

year—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HARMER: Memorial and paper to accompany petition of George W. Roosevelt, of Company K, Twenty-sixth Regiment, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRIES: Petition of the German Soldier Society of Winona, Minn., asking Congress to repeal the act closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HATCH: Petition of farmers of Clark County, Mo., for the passage of the antiopium bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAYNES of Ohio: Resolution of the board of health of the village of Woodville, Ohio, in favor of the National Government controlling the quarantine system—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of the Rockford Furniture Company, of Rockford, Ill., for 1-cent letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of the Ohio Society of Surveyors and Civil Engineers, of Columbus, Ohio, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and re-referred to the Committee on Agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOUK of Ohio: Two petitions of associations of Ohio; one of Putnam Council, Order of United American Mechanics of Dayton, and Fulton Council, Order of United American Mechanics of Dayton, both for amendment of the immigration laws—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Memorial of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, praying that the present session be extended from sixty to seventy days—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of I. Q. A. Lathrop and ninety-two others, of Hingham, Mass., praying for the repeal of the silver-purchase act of July 14, 1890—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of the United Order of American Mechanics of Plymouth, Mass., praying for the restriction of immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OHLIGER: Resolution of U. S. Grant Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics of Canton, Ohio, concerning immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of East Liverpool (Ohio) Turnverein, for the repeal of the Sunday-closing law—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: Resolutions of the Iron Moulders' Beneficial Society, No. 98, of Columbus, Ohio, urging the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau—to the Select Committee on the Eleventh Census.

Also, petition of the Helvetia Aid Society, of Columbus, Ohio, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the establishment of a national commission on quarantine—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of Miantonomoh Council, No. 30, United American Mechanics, of Norwich, Conn., in favor of restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade and citizens of Norwich, Conn., for the suspension of all purchases of silver bullion—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Mohegan Council, No. 75, United American Mechanics, of Old Lyme, Conn., in favor of restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Warren Council, No. 53, United American Mechanics, of Niantic, Conn., in favor of restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MSTAHLNECKER: Resolution of the New York State Legislature, favoring the construction of a national harbor of relief in the bight of Canaveral, Florida—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: Papers in the claims known as the Paducah claims of John E. Williamson, administrator of the estate of John B. Thompson, deceased, and other citizens of Paducah, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR: Nine memorials setting forth the evil results of unrestricted immigration, praying legislation that will prohibit immigration for one year excepting visitors to the World's Fair, and the appointment of a commission to in-

vestigate and report on the evils of immigration, said memorials bearing the signature of Dr. Frank James and 201 other citizens of the Eighteenth Congressional district of Ohio—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VINCENT A. TAYLOR: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Sunday school of Akron, Ohio, for closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 12 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WARNER: Petition of business men of New York, for the repeal of the law authorizing the purchase of silver bullion—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of farmers and laborers of Clinton County, Ill., relative to a combination between the millers, railroads, and elevators for the purpose of depressing the price of wheat and praying for a Congressional investigation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 10, 1893.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal of yesterday's proceedings will be read.

Mr. QUAY. I desire to inquire whether there is a quorum of the Senate present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The roll will be called.

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

Allison,	Dolph,	Hoar,	Sawyer,
Bate,	Dubois,	Huntton,	Sherman,
Berry,	Felton,	Kyle,	Shoup,
Blodgett,	Gallinger,	McMillan,	Stewart,
Butler,	George,	McPherson,	Stockbridge,
Caffery,	Gibson,	Morrill,	Teller,
Call,	Gorman,	Palmer,	Turpie,
Carey,	Hale,	Pasco,	Washburn,
Chandler,	Hansbrough,	Peffer,	White.
Cockrell,	Harris,	Perkins,	
Cullom,	Hawley,	Pugh,	
Dawes,	Hiscock,	Quay,	

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Forty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Journal of yesterday's proceedings will be read by the Secretary.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a supplemental list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement relative to the work of the division of warrants, estimates, and appropriations, and requesting that a provision of law be enacted authorizing the use of any unexpended balances of appropriations for extra work performed in that division; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted by the Tacoma (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, February 2, 1893, favoring the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of Council No. 707, Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Draketown, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called Chandler immigration bill; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I present a petition of the Legislature of North Dakota, praying that the abandoned portion of the Fort Abraham Lincoln military reservation and the buildings and material thereon be donated to the State of North Dakota for the benefit and use of a State reform school.

I desire to state that Congress has not the power to legislate in the matter by reason of the fact that a part of the lands which the State wishes to acquire are covered by the Northern Pacific Railroad grant. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of the Presbyterian Church of Beech Springs, Ohio, remonstrating against the repeal of the law closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of Iron Moulders' Beneficial Society, No. 98, of Columbus, Ohio, praying for the establishment of a permanent Census Bureau and the collection of statistics showing the distribution as well as the production of wealth; which was referred to the Committee on the Census.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of 28 farmers of Massac County, Ill., and of sundry citizens of Marion County, Ill., praying for the establishment of a commission to investigate the combine formed to depreciate the price of grain, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. CHANDLER. I present a petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, in convention assembled at Denver, Colo., in November, 1892, signed by Frances E. Willard, president, and the other officers of the union, praying for a further and more stringent restriction of immigration at our ports of entry.

The petitioners state that they believe the safety and welfare of our nation and Government are imperiled by the admission of such a large number of aliens, especially as nearly half of our Commonwealths, either by statutory or constitutional enactments, permit male immigrants over 21 years of age to vote at all elections within twelve months after their arrival in our borders by filing their intention to become citizens. They respectfully urge that a larger restriction be placed upon the number, the character, or the power of those coming to our shores, that they may not practically hold, upon their arrival, far greater power over our morals and even the very life of the nation than the women who are born of American parents, and who have all their lives lived as good and faithful citizens in our midst.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KYLE presented a memorial of West Union Farmers' Alliance, No. 599, of Day County, S. Dak., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called Sherman silver law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Kansas, praying for the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. POWER presented petitions of citizens of Helena, Butte City, Great Falls, Musselshell, and Missoula, in the State of Montana, and petitions of Eagle Butte Lodge, No. 328, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Forsyth; of Union No. 123, Journeymen Bakers and Confectioners' International Union of America, of Butte City; of Bonanza Lodge, No. 194, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Missoula, and of Union No. 43, Journeymen Tailors' Union of America, of Great Falls, in the State of Montana, praying for the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. CAREY presented a memorial of citizens of Sheridan County, Wyo., remonstrating against the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of George Parsons Lathrop and other citizens of the United States, praying for the passage of legislation incorporating the National Historical Society; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. QUAY presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the adoption of any amendment to the pension laws decreasing pensions; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Pensions, as follows:

Concurrent resolution.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF PENNSYLVANIA,
Harrisburg, January 27, 1893.

Resolved by the house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (if the senate will concur). That we view with alarm the proclaimed purpose to strike down the pensions of the patriotic men who saved this country from disruption, and declare that, instead of the reduction of pensions, we are in favor of placing every honorably discharged soldier on the pension rolls, under the terms of the Pennsylvania service pension bill, introduced into the United States Senate by Senator J. D. CAMERON, or a modification thereof, whereby every honorably discharged soldier of the war of the rebellion shall be treated as the veterans of all other wars of the United States have been.

We furthermore enter our solemn protest against the effort now being made to deprive the armless and legless veterans of their right, under the present law, to an exchange of their artificial limbs. We believe the preservation of this nation is worth all it cost in blood and treasure, including the money heretofore paid and to be paid to its veteran soldiers as pensions, and we earnestly request the Pennsylvania Senators and members of the House of Representatives to use their best efforts to secure the immediate pension-

ing of every honorably discharged soldier, and to prevent the threatened injustice to our armless and legless veterans.

CHARLES E. VOORHEES,

Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

In the Senate, January 31, 1893, the foregoing resolution concurred in.

E. W. SMILEY,

Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Approved the 6th day of February, 1893.

ROBT. E. PATTISON.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom were referred the memorial of M. Ashford, J. B. Wilson, and 27 others, owners and dealers in real estate in the District of Columbia, and the memorial of S. J. Fague & Son, Easterday & Haldeman, Allen O. Dart, and 57 others, owners and dealers in real estate in the District of Columbia, remonstrating against the proposition in the District of Columbia appropriation bill to authorize the District Commissioners to reassess special assessments and taxes which have been or shall hereafter be declared void by the courts, asked that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the memorials, and moved that they be referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2177) to provide for the reassessment and relieving of taxes declared illegal and void, and for other purposes, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3808) amending the charter of the Maryland and Washington Railway Company, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8125) to provide for the regulation of the equipment and operation of street railroad lines within the District of Columbia by the Commissioners of said District, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3792) to incorporate the American University, reported it with amendments.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1422) for the relief of George M. Henry, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PALMER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3184) correcting the muster of Lieut. Gilman L. Johnson, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5519) for the relief of Daniel Eldridge, Company D, Fifteenth Illinois Volunteers, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4071) for the relief of George W. Schachleiter, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1968) for the relief of Dr. James Madison, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. HUNTON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3795) to authorize the Washington, Alexandria and Mount Vernon Electric Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Potomac River, and to construct a railroad over the same and through certain streets and reservations of Washington, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce; which was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 3788) granting right of way to the Colorado River Irrigation Company through the Yuma Indian Reservation, in California; and

A bill (S. 3843) to authorize the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company to renew its railroad bridge across the Big Sandy River upon such plans and location as may be approved by the Secretary of War.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. Res. 214) providing for additional telegraphic and electric light facilities in the city of Washington during the inaugural ceremonies on the 4th day of March, 1893; in which the concurrence of the Senate was requested.

