr. SPRINGER. And more disastrously.

Mr. ROGERS. And more disastrously, as my friend from Illinois says. And has it come to this, that after he has suffered the terrible penalty which came from this responsibility, forced upon him by party exigencies and the party caucus, has it come to this, that he is yet to be called upon to make more sacrifices, personal sacrifices, greater than the severe and hard penalty which the country has inflicted upon him, at the caucus command? Mr. Chairman, I submit to their generosity, to their magnanimity, and to their courage, that, if there is further responsibility upon this great question to be assumed, it should come from the other end of the Avenue; it should come from those who openly and avowedly announce themselves against free silver.

Mr. Chairman, I am led to this conclusion by some remarks of a very distinguished and eloquent public man of long service in another place, who said:

There is, Mr. President, a deep-seated conviction among the people, which I fully share, that the demonetization of silver in 1873 was one element of a great conspiracy to deliver the fiscal system of this country over to those by whom it has, in my opinion, finally been captured. I see no proof of the assertion that the demonetization act of 1873 was fraudulently or corruptly procured, but from the statements that have been made it is impossible to avoid the conviction that it was part of a deliberate plan and conspiracy formed by those who have been called speculators to still further increase the value of the standard by which their accumulations were to be measured. The attention of the people was not called to the subject. It is one of the anomalies and phenomena of legislation.

That bill was pending in its various stages for four years in both Houses of Congress. It passed both bodies by decided majorities. It was read and reread and reprinted thirteen times, as appears by the records. It was commented upon in newspapers; it was the subject of discussion in financial bodies all over the country; and yet we have the concurrent testimony of every Senator and every member of the House of Representatives who was present during the time that the legislation was pending and proceeding that he knew nothing whatever about the demonetization of silver and the destruction of the coinage of the silver dollar.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], who knows so many things, felt called upon to make a speech of an hour's duration to show that he knew nothing whatever about it. I have heard other members declaim and with one consent make excuse that they knew nothing about it.

As I say, it is one of the phenomena and anomalies of legislation, and I have no other explanation to make than this: I believe that both Houses of Congress and the President of the United States must have been hypnotized.

[Laughter and applause.]

Is it to be wondered at, Mr. Chairman, that I cautioned the Chair against hypnotism myself, when it is believed by the distinguished gentleman from whose remarks I read that both bodies of the American Congress and that distinguished and able general and statesman and President of the United States, General Grant, were all hypnotized when silver was demonetized?

Mr. KERR, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise to submit two points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his points of order.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. The first is that the gentleman from Arkansas is quoting the language of a Senator without giving him credit and the second is that he is not addressing himself to the question before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas did not seem to be using the name of any person now in public life, and the gentleman from Arkansas will proceed.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I shall not be taken from the floor, nor have these interrogation points put into my speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will protect the gentleman from Arkansas. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROGERS. I continue to read from the same great speech:

So great was the power of capital, so profound was the impulse, so persistent was the determination, that the promoters of this scheme succeeded by the operation of mind power and will force in capturing and bewildering the intelligence of men of all parties, of members of both Houses of Congress, and the members of the Cabinet, and the President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, there are gentlemen who are vicious and irreverent enough to state that in making this great speech this distinguished Republican got down on his belly and crawled in the dust that he might get back within the horizon of public favor. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] But, Mr. Chairman, if he did—if he did that and got down and crawled, he crawled towards the principles of honest Democracy; and I warn you, Mr. Chairman, and those in sympathy with you, who propose to throw barriers in front of the enactment of free coinage of silver that you will have to get down and crawl in the dust before you can get back within the horizon of public favor with your own constituents. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I continue to read from the speech of the same distinguished gentleman:

Once, twice, thrice, by executive intervention, Democratic and Republican, by parliamentary proceedings that I need not characterize, by various methods of legislative jugglery, the deliberate purpose of the American people, irrespective of party, has been thwarted, it has been defied, it has been contemptuously trodden under foot; and I repeat to those who have been the instruments and the implements, no matter what the impulse or the motive or the intention may have been, at some time the people will elect a House of Representatives, they will elect a Senate of the United States, they will elect a President of the United States who will carry out their pledges and execute the popular will.

Mr. Chairman, a tender solicitude and a profound sympathy for our great Speaker, who has sacrificed so much for his party and accomplished so much good for the Democratic party and the country, impels me to beg you to call a halt and demand no further responsibilities of him in this behalf. Let others assume it. But spare him.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Give me a little more time. Give me five minutes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It is impossible to give you five minutes more, because I have promised other gentlemen time. I will give the gentleman three minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that I would be able to reach this bill. I am proceeding upon direct lines to it, as you observe. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I now come to the consideration of this bill, and I regret that I am not permitted to have a sufficient part of the large time allotted for the discussion of it to present some questions which I regard as of very considerable importance. Mr. Chairman, in the discussion upon this bill the other day the gentleman from New York [Mr. BELDEN] had this colloquy with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS]:

Mr. MCCOMAS. I will inform the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that I am not by law a commissioner of the District of Columbia, but—

Mr. BELDEN. Ah!

Mr. MCCOMAS. Let me answer your question, now you have put it and need information on this subject. I have endeavored in every way to put down the price of street-cleaning here, because I was not satisfied that it was well done and cheaply done.

Mr. BELDEN. Mind you, he does not answer the question I asked him. I knew he would go off on something else. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MCCOMAS. And I went to the commissioners and asked them, as the gentleman himself, if he had known the law, would have gone to them with this complaints about the street-cleaning.

Mr. BELDEN. You see, gentlemen, how he answers me.

Mr. MCCOMAS. And the committee see how active this gentleman is. Now, it has been observed that when we want a model reformer, sweet and clean and pure, with experience large and ample—

Mr. BELDEN. I yielded to the gentleman, you know, for an explanation.

Mr. MCCOMAS (continuing). We ought to go to some place else than to the gentleman from New York, with all his experience in these matters—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BELDEN] has expired.

Mr. BELDEN. Now, you have heard my question, gentlemen. I asked how he guarded against an unwise expenditure of money, and to know how the street-cleaning was done. You have heard his answer. It is something about reformers. I do not know what it is exactly. [Laughter.]

Soon after this my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. BELDEN] lost the floor, and that was the end of the explanation. Mr. Chairman, why is this? Is it possible that we are to be deprived of the assistance of the distinguished gentleman from New York because of these dark insinuations in relation to something that lies behind, and concerning which the House has no information? Why are we not having his assistance? And shall we not have it when we come to discuss the bill under the five-minute rule? Shall we not then have his aid to throw the light of his luminous experience upon this bill, to perfect it and make it such as it ought to be for the government of this great District? It can not be that he will be intimidated. I shall expect him in the forefront in perfecting this legislation.

But the gentleman from New York made a more important statement than any contained in the extract which I have read, one involving a legal proposition of considerable value in the proper determination and settlement of this bill. He said:

Mr. BELDEN. Mr. Chairman, as I have understood in the committee, the only explanation was that they had a letting, and had it for a series of years, and the contractors combined to put up the price more than it had ever been before, and then the contract was let for a number of years, and then they divided it up among themselves.

This is a grave charge. Conspirators these contractors are if this statement be true; conspirators against the Government to rob the Treasury by combining and conspiring to raise the price of cleaning and sweeping the streets; and yet we are told the Senate was right in striking out a provision in the appropriation bill of last year reducing this pay, because they were working under contracts saturated with fraud, if the gentleman from New York is right. Is this right? Is it law, are we remediless in such contingency?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. Oh, I ought to have more time.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] be permitted to continue for five minutes longer, not to come out of the time on either side.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Five minutes, to be taken out of the time on that side of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. No; I ask unanimous consent to extend the time for general debate five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The House has limited the time for general debate, and the Chair does not understand that the committee has power to change the order of the House in that respect. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS], by unanimous consent, has control of the time on his side of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. How much time is still remaining on the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. One hour and forty minutes. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS] is recognized.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Chairman, I would be very glad to accommodate my friend from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] with additional time, but it is utterly impossible for me to do so out of the time allotted to me.

Mr. ROGERS. Well, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate myself that I have neither been pantomimed nor hypnotized off the floor. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAUX].

Mr. VAUX. Mr. Chairman, it is utterly impossible to discuss this question in seven minutes, and I understood that there would be some additional allowance of time made to this side on account of the twenty minutes yielded by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS] to a gentleman on the other side, but it seems there is to be none.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I will yield eight minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAUX. Mr. Chairman, in coming to the intelligent consideration of this bill one must be possessed of a very large amount of information which the bill itself does not contain; or, if the bill is to be considered upon its text alone, then it presents to my mind a very extraordinary confusion of appropriations. When we seek information elsewhere, when we go to the distinguished chairman of the committee, who, as I said last session and say now, has shown an amount of devotion to the details of this bill that is really phenomenal in any committee of this House, we receive from him information which changes the whole character of the bill. My objection to it is that it is not to be regarded as a general appropriation bill.

The House can not regard it as a general appropriation bill. It is limited to what is generally called a municipal appropriation bill. It relates to the cost and expense of carrying on the government of the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia has no legislative department of its own, and the Congress steps in and acts for it—all of which I approve. But the trouble is that the information which a legislator ought to have in order to pass upon the several items contained in this bill is not to be found in the bill. Reference is made here and there to some other information, which is not accessible to the members of this House discussing the bill unless they find it elsewhere than in the bill itself. For instance, under the title of "Improvements and repairs," line 14, page 11, we find "For work on sundry streets named in Appendix NN."

Now, it seems that in this appendix there is an arrangement of all those locations for improvements and repairs upon a map of the District, and in the index these locations are marked to suit their geographical relations one to another. Now, sir, when we are asked to appropriate \$367,200 to be expended by the commissioners upon streets and avenues, we find that they are specified in the schedules in the appendix, and before we can apply this appropriation to what the appendix refers to we must ascertain who made the appendix, what is its purpose, and how this money is to be applied to the several divisions of the appendix.

On the general principles of appropriation for municipal government I object to leaving this appendix out of the bill. In order to make this bill what it ought to be that appendix should be put in, or its contents should be incorporated in the bill, so that we might add a proviso that "no part of these appropriations shall be expended in excess of the limitations of appropriation as defined in the preceding schedule."

My distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee, has stated, I believe, that that is all done by general acts of Congress. Then I assert, Mr. Chairman, that this bill is a monstrosity, because what ought to be in the text is nowhere found there to enlighten a member who may vote upon it; and he must go without information unless he gets the acts of Congress relating to the Government of the District and consults the several statutes relating to these expenditures.

At the last session of Congress, when the deficiency appropriations for the District of Columbia were under consideration, I had the honor to address the House for five or seven minutes calling attention to the origin of those deficiencies and claiming that there could be no well-regulated government where it was possible that expenditures should be made in such a way as to give rise to so large an amount of deficiencies. I said then, and I take this occasion to repeat, that there can be no proper administration of municipal government, unless there is provision for properly checking and watching the expenditures, by a clear and unmistakable enactment that no part of the sum appropriated shall be expended for any other purpose than those specified.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CLEMENTS. How much of the time on this side of the House remains?

The CHAIRMAN. Eight minutes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The gentleman from Maryland proposes to yield this side twenty minutes of the time belonging to his side in consideration of the twenty minutes which I yielded to a gentleman on the other side at the commencement of this debate.

Mr. MCCOMAS. In order to equalize the occupation of time I have, as my colleague states, agreed to yield to him twenty minutes of the time on this side.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy, and I

yield the remainder of the time on this side—twenty-eight minutes—to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SHIVELY].

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. Chairman, I avail myself of the kindness of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS] and the latitude permitted in Committee of the Whole to submit a few observations this afternoon on the proposition in charge of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR]. A copy of that measure lies before me. It is entitled, "An act to place the American merchant marine engaged in the foreign trade on an equality with that of foreign nations." The title is enticing enough, but the bill itself is simply an effort on the part of accommodating statesmen to initiate another class of corporations into the mysteries of dividends by statute. These statesmen have subsidized the railroads out of the public lands. They have subsidized the banks out of the public credit. They have subsidized the trusts out of the pockets of the people. They have subsidized the sugar-producers out of the public Treasury. Having subsidized every corporate interest in sight on land, they now propose to introduce the corporate interests of the sea to the generous bounty of a benign Government.

It is certainly touching to witness the tender solicitude of the advocates of this bill for the fate of our merchant marine. But for the lessons of history and the irony of contemporaneous facts, the situation might suggest cheerful assurances of respectful sympathy. It is undoubtedly a most laudable ambition that beckons the day when the white sails of our enfranchised commerce shall again carry the rugged and commanding influence of our civilization to the uttermost parts of the earth. Interest, pride, and patriotism alike suggest that here is a field in which American statesmanship may win splendid triumphs for American enterprise and, at the same time, impart lasting strength and dignity to American institutions.

But governments, not less than individuals, are inexorably bound by the immutable force of economic law. The conduct of public affairs should conform to some settled policy. Reasonable prudence requires that such policy be consistent and harmonious in all its parts. Friction involves loss, whether in mechanics or economics. When contradictions, inconsistencies, and antagonisms are introduced, one set of forces is played off against another to the destruction of both. Amid the jar and discord of conflicting elements the national resources are wasted and the foundations of public prosperity are undermined.

The present legislative situation furnishes an illustration which most happily emphasizes the principle just stated. The McKinley tariff law of the last session on the one hand and the pending subsidy bill on the other involve not only friction and consequent loss, but positive collision and consequent destruction. That law raises still higher our ramparts against the highway of nations; this is a bill to subsidize our commerce over the walls. That law sentinels more closely than ever our seacoast against the commerce of the world; this is a bill to bribe our commerce through the lines. That law in every section proclaims that ocean traffic is a swindle and foreign commerce a fraud; this bill proclaims that ocean traffic is a blessing and foreign commerce the end of wisdom. That law announces a perpetual embargo on commercial intercourse with friendly foreign nations; this is a bill to buy our commerce over our legislative obstructions into foreign ports. That law fines the American people for trading with foreigners; this is a bill to fine the American people that they may trade with foreigners. That is an act to circumscribe our foreign markets and narrow our foreign influence; this is a bill to buy back our markets and broaden our influence. That law emphasizes anew the sacred folly that this nation must remain a hermit; this is a bill to purchase immunity from the effects of the wasteful doctrine of isolation. That law chains the American flag to a fabled and legendary home market; this is a bill to bribe that sacred parable of free government into notice on the high seas.

The antithesis is so complete at every point as to excite amazement at the brazen trifling with the public interests. The constant waste attending such collision of economic forces is all to be charged against the American people. On the one hand, foreign commerce is outlawed and, in the name of American labor, American monopoly is licensed to pillage the purses of the American people; on the other hand, in the name of that outlawed commerce, a miserable brood of scurvy subsidy-beggars is to be licensed to pillage the public Treasury and project its debauching influence into the public life of the nation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] It is possible that human ingenuity might devise a more discordant, inconsistent, incongruous, wasteful, corrupting and suicidal policy, but it certainly never has.

But aside, Mr. Chairman, from the consideration of its utter inconsistency with the insular economic policy of the Government, this measure is the old and familiar wail of deadhead greed in the name of the American flag for an appropriation to protect itself from self-helping, self-reliant, and self-respecting competition. The venerable and classic pretensions of its friends are as inconsistent as the commercial policy it assumes to encourage. But a few months ago we were listening here for hours to gloomy asseveration and hysterical prophecy as to the awful and disastrous folly of England's commercial policy; now that policy and its fruits are invoked as the perfection of wisdom to induce Congress to enter on this system of subsidies. It is sought to create the impression that England subsidized her merchant marine into its present supremacy. It were needless to combat self-evident error. Eng-

land's possessions encircle the globe. Postal communication is indispensable to her colonial and military policy. Mails attend empire; it does not follow that they pioneer trade. Our empire is on the land; the British Empire is connected only by the seas. How different, therefore, the circumstances of both our postal and military policy. Trade follows the prospect of profit, not the prospect of a postal card.

Col. John C. New, our consul general at London, says in his report of September 3, 1889, to the State Department, "The British Government does not grant subsidies in the general sense of that term to any steamship companies." He adds that the British "post-office authorities simply make contracts for the conveyance of mails with steamship companies having steamers sailing to those ports." The only other payment made by the British is a war-department disbursement to the owners of certain large steamships for the privilege of calling them into the naval service at any time as war ships or transports.

Both of these payments relate solely to the postal, colonial, and military policy of Great Britain, and in no sense, except as an incident, to her commercial marine. As well claim that the payment by our Government to carry the mail from South Bend to North Liberty is a subsidy to our internal commerce, or the payment to the owner of a mule for hauling provisions from Chadron to Pine Ridge agency a subsidy to our stock-raising industry, as to claim that either of the forms of British payment is a subsidy to the British merchant marine. [Laughter and applause.] There is no analogy whatever between such payments and the appropriation proposed by this bill. The postal authorities of Great Britain simply make contracts for carrying the mails with the lowest responsible bidders, whether they be English, German, or American. The North German Lloyd held a contract for ten years carrying mails between England and New York.

Great Britain has a fleet of 6,625 steamships in her trade with America, Asia, Africa, and Australia, and only 336 of these carry mails or receive a farthing from the postal funds. Only 5 per cent. of these vessels, or 13 per cent. of the British tonnage in this trade, receive pay for carrying mails. Besides this, Great Britain has a fleet of 15,000 sail ships, with 3,000,000 tonnage, to which not a farthing is paid by the Government. Ninety-eight per cent. of the ships and 92 per cent. of the tonnage for the year 1889 were absolutely free from any pecuniary connection with the Government. Why do not the advocates of this bill point for example to the great body of British merchant marine unemployed by the Government and in no way sustained by it? Why prefer for illustration the 2 per cent. to the 98 per cent.?

The Cunard Line, with five steamers, and the White Star Line, with seven steamers, carry mails between Great Britain and New York under a British postal subvention, while the Guion Line, Wilson Line, State Line, Anchor Line, Inman Line, National Line, Beaver Line, and Sumner Line, with an aggregate of ninety-two steamers, operate between the same points, and also between the Mediterranean and New York, and pay dividends, yet receive not one cent from the British Government by way of subvention or subsidy. The Collins Line was started in 1850 and backed by an American subsidy of \$19,250 per voyage, and in 1858 bankrupted. In 1850 the Inman Line was established and operated without a penny of subsidy, and it prospered, paid dividends, and flourishes to this day. The Galway Line, backed by a subsidy of £3,000, or \$15,000 per voyage, went to the wall, while the Anchor Line, without a penny of subsidy, met all competition and grew stronger every year.

The history of subsidy, as such, is a history of hazard, fraud, corruption, and failure. The construction and sailing subsidies of France filled her dockyards with useless vessels and her harbors with idle and decaying ships. Italian subsidies increased the tools of trade, but added little to the trade itself. Every seaport in the world to-day presents the spectacle of idle ships waiting in vain for cargoes. The wisdom of the proposed scheme is the wisdom of the man who invests \$1,000 in a farm and \$9,000 in wagons wherewith to market the produce. [Laughter and applause.] I am aware that an imposing array of literature is brought to the support of this bill. With an appropriation involved, plenty of talent is available to disprove the law of gravitation. [Laughter.] But with every item of literature on both sides of the subject out of the way the provisions of this bill in themselves would suggest from first to last that charity, dependence, charlatanism, and gratuities are to be substituted for manly enterprise, commercial integrity, business sagacity and individual self-reliance. [Applause.]

The authors of this bill are careful to make the appropriation a continuing one, running through nineteen years. Why are these gratuities to private corporations placed on a so much higher plane than ordinary charges on the public Treasury? Why should the last dollar in the Treasury be subject to the call of a private interest, even if the salaries of the judges of the Supreme Court or pensions to our soldiers should go by default? The reason is elementary. The character of the bill itself explains the presence of this obnoxious provision.

Gentlemen tell us that this assurance of permanency of appropriation is necessary to induce capital to invest in our merchant marine; that no man will embark in foreign commerce unless insured against interruption of his annual gratuity by a subsequent Congress. In other words, this Congress is to barter away the right and duty of future

Congresses to scrutinize and supervise the expenditure of the public revenues in order that the public will may not interfere with the steady stream of the people's taxes from the national Treasury to the coffers of the corporations until both branches of Congress and the Executive are wrested from the party of monopoly and subsidies.

Why not ask a continuing appropriation for our Army and Navy? Why not provide a continuing appropriation for the Post-Office Department and the Department of Agriculture? Why not provide continuing appropriations for the salaries of the Supreme Court and the President of the United States? Why not make permanent appropriations for the pensions to the maimed and diseased veterans of the late war and their widows and orphans? These appropriations are all for public and legitimate purposes. They are approved by the people who pay the taxes. They are approved by the men who bear the burdens of the Government in peace and fight its battles in war. They are the necessary legitimate charges on the public treasury, and each Congress is charged with the duty of adjusting the revenues to these necessary and legitimate requirements.

No appropriation made in pursuance of the just and legal functions of the Government requires a nineteen-year mortgage on the public revenue. This feature of the bill originated in a consciousness of the inherent iniquity of the whole subsidy scheme. It is needless to argue that it is contrary to the genius, spirit, and purpose of our institutions. The only subject upon which permanent appropriations can be measurably justified is the interest on the public debt. When attempted in any other measure the motive instantly appears in settled distrust of the people and the consciousness of the unworthy character of the project.

The continuing appropriation for Federal election supervisors was a step toward divorcing the right to choose representation from the power to regulate taxation. The continuing appropriations provided in the McKinley bill for the sugar-producers is a conspicuous lodgment of the purse strings of the Government in the hands of private individuals. Every vestige of Anglo-Saxon liberty worth preserving was won by the Commons from the Crown by means of their control over the revenues and the appropriations of the realm. Placed in irresponsible hands and removed for a term of years from immediate Congressional supervision, an appropriation becomes the prolific source of corruption and debauchery. The purpose of this appropriation is wrong; its method is but the complement of its purpose. It is simply legalized grand larceny of the public revenues, and this is why Congress is to be bound hand and foot for nineteen years while the plunder of the Treasury goes on, or until the people, in spite of the bribery and corruption which this subsidy invites, can overthrow the party that authorizes and fosters it. [Applause.]

Every doubtful economic scheme, Mr. Chairman, has its cabalistic terms. Privilege in its marches on the public Treasury flanks itself with an array of well-ordered sentiment and prejudice to soothe the public conscience and flatter the national pride. However inconsistent and ludicrous the means, the end, which is possession of other people's money without compensation, is steadily kept in view. The President of the United States, in his late message to Congress, comes to the rescue of the subsidy lobby. After his apostrophe to the tariff which outlaws trade, he presents the usual pathetic lament at the decay of our merchant marine and in substance suggests that the public Treasury be placed at the service of the steamship companies. He points to the reciprocity proposition in the McKinley tariff act and asserts that its provisions can be of little service unless we subsidize our ocean commerce.

Reciprocity is the term by which he is to conjure dollars out of the public Treasury into the coffers of charity-begging corporations. Trade has a large social element in it. Reciprocity comprehends the two that it requires to make a bargain. What is the alleged reciprocity of the McKinley law? What field of trade does it annex? What obstruction to trade does it remove? What article of restricted commerce does it release? Coffee is now an article of free commerce; that so-called reciprocity clause authorizes the President to tax it at 3 cents a pound. Tea has for twenty years been free; that clause authorizes the President to tax it at 10 cents a pound. Hides have been free for years; that clause authorizes a tax of 1½ cents a pound. Sugar is made free to the sugar trust by the sugar schedule of the act; your reciprocity clause authorizes the restoration of the tax on sugar.

Mr. McMILLIN. Is it not a fact that the so-called reciprocity clause of the tariff law authorizes the President to impose taxes without convening or consulting Congress?

Mr. SHIVELY. Certainly. It confers an absolute, unqualified taxing power of over \$50,000,000 per annum on the President. He may employ it or not at his pleasure. It is a ludicrous perversion of terms to employ the word "reciprocity" in connection with that clause of the tariff law, except in the sense of reciprocal obstruction and destruction of trade. [Applause.] The whole scope of your reciprocity proposition is to narrow the area of trade, not to broaden it. It enchains that part of our commerce now free. It taxes that which is now untaxed. It hangs weights on the bleached skeleton of our jaded trade. It proposes to manacle and obstruct the slender remnant of our unrestricted commerce. It proposes to tax our own people on the prime necessities of life to spite foreigners who have taken us at our

word and left us to our own folly. It proposes to close up our walls against the sea and complete our commercial isolation.

And this is the reciprocity in the name of which we are asked to set a new symposium of tax-eaters within the vaults of the public Treasury. [Laughter and applause.] It will not do, gentlemen. There is no magic in a reciprocity organized on such lines. Frankness and candor on the part of the President might have suggested that subsidy was necessary to overcome the additional obstructions to our merchant marine created by the late tariff law, and that legislative bribery and gratuity alone could rescue the receding shadow of our once commanding ocean commerce from the obliteration threatened by the reciprocity clause.

No one is deceived. It is not commerce, it is dollars the beneficiaries of this bill want. Those dollars are in the public Treasury, and the vulgar brood is careless of the means employed to swing back the door. "Reciprocity," which, in its true significance, may mean liberation of trade and the enfranchisement of commerce, is employed by the President and the advocates of this bill as a sort of burglar tool to assist licensed greed to break into the public treasures coined from the sweat of the American people. [Applause.]

Besides, sir, what right have gentlemen to ask gratuities in the name of our merchant marine in the face of the barbarous provisions of our navigation laws? That code from first to last subordinates the vast and commanding interest of ocean commerce to the inferior and local interest of shipbuilding. Commerce itself is chained to the greed and caprice of the maker of its tools. That code outlaws all commerce which does not first pay tribute to the Caesars of our shipyards. It denies the protection of the American flag to American capital invested on principles of prudence, economy, and thrift, and extends its protection only to the investment made against the plainest dictates of business sense and in the face of inevitable insolvency. [Applause.]

The American citizen who desires to carry the American flag onto the high seas must, under our navigation laws, ignore all bargains and pay from 15 to 25 per cent. above the general market price to an American shipbuilding monopoly for a vessel. The patriotic citizen who attempts competition on the high seas with every prospect of dividends discounted 25 per cent. in advance, soon yields to the cold, unsympathetic environments of unhampered rivalry and anchors his enterprise over the dead line of bankruptcy. [Applause.] No wonder that in the great ocean trade are seen flaunting in proud rivalry against every sky the flags of all nations but our own.

An interest that but for the hostility of our own laws should represent a billion dollars of American capital is made subservient to an inferior interest of less than a half dozen million pampered into insolent helplessness by Government favor. Not a man who advocated this bill before the committee that reported it favored the liberation of trade. Every one expressed his preference for an obstructive tariff and several advocated absolute prohibition. One professional jaw-smith, who came as the self-appointed messenger of American labor wanted a Chinese-wall tariff, and subsidized ships to carry cargoes one way and ballast the other. [Laughter and applause.]

Another economic crime, involving unmixing waste of our national resources and additional impoverishment of our national revenue, is advocated in the name of American labor. American labor has for twenty-five years been plundered, its opportunities have been narrowed, its environments rendered more harsh and inflexible, its earnings confiscated and its future mortgaged away, all in the sacred name of American labor. Now American labor is again to be made the horse of Ulysses to steal a new body of Greeks into the national Treasury to feast on the sweat of American labor. [Applause.] The pretense that this bill is in the interest of American labor is the stale resort of every loafer who wants his private interests fed from the public Treasury. [Applause.]

But suppose that, despite the apparently insurmountable obstructions of our tariff and navigation laws, your dreams of foreign commercial conquest under this bill are realized and at the end of ten years our ocean traffic shall have increased tenfold? It is the vice of all such measures that the charge on the public Treasury increases just in proportion that their alleged objects are attained. If the prophecies of the advocates of this subsidy are measurably fulfilled it will take \$30,000,000 per annum out of the public Treasury at the end of ten years. Is any man credulous enough to believe that the interests thus licensed to appropriate vast sums of the national revenues will yield back to the Government such a franchise until it has exhausted every resource of fraud and corruption to retain it?

The history of subsidies in our country furnishes us with hints of what may be expected if this measure is ever placed on the statute-book. Not seventeen years ago an investigation in the House showed that the president of one of our steamship companies, through his agent, expended nearly \$1,000,000 to procure a subsidy for his line. One member of Congress found himself in possession of \$300,000 for which, by reason of defective memory, he was unable to account. [Laughter.] The Postmaster of the House, then a member-elect, found that pressing business required his presence in Canada. [Laughter.] The atmosphere of the Capitol literally reeked with the foul odors of subsidy scandals until overborne by the yet more shameless disclosures

of the *Crédit Mobilier* debauchery which likewise arose out of a corrupt appropriation of the public lands and public credit to private corporations. [Applause.]

Pass this bill, unloose this tiger, then chain him again if you can. License this interest to prey on the public revenues and it will overawe your Congress and laugh at the limitations in your law. It will sacrifice millions to renew its lease and perpetuate its power. It will lay every agency within reach under contribution. It will subsidize party organizations, dictate party platforms, shape party policies, control conventions, command nominations, and enlist every venal newspaper in the land in its service. It will elect Presidents, choose Representatives, and invade your State capitals to purchase its tools into the United States Senate. It will project its debauching influence into every department of the Government and infect with its leprous corruption every fiber of our national life. It will never yield back a franchise worth millions a year until after a struggle that will test every public virtue and shake the foundations of the Republic. Accepting your own predictions as to the immediate effects of this bill, you still count without its certain though more remote and fatal consequences. [Applause.]

For the details of this bill, Mr. Chairman, I care nothing. In these the bill is probably as good as anything essentially bad can be. Not the mask of patriotism, the enticements of statistics, nor the garniture of exuberant prophecy can redeem the scheme from its organic vice. The general principle underlying the whole subsidy system is inherently vicious and constitutionally alien to our institutions. No genius can give it grace, no magic can impart to it righteousness. Its only redeeming feature at this juncture of our national life is that it hastens the inevitable hour for the compulsory choice between a restoration of the General Government to its few and simple functions as ordained by the fathers on one side and a complete resolution of that Government into the numberless functions of universal state socialism on the other. [Applause.]

If under your dragnet, "general welfare" construction of the Federal Constitution we to license the beneficiaries of the pending and kindred measures are to feast on the bounty of the Government, we might as well conform ourselves to the inexorable consequences of our paternal doctrines. The general welfare requires that every man, woman, and child in the land should have an abundance of food, clothing, and shelter. This consideration is paramount to commerce on the ocean or dividends to steamship companies. Your phalansterian creed can not be employed to enrich the few at the expense of the many and be held within those bounds. The claims of the whole are superior to those of any of its parts. Even now you are at the parting of the ways. If the cane-grower of Louisiana, the beet-raiser of Nebraska, the sap-tapper of Vermont and the shipbuilder of Maine are to hold banquets in the vaults of the public Treasury and feast on the public revenues, you might as well prepare to welcome the corn-burner of Kansas, the sooty coal-miner of Indiana, the locked-out iron-worker of Pennsylvania, and the famishing agriculturist of New England to the sweet delights of your statutory festivities. [Applause.] No hackneyed maxim nor subtle distinction can avail. Your partial, one-sided communism and your bogus, left-handed socialism are but finger-boards along the steep descent to beatified St. Simonism. Along that route there is no camping ground. You must choose to rush on to the goal or retrace the course. The wail of the few for luxuries from the public table heralds the demand of the many for daily bread. Greed can not forever invoke the statutes it has purchased or the constitutions it has mangled to protect its gold from the forces of its own creation. Come on with your millennium of universal prosperity by statute and universal riches by taxation, or dissolve your corrupting and debauching partnership between the Government and favored private interests and give us back the ideal of the fathers in a sturdy, self-reliant, self-helping, and self-respecting individualism as the crown jewel of American politics, the settled and perpetual type of American civilization. [Long-continued applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks, when the time of Mr. SHIVELY had expired,

Mr. SHIVELY said: A few minutes more, please.