AIDS TO NAVIGATION.

Mr. DOLPH. By direction of the Committee on Commerce, I obtained the recall from the House of Representatives of the bill (H. R. 9955) providing for sundry light-houses and other aids to navigation, and the bill was returned last evening. I ask that

the bill be taken up and that the votes by which it was ordered to a third reading and passed may be reconsidered. I shall then ask that the vote be reconsidered by which the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon moves to reconsider the votes by which the bill (H. R. 9955) providing for sundry light-houses and other aids to navigation was ordered to a third reading and passed.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate.

Mr. DOLPH. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole were concurred in by the Senate and also the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], was agreed to in the Senate. The object is to disagree to the Senate amendments and cut the bill down to what it was when it passed the other House.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. DOLPH. I now ask that the amendments made by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, as well as the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], offered in the Senate, be disagreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendments will be disagreed to if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOLPH. Let the bill now be placed on its passage, without amendment.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill stands passed without amendment.

EMPLOYMENT OF ARMED MEN FOR PRIVATE PURPOSES.

Mr. GALLINGER. In behalf of the select committee to investigate and report the facts in relation to the employment for private purposes of armed bodies of men in connection with differences between workmen and employers, I have the honor to submit a written report with the testimony accompanying it; which I ask be printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The order to print will be made.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed 6,000 copies of the report of the Senate select committee to investigate and report the facts in relation to the employment for private purposes of armed bodies of men or detectives in connection with differences between workmen and employers, 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

SETTLERS ON FOREST RESERVATIONS IN CALIFORNIA.

Mr. FELTON. I am directed by the Select Committee on Forest Reservations in California to report a joint resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 150) to provide for the appointment of a commission by the Secretary of the Interior to appraise the improvements made by actual settlers upon public lands, holding in good faith under the United States, in the Sequoia and Yosemite reservations, in California, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall appoint three commissioners, one of whom shall be nominated by the Secretary of the Keweenaw Cooperative Association of California and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and the remaining two citizens of California, who shall be competent and impartial persons, to perform the duties herein prescribed, for which they shall receive a compensation of \$8 for each day of actual service.

Second. That said commissioners shall make an appraisement of the actual value of all lands filed upon or patented, and all permanent improvements heretofore made, on any lands in the public reservations created by the laws of the United States in California, and known as the Yosemite Reservation and the Sequoia Reservation, by actual settlers on the public domain therein who have obtained patents, or other evidences of title to such lands from the United States, or have, in good faith, entered such lands as homestead settlers or under timber laws, or have heretofore filed their claims thereto as such, and said commission shall report their appraisements to the Secretary of the Interior, who shall include the result of his findings in his next annual estimate of appropriations for his Department.

Third. Before entering on their duties under this act, said commissioners shall take an oath before a competent officer, that they will faithfully and impartially execute said duties, and they shall have authority to examine witnesses on oath and report the testimony to the Secretary of the Interior with their recommendations.

Fourth. That those persons who were or are now actual bona fide settlers on said lands shall have the right of free access to the same, and of egress from the same, with their property of every description, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe through either or both of said public reservations.

Nothing herein contained shall be construed as authorizing any person, not now in actual occupation of said lands in this act described, to enter upon any public lands in said reservations for purposes of settlement.

Fifth. That the sum of \$2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be applied by the Secretary of the Interior to the compensation of said commissioners for their services and for the payment of the other necessary expenses of making and reporting the appraisement therein

provided for, but this act shall not be construed as an admission that the United States is, under any legal obligation to pay for any improvements that have been made on any lands to which this act applies.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. DOLPH. There is; I object to it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made, and the joint resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. FELTON. I understand that an objection carries the joint resolution over one day.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It places it on the Calendar in its order.

Mr. KYLE. I give notice that to-morrow at the proper time I shall move to take up the joint resolution for consideration.

Mr. DOLPH. The joint resolution comes from what committee?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It comes from the Select Committee on the Yosemite and Sequoia reservations of California.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 3855) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad and other improvements through and on the Hot Springs reservation, State of Arkansas; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. CHANDLER (for Mr. DAVIS) introduced a bill (S. 3856) to amend section 7 of the act approved February 15, 1892, relative to the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at South St. Paul, Minn.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 3857) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Monongahela River at the foot of Main street, in the borough of Belle Vernon, in the State of Pennsylvania; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. KYLE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3858) to incorporate the Washington Traction Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the District of Columbia.

Mr. HILL introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 151) extending the session of the Thirtieth Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico from sixty to seventy days; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Military Academy appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. QUAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, the amendment providing that no moneys shall be expended for the removal of Smiths Island and Windmill Island, Pennsylvania, and Pettys Island, New Jersey, and adjacent shoals until after the termination of the fiscal year expiring the 30th day of June, A. D. 1894; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, the amendment proposing to make an appropriation of \$2,500 for dredging the channel of the Negro cut at the Indian River Inlet, Florida, at the entrance of that cut into the Indian River; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHOUP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHOUP. I also submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and I desire to have it referred in the first instance to the Select Committee on Indian Depredations before being referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I move that the amendment be referred to the select committee I have named, and that it be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUNTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TURPIE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. QUAY. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which I desire to have printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. I should be glad to have it read for the information of the Senate.

The amendment was read, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

Add as follows:

"No contract shall be awarded affecting any money to be expended under this act to any corporation chartered by any foreign government or owned by citizens thereof or to any person or persons not a citizen or citizens of the United States."

Mr. SHERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF LABOR.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed 35,000 additional copies, in cloth binding, of the Eighth Annual Report of the Commissioner of Labor, relating to industrial education in the United States and Europe; 16,000 copies for the use of the members of the House of Representatives, 8,000 copies for the use of the members of the Senate, and 11,000 copies for distribution by the Department of Labor.

WEATHER BUREAU REPORT.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed in quarto form of the annual report of the Chief of the Weather Bureau, with appendices, 9,000 copies, of which 1,000 copies will be for the use of the Senate, and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 6,000 copies for the use of the Weather Bureau.

The report will cover the transactions of the Bureau from date of its transfer from the War to the Agricultural Department, July 1, 1891, to December 31, 1892.

GEORGE H. PLANT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there is no further morning business, that order is closed and the Calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order. The first Senate bill on the Calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 707) for the relief of George H. Plant, of the District of Columbia, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, in line 6, before the word "thousand," to strike out "six" and insert "five," and after the word "thousand" to strike out "seven" and insert "two;" and in line 11, after the word "river," to add to the bill "and to be received by him in full satisfaction of all claims and demands in consequence of the said collision;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to George H. Plant, of the District of Columbia, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,216.85, the same being the amount found to be due him by the Court of Claims for losses and damages sustained by him by reason of a collision between the United States steamship Gettysburg and the steamboat Lady of Lake, on the Potomac River, and to be received by him in full satisfaction of all claims and demands in consequence of the said collision.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID C. CANFIELD.

The bill (S. 1825) granting a pension to David C. Canfield was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. I object to that bill. I move that it be indefinitely postponed, as it is an adverse report.

The motion was agreed to.

JOHN BENN.

The bill (S. 1018) granting a pension to John Benn was announced as next in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is an adverse report. I move that the bill be postponed indefinitely.

The motion was agreed to.

HOLSTEIN-FRIESIAN CATTLE ASSOCIATION.

The bill (S. 3165) to incorporate the Holstein-Friesian Cattle Association of America was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was read.

Mr. COCKRELL. I can not believe that it is necessary for Congress to incorporate the owners of a certain breed of cattle and authorize them to make their own reports, to be transmitted through the Secretary of Agriculture to Congress, those reports to be printed at the public expense. I must therefore object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MANDERSON. I hope that the Senator from Missouri

will not object to the consideration of the bill. I have an amendment in hand which I will read for his information that I think strips from the bill the objectionable feature there is in it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let me hear the amendment.

Mr. MANDERSON. The gentlemen who are named in the bill as incorporators are all of them men well known throughout the country as having at enormous private expense taken action tending to better the breed of cattle in this country. The particular breed known as the Holstein cattle is perhaps the best ever imported for general use, not only for milk-giving, butter-producing, and cheese-making purposes, but also for the usual purposes of beef cattle.

What is desired by these gentlemen is that they shall have the same character of organization that has been given to some others who are engaged in similar pursuits. I do not think that there should be any sanction in the bill that would authorize them to make reports to the Secretary of Agriculture, which, of course, would require ultimately the printing of such reports as they might see fit to give forth.

I notice in the bill as reported favorably from the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives an amendment that strips it, I think, of the objectionable feature. I propose to strike out all after the word "law," in line 22, down to the end of the bill, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

The principal office of the association shall be at Washington, in the District of Columbia, but annual meetings may be held in such places as the incorporators or their successors shall from time to time determine.

That, I think, strips the bill of any objection. I fully concur in the views of the Committee on Agriculture of the two Houses, not myself being a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and not being in charge of the bill but advocating it in the absence of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], who has it directly in charge. Several of these gentlemen have spoken to me of the great good that will flow from such an operation, and I think by the amendment the bill is stripped of all objection. I hope the Senator from Missouri will let the bill be passed.

Mr. COCKRELL. I withdraw my objection. If the amendment is agreed to it strips the bill of the objectionable feature.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think so; and it makes the Senate bill conform to the House bill as reported in the other branch.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 22, after the word "law," strike out the remainder of the bill and in lieu thereof insert:

The principal office of the association shall be at Washington, in the District of Columbia, but annual meetings may be held in such places as the incorporators or their successors shall from time to time determine.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think there will be no objection to the bill as proposed to be amended. I wish to state that this is a voluntary association of the leading stock-breeders in the United States. It is not an association for the purpose of making money, but merely for the purpose of improving this particular breed of cattle.

Mr. COCKRELL. But does not the Senator see that if we required the association to make an annual report to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Agriculture to submit the report to Congress, it would be a magnificent advertisement of a private enterprise at public expense?

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not believe in doing that, and I do not think they intended it, because the Commissioner of Agriculture calls upon these gentlemen for information on this very subject, receives from them such information as they can give, and that information is embodied more or less in his reports to Congress. I do not suppose these gentlemen desire to make report except when called upon for information by the Secretary of Agriculture. The amendment strikes out any idea of that sort.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the amendment be read again so as to see exactly what it is.

Mr. MANDERSON's amendment was again read.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have no special objection to the bill in the form proposed, except that some parties in the United States do not agree with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, that the Holstein is the best possible breed of cattle.

Mr. MANDERSON. I said for all purposes. The Jerseys are better in some respects.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL SANITARIUM.

The joint resolution (S. R. 67) providing for the appointment of a commission to select a site for the establishment of a na-

tional sanitarium for the treatment of pulmonary diseases was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The joint resolution, being adversely reported, will be indefinitely postponed, if there be no objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that that joint resolution may be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be so ordered.

LEGAL-TENDER PAPER MONEY AND SILVER.

The resolution submitted by Mr. MORGAN July 14, 1892, directing the Committee on Finance to report a bill to give to all paper money issued directly by the United States as a legal tender, etc., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORRILL. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] is not present. I suppose he has allowed the resolution to lie upon the table of the Senate so as to enable him to call it up and make some remarks upon the subject. I therefore ask that the resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

HIRAM W. LOVE.

The bill (S. 1119) for the relief of Hiram W. Love, which had been reported adversely by the Committee on Claims, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that that bill be indefinitely postponed.

The motion was agreed to.

WHARF AT WAKEFIELD, VA.

The joint resolution (S. R. 102) to provide for the construction of a wharf as a means of approach to the monument to be erected at Wakefield, Va., to mark the birthplace of George Washington, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that \$11,136, or so much thereof as may be necessary, of the amount appropriated by an act of Congress approved February 26, 1881, for the purpose of erecting a monument at and marking the birthplace of George Washington, may be expended and used, under the direction of the Secretary of State, to construct a wharf as a means of approach to the proposed monument at Wakefield, Va.; the wharf to be constructed of cast-iron screw piles, with a timber deck, as planned and estimated for by Col. Thomas L. Casey, of the Engineer Corps, United States Army, in his letter of April 18, 1884, to the honorable Frederick T. Frelinghuysen, Secretary of State.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION OF NEW MEXICO.

The bill (H. R. 7136) to enable the people of New Mexico to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORRILL and Mr. QUAY. Let that bill go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JACOB KERN.

The bill (S. 2337) for the relief of Jacob Kern was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. MORRILL. I think that had better go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

CATHERINE E. WHITALL.

The bill (S. 2126) for the relief of Catherine E. Whittall was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN. A bill similar to this was reported a few days ago and passed. Therefore this bill should be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be indefinitely postponed, in the absence of objection.

Mr. BATE. A similar bill passed last here Saturday, which was reported by the Military Committee. I think exactly the same bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That was a bill of a different number. The bill, the title of which has been reported, has been indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BATE. Very well.

ISRAEL KIMBALL.

The bill (S. 594) for the relief of Israel Kimball, which had been reported adversely by the Committee on Claims, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that bill be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be indefinitely postponed, in the absence of objection.

MARY P. C. HOOPER.

The bill (S. 2130) for the relief of Mrs. Mary P. C. Hooper was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to

extend the patent granted to Mrs. Mary P. C. Hooper, of New York, for improvement in machine for sewing straw braid, on the 26th of May, 1885, reissue numbered 10,600, the original letters patent of which were granted to her under her maiden name of Mary P. Carpenter, January 4, 1876, for the benefit of Mrs. Mary P. C. Hooper, her heirs and legal representatives, for seven years from and after the 4th of January, 1893; but the extended patent shall be open to legal inquiry and decision in the same manner as if issued under the general law relating to patents.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to strike out in line 11, before the word "years," the word "seven" and insert "four."

I doubt the propriety of the passage of any bill extending a patent right, a monopoly, which has existed for 17 years. I think that is quite sufficient, but as I understand from the report in this case that this party practically has had no benefit of the existence of her patent, I am willing to give four additional years. That will make the patent then of full age, 21 years.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 11 it is proposed to strike out the word "seven" and insert "four;" so as to read:

And the same are hereby extended for the benefit of the said Mrs. Mary P. C. Hooper, her heirs and legal representatives, for four years, from and after the 4th day of January, 1893.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH ARLINGTON RESERVATION.

Mr. BLODGETT. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 3711.

There being no objection the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3711) granting the right of way through the Arlington reservation for railroad purposes.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments; in section 1, line 9, after the word "width," to strike out "measured at right angles to the" and insert "each side of the;" in line 13, after the word "that," to insert "said line or route shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, and;" and in line 16, after the word "Government," to insert "and said road shall be commenced within one year from the date of the passage of this act and finished within three years;" so as to make the section read:

That the Washington Southern Railway Company is hereby authorized to construct and thereafter maintain and operate its railroad across the grounds of the United States Government known as the Arlington reservation, in the State of Virginia, opposite the city of Washington, and for such purpose said company is hereby granted a right of way 33 feet in width, each side of the center line of the adopted line for the Georgetown branch of the Washington Southern Railway, through the grounds aforesaid, at the points marked A and B, respectively, as shown on plat filed with the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That said line or route shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War and when said right of way shall cease to be used for the purpose aforesaid, the same shall revert to the United States Government, and said road shall be commenced within one year from the date of the passage of this act and finished within three years: *Provided further*, That before this act shall take effect the Secretary of War shall cause to be assessed the damage, if any, which may accrue to the United States Government by the grant of this right of way, by three officers of the Army, and the amount of such award shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to ask if it is really necessary that 66 feet should be given for the right of way.

Mr. BLODGETT. Sixty-six feet is the amount necessary for the right of way.

Mr. MANDERSON. I will state further that that was really the understanding of the language of the bill had by the War Department, but it was a misstatement. Instead of giving 66 feet the bill reads "giving 33 feet," making the center line of the road the center of 33 feet, when it should have been the center of 66 feet.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INAUGURATION ARRANGEMENTS.

Mr. McMILLAN. I ask for the present consideration of a joint resolution which has come from the House of Representatives, which is of some local importance. It will take but a moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a joint resolution, this day received from the House of Representatives.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 204) providing for additional telegraphic and electric-light facilities in the city of Washington during the inaugural ceremonies on the 4th day of March, 1893,

was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized to permit the Western Union Telegraph Company and the United States Electric Light Company to extend overhead wires into the Pension building and to such points along the line of parade as shall be deemed by the chief marshal convenient for use in connection with the parade and other inaugural purposes, the said wires to be taken down within ten days after the conclusion of the ceremonies on the 4th day of March, A. D. 1893.

Mr. McMILLAN. I ask for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOWARD LODGE, GALLATIN, TENN.

The bill (S. 3001) for the relief of Howard Lodge, No. 13, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Gallatin, Tenn., which had been reported adversely by the Committee on Claims, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that that bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. BATE. I ask that the bill may go over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. All right.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over without prejudice, retaining its place on the Calendar.

PETER BUCKLEY.

The bill (S. 3446) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter Buckley was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with an amendment, in line 8, after the name "Buckley," to strike out "with all the pay and other emoluments due him at date of expiration of term of his enlistment," and insert "as of the 25th of July, 1861, with the pay and emoluments due him at that date," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause the records to be so amended as to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter Buckley, late a member of Company E of the Eleventh Regiment of New York Volunteers, and that an honorable discharge be granted the said Peter Buckley as of the 25th of July, 1861, with pay and emoluments due him at that date.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE HILL, JR.

The bill (S. 612) for the relief of George Hill, jr., which had been reported adversely by the Committee on Claims, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. SAWYER. I ask that that bill may be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask that the bill may retain its place on the Calendar until I can examine it. I once reported that bill favorably.