Mr. BLAND. I hope unanimous consent will be given to allow the gentleman to proceed.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would be glad to yield the gentleman more time, but there is no further time on this side. I hope the gentleman will be allowed to proceed.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I have already yielded twenty minutes of our time to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. SHIVELY. I will close in a few minutes.

Mr. CANNON. I ask consent that the gentleman be allowed two minutes longer.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope he will be granted ten minutes, if necessary.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have five minutes.

Mr. SHIVELY. I trust I may be allowed to finish my remarks. I shall get through in five or six minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Very well; I will make it seven minutes.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentlemen be allowed five minutes additional.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate has been limited by the House; but if there is no objection the gentleman will proceed.

When Mr. SHIVELY had continued his remarks for five minutes further,

Mr. MCCOMAS said: I yield one minute more to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SHIVELY then resumed and concluded his remarks as already given.

The CHAIRMAN. The time allowed for debate in opposition to the bill has been exhausted. Of the time in favor of the bill there remains one hour and fourteen minutes. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] is recognized.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Our time remaining was one hour and twenty minutes, I believe. I yielded only one minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yielded five minutes previously. Mr. MCCOMAS. That was by unanimous consent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It was understood that the five minutes were granted by unanimous consent and should not be charged to the time of the gentleman from Maryland.

The CHAIRMAN. The House having fixed the limit for general debate, the committee can not change it.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I did not yield those five minutes, although they are gone. The time of this side, I submit, is one hour and nineteen minutes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think it is right that those five minutes should not be counted against the time controlled by the gentleman from Maryland.

The CHAIRMAN. If no member of the committee objects, of course the Chair will not.

Mr. CLEMENTS and others. There is no objection.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I shall confine myself very briefly to the only three matters adverted to this morning which relate to this bill. My colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS], made yesterday forcible objection in cogent argument to the appeal of the working people of this District for free school-books; but that matter can better be discussed under the five-minute rule, when we reach that paragraph of the bill.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] made one reference to this bill; and to that part of his speech only will I give attention. He complained of the high price paid for sweeping the streets of this District and wondered why it was that no effort had been made to reduce the amount paid. I will tell the gentleman and the committee why the present price is paid and what effort has been made in this House and by the present Appropriations Committee to secure the doing of the work at a lower price.

The appropriation act for 1885, reported to this House by a Democratic committee when a majority of the House was largely Democratic, embodied a provision—

For sweeping, cleaning, and sprinkling the streets and avenues, etc.: *Provided*, That hereafter—

Making it permanent law—

contracts for cleaning the streets and alleys may be made for periods not exceeding five years, and subject to annual appropriations thereafter by Congress.

The Republican Committee on Appropriations of this Republican House, with the assent and co-operation of our Democratic colleagues on that committee, endeavored to undo this error of a Democratic House in a Democratic bill; and in the last annual appropriation bill, as it passed this House, on page 15, will be found a rider that we attached to the appropriation for sprinkling, sweeping, and cleaning the streets, in the following language:

Provided, That no expenditures hereunder shall be made at a price higher than 30 cents per thousand square yards.

It had happened that under the Democratic law, put as a rider on the appropriation bill to which I have already referred, contracts had been let, and there was then and there is now running a contract for five years which will not expire for one year and a half beyond the period of this appropriation bill, a contract to pay at the rate of 35 cents for each thousand square yards. When this Republican House passed this proviso to undo that Democratic work of extravagance, we were finally met by the contract running for five years, and the threat that the contractor would take advantage of that Democratic provision in this law attached to the bill of 1885 and go into the Court of Claims and recover the money.

Mr. ROGERS. Would it disturb the gentleman from Maryland to ask him a question?

Mr. MCCOMAS. Not if it is brief.

Mr. ROGERS. Bearing right on the bill.

Mr. MCCOMAS. On this point?

Mr. ROGERS. Precisely, and a business point. I am not going to talk about anything else.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I yield for that question.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman from New York stated on yesterday,

as appears from page 1342 of the RECORD, and not denied by the gentleman himself, or by anybody else—

Mr. McCOMAS. Let us have the question.

Mr. ROGERS. I am coming to it instantly. He stated that the contractors conspired to put up the contract price. Now, if that fact be true, can these parties who conspired to rob the Government stand in any court of justice on a contract of that sort?

Mr. McCOMAS. In my judgment they can not.

Mr. ROGERS. Did you investigate that matter before the committee?

Mr. McCOMAS. I investigated the matter as best I could and endeavored to find the truth of the allegation; and the gentleman from New York gave no clew and said he knew nothing, and we could find none, because I suppose such a bargain, if made at all, is always done in a corner; and we endeavored, therefore, to meet it outright by cutting down the pay, and we did it in this House, and only finally yielded to the contract, passed under a Democratic law in a Democratic House in 1885.

Mr. ROGERS. Did my friend give the gentleman from New York an opportunity to put the evidence on which he based his statement before the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. McCOMAS. He has had a year and a half to do it, and has the remainder of this session, and said he had no evidence, and says so now.

Now, as to the point made by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURCHLER] as to the revenues of the District. I hold in my hand a statement which is the same, given by the same officer, the auditor of the District, to my colleague from Pennsylvania, and in view of what has happened I desire the House to look at this carefully and examine these resources of the District. I read from a letter, to which the gentleman no doubt referred, from Mr. Petty, the auditor of the District, dated July 26, 1890, in which he says that the actual revenues for the fiscal year 1890 were in excess of the estimated revenues to the amount of one hundred and twenty-eight thousand and odd dollars. The estimates for the year 1891 are the figures with which my colleague dealt; and if the actual receipts should exceed the estimated revenues in the same amount for 1891 that it did exceed it in 1890, then there would be no deficit whatever upon the annual appropriation bill.

Mr. SAYERS. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. McCOMAS. In a moment.

And secondly, Mr. Chairman, we have had the advantage of one-half of the year of the actual receipts of the District of Columbia wherewith to compare the estimate, and I find they bear this relation to the estimated revenues: The actual receipts for the six months are \$1,323,101.22, which doubled makes \$2,656,202.44. Adding the surplus in the Treasury on July 1, 1890, \$105,512.53, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we have a total of \$2,761,714.97, being the one-half of the total appropriations carried by the bill—that is, the half paid by the District of Columbia, the other being paid by the United States—the total doubled making \$5,522,429.94; and the actual appropriation bill of which I spoke a year ago, and about which I made prediction a year ago that there would be little deficit if any, was only \$5,560,534.97 as it passed and became a law, leaving only an apparent deficit of \$33,107.03, one-half of which, about \$19,000, is the only apparent deficit of the District of Columbia; and, if the total receipts of the District grow with the growth of the city as they have done heretofore, they will largely exceed it; for I find now in the first six months of 1890 that \$1,264,627.54 were collected, whereas the sum collected in the first six months of this year is considerably in excess of that figure, and, if you take the growth of the city, the collections for the next fiscal year ought to increase in the same proportion.

One thing further, and then I will yield to my colleague from Texas for an interruption. It appears that in the second half of 1890 the receipts of this District exceeded the first half of the year in the sum of about \$65,000, and if the second half of 1891 exceeds the first half in like manner there will be about the same increase, which will wipe out this little apparent deficit of eighteen or nineteen thousand dollars at a like rate of increase of the \$65,000 in the second half of the year over the collections in the first half of the fiscal year 1891.

Now, one thing more in that connection. The gentleman has spoken of the Zoological Park and the annual appropriation for the National Park. I have here a letter, which I will send to the Clerk's desk to be read, which very nearly disposes of the main item of \$150,000 deficit to which my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURCHLER] adverted a moment ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1891.

Sir: In response to your verbal inquiry of this date I have the honor to state that I have been informed by Capt. W. T. Rossell, executive officer of the Rock Creek Park Commission, that very little, if any, of the appropriation will be used between now and the 30th of June next. In that event the \$150,000 which, under the terms of the act establishing the park, might be charged against the revenues of the District of Columbia during the present fiscal year, will, of course, not be required.

Very respectfully,

J. T. PETTY,
Auditor, District of Columbia.

Mr. McCOMAS. There is a sum of nearly \$150,000 which will not be expended out of the District of Columbia appropriation. In all prob-

ability \$8,000 or \$9,000 only will be expended in this current year, out of the total of \$150,000. I observe in the estimates and in the amount of expenditures for the Zoological Park, that up to this time, one-half of the fiscal year, the total expenditures out of the \$92,000 have only been some \$17,000. It may be that the balance will be expended, and it may not be, in the remainder of this year.

And now I come to the inquiry of my friend from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] with respect to the sinking fund.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Before the gentleman leaves the matter of the park, I desire to make this suggestion. The manner in which he disposes of the \$150,000 alluded to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURCHLER] applies to the use of that money during this fiscal year, ending June 30 next.

Mr. McCOMAS. Yes, this current year.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That would still leave \$150,000 for the next year for which this bill makes appropriation.

Mr. McCOMAS. Or some part thereof. The \$150,000 here referred to is an abatement of the expenditure of this current year, and there will be \$150,000, or so much of it as may be needed, in the next succeeding fiscal year. Now, my colleague on the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] has asked me with respect to the sinking fund and the condition of that fund, and I shall tell the House briefly about it.

Mr. SAYERS. If my friend will allow me, what I desire the gentleman to explain is in reference to the bonded indebtedness of the District and what provisions have been made in order to meet the debt which matures on the 1st of July, 1891, something over \$3,000,000.

Mr. McCOMAS. I shall endeavor to give a satisfactory answer to that question. The history of the sinking fund of the District of Columbia begins in the year 1818. I shall not follow it down through the various acts, but probably can satisfy the inquiry of my friend by reminding him that in the year 1878, when the organic act took charge of the District of Columbia here, the various provisions of the sinking fund seem not to have been wholly complied with, and the Treasurer of the United States made a recommendation that in lieu of the provisions as to the sinking fund contained in various acts, to which I shall not now advert, there should be a permanent annual appropriation of \$1,155,000 to pay interest and maintain a sinking fund, which amount he estimated, on the basis of 4 per cent. per annum, would be sufficient to extinguish the debt of the District upon the maturity of the 3.65 bonds in 1924.

Now, Congress adopted the recommendation of the Treasurer and appropriated for interest and for the sinking fund in several years thereafter. In the year 1880, by the act of June 16, 1880, an additional issue of these funds was authorized by Congress, and an estimate for the sinking fund on the new basis was made for Congress. Thereupon Congress appropriated the sum of \$1,213,947.97 for the year 1882. That precise sum has been included and appropriated for in every appropriation bill from that day to this, for that same amount; and for the water fund, in various statutes which I shall not here recapitulate, further sums have been added, and the interest thereon, and that is the extent of the authority and scope of power of the Appropriation Committee with respect to the sinking fund of the District of Columbia, namely, to appropriate \$1,213,947.97 and the interest on the debt of the District of Columbia annually.

Mr. SAYERS. But, if the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. McCOMAS. I am coming to my friend's question. Of course as it is beyond our power under the rules of the House to legislate for the District of Columbia, all we can do is to provide out of these funds, according to the laws I have here recited, for the annual sinking fund and the additional fund for the water service provided by the several acts of March 3, 1879, of March 3, 1881, and of March 3, 1883, and that has been fully done. Now, to answer my colleague's further question, the present state of the bonded debt—

Mr. SAYERS. I wish to interpose a question right there before you get on that branch of it. I notice from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury that our bonded debt on July 1, 1878, amounted to \$22,106,600.

Mr. McCOMAS. And I was about to state I think I can answer the gentleman's question. I anticipate the question and can answer it here. The gentleman is talking about the bonds falling due.

Mr. SAYERS. You spoke in reference to the sinking fund.

Mr. McCOMAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SAYERS. I want to show you that, notwithstanding, as you say, more than a million of dollars have been appropriated annually for the sinking-fund purposes, from the 1st day of July, 1878, until July 1, 1890, only \$2,325,600 of the debt has been reduced.

Mr. McCOMAS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was coming to that. If my friend will turn to the acts that I have named he will find that the debt of the District of Columbia, by the issue of more 3.65 bonds and by providing for a large, expensive, and wasteful water tunnel, and other items, has been largely increased, and in my opinion has not been rapidly enough reduced, and I fought a year ago to prevent the addition of further floating debt in this District for that reason. The total sum, the debt of \$22,106,650, has been reduced by the operation of the sinking fund, and from other causes, in the sum of \$4,363,-

850; but there remains \$19,781,056, and the net reduction from all of these sources, taking into consideration the water service and the like, is \$2,325,600.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there follows also the recommendation made in this year's report by the Treasurer of the United States, who is the custodian of this water fund, in which he recommends to Congress that it shall provide for a sum of \$2,700,000—not a sum of \$3,900,000, as my colleague had supposed, because part of the bonds maturing will be provided for by the sinking fund. But he recommends that Congress now provide \$2,700,000 to be refunded in bonds of two years at the rate of 4 per cent., taking the place of so much falling due in July, 1891, or that there be a deferred payment in six years with an abatement of interest whereby there will be paid only 3 per cent.

I have been informed by gentlemen on the Committee on the District of Columbia, whose province it is to legislate with respect to that recommendation of the Treasurer, which is also concurred in by the Secretary of the Treasury in his annual report, that they intend to or are going to bring in a bill providing for either a deferred payment of interest or a bill that provides for the issuing of bonds for several years at a lower rate of interest; whether it be 2, 2½, or 4 per cent. is a matter of discretion and determination which will be in the province of that committee of this House.

If that should fail to be done or if they should fail to do what they say they will try to do, I should be glad with my colleague to ask a waiver of the rules of this House, and before this appropriation bill goes through between the House and the Senate to put a provision in the appropriation bill in defiance of rules, if they fail to perform their function as a committee. But I have no right to assume, and I will not, nor will my colleague, that that committee will not endeavor to do what they say they will do or what gentlemen on that committee say they will speedily do in that committee, whose duty it is, and then it will be provided for.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed twenty-two minutes of his hour and nineteen minutes.

Mr. McCOMAS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, as an offset to the free-silver speech of the distinguished Democrat from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS], in favor of a debased currency, in which he speaks for the Democratic party, I desire to send to the Clerk's desk and have read some resolutions offered by Mr. Quincy, the leader of the Democratic party in the Massachusetts Legislature, day before yesterday. I predict, Mr. Chairman, that when these resolutions reach consideration in the Massachusetts Legislature they will pass unanimously; not a Democratic member will dare to vote against them. Men of all parties in Massachusetts believe in honest money. They believe in a dollar with a hundred cents, and no part of it flat; and I say further that not a Democrat could have been elected from Massachusetts as a member of the next Congress who declared himself in favor of a debased currency or in favor of free silver. The State was carried against the Republicans in the recent campaign by misrepresentation and falsehood.

It was denied on the stump in Massachusetts in the late campaign, as claimed by the gentleman from Arkansas, that the Democratic party stood for debased currency and for free silver.

The provisions of the McKinley bill were shamefully misrepresented, peddlers were employed to pretend to offer to sell goods, and when the tremendous price asked was complained of the people were told that it was the effects of the McKinley bill. As a specimen lie the laboring men were told that the poor man's house would cost him more now because the McKinley bill doubled the duty on lumber (it reduced it one-half), and that lie was repeated night after night in my district, and the misrepresentation of the true position of the Democratic party upon the question now under consideration was a part and parcel of the campaign of lying, falsehood, and misrepresentation by which Massachusetts elected a Democratic governor and a majority of Democratic Congressmen to the Fifty-second Congress.

The truth is dawning upon the people of my State, Mr. Chairman, but I fear too late to prevent the appalling financial disaster sure to overtake the country at the meeting of the next Congress unless a Republican President shall interpose a veto.

The Clerk will please to read the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE LEGISLATURE OF MASSACHUSETTS FOR SOUND MONEY.

Resolutions introduced by Mr. Quincy, of Quincy:

"Resolution in favor of the maintenance of the bimetallic standard of value, and against the debasement of the currency through the free coinage of silver.

"Whereas the people of this Commonwealth, without distinction of party, are generally opposed to any legislation which will lead to the debasement of the Federal currency and the substitution of a single depreciated standard of value, based upon silver, for the present double standard, based upon gold and silver circulating at a parity; and

"Whereas such legislation, while injurious to the whole community, would bear with especial hardship upon the wage-earning masses of the people; and

"Whereas the free coinage of silver, as proposed by a measure now pending before the Senate of the United States, would bring about these results in a comparatively short period of time, destroying the chances of securing an international agreement for maintaining gold and silver at a parity, threatening the

ability of the Treasury to maintain gold payments, and thus carrying gold to a premium and withdrawing it from the currency:

"Resolved, That we hereby declare our opposition to the free coinage of silver and protest against the passage of such legislation by Congress.

"Resolved, That these resolutions be communicated to Congress, and that a copy thereof be transmitted to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this Commonwealth."

Mr. McCOMAS. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. LANGSTON].

Mr. LANGSTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has fifty-two minutes.

Mr. LANGSTON. If there is anything that I would gladly see, it is "Our country first on land, and first on sea," and it is natural for me, coming into this body, as I do, from the Old Dominion that gave life to Washington and birth to Jefferson to come with the sentiment I have just expressed. I have seen American masters of ships wronged in foreign countries, and finally successfully defended by the Government through the vigorous and manly efforts of our representatives abroad. I recollect among the very last things that occurred when I had the honor of representing this Government abroad was this fact, first, that an old shipmaster said to me in our legation, "When you go home, if you ever have the opportunity to say a word for us, say it, say it freely and say it positively, and so emancipate us, that on the great sea, as well as at home, we may feel the consciousness that we are Americans."

I promised that shipmaster that if ever I had the opportunity of speaking for our shipping I would do it, and do it fearlessly and thoroughly. One of these days, in this august body, I trust that I shall have the opportunity of saying a word. But how can we make our land and our Government great in the estimation of others, except as finally we plant ourselves as a nation on those fundamental, far-reaching, eternal principles underlying all democracies and perpetuating all republics?

I would speak to-day to you, not in any other wise than as I would defend the Constitution of my country, planting myself on those doctrines of the Declaration so clearly and forcibly enunciated in these words:

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, the day has come to us now when we are to recur in our thoughts and reach in our purposes those olden times of this Republic when our fathers built, as Christ did, "on the rock," that His church might stand, and now that our Government may stand.

Why, the feeling in the country seems to be to-day that silver is the thing; and a man said to me the other day, when the silver bill had been laid aside for the time being, "Ah, sir, your cause has been sold for thirty pieces of silver."

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. The "elections bill," you mean, was laid aside.

Mr. LANGSTON. Yes; I mean when the election bill was laid aside. But I said: "Not so, sir, for we live in the United States of America, in the midst of schoolhouses, in the midst of schools, in the midst of churches, in the midst of Christians, and we have built our nation on other material than that which shall find any class of our population, politicians or statesmen, finally willing to sell the cause of liberty, the rights of the humblest citizen of our Government, for anything like a compromise, even in silver." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Why, on what are we built and where do we go? Our nation is built first on those fundamental laws given in the midst of the flame and smoke of Sinai, and across the gateway of the old Mosaic system it was written, "He that stealeth a man and selleth him, or if he be found in his hands, he shall surely die;" and in the light of this law slavery has gone. We find that there was in the same law, enunciated so clearly and so beautifully by Him "whospeak as never man spake," the maxim that "Whatever you would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." And we built on that afterwards. But here is the declaration which we have built on, and that is this Constitution, which we have amended, not because it needed amendment, but that there might be no mistake as to the question of whether a black man might be free or slave; whether he should continue ignorant and a discredit to you by having been born in this country. In his nativity he finds the fact that he is an American, and the law must protect him in that character. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

But my friend on the other side of the House the other day referred to what was done in 1815. He alluded to the fact that great men moved in that day, and I watched for him to come down to the position of General Jackson on the negro question, because I wanted to hear him on that; but he tarried at the Hartford convention and did not come on down to the victory that was won at New Orleans, when the great general of that day called his troops about him and gave utterance to sentiments that the negro loves and some men hate even up to this hour. [Applause on the Republican side.] Ah, General Jackson was not a bad man, although he was a Democrat in some senses of the word. [Laughter.]

I would that the Democrats of the United States would accept the doctrines of that great and venerable man who, firm and true to the last, was able to see, beyond a curl of a man's hair and beyond the color of his face, the fact that he was a man and the fact that he could be a patriotic American. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, if you will permit me I will read a few words from the utterance of that distinguished man on this subject, to show that he could call us citizens of the United States, American citizens, and, in addressing us, could use language which became the lips of a brave and valiant American general—

Soldiers—

He says, in addressing his black troops after the war—
soldiers, when on the banks of the Mobile I called you to take up arms, inviting you to partake the perils and glory of your white fellow-citizens—

Ah, my white fellow-citizens on the other side of the House [laughter], and my white fellow-citizens on every side of the House, and my white fellow-citizens in every section of the country, black as we are no man shall go ahead of us in devotion to this country, in devotion to its free institutions, for we hold our lives, our property, and our sacred honor in pledge to the welfare of our country and of all our fellow-citizens. [Applause on the Republican side.] Do you want men to fight; call us and we will come. Do you want men to tarry at home and take care of your wives, take care of your children, take care of your homes and protect your interests; call on us. And when the time is past, if you can find a negro who has betrayed you in a single case put your finger on him and we will aid you in lynching him. [Applause.] But he can not be found.

Oh, no. What a wonderful chapter that is, that the men who lived near where General Jackson uttered these words, in the State of Louisiana, and in the States of the South, all along the line of battle, could go away leaving everything in the hands of the negro and come back and find that it had been guarded, thoroughly protected. For that alone, if for no other reason, the negro might well be accorded the freedom and justice that are his right, and he would be if those men had only been fair and true to him. Now, you see, General Jackson calls us your "fellow-citizens" by referring to the white man as our "white fellow-citizens." [Laughter.] That certainly is legal and logical. He says further:

I expected much from you, for I was not ignorant that you possessed qualities most formidable to an invading enemy. I knew with what fortitude you could endure hunger and thirst and the fatigues of the campaign. I knew well how you loved your native country—

"Your native country." Oh, yes; this is our native country. We do not have to go abroad to find our native country, for Jackson has told us we need not go. Some men want us to go to Africa and to the isles of the sea, but, blessed be the name of this grand old Democrat, he has taught us another lesson; he has taught us that this is our home; and in the name of Jackson, whose shade is about me now, I declare in this sacred place that we are here to stay and never will go away. [Laughter.] Why, we can not go. How can I get out of this country?

I undertook to leave Virginia, and the first thing I knew I was back there. I moved away and located in Ohio, but I could not stay. I came to the District of Columbia, but I could not stay here. I went abroad, but I could not stay there. When I returned and undertook to go away again, by a curious adjustment of Providence I found myself in Virginia; and to-day, by a curious adjustment of Providence, I find myself standing in this august and wonderful presence. We can not control ourselves in these things.

Do you think that the negro would have come to this country to find slavery when the white man came here to find liberty? Yet, when the white men were landing on the eastern shores of the continent and beginning to build our nationality, the negro came in chains to the southward; and, as the white men became great in numbers, the negroes multiplied, until finally, in the great struggle for liberty, when, in its far-reaching and broad sweep, slavery had stricken down the liberties of the people, and the fight had to come, the negro, in the midst of the thunder of the great contest, is called from his slumbers, comes forth from his rags a free man, and enters upon real life the equal of his white fellow-citizen. [Applause on the Republican side.] Here we are and here we are to stay. And I give my Democratic friends warning that they may oppress us as much as they will, but still we shall remain. Abuse us as you will, gentlemen, we will increase and multiply until, instead of finding every day five hundred black babies turning up their bright eyes to greet the rays of the sun, the number shall be five thousand and shall still go on increasing. [Laughter and applause.]

There is no way to get rid of us. [Laughter.] It is our native country.

And that you as well as ourselves had to defend what man holds most dear, parents, wife, children, and property. You have done more than I have expected. In addition to the previous qualities I before knew you to possess, I found among you a noble enthusiasm which leads to the performance of great things.

And we will not disappoint you in that.

Soldiers! the President of the United States shall hear how praiseworthy was your conduct in the hour of danger, and the representatives of the American people will give you the praise your exploits entitle you to. Your general anticipates them in applauding your noble ardor.

We are simply fellow-citizens. We have always been fellow-citizens. We are nothing but fellow-citizens to-day, and fellow-citizens in permanent residence in this our native country.

But this is not the only testimony. I can offer on this subject Southern testimony which goes further than this. Gentlemen are very timid about us; not only timid, but anxious. But where do you find the very first judicial opinion, broad and comprehensive, recognizing the negro of this country not only as a citizen, but as an elector? Suppose I should state here, Mr. Chairman, that in this matter we must follow the lead of the South? Suppose I should say that as a matter of fact the cunciation in that behalf, clear and distinct, was made not by a Northern judge, but by a Southern judge, and that this judge was the first lawyer of the State of North Carolina? I will say so; and I will astonish you by reading (if you have not read it) from the learned opinion of Chief Justice Gaston, as given in the case of the State vs. Manuel. A negro boy, having assaulted a white boy, was brought to trial and found guilty; the punishment adjudged was thirty-nine lashes at the whipping post.

A young white lawyer said to gentlemen of Fayetteville, N. C.: "Raise a little purse and I will take this case before the supreme court of the State; I will ask Judge Gaston to pass on the case, and I believe he will decide that no colored man, even though born a slave, if subsequently emancipated, as Manuel has been, can be punished at the whipping post, because by reason of his nativity he is an American citizen." The money was raised and the case carried to the supreme court. Judge Gaston sat in that case and delivered the opinion. Now, what do my Democratic friends think he said? Mark you, I read from the opinion of a North Carolina judge. Listen:

According to the laws of this State (North Carolina) all the human beings within it who are not slaves fall within one of two classes. Whatever distinctions may have existed in the Roman laws between citizens and free inhabitants, they are unknown to our institutions. Before our Revolution all free persons born within the dominions of the King of Great Britain, whatever their color or complexion, were native-born British subjects; those born out of his allegiance were aliens. Slavery did not exist in England, but it did in the British colonies. Slaves were not, in legal parlance, persons, but property. The moment the incapacity, the disqualification of slavery was removed, they became persons, and were then either British subjects or not British subjects, according as they were or were not born within the allegiance of the British King.

Upon the Revolution no other change took place in the laws of North Carolina than was consequent on the transition from a colony dependent on a European king to a free and sovereign State; slaves remained slaves; British subjects in North Carolina became North Carolina freemen; foreigners, until made members of the State, remained aliens; slaves manumitted here became freemen, and therefore, if born within North Carolina, are citizens of North Carolina, and all free persons born within the State are born citizens of the State. The Constitution extended the elective franchise to every freeman who had arrived at the age of twenty-one and paid a public tax, and it is a matter of universal notoriety that under it free persons, without regard to color, claimed and exercised the franchise until it was taken from freemen of color a few years since by our amended constitution.

North Carolina started this doctrine and we accept it.

And on this question of citizenship, allow me to read the opinion of Hon. Edward Bates, given by him as Attorney-General of the United States, in 1862, in response to the question propounded by the then Secretary of the Treasury, Salmon P. Chase, "Are colored men citizens of the United States, and therefore competent to command American vessels?"

1. In every civilized country the individual is born to duties and rights, the duty of allegiance and the right to protection; and these are correlative obligations, the one the price of the other, and they constitute the all-sufficient bond of union between the individual and his country, and the country he is born in is *prima facie* his country.

2. And our Constitution in speaking of natural-born citizens uses no affirmative language to make them such, but only recognizes and reaffirms the universal principle, common to all nations and as old as political society, that the people born in the country do constitute the nation, and, as individuals, are natural members of the body politic.

3. In the United States it is too late to deny the political rights and obligations conferred and imposed by nativity, for our laws do not pretend to create or enact them, but do assume and recognize them as things known to all men, because pre-existent and natural, and therefore things of which the laws must take cognizance.

4. It is strenuously insisted by some that "persons of color," though born in the country, are not capable of being citizens of the United States. As far as the Constitution is concerned, this is a naked assumption, for the Constitution contains not one word upon the subject.

5. There are some who, abandoning the untenable objection of color, still contend that no person descended from negroes of the African race can be a citizen of the United States. Here the objection is not color, but race only. * * * The Constitution certainly does not forbid it, but is silent about race as it is about color.

6. But it is said that African negroes are a degraded race, and that all who are tainted with that degradation are forever disqualified for the functions of citizenship. I can hardly comprehend the thought of the absolute incompatibility of degradation and citizenship; I thought that they often went together.

7. Our nationality was created and our political Government exists by written law, and inasmuch as that law does not exclude persons of that descent, and as its terms are manifestly broad enough to include them, it follows inevitably that such persons born in the country must be citizens unless the fact of African descent be so incompatible with the fact of citizenship that the two can not exist together.

Being citizens, being electors, we are confronted to-day as distinctly as in 1861-'65 with the question of slavery or freedom, with the question whether every American citizen may wield the ballot in this country freely and according to his own judgment in the interest of the welfare of our common country. It does not matter how black we are; it does not matter how ignorant we are; it does not matter what our race may

be; it does not matter whether we were degraded or not; the question presented to-day under our amended Constitution, as under the Constitution without amendment, is, shall every freeman, shall every American citizen, shall every American elector in the North and in the South, every where in the country, be permitted to wield a free ballot in the interests of our common country and our free institutions? [Applause.]

Here lies the difference: The old Democratic party used to maintain that this right should be accorded to every American citizen; the new Democratic party is fighting it. But, thank God, the genuine Americans—mainly found in the Republican party—some few in the Democratic party, but through mistake [laughter]—are standing up bravely and truly to-day to meet this question intelligently and patriotically.

"Oh," but the Democrats say, "you got beaten at the last election." In one sense we did and in one sense we did not. "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth." [Laughter.] We have only been chastened a little to make us more firm, and more solid, and the more certain in the high march that is before us to the "promised land" in the midst of our own homes to which God would lead us in the establishment of an all-comprehensive freedom and equality of right.

How dark it was in 1861! How dark it was in 1850! Ah! compromises were made; the great orators spoke; the great parties resolved; and the friends of freedom came well-nigh to despair. But the voice of the faithful and the true was still heard; and finally in the thunder of great guns, in the midst of terrible smoke as of the Mountain of Sinai, and in the flashes of light that made every slave in the land glad, emancipation was declared and the country was saved. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, it is sneeringly said that the Republican party laid aside the elections bill in the Senate. But it was only for a little while; it was only to take it up again; that was all. And they have taken it up now in earnest. And if the elections shall come around shortly you will see the change when the people have been forgotten who failed to do their duty in connection with the matter. Yes, they have taken up the elections bill again, and those people who yielded it for awhile, who laid it aside to address themselves to other matters, have gone back to the solid, patriotic conviction that at last liberty is the whitest and brightest jewel in the firmament, and that the greatest heritage of American citizenship is to be free. [Applause.]

Why, sir, the Democrats talk of carrying the election in 1892. How could they carry it? They could not do it by any fair means. But our Democratic friends do not talk of fair means any more. They avoid all that. [Laughter.] A gentleman who spoke the other day, and talked of free ballots and all that sort of thing, was asked against whom he made the charges. He said "The Democratic party." Why should we not so charge it under the circumstances? I would like to see somebody put his finger on something that the Democratic party has done from the beginning that looks like favoring freedom or favoring the colored men in this country, at whose friends on this floor strange words have been hurled. How peculiarly our friends are characterized! You can hardly believe the language that is used towards them. I have some of it here before me, studied, selected, written, and rewritten it must have been, but yet very peculiar language. I have read it a good many times, but I never saw anything like it before. Here is a specimen:

Mr. Speaker, I am heartily tired and sick of this eternal cant and hypocrisy. I think the time has come to tear off the thin veil which covers it, and to express our opinions about this business and the fellows who are engaged in it.

What is this bill, anyhow? It is urged on the pretense that it is necessary to secure fair elections. But every honest man of intelligence knows that that is a mere subterfuge. It originates in a section of the Union which has grown enormously rich at the expense of the West and South. It observes the development and rapid growth in political power of the West and South with ever-increasing alarm. Conscious that unity of interest will, as a matter of self-defense, ultimately inevitably in bringing about some unity of action between the West and South, this bill is thrown as a firebrand into our politics, with the hope of passing it under the spur of partisan prejudice and pressure, thereby delaying that political adhesion already approaching in other sections, and using it to perpetuate as long as possible a local advantage.

Fair elections! Sir, it will be a sad day for this Republic when the people can be no longer trusted with the ballot box. Virtue is the very essence of popular liberty; but equally so is liberty the essence of public virtue. These gentlemen say they can no longer trust the States and the people with their own ballot box. They hold it has become necessary to have an army of officials, without direct responsibility to the voters, to watch, to supervise, and, if need be, to punish them. If, indeed, it be true that patriotism and public sentiment and public morals have come to this low ebb, then are we approaching that starless night into whose eternal shadows has disappeared nearly every effort at popular government which mankind, striving for higher and nobler ideas of liberty, have ever made in the history of the world. I do not believe it.

I can still trust with perfect confidence the people of all or any of the States of the American Union. I had rather confide the ballot box to the plain people of the land, risk its purity to their patriotism and its safety to their hands, than trust it to any band of partisan mercenaries, with badges on their lapels and batons or bayonets in their hands, appointed by any Federal administration that ever was or shall be.

Against whom, specially and professedly, is this haughty insolence directed? Against whom are these charges of fraud and crime, these burning and intolerable insults, leveled? The Democratic party. Forget not, gentlemen, that that party represents a large majority of all the people of the whole country, and a full round million majority of the white voters of the United States, the sons of the warriors and matrons who won the battles of the Revolution and laid broad and deep the foundations of the Republic. They can not be intimidated by a threat nor overawed by a menace.

There is no need to continue this. It is found on every page of the RECORD.

In this connection I wish to quote in contrast what is said so ably by the President in his last annual message:

But it is said that this legislation will revive race animosities, and some have even suggested that when the peaceful methods of fraud are made impossible they may be supplanted by intimidation and violence. If the proposed law gives to any qualified elector, by a hair's weight, more than his equal influence, or detracts by so much from any other qualified elector, it is fatally impeached. But if the law is equal and the animosities it is to evoke grow out of the fact that some electors have been accustomed to exercise the franchise for others as well as for themselves, then these animosities ought not to be confessed without shame and can not be given any weight in the discussion without dishonor. No choice is left to me but to enforce with vigor all laws intended to secure to the citizen his constitutional rights, and to recommend that the inadequacies of such laws be promptly remedied. If to promote with zeal and ready interest every project for the development of its material interests, its rivers, harbors, mines, and factories, and the intelligence, peace, and security under the law of its communities and its homes, is not accepted as sufficient evidence of friendliness to any State or section, I can not add connivance at election practices that not only disturb local results, but rob the electors of other States and sections of their most priceless political rights.

Eight millions of people who stand behind me to-day, a few in the West and all over the South, command me to say to you that so long as there is a name akin to that of HOAR in New England we will honor and revere it because that man has been true to us in the Senate. [Applause on the Republican side]. But it would not have made any difference. We do not forget our friends.

You recollect that there was a Hoar who went South once, and he went to Charleston, S. C., going there as the agent of the great State of Massachusetts. He appeared in the name of the sovereignty of that great State as a lawyer, not to "steal negroes," but to inquire in the courts of that State as to whether it was legal for a colored citizen of the State of Massachusetts, sailing into the harbor of Charleston on a Northern vessel, to be arrested and imprisoned and adjudged a free negro and sold into interminable slavery. He was accompanied by his sweet, elegant, charming daughter, a young lady of Boston. He appeared, and very soon a committee of gentlemen of property waited on him. "What is your business here, sir?" He said, "I have come," as I have described, "in the name of the Commonwealth in which I live, to look after matters of interest to the great body of the people of our State."

"We give you, sir, one hour's notice to take your trunk and leave this city, and if you are not gone within that time we will tar and we will feather you." And at the end of that time the committee waited on him again. He was a little behind time. And, Mr. Chairman, it is recorded in history that the presence of his daughter alone saved him from their clutches.

Mr. MORSE. That is as true as Gospel.

Mr. LANGSTON. And coming around to Philadelphia a Whig national convention was in session, and this noble man of Massachusetts, this grand man, was called on for a speech. How do you think he opened his address?

Fellow-citizens, having escaped the bloody clutches of the slaveholders of the South, I take a great deal of pleasure in addressing you.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, this spirit does not know white man or black man. All stand equal before it, as they should stand equal before the law. When I stand here to-day speaking for the cause of the people of my State, my native State, the State of Virginia, I am pleading for her people both white and black. I am speaking for white men as well as for negroes; for white men in my State are proscribed, and they are denied a free ballot, though their "locks be flaxen and their eyes blue." I might cite you to the case of a man, a friend of mine, residing in Chase City, the postmaster at that place, appointed through my efforts. He writes me:

I can not go to the polls on election day to vote for you because I was proscribed already for my support of you. My family were proscribed, my children at the school, and we are all hated because I vote the Republican ticket.

And that is no uncommon or isolated case. But go into another county, if you will. Go with me to my beautiful city of Petersburg. They sometimes say I do not live there, but if you will go with me down there I will show you that I do live there and live at home. [Laughter.] One man said, "I do not believe you live in Petersburg, because you have a house in Washington." Well, unfortunately, I have got a house in Washington, because it sometimes happens that a colored man can have two houses, one in which he lives and one where he does not live. [Laughter.] White men, of course, may have three or four without question.

Mr. ATKINSON, of West Virginia. Some do not have any.

Mr. LANGSTON. That is true. But most negroes now have their own homes.

Come down there with me. Let me introduce you to a fine-looking man with splendid hair, noble face, fine bearing, the picture of intelligence. He leaves his table on election day and gets to the door of his office, where he is met and asked:

"Where are you going?"

"Going to vote."

"Are you going to vote for that fellow?"

"What do you mean?" he asks.

"Why, are you going to vote for LANGSTON?"

"Yes, I am. LANGSTON is a Republican. There is only one Republican running, and I always vote the Republican ticket. Here is my ticket. I am on the way to vote for him."

He went and voted. What was the result? The next morning at 5 o'clock, when he stepped out of his door, he found it all draped with crape. What was going to be done? Why, he voted for a Republican yesterday, and this crape was significant. What was the result? He was proscribed, his children were proscribed. They point their fingers at his children as they are on the way to school, and when they get to the school they call his children names. And I plead the cause here to-day, Mr. Chairman, not only of 7,000,000 negroes of the South, but of the white men in all the South who have accepted the principles of the fathers and dedicated their faith to Republican doctrine. [Applause on the Republican side.] And I do not apologize for it.

I appeal to any and every Democrat on this floor, if it is not true, that I state hastily here, too hastily to make myself well understood, the doctrine, first, that the white men of the South have maintained that negroes are citizens upon their nativity; secondly, the decision of Judge Gaston, who ruled that we are entitled to the elective franchise upon a property qualification in North Carolina; and then, thirdly and lastly, if it is not true to-day in the South that white men may not vote the Republican ticket with greater facility or larger freedom from proscription than negroes themselves? Oh, you ought to come down there and see it. You ought to see an intelligent, fine-looking white girl, well dressed, well behaved, bearing herself like a lady, passing along the street with a rabble of white men saying, "Your father voted for a damned negro and we will show you," and frightening that sweet American girl.

Do you like that spirit? I do not. I will never be the coward to say that I do. And I would pass bills and pile up penalties and put behind every bill soldiers until they rose to the top of the mountains and kissed the stars, to put these women and these men in the sure consciousness of their protection by law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, oppress negroes if you must, but for God's sake stop oppressing white voters. [Applause on the Republican side.] Deny to the negro the ballot if you will, but for God's sake do not take the ballot from your own brothers with flaxen hair and blue eyes! And yet that is done.

Now, another speaker says, "Why don't you make Bruce President? Why don't you make LANGSTON President?" I want to plead guilty to some things here. I think we have honored Mr. Bruce a good deal. He is a splendid gentleman. He is one of the class of good-looking colored men on this continent, and you will excuse me if I tell you we have got some of the finest looking negroes on this continent that you ever saw. And then we have got so many. You think you have got millions in the United States, but go with me where I used to live when I was your representative, and let me show you hundreds of thousands there, so black on one side of the island and so light on the other, and let me introduce you to that living monument of fine appearance and culture and magnificent appointments in every respect, the man who used to be president of the Republic of Hayti.

When Rear Admiral Cooper visited me on his ship, the Tennessee, I said, "Admiral, do not you want to see a splendid man; do not you want to see the best-looking black man in the world; do not you want to see a great man, the impersonation of learning and culture, a man who many a day escorted Mrs. Dix to dinner in Paris, who towered up there in all his beauty as a gentleman admired by every representative of every foreign country?" The old admiral said, "I would like to see him." And I made arrangements whereby on the next morning, at 10 o'clock, we went to the national palace, the White House of that country, where we were received in fine style, the national band playing what they thought was our national air:

John Brown's body lies moldering in the grave,
But his soul is marching on.

[Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

That will be your national air one of these days, in the good time coming. Our bands shall play it, our choristers shall sing it, and we as a Christian nation shall march on under the banner of the Republican party to national and local victory under the impulse and purpose which that song will awaken in our souls.

We entered the palace, and very soon we were in the presence of this magnificent man of more than 300 pounds' weight. His hair was as white as the snow, his face as black as the night, his face the face of Webster, his manner polite, genteel, and elegant, like the manner of Wendell Phillips. He was the impersonation of culture. And when I said to him in French: "Mr. President, I have the honor to present to you a rear admiral of the American Navy," the bow he made, out of his high regard for our free institutions and our noble country and our magnificent nation, was charming in the extreme.

And shortly we took the usual elegant drink of magnificent champagne without ice, as is the custom in this country. [Laughter.] When the rear admiral was about ready to go he said, "Now, minister, make my speech to the President. Tell the President that my goodly ship, the Tennessee, has carried me into the waters of every civilized na-

tion; that I have looked into the faces of kings and queens, emperors and empresses, and the executives of all sorts of men and governments; and say to him that I see now, in the presence of this President, to stand in the presence of the man whom we call the Father of our Country, 'First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.' I feel that I stand in the presence of Washington himself." I threw it into French, as I could then, and then these great men advanced with tears in their eyes and gave each other the warm palm; and I said to them, "Ah! gentlemen, this is the Great Republic of the North extending her warm palm in sympathy to this negro republic."

It is prophetic of what? That American influences shall prevail with reference to the negro race of this country on the continent and in the isles of the sea. We are here on the continent; we are here living on the continent as a part of a great nation. God is with us; the people are with us, and we are with you, and we are in the South to remain; coming gently towards the North, increasing day by day, to wield the ballot, the free ballot, given to us by the Government that we defended in its possession, and we will wield it to make our country great on the land and great on the sea, matchless in the ship, and matchless in industry, with mankind to applaud our magnificent pride of country, emulating the white man in our endeavors to realize the glory and distinction which the fathers knew this country would attain in the future; and to that end may God help us. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose to receive a message from the Senate and a message from the President.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCook, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had agreed to the reports of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the following bills:

The bill (S. 77) to provide for the construction of a public building at Portland, Oregon;

The bill (S. 1334) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Mankato, in the State of Minnesota;

The bill (S. 2427) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at St. Albans, in the State of Vermont; and

The bill (S. 1354) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sioux Falls, in the State of South Dakota.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment the bill (H. R. 11098) for the relief of Lorenzo S. Coffin, late chaplain Thirty-second Regiment of Iowa Volunteers, asked for a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MANDERSON, and Mr. COCKRELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment House bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 7119) to authorize the Secretary of War to loan certain cannon to the Saratoga Monument Association;

A bill (H. R. 7471) to provide an increase of pension to Hosea Brown, of the war of 1812; and

A bill (H. R. 7579) granting pension to Emily P. Collins.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which concurrence was asked:

A bill (S. 2529) granting a pension to Sarah J. Powers;

A bill (S. 2635) for the relief of Charles G. Hood;

A bill (S. 3473) making appropriations for the improvement of the Columbia River; and

A bill (S. 4697) to pension Charles W. Geddes for services rendered in the war with Mexico.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced the approval, on January 16, of an act (H. R. 1400) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to issue certain duplicate bonds to James E. Andrews, to replace same destroyed by fire.

DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The CHAIRMAN. There yet remain six minutes for general debate on this bill.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I ask that we now proceed to the consideration of the bill by sections.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, that will be done.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For executive office: For two commissioners, at \$5,000 each; one engineer commissioner, \$424 (to make salary \$5,000); one secretary, \$2,160; one clerk, \$1,500; one clerk, \$1,400; three clerks, one of whom shall be a stenographer and typewriter, at \$1,200 each; one messenger, \$600; one messenger, \$480; one driver, \$480; one inspector of buildings, \$2,400; one assistant inspector of buildings, \$1,200; one assistant inspector of buildings, who shall also perform the duties of inspector of elevators and fire escapes without additional compensa-

(102, \$1,000; one assistant inspector of buildings, \$1,000; one clerk, \$1,600; one clerk, \$900; one messenger, \$480; one janitor, \$700; one laborer, at \$1 per day, \$314; one steam engineer, \$900; one property clerk, \$1,600; one clerk, \$900; one clerk, \$720; one messenger clerk, \$600; one messenger, \$480; three watchmen, at \$480 each; one chief inspector of plumbing, \$2,000; two assistant inspectors of plumbing, at \$1,000 each; one harbor master, \$1,200; for rent of property yards, \$1,000; for arranging and indexing old records, completion of same, \$1,500; in all, \$14,973: *Provided*, That the accounting officers of the Treasury are authorized and directed to re-examine the accounts of the commissioners of the District of Columbia accruing since July, 1878, and prior to March 6, 1883, and credit the same with all such disbursements and expenditures made in good faith heretofore suspended or disallowed in settlement of the same, wherein it shall satisfactorily appear that the money was paid to employes of the District prior to their discharge, and for goods sold and delivered, work and labor done, materials furnished or services rendered to the District in accordance with contracts and agreements made in good faith on behalf of the District, and also to adjust and settle equitably said accounts, allowing all payments made in settlement of claims against the District, and for expenses incurred in good faith on account of the District.

During the reading,

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky said: Mr. Chairman, this is a very long paragraph, covering two pages, and I do not know, under the language of the rule, whether these two pages have to be read before an amendment is offered.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I would suggest that both pages be read and then the gentleman can offer the amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I wanted it to be so that I should not lose my right to offer an amendment at the second line or the fourth line.

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment will be in order after the paragraph is read. The Chair will then recognize the gentleman from Kentucky.

The reading of the paragraph was resumed and concluded.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I move to strike out of lines 4, 5, and 6 the words "one engineer commissioner, \$424 (to make the salary \$5,000)."

Mr. McMILLIN. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, before this paragraph is thrown open to amendment I desire to raise a point of order upon certain words in the paragraph, namely, the words in lines 3 and 4, on page 3, "one chief inspector of plumbing, \$2,000; two assistant inspectors of plumbing, at \$1,000 each." I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether it is not the fact that on the last District day we had a bill on this subject, which bill has not yet become a law.

Mr. MCCOMAS. This has been in the law for years. There has been no change for three or four years.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Then what was the bill that we had up the other day?

Mr. MCCOMAS. I do not know about that bill, but I know about this. This item has been in the appropriation bills, as I have said, for three or four years past.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Then I withdraw the point of order. It seems, Mr. Chairman, that we were asked to legislate the other day where there was no need for it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I did not hear the explanation of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I said that the language to which the gentleman's point of order was intended to apply is to be found in the existing law and has been in the law for some years past.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Now, Mr. Chairman, I renew my motion to strike out of lines 4, 5, and 6, on page 2, the words "one engineer commissioner, \$424 (to make the salary \$5,000)". I do not raise the point of order, because, if the House thinks this appropriation ought to be made, I have no special objection to it.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that part of the paragraph that it is new legislation and changes existing law by increasing a salary.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Do I understand that the gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order on the words in parentheses?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. No, I do not make that point of order at all. It is the question of policy and not the question of order that I desire to submit. But the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR] interrupted me to raise the point of order, and I am simply yielding to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa makes the point of order that this provision of this paragraph changes existing law, and the Chair will be glad to hear from the gentleman in charge of the bill.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Will the gentleman indicate the words to which his point applies?

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. "Four hundred and twenty-four dollars."

Mr. MCCOMAS. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that those words are not liable to the point of order. They are in the existing law and have been in the law for ten years past. There may be a question of policy there, but, as a matter of fact, for ten years Congress has annually appropriated this sum to this officer to make his salary equal to the salary of the other two commissioners. The commissioners have like functions, powers, and responsibilities, the only difference being that the civil commissioners give bonds while the engineer commissioner does not; but, as I have said, these words are in the current law and have

been in the law for ten years, and therefore they are not subject to a point of order.

Mr. CHEADLE. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MCCOMAS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHEADLE. Is not this engineer commissioner an officer in the Army?

Mr. MCCOMAS. He is an officer in the Army.

Mr. CHEADLE. Is not his salary as such fixed by law?

Mr. MCCOMAS. His salary by law is enough money, in addition to the pay of his rank, to make the amount \$5,000.

Mr. CHEADLE. Then you are paying him two salaries?

Mr. MCCOMAS. We are paying him the same amount that we are paying the other commissioners. Furthermore, the custom is that when an officer is detailed to other duty, at West Point, for instance, he gets enough in addition to his pay as an officer to give him the salary provided by law for the duties he performs, and no more.

Mr. McMILLIN. What would the salary of this officer be if you did not put in this clause?

Mr. MCCOMAS. It would be \$5,000 less \$424.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then does not that test show what is the existing law concerning his salary?

Mr. MCCOMAS. As I have said, the current law and the law for ten years has given him \$5,000 a year.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I make the point of order that this provision is against existing law. I understand that "existing law" means the permanent law, and not the current appropriation bill. That bill merely makes the appropriation, and it is not the "law" in the sense in which the rule is to be understood. The fact that a given amount was appropriated in twenty appropriation bills would not change the permanent law as to the amount of an officer's salary.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, my recollection, running back for a few years, is that in many instances it has been decided by the Chair that where any appropriation or any other declaration of law had appeared in an appropriation bill of the preceding year it was not subject to a point of order if it appeared in the bill under consideration. I think that has been the usual decision, that an appropriation bill is just as much a law as any other act. This decision I believe has been rendered when there was a proposition to increase salaries.

The Chair will recollect that some years ago the Appropriations Committee reduced salaries throughout the Departments generally on appropriation bills; that is, by simply appropriating a less sum than was provided for in the general law. For instance, where officers had been receiving under the general law salaries of \$4,000 a year the Appropriations Committee reported in their bill salaries of \$3,600. Those reductions were accepted and passed in the House. When an effort was subsequently made to restore such salaries my recollection is that the Chair decided such a proposition obnoxious to a point of order because the appropriation bill had virtually repealed the statutes and established the lower salaries.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, independently of the point raised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] and of the question of policy, about which I know nothing, I do not think that a provision is subject to a point of order when it appropriates a certain sum for certain services to a certain man who for other services gets a salary in addition. This engineer commissioner—I do not know who he is—receives a salary, as I understand, of about \$4,500 as an officer of the Army. He would get that salary whether he serves as engineer commissioner or not. The House chooses to appropriate this small sum to him for his services as engineer commissioner, in addition to the salary which he receives as army officer. The existing law is not thereby changed. His salary as an army officer is what it was before; and this sum is appropriated, as Congress may appropriate it, as compensation for his services as engineer commissioner of the District. It does not change the law in any particular.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, this officer who is detailed to act as one of the commissioners of the District is described by his title. In this bill he is spoken of as a certain officer whose salary is fixed by law. It seems to me that the committee in fixing a salary different from what the law designating the office with its duty and salary provides will be changing existing law in reference to this officer. And I have no sympathy with the idea that simply because a man is detailed to perform a particular duty he must necessarily have additional salary. When a man is getting \$4,500 annually from the Government, the Government is entitled to the benefit of his services and his abilities, and he ought not to be allowed anything more.

Mr. MCCOMAS. That is a question of policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa will please confine himself to the point of order.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. What I said in the beginning bears upon the point of order; that is, when the law designates an officer and fixes his salary, a provision which differs from the law creating the office and fixing the salary changes the existing law.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I think I can relieve the gentleman from Iowa on this question. As I understand, the current law settles the point of order; on that ground alone the point is not good. But

here is a provision which is conclusive. The Statutes at Large, volume 21, page 460, provide:

And hereafter the engineer commissioner shall be entitled to receive such compensation in addition to his army pay and allowances as will make his compensation equal to \$5,000 per annum; and a sum sufficient to pay said additional compensation is hereby appropriated.

The law requires us to appropriate the money to make this salary \$5,000; and the committee has recommended the appropriation as required by law.

Mr. DOCKERY. Has the amount been fixed at \$5,000 each year?

Mr. McCOMAS. It has been fixed by law; and it has been so appropriated annually for ten years.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is the amount fixed by the appropriations?

Mr. McCOMAS. The appropriation of \$5,000 has been made annually for ten years in accordance with the existing laws.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. If the gentleman from Maryland cites a provision in general terms that "hereafter"—not for one or two years—

Mr. McCOMAS. I will remind my friend that the word "hereafter" in an appropriation bill makes a permanent provision of law.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] offers an amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I have offered an amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I raise a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. McCOMAS. It is impossible to hear either the amendment or the statement of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky will state his amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky. The amendment I offer is to strike out in lines 4, 5, and 6 the words "one engineer commissioner \$424 (to make salary \$5,000)."

Mr. Chairman, the policy pursued by Congress has been to give to the engineer commissioner, as he is known, the same salary as the other two commissioners receive. On its face that looks plausible. It is not, however, at all just, it seems to me. The two commissioners taken from civil life, and receiving \$5,000 each, are obliged to devote their whole time to their official duty. This interferes with their private business. If they are lawyers it is almost equivalent to giving up their practice.

When their term is out they turn to their original vocations of civil life and have to restore that business anew. Now, an army officer is brought here to a comfortable place; his pay goes on all the years that he remains. He is detailed on a sort of civil duty, though he has a life tenure in the Army, and as time goes on his longevity pay of course increases. When the term of office is out here, instead of being hurt at all by the assignment, he has been in every way benefited by it. There is nothing about it that has not been an advantage to him. It is an easy place in a certain sense. It is a good position. It gives him certain comforts. His pay and rank continue, and hence there is no equality at all in the argument which gentlemen set up.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe in the engineer commissionership. I think it is a mistake to have an army officer exercising the powers that are exercised by the engineer commissioner. I do not mean to criticize the present gentleman who occupies that position, because as far as I am able to judge he is an unusually able and excellent man, entirely competent for the duty. But this anomalous government which we have here in the District is one that ought to be changed in that regard. We ought not to have an army officer detailed by the President for the apparent and nominal reason that his skill as an engineer is needed, and then give him all the governmental and executive powers that the other commissioners have.

It is not a proper position for an army officer, detailed by the President, to occupy, it seems to me. And hence, in good faith, I offer the amendment that it may remain as the judgment of Congress that that gentleman is an army officer, that he is here as an army officer, and that he does not occupy the position that the other two commissioners do; that he is not put upon the same footing with them in regard to the government of the District of Columbia, and thus, instead of obliterating the distinctions between these commissioners, that we shall thereby intensify them. He comes from the Engineer Corps because of his scientific attainments, and he is to be put at the head of a certain department and give them the benefit of his scientific, technical, and engineering skill. Congress ought not to obliterate the distinction originally intended to be made by providing two civil commissioners and one from the Army.

I have therefore called the attention of the committee to it with a view of fixing the matter beyond controversy hereafter.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. What has become of the point of order against the gentleman's amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the gentleman to submit a point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I did submit a point of order, and rose and repeated it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will please state the point of order again.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. That the amendment changes existing law.

Mr. ROGERS. That was withdrawn for you when you were out.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I beg pardon; I have not been out.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order that was withdrawn was the point submitted by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR].

The gentleman from New Jersey makes the point of order that the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky, if it prevails, changes existing law.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. It does not change existing law, Mr. Chairman, because, if the gentleman from New Jersey will allow me to point out the distinction, which I think is clear, as he will see in a moment, the salary of an officer is fixed by law. Now, the salary of the engineer commissioner is his salary received as an officer. There is an annual appropriation, which of course falls at the end of each year, for an additional four hundred and odd dollars, which is not a matter of permanent statute fixing that as a salary, but is merely an annual appropriation, and if dropped out he simply would not receive that amount for the next year. It is not, therefore, a change of law to omit that appropriation from the bill, because he receives his salary from the permanent annual appropriation in the present bill; but if we do not put it in this bill he will not get this money during the next year. He will continue drawing the salary until the expiration of the present appropriation bill. That is all.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Maryland—

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. If the gentleman from Iowa can be held quiet for a few moments I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. I only wanted to suggest that the law the gentleman from Maryland quoted as a permanent law does not fix any positive amount.

Mr. ROGERS rose.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I think in the face of this assertion it will be well to read the law itself. I read from page 460, volume 21 of the Statutes at Large.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, am I recognized or the gentleman from New Jersey?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I have not given up the floor yet.

This provision of law goes on to provide:
And hereafter the engineer commissioner shall be entitled to receive such compensation, in addition to his army pay and allowance, as will make his compensation equal to \$5,000 per annum.

That makes this provision permanent, because it expressly states that "hereafter he shall be entitled to receive a sum sufficient," etc. That is the law until it is changed by act of Congress.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. But the gentleman will not contend that under our rule we may not appropriate a less sum than the salary fixed by statute?

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. I mean to say that in the Forty-ninth Congress, or perhaps it was in the Fiftieth Congress, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole so held repeatedly on a number of points of order raised on an appropriation bill which was in charge of the then living gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Randall].

Mr. MORROW rose.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I think you will find that there are now not less than probably two or three hundred public officers who for a series of years have been receiving a smaller sum of money annually than the salary fixed by statute. My friend from California [Mr. MORROW], who is about to interrupt me, is a good witness, because he has been trying to get two or three of the officers in California paid the difference between what Congress appropriated and what the statute would carry.

Mr. MORROW. Permit me, then, to testify that in the case referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky the salary of the officer was one that was provided for from year to year in the appropriation bill, but the law which was referred to by Mr. Speaker CARLISLE in the Forty-ninth Congress was with respect to the salary of an officer provided for by law, in which case the Supreme Court, in the case of Langston vs. The United States, decided that the person entitled to that salary could recover it by a suit at law in the Court of Claims. Now, in this case the law prescribes that this engineer commissioner shall be entitled to receive the salary that is provided by law for the civil commissioner, and the law provides that these commissioners shall receive \$5,000 each. Therefore, if you strike out this additional sum here, under the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Langston vs. The United States he will be entitled to recover the difference.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. In a suit?

Mr. MORROW. In a suit.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. What he may be entitled to recover in a suit in case Congress does not act is one thing. What the

House has a right to do under its rules is an entirely different proposition. There are a great many commissioners, or heads of divisions, whose salaries are \$4,000, and so fixed by statute; but we have for a series of years appropriated only \$3,600.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. But if the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. There are a great many Territorial officers whose salaries are fixed at \$3,000 and over, and we have for a series of years appropriated \$2,600.

Mr. MUTCHLER. There would perhaps be no objection if that reduction had been made by the committee which reported the bill. I grant you that the Committee on Appropriations may reduce a salary by refusing to appropriate the amount called for by the statute.

Mr. BLAND. And the House can do so.

Mr. MUTCHLER. But it is not competent, I think, to offer an amendment in the House.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Then I understand my friend [Mr. MUTCHLER], who is a distinguished lawyer from Pennsylvania, that the committee has the power to reduce a salary by nonaction, but that the House has no power to change the action of the committee.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I so understand, that by the rules of the House an amendment of that kind would be out of order because it changes existing law.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. It does not change existing law. We leave the law exactly as it is. We leave the law that the salary shall be such an amount, but we appropriate in the bill a smaller sum. That is the difference.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Now, will the gentleman explain the wisdom of any such action as that by this House?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The wisdom of it is simply this: It is the mode which this Congress and all preceding Congresses have adopted, and is the only mode under our rules of fixing the salaries of officers as according to their judgment the exigencies of a particular year require.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. But the officer is still entitled to recover the difference between what we appropriate and the amount fixed by law, in the Court of Claims. Therefore, is there anything accomplished by reducing the salary in the appropriation bill?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. That is not the question. That is a question which the gentleman may fairly present to himself when he comes to vote on the amendment.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That is one of the questions that go to determine the wisdom of our action on the matter.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. But that is not the question of order.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I am not discussing the question of order at all. I am discussing the propriety of the action.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I hope we will get a decision and then a vote. Of course the point of order is not good, because this House can refuse to appropriate a man's salary, if it chooses. Let the matter be determined by a vote.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I was going to say, in the line of what my friend from Maryland has said, that if the Chair decides this motion is out of order it will be a more comprehensive and dangerous decision than almost any one I can imagine that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole would be required to pass upon, for it would instantly tie the hands of the committee and prevent us from making a great many provisions in various appropriation bills and would be a reversal of what the committee has done for a great many years. Therefore, I agree very heartily with my friend from Maryland that the committee has the power. And I leave it to a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky. The proposition the gentleman makes is to strike out the words named, "one engineer commissioner, \$424 (to make salary \$5,000)."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I move to strike out—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] insists that this is now the existing law. The Chair, if it does change existing law, would have nothing to do but rule it out on the point of order.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. But it does not change existing law. It leaves this law exactly as it is.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. If this is going to take further debate I will withdraw the point of order and let a vote be taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate on the amendment is exhausted.