Mr. SAWYER. I have no objection to the course the Senator suggests.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will go over without prejudice, retaining its place on the Calendar.

JERONEMUS S. UNDERHILL.

The bill (S. 3194) for the relief of Jeronemus S. Underhill, of the city of New York, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to submit to the Court of Claims the claim of Jeronemus S. Underhill for further compensation for the construction of the ironclad steam battery Modoc under and in compliance with the rules and regulations of the court, and giving the court jurisdiction to hear and determine and render judgment upon the same.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE W. QUINTARD.

The bill (S. 2598) for the relief of George W. Quintard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to submit to the Court of Claims the claims of George W. Quintard for further compensation for the construction of the ironclad vessel Onondaga, under and in compliance with the rules and regulations of the court, and giving the court jurisdiction to hear and determine and render judgment upon the same.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT LARAMIE, WYO.

The bill (S. 1844) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Laramie, Wyo., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments, in line 11, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty," and in line 15, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty," so as to read:

The site and building thereon, when completed according to the plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall not exceed the cost of \$50,000, and the site purchased shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of at least 50 feet, including streets and alleys; and for the purposes herein unmentioned the sum of \$50,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN FINN.

Mr. COCKRELL. My colleague [Mr. VEST], who is necessarily absent, desired that I should call up the bill (H. R. 5504) to permit the withdrawal of certain papers and the signing of certain receipts by John Finn or his attorney, which was reported favorably by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL]. It will only take a moment, and I ask that it may be considered.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5504) to permit the withdrawal of certain papers and the signing of certain receipts by John Finn or his attorney.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment in line 6, after the words "thirty-three," to strike out "quartermaster's vouchers belonging to him, and aggregating the sum of \$7,066.64, which vouchers are unsigned by the payees, and were left with the said Auditor for the sole and only purpose of verification with," and insert "papers purporting to be quartermaster's vouchers heretofore deposited by him in the office of the Quartermaster-General and by that officer referred to the Third Auditor of the Treasury, and aggregating the sum of \$7,066.64, which vouchers are unsigned by the payees; and the receipt by said John Finn, filed with the Third Auditor for the same, shall be taken and deemed sufficient to authorize the delivery thereof to him of said alleged vouchers by the Third Auditor," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to permit John Finn to withdraw, on depositing with the Auditor copies of the same, from the office of the Third Auditor of the Treasury, 333 papers purporting to be quartermaster's vouchers heretofore deposited by him in the office of the Quartermaster-General and by that officer referred to the Third Auditor of the Treasury, and aggregating the sum of \$7,066.64, which vouchers are unsigned by the payees; and the receipt by said John Finn, filed with the Third Auditor for the same, shall be taken and deemed sufficient to authorize the delivery thereof to him of said alleged vouchers by the Third Auditor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to permit the withdrawal of certain papers and the signing of certain receipts by John Finn."

MRS. FANNIE N. BELGER.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask the Senate to consider Order of Business 1296, being Senate bill 1683.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1683) for the relief of Mrs. Fannie N. Belger was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in line 10, after the word "death," to insert "so that said sum shall not exceed \$4,687.46," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Mrs. Fannie N. Belger, wife of Maj. James Belger, United States Army, deceased, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum of money equal in amount to the difference between the pay of a major on the retired list of the Army and that of a colonel on said list, from the date of the restoration and retirement of said James Belger to the date of his death, so that said sum shall not exceed \$4,687.46.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAKE UNION AND WASHINGTON SHIP CANAL.

The bill (S. 1801) making appropriations for the construction of a ship canal connecting Lakes Union and Washington with Puget Sound, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that bill be passed over for the present, as the Senator who reported the bill and the Senator who introduced it are both absent.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

KANSAS RIVER DAMS.

The bill (S. 3294) to authorize the construction of a dam across the Kansas River, near Kansas City, in the State of Kansas, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 3, after the word "company," to insert "a corporation duly created and organized under the laws of Kansas;" in line 5, before the word "successors," to strike out "their" and insert "its;" in the same line, before the word "hereby," to insert "are;" in line 6, before the word "authorized," to strike out "are," and in the same line, after the word "authorized," to strike out "empowered;" so as to make the section read:

That the Kansas City Land and Water Power Company, a corporation duly created and organized under the laws of Kansas, and its successors or assigns be, and are hereby, authorized and permitted to erect and maintain a dam across said Kansas River at some point thereon between the west line of section numbered 17, township numbered 11, range numbered 25, and the west line of section numbered 28, township numbered 12, range numbered 24, in Wyandotte County, State of Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 1, after the word "the," to strike out "dam so to be constructed shall be and constitute a lawful improvement when completed under and in accordance with the statute laws of the State of Kansas, entitled 'An act to authorize the erection and maintenance of milldams and mills,' approved May 27, 1867," and insert "right to alter, amend, or repeal this act at any time is hereby expressly reserved;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act at any time is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill (S. 3297) granting to the Interstate Water and Electric Power Company, of Kansas, the right to erect and maintain a dam or dams across the Kansas River, within Wyandotte County, in the State of Kansas, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 6, after the word "dam," to strike out "or dams;" in line 7, after the word "place," to strike out "or places;" and in line 8, before the word "county," to strike out "Shawnee" and insert "Wyandotte;" so as to make the section read:

That the assent of Congress is hereby given to the Interstate Water and Electric Power Company, a corporation created and organized under the laws of Kansas, its successors and assigns, to erect, construct, and maintain a dam across the Kansas River at any suitable place within Wyandotte County, in the State of Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 2, after the word "act," to insert "at any time;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act at any time is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting to the Interstate Water and Electric Power Company, of Kansas, the right to erect and maintain a dam across the Kansas River within Wyandotte County, in the State of Kansas."

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION OF ARID LANDS.

The bill (S. 2529) providing for the irrigation and reclamation of arid lands, for the protection of forests and utilization of pasturage, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that bill be passed over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

OURDAN & KOLB LETTER-ENGRAVING MACHINE.

The bill (S. 2993) authorizing the purchase of the Ourdan & Kolb letter-engraving machine for the use of the Navy Department, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read in that case, Mr. President.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will allow me, I will call his attention in the report to the clause where the board of experts recommend the purchase of this machine. It is on the second page of the report:

It appearing from the reports referred to that the work of engraving the charts issued by the Hydrographic Office would be greatly facilitated by the use of the Ourdan & Kolb letter-engraving machine, the Department deems it advisable to purchase the same.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be read at the desk, and then we can all hear it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. CHANDLER, July 25, 1892:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2993) authorizing the purchase of the Ourdan & Kolb letter-engraving machine for the use of the Navy Department, have considered the same and recommend its passage for the reason contained in the following communications of the Navy Department:

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, July 14, 1892.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram of yesterday requesting a statement of the views of this Department as to the advisability of authority to purchase the Ourdan & Kolb letter-engraving machine for use in the Hydrographic Office.

In reply I have to state that the Department has addressed a communication to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, in response to his request for a recommendation in the matter of the proposed purchase of the machine referred to, and as the said communication contains a full statement of the views of the Department upon the subject, I transmit herewith a copy of the same, with its inclosures, for your information.

Very respectfully,

B. F. TRACY,
Secretary of the Navy.

HON. WILLIAM E. CHANDLER,
United States Senate.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, Washington, July 14, 1892.

SIR: Referring to the letter of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, dated the 4th of May last, transmitting a copy of House bill No. 5799, authorizing the purchase of the Ourdan & Kolb letter-engraving machine for the use of the Navy Department, with the request that this Department communicate to the committee any recommendations it may desire to make with reference to said bill, I have the honor to state that the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, to whom the inquiry of the committee was referred by the Department for report and recommendation, has submitted, with his concurrence, the following report, made by the Hydrographer to the Bureau:

"In reference to bill H. R. 5799, to authorize the purchase of the Ourdan & Kolb letter-engraving machine for the use of the Navy Department, I have the honor to state that the machine has been examined and tested by a board composed of naval officers and civil experts and found to be suitable for engraving the figures representing depths of water on the charts issued by the Navy Department. The advantage of the machine is that it engraves economically a portion of the work to be done on each chart plate and leaves the engravers available for the performance of those parts of the work which must be done by hand. It will, therefore, increase the capacity of a given working force and enable the Department to place the results of important surveys at the service of the mariner more promptly. I think it would be advisable to purchase the machine.

"The right of the Government to reproduce the machine or any of its parts free of all royalty should be inserted in the bill. I consider \$20,000 for a single machine as excessive."

A copy of the report of the board herein mentioned is inclosed for the further information of the committee.

It appearing from the reports referred to, that the work of engraving the charts issued by the Hydrographic Office would be greatly facilitated by the use of the Ourdan & Kolb letter-engraving machine, the Department deems it advisable to purchase the same, but the attention of the committee is invited to the statement of the Hydrographer that the sum of \$20,000 is regarded as an excessive price for a single machine. If it is the intention of the bill to provide that by the proposed purchase the United States shall acquire not only a single machine but the right to manufacture and use the Ourdan & Kolb letter-engraving machine without the payment of royalty, the Department would suggest that the bill be amended so as to clearly provide for the purchase of the patent right, and that a further provision be inserted securing to the United States the benefit of all improvements which have been or may be made in said machine by the inventors.