Mr. ROGERS. Then I move to strike out the last word of the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, ordinarily I am pleased to say that I have no difficulty in accepting the arguments presented by my distinguished friend from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] for such votes as he is accustomed to make upon public questions; but I can not go

with him in the amendment which he has just now offered. I do not conceive that any good will be attained by striking out this appropriation, for the only fruit or effect of it will be to secure to the Government another lawsuit, the expense of which the Government in the end will have to pay.

Not only that, but the Court of Claims, having charge or jurisdiction of this subject-matter, is already completely overlaid with meritorious causes, in questions that are referred to it to be litigated, and that require time to investigate, and in which the personal interests of individual citizens and others are involved. We ought not, by any mere policy of reduction of appropriations, to send any more suits to the court, when we will be compelled to appropriate for the amount if it be stricken out of the provision of the appropriation bill, where by permanent law the salary is fixed.

Now, I can easily see very many reasons, in addition to those assigned by the gentleman from Kentucky, why the law itself, as it now stands, as permanent law, is bad. Why, in this instance this distinguished gentleman, I assume, who has been selected by the Executive for the purpose of administering these matters of important government here, where suffrage has been abolished and where neither the white man nor the negro has the right to vote and exercise the great privileges of American citizenship—I say I assume that a man who is competent and who has so far secured the confidence of the Executive as to be selected for the performance of this duty is relieved of the duty of staying upon the frontier and of shooting down helpless Indian women and children.

That is one good reason why I think this man has a more desirable place. I could go on and recite many other reasons, but will not do so. But in regard to this permanent law, fixing that salary, I will confine myself to stating if we strike it out we will have to pay the attorney fees in the Court of Claims in his suit to recover the amount; and I think it would be unwise. I know the unusual clearness and lucidity and eminent capability of my friend from Kentucky, and that he almost always shows his ability and patriotism in the positions he takes; but in this one instance I think he has not shown it, at least on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I desire to be heard on the other side of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that the amendment was merely *pro forma*.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I hope that my colleague on the committee will not take the floor upon this occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky will proceed for five minutes in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I do not see how the amendment made could be possibly adopted if the last word were stricken out; it would be mutilated in such a way. Now, in entire sincerity, availing myself of the opportunity which my motion has given me, I think the gentleman must have been mistaken in asking to strike out the last word instead of one of the middle words of the amendment; for I do not think that with his usual lucidity, entirely free from any pantomimic performance or hypnotic operation, he could have made such a mistake. [Laughter.] But as to the merit of the amendment I offered. I offered it in good faith.

Mr. Chairman, I do not particularly care whether the committee adopt it now or not. Since I have been on the Committee on Appropriations I have looked somewhat into the government of this city, and I have believed that it needed entire reorganization. I took the liberty of saying so a year ago. I ask the gentleman from Maryland, who is very familiar with this question, and other gentlemen on this floor, that they may take the matter up and consider in this Congress what changes this Government ought to have. My judgment is that the city of Washington has outgrown this particular form of government, that it is one that we ought to reorganize, and I offered this amendment simply to emphasize what I believe ought to be emphasized, and what is apparently desired to be obliterated, and that is the power of the President to select an officer in the Army, without regard to his residence in Washington, without the slightest regard to any special capacity or experience that particularly fits him, and make him the real executive of the city of Washington, giving him the decisive vote when the two commissioners divide.

We have seen that very thing this winter. The two civil commissioners selected by the President differed on certain questions, and the military commissioner had the casting vote. He was actually the executive officer of the Capital of the nation. That is to say, a gentleman selected solely because of his eminent skill as an engineer and his excellent qualities as a soldier became by this most anomalous act the real chief executive of the Capital of the nation.

Now, I do not think that that is a wise form of government. I have not the time in five minutes to point out, as I may be able to do in other discussions on this bill, in which I hope to have the attention of my friend, the chairman of the committee, at times during the next day or two which we shall probably devote to the consideration of this

bill. [Laughter.] I have not now the time to point out the various evils that I think grow out of this anomalous and unamerican form of government. There is no reason why this commissioner, as a matter of justice, should receive the same exact salary that the other commissioners receive.

But I do not care about that. Four hundred dollars is a mere bagatelle in a bill which carries over \$5,000,000; but the principle that is involved is that he is by law put upon exactly the same rank and with the same duties as the other commissioners, when my judgment of the meaning of the act is that he was not intended to have the same powers as the civil commissioners, but was to be especially in charge of the scientific and industrial departments of the District government.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, in view of these wise reflections of my friend from Kentucky, I think that my amendment ought not to be adopted, and I withdraw it.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move to strike out the last three words. I have thought it not inappropriate in the consideration of this bill at this time, in view of the force bill now being urged, to comment briefly upon the anomalous government of this city, and, in that connection, to show a little of the hypocrisy that characterizes the party who are now in charge of all the different departments of the Government. This city, like the balance of the country, was formerly blessed with the right of self-government, that is, the citizens of the District could vote and had a voice in determining who should rule over them.

By and by, after the close of the war, it was determined by the party then in power to enfranchise a large proportion of the population formerly held in slavery and who therefore had not participated in the Government. They were enfranchised. They were given the right to vote in this city, as they were in the balance of the Union; but it is a very peculiar commentary upon those times that the party that had enfranchised the colored man ultimately determined that they would disfranchise him; not that they would disfranchise him in the South; not that they would take away his right to vote in Tennessee, or in Arkansas, or in Mississippi, but that they would take it away here, in the Capital of the Republic, in the home of the Government, this model city of self-government.

I am not going to discuss the question of what form of government is best for this city, nor what changes should be made as to suffrage therein now. But I want to show the hollowness of that hypocrisy which now pretends to be striving to give free elections everywhere.

Not only did these pretended lovers of the ballot box disfranchise the negro, Mr. Chairman, but in order to get rid of him as a voter in the District of Columbia they disfranchised all the white men here, so that we have the strange anomaly presented of the citizens of the Capital of a great Republic being disfranchised.

Mr. CRISP. And under a military government.

Mr. McMILLIN. And my friend from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] calls my attention to the fact that, as stated by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], they have a military government or a quasi-military government established over them. At the same time that this goes on Congress fixes one-half the taxes of this city upon the people of the rest of the country, and the very men who have done these things are now in another place, which shall be nameless, proposing to subvert the Government by a Federal election law to turn the legislative branch of it over to the judicial branch and to change our system of electing members of Congress, and all, as they say, for the purpose of insuring fair elections for the freedmen.

I was determined, Mr. Chairman, that this occasion should not pass without attention being called to the hypocrisy which characterizes those who propose to give the negro votes everywhere else except where their own property happens to be located and where it is to be taxed.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman give the date of that act of disfranchisement?

Mr. McMILLIN. It was done under Republican rule on the 20th of June, 1874, ten years after the close of the war; done to prevent the colored man from having a voice here and to prevent him from imposing taxes on the property of some of those who did it. As I indicated, I do not undertake to say now what is best, but these men should not be inconsistent.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McADOO rose.

Mr. MCOMAS. I ask unanimous consent that debate upon the pending paragraph and amendment be limited to one minute.

Mr. BLAND. I move to amend by making it thirty minutes.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I hope the motion of the gentleman from Maryland will not prevail. There are a great many things in this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland moves that debate on this paragraph and amendment be limited to one minute.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, have not I a right to move an amendment to that?

The CHAIRMAN. The committee is dividing.

Mr. BLAND. But I made my motion to amend before the Chair put the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was so unfortunate as not to have it brought to his attention.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman rose for the pur-

pose of moving an amendment, the confusion in the Hall ought not to deprive him of his right.

Mr. BLAND. I generally have a pretty clear voice and I exercised it on this occasion as fully as usual, but the confusion cut me off so I may not have been heard. I desire now to move an amendment to make the time two hours instead of one minute.

Mr. MCOMAS. I have not yielded the floor, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not entertain a motion while the committee is dividing.

Mr. BLAND. There is no previous question in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MCOMAS. Mr. Chairman, if debate on the pending paragraph is considered as closed, I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. We do not want debate closed on the paragraph.

Mr. TRACEY. I call for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must proceed in order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCOMAS]—

Mr. BLAND. Have I not the right to insist on my amendment being voted on? I offered an amendment to the motion of the gentleman from Maryland.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee of the Whole will be in order. The Chair has no knowledge of the fact that the gentleman from Missouri offered any amendment before division began.

Mr. BLAND. I state to the Chair most emphatically that I rose here and almost in the same voice in which I now talk I did move an amendment. I am not responsible if, in the confusion, the Chair did not hear me.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from Missouri was heard all around here.

Mr. BLAND. I am not responsible for the disorder in the Hall. I have stated that I offered the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, unless I am more mistaken than I have been for a long time, the Chair commenced putting the question on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland before the gentleman from Missouri offered his amendment.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman from Illinois is mistaken altogether. I offered my amendment before the Chair began to put the question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Not only before that, but before I appealed to the gentleman from Maryland not to make his motion apply to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to make a statement. Under the rules it is necessary that a gentleman addressing the House or the Committee be recognized by the Chair before his motion is in order. The Chair was engaged in putting the question to the committee upon the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland. If the gentleman from Missouri rose and made a motion he was not recognized by the Chair.

Mr. BLAND. Before that, however, I had made my amendment; and the Chair went on putting the question when I called attention to the fact that I had offered an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. But the Chair did not hear the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND. If the Chair is deaf, that is not my fault. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is—

Mr. BLAND. I want to know whether the Chair proposes to rule out the amendment I offered before the Chair began to put the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can only put such motions as are before the committee.

Mr. BLAND. I did all I could to make the Chair hear the amendment which I offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is hardly in order.

Mr. BLAND. I insist that the Chair is out of order in refusing to put the question on the amendment which I offered before the Chair began to put the question on the motion of the gentleman from Maryland.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not entertain the gentleman's motion. If the gentleman had been recognized and the Chair had understood him as making a motion, the Chair would of course have entertained the amendment and put it to the committee.

Mr. BLAND. I can not help it if the Chair did not understand me. Gentlemen were talking all around me here.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from Missouri did rise and in a loud voice offered his amendment. He was heard by all the gentlemen around him. But there was great confusion at the time; and it is not strange that the Chair did not hear him. But the failure of the Chair to hear the gentleman's proposition does not deprive him of his right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee will hardly claim that the gentleman from Missouri could have a motion properly before the committee unless he had been recognized.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from Missouri stated his motion to the Chair; and it was the duty of the Chair to recognize him and announce the motion to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. But if the Chair did not hear the gentleman's motion—

Mr. BLAND. It is the duty of the Chair to put a motion when a member makes it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the duty of the Chair to put such motions as he hears.

Mr. McMILLIN. With all respect to the Chair, I beg to state the rule is that where the Chair, on account of confusion in the Hall at the time, fails to hear a proposition made by a member, and it is established by the statement of the member himself or of those around him that the motion was made in time, the Chair does not cut him off.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no rule to that effect, although the practice is such. Under the circumstances the Chair will entertain the gentleman's motion.

Mr. McMILLIN. That is right.

Mr. McCOMAS. I ask to dispense with all further debate upon the pending amendment and upon the rest of the paragraph down to the word "provided"—

The CHAIRMAN. What is the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND]?

Mr. BLAND. I move to amend by allowing two hours for debate. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCOMAS. I ask consent that all debate on the pending amendments and upon the paragraph down to the word "provided" be considered as closed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Maryland, because I think this confusion is only temporary, that there are two amendments we want to offer to this paragraph: one to strike out one of the inspectors of buildings and the other to strike out one inspector of plumbing. On neither of them do I care about occupying more than five minutes.

Mr. McCOMAS. Is that all of the amendments?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. And the gentleman from Texas, Governor SAYERS, has an amendment as to the proviso. That is all that I have any information about.

Mr. SAYERS. An amendment which I wish to offer in perfectly good faith.

Mr. McCOMAS. Then I move, Mr. Chairman, that the committee now rise.

Mr. DOCKERY. Has my colleague been recognized by the Chair?

Mr. BLAND. I yield for that motion. [Laughter.]

The motion of Mr. McCOMAS was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan, reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the District of Columbia appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

WORLD'S COLUMBIAN COMMISSION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith the report of the World's Columbian Commission, with the accompanying papers.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, January 16, 1891.

BENJ. HARRISON.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles: when the Speaker signed the same, namely:

A bill (S. 77) to provide for the construction of a public building at Portland, Oregon;

A bill (S. 2082) for the erection of a public building at Staunton, Va.; and

A bill (H. R. 11814) to provide the assessor of the District of Columbia with plats of subdivisions outside the cities of Washington and Georgetown.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. TURNER, of New York, for three days, on account of important business.

To Mr. PICKLER, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. SKINNER, until Tuesday next, on account of important business.

To Mr. PENINGTON, until January 22, on account of important business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The time having arrived when under the rule the recess begins, the Chair declares the House in recess until 8 o'clock this evening, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MORROW] will preside as Speaker *pro tempore*.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House, at 8 o'clock p. m., was called to order by Mr. MORROW.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. Speaker, I find on the Calendar, on page 59, House bill 8661, granting a pension to Mary T. Cook, which was passed at the last session. I move that it be stricken from the Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MORRILL. I now move that the committee proceed to consider the bills on the Calendar in their regular order in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The motion was agreed to.

JESSE C. TAYLOR.

The first business on the Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11070) to correct the military record of Jesse C. Taylor, Sixth Tennessee Cavalry. The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to remove from the rolls and records in the office of the Adjutant General of the United States Army the charge of desertion now standing on said rolls and records against Jesse C. Taylor, late of Company E, Sixth Tennessee Cavalry.

Mr. McCLAMMY. Is there a report accompanying that bill?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The report (by Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11070) to remove the charge of desertion against Jesse C. Taylor, having considered the same, respectfully report:

That the evidence filed before the committee shows that Jesse C. Taylor while in the line of duty was captured by the Confederate forces and paroled, returning to his home in Linden, Tenn. When released from parole he could not, without great danger of recapture or being killed, rejoin his regiment on account of the Confederate forces being between his home and his regiment. He enlisted in another regiment, served out his time, and received an honorable discharge. The committee are of the opinion that this soldier had no intention of deserting the service of the United States Army, and therefore recommend the passage of the accompanying bill. The committee refer to the report of the Secretary of War, which is hereto attached and made a part of this report.

Mr. McCLAMMY. I do not ask the further reading of the report.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ELIZABETH M. HOLLINGSWORTH.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11582) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth M. Hollingsworth.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. Elizabeth M. Hollingsworth, widow of Noah Hollingsworth, late a private in Company A, Eighth Regiment Iowa Cavalry Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11582) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth M. Hollingsworth, submit the following report:

The husband of claimant, Noah Hollingsworth, was a private soldier in Company A, Eighth Iowa Cavalry, who died while in the service in 1853. The claimant, his widow, was on the pension roll until 1853, at which time she remarried. The facts set forth in the evidence clearly indicate that her remarriage was a fraudulent one.

Claimant in her allegation, which is corroborated by other witnesses, makes affidavit that a man known as Josiah Trague engaged her to do his washing and sewing, by which means she was occasionally thrown into his company; that the said Trague was a good converser and made himself very agreeable to her, and by his flattery induced her to marry him on a short acquaintance of only three months; that very soon after her remarriage it became evident that Trague had married her for the purpose of getting hold of what little property she possessed. Claimant mildly remonstrated, at which he became very abusive and in less than two months after their marriage Trague took her mare, worth \$200, and left for parts unknown.

After Trague's departure claimant learned from four different parties that he, Trague, had several wives living. Several years after claimant was informed that Trague was living with a Spanish woman in Lower California. Claimant made application and was granted a decree of divorce by the district court in Labette County, Kansas, in the year 1873. A certificate of the clerk of the circuit court of Vermillion County, Indiana, shows the claimant was married to Noah Hollingsworth, the deceased soldier, February 3, 1846. She is now old and without means of support, and is shown to have the confidence and respect of the community where she resides.

Your committee report favorably and recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, there was a bill passed over, House bill 3499, a bill reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, which should have precedence, and I think is entitled to consideration to-night. It appears to have been overlooked. It is a House bill which should have been called first. I refer to the bill for the relief of Joel B. Ellis.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman from Kentucky that this bill does not seem to properly come up for consideration under the rule.

Mr. FINLEY. This bill places the name of Joel B. Ellis, of Company H, Fifteenth Kentucky Cavalry, on the pension roll, and I think it is clearly in order under the provisions of the rule.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it is not a pension bill, nor does it remove the charge of desertion.

Mr. FINLEY. No; but it will have the effect of granting a pension eventually.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will read the rule under which the House assembled to-night.

The Clerk read as follows:

2. The House shall on each Friday at 5 o'clock p. m. take a recess until 8 o'clock, at which evening session private pension bills, bills for the removal of political disabilities, and bills removing charges of desertion only shall be considered; said evening session not to extend beyond 10 o'clock, and 30 minutes.

Mr. FINLEY. This bill is unquestionably in order, I think, unless some gentleman sees fit to object to it. This man was captured and killed. He leaves a wife and some helpless children. He was a soldier; the proof clearly shows it. He was sworn into the service, but before being mustered in was captured and killed.

Mr. BAKER. Let me ask whether the effect of the bill is not to put this veteran or his widow upon the pension roll.

Mr. FINLEY. It places his name on the rolls of the company in order that his heirs may obtain some relief from the Government.

Mr. BAKER. I think the effect is only to enable the widow or heirs to get a pension; and hence the bill is in order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is advised that this bill does not properly come within the rule.

Mr. FINLEY. Would it be in order to ask unanimous consent to consider it?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it could not be properly granted.

MARGARET A. MYERS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5003) for the relief of Margaret A. Myers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Margaret A. Myers, and that she be granted a pension at the rate of \$25 per month.

The report (by Mr. BELKNAP) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5003) for the relief of Margaret A. Myers, have had the same under consideration and beg leave to report:

That the claimant is the sister of William P. Pettierew, who enlisted as a private in Company E, Tenth Regiment of Kansas Volunteer Infantry, on the 12th day of August, 1861, for three years, and was discharged on the 18th day of August, 1864, by reason of expiration of term of service, and who thereupon re-enlisted and served until the close of the war.

That on the 31st day of May, 1868, said soldier died of consumption, a disease contracted in the service. Never was married.

It further appears from the evidence filed with your committee that the claimant in this case was left a widow in 1866 with a daughter eight years of age dependent upon her for support. That in 1867 her eyesight began to fail, and for the last fourteen years she has been totally blind, and that the physicians declare that her eyesight is totally destroyed.

That the daughter is married, but is wholly unable to contribute anything toward her support.

It further appears that the only property she has is an undivided interest in a house and lot valued at \$600. It further appears that the soldier was the only brother of the claimant, and that she has no near relatives living except her married daughter.

It also appears that upon the return of the brother from the Army he took care of his sister, the claimant, until the time of his death, and he was her only support.

It also further appears from the testimony of neighbors, who have known the claimant for many years, that she is a very worthy woman, fifty-five years of age, totally blind, and that unless her necessities are relieved by the Government she will become a public charge or must be dependent on charity for subsistence.

In view of all the circumstances of the case your committee reports the bill back with a favorable recommendation, amended, however, by striking out the word "twenty-five," in line 7, and inserting "twelve" in place thereof.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

PATRICK HYLAND.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8848) for the relief of Patrick Hyland:

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion from the name of Patrick Hyland, enlisted as a private September 9, 1861, in Company B, Sixty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, at Philadelphia, Pa.

The report (by Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio) is as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8848) for the relief of Patrick Hyland, having considered the same, respectfully report:

That Patrick Hyland enlisted September 9, 1861, in Company B, Sixty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, and served faithfully until January, 1864, when he re-enlisted in the same organization as a veteran. He went home on a veteran furlough in April, 1864, with his regiment, but when his leave expired he was sick in bed with typhoid fever. As soon as he was able he started to rejoin his regiment, and went as far as Washington, D. C., when he suffered a relapse and returned to his home. Here he remained a long time severely sick.

From affidavits submitted to your committee we are satisfied that such sickness wholly disqualified such soldier from military duty during the remaining period of the war. That his failure to return to the service was through no fault or neglect of his own, but simply the result of an unavoidable sickness. Your committee submit as a part of their report the soldier's record as shown in the War Department, and the affidavits of Thomas Fagan, Margaret Loden, and said Patrick Hyland, which fully explains the case.

Your committee recommend the bill to be amended by adding to line 7 the following words, "and grant him an honorable discharge under date of May 1, 1864," and that the bill, when so amended, do pass.

Case of Patrick Hyland, late private Company B, Sixty-Seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers.

RECORD AND PENSION DIVISION, July 30, 1890.

Patrick Helan (also borne as "Heland"), private Company B, Sixty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, was enrolled at Philadelphia, Pa., on September 9, 1861, to serve three years, re-enlisted on January 1, 1864, as a veteran volunteer, and is reported present on roll of company for January and February, 1864; roll for March and April, 1864, shows him absent with leave, on veteran furlough; roll for May and June, 1864 (last roll of the company upon which his name is

borne), reports him absent, deserted about May 1, 1864. He did not thereafter return to military control, although his command was retained in service until July 14, 1865.

The Hon. HENRY H. BINGHAM, M. C., was informed by the Department, in a letter dated July 14, 1888, in which the soldier's record was quoted, that if, as is inferred from the soldier's letter herewith returned, he was prevented from returning and completing his term of enlistment by reason of physical disability, it will be necessary for him to establish that fact by the testimony of his attending physician or other reliable parties, and also that such disability was contracted in the line of his duty, before he can become entitled to a discharge certificate from his veteran enlistment.

The testimony required has not been furnished, and in its absence the case is not embraced within the provisions of any law governing the subject of desertions.

Respectfully submitted.

F. C. AINSWORTH,
Captain and Assistant Surgeon, United States Army.
The SECRETARY OF WAR.

GENERAL AFFIDAVIT.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Philadelphia, ss:

In the matter of Patrick Hyland, Company B, Sixty-seventh Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteers.

On this 13th day of March, A. D. 1890, personally appeared before me, a magistrate in and for aforesaid county and State, Thomas Fagan, aged forty-seven years, a resident of the city of Philadelphia, county of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, whose post-office address is 4122 Parish street, and who, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says in relation to the aforesaid case as follows:

I served in Company B, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, and was personally acquainted with Patrick Hyland of the same company and regiment. I re-enlisted at the same time that Patrick Hyland did, and came home with the regiment at the same time, and am personally knowing of the fact that when the regiment's veteran furlough expired and was returning to the front that the said Patrick Hyland was laid up sick from typhoid fever, and was confined to his residence and under the care of a physician.

Between the time the regiment went back on its veteran furlough, January, 1864, and October, 1864, I saw a letter that was received by Private James Tag, of the same company, and in said letter it stated that Patrick Hyland was still very sick and not expected to live.

In the battle of October, 1864, I was wounded and came home, and when I came home I saw the said Patrick Hyland and he was only a shadow of his former self; he was just recovering from his sickness, was just able to walk about, and in conversation he informed me that he had been sick ever since the regiment left.

I was home from October to the latter part of January, 1865, and during this time I saw him quite frequently and know that he was not at any time fit to perform any military duty, he being still very weak.

I was discharged in July, 1865, and saw him again and he was a physical wreck, and had not done any work, neither was fit to do any work or to perform military duty.

He was always regarded by the officers as being homesick; he was not looked upon as a deserter; had they suspected him of such he could have easily been arrested, as it was known to us all where he was.

I further declare that I have no interest in said case, and am not concerned in its prosecution.

THOMAS FAGAN.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this day by the above-named affiant. I further certify that I am in no wise interested in said case, nor am I concerned in its prosecution.

Witness my hand and official seal this 13th day of March, 1890.

[SEAL.]

ISRAEL W. DENHAM,
Magistrate Court No. 6.

GENERAL AFFIDAVIT.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Philadelphia, ss:

In the matter of Patrick Hyland, late Company B, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers.

On this 12th day of March, A. D. 1890, personally appeared before me, a magistrate in and for said county and State, Margaret Soden, aged fifty-two years, a resident of the city of Philadelphia, county of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, whose post-office address is 2419 Factory street, and who, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says in relation to the aforesaid case as follows:

I am knowing of the following facts: My husband, James Tag, was a member of Company B, Sixty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, and I resided within one square from the residence of Patrick Hyland, the claimant, and know that while he was home on a veteran furlough that he was taken very sick with the typhoid fever and was confined to his residence, and when their time of furlough was expired and they were going back to the Army, then the said Patrick Hyland was sick in bed with the typhoid fever and was under the care of a doctor, William Hopper, and to my own personal knowledge he, the said Patrick Hyland, was mentally distressed because he could not return with the regiment, and to relieve his fears I personally went to the colonel and reported his sickness and the severity of the same, and the colonel requested that he follow the regiment as soon as he was able.

I nursed him in his sickness and know he was delirious and out of his mind and hovered between life and death for a month or two, and he left his room earlier than he should have done and the result was he had a relapse and then was sick for about three months, and as soon as he was able to move about again he started for to join his regiment. He was very weak and could scarcely walk, and when he got as far as Washington he had to come back again, and he wanted to go to the hospital, at Twenty-fifth and South streets, but his father would not allow it, and he was brought home again and was under the charge again of Doctor Hopper.

Then when he did get well of the fever he was taken sick with a chronic diarrhoea and he had big blotches to break out all over his body and he continued in this condition until long after the war was over. He was not able to do any work for fully two years after the close of the war.

I am confident he was at no time in a condition fit to do or perform military duty from the time he came home on his veteran furlough in 1864 until fully a year after the war was over. I further declare that I have no interest in said case and am not concerned in its prosecution.

Mrs. MARGARET SODEN.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this day by the above-named affiant. I further certify that I am in no wise interested in said case, nor am I concerned in its prosecution.

Witness my hand and official seal this 12th day of March, 1890.

[SEAL.]

ISRAEL W. DURHAM,
Magistrate Court No. 6.

APPLICATION FOR REMOVAL OF CHARGE OF DESERTION.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Philadelphia, ss:

On this — day of March, A. D. 1890, personally appeared before me, a magistrate in and for the county of Philadelphia, in the State of Pennsylvania, Patrick Hyland, now a resident of Philadelphia, county of Philadelphia, State of Pennsylvania, who, being duly sworn, declares that he is the identical person who served under the name of Patrick Heland in Company B, in the Sixty-seventh Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteers; that he was enlisted in said company and regiment on or about the 9th day of September, 1861, at Philadelphia, in the county of Philadelphia, and State of Pennsylvania, by Capt. Thomas Connor, mustered into service on or about the 9th day of September, 1861, at Philadelphia in the county of Philadelphia, and State of Pennsylvania; that he served faithfully until on or about the 1st day of February, 1864, when, without any intention of deserting, he left the regiment under the following circumstances, namely:

Whilst he was home on the veteran furlough he was taken sick with typhoid fever and was unable to return with his regiment at the expiration of said furlough, and his anxiety to go back was so great that in enfeebled condition he left his sick room and followed the regiment as far as Washington, D. C., and whilst en route thereto the fever increased and to such an extent that when he reached Washington he was unable to proceed any further, and by the advice of officers and men who were strangers to him and who were awaiting transportation at the depot in Washington, all of whom advised him to return home again and go to some hospital in his native city, which the claimant did, and as soon as he arrived in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., he immediately went to the South Street United States general hospital, which was only about one square from his residence.

He was admitted to the said hospital, but was only there a short time, as his father called at said hospital and obtained consent of the surgeon in charge to take the claimant to his residence for treatment; this request the surgeon very readily complied with, and stated he was glad to do so, as the hospital was so well filled with sick and wounded at that time. The claimant continued very sick with the typhoid fever for about several (three) months, i. e., just as he was recovering from the first attack he was taken with a relapse and was then about five weeks in a delirious condition.

Furthermore, whilst suffering from the typhoid fever, the chronic diarrhea came on him, and so severe in character as to prostrate him, and from the effects of the typhoid fever and chronic diarrhea he was never at any time sufficiently recovered to perform military duty, and said debilitated condition continued on him from February, 1864, to May, 1865, and for some time subsequent thereto, and as his absence from his command was not due to nor the fault of the claimant in any manner, therefore he files this declaration, which is made for the purpose of securing a removal of the charge of desertion, and he hereby appoints, with full power of substitution and revocation, James B. O'Neill, 118 South Sixth street, of Philadelphia, Pa., his attorney to present his application, and to receive and receipt for the discharge that may be issued thereon, and to do any and all acts necessary to effect the purpose of his said appointment. His post-office address is 410 South Twenty-sixth street, Philadelphia, Pa.

PATRICK HYLAND.

Also personally appeared before me Charles Seger, now a resident of the city of Philadelphia, in the county of Philadelphia and State of Pennsylvania, and Daniel Devenny, now a resident of the city of Philadelphia, in the county of Philadelphia and State of Pennsylvania, to me well known as credible persons, who, being sworn, declare that they have been for — acquainted with the above-named applicant; that they know him to be the person he represents himself to be; that they have every reason to believe that the foregoing affidavit by him subscribed is correct and true; and they have no interest in this claim.

CHARLES SEGER,
DANIEL DEVENNY.

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA, County of Philadelphia, ss:

Sworn to and subscribed before me this day by the above-named affiant, and I certify that I read said affidavit to said affiant, including the words — erased, and the words — added, and acquainted him with its contents before he executed the same. I further certify that I am in no wise interested in said case, nor am I concerned in its prosecution; and that said affiant is personally known to me and that he is a creditable person.

[SEAL.]

ISRAEL W. DURHAM,
Magistrate Court No. 5.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

W. W. BRADLEY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1223) granting a pension to W. W. Bradley.

The bill was read at length for information.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. Speaker, does that come under the order for this evening session?

Mr. SAWYER. It is to correct a military record.

Mr. OWEN, of Indiana. It is to correct his muster-in.

Mr. SAWYER. We have passed bills like that at evening sessions, have we not?

Mr. MORRILL. We just refused to consider such a bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is of the opinion that the bill does not come under the order of business for this evening.

MONTGOMERY GEIGER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11972) for the relief of Montgomery Geiger.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Montgomery Geiger, of the county of Lincoln and State of Missouri, a private in Company B, of Powell's Battalion, Mexican war, and pay him a pension of \$20 per month from and after the passage of this act.

The report (by Mr. NORTON) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11972) granting a pension to Montgomery Geiger, have considered the same and report: The claimant was a private in Company B, Powell's Battalion Missouri Mounted Volunteers, and served from July 1, 1847, to November 7, 1848.

His claim for pension under the Mexican war service-pension act of January 29, 1887, was rejected by the Pension Bureau on the ground that the organiza-

tion to which the claimant belonged did not serve in Mexico, or on the coasts or frontier thereof, or en route thereto.

The claimant, who is sixty-two years old, is shown by the statements of D. W. Tice and Dr. J. A. Ward, both of Troy, Mo., to be partially paralyzed, unable to do any manual labor, and without any income or other means of support.

The services of Powell's Battalion during the time of the Mexican war are known to have been of the greatest value to the country, and your committee have heretofore recommended the pensioning of the survivors of that organization.

The case seems to be a just and meritorious one, and your committee return the bill with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARY B. FLOYD.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10992) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary B. Floyd.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, instructed to place on the pension rolls Mrs. Mary B. Floyd, of Newton County, Georgia, widow of John B. Floyd, late a captain of a company of Georgia troops, in the Creek Indian war of 1836, and pay her a pension, subject to the limitations and provisions of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. DE LANO) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10992) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary B. Floyd, have considered the same and report:

John J. Floyd, the claimant's late husband, was a captain of Georgia volunteers, and served one month and eleven days in the Creek Indian war of 1836.

McCormick Neal, J. T. Henderson, George H. Hammond, and other citizens of Fulton County, Georgia, testify that the claimant is seventy-three years old, in feeble health, indigent circumstances, and dependent upon her children for a home and the comforts of life.

Many precedents have been established for the granting of pensions by special acts to applicants of this class, and your committee therefore report the bill back with a favorable recommendation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MRS. G. W. GRIFFITH.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7880) granting a pension to Mrs. G. W. Griffith.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. G. W. Griffith, of Fayette County, Georgia, widow of G. W. Griffith, a private in the Creek Indian war of 1836, and who was a member of Capt. James Sanford's company, Georgia troops.

The report (by Mr. DE LANO) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7880) granting a pension to Mrs. G. W. Griffith, have considered the same, and report as follows:

The claimant's deceased husband, George W. Griffith, was a private in Capt. James N. Sanford's company of Georgia Volunteers, Creek Indian war, and served from June 2, 1836, to July 12, 1836.

His widow is now advanced in years, without property or income, and a sufferer from rheumatism to such an extent that she can do no labor by which to earn a livelihood.

In view of the facts stated, your committee return the bill with a favorable recommendation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH P. SATTERFIELD.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9663) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Satterfield.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Elizabeth P. Satterfield, widow of John R. Satterfield, late a soldier in the Black Hawk war, on the pension roll at the rate of \$12 per month.

The report (by Mr. DE LANO) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9663) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Satterfield, have considered the same, and report as follows:

The petition of the claimant for relief by special act is based upon the service of her deceased husband, John R. Satterfield, in Capt. James Bowman's company of Illinois militia, Black Hawk war.

The muster roll of the company can not be found in the files of the Government and the records are otherwise incomplete, but the Second Auditor of the Treasury reports that Mr. Satterfield's name appears on the pay roll of the above-named company as a sergeant, and that he was paid for service from June 10 to June 16, 1832.

That this item on the pay roll does not show the full term of Satterfield's service is shown by the testimony of Samuel W. Carpenter and Wyatt Parish, who swear that they were in the same company with Satterfield, and that they were all away from home about ninety days at the time of their service, and that the period of actual service was about sixty days.

That the claimant is the lawful widow of the soldier is fully shown by testimony filed with the committee, and it is also established that she is about seventy-five years old and without any means of support.

Your committee believe the case to be a just and meritorious one, and the bill is therefore returned with a favorable recommendation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

B. JONES.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7147) granting a pension to B. Jones.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, at the rate of \$3 per month, and subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of B. Jones, of South Carolina, late a private of Captain Chestnut's company of Mounted Men, South Carolina Volunteers of the Florida war.

The report (by Mr. DE LANO) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7147) granting a pension to B. Jones, have considered the same and report as follows:

The claimant, Binwell Jones, was a private of Capt. John Chestnut's company, of Col. R. H. Goodwyn's regiment of "Mounted Gunmen," South Carolina Volunteers, Florida Indian war, and served from February 17, 1836, to May 6, 1836.

The claimant's identity is fully established by the testimony submitted in support of the bill, and it is further shown that he is eighty-one years old, that his lands are covered by mortgages, and he is in needy circumstances.

Your committee believe the case to be a worthy one, and therefore return the bill recommending its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT HALL.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10873) to increase the pension of Robert Hall.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension now allowed to Robert Hall, of Shelbyville, Mo., late a soldier in the Mexican war, under certificate numbered —, and pay him the sum of \$24 per month.

The report (by Mr. NORTON) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10873) to increase the pension of Robert Hall, have considered the same and report:

This soldier was a private in Company G, Second Illinois Volunteers, and served from June 17, 1846, to June 18, 1847, in the war with Mexico.

He is now a pensioner at \$3 per month on account of that service.

Accompanying the bill is a sworn statement signed by J. T. Perry, county clerk; L. Dobbins, postmaster, and six other citizens of Shelbyville, Mo., to the effect that the claimant is past eighty years old and so feeble that for the past two years he has been unable to dress himself; also that he owns no property except a courtesy in 100 acres of land assessed at \$1,000, in Shelby County, Missouri, and his income (including his pension of \$3 per month) is inadequate to supply his needs.

In view of the claimant's service and his great age and necessities, your committee recommend the passage of the bill, amended, however, as follows: By striking out the words "twenty-four," in line 7, and substituting in lieu thereof the word "twenty."

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

DR. FRANCIS LAMBERT.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9575) granting a pension to Dr. Francis Lambert.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Dr. Francis Lambert, at the rate of \$25 per month, late a surgeon in the Creek war.

The report (by Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9575) granting a pension to Dr. Francis Lambert, have considered the same and report as follows:

The records of the Second Auditor's Office, Treasury Department, show that the claimant was paid for service as a private in Capt. E. B. Robinson's company of District of Columbia volunteers from June 1, 1836, to August 31, 1836, in the Creek Indian war. He also appears as an assistant surgeon on the rolls of the company, but the records fail to show that he was ever mustered in as of that rank.

Dr. Frederick Hutchison, a reputable citizen of Arcola, Va., certifies that Dr. Lambert is seventy-five years old, physically incapacitated to earn a living (being a confirmed invalid) and in needy circumstances.

The claimant's residence and post-office address is Arcola, Loudoun County, Virginia.

In view of the claimant's service, great age, and necessitous condition, your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

DENNIS KELLY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11792) for the relief of Dennis Kelly.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and hereby is, empowered and directed to correct the record of Dennis Kelly by expunging the charge of desertion which now stands against him on the records of the Navy Department, and to issue to him a certificate of honorable discharge from the naval service.

The report (by Mr. DOLLIVER) is as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11792) for the relief of Denis Kelly, have duly considered the same and submit the following report:

The facts in the case are fully embraced in the record evidence from the Navy Department, as also by the sworn statement of the beneficiary, which are herewith submitted.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, July 19, 1890.

SIR: Referring to your communication relative to the removal of the charge of desertion, in the case of Denis Kelly, of Brayton, Iowa, I have the honor to inform you that it appears from an examination of his record of service that he enlisted in the Navy March 14, 1865, as landsman, for two years; served on board the U. S. S. William G. Anderson, Choctaw, Potomac, and J. C. Kuhn, and is charged with desertion from the last-named vessel on March 17, 1866.

The Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery reports that Denis Kelly was admitted to the sick list of the J. C. Kuhn, October 19, 1865; disease, hem-

orrhoids; discharged October 21, 1865, to duty; and that there is no further record of him in that bureau.

Inasmuch as the act of Congress "to relieve certain appointed or enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps from the charge of desertion," approved August 14, 1888, requires that an applicant for relief thereunder, who deserted the service prior to the expiration of his term of enlistment, shall have served faithfully until the 1st of May, 1865, having previously served six months or more, or shall have been prevented from completing his term of service by reason of wounds received or disease contracted in the line of duty, and it appearing from the facts of record, as stated above, that Dennis Kelly enlisted only on March 14, 1865, and there being no evidence to show that he was prevented from completing his term of service by reason of wounds received or disease contracted in the line of duty, his case is not one which can properly be considered under the act referred to.

In the absence of conclusive evidence that the charge of desertion was erroneously entered in the case of Dennis Kelly, he is regarded as having been properly marked as a deserter at the time stated, namely, March 17, 1866, and it is not, therefore, in the power of the Department to remove that charge. Congress alone can grant the relief asked for.

Very respectfully,

B. F. TRACY,
Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. J. R. REED,
House of Representatives.

GENERAL AFFIDAVIT.

STATE OF IOWA, Cass County, ss:

In the matter of claim of Dennis Kelly, a landsman in United States Navy.

Personally came before me, a notary public in and for aforesaid county and State, Dennis Kelly, aged fifty years, and citizen of the town of Brayton, county of Audubon, State of Iowa, well known to be reputable and entitled to credit, and who, being duly sworn, declares in relation to aforesaid case as follows:

Then I enlisted on the 14th day of March, 1865, and served on the following-named vessels, to wit, Choctaw, Wm. G. Anderson, Potomac, and J. C. Kuhn, until March 17, 1866, at which time I was sick and got liberty to go ashore, and did not go back for the reason that I understood when I enlisted that I would be discharged as soon as the war was over, notwithstanding my enlistment was for two years, and the war was virtually ended in April, 1865, and as I had already served over one year, and nearly all that time after the war was over, I considered my service was no longer needed. And further, I understood when the ship landed at New York we were to be discharged; and further, I was sick and unable to do work for more than six months after I left the ship, and my health has been very poor ever since I left the service and have been a continual sufferer from hemorrhoids each year since I came out of the service, and I verily believe had I not left the ship when I did I would have died before my time of service was out.

DENNIS KELLY.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this day by the above-named affiant; and I certify that I read said affidavit to said affiant, and acquainted him with its contents before he executed the same. I further certify that I am in no wise interested in the case, nor am I concerned in its prosecution; and that said affiant is personally known to me; that he is a credible person and so reputed in the community in which he resides.

Witness my hand and official seal this 23d day of August, 1890.

[SEAL.] JAMES PUGH, Notary Public.

Your committee are of the opinion that upon the facts shown the said Dennis Kelly ought to be relieved from the charge of desertion, and we therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

JULIUS A. KAISER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1840) for the relief of Julius A. Kaiser.

The bill was read at length for information.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this bill is not embraced in the order for the Friday evening session.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The point of order is well taken.

GEORGIANNA C. HALL.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9616) granting increase of pension to Georgianna C. Hall, dependent mother of Maj. John W. Williams, deceased, late surgeon United States Army.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension allowed under the act of January 29, 1887, to Georgianna C. Hall, as the widow of William Hall, of Company B, Third Louisiana Volunteers in the Mexican war, to a sum equivalent to the amount which she would be entitled to as dependent mother of her son, the late Maj. John W. Williams, deceased, surgeon of the United States Army, on whom she was dependent for subsistence.

The report (by Mr. DE LANO) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9616) granting increase of pension to Georgianna C. Hall, have considered the same and beg leave to report as follows:

The claimant is the widow of William Hall, who was a corporal in Company B, Third Louisiana Volunteer Infantry, and served from May 4, 1846, to August 14, 1846. She is now in receipt of a pension at \$8 per month, under Mexican war service pension act of January 29, 1887. At the time of the granting of said pension by the Pension Office, Mrs. Hall proved that she was dependent for support upon her son (by a former marriage) John W. Williams, major and surgeon, United States Army. This son has since died, leaving a widow who receives the pension due on account of his service and death.

Mrs. Hall is now sixty-nine years old, and so much affected by rheumatism as to be unable to do any work for a livelihood. She has no property of any kind and no income aside from the small pension, which is insufficient to supply the necessities of life, and she has to depend upon a widowed daughter for assistance. This daughter is poor and has to depend upon her labor for support.

The facts are established by the testimony of Thomas A. Mitchell, George H. Baldwin, W. O. Dennison, and other reputable citizens of Washington, D. C.

Believing the case to be a meritorious one, your committee recommend the passage of the bill, amended, however, as follows: By changing the title so as to read, "A bill granting increase of pension to Georgianna C. Hall, widow of William Hall;" also, by striking out all after the word "war," in line 8, and substituting in lieu thereof the words "to \$20 per month."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill granting increase of pension to Georgianna C. Hall, widow of William Hall."

MARY CONDY RINGGOLD.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12120) to increase the pension of Mary Condry Ringgold, mother of George H. Ringgold, late lieutenant colonel and deputy paymaster general, United States Army.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay Mary Condry Ringgold, mother of George H. Ringgold, late lieutenant colonel and deputy paymaster general, United States Army, a pension at the rate of \$50 per month instead of the pension she is now receiving.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12120) granting a pension to Mary C. Ringgold, submit the following report: The beneficiary is the widow of George H. Ringgold, late lieutenant colonel and deputy paymaster general, United States Army.

Colonel Ringgold graduated at West Point in the same class with General Rosecrans, was appointed an additional paymaster in 1846, was promoted deputy paymaster general, with the rank of lieutenant colonel United States Army, in May, 1862, and was chief paymaster Department of the Pacific from 1861 to April 4, 1864, when he died.

The beneficiary is now his widow, sixty-two years of age, in feeble health, and is absolutely without any means of support except her pension of \$30 per month, which she is now receiving and the earnings from her own labor.

She has two daughters (her only children) both unmarried. The younger is in delicate health and is supported by her mother.

Mrs. Ringgold has also an invalid sister supported by her and her older daughter. She has no relative to whom she can look for her support in her old age.

Colonel Ringgold was a Southern man by birth, and when the civil war broke out he was stationed at San Francisco, Cal. General Albert S. Johnston was then stationed at this place, in command of the Department of the Pacific.

As is well known, there was a large element in the population of that State that favored the secession of that State, and plans were being laid with the knowledge and under the advice of General Johnston to secure that result. Suddenly General Johnston was relieved of his command and General Sumner appointed in his place, and the efforts to secure the secession of California were thwarted, and that State, and perhaps Oregon, were saved to the Union.

This was before the days of telegraphs and railroads across the continent. The part that Colonel Ringgold had in securing this important result will fully appear in the accompanying letter from General W. C. Kibbe, then and for several years thereafter adjutant general of that State:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., September 26, 1890.

"MY DEAR MADAM: I have great pleasure in stating to you, in connection with your request that I see the Hon. Mr. SAWYER, of New York, that there is a matter of unwritten history which may avail you in the legislation you are seeking from Congress.

It is this, namely: Early in 1861—say about the 29th of March—while adjutant general of California, being on business for my State, I received a joint letter from two very dear and loyal friends in San Francisco stating that plans were on foot and nearing completion for the secession of California from the Union, in which Oregon would join, giving me full particulars of the same and stating that the writers, being of Southern birth, had been approached with impunity, the plotters not dreaming but that a simple request was all that would be required to enlist my friends in this bold and promising scheme. But, to their great disgust and disappointment, one of them replied: "I was educated by the Government, and nurtured and protected under the old flag, which I have sworn to defend under any and all circumstances, and you must not now ask me to lift a hand against it, for this I shall never do." The other responded in a manner to almost dismay these plotters.

Presuming now that you are getting anxious to know the names of my old and loyal friends referred to, I will give them to you, as follows:

The first named was Maj. George Ringgold, United States Army, and the second, General Charles Doane, major general of the militia of California. This letter I immediately took to the Secretary of War (Cameron) who, properly impressed with its importance, immediately ushered me with the letter into the presence of President Lincoln, to whom I read the letter, and the following conversation rapidly ensued between us thus, Mr. Lincoln to me: "General, do you vouch for the statement these gentlemen make?" "I do, most emphatically; I know them intimately, they are both reliable and chivalrous, the salt of the earth."

To Secretary Cameron: "General, who is there near at hand whom we can trust to send out to California? Sumner is in New York, can we send him? If we can not, we have none who can be trusted. Telegraph Sumner to report here to-morrow." Lincoln to me: "General, when does the next steamer sail?" "Day after to-morrow." Sumner did report, and did sail on the following Wednesday under sealed orders "to be opened as you enter the Golden Gate," and when he arrived and was entering the Golden Gate he opened these orders and read: "Land at the first wharf and proceed with all haste to the headquarters of the Army and assume command of the Pacific Department, United States Army, and relieving Col. A. Sidney Johnston." Sumner landed at the presidio and was in command before the steamer reached her wharf at the foot of Clay street.

Now, this noble deed of George H. Ringgold, colonel in the Army, your husband, saved the secession of the Pacific States with all that that implied and which no man can compute, and I only wish the committee having your petition in charge would summon me before them that I might render homage to one who was true as steel and ready to make every and all sacrifice to duty and right.

I am, sincerely and truly, dear madam, your friend,

W. C. KIBBE.

Mrs. MARY C. RINGGOLD.

Colonel Ringgold had a brother, Major Ringgold, killed at the battle of Palo Alto, and another brother served with distinguished bravery in the naval service during the civil war. A similar bill was introduced into the Senate and was favorably reported in 1886. The report in that case is hereto annexed, with several letters from his Army friends testifying to the value of his military services attached.

Your committee believe that it is but just that the venerable widow of this meritorious officer, in her old age and in her dependent condition, should receive

the increase of pension proposed to be given by this bill, especially in view of the peculiarly valuable services rendered by her late husband, and they would therefore recommend that the bill do pass, amended by striking out the word "mother" in the title and inserting the word "widow," and by striking out the word "mother" in the fourth line of the bill and inserting the word "widow."

An act granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary Condry Ringgold, widow of George H. Ringgold, late lieutenant colonel and deputy paymaster general, United States Army.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to increase to \$50 per month the pension of Mrs. Mary Condry Ringgold, widow of the late George H. Ringgold, lieutenant colonel and deputy paymaster general, United States Army, who died in San Francisco, Cal., April 4, 1864.

[Senate Report No. 301, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 516) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary C. Ringgold, have examined the same and report:

The claimant is the widow of George H. Ringgold, late lieutenant colonel of the United States Army (certificate No. 59798). The following certificates and petition of the widow will show the character of his services:

WAR DEPARTMENT, PAYMASTER GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., December 17, 1884.

I had not the pleasure of a personal acquaintance with the late Lieut. Col. George H. Ringgold, deputy paymaster general. He was a graduate at West Point and served in the line of the Army for over three years; was appointed an additional paymaster in 1846, and in the regular service July 21, 1847, and was promoted deputy paymaster general with the rank of lieutenant colonel on the 23rd May, 1862, and was chief paymaster Department of the Pacific from 1861 to April 4, 1864, the day of his death.

Lieutenant Colonel Ringgold had the reputation of an accomplished gentleman and faithful public officer.

WM. B. ROCHESTER,
Paymaster General U. S. Army.

I heartily concur in the above.

S. V. BENÉT,
Brigadier General, Chief of Ordnance.

I knew Colonel Ringgold for many years. He was a faithful officer and a worthy gentleman. Great sympathy is due his family for their own sakes as well as for his valuable services to the United States.

E. D. TOWNSEND,
Brigadier General U. S. Army, Retired.

To whom it may concern:

It was my good fortune to know the late lamented Lieut. Col. George H. Ringgold, paymaster United States Army, for some years before his death, and on the California coast. He was an accomplished gentleman and a thorough man.

He was in San Francisco at the beginning of the late rebellion, and as a Marylander opposed secession as an entirety and in the particular. What with speeches and open activity he did much to dishearten the organization of the Knights of the Golden Circle, and in all this secured to himself much enmity from State's people and other Southern people with whom he had before been on terms of local as well as social brotherhood.

He had a large family, entertained hospitably, and died during the war, leaving nothing to them but his good name.

Of one of the best old families of our country they have left their lives and name written on our battlefields. Ringgold, of Palo Alto, Tex., was the colonel's brother, while the Tilghmans, Keys, and Hayes were all his relatives. The times have changed, and people who once could have come forward to the help of the family have passed away, and its support depends now on the efforts of his wife.

A grateful country could not act in a more worthy place than here in helping her to keep together a body of delicate and dependent children of him who was so true to his flag, when appeals like a litany were being made to every Southern gentleman.

JNO. HAMILTON,
Colonel, Fifth Artillery.

Given at Fort Hamilton, N. Y., December 15, 1884.

Colonel Ringgold was an accomplished gentleman, and served his country faithfully and well.

R. C. DRUM,
Adjutant General, U. S. Army.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 17, 1884.

Your petitioner, Mary C. Ringgold, whose post-office address is Washington, in the county of Washington and District of Columbia, respectfully represents that she is a pensioner under certificate No. 59798, at the rate of \$30 per month, as the widow of the late Lieut. Col. George H. Ringgold, deputy paymaster general, United States Army.

Referring to the many cases wherein additional pension has been granted by Congress, none of them more meritorious than hers, she respectfully prays for the passage of a special act increasing her pension to \$50 per month.

The services of Colonel Ringgold were especially valuable to the Government, and as the expenses of living consumed all his pay, at his death his family was left destitute, and your petitioner has ever since been compelled to provide for herself and four children. She is now in declining years, and her two sons, whom she had hoped would be able to assist her, having both died, she finds herself compelled to ask that an increase of pension, which many have received for far less service, may be generously given for the brief period that remains.

She would also remind you that she belongs to a family whose members have all been faithful servants of the Government, and who have all passed away. She is the great-grandchild of the renowned hero of Cowpens and Eutaw, and her family wealth was freely given during the Revolution to insure American success.

She asks attention to the papers accompanying this petition, and respectfully prays that the needed relief may be granted.

It appears that Mrs. Ringgold was left in destitute circumstances at her husband's death, with four young children to provide for. Her sons have died, and also a stepson, leaving her without any male relatives, but with an invalid sister and daughter to support, entirely dependent upon her. She is nearly sixty years of age and in poor health.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "fifty," in line 7, and insert the word "forty" in lieu thereof.

WAR DEPARTMENT, PAYMASTER GENERAL'S OFFICE,
September 19, 1890.

I cheerfully concur in the indorsement of General Rochester of December 17, 1884, relating to the service and reputation of the late Lieutenant Colonel Ringgold.

WM. SMITH,
Paymaster General United States Army.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, REGISTER'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., September 22, 1890.

DEAR MADAM: I have read Senate Report 301, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, concerning the services of your late husband, Lieut. Col. George H. Ringgold.

I regret that I am unable to reproduce in detail the facts which came to my knowledge in the course of my correspondence with him and his friends and brother officers, but I remember they showed that his character and services were held in high esteem for very substantial reasons, and that his services were especially valuable on the Pacific coast, at a time when the interests of the Government required such fidelity and intelligence as he displayed.

Sympathizing with you in the struggle you have had since his death and in the losses of your children and stepson, I sincerely hope Congress will increase your pension to \$50 per month, as you desire.

Very truly yours,

W. S. ROSECRANS.

Mrs. MARY C. RINGGOLD,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. CHEADLE. I will ask the Clerk to state the amount of pension allowed in that case.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The amount is \$50 a month.

Mr. CHEADLE. Then I object to its consideration without the presence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The amount received at the present time is \$30, and the bill increases the pension to \$50.

Mr. CHEADLE. I object to its consideration without the presence of a quorum.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the case may go over, retaining its place on the Calendar. I know of but one power that could change the course of the gentleman from Indiana. I would not limit the power of the Almighty.

Mr. CHEADLE. I want to say, and I want the RECORD to show it, that as a member of this House I am entitled to the same courtesies as every other member. I have availed myself of the privileges authorized by our rules—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on unanimous consent being given that this bill shall be laid aside, to retain its place on the Calendar.

Mr. SAWYER. If there is anything in my remarks that offends the gentleman from Indiana, I will withdraw it.

Mr. CHEADLE. I do not propose that any member of this body shall criticize my motives. I am responsible to the people whom I represent and to my own conscience, and not to the gentleman from New York or any other member.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request that the bill be laid aside and be allowed to retain its place on the Calendar? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EUGENE A. OSBORN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11311) granting an increase of pension to Eugene A. Osborn.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, to increase the pension of Eugene A. Osborn, late a private in Company A of the Third Regiment of Ohio Cavalry Volunteers, to \$60 per month.

The report (by Mr. YODER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11311) granting an increase of pension to Eugene A. Osborn, submit the following report:

The committee have given this case careful consideration, and find that the claimant received a gunshot wound in action, the ball entering in front of the right ear and passing out immediately over the left eye, entirely destroying the right eye and nearly destroying the sight of the left eye. The sight of the left eye has been growing feebler for some years, and the evidence shows that eventually it will be entirely lost. He can see but little with that eye now; enough to enable him, with the use of a cane, to go about the streets part of the time, but not enough to enable him to know or distinguish one person from another. He has to be led much of the time. In his own house he falls over the furniture, and needs to be constantly watched to prevent accident. His senses of smell and taste are entirely destroyed, and his wound affects his brain and impairs his mind.

His pension has been increased from time to time, until he now receives \$30 per month.

The committee feel that he ought to receive at least the amount stated in the bill, and therefore recommend its passage, amended, however, by adding after the word "month," in line 7, the following: "Provided, however, That if he shall become totally blind, his pension therefor shall be rated in accordance with the provisions of the general laws."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MRS. S. J. RAYNER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4483) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. S. J. Rayner.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of Mrs. S. J. Rayner, widow of Rev. James O. Rayner, late chaplain United States Army, from \$20 per month to \$5 per month, to take effect from and after the passage of this act.

The report (by Mr. DE LANO) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4483) granting an increase of pension to Sarah J. Rayner, have considered the same and report as follows:

The husband of the claimant, Rev. James O. Rayner, was elected chaplain by post council of administration (act July 5, 1833) and appointed post chaplain United States Army April 3, 1837, and served continuously as chaplain United States Army until retired February 19, 1857, by operation of law. He died at his home, San Mateo, Cal., June 18, 1858. His widow, the claimant, is a pensioner at the rate of \$20 per month.

She applies for increase to \$50 per month, declaring that she has no property to afford her any income and that she is in a very helpless condition, unable to walk or to use her hands, from the effects of rheumatism; that she is unable to earn a living or to take care of or dress herself. This throws the burden of support upon her pension, which is insufficient to meet her necessary wants.

Maj. Gen. J. M. Schofield, United States Army, in an indorsement submitting, under date of December 20, 1889, a communication received by him from claimant to the Secretary of War, states:

"Mr. Rayner was a very worthy and faithful chaplain in the Army. He was stationed at Angel Island, Cal., several years. In addition to his duties at that post he very cheerfully and zealously fulfilled my wishes by administering to the prisoners at Alcatraz Island. It appears that his widow is now left helpless and destitute, except for her pension of \$20 per month, barely enough to pay the hire of a servant. I trust Mrs. Rayner's pension may be increased so as to provide her absolute necessities during the short remainder of her life."

Under date of November 23, 1889, A. T. Steigers, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, at that time stationed at Alcatraz, Cal., certifies that the claimant is afflicted to such an extent with chronic rheumatism that she is a helpless invalid, unable to walk or use her hands or move without assistance, and that she requires the constant attendance of another person.

In a sworn statement, executed February 5, 1890, John Widney, of Santa Clara, Cal., says he has been the friend, adviser, and assistant of the claimant for years and knows that her income, outside of her pension, is small (perhaps from \$6 to \$9 per month), and but little more than sufficient, with her pension, to pay her nurse and wood bill, leaving her insufficient to purchase the common necessities of life. She is confined to an invalid's chair and can dress and undress herself only with the assistance of others; also that she deserves and needs help.

Robert Winsom makes substantially the same statement relative to the claimant's physical and financial condition.

Your committee think she should have her pension increased as prayed.

The passage of the bill is therefore recommended.

Mr. CHEADLE. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of this bill without a quorum.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be laid aside without prejudice, to retain its place on the Calendar.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MARY B. CLAYTON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11350) for the relief of Mary B. Clayton.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, at the rate of \$40 per month, the name of Mary B. Clayton, widow of the late Maj. Henry Clayton, late paymaster United States Army, and pay her a pension from and after the passage of this act.

The report (by Mr. DE LANO) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11350) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Clayton, have considered the same and report as follows:

The claimant is the widow of Henry Clayton, late major and paymaster, United States Army. This officer's military service began November 14, 1861, when he was mustered in as first lieutenant of Company B, Purnell Legion of Cavalry, Maryland Volunteers. After three years of faithful and arduous service he was mustered out with his company, October 28, 1864.

On the 4th day of October, 1866, he accepted appointment as captain Nineteenth United States Infantry, and served with distinction in the West until December 31, 1872, when he resigned. He was appointed major and paymaster September 12, 1882, and died at Fort D. A. Russell, Wyoming, December 26, 1888, of disease of the heart contracted in the service and line of duty.

Mrs. Clayton is now receiving a pension at the rate of \$25 per month, the same having been allowed her under the provisions of the general pension laws.

In her petition for relief the claimant states that the soldier left no estate to enable her to educate and support their two children.

There are many precedents for the allowance of the increase prayed for in this case, and your committee therefore return the bill, recommending its passage.

NOTE.—Amend by adding to the bill, after the word "act" in line 8, the words "at the rate above named, the same to be in lieu of the pension now paid her."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MATILDA KENT.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9948) granting a pension to Mrs. Matilda Kent.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. Matilda Kent, of Walton County, Georgia, whose husband was a private soldier in Captain Wilcox's company, in the Florida Indian war of 1812, and allow her a pension of \$12 per month.

The report (by Mr. DE LANO) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9948) granting a pension to Mrs. Matilda Kent, have considered the same and report as follows:

The claimant's late husband, Jesse Kent, deceased, was a private in Capt. S. Mann's company (company during a part of its period of service also being commanded by Capt. John B. Strong) of Georgia Volunteers, and served from February 8, 1812, to May 22, 1818, in the Florida Indian war.

It is shown by the testimony of Samuel H. Brodnax, Augustus W. Clay, Dr. R. A. Hammonds, and Robert A. England, citizens of Walton and De Kalb Counties, Georgia, that Mrs. Kent is physically unable to do anything towards supporting herself, and the only property possessed by her is a farm of about

\$500 in value, which is mortgaged for all it is worth. This farm is very poor land and only a few acres of it is fit for cultivation, and from this she does not derive enough income to make her comfortable. She has no other source of income.

Your committee believe the case to be a meritorious one, and they therefore return the bill with the recommendation that it do pass, amended so as to allow a pension of \$12 per month; also by striking out the word "Wilcox's," in line 7, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Mann's;" also by striking out the word "twelve," in line 8, and inserting in lieu thereof the word "eighteen."

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. WRIGHT.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12094) for the relief of John W. Wright, of Audrain County, Missouri.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of John M. Wright, of Audrain County, in the State of Missouri, and pay him a pension of \$12.50 per month.

The report (by Mr. NORTON) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12094) granting a pension to John M. Wright, have considered the same and respectfully report as follows:

The claimant was a private in Company F, United States Mounted Rifles, and served from September 15, 1831, to September 15, 1856.

On the 20th of October, 1883, he filed an application in the Pension Bureau declaring that at Fort Merrill, Texas, in 1833, he contracted rheumatism, which continues to affect him to the present time.

The War Department records show that Wright was sick in hospital for a considerable length of time on two different occasions during his term of service, but the hospital records not being on file the nature of his sickness does not appear.

The claim filed at the Pension Bureau was rejected because of the applicant's failure to secure the proof required.