Very respectfully,

B. F. TRACY, Secretary of the Navy.

HON. WILLIAM S. HOLMAN,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 7, 1891.

SIR: In obedience to your order of February 6, 1891, we have the honor to make the following report:

The examination of the Ourdan & Kolb letter-engraving machine consisted of a close observation of its performance in engraving the soundings on two copper plates from drawings of charts prepared for engraving by the Hydrographic Office. On the first plate were engraved the soundings, shown on the Hydrographic Office chart No. 1102, which lie south of the parallel of 48°; and on the second were engraved the soundings on the chart of Shanghai Harbor now in course of construction, and preliminarily numbered 228 P. Proofs of these plates, marked A and B respectively, are herewith appended.

The scale of the projection on the first plate was designedly changed so as to make its extreme dimensions about one-half an inch greater than the corresponding dimensions of the drawing in order to provide an incidental test of the capacity of the machine to adjust the work for the small differences of scale which sometimes exist in practice between the drawing and the engraving. It should be stated that the difference which was assigned is much greater than those ordinarily occurring in practice.

The machine is found to be suitable for use in engraving the charts issued by the Navy Department.

An examination of the plates and proof show that the soundings have been neatly and durably engraved, and that they are well spaced, distinct, and clearly readable. The adjustment of the work for the difference in scale

between the first plate and the corresponding drawing is sufficient to show that in practice no errors from this cause are likely to occur.

On the second plate there was no difference between the scale of the plate and that of the drawing. On this the stationing of the soundings was found to be exact. The distribution of the work on the first plate is such as to make the engraving of it difficult alike by hand and by machine, while that on the second plate is convenient alike for execution by hand and by machine. The performance of the machine under average circumstances can thus be fairly deduced and compared with the results attained by hand.

The services of two men are required to operate the machine. They would be fairly paid at the rate of \$4 and \$2 per day, respectively.

On the first plate 2,900 soundings were stationed and engraved in a period extending over four days and amounting to twenty hours. On the second plate 3,200 soundings were stationed and engraved in six consecutive hours. On both plates 6,100 soundings were engraved in twenty-six hours or four working days.

A skilled engraver required seven and three-quarter hours to trace and lay down the soundings on the first plate. He would require nine hours to gauge and mark them in, and seven days to engrave them according to the present standard, or ten days for the stationing and engraving of the 2,900 soundings on the first plate. Similarly for the second plate, nine days would be required to station and engrave the 3,200 soundings. For both plates nineteen days would be required to station and engrave the 6,100 soundings. Thus if skilled engraver working nineteen days, or 19 skilled engravers working one day, or approximately 5 skilled engravers working four days will accomplish as much as the machine does in four days.

The cost of operating the machine one year, exclusive of the interest on the investment, is \$8 (365—52) = 6 × 313. \$1,875
The services of five skilled engravers for one year will cost 7,825

Annual gain in the capacity of the office 5,947

It appears also that this machine will station and engrave soundings at the rate of 40 cents per 100. The average cost of this work in the office is \$1.50 per 100, and by contract \$2 per 100. The cost of engraving soundings by this machine is one-fourth of the usual cost.

It should be clearly stated that part of this advantage is involved in the change of the character of the figure engraved, and, inasmuch as engravers have not generally been engaged under the supervision of the Government in engraving figures consisting of lines of invariable breadth, such as are engraved by this machine, it becomes difficult to state the advantage of the machine in exact terms.

After the second plate was removed from the machine an engraver was employed one and one-half hours in finishing the 4's and 8's. It is our opinion, however, that it is unnecessary to modify the figure 4 as it is engraved by the machine.

The board finds itself unable to fix a price for a machine involving so much skill, genius, and labor, but is of the opinion that if a price is submitted judgment could be formed as to whether it is fair.

Respectfully submitted.

JOHN A. NORRIS,
Lieutenant, U. S. Navy.
HERBERT G. OGDEN,
Assistant, U. S. Coast and Geodetic Survey.
H. M. WITZEL,
Lieutenant, U. S. Navy.
G. W. LITTLEHALES,
Assistant, U. S. Hydrographic Office.

The HYDROGRAPHER, U. S. NAVY,
U. S. Hydrographic Office, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

Mr. COCKRELL. In line 6, after the word "machine," I move to insert "and the right to manufacture and use the same and any improvements which have been or may be made in the same without the payment of any royalty therefor." That is the express recommendation of the board.

Mr. CHANDLER. That amendment should be made. I had drawn a similar amendment, but it is entirely complete in the language used by the Senator from Missouri and should be adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. After the words "Navy Department," in line 4, I move to insert "or any other Government Department."

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct.

Mr. COCKRELL. Perhaps it would be better to strike out the words "Navy Department" and insert "for the use of the Government."

Mr. CHANDLER. Say "for the use of the United States."

Mr. COCKRELL. I move, in line 4 and line 7, to strike out the words "Navy Department" where they occur and insert "United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAWLEY in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 4, it is proposed to strike out "Navy Department" and insert "the United States;" and in line 7, to strike out "Navy Department" and insert "United States;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to purchase for the use of the United States, at a cost not exceeding the sum of \$20,000, the Oudran & Kolb letter-engraving machine, for the use of the United States, etc.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no disposition to delay the consideration of this bill, if it is a good one, but I have not had time to examine it; and remembering that the Government has reversed its policy in reference to presses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and returned to hand work, I ask that the bill go over until I can look into it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the last amendment be adopted, and then let the bill go over.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have no objection to that.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill goes over under objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the bill be printed as amended. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be printed as amended in the absence of objection.

WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas submitted the following conference report; which was read:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9527) to restore to the public domain a portion of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation in the Territory of Arizona, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 2 thereof strike out the word "Colville" and insert in lieu thereof the words "White Mountain Apache Indian;" and the Senate agree to the same.

JAMES K. JONES,
O. H. PLATT,
CHARLES F. MANDERSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
S. W. PEEL,
THOMAS DUNN ENGLISH,
JOHN L. WILSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was concurred in.

LIBRARY OF HUBERT HOWE BANCROFT.

The joint resolution (S. R. 108) directing the appraisal of the library of Hubert Howe Bancroft was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COCKRELL. I see there is no report accompanying this joint resolution.

Mr. QUAY. This is not the original proposition for the purchase of the Bancroft library, which I think, as submitted, involved an expenditure of \$500,000, but merely provides for an appraisal. It is a subject in which the late Mr. Blaine took a deep interest. It was brought to my attention by Mr. Curtis, of the Bureau of Pan-American Republics, who has examined the documents in the library of Mr. Bancroft, and believes they are of the greatest value to the Government and ought to be in our possession.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WASHINGTON AND ARLINGTON RAILROAD COMPANY.

The bill (S. 3448) to amend the charter of the Washington and Arlington Railroad Company was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask that that bill may be temporarily passed, retaining its place on the Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be so ordered.

Mr. HUNTON subsequently said: I desire to inquire what was done with the bill to amend the charter of the Washington and Arlington Railroad Company?

Mr. PERKINS. It was passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was temporarily laid aside.

Mr. HUNTON. Why was it passed over?

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN], the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, requested me to have the bill passed over. I did so at his request. I do not know why he made the request.

CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND AND PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 3702. I think the bill will take no time.

By unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3702) granting to the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company the use of certain lands at the Chickasaw Station, and for a "Y" in the Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "station," to strike out "Chickasaw" and insert "Chickasha;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company, a corporation created under and by virtue of the laws of the States of Illinois and Iowa, is hereby granted the right to use for railroad purposes two additional strips of land, each 100 feet in width, lying on each side of the ground selected for station purposes, under act of Congress, Chickasha Station, in the Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory; and said railway company is also granted a right of way 1,500 feet in length for a "Y" in sections 21 and 22, township 7 north, range 7 west of Indian meridian, said right of way to be of a width of 300 feet for a distance of 400 feet, and for the remaining 1,100 feet the width shall be 100 feet. The amount of compensation to be paid to the Chickasaw Nation or tribe of Indians for such appropriation of land and

right of way shall be ascertained and determined in the manner provided for the determination of the compensation to be paid to individual occupants of lands, as provided in section 8 of an act entitled "An act to grant the right of way through the Indian Territory to the Chicago, Kansas and Nebraska Railway Company, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1887: *Provided*, That said strips of lands and the lands included in the said "Y" shall be subject to all the conditions, restrictions, and limitations contained in the said act of Congress last mentioned.

Mr. PERKINS. This amendment simply changes the name of the station, which was erroneously printed in the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PERKINS, the title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting to the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company the use of certain lands at Chickasha Station, and for a 'Y' in the Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory."

GAINESVILLE, OKLAHOMA, AND GULF RAILWAY.

Mr. COKE. I ask for the present consideration of House bill 3627.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator from Texas if he will withhold that request until the next bill on the Calendar is reached.