Accompanying the bill is the testimony of Dr. U. V. Williams, of Frankfort, Ky., and that of Jeremiah V. Harrison, Joseph W. Howard, and the claimant, all residents of Audrain County, Missouri, showing that ever since his said military service the claimant has been a sufferer from rheumatism and is now so much disabled thereby as to be able to do only the lightest labor. He does not own a home, and his only means of support is such labor as he and his aged wife are able to do.

The claimant's post-office address is Mexico, Audrain County, Missouri.

In view of the facts recited above, your committee respectfully recommend the passage of the bill, amended, however, by striking out the words "and 50 cents" in line 6 of the bill.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

FRANCES T. DANA.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11244) for the relief of Frances T. Dana.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Frances T. Dana, widow of the late Commander William Starr Dana, of the United States Navy, and to pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month.

Mr. CHEADLE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BOOTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand objection is made to the amount in this bill. The friends of the beneficiary, in order to obviate objection, are willing that it shall be amended by striking out "fifty" and inserting "thirty." I move that amendment.

Mr. MORRILL. Let the report be read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, that amendment will be considered as adopted. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like the report read in that case.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I did not quite understand the statement of the Chair as to the amount proposed in the amendment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The amendment reduces the amount from \$50 to \$30.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. That is right.

The report (by Mr. DE LANO) was read as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11244) granting a pension to Frances T. Dana, widow of the late Commander William Starr Dana, United States Navy, have considered the same and report as follows:

The following report of the service of Commander Dana is compiled from the official records:

William Starr Dana was born in New York, April 20, 1843; entered the Naval Academy, October 23, 1859; graduated, 1863; promoted to the rank of acting ensign, October 1, 1863; ordered to U. S. S. Niagara, North Atlantic Squadron, October 1, 1863; detached from the U. S. S. Niagara, North Atlantic Squadron, February 20, 1864; ordered to U. S. S. Brooklyn, Gulf Blockading Squadron, February 20, 1864; ordered by Admiral Farragut to flagship Hartford, July 11, 1864; ordered north from hospital, Pensacola, September 9, 1864; discharged from Chelsea Hospital, Boston, October 3, 1864; ordered to U. S. S. Lancaster, Pacific Station (flagship), November 18, 1864; ordered to U. S. S. St. Mary's, Pacific Station, March 27, 1865; promoted to master, May 10, 1866; detached from U. S. S. St. Mary's, September 22, 1866; ordered to U. S. S. Aroostook, Asiatic Squadron, December 10, 1866; commissioned lieutenant, February 21, 1867; detached from U. S. S. Aroostook, January 1, 1868; ordered to U. S. S. Shenandoah, Asiatic Squadron, January 1, 1868; commissioned lieutenant commander, March 21, 1868; ordered to U. S. S. Ashuelot, Asiatic Squadron, September 5, 1868; detached from U. S. S. Ashuelot, Asiatic Squadron, December 29, 1869; ordered to U. S. S. Brooklyn, European Squadron, August 15, 1870; ordered to U. S. S. Plymouth, European Squadron, April 10, 1872; detached from U. S. S. Plymouth, European Squadron, June 24, 1873; ordered to U. S. S. Ossipee, Executive, West Indies Squadron, January 24, 1874; detached from U. S. S. Ossipee, August 25, 1875; ordered to receiving ship Colorado, Executive, Brooklyn navy

yard, October 11, 1875; detached from receiving ship Colorado, Executive Brooklyn Navy Yard June 27, 1877; ordered to torpedo instruction, Newport, R. I., June 1, 1878; detached torpedo instruction, Newport, R. I., September 6, 1878; ordered to U. S. S. Shenandoah, Executive, South Atlantic, September 6, 1879; detached from U. S. S. Shenandoah, executive, South Atlantic, October 16, 1881; commissioned commander September 14, 1881; ordered to navy yard, New York, February 1, 1884; detached from navy yard, New York, and ordered to command U. S. S. torpedo ram Alarin, June 30, 1884; detached from U. S. S. torpedo ram Alarin, September 29, 1884; ordered to command U. S. S. Nipsic, South Atlantic, October 14, 1884; detached at the end of her cruise, June 2, 1886; ordered to duty at Naval War College, Newport, R. I., August 6, 1887; detached from Naval War College, Newport, R. I., September 22, 1887; ordered, attendance on torpedo instruction, Newport, R. I., May 1, 1888; detached from attendance on torpedo instruction, Newport, R. I., August 4, 1888; ordered to duty at Naval War College, Newport, R. I., August 6, 1888; detached from duty at Naval War College, Newport, R. I., November 6, 1888.

Commander Dana was promoted to ensign the same year of his graduation, 1863. He was a short time on the Niagara, North Atlantic squadron, and was ordered to the West Gulf blockading squadron June 10, 1864. He was an officer of the Hartford, flagship of Admiral Farragut in Mobile Bay, and assisted in the taking of Forts Morgan, Gaines, and Powell, and the rebel ram Tennessee.

In a general order of the date of July 6, 1864, he received the thanks of the admiral for conspicuous gallantry, and at the battle of August 5 he was again conspicuous for his coolness and bravery.

On February 10, 1866, the thanks of Congress were tendered by a resolution to Vice Admiral David G. Farragut and to the officers, seamen, and marines under his command for the unsurpassed gallantry and skill exhibited by them in the engagement in Mobile Bay on the 5th day of August, 1864.

FLAGSHIP HARTFORD, Mobile Bay, August 6, 1864.

SIR: I have the honor to offer the following report of the part which this vessel took in the action of yesterday: * * *

With this report I inclose those of the executive officer, the officers of the divisions, and of the gunner, carpenter, and sailmakers, and I beg leave to heartily indorse all that is said in them about the officers and men of their respective commands.

I would also beg leave to say, that although there was very considerable loss of life in the powder division, thanks to the good arrangements and example of Ensign Dana, who was in charge of it, there was no confusion. He was also greatly assisted in the afterpart of the division by Sailmaker T. C. Herbert, whose example tended much to give confidence to those around him; he is a most deserving officer. Gunner J. L. Staples and Carpenter George E. Buscham also deserve notice for their strict attention to duty.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

P. DRAYTON, Captain.

Rear Admiral D. G. FARRAGUT,
Commanding So. G. B. Squadron.

NEW YORK, February 28, 1865.

GENTLEMEN: Acting Ensign W. Starr Dana served for about six weeks under my command in the United States steamer Hartford, in the year 1854, and during that time his conduct met with my entire approval. He was in the action of the 5th August, when an entrance was forced into the Bay of Mobile by our fleet, and proved himself on that occasion to possess courage and energy.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

P. DRAYTON,
Captain, United States Navy.

The EXAMINING BOARD FOR THE PROMOTION OF MIDSHIPMEN.

He was executive officer of the United States steamer Shenandoah (flagship) from September 6, 1879, to October 15, 1881, South Atlantic Squadron.

On January 26, 1881, Captain Lewis was detached, and until April 2, 1881, when Captain Kirkland took command, Mr. Dana was in command of the Shenandoah.

On taking command of the Shenandoah, Capt. W. A. Kirkland, in accordance with the regulations of the Navy, made a thorough inspection of the ship, and under date of Montevideo, Uruguay, April 30, 1881, forwarded to Rear Admiral Bryson a detailed report upon the condition of the vessel, discipline of the men, etc., in which he says "everything about the vessel has evidence of unremitting labor and of unceasing vigilance and care on the part of those in authority, and I feel a natural pride in finding myself in command of a man-of-war as near perfection as the exertions of officers and crew could arrive at with the armament furnished by the Government."

In forwarding this report to the Navy Department Rear Admiral Bryson indorsed as follows:

"It is a pleasure to be able to place on the records of the Department the state of the ship commanded by the late Capt. R. F. Lewis, so ably assisted by Lieut. Commander W. S. Dana. The report of Captain Kirkland is approved in full, and it is a satisfaction to me to be able to state that all of Mr. Dana's best energies have been given, as the executive, to the well-being of the vessel."

A copy of this report was sent by the Secretary of the Navy to Lieutenant Commander Dana with the letter on the next page, June 8, 1881.

Possessed of marked qualifications for seamanship, he repeatedly attracted the attention of the Navy Department for the order and discipline of the vessels of which he was the executive officer or commander.

The late Admiral Nicholson, who was an excellent judge in such matters, said of him, "He was a conscientious, painstaking officer."

He was for a time a member of the military order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, and of the Academy of Sciences, of New York.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, June 8, 1881.

SIR: I have the pleasure to transmit a copy of the report, of the 30th of April last, of Capt. W. A. Kirkland, forwarded and indorsed by Rear Admiral Bryson, of the very satisfactory condition of the U. S. S. Shenandoah, which reflects great credit upon you as the executive and for a time the commanding officer.

Very respectfully,

W. H. HUNT, Secretary of the Navy.

Lieut. Commander W. S. DANA,
U. S. S. Shenandoah, South Atlantic Station.

UNITED STATES NAVY YARD,
Pensacola, September 9, 1864.

SIR: A board of medical officers having recommended that you be sent North, you will report to Captain Alden, of the U. S. S. Brooklyn, for a passage in that ship to Boston; and on your arrival there you will report in person to the commandant of that station, and by letter to the honorable Secretary of the Navy.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

U. SMITH,

Commodore, Commanding Navy Yard.

Acting Ensign WM. S. DANA,
Naval Hospital, Navy Yard, Pensacola, Fla.

Reported September 20.

S. H. STRINGHAM, Commandant.

Relative to the date and cause of Commander Dana's death, the following affidavit is submitted:

18 RUE DUPIROT, Paris, France, July 17, 1890.

SIR: I have the honor to inform you that Commander William Starr Dana, of the United States Navy, died at Paris, France, on January 1, 1890, and I hereby certify that he was under my care from about December 23 to the day of his death, and that he died of broncho-pneumonia, following on influenza, and aggravated by chronic malarial poisoning, contracted, I believe, whilst serving as an officer of the United States Navy, in tropical climates.

I have the honor to be, your obedient servant,

A. P. HERBERT.

The SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
United States of America, Washington, D. C.

Sworn to before me, Dr. A. P. Herbert, this 17th day of July, 1890.

[SEAL.]

R. J. PRESTON,
Vice Consul-General.

General Egbert L. Viele, of New York, under date of August 4, 1890, certifies as follows:

"I am well acquainted with Mrs. Frances T. Dana, widow of William Starr Dana, late commander United States Navy, and I know of my own knowledge that she has no property of any kind, either real or personal, and that by the death of her husband she is left without any resources whatever, and is now entirely dependent upon others."

In view of Commander Dana's long and valuable services to his country, and the fact that his widow is left in needy circumstances, your committee think the relief prayed for should be granted. The bill is therefore returned with a favorable recommendation.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. CHEADLE. Is the question on the amendment?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair stated that "if there be no objection the amendment will be adopted." There was no objection, and the amendment was adopted. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

LUCY J. BLANCHARD.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12603) granting a pension to Lucy J. Blanchard, late a volunteer nurse in the United States military service.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll the name of Lucy J. Blanchard, of Syracuse, N. Y., late a volunteer nurse in the United States military service during the war of the rebellion, and pay her at the rate of \$25 per month.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12603) granting a pension to Lucy J. Blanchard, submit the following report: The evidence filed with your committee shows that the beneficiary served as a volunteer army nurse from July 1, 1863, to June 7, 1865; that she is now past seventy years of age, broken down in health, incapacitated to earn her own support by her own labor, and in reduced circumstances.

In view of the practice of this committee, your committee recommend the passage of the bill with an amendment striking out the word "twenty-five," in line 8, and inserting in the place thereof the word "twelve."

The amendment recommended in the report was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

CHRISTIAN C. WHISTLER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7924) granting a pension to Christian C. Whistler.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to place the name of Christian C. Whistler on the pension rolls, subject to the pension laws of the United States, he being the father of William Whistler, who was a member of Company F, Ninth Regiment United States Infantry.

The report (by Mr. PARRETT) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7924) granting a pension to Christian C. Whistler, have considered the same and report as follows:

The claimant is the father of William H. Whistler, who died of starvation on the Greely Arctic Expedition.

William H. Whistler's military record is as follows: He enlisted in Company F, Ninth United States Infantry, at Omaha Barracks, Nebraska, September 4, 1878, and was discharged September 3, 1883, by expiration of term of service. He re-enlisted September 4, 1883, for the same company and regiment and died May 24, 1884, at Camp Clay, Ellesmere Land (south shore of Buchanan Strait), between Cape Sabine and Cooked Hat Island, from action of water on the heart, induced by insufficient nutrition; rank, a private.

The claimant's identity as the father of the soldier is shown by the testimony of Jacob Bowman, William S. Whistler, Joseph A. Sims, and Lewis Gros, citizens of Carroll County, Indiana, and it is further shown by the testimony of the same witnesses that the claimant is poor and in bad health; that he is so much afflicted with asthma as to be able to do but little, if any, manual labor.

The claimant's post office address is Delphi, Carroll County, Indiana. He is now about seventy years of age.

William H. Whistler, the soldier, had never been married. In view of the facts stated above your committee are of the opinion that the bill is meritorious, and the same is hereby returned with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ALLEN S. THATCHER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5319) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Allen S. Thatcher.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Allen S.

Thatcher, late of Company E, Ninth Indiana Volunteers, and to issue to said soldier a certificate of honorable discharge.

The committee recommended an amendment, adding at the end of the bill, after the word "discharge," the words "to date October 1, 1862."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MARY B. CLAYTON.

Mr. CHEADLE. Mr. Speaker, in the case of House bill 11350, for the relief of Mary B. Clayton, passed this evening, I misunderstood it when it was read. I find that it provides for a pension of \$40 per month. In order to be consistent, if I object to one bill of that character I must object to all. I therefore move that the vote by which that bill was passed be reconsidered. I am perfectly willing that any person may receive the largest amount that is allowed by the general law of the land, but I want the rule to be uniform. If the vote be reconsidered, I am perfectly willing that the bill may be amended and passed granting a pension at the rate of \$30 a month.

By unanimous consent, the vote by which the bill was passed was reconsidered. The bill (printed above) was then taken up and amended so as to grant a pension at the rate of \$30 per month. So amended, it was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MARGARET PROCTOR NOYES.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12307) granting a pension to Margaret Proctor Noyes.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension rolls, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Margaret Proctor Noyes, widow of General Edward F. Noyes, late colonel of the Thirty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and brevet brigadier general, at the rate of \$50 per month.

The report (by Mr. YODER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12307) granting a pension to Margaret Proctor Noyes, submit the following report:

Mrs. Margaret Proctor Noyes is the widow of the late General Edward F. Noyes, who died suddenly on September 4, 1890. Edward F. Noyes entered the service as colonel of the Thirty-ninth Ohio Volunteers July 8, 1861, and was honorably mustered out April 22, 1865, on account of loss of leg from gunshot wound received in action near Marietta, Ga., July 4, 1864, and other physical disabilities contracted during his long and faithful services in the Army. He was brevetted brigadier general in March, 1865.

General Noyes's subsequent career was conspicuous and brilliant. He served his State in several capacities until he became its governor. Subsequently he represented with great credit his country as minister plenipotentiary and envoy extraordinary to the Government of France. At the time of his sudden death he served as judge of the superior court of Cincinnati, Ohio.

General Noyes was a constant sufferer from the loss of the leg. There can hardly be any doubt that his heart became affected thereby and that his death was due to heart failure.

The widow is now advanced in years and in fragile health. The property left by General Noyes is heavily mortgaged and much of it unproductive and unsalable, thus affording her an income entirely insufficient to keep her from dependence and want.

In the opinion of your committee the gallant services of her husband during a long period of war entitle Mrs. Noyes to favorable consideration at the hands of the Government, and therefore return the accompanying bill with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. CHEADLE. Mr. Speaker, I am authorized by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CALDWELL], who is not present, to offer an amendment to this bill by striking out "fifty" and inserting "thirty" before the word "dollars;" so as to make the pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

HANNAH L. PALMER.

The next bill on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12797) granting a pension to Hannah L. Palmer.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll the name of Hannah L. Palmer, who served as a hospital nurse during the war of the rebellion, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12797) granting a pension to Hannah L. Palmer, late a hospital nurse in the war of the rebellion, have considered the same, and respectfully submit the following report.

The following is a copy of the report of service received from the War Department:

CASE OF MISS HANNAH PALMER, ARMY NURSE.

The muster rolls of Columbian College General Hospital, Washington, D. C., for May and June, 1864, report H. L. Palmer, female nurse, attached to hospital, April 27, 1864, and she is reported on rolls for July and August, and November and December, 1864, with remark on latter roll: "Final statement made out to include January 10, 1865."

Roll for January and February, 1865, reports H. L. Palmer, female nurse, at-

tached to hospital April 27, 1864, with remark: "Pay due as nurse from December 31, 1864, to January 10, 1865, at 40 cents per day."

No further record has been found.
Respectfully submitted.

F. E. AINSWORTH,

Captain and Assistant Surgeon, United States Army.

RECORD AND PENSION DIVISION, January 3, 1891.

THE SECRETARY OF WAR.

Marvin H. Bacon, of Red Willow County, Nebraska, and Horace A. Parker, of Middlesex County, Massachusetts, knew Miss Palmer during the time of her service as army nurse and testify to the faithful and efficient manner in which she performed her arduous duties.

Dr. William Taylor, late assistant surgeon Eightieth New York Infantry and a physician of good standing at Canastota, N. Y., testifies that he has known Miss Palmer for eighteen years and has frequently prescribed for her; also, that he has recently examined her and finds her suffering from chronic disease of the liver and spleen, the results of malarial poisoning.

The doctor further testifies that the claimant has suffered with the above-named diseases during the whole period of his acquaintance with her, and that she is totally disabled thereby, being unable to do any work by which to gain a livelihood.

Resolutions were unanimously passed December 23, 1890, by the Grand Army of the Republic post at Canastota, N. Y., requesting the passage of this bill and stating that Miss Palmer is liable to become a county charge unless relieved by a special act of Congress.

There are numerous precedents for the proposed legislation, and in view of the claimant's long and faithful service and her disabled and destitute condition, your committee respectfully recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MAJ. GEN. FRANZ SIGEL.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12293) to grant a pension to Major General Franz Sigel.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Franz Sigel, late major general of volunteers in the Union Army, with the pay of a brigadier general of volunteers, from and after the passage of this act.

The report (by Mr. TURNER, of New York) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12293) granting a pension to Maj. Gen. Franz Sigel, submit the following report:

That the beneficiary, whose distinguished service is known to all, is now old and poor and without means of support. Your committee believe that, in view of the many precedents of pensions of equal or greater amount to the widows of officers of far less distinguished service than General Sigel, it is but an act of simple justice to care for this old hero in his old age and poverty. Memorials requesting the passage of this bill have been received by your committee from the various Grand Army of the Republic posts of New York City.

Your committee recommend the bill, as amended, do pass.

A transcript of the military record of General Sigel is subjoined:

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, January 8, 1891.

Statement of the military service of Franz Sigel, of the United States Army, compiled from the records of this office.

He entered the service as colonel, Third Missouri Infantry, May 4, 1861; accepted appointment as brigadier general of volunteers August 28, to rank from May 17, 1861, and was appointed major general of volunteers March 21, 1862. He commanded a brigade in Missouri under General Lyon, and participated in the movement against, and the occupation of, Camp Jackson, Missouri, in the operations against the Confederate forces under Generals Price and McCulloch in Southwestern Missouri, and commanded the forces in the action at Dry Fork, Missouri, July 5, 1861; he commanded a brigade at the battle of Wilson's Creek, Missouri, August 10, 1862, and a division in Missouri from September 30, 1861, to April 4, 1862, participating in the campaigns and several engagements in Missouri and Arkansas to April 4, 1862; on leave to May 31, 1862; commanding division in the Shenandoah Valley to June 29, 1862; the First Corps, Army of Virginia, in the campaign under General Pope, in Virginia, to September 1, 1862 (designation of corps changed to Eleventh Corps in September, 1862); in the defenses of Washington to December 9, 1862, commanding Reserve Grand Division, Army of the Potomac, consisting of the Eleventh and Twelfth Corps, to February 5, 1863, and the Eleventh Army Corps to February 24, 1863; on leave and awaiting orders to July 6, 1863; commanding militia and volunteers assembled at Reading, Pa., and Lehigh district, in department of the Susquehanna, to February 29, 1864; commanding department of West Virginia March 10 to May 21, 1864; commanding Reserve Division, department of West Virginia, to July 8, 1864; on leave and awaiting orders to May 4, 1865, upon which date he resigned.

J. C. KELTON, *Adjutant General.*

The committee recommended an amendment striking out the words "with the pay of a brigadier general of volunteers" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "at the rate of \$100 per month."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

SARAH THOMASSON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was a bill (H. R. 12640) to pension Sarah Thomasson.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Sarah Thomasson, of Prescott, Ark., widow of Beverly D. Thomasson, deceased, who served as third lieutenant, Captain Green's company, Wood's battalion, Georgia Militia, Creek war, 1836, and as first lieutenant Captain Storey's company, First Georgia Infantry, Cherokee war, 1838, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month.

The report (by Mr. PARRETT) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12640) grant-

ing a pension to Sarah Thomasson, have considered the same and respectfully submit the following report:

The claimant's late husband, Beverly D. Thomasson, deceased, served as third lieutenant in Captain Green's company, Wood's Battalion, Georgia Militia, from June 6, 1836, to August 13, 1836, in the Creek Indian war. He was again enrolled May 10, 1838, as first lieutenant in Captain Storey's company of the First Georgia Infantry, and served until June 23, 1838, in the Cherokee Indian war.

It is shown by reliable testimony that Mrs. Thomasson is about sixty-eight years old and so badly crippled as to be unable to walk without the aid of crutches; she has the care of a daughter who is totally blind, and both the mother (this claimant) and daughter are wholly dependent upon relatives for support.

There are numerous precedents for the allowance of pensions by special act to the disabled and dependent widows of the soldiers of the old Indian wars, and your committee therefore return the bill with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MARY S. WHEELER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12386) granting a pension to Mary S. Wheeler.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to restore to the pension roll the name of Mary S. Wheeler, widow of Ambrose M. Burleson, late private of Company I, Fourth Regiment Michigan Cavalry, and pay her a pension hereafter at the rate of \$12 per month.

The report (by Mr. BELKNAP) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12386) granting a pension to Mary S. Wheeler, submit the following report:

The claimant was the widow of Ambrose M. Burleson, late a private in Company I, Fourth Michigan Cavalry, and who died while in the service; killed at Big Shanty Station, Georgia, June 20, 1864. She was pensioned as such widow until her marriage to William H. Wheeler, December 10, 1868.

The said William H. Wheeler died January 10, 1884, leaving her again a widow and in a destitute condition. An abundance of testimony is furnished to substantiate this. She is well advanced in years and in very feeble health and must be dependent upon others not legally bound to her support.

It being a well-established principle to restore pensions of this character, your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ELIZA JANE SAUNDERS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12118) granting a pension to Eliza Jane Saunders.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Eliza Jane Saunders, stepmother of Philip N. Saunders and Jay Saunders, late privates in Company I, Twentieth Michigan Volunteers, as if she was the mother of said Philip N. Saunders and Jay Saunders, and place said Eliza Jane Saunders on the rolls as a dependent mother.

The report (by Mr. BELKNAP) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12118) granting a pension to Eliza Jane Saunders, submit the following report:

It appears from the evidence on file in this claim, and a part of which is made a part of this report, that the claimant was the stepmother of Philip N. Saunders and Jay Saunders, late privates in Company I, Twentieth Michigan Infantry, she having married their father when they were small children and became their mother, in fact, caring for and helping to earn their support.

Philip N. Saunders, the elder of the two sons, died from wounds received in action June 17, 1864, at Petersburg, Va. The younger son served out his term in the Army, but afterwards died from disease contracted in the service.

In 1884 the father made application for pension as dependent father, but died before the claim could be adjudicated, leaving the mother without any means of support. It is in evidence that both of these sons contributed to the support of both father and mother, both before and after their enlistment, and that the applicant is now well advanced in age, with no means of support other than her daily labor.

Believing this a very meritorious case and of a well-established class of claims for special legislation, your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The petition of Eliza Jane Saunders very respectfully shows that she is fifty-eight years of age, a resident of the town of Lee, in Calhoun County, Michigan, and the widow of Arba N. Saunders, late of Lee, who died on the 8th day of February, 1885; that said Arba N. Saunders by his first wife was the father of two sons, Philip N. and Jay Saunders, both of which sons enlisted into Company I, Twentieth Regiment Michigan Volunteers, on the 4th day of August, 1862, for three years or during the war; that said Philip N. was wounded in the ranks before Petersburg on the 17th of June, 1864, and died in the hospital at Washington on the 22d day of June; and that said Jay served out his term of enlistment and was honorably discharged and died in Texas in the month of September, 1885.

She further shows that the said Arba N. Saunders, father, as aforesaid, on or about the 1st day of July, 1834, made and caused to be filed in the Pension Office in Washington his claim for a pension as the dependent father of the said Philip N., as will be seen by reference to the files in claim No. 316965, and such proofs were made that the order was issued requiring the said Saunders to appear before Dr. Henry L. Joy, at Marshall, for examination; that said order, herewith attached, is dated December 9, 1884, and that before he was able to appear before said examining surgeon he lingered along and died, and your petitioner was then advised that as the stepmother of the said Philip and Jay she could not set up any claim as the dependent mother, etc.

Your petitioner further shows that she married the said Arba N. on the 15th day of August, 1850, when the said Philip N. and Jay were mere boys of tender age, just removed from infancy; that she bestowed on them all the tender care and affection of a mother and continued so to do until the time when they enlisted into the Twentieth Regiment as above stated; that these two sons, the oldest of the children, as soon as able, assisted largely by their labor in the support of the family, and did so after enlisting also.

Your petitioner further shows that at the death of her said husband she was left poor, and has been and now is entirely dependent upon her own manual labor for her daily bread; and that although by the letter of the law she is not entitled to a pension as the dependent stepmother, but that in consideration of all the circumstances she is advised that her case is one for the consideration of

Congress, and therefore asks that Congress will grant her such relief as she is entitled to by passing a special act by which her name may be inscribed on the rolls of the Detroit, Mich., agency at the rate fixed by law for dependent widows, and as in duty bound will ever pray, etc.

Lee, Calhoun County, Michigan, September 19, 1890.

ELIZA J. SANDERS.

Witnesses:

W. H. H. MINOT,
SAM'L S. LACY.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

JANE FALK.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12478) granting a pension to Jane Falk.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Jane Falk, of Cloverdale, Mich., widow of Burt D. Van Horn, late of Thirteenth Michigan Battery Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. BELKNAP) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12478) granting a pension to Jane Falk, submit the following report:

The claimant was the widow of Burt Van Horn, a member of the Thirteenth Michigan Light Artillery, and who died while in the service July 1, 1865. She was pensioned as such widow until her remarriage to Peter Falk in December, 1872. Said Peter Falk died in June, 1889, leaving her absolutely penniless. She is sixty years of age, in poor health. She is dependent upon others not legally liable to her support.

In view of the above facts your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

LORAIN M'COOK.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12583) granting a pension to Lorain McCook.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate per month of \$50, the name of Lorain McCook, widow of General Edwin S. McCook, late a captain of Company I, Thirty-first Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and lieutenant colonel and colonel of said regiment, and a brevet major general in the volunteer military service of the United States in the war of the rebellion.

The report (by Mr. YODER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12583) granting a pension to Lorain McCook, submit the following report:

Lorain McCook is the widow of General Edwin S. McCook, who entered the service as captain of volunteers September 18, 1861. He was appointed lieutenant colonel February 16, 1862, and colonel, April 19, 1863. In June, 1863, he is reported absent with leave on account of wound received in action, and in August, 1864, absent sick.

The medical records report him wounded at the battle of Raymond, Miss., May 12, 1863. He was brevetted brigadier general of volunteers March 13, 1865, for gallant and meritorious service during the war, and major general of volunteers (same date) for gallant and meritorious service in the field during the war.

This general was a member of the "Fighting McCook" family, and it is said that no one by that name is drawing a pension, although nearly the entire family lost their lives in the service of the country.

Claimant is now old and in destitute circumstances. Her husband died while governor of Dakota, about 1873. She had some relatives who supported her who are now dead and she has no one to whom she can look for support or maintenance.

In view of all these facts your committee is of the opinion that this is a meritorious bill and recommend its passage.

Mr. HEADLE. To this bill I make the same objection I have made to others.

Mr. JASON B. BROWN. I appeal to my colleague to let this bill go through at \$30 a month.

Mr. HEADLE. I am perfectly willing.

Mr. JASON B. BROWN. I think the amount of pension ought to be \$50 a month, but it is now late in the session, and we will try to get an increase in the next Congress.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection the amendment, to strike out \$50 and insert \$30, will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

SUSAN WOOD.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12647) granting a pension to Susan Wood.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, directed to place the name of Susan Wood, a dependent sister of the late Isaac J. Wood, private in Company C, One hundred and Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, on the pension roll, subject to the limitations and provisions of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. YODER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12647) granting a pension to Susan Wood, submit the following report:

Claimant, Susan Wood, is the sister of Isaac J. Wood, late a private in Company C, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and who had also served in the three months' service.

On December 6, 1864, he was taken prisoner and confined at Andersonville, where he remained until a few days of his death, April 17, 1865, when he lost his life on the ill-fated steamer Sultana.

He was during his life and while in the service the main support of his mother and his invalid sister, Susan Wood, who has been an invalid for the past thirty-

two years. For the last seventeen years she has been confined to her bed most of the time. Except during the time he was in prison he sent his pay home by and through Lieut. John Eddie, of the same company and regiment, to his mother and said invalid sister. After his death his mother, Rebecca Wood, drew a pension through him until the time of her death. This pension was the main support of herself and the said Susan. The mother died in 1873, and since that time the said Susan has been supported by charity and her relatives, who are very poor.

The soldier never was married. The claimant is forty years of age. Her father died in 1877. He was a bad cripple and an invalid, who could do nothing for the support of his family, he having been a soldier in the war of 1812, and drew a small pension for such service until he died.

H. W. Carter, M.D., the attending physician of claimant, testifies that he had been her attending physician for twenty years, and testifies to her helpless condition and that she is permanently disabled.

There is no one now drawing a pension on account of the soldier's death and service, and according to precedent established by your committee, we recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ANNIE B. PETTIGREW.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12244) granting a pension to Annie B. Pettigrew.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay Annie B. Pettigrew, dependent daughter of Henry J. Pettigrew, Company E, Third New Hampshire Regiment, a pension of \$12 per month.

The report (by Mr. FLICK) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12244) granting a pension to Annie B. Pettigrew, submit the following report:

Annie B. Pettigrew is the daughter of Henry J. Pettigrew, who served in Company E, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteers, from August 16, 1861, to July 20, 1865, when honorably mustered out. He died November 11, 1867, of chronic diarrhea, contracted in service, and his widow was placed upon the pension roll, and continued to draw pension until her remarriage in 1876.

The proposed beneficiary is about thirty years of age. From the statements of the selectmen of the town in which she resides and the testimony of reputable physicians it appears that she is without property or means of subsistence and by reason of physical disability incapacitated to earn a support. Her disability is described as chronic inflammation of all the structures of joints, or rheumatic arthritis; the right knee is completely ankylosed, with limbs contracted; the left knee nearly stiff, left elbow entirely ankylosed, and the right partially; wrists involved, jaws stiff and incapable of free movement; back and shoulders in the incipient stage of the disease; is unable to move about without crutches. The disease is incurable. She is highly respected for her moral worth by all who know her.

Following a long line of precedents, your committee are of opinion that the relief asked for should be granted, and therefore report favorably on the bill and ask that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

FREDERICK SLAWSON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 4506) granting a pension to Frederick Slawson.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Frederick Slawson, dependent father of Charles B. Slawson, late captain of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry.

The report (by Mr. FLICK) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4506) granting a pension to Frederick Slawson, submit the following report:

Your committee adopt the report of the Senate committee, as prepared by Senator DAVIS, which is as follows:

"The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4506) granting a pension to Frederick Slawson, examined the same, and report:

"Charles B. Slawson, of Waukesha, Wis., enlisted in the Twenty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Infantry Volunteers in August, 1862, and was commissioned second lieutenant Company B of that regiment.

"He served from that time until the end of the war, and was discharged as captain of the same company. He was a brave and faithful soldier. While in the military service, he did, to the personal knowledge of the writer of this report, contribute out of his pay to the support of his father, Frederick Slawson, and after his discharge from the service rendered similar assistance.

"Captain Slawson died in St. Paul, Minn., August 14, 1879, leaving no property. His widow remarried without ever applying for a pension.

"Frederick Slawson is now seventy-four years of age. He has been industrious and a man of good habits all of his life, but is now old, sick, and poor. The object of this bill is to place him upon the pension roll, subject to the limitations of the pension laws, as the dependent father of Charles B. Slawson, and the passage of the bill is recommended."

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE A. PERKINS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 3976) granting a pension to George A. Perkins.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George A. Perkins, late a private in Company A, One hundred and eleventh Regiment New York Volunteers, and pay him a pension of \$24 a month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The report (by Mr. PERKINS) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3976) granting a pension to George A. Perkins, submit the following report.

Your committee adopt the report of the Senate committee, as follows: "The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3976) granting a pension to George A. Perkins, have examined the same and report:

"This applicant is now in receipt of a pension of \$16 a month for gunshot wounds of left leg and results, and asks that this pension be increased to \$24. He has applied to the Pension Office for such increase, and his application has been rejected three times. There is no question about the incurrence of the disabilities claimed in line of duty, and the only point involved is whether such disabilities entitle the claimant to a higher rating than \$16.

"The evidence furnished by the board of examining surgeons discloses the following objective conditions: 'Six inches above the left heel is a large cicatrix, result of shell wound, and sloughing. It is 4 inches long by 3 inches wide, irregular, bridled, red, very tender, slightly movable, deeply depressed, owing to great loss of substance. Immediately above scar there is a great bunch of muscular tissue, also a small bunch below. Heel is slightly elevated; ankle joint impaired in motion about 40 per cent., and two-thirds of an inch larger than the right; knee slightly flexed on thigh, about 10 per cent.; foot is covered with varicose veins size of a lead pencil; leg below and above scar presents varicose veins size little finger.

"Over center of upper third of crest of left tibia is a linear scar, purple, depressed, slightly attached, tender; result of shell wound. A little below and to the outer side of scar last described is a third scar, a bullet wound. There exists considerable tenderness in parts adjacent to wounds. The outer side of foot and leg is nearly completely anesthetic. Power of limb impaired about 50 per cent. His combined disabilities are not quite equal to the loss of a hand or foot, but are equal to twenty-thirtieths."

"The law recognizes no such rating as twenty-thirtieths, but the above examination shows claimant's disabilities nearly equal to the loss of a hand or foot, and your committee recommend the passage of the bill."

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHANNA TEUBNER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 4507) granting a pension to Johanna Teubner.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Johanna Teubner, widow of Augustus C. Teubner, late captain of Company G, One hundred and sixty-third Regiment New York Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate provided by law for a captain's widow.

The report (by Mr. FLICK) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4507) granting a pension to Johanna Teubner, submit the following report:

This bill passed the Senate December 20, 1890, and for report thereon your committee adopt the report of the Senate Committee, which is as follows:

"The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4507) granting a pension to Johanna Teubner, have examined the same and report:

"The petitioner in this case applied for pension under the general law, as the widow of Capt. Augustus C. Teubner, but her claim was rejected on the following grounds:

"The name of Augustus C. Teubner is not borne on the register of the commissioned officers of the One hundred and sixty-third New York Volunteers. This regiment had but six companies, A to F, inclusive. Company G was never organized. The battalion was consolidated with the Seventy-third New York in January, 1863. Although the alleged officer may have been commissioned by the governor of his State, there is no provision of law under which pension would be allowed in his case."

"Under the order of the Secretary of War authorizing General Spinola to raise a brigade the claimant's husband, Augustus C. Teubner, proceeded to recruit a company, and on or about the 15th of September, 1862, he had recruited eighty-nine men ready for active service, as appears by the muster-in roll of said battalion on file in this case, and he was commissioned as captain by Governor Horatio Seymour, as appears by the commission also on file. Before the company could be mustered into the United States service, however, Teubner, as a result of his overexertion and anxiety in performing these services, was taken suddenly sick with brain fever, which disease developed into softening of the brain, from which he died at Blackwell's Island Insane Asylum, January 15, 1863. His company was accordingly consolidated with the Seventy-third New York and mustered in as a part of said regiment at just about this time.

"Your committee, considering these facts: That Teubner collected a full complement of men for a company, was commissioned and mustered by the State, and had his company all ready for muster into the United States service; that said company was actually mustered into such service, but that, in consequence of his illness and death, said Teubner was unable to be mustered as captain; and that the widow, now sixty-five years of age, finds herself without the means of support, recommend the passage of this bill."

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISAAC F. QUINBY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12841) granting an increase of pension to General Isaac F. Quinby.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Isaac F. Quinby, late a brevet major general in the Army of the United States, at the rate of \$72 per month; said pension to be in lieu of that which he now receives.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12841) granting an increase of pension to General Isaac F. Quinby, submit the following report:

General Quinby graduated from the West Point Military Academy July 1, 1843. He served with the Second United States Artillery until promoted full second lieutenant, when transferred to the Third Artillery; went with his command to Mexico, having been promoted to first lieutenant, and resigned his commission March 16, 1852.

Again entered the service as colonel of the Thirteenth New York Volunteers, May 14, 1861; was appointed brigadier general of volunteers, commander of the district of Mississippi, and subsequently the seventh division of the Seventeenth Army Corps. During this service he contracted chronic diarrhea and malarial poisoning, which necessitated his retirement from the Army on December 31, 1863. He is now a pensioner for said disabilities at the rate of \$30 per month, the highest rate allowable under the law until he becomes totally helpless therefrom.

General Quinby's condition is more fully set forth in the affidavit of Dr. Charles S. Starr, of Rochester, N. Y., a physician of good repute. The physician states:

"At various times since December 14, 1858, I have made careful physical ex-

amination of his condition and have always found existing marked chronic bronchitis, a weak pulse with undoubted organic disease of the heart (I think angina pectoris), in addition to poor digestion, evidently from chronic catarrhal disease of the stomach. Together with all the above he at all times exhibited a distinct rheumatic tendency, as all his symptoms are made worse by sudden changes of temperature or the occurrence of dampness in the atmosphere. At various times since 1858 he has suffered from severe attacks of dyspnea most severe and most prolonged at night.

"During these seizures he apparently suffers great pain, described by him as occurring mainly in the left side and running down the left arm; he is unable to lie down, sits gasping for breath, raises large amounts of thick, tenacious sputum, quite frequently largely intermixed with blood (evidently capillary), these attacks always requiring the most prompt and energetic treatment to afford him any relief. I regard these asthmatic paroxysms as being both of a pulmonary and cardiac origin. For six months past he has done nothing, and several times lately when I have seen him on his infrequent appearance in the public streets, on which occasions he has not seen me, I have noticed that he walks with a very faltering, feeble gait.

"During the last few months his general condition has greatly and steadily changed for the worse. Takes but very little nourishment except milk. The necessity of constant personal care and the necessity of being cared for becomes more and more apparent."

General Quinby is now utterly disabled from engaging in business pursuits, receives the attention of medical advisers continually, and in a large measure is dependent upon others to attend to his ordinary physical wants. He asks that his pension be increased to meet the expenses of such medical and other attention.

His long and faithful service in two wars surely entitles General Quinby to the most favorable consideration at the hands of Congress. Being over seventy years of age and entirely broken in health from exposure in service, he can not at best long need the assistance he seeks to get.

Your committee are of opinion that the relief asked for should be granted, and therefore report favorably on the accompanying bill and ask that it do pass, amended, however, by striking out the words "one hundred," in line 7, and insert therein instead the word "seventy-two."

The amendment reported by the committee, to strike out "\$100," in line 7, and insert "\$72," was read.

Mr. BAKER. I trust that this amendment will be disagreed to and the pension of \$100 a month allowed, as proposed in the bill. The circumstances of the case are familiar to me, as General Quinby lives in my city. At the time of the breaking out of the war he was a professor in the Rochester University. He was a classmate of General Grant at West Point. In the Yazoo Pass campaign he contracted disease and disability which to-day render him, at seventy years of age, utterly helpless, so that he requires almost constant medical care. He has a large family dependent mainly upon him for support. He is unable to provide for them, being himself largely dependent upon charity. I know his circumstances, and I know that if the House understood the case as I understand it and as it is stated in the report, there would be no objection to making this pension \$100 per month.

Mr. MCCLAMMY. I earnestly hope the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] will be acceded to. I feel an interest in this case, for I know it to be a worthy one. I hope the amendment of the committee will be rejected.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ANN MARIA BULLOCK SCHRAM.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12835) granting a pension to Ann Maria Bullock Schram.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Ann Maria Bullock Schram, a resident of Fort Plain, N. Y., at the rate of \$15 per month, on account of disability resulting from disease contracted while serving as a hospital nurse during the war of the rebellion.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12835) granting a nurse's pension to Ann Maria Bullock Schram, submit the following report:

In September, 1861, certain patriotic citizens of Amsterdam, N. Y., where the claimant then resided, assisted her to proceed to the front for the purpose of rendering aid as a volunteer nurse in army hospitals.

She alleges that she first went to Burkittsville, Md., but finding that the hospital had been removed to Frederick, Md., reported for duty there, and was assigned by the medical staff as hospital nurse to duty in Camp B, outside of Frederick City, among wounded and sick soldiers removed thither from South Mountain and Antietam. That she served as nurse in such hospital, ministering to, caring for, and nursing the sick and wounded soldiers there for about eight months, without pay and defraying her own expenses, including her board outside of the hospital at \$5 a week, and frequently furnishing, at her own expense, to convalescent, and other sick and wounded soldiers, necessaries for which army regulations did not provide.

The exposure incident to camp life and her untiring work among the sick and wounded culminated in the contraction of piles, a disability which rendered her unfit for duty and caused her, upon the advice of the surgeon in charge, to return home. This disability has continued ever since, and has caused her much suffering, and greatly impaired her ability to earn her living.

Affidavits are submitted by Charles F. Haynes, M. D., late surgeon and brevet lieutenant colonel United States Volunteers, who was the surgeon in charge of Camp B general hospital at Frederick, Md., substantiating claimant's statements as to her services there as well as to the contraction of her disability while so serving, and also stating:

"She rendered faithful and meritorious service, and was kind, sympathetic, and untiring in her efforts to relieve the sufferings of all who came within her immediate supervision."

Evidence is also furnished by Douglas Ayres, M. D., of Fort Plain, N. Y., as to her disability at the present time.

In accordance with their custom where nurses were deserving and served without pay, the committee recommend the passage of the bill, with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "fifteen," in line 6, and insert in the place thereof the word "twelve."

The amendment reported by the committee, to strike out "\$15," in line 6 and insert "\$12," was read, and agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

HENRY A. HOAR.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6259) granting a pension to Henry A. Hoar.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Henry A. Hoar, a member of the Indiana Legion.

The report (by Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6259) granting a pension to Henry A. Hoar, submit the following report:

In the month of July, 1863, during the war of the rebellion, General John Morgan, in command of Confederate forces, crossed the Ohio River from the State of Kentucky and invaded the State of Indiana with his command and passed into and through the county of Washington in said State. That as said General John Morgan was marching toward Salem, the county seat of said county of Washington, with his command this claimant at once enlisted in a company of men under command of Capt. Burr Vance, which had been raised to resist General Morgan's invasion, and if possible drive him back, and render such aid to the Federal troops who were in pursuit as was possible.

That on the 10th day of July, 1863, an engagement took place between the Confederate forces, under the command of General John Morgan, and the citizens' Union forces, under the command of General James A. Cravens, near the said town of Salem, Ind., the Confederate forces making an effort to take and occupy that town. That during said engagement, and while said Henry A. Hoar was a member of Capt. Burr Vance's company of citizen volunteers, and while he was in discharge in his duty and obeying orders, and aiding in resisting the invasion of the Confederate troops, he was shot in the left side by some one of the enemy. That he fell from his horse, was carried to a house near by, and three days afterward the ball was extracted.

That he never recovered from said wound, and is now in poor health in consequence of it, and is more than two-thirds disabled, and will be disabled all his life. Those facts appear from the affidavits of the said Henry A. Hoar and Benjamin F. Wibel, who was with him at the time he received his injury, and the statement of Hon. JASON B. BROWN, who personally knows him and saw him as late as October last.

That in the year 1887 Henry A. Hoar applied to the Pension Department for a pension, on the grounds of having received said injury in the manner before stated, and furnished evidence in support of his claim. That on April 8, 1888, his claim for pension was rejected by the Pension Department on the ground that the records of the War Department failed to show that he was ever enlisted in the military service of the United States, as will be seen by reference to the letter of General John C. Black, then Commissioner of Pensions.

Your committee therefore report back the bill and recommend its passage with an amendment allowing him a pension of \$50 per month.

The amendment reported by the committee, striking out the words "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws" and adding to the bill the words "and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month," was read.

Mr. CHEADLE. Is it proposed in this case to make the pension \$50 a month?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This pension is for a soldier, not a soldier's widow.

Mr. CHEADLE. That is all right. I make no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. BUSSABARGER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6262) granting a pension to John W. Bussabarger.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John W. Bussabarger, a drafted man who was forced to report while sick, and was deprived of his hearing in consequence thereof.

The report (by Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6262) granting a relief to John W. Bussabarger, submit the following report:

The facts as made to appear by the affidavit of Dr. H. S. Wolfe and the statements of Hon. H. M. Stockslager and Hon. JASON B. BROWN, M. C., are briefly these:

In February, 1865, John W. Bussabarger, the claimant, was attacked with a severe attack of spinal meningitis, from which he partially recovered. That after his partial recovery he was drafted into the Army of the United States and reported in obedience to such draft at Jeffersonville, Ind., before he was able to properly do so, by which he was thrown into a relapse and was unable to be mustered into the service of the United States. That he never recovered from such relapse, but has become entirely deaf and has almost entirely lost his power of speech. That he is advanced in years, unable to do manual labor, has a family, and is in great need of assistance.

Your committee therefore report the bill back with a favorable recommendation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

LYDIA P. HOLMES.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12946) granting a pension to Lydia P. Holmes.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Lydia P. Holmes, of Athens, Somerset County, Maine, mother of William L. Holmes, late of Company I, First Regiment Maine Heavy Artillery Volunteers, at the rate of—dollars per month.

The report (by Mr. NUTE) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12946) granting a pension to Lydia P. Holmes, submit the following report:

Lydia P. Holmes is the mother of William L. Holmes, who served as private in Company I, First Maine Heavy Artillery, from December 23, 1863, until January 14, 1865, when discharged upon surgeon's certificate of disability arising from amputation of right leg from wound received in battle May 19, 1864. William L. Holmes was a pensioner for said loss of leg and died April 8, 1887, leaving neither widow nor minor child surviving him. He made his home with his parents and the pension received by him was used for their support. Since his death they have been supported by charity.

Lydia P. Holmes is eighty-two and her husband, the soldier's father, eighty-six years of age. She has no title under the general law, because the soldier's death-cause can not be traced directly to his military service.

Your committee are of opinion that the case is highly meritorious, and therefore report favorably on the accompanying bill and ask that it do pass, amended, however, by striking out all after the word "volunteers" in line 7.

The amendment of the committee striking out the words "at the rate of—dollars per month" was read and agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES D. HANSCOM.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12714) granting a pension to Charles D. Hanscom.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles D. Hanscom, late of Company I, Second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of \$36 per month, in lieu of the pension which he is now receiving.

The report (by Mr. LAWS) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12714) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Hanscom, submit the following report:

Beneficiary is now drawing a pension of \$24 a month for wounds received in battle. He is now suffering from complete anchylosis of hip joint; suffers continuously, and is unable to perform manual labor to any considerable extent. Claimant is a man of good habits, has a family to support, and is without stated income except his present pension.

Your committee are of opinion that claimant's disability is equivalent to loss of a limb above knee joint, and that he is entitled to the pension asked for, and therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE W. BRYANT.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12984) granting a pension to George W. Bryant.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of George W. Bryant, late a corporal in Company H, Eighth New Hampshire Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month on and after the passage of this act.

The report (by Mr. TURNER, of New York) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12984) granting a pension to George W. Bryant, submit the following report:

That the beneficiary was a clergyman of the Methodist Church who resigned his charge and enlisted in the Eighth New Hampshire Infantry as a private.

While on Ship Island he contracted fever and scurvy, and as a result lost his teeth. That no hospital records were kept at that place and he can not prove incurrence of this injury. He was made corporal for gallant conduct and was detailed with about forty others to make a forced march to Manchoque Pass and destroy rebel stores, and on this march suffered injury to feet, from which injury he still suffers.

His claim can not now be proved up in the Pension Office for the reason that no single soldier can be found now living who accompanied him on that expedition.

After his return from the army, where he served three years, he was unable, by reason of the condition of his mouth, to resume his profession as a preacher, and has lived by manual labor ever since. He is now sixty-four years old, unable to do any kind of work, and in abject poverty.

The condition of the beneficiary is personally known to the writer of this report, as well as the high character of the man himself. He states of his own knowledge that the claimant's feet are covered with ulcers, and that these are the result of his army service is shown by the affidavit of John W. Herbst and Capt. B. F. Wells, both well known to the writer.

In view of the above your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MARY A. MCKEE.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12639) granting a pension to Mary A. McKee.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. Mary A. McKee, for her services as army nurse during the late war of the rebellion, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 a month.

The report (by Mr. BELKNAP) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12639) granting a pension to Mary A. McKee, submit the following report:

The claimant, Mary A. McKee, was appointed an army nurse by authority of Miss Dix in the year 1862, and served as such in various hospitals until January, 1866, about four years in all, rendering constant and valuable service to the sick and wounded. She is a widow, fifty-seven years of age, very poor, and unable longer to earn her support, and must soon be dependent upon charity.

A statement made by the adjutant general, State of New Jersey, and one made by John W. Ward, superintendent of the New Jersey State Lunatic Asylum, is appended hereto and made a part of this report.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY, OFFICE OF ADJUTANT-GENERAL,
Trenton, December 12, 1890.

GENTLEMEN: In the matter of pension to Mrs. Mary A. McKee, I have personal knowledge of the petitioner herein mentioned, who is an applicant for pension by special act of Congress. She has for a long time been a trusted and competent attendant at the New Jersey Lunatic Asylum, at Trenton, of which I have the honor to be one of the board of managers.

The applicant entered this service after her discharge from hospital work, soon after the close of the war of the rebellion, and has been attached thereto ever since. I am informed that she is in failing health and will by reason of an increase of her physical disabilities—which I have every reason to believe is the result of arduous work and exposure consequent upon service as an army nurse—become a charge on some one, she being without other means of support than her daily labor. She is spoken of as having been very efficient during her hospital career and service as nurse under Miss Dix.

From information received from the authorities of the New Jersey asylum, in whose service she has been for many years, and the fact that this service, by reason of infirmities, will certainly in a short time terminate and her dependence commence, I am of the opinion that this case, which has so much merit in it, which in the absence of a general law granting pensions to this class of our people can not be passed upon by the Pension Office, deserves the recognition of Congress in an early passage of this bill.

Very respectfully,

WILLIAM S. STRYKER,
Adjutant General.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

NEW JERSEY STATE LUNATIC ASYLUM,
Trenton, December 10, 1890.

MY DEAR SIR: Mrs. Mary A. McKee, whose statement in regard to her services in the Army accompanies this note, has been employed as housekeeper in this asylum continuously since February 14, 1865. She was employed as a nurse during the war, and I have frequently heard the late Miss D. L. Dix speak of her as one of her most faithful and valuable aids. While in the employ of this institution she has always been faithful in the performance of her duties, entirely reliable, and of excellent moral character.

For some months past she has suffered from serious cardiac disease and also from varicose veins of the lower extremities, which considerably impair her ability to fully perform the work assigned her. She is an excellent woman and fully deserves the pension which she seeks.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN W. WARD,
Superintendent of Asylum.

General WILLIAM S. STRYKER.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARY M'INTOSH.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 3957) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary McIntosh.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of \$17 now received by Mrs. Mary McIntosh, widow of First Lieut. Donald McIntosh, Seventh Cavalry, United States Army, to \$30 per month during her natural lifetime, to take effect from and after the passage of this act.

The report (by Mr. SCULL) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3957) increasing the pension of Mrs. Mary McIntosh, have considered the same and report: Said bill is accompanied by Senate Report No. 1439, which your committee adopt as their report and return the bill, recommending its passage.

[Senate Report No. 1439, Fifty-first Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3957) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Mary McIntosh, have examined the same, and report:

First Lieut. Donald McIntosh was one of the officers killed at the memorable Custer massacre at the Little Big Horn River June 25, 1876. At the time of his death and for some years previously, Lieutenant McIntosh had been acting captain commanding Troop G of the Seventh Cavalry. The widows of officers who fell in that action have been pensioned by special acts, as follows:

Elizabeth C. Custer, widow of General George A. Custer, \$50 a month.
Annie Gibson Yates, widow of Capt. George W. Yates, \$35 per month, with \$2 per month additional for each of three children.
Maria Custer, mother of Capt. Thomas W. Custer, \$20 per month.
Emanuel H. Custer, father of Captain Custer, \$50 per month.
Eliza F. Porter, widow of Lieut. James E. Porter, \$30 per month.
Grace Harrington, widow of Second Lieut. Henry M. Harrington, \$15 per month under the general law and by special act \$30 per month for two children under sixteen years of age.

Other wives of second lieutenants, including Mrs. McIntosh, who, as stated, was the wife of an acting captain, have been pensioned under the general law at \$17 per month. The precedent is in favor of granting the increase recommended by the committee.

The tragic nature of the conflict which robbed these women and children of protectors is so well known that it is unnecessary to dwell upon it. The number of beneficiaries is few, the circumstances peculiar, and your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

A. L. SCHUYLER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7327) for the relief of the legal representatives of P. S. Schuyler, deceased.

The bill was read, as follows:

Whereas P. S. Schuyler, late a captain in the Second Michigan Cavalry, was at the time of his death, on March 21, 1879, a pensioner under certificate numbered 124753; and

Whereas said time said pensioner was justly entitled to arrears of pension and for which in July, 1879, an arrears pension certificate was issued in ignorance of his death, but which has not been paid; and

Whereas said P. S. Schuyler left no widow or children under the age of sixteen years surviving him: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to pay the amount of said arrears pension certificate of said P. S. Schuyler, deceased.

Amend the title so as to read "A bill for the relief of the heirs of P. S. Schuyler, deceased."

The report (by Mr. FLICK) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7327) for the relief of the legal representatives of P. S. Schuyler, deceased, having examined and considered the same, report the same back with the recommendation that it be amended by striking out the words "legal representatives" in the title to said bill and inserting in lieu thereof the word "heirs," and the words "to the legal representatives," in line 5 of said bill, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "to A. B. Schuyler, the only living child and sole heir," and that as thus amended it do pass. The several increases of this bill correctly state the facts, and there seems to be no reason why this money should not be paid.

It was earned by the soldier and equitably belonged to him, and the Government has no just claim to it or right to withhold it from his heirs. This principle has been fully recognized by Congress time and time again, and it did so in the pension appropriation act approved March 1, 1889, and this case only technically falls without the wording of that act by reason of the death of the soldier just before rather than just after the issuance of the arrears-of-pension certificate. We suggest the amendment making it payable to the heir rather than the representatives of the deceased soldier, in analogy to the laws mentioned, which so do in effect.

The amendment recommended by the committee was adopted. Mr. WALTER I. HAYES. The name of the beneficiary in this amendment is incorrectly printed. It should be A. L. in place of A. B. Schuyler, and I move to amend the body of the bill and the title.

The amendment was adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed. The title was amended to conform.

LEWIS D. TERRY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12704) granting a pension to Lewis D. Terry.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be authorized, and is hereby directed, to place upon the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Lewis D. Terry, late a member of Capt. Joe McClintock's company of State Guards.

The report (by Mr. WILSON, of Kentucky) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12704) granting a pension to Lewis D. Terry, submit the following report:

Lewis D. Terry was a member of a home-guard company of Cynthiana, Ky., under command of Capt. Joseph B. McClintock, when, on the 17th of July, 1862, said town was attacked by the Confederate forces under General John Morgan. There were but three companies of the Eighteenth Kentucky Volunteers garrisoning the place.

The home-guard company aforesaid, together with Lewis Terry, were called into action, and during the engagement the latter received a gunshot wound of left leg between the hip and knee, as is fully established by the testimony of Captain McClintock and Dr. J. A. Lair, who treated Lewis D. Terry immediately after the battle. Two balls struck the thigh, one of which still remains deeply seated in the muscles.

Had Terry applied for a pension prior to July 4, 1874, he would have long since been enjoying a pension. But the application therefor was not filed until subsequent to that date, and he can not now be pensioned under the general law because of the provisions of paragraph 3, section 4693, Revised Statutes.

The case comes clearly within the well-established rule of Congress, to pension volunteers and State militiamen for wounds or injuries received in action with the enemy who have failed to establish their claims within the prescribed period, and therefore report favorably on the accompanying bill and ask that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

SARAH A. PHELPS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 10990) granting a pension to Sarah A. Phelps.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension rolls, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sarah A. Phelps, widow of William L. Odell, late of Company E, Second Tennessee Regiment Volunteers, the said Sarah A. Phelps having, after the death of William L. Odell, married William A. Phelps, who died on the 25th day of October, 1887.

The report (by Mr. WILSON, of Kentucky) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10990) granting a pension to Sarah A. Phelps, submit the following report:

Sarah A. Phelps was first married to William L. Odell, who died while serving as private in Company E, Second Regiment Tennessee Volunteers. She received pension until her remarriage with one William A. Phelps, whereupon the soldier's children were placed upon the pension roll and drew pension until the younger became sixteen years of age, January 17, 1877, since which date no pension has been paid to any one on account of the services and death of William L. Odell.

Mrs. Phelps has again become a widow, October 25, 1887; she is now well advanced in years, in feeble health and without income except that derived from her daily labor. She therefore asks Congress to again place her on the pension roll.

The precedents for favorable action in similar cases are numerous; therefore your committee return the accompanying bill with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

NANCY JANE KNETSAR.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13080) granting a pension to Nancy Jane Knetsar.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll the name of Nancy Jane

Knetsar, widow of James Knetsar, who was a soldier in Capt. Daniel Powell's company in the first regiment, commanded by Col. Hosea Pierce, in the Black Hawk war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The report (by Mr. SMYSE) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13080) granting a pension to Nancy Jane Knetsar, have considered the same and respectfully submit the following report:

At the first session of the present Congress your committee favorably reported to the House a bill (H. R. 3528) granting a pension to James Knetsar, the husband of this claimant, and the report on that bill is made a part of this report, as follows:

"The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3528) granting a pension to James Knetsar, have considered the same, and report:

"The claimant was a private in Capt. Daniel Powell's company, Third Regiment, Second Brigade, Illinois Volunteers, Black Hawk war, from June 19, 1832, to August 2, 1832, as shown by the records of Second Auditor's Office, Treasury Department.

"The claimant in his petition for a pension for said service swears that he was born December 23, 1814, in White County, Kentucky; consequently he is now past seventy-five years old.

"Twenty-six of the leading citizens of the claimant's home (Moline, Ill.) petition Congress to grant the relief contemplated by the bill, and they state that they have known the claimant for many years as a hard-working, honorable, and honest citizen.

"It is also stated by reliable persons that the claimant is in a condition of almost absolute poverty.

"There are many precedents for the allowance of pensions to the aged survivors of the old Indian wars, and your committee report the bill back, recommending its passage."

The bill granting a pension to James Knetsar became a law September 27, 1890, and he died January 1, 1891, leaving a widow (this claimant) without any means of support.

The passage of the bill to pension Mrs. Knetsar is respectfully recommended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MARY WILLIAMS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12614) granting a pension to Mary Williams.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Mary Williams, widow of Curtis Williams, late a soldier in the Black Hawk war, in the company of Captain George B. Willis, Fortieth Regiment, Fourth Brigade, First Division, Illinois soldiers, on the pension roll, to be paid a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The report (by Mr. HILL) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12614) granting a pension to Mary Williams, have considered the same and report:

The claimant's late husband, Curtis Williams, deceased, was a private in Capt. George B. Willis's company of the Fortieth Regiment of Illinois Volunteers, and served twenty-two days in the Black Hawk war of 1832. This service is a matter of record in the office of the Second Auditor, United States Treasury.

The claimant is now eighty-six years old, and so poor that the town in which she resides contributes to her support from the public funds. She is also shown to be a very worthy woman. Her post-office address is Annawan, Henry County, Illinois.

The passage of the bill is recommended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ELENDER JOHNSTON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12147) to grant a pension to Elender Johnston.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Elender Johnston, widow of Joseph Johnston, ensign of the company of Capt. J. W. Redding, in the regiment commanded by Col. Alexander Russel, in the Black Hawk war, in May, 1832, and to pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The report (by Mr. HILL) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12147) granting a pension to Elender Johnston, have considered the same and report as follows:

The claimant is the widow of Joseph Johnston, who served for thirty days as an ensign in Capt. John W. Redding's company of the Fortieth Indiana Regiment of militia in the Black Hawk war of 1832. Johnston's service is a matter of record in the office of the Second Auditor, United States Treasury.

Testimony accompanying the bill shows the death on February 3, 1838, of the soldier and the identity of the claimant as his widow.

A. W. Boyden and Anthony Morrasy, citizens in high standing of the town of Sheffield, Ill., swear that the claimant is over eighty years of age, and has no means of support, but is dependent upon relatives.