Mr. COKE. This is the next bill on the Calendar. It will take but a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate was considering the Calendar in regular order and had just disposed of the Senate joint resolution 108, when a special request was made by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] for the consideration of another bill, which has been passed.

Mr. COKE. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3627) to grant to the Gainesville, Oklahoma, and Gulf Railway Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, which stands next in order on the Calendar to the bill called up by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will not object to the consideration of the bill which the Senator asks to have taken up, but I am waiting patiently for the next bill on the Calendar in regular order; and therefore I shall object to any other request for special consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3627) to grant to the Gainesville, Oklahoma, and Gulf Railway Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 12, after the word "Territory," to insert "and Oklahoma."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 11, after the word "roadbed," to insert "not exceeding 100 feet in width on each side of said right of way;" so as to read:

That a right of way of 100 feet in width through said Indian Territory is hereby granted to the Gainesville, Oklahoma, and Gulf Railway Company, and a strip of land 200 feet in width, with a length of 3,000 feet in addition to the right of way, is granted for such stations as may be established, but such grant shall be allowed but once for every 10 miles of the road, no portion of which shall be sold or leased by the company, with the right to use such additional grounds where there are heavy cuts or fills as may be necessary for the construction and maintenance of the roadbed, not exceeding 100 feet in width on each side of said right of way, or as much thereof as may be included in said cut or fill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, line 10, after the word "President," to insert "of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to add to section 5 the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That if said right of way shall pass over or through any land allotted to an Indian in accordance with any law or treaty it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to provide for obtaining the consent of such allottee or allottees to said right of way and to fix the amount of compensation to be paid such allottees for right of way and for damages sustained by them by reason of the construction of the road; but no right of any kind shall invest in said railway company to any portion of said right of way passing over or through any allotted lands until the compensation herein provided for shall be fixed and paid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the word "invest," in the third line on page 7, where it reads, "but no right of any kind shall invest in said railway company." The word should be "vest," the Chair supposes.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yes; that correction ought to be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, that correction will be made. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, line 2, before the word "route," to strike out the word "general."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No further amendment is reported by the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. If there is no objection on the part of the Senator reporting the bill, I suggest that the tenth section be stricken out. I know it has been usual to insert such a section in these bills, but it seems to me the time has come when there is no propriety in inserting the provision. I will move to strike it out unless the motion is going to be antagonized. If it is, I will not make the motion.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I would object to striking out that section. The bill was submitted to the Indian Office and the opinion of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs was asked about it, and he prepared the bill in its present shape.

Mr. PERKINS. I will not move to amend.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The bill was so reported by the committee, and I think it ought to stand in its present condition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CULLOM. I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 9350.

Mr. COKE. I ask the Senator from Illinois to let the pending bill be disposed of.

Mr. CULLOM. If the bill can come to a final vote without debate I shall not raise any objection.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It will take but a moment to dispose of it.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. COKE. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Presiding Officer was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. JONES of Arkansas, Mr. PLATT, and Mr. DAWES were appointed.

TRANSPORTATION OF MERCHANDISE IN FOREIGN VESSELS.

Mr. CULLOM. I have consented to yield to the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], who has in charge a measure he wishes to have considered.

Mr. FRYE. I desire to call up the bill (S. 3510) to amend section 4347 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. It is an important bill, reported unanimously by the Committee on Commerce, and it ought to be sent to the other House.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FRYE. The bill as reported need not be read, because it recites a very long statute. I propose an amendment in its place, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert what I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 4347 of the Revised Statutes of the United States be amended by inserting after the word "power," in line 4, the following words: "And the transportation of merchandise in any such vessel or vessels from one port of the United States to another port of the United States via any foreign port shall be deemed a violation of the foregoing provision."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. McPHERSON. What does it relate to?

Mr. FRYE. There has sprung up within the last three years a custom on the part of foreign vessels to load at New York, clear for Bremen or Antwerp, and then reclear for San Francisco, thus interfering very seriously with our coastwise trade between New York and San Francisco. This is to stop it.

Mr. McPHERSON. Will not the distance between New York and Europe and from there to San Francisco necessarily stop it?

Mr. FRYE. It does not.

Mr. McPHERSON. Without legislation?

Mr. FRYE. It does not. I called the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury to this violation of the law about two years ago. The Secretary agreed with me that it was a plain, palpable violation of existing law, and ordered the seizure of a cargo of nails, shipped in New York, cleared for Antwerp, and then recleared, without landing at all, for San Francisco. The cargo was seized. The court held that while it was an evasion of the law, it was not, in strict terms, a violation, because, in words,

the act complained of was not forbidden. The court suggested that the only way to remedy it was for Congress to legislate.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The nails, I suppose, were sold by a nail manufacturer in the United States. I understand the Senator from Maine to say that they were shipped to Antwerp.

Mr. FRYE. Yes.

Mr. MCPHERSON. And without breaking bulk or breaking cargo, the ship sailed from Antwerp to San Francisco. If a market could have been found at Antwerp the cargo of nails would probably have been unloaded there.

Mr. FRYE. No.

Mr. MCPHERSON. It was done to violate the law?

Mr. FRYE. It was done to violate the law.

Mr. MCPHERSON. It seems to me, then, as though our domestic commerce needs an immense amount of protection if a vessel can sail eight or ten thousand miles in addition to that now sailed by our own vessels and still remain in competition with local commerce. This seems to me to be a protective measure far in excess of what any domestic commerce of the United States ought to require.

Mr. FRYE. Let me say as to the rate of freight, the last freight from New York for San Francisco by one of Arthur Sewell's large ships was a cargo of anthracite coal, at \$7 a ton, 15,000 miles. Nobody on earth can complain of that rate. It is at least for a ton per mile one-fifth of what any railroad on the face of the earth could carry it for. You can not and ought not to ask a lower freight rate. They do not make a lower freight rate; they make a longer service for the same freight rate.

Mr. DAWES. When these vessels clear from New York it is with the intention to go to San Francisco?

Mr. FRYE. Certainly.

Mr. DAWES. And to go around via Antwerp?

Mr. FRYE. To go around via Antwerp, in order to interfere with our coastwise trade.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 9786) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Monongahela River at West Elizabeth, in the State of Pennsylvania; and

A bill (H. R. 10331) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

A bill (H. R. 7762) to ratify and confirm agreement between the Puyallup Indians and the Northern Pacific Railroad Company for right of way through the Puyallup Indian Reservation; and

A bill (H. R. 8123) granting to the Santa Fe, Prescott and Phoenix Railway Company the right of way across the Whipple Barracks military reservation in Arizona.

CIRCUIT COURT JURISDICTION.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] states that there was a bill before the Senate yesterday, which was read, and which, he thinks, will lead to no discussion. I yield to him for the purpose of putting the bill on its passage.

Mr. HOAR. The bill went over in order that it might be printed. I think there will be no objection to it.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3851) to amend the act approved August 13, 1888, in relation to the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of the United States (chapter 866, 25 Statutes at Large, page 433).

Mr. DOLPH. I renew the suggestion I made yesterday to the Senator having charge of the bill as to whether it does not go too far in validating void service.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think there will be a single case under it except where the operations are in court and the facts are known.

Mr. DOLPH. There will be an attempt, whether we can do it or not, to validate what might be a void judgment.

Mr. HOAR. I will let that part of the bill be stricken out to save any possible question. I move to strike out of the bill, on

page 2, in line 14, after the word "brought," the following words:

And in all suits or actions brought since August 13, 1888, process heretofore or hereafter so served on such corporation shall be held valid to give said circuit court jurisdiction.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts state in what respect the bill proposes to change the existing law?

Mr. HOAR. The law from the beginning of the Government until 1888, made corporations established in one State suable in the United States courts wherever they were found transacting business, but by a construction which is supposed to have been put upon that law by the Supreme Court, they are only suable now in the State where they are chartered, so that if a citizen of Massachusetts goes to California and commits a trespass on the land of the citizen of the Government, he is suable in California; but a Massachusetts corporation which does the same thing can only be sued in the State of its domicile. The bill restores the ancient law and provides that in such cases the corporations may be sued in the State where they are found. That is the whole of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAWLEY in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, striking out certain words, beginning in line 14, on page 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. The same words should be stricken out where they occur later in the bill. In line 51, on page 3, after the word "brought," I move to strike out all down to and including the word "jurisdiction," in line 54, as follows:

And in all suits or actions brought since August 13, 1888, process heretofore or hereafter so served on such corporation shall be held valid to give said circuit court jurisdiction.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 10331) making appropriations for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill (H. R. 9786) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Monongahela River at West Elizabeth, in the State of Pennsylvania, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SAFETY OF LIFE ON RAILROADS.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that the regular order be now proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9350) to promote the safety of employes and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their cars with automatic couplers and continuous brakes, and their locomotives with driving-wheel brakes, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I desire to offer sundry amendments to the bill now pending before the Senate, for the purpose of perfecting and completing the bill in accordance, at least, with my idea of what the bill should be. I move, in section 2, on page 7 of the copy of the bill that I have before me, to strike out the following words, beginning with the word "coupling," in line 5, to and including the word "and," in line 6; so as to make the section read:

That on and after the 1st day of January, 1893, it shall be unlawful for any such common carrier to haul or permit to be hauled or used on its line any car used in moving interstate traffic not equipped with couplers which can be uncoupled without the necessity of men going between the ends of the cars.