The passage of the bill is respectfully recommended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

CAROLINE E. GRAY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7394) granting a pension to Caroline E. Gray.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Caroline E. Gray, an army nurse during the late war of the rebellion, and pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

The report (by Mr. LANE) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7394) granting a pension to Caroline E. Gray, submit the following report:

The committee find from the evidence that the complainant was appointed an army nurse on July 21, 1863, and served as such for more than one year, and that she is now depending on her daily labor for her support. She is fifty-six years old and unfit for labor, and has no other means of support.

Your committee recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

HANNAH C. REID.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12195) to pension Hannah C. Reid.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll the name of Hannah C. Reid, widow of Henry C. Reid, late a private in Company D, Forty-third Battalion New York Volunteers, and to pay her a pension of \$12 a month.

The report (by Mr. YODER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12195) granting a pension to Hannah C. Reid, submit the following report:

Claimant is the widow of Henry C. Reid, who was a member of Company D, Forty-third Regiment New York Volunteers.

The records in the War Department show that such soldier was enrolled September 13, 1862, and mustered out a private January 27, 1865.

He has been absent for twenty years, and by affidavits on file by his former comrades and the testimony of neighbors, the fact is established that he is and has all this time been dead these twenty years.

Claimant is a woman of good repute and in needy circumstances; has not remarried, and no one is drawing a pension on account of said soldier's death.

According to established precedent, your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW L. GRUGETT.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12824) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Andrew L. Grugett as a former member of Company E, Sixth Tennessee Cavalry, in the war of the rebellion, and to grant him an honorable discharge therefrom.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Andrew L. Grugett as a former member of Company E, Sixth Tennessee Cavalry, in the war of the rebellion, and to grant him an honorable discharge therefrom.

The committee recommend the following amendment:

Said discharge to bear date June 10, A. D. 1863.

Mr. KERR, of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I call for the reading of the report in that case.

Mr. McCLAMMY. I would like to hear it myself.

The report (by Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom House bill 12824 was referred, after having carefully considered the same, respectfully report as follows, namely:

It fully and satisfactorily appears from the evidence submitted in this case that the claimant, Andrew L. Grugett, duly enlisted and was enrolled as a corporal in Company E, First West Tennessee Cavalry (subsequently known as the Sixth Tennessee Cavalry), September 18, 1862; that he was captured by the Confederate forces on or about the 24th day of January, 1863, near Bolivar, Tenn.; that he was afterwards paroled by one W. W. Jackson, claiming to be a Confederate paroling officer; that after such parole he reported to the Federal forces at Corinth, Miss., and was given transportation and subsistence from there to Bethel, Tenn., where he expected to find his regiment; that on arrival at Bethel he could not learn anything definite from his regiment and was passed to Purdy, Tenn., but on reaching said point his regiment was not there.

He then returned home, as the Confederates were swearing about Purdy; that he was recaptured by "bushwhackers," who disregarded his parole; that he escaped from them and again returned to his home; that after waiting for some time, dodging and avoiding the "bushwhackers," he enlisted in the Second Tennessee Mounted Infantry, said command being near him at that time, said last enlistment being in Company C, Second Tennessee Mounted Infantry, and was duly enrolled in said company and regiment March 1, 1864; that the captain of said Company C was Andrew J. Roberts, a brother of Capt. Elijah Roberts, who was captain of said Company E, First Tennessee Cavalry, to which he first belonged; that in his said second enlistment he gave his name as Andrew L. Grugett, same as in his first enlistment.

That if any error on the company or muster rolls appears as to his first or Christian name, same was not through any fault or intention of his, he having given his name in second enlistment same as in the first; that afterwards he met his old regiment at Nashville, Tenn., when both regiments to which he had belonged met for the first and last time during the war, and there met his former captain, said Elijah Roberts, who recognized him, but refused to receive him back into his company until he was duly exchanged; that so far as he knows or has ever known, he was never exchanged after capture and parole as before stated; that he was present at a meeting of said captains, Elijah and Andrew J. Roberts, in 1864, and was recognized by his said first captain; that he under his said second enlistment, served his country fully and faithfully, as also under his said first enlistment, and that he was honorably discharged from said Company C, Second Regiment Tennessee Mounted Infantry, at Nashville, Tenn., on the 6th of May, 1865, as shown by his certificate of discharge presented to this committee.

From the evidence your committee are fully satisfied that said Andrew L. Grugett never deserted from said Company E, First West Tennessee Cavalry, but that his absence therefrom was owing to his capture by the enemy as aforesaid and his subsequent parole and afterwards recapture by bushwhackers of the Confederacy; that he never did, nor intended to, desert his command; that his failure to obtain a discharge from said first enlistment was wholly or in part from his youth and ignorance of the rules of war.

The evidence before the committee fully establishes the fact that he faithfully served his country in the late war in two companies and regiments and holds an honorable discharge from the last company, said discharge having been granted him at the close of the war.

Your committee, therefore, recommend that said bill be amended by inserting after the word "therefrom," in line 7 thereof, the following: "Said discharge to bear the date of June 10, A. D. 1863;" and that, when so amended, said bill do pass.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MICHAEL MAHAR.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12643) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Michael Mahan. The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Michael Mahan, late of Company D, Twenty-eighth Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and restore him to all the rights and privileges he would have been entitled to if said charge had never been entered against his name.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Strike out, in line 5, after the word "Michael," the word "Mahan" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Mahar;" also add to the end of the section the following: "His discharge to bear date December 12, 1864."

The report (by Mr. WILLIAMS, of Ohio) is as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12643) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Michael Mahan submit the following report:

The evidence in this case shows that the soldier was not over fourteen years of age when he enlisted; that he was enrolled at Louisville, Ky., November 25, 1861, and that he deserted January 23, 1863, and returned to the regiment April 18, 1863; that he remained with his regiment until December 12, 1864, from which date he is marked as a deserter. The records show that he had served over the time of his enlistment with the exception of two months and twenty-five days absent during his first desertion, which brings him within the provisions of the law; besides the records show that he has been duly punished.

The second desertion occurred after his time of service expired. The soldier states under oath that on December 12, 1864, he left his company without leave, his regiment being encamped near Nashville, Tenn., and went to Nashville, intending to return to his regiment, but that he was captured by the provost guard and was sent to the guardhouse to be returned to his regiment. He, however, was kept in confinement until December 24, 1864, when he was released without instructions, transportation, money, rations, or any means by which he could reach his regiment, which had left Nashville, for what place he did not know and was not informed. He then returned to his family in Louisville, Ky.

The committee are of the opinion that on account of this soldier's extreme youth and his long service the charge of desertion should be removed.

The committee recommend that the name in the bill be corrected so as to read Michael "Mahar" instead of "Mahan," the same being an error in printing. Also that the bill be so amended as to direct the Secretary of War to issue an honorable discharge from date of December 12, 1864.

With these amendments recommend the passage of the bill.

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed. The title was amended to conform to the body of the bill.

PATRICK J. BENCH, ALIAS PATRICK M'BENCH.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11560) to relieve Patrick J. Bench, alias Patrick McBench, from the charge of desertion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy of the United States hereby authorized and directed to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Patrick J. Bench, alias Patrick McBench, late a seaman on the United States steamship Brooklyn, on the records and rolls of the Navy Department, and to grant and issue to said Bench an honorable discharge from the said service.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARY A. M'CUULOCK.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7789) to increase the pension of Mrs. Mary A. McCulloch.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of Mrs. Mary A. McCulloch, widow of the late Capt. Charles McCulloch, Seventh New York Heavy Artillery, to \$90 per month, in lieu of the pension now paid to her.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Strike out the word "fifty," in line 7, and insert in lieu thereof the words "thirty-two."

The amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MARY E. ARMSTONG.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13023) granting a pension to Mary E. Armstrong.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension rolls, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary E. Armstrong, widow of John Fogel, late first sergeant of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment of Ohio Volunteers.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

Amend by filling up the blank in the bill with the following words: "John Fogel."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

JANE BRANIGAN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 11877) for the relief of Jane Branigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month, the name of

Jane Branigan, guardian of Samuel J. Maxwell and the widow of John B. Maxwell, late private of Company G, of the Thirtieth Regiment of Ohio Volunteer Infantry, the said widow having been married to Arthur Branigan, who subsequently died, leaving her without any means of support.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, some misunderstanding may arise as to the wording of that bill. There are certain words in it that appear to be simply descriptive, and which are not necessary for a proper understanding of the facts. I therefore move to strike out in line 7 the words "guardian of Samuel J. Maxwell and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW J. BRISCOE.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12793) granting a pension to Capt. Andrew J. Briscoe.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Capt. Andrew J. Briscoe, pilot of the United States Government transport boats on the Ohio, Mississippi, Tennessee, and other rivers, at \$100 per month.

The committee recommend the following amendment:

Amend in line 8, by striking out the words "one hundred," and inserting the word "thirty," in lieu thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH J. BARTLETT.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12998) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Bartlett.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Joseph J. Bartlett, late colonel Twenty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteers, and brevet major general, and pay him a pension of \$100 per month in lieu of that which he now receives.

Mr. CHEADLE. Mr. Speaker, in that case I would like to hear the report read.

Mr. WADE. Let the chairman of the committee explain it.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the report seems to be a very long one, and perhaps some gentleman can give us a statement.

Mr. BAKER. If the gentleman will be content with a brief statement, I can make it.

Mr. CHEADLE. I am perfectly willing to hear the statement of the gentleman, in lieu of having the report read.

Mr. BAKER. General Bartlett went into the service as captain of the Twenty-seventh New York Regiment.

Mr. MORRILL. He enlisted as a private.

Mr. BAKER. He enlisted as a private, but was a captain in the organization of the regiment, and I think is the only living general officer who served during the war and who was in every engagement of his command from the first Bull Run to Appomattox. His service embraced the whole period of the war, and of the thirteen hundred days of service, over twelve hundred days Joseph J. Bartlett, as captain, as major, as colonel, as brigade commander, as division commander, performed his duty at the front. His condition to-day is that of a complete wreck. His mind has been somewhat impaired by the service rendered.

He is unable to do anything and requires the constant attendance of his medical advisers and the almost constant attendance of a person to take care of him. His condition is well known to many members of the House and to a great many of our colleagues who have had occasion to do business with him while he was deputy commissioner of pensions, and it entitles him, in my judgment, to the consideration proposed by this bill. The bill is reported unanimously by the committee as I understand.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

H. W. GOODNIGHT.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5546) granting a pension to H. W. Goodnight.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Henry W. Goodnight, late a private in Company H of the Seventy-second Regiment of Enrolled Missouri Militia, and to pay him a pension from and after the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM H. MORSE.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 9516) authorizing an increase of invalid pension to William H. Morse, of Lawrence, Mass.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, directed to cause the name of William H. Morse, formerly employed in the Ord-

nance Department at the Washington navy yard, and whose name is now borne on the invalid pension rolls under pension certificate (naval) No. 5429, to be entered upon said pension rolls for such increase of pension as may be recommended according to law for wounds and disabilities received by said William H. Morse while in the naval service of the United States of America, but not duly enlisted therein, on or about the 25th day of May, 1862, and subsequently thereto, and that said William H. Morse receive such increase of pension as he would have received had he been duly enlisted in the naval service of the United States when he received said wounds and disabilities.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

MRS. K. S. SUTLIFF.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12319) granting a pension to Mrs. K. S. Sutliff, widow of John D. Sutliff.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be directed to place the name of K. S. Sutliff, widow of John D. Sutliff, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, on the pension rolls subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

THERESA D. DOUBLES.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12113) granting a pension to Theresa D. Doubles.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, directed and authorized to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Theresa D. Doubles, late the widow of Israel D. Smith, Company B, Two hundred and eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers.

Mr. CHEADLE. Mr. Speaker, the general law now authorizes two different rates of pension for the widows of enlisted men. The statute prior to the enactment of June 27 allows pension at the rate of \$12 per month and those granted under the act passed June 27, 1890, at \$8 a month. I do not know anything about the facts in this case, but I think the bill ought to be amended so as to read "\$12 a month."

Mr. MORRILL. The bill reads the same as all the other bills we have passed to-night. The facts in this case are that the widow received a pension of \$12 a month as the widow of her first husband, who was a soldier. She afterwards remarried and the second husband died; and this bill simply restores her to the pension roll. The bureau would rule that she should be reinstated at the old rate of \$12 a month.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

FREDERICK B. SELLS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8125) granting a pension to Frederick B. Sells.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Frederick B. Sells, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment of Illinois Volunteers.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

ELLEN E. TRUOX.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 1196) granting a pension to Ellen E. Truox.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ellen E. Truox, widow of William S. Truox, late colonel of the Fourteenth Regiment of New Jersey Volunteers and brigadier-general by brevet, United States Volunteers.

The committee recommend an amendment by inserting after the word "laws" the words, "at \$30 per month in lieu of the sum now paid her."

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. CHEADLE. I would ask for information what pension the beneficiary is now receiving.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. She is receiving \$8 a month as widow of a Mexican veteran.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

GENERAL NATHANIEL PRENTISS BANKS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 13060) to grant a pension to General Nathaniel Prentiss Banks.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be directed to place upon the pension rolls the name of Nathaniel Prentiss Banks, of Waltham, Mass., late major general of volunteers, at the rate of \$200 per month.

SEC. 2. That this act shall go into effect upon its passage.

The committee recommend to amend by striking out "two" and inserting "one;" so as to read, "at the rate of \$100 per month."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed. [General applause.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire whether the Calendar is now clear of pension bills?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is informed that the Calendar is clear of all pension bills, with the exception of those which have been laid over.

Mr. BUCHANAN, of New Jersey. Then they have all been reached? The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. They have.

MRS. LILLIE E. WILLIS.

Mr. FLOWER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Invalid Pensions be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 11513) for the relief of Mrs. Sallie E. Willis, and that it be now considered. It is a bill for the relief of the widow of your late colleague, Benjamin A. Willis. She asks for \$25 a month to support her. She has three children under nine years of age, and two of them were but nine days old when Colonel Willis died.

Mr. MORRILL. He was wounded in action.

Mr. FLOWER. He was wounded in action. He was a brevet lieutenant colonel, but was major of the One hundred and nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry. Mrs. Willis was here yesterday, and she asked me to request the House to expedite this matter. This a worthy case, and I ask that the committee be discharged and the bill be considered.

Mr. CHEADLE. Why not give her \$30.

Mr. FLOWER. She is only allowed \$25 by the law.

Mr. CHEADLE. There are cases in which they are only allowed \$30, when they have no difficulty in getting \$100 and up even to \$3,000.

Mr. FLOWER. Under the circumstances I will not accept the amendment.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. Sallie E. Willis, of the city of New York, State of New York, widow of the late Benjamin A. Willis, major One hundred and nineteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORRILL moved to reconsider the several votes by which the various bills were passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORRILL. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and, accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

PUBLIC BUILDING, TAUNTON, MASS.

Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, requesting that the sum, not exceeding \$75,000, carried by the act of Congress approved January 2, 1891, providing for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Taunton, Mass., be appropriated at this session of Congress—to the Committee on Appropriations.

U. S. MARINE-HOSPITAL BUILDING, LAKE VIEW, CHICAGO, ILL.

Letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, requesting an additional appropriation of \$20,000 for the United States marine-hospital building, Lake View, Chicago, Ill.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

WATCH HILL COVE, RHODE ISLAND.

Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, a report of the examination and survey of Watch Hill Cove, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

NARRAGANSETT BAY CHANNEL, RHODE ISLAND.

Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, a report of the examination and survey of Narragansett Bay Channel, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

TANGIER HARBOR, VIRGINIA.

Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, a report of the examination and survey of Tangier Harbor, Virginia—to the Committee on River and Harbors.

ROBERT E. TWEEDY VS. THE UNITED STATES.

Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact filed by the court in the case of Robert E. Tweedy against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

MATHEW WOODYARD VS. THE UNITED STATES.

Letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of Mathew Woodyard against The United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

the Chief of Engineers, a report of the examination and survey of Moke-lumne River, California—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

SAUGATUCK RIVER, CONNECTICUT.

Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, a report of the examination and survey of Saugatuck River, Connecticut—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

NEWPORT HARBOR, RHODE ISLAND.

Letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, a report of the examination and survey of Newport Harbor, Rhode Island—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL MARINE CONFERENCE.

Communication from the Secretary of the Navy, in reply to concurrent resolutions of September 24 and 29, 1890, calling for report and recommendations in connection with the report of the delegates of the United States to the International Marine Conference, dated February 20, 1890, so far as the subjects apply to the Navy Department—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION, WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a detailed estimate of appropriations submitted by the World's Columbian Exposition for expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892—to the Committee on Appropriations.

GOVERNMENT'S EXHIBIT AT THE WORLD'S COLUMBIAN EXPOSITION.

Letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting that the sum of \$300,000 be appropriated for the Government's exhibit at the World's Columbian Exposition, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892—to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A bill (S. 3940) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Fresno, in the State of California—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 4017) for the relief of Nathan Kimball, postmaster at Ogden, Utah—to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 4604) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North at Drayton, N. Dak.—to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4683) to provide a suitable site for a post office in the city of Providence, R. I.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

A bill (S. 4811) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Joliet, in the State of Illinois—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, the following resolutions were introduced and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas:

Whereas it is alleged that since the election held for members of Congress on the 4th day of November last one John McClure has instituted proceedings in the Federal court of the eastern district of Arkansas, under instructions from the Attorney-General, in the absence of any indictment or accusation of any violation of the election laws, to obtain possession of certain ballots and poll books of said election: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the House at his earliest convenience if any such proceedings have been instituted by said McClure or by anyone under the authority or instruction of the Department of Justice. He is also requested to state what amounts of money have been paid to said McClure since November 6, 1888, and for what purpose, and what accounts from him are now pending and unpaid; also to transmit to the House a copy of all correspondence and instructions since November 4 last in connection with his services and employment; also to state whether any United States deputy marshals were appointed in said judicial district on or within three weeks prior to the 4th day of November last, by what authority, and what disposition was made of them prior to and on the said 4th day of November, together with a statement of all funds paid out therefor;

to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANDLER, of Massachusetts:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on the World's Fair be, and is hereby, authorized to employ a clerk during the present session of the Fifty-first Congress, to be paid, from the beginning of said session, out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided, a compensation of \$6 per day;

to Committee on Accounts.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk and disposed of as follows:

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 7789) to increase the pension of Mrs. Mary A. McCulloch, accompanied by a report (No. 3473)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12899) for the relief of Sally Sterrett Tate, deceased, reported, as a substitute therefor, a bill (H. R. 13176) for the relief of the estate of Sally Sterrett Tate, deceased; which was read twice and accompanied by a report (No. 3474)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. YODER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 11877) for the relief of Jane Branigan, accompanied by a report (No. 3475)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

He also, from the same committee, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 13023) granting a pension to Mary E. Armstrong, accompanied by a report (No. 3476)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MARTIN, of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 12793) granting a pension to Capt. Andrew J. Briscoe, accompanied by a report (No. 3477)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 12998) granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Bartlett, accompanied by a report (No. 3478)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 5546) granting a pension to H. W. Goodnight, accompanied by a report (No. 3479)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FLICK, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 6516) authorizing an increase of invalid pension to William H. Morse, of Lawrence, Mass., accompanied by a report (No. 3480)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported with amendment the bill of the House (H. R. 11681) to ratify and confirm certain agreements with the Citizen band of Pottawatomie Indians and the Absentee Shawnee Indians, and to make appropriations for carrying the same into effect, accompanied by a report (No. 3481)—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAY, from the Committee on Claims, reported favorably the following bills of the Senate; which were severally referred to the Committee of the Whole House:

A bill (S. 949) for the relief of W. H. Ward. (Report No. 3482.)

A bill (S. 2368) for the relief of James Grace. (Report No. 3483.)

Mr. CARTER, from the Committee on Mines and Mining, reported with amendment the bill of the Senate (S. 165) to amend chapter 6 of Title XXXII of the Revised Statutes, relating to mineral lands and mining resources, accompanied by a report (No. 3484)—to the House Calendar.

Mr. CRAIG, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported favorably the following bills of the House; which were severally referred to the Committee of the Whole House:

A bill (H. R. 12319) granting a pension to Mrs. K. S. Sutliff, widow of John D. Sutliff. (Report No. 3485.)

A bill (H. R. 12113) granting a pension to Theresa C. Doubles. (Report No. 3486.)

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 8125) granting a pension to Frederick B. Sells, accompanied by a report (No. 3487)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BELKNAP, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported favorably the bill of the House (H. R. 1196) granting a pension to Ellen E. Truex, accompanied by a report (No. 3488)—to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the following changes of reference were made:

A bill (H. R. 6878) for the relief of Michael Carling, assignee of Joseph R. Shannon, deceased—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 13063) for the relief of George M. Clapp—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 5258) for the relief of Benjamin F. Wells, sr.—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and a joint resolution of the following titles were introduced, severally read twice, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FRANK: A bill (H. R. 13177) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Carthage, in the State of Missouri—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TUCKER: A bill (H. R. 13178) for the erection of a public building at the town of Lexington, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FLOWER: A bill (H. R. 13179) to legalize standard time—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 13180) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Annapolis, Md.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FEATHERSTON: A joint resolution (H. Res. 270) proposing an amendment to the Constitution changing the manner of electing Senators of the United States—to the Select Committee on the Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 13181) for the relief of James Hill—to the Committee on Elections.

By Mr. PARRETT: A bill (H. R. 13182) granting a pension to Oliver R. Brown—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13183) to pension Wilson H. Daniel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13184) to pension Samuel F. Tennant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13185) for the relief of Merriman Thompson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 13186) for the relief of estate of M. L. J. Christian—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13187) for the relief of the legal representatives of William W. Hildreth, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By Mr. ANDREW: Papers to accompany House bill for relief of Charles H. Neill—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ATKINSON, of Pennsylvania: Petition of John T. Brady, colonel of Encampment No. 69, Union Veteran Legion, and 92 ex-soldiers and sailors, praying for the passage and approval of House bill 8257, for the protection of honorably discharged soldiers and sailors in the civil service of the Government—to the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOKSHIRE: Papers to accompany House bill 13113, to correct the military record of Henry Staff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of O. H. Crane and 30 others, citizens of Vermilion County, Illinois, and Farmers' Alliance, No. 71, of Vermilion County, Illinois, favoring passage of House bill 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARK, of Wisconsin: Petition of citizens of Marquette County, Wisconsin, in favor of the anti-option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER, of Ohio: Petition of George E. Salmon and 22 others, citizens of Marion County, Ohio, for the passage of House bill 5353, defining options and futures—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CRAIG: Resolution of Col. C. A. Craig Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Parker's Landing, Pa., favoring passage of the prisoners-of-war bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Petition of George M. Millan and 19 others, also of Farmers' Alliances Nos. 535 and 542, and others, of the State of Michigan, praying speedy passage of the Butterworth option bill, H. R. 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Resolutions of Kimbal Alliance, Carroll County, Iowa, praying speedy passage of the Butterworth option bill, H. R. 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Marion Center Alliance, No. 571, of Hamilton County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Logan Farmers' Alliance, No. 1675, of Winnebago County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Dawson Township Farmers' Alliance, No. 1006, of Greene County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Greene County Alliance, of Jefferson, Greene County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Burt Alliance, No. 1719, of Burt, Kossuth County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Central Alliance, No. 1304, of Greene County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Paradise Farmers' Alliance, No. 1481, of Bell, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Emmet Township Farmers' Alliance, No. 1649, of Estherville, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Alliance No. 1329, of Winnebago County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Boone Ridge Farmers' Alliance, of Hancock County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Alliance No. 763, of Crawford County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Jasper Alliance, No. 525, of Carroll County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Peoples Farmers' Alliance, of Peoples Township, Boone County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Farmers' Alliance, No. 1858, of Hamilton County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Mallard Alliance, No. 1117, of Palo Alto County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Pilot Mound Farmers' Alliance, No. 1407, of Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Aikin Muench and 25 others, citizens of Pilot Mound, Boone County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Charles A. Ristrim and 24 others, citizens of Hamilton County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of F. M. Ford and 18 others, citizens of Greene County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of D. C. Gullickson and 22 others, citizens of Winnebago County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. W. Linton and 17 others, citizens of Carroll County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of C. P. Walke and 12 others, citizens of Dawson Township, Greene County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of John K. Johnson and 23 others, citizens of Mount Valley, Winnebago County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of D. C. Wood and 41 others, citizens of Hamilton County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of P. S. Porter and 10 others, citizens of Webster County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of N. B. Shelder and 5 others, citizens of Greene County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Charles S. Dempsey and 24 others, citizens of Winnebago County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of S. A. Grubb and 19 others, citizens of Carroll County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Oak Hill Alliance, of Union Township, Carroll County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of John Bobenfue and 40 others, citizens of Hamilton County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. Carson and 28 others, citizens of Paradise Township, Crawford County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. W. Woods and 16 others, citizens of Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. P. Thompson and 19 others, citizens of Winnebago County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of S. G. Smith and 9 others, citizens of same county and State, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Thomas Presnall and 19 others, citizens of Hancock County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Ed. F. Dingley and 19 others, citizens of Crawford County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Z. T. Nixor and 16 others, citizens of the same county and State, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Henry Miller, jr., and 34 others, citizens of Jasper Township, Carroll County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. P. Calouky and 13 others, citizens of Boone County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of B. R. Crose and 22 others, citizens of Greene County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of G. W. Swersinger and 36 others, citizens of Palo Alto County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of S. T. Wray and 23 others, citizens of Winnebago County, Illinois, for passage of the anti-option bill, H. R. 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial and resolutions of Elida (Ill.) Lodge, No. 3928, Farmers' Mutual Benefit Association, against gambling in futures and urging the anti-option bill, H. R. 5353—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of William Jones and 12 others, citizens of Winnebago, Winnebago County, Illinois, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of William Johnson and 40 other farmers of Polk County, Wisconsin, in favor of the anti-option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Louis Gagner and 23 others, citizens of Stanfold, Barrios County, Wisconsin, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Andrew Henning and 2 others, citizens of Polk County, Wisconsin, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Farmers' Alliance of Laketown, Polk County, Wisconsin, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Otto Thingwold and other citizens of Barrios County, Wisconsin, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Little Falls Farmers' Alliance, No. 122, of Little Falls, Polk County, Wisconsin, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of S. S. Selvig and 30 others, citizens of Polk County, Wisconsin, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KELLEY: Resolutions of a mass convention of the citizens of Decatur County, Kansas, in reference to the irrigation of western Kansas—to the Select Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands in the United States.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of H. R. Smith and 19 others, citizens of Nebraska County, Iowa, praying speedy passage of the antiopinion bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Adams Alliance, of same county and State, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Cooperville Alliance, No. 1738, of Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Union Hall Alliance, No. 1834, of Keokuk County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Sugar Grove Alliance, No. 599, of Jasper County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Forest Grove Farmers' Alliance, No. 1639, of Mahaska County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Cross Roads and Round Point Union, No. 1830, of Agency, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Honey Grove Alliance, No. 1346, of Keokuk County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of John Leeper and 85 others, citizens of Jasper County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of T. H. Holmes and 11 others, citizens of Mahaska County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Baltiour Kosman and 2 others, citizens of Wapello County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of W. J. Willhort and 11 others, citizens of Adams Township, Mahaska County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of William S. Epperly and 51 others, citizens of Wapello County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Freedom Alliance, No. 1057, of Hamilton County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. C. Humbert and 18 others, citizens of Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Farmers' Alliance, No. 1639, of Forest Grove, Mahaska County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of J. C. Ulin and 23 others, citizens of Keokuk County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Garfield Alliance, No. 1186, of Mahaska County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: Resolutions of McCoy Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Columbus, Ohio, in favor of such legislation as will secure to the soldiers and sailors of the late war for the Union their just claims as to the difference between the pay they did receive from the Government and that which they should have received had they been paid in gold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: Petition of Nicholas McPherson, of Jackson County, Missouri, for reference of claims to Court of Claims under provisions of the Bowman act—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Mary Ann Wester, administratrix of the estate of Ephraim Dockery, late of Cherokee County, Alabama, for same relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Belson W. Owens, of Cherokee County, Alabama, for same relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of George W. Wilson, of Orangeburgh County, South Carolina, for same relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STRUBLE: Petition of Peyton Alliance, of Sac County, Iowa, favoring passage of the Butterworth option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of C. H. Bauer and 100 others, citizens of Plymouth County, Iowa, favoring passage of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions by members of Alliance No. 1671, of same county and State, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Prairie Grove Alliance, of Sioux County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SWENEY: Petition of William Hows and 31 others, citizens of Allamakee County, Iowa, urging speedy passage of antiopinion bill (H. R. 5353), known as the Butterworth bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Charles Smith and 27 others, citizens of French Creek, Allamakee County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of B. F. Paige and 30 others, citizens of Highland, Clayton County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of N. C. Puckett and 29 others, citizens of Mitchell County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of H. H. Wells and 43 others, citizens of Cresco, Howard County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of S. J. White and 29 others, citizens of Worth County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of M. B. Jewett and 28 others, citizens of Worth County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. L. Farrington and 23 others, citizens of Howard County, Iowa, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Michael Wolf and 21 others, citizens of St. Charles, Floyd County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of E. P. Lamb and 12 others, citizens of Lime Creek Township, Cerro Gordo County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Howard Alliance, No. 1809, Cresco, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the French Creek Branch, No. 1467, of the Iowa Farmers' Alliance, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Nora Alliance, No. 1355, of Highland Township, Clayton County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Worth County Farmers' Alliance, of Worth County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Fairview Alliance, No. 1453, Lime Creek Township, Cerro Gordo County, Iowa, in favor of same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TAYLOR, of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Chicago, asking that the pay of keepers and surfmen in the Life-Saving Service be increased—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition and papers to remove the charge of desertion against John Daley, late Company C, Seventy-second New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND, of Colorado: Petition of Andrew Anderson and 16 others, citizens of Kit Carson County, Colorado, praying speedy passage of the Butterworth option bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Burke Potter and 13 others, citizens of El Paso County, Colorado, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Advance Alliance, No. 1, of Kit Carson County, Colorado, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Byron Huff and 16 others, citizens of Kit Carson County, Colorado, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Peyton Alliance, No. 28, of El Paso County, Colorado, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition and papers to accompany bill for relief of James K. P. Addis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS, of Illinois: Petition for claim of Thomas Summers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Hamilton County, Illinois, against the Conger lard bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON, of Washington: Resolution of Harrington Alliance, Lincoln County, Washington, relative to House bill 5353, defining options—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Sassin Alliance, of same county and State, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of Pioneer Alliance, No. 12, Washington, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Farmers' Alliance No. 107, of Latah, Spokane County, Washington, G. W. Coplin, secretary, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Liberty Alliance, No. 77, Washington, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 28 citizens of Spokane County, Washington, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 28 citizens of same county and State, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 30 other citizens of same county and State, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 5 other citizens of same county and State, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 5 other citizens of same county and State, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 42 citizens of Lincoln County, Washington, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 43 other citizens of same county and State, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Farmers' Alliance No. 121, of Lincoln County, Washington, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 11 citizens of the State of Washington, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of 13 citizens of Spokane County, Washington, for same measure—to the Committee on Agriculture.