The amendment eliminates from the bill anything and everything which directs railroads to put on car couplers which must be automatically coupled by impact.

The words in line 5, "uniform in type and action," I understand have already been stricken out of the bill. Now, if there is any reason for striking those words out there is equally a good reason for striking out the other words to which I have referred. This leaves the section then as I have read it. It directs the railroad company to have some form of coupler that will not compel the men to go between the ends of the cars to couple them, and without directing whether they shall use an automatic coupler which couples by impact or what it shall be. This amendment, I think, should be made.

Then, if the Senator from Illinois who is in charge of the bill will turn to section 5, on page 8 of the bill, he will find how entirely unnecessary such a section is in the bill. Assuming it to be true, which the Senator has often repeated on the floor of the

Senate, that the object of the bill is humanitarian, let us make it a humanitarian bill. Let us say that the railway companies shall employ some devices that will not compel couplers and those employed in braking and unbraking cars to go between the cars, and leave it then for the railroad companies to adjust the appliances in their own way to suit their own convenience.

The fifth section of the bill provides that they shall fix a maximum variation for drawbars, the height that they shall be above the level of the tops of the rails, etc., and that this shall be a joint arrangement between the American Railway Association and the Interstate Commerce Commission. It further provides that—

"Thereafter all cars built or sent to the shops for general repairs shall be of that standard."

Now, the criticism made yesterday afternoon by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] was a very just and proper one in respect to the question of repairs. Who is going to determine whether a car that goes into the shops shall be subjected to general repairs or only such repairs as are needed for a special purpose. There will be a continual conflict of authority, and this section of the bill must necessarily be entirely inoperative. Therefore, if the Senator from Illinois will permit section 5 to be stricken from the bill, and also the amendment to be made in section 2 which I have proposed, it then leaves the bill as I shall state.

Section 1 provides that there shall be power applied to the engine which will enable a train to be controlled by a brake, so that in a season of the year like the present, when the cars are covered with ice, a brakeman shall not be required to run from one end of the train to the other and in that way endanger life and limb for the purpose of breaking the train. Now, that is a very proper provision.

Section 2 would then only provide that they should employ some device which would not require the couplers to go between the ends of the cars to couple them. This is a very proper measure of legislation.

Then section 3 would remain as it is, and practically it declares that it shall not be unlawful to refuse freight from the connecting line of railroads if the cars are not sufficiently equipped, or properly equipped with these improvements.

Section 4 provides that they shall provide grab irons or handholds at the ends and sides of each car. Nobody disputes but that this is a proper subject of legislation.

Section 6 then provides a penalty for a violation of the law. And what would be the law? That there should be some appliance to fulfill this law which railroads themselves may be able to adopt, and regulate the universal use of the appliance. In reality they are the only power that can adjust this matter satisfactorily or rightfully. Leave them, then, to determine the question as to what form of brake or coupler shall be used. To illustrate, take the great city of Chicago, where hundreds of railroads meet and diverge from that city.

One of the trunk lines of road running to the city of Washington, Philadelphia, or Baltimore, enters the city of Chicago with freight destined for a point west of Chicago. It will certainly be to the interest of the roads west of Chicago to use the same kind of appliances that are used by the trunk lines east, and also for the interest of the trunk lines east to use the same devices used by the roads west of Chicago, which collect the vast amount of freight and bring it to that great distributing point. Therefore, it is safer and wiser and better to permit the railway companies to adjust their own devices and not undertake to direct it by legislation.

Now, if section 5 is stricken out, and the amendment I have offered to section 2 be adopted, it will leave the bill a purely humanitarian measure. It will declare that the roads shall not use devices which will require brakemen to run over the tops of their trains, which will require couplers to pass between the end of the cars, and it will then provide a penalty for the violation. To do more is to defeat the purpose you have in view.

I move, on page 7, section 2, line 5, to strike out the words "coupling automatically by impact and."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, section 2, line 5, strike out the words "coupling automatically by impact and;" so as to make the section read:

That on and after the 1st day of January, 1898, it shall be unlawful for any such common carrier to haul or permit to be hauled or used on its line any car used in moving interstate traffic not equipped with couplers which can be uncoupled without the necessity of men going between the ends of the cars.

Mr. MCPHERSON. That is all you can accomplish by legislation, and I repeat it is infinitely safer, better, and wiser in every way, without any direction in a bill passed by Congress, to permit them to regulate their own coupling affairs in their own way, as will be most consistent with the public interest, because

what is for the interest of the railroad in this respect is for the interest of the public.

Mr. WHITE. Under the Senator's amendment will men be required to couple the cars without going between them?

Mr. MCPHERSON. It does not matter whether the cars are to be coupled or uncoupled. The only thing we are trying to reach here by legislation is that the employé of the railway company shall not be required to expose his life and limb to the impact of the car. It may be done by a coupler which is adjustable by impact. It may be by any other device which the railway company may seek to employ.

Mr. WHITE. I did not make my question perhaps clear to the Senator. By the terms of his amendment will it be necessary that the cars shall be coupled without men being permitted to go between the cars?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Most assuredly.

Mr. WHITE. I ask that the amendment be read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be again read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, section 2, line 5, after the word "couplers," it is proposed to strike out the words "coupling automatically by impact and;" so as to make the section read:

That on and after the 1st day of January, 1898, it shall be unlawful for any such common carrier to haul or permit to be hauled or used on its line any car used in moving interstate traffic not equipped with couplers which can be uncoupled without the necessity of men going between the ends of the cars.

Mr. MCPHERSON. It should read "which can be coupled or uncoupled." I will supply the words "coupled or." I did not notice that.

Mr. WHITE. That answers my question.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey, who is very well informed, indeed, upon this class of questions, whether there is any car in common use that will not be described by the section as he proposes to leave it?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Not any in the world. I do not suppose there could be. I can not imagine a car that would not be described by the section.

Mr. HOAR. I think the Senator does not understand my question. I will state the point of my question more fully. I understand that the old link and pin cars which are in use can not be coupled and uncoupled without going between the cars. A stick or some mechanism, four or five feet long, is used for the purpose, but practically the men will go between the cars. Practically they will be required to do so, for a brakeman who will not do it and takes the longer method, the longer time to do it, is very likely to be discharged by his company. So, as the Senator's amendment would leave the bill applicable only to cars which can not be uncoupled except by going within, we should have no practical legislation on the subject.

Mr. MCPHERSON. We would have this legislation. The Senator speaks of what would be a practical working device. Certainly it has been proven by experience, and long experience, that the common cars now in use coupled with links can not be coupled and uncoupled in practice in any other way, except by going between the cars.

Mr. HOAR. I understood the Senator to say just now that they could.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I say they can not, as a practical fact, be coupled in any way except by going between the cars; and with my amendment to the bill, as I understand it, the effect of it would be to put on some devices that would not require the men to go in between the cars.

Mr. HOAR. It is not true that the old-fashioned link-and-pin car can be coupled or uncoupled by a stick with a hook at the end of it without going between the cars?

Mr. MCPHERSON. The Senator knows perfectly well that in the practice of running railroads in this or any other country such a thing would be totally impracticable and out of all reason.

Mr. HOAR. That is precisely the point of my objection. The Senator has not described what can be done in practice under the bill as he leaves it. He has described what is possible. He uses the word "necessity." Therefore if the Pennsylvania or Baltimore and Ohio Railroad shall go back to the old link and pin on every freight car, it has, as the Senator leaves the bill, a perfect defense to any legal complaint, because your bill does not say they shall not use cars which in practice forbid the men to go between, but you provide against cars where there is a necessity to go between.

Mr. MCPHERSON. You require that they shall be coupled or uncoupled automatically by impact in the bill as it stands at present.

Mr. HOAR. I am not speaking of the bill as it stands.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Now, I do not care how they are coupled, if they are coupled by some device outside of the car by some

system of leverage which may be employed, provided that it does not require the operator to go between the cars. I can imagine a device whereby an operator might stand on the outside of the car, by a system of leverage which is attached to the car. The idea, though, of directing the bolt or directing the link by a stick would be totally impracticable and to me very absurd.

Mr. HOAR. On the contrary, several Senators have stated the reverse.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I have promised to yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE], and after that I will yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator pardon me one moment? The point of my question to the Senator is not in relation to the object or purpose of the measure. I am in accord with him as I understand him. I suppose, in regard to this matter, the Senator and I are exactly in accord in our desire as to what is to be done. The point of my question had reference to the mere question of phraseology. The Senator has offered an amendment, which, as I understand it, enables the carrier to defend himself if he can show that there is not an absolute physical necessity for the man to go in between the cars, although he still continues a form of coupler under which, in practice, every man will go in between cars. It is a question about the phraseology of the bill as left by the Senator's amendment.

Mr. BRICE. It is precisely as to that point I wanted to make the suggestion that in the amendment I offered yesterday, at the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. WHITE], I inserted the following words, which I will ask the Senator from New Jersey to incorporate in his amendment:

Which require or which in practice result in.

Mr. HOAR. That is the point I want to get at.

Mr. MCPHERSON. That I think would be a betterment. I do not know that the amendment I moved would be liable technically to the objection made by the Senator from Massachusetts. In practice it would not be at all liable to his objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey will present the amendment in the form he and the Senator from Ohio have agreed upon.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I think we had better pass over that amendment for a moment. I will have the amendment reconstructed entirely, which will require some little time.

Now, we will take up section 5.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator yield to me now?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Certainly.

Mr. BERRY. If I understood the Senator correctly, he says it is absurd to say that these cars may be coupled and uncoupled with a stick without the brakeman entering between. I overheard, while riding on a herdie the other evening, an officer connected with the Richmond and Danville Railroad say that they had positive orders now on their roads to permit no brakemen to enter between the cars; but that they were invariably ordered to couple and uncouple them with a stick with a hook on the end of it, as stated by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Either the officer or some other gentleman who was present furthermore made the remark that the brakemen sometimes disobey the orders of the officers. The question was then raised as to whether the road would be liable for damages where one of their employés did disobey the order. He stated that it was the invariable practice and order on the road at this time that no brakeman should enter between the cars. The Senator stated that it was absurd. I simply make that statement. I did not know the gentleman, but he was an officer connected with the Richmond and Danville Railroad. So I was informed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. RANSOM], who was present and heard the conversation.

Mr. WHITE. In connection with what the Senator from Arkansas said, I call the attention of the Senator from New Jersey to the fact that in the discussion of this bill the other day, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] said that there was no necessity for going between the cars with a link pin; that there was a stick which took its place, and that all the railroads had organized schools by which the men could use the stick, but that the men said this was some device of a tenderfoot and it was not necessary, that they were not children and they would not use the stick, and they went in between the cars. So the statement which the Senator from New Jersey thinks absurd has been stated on the floor to be the method now, if the railroads or the men should choose to avail themselves of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the first proposition of amendment by the Senator from New Jersey is withdrawn.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I ask to have that amendment laid aside for a moment in order that I may reconstruct it and incorporate

the words proposed by the Senator from Ohio. I now move that section 5 be stricken out.

Mr. DOLPH. Does the Senator still hold the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has just offered an amendment, which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out section 5, the words to be stricken out being as follows—

Mr. CULLOM. There is no use to read the section. Everybody knows what it is.

Mr. DOLPH. Has the Senator from New Jersey yielded the floor?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLPH. I am inclined to agree with the Senator from New Jersey that the fifth section is not necessary, and I desire to have the attention of the Senator from Illinois while I state what I suppose to be the effect of it. I understand the drawbar to be the portion of the car to which the coupling device is attached, and upon which the jar of the impact comes, when the cars come together, and upon which the strain in hauling the train comes; and that the object in having the drawbar of uniform height above the track is simply so that the cars can be coupled by the device, which is attached to the drawbar on the cars.

Now, having provided in section 2 substantially that the companies after a certain date shall use no car that can not be coupled by couplers which couple by impact, does not that necessitate the drawbars of uniform height, or of a sufficiently uniform height so that the automatic couplers can be used? If that is true, why is it necessary for Congress to bother itself as to how and when the railroad companies shall adopt a drawbar of uniform height, if they must have a drawbar of uniform height before they can adopt this coupler? In any event it would be necessary, as suggested by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] yesterday, that line 13 and a part of line 14 of section 5 should be stricken out, which requires that after the adoption of a height for the drawbars all cars built or sent to the shops for general repairs shall be of that standard, because certainly Congress has nothing to do with the kind of drawbar that shall be used in a car that is simply used within the limits of a State and not used in interstate commerce. There are a great many cars of that kind, and the last clause of the section is sufficient for the purpose, which requires that—

After July 1, 1893, no cars, either loaded or unloaded, shall be used in interstate traffic which do not comply with the standard above provided for.

If we provide that at a certain date the companies shall adopt a certain standard which has been provided, it is not necessary for us to provide that whenever they send a car to the shops for repair they shall adopt this standard. That is a matter for themselves. They will undoubtedly do that to save expense. They will begin to prepare for the date when they are to have drawbars of uniform height.

But I return to my original proposition in regard to the fifth section. If the companies are required to adopt a coupling device which requires a drawbar of uniform height, why is it necessary for Congress to go on and say they shall begin to adopt that drawbar prior to the time they adopt the coupling device? The coupling device is included in and necessarily follows the provision that they shall adopt uniform drawbars, it seems to me.

Mr. CULLOM. There is some force in the statement of the Senator from Oregon and in the proposition to strike out the fifth section. It is true, I think, if these common carriers shall repair the cars, or make them in the first instance, so that the coupling of a car can be carried on without going between the cars, necessarily the height of the drawbar of the different cars must be substantially the same. At the same time I do not think that it is wise to strike that section out of the bill. It is an addition to the requirements of the proposed act in the direction of improving the cars in different ways so that there shall be no question about whether they shall be coupled as proposed.

There is very little in the question of hardship upon these common carriers, because there is no dispute, as I understand it, about what the height of the cars shall be, the height of the drawbars, etc. I hold in my hand a report of the proceedings of the Master Car Builders' Association, made in 1891, and I find in that report the following statement:

The standard height for drawbars which was recommended, or was intended to be recommended at the fifth annual convention held at Richmond Va., in 1872, is 2 feet 8 inches measured perpendicularly from the tops of the rails to the center of the drawbar when the car is empty. This is the present standard height for freight cars.

This was in 1891. This association, as I understand from gentlemen who are connected with it, represents substantially if not entirely all the roads of the country. I do not know whether the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE] took the shape of an amendment, but I think that there should be an amendment

to the bill to meet the fact that there are different gauges, widths of track, and so on. The suggestion of the Senator from Ohio may be met by an amendment to the bill.

Mr. VILAS. If the Senator from Illinois will give me leave for a moment, I will state that I have prepared an amendment with that end in view, which I trust will meet with his acceptance.

Mr. CULLOM. It will, as I understand the amendment.

Mr. VILAS. If this be the proper time, and I suppose it is, to offer amendments, I should like to offer three amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the motion of the Senator from New Jersey to strike out section 5.

Mr. CULLOM. The section is amendable before the motion to strike out is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Quite so.

Mr. VILAS. These are amendments with a view of perfecting section 5, which I suppose may be considered before a motion to strike out the section.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments are perfectly in order.

Mr. VILAS. I send up the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 5, line 6, after the word "bars," insert the words "for each of the several gauges of railroads in use in the United States."

Strike out line 13, of section 5, and the first six words of line 14, being the words "and thereafter all cars built or sent to the shops for general repairs shall be of that standard."

Add at the end of line 16, of section 5, "before July 1, 1893, and immediately to give notice thereof as aforesaid;" so that the section as amended will read:

That within ninety days from the passage of this act the American Railway Association is authorized hereby to designate to the Interstate Commerce Commission the standard height of drawbars for freight cars, measured perpendicular from the level of the tops of the rails to the centers of the drawbars for each of the several gauges of railroads in use in the United States, and shall fix a maximum variation from such standard height to be allowed between the drawbars of empty and loaded cars. Upon their determination being certified to the Interstate Commerce Commission said commission shall at once give notice of the standard fixed upon to all common carriers, owners, or lessees engaged in interstate commerce in the United States by such means as the commission may deem proper. But should said association fail to determine a standard as above provided it shall be the duty of the Interstate Commerce Commission to do so before July 1, 1893, and immediately to give notice thereof as aforesaid; and after July 1, 1893, no cars, either loaded or unloaded, shall be used in interstate traffic which do not comply with the standard above provided for.

Mr. CULLOM. I accept the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin so far as I am able to do so.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin to perfect section 5 of the substitute of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question recurs on striking out section 5 as amended.

Mr. HARRIS. Yesterday the Senator from New Jersey stated to the Senate, as the RECORD shows, that railroad companies, at least the impecunious and poorer class of companies as a rule, I believe, do not own their cars, but a car trust furnishes cars to such companies upon a mileage rate. I thought at the time that the Senator had been misled by the statement of parties outside. I hold in my hand a communication from a railroad manager of large experience and long service, one who commenced at the lower round of the ladder in railroad management and step by step has reached the highest and most important position in such management. The author of the paper that I hold in my hand is now the commissioner of the Southern Railway and Steamship Association, which includes all the railroads east of the Mississippi and south of the Potomac and some steamship transportation lines as well.

Now, the substance of this communication, as well as another which lies upon my table from a railroad man of high authority, is that the Senator from New Jersey is entirely mistaken in the conclusions to which he arrived and to which he gave expression yesterday; that as a matter of fact the railroad trust, of which he speaks, never furnishes a car to a railroad line upon a mileage rate.

Mr. McPHERSON. I said companies.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well. This explanation amounts to this: There is a railroad car trust or some other organization, no matter by what name, that manufacture and sell cars to railroad companies; that the poorer roads which chance not to be able to pay the money for the cars they need and must have, have adopted this method in many instances and have to resort to it in many instances.

They go to a banking or other corporation that can lend them money. Having a road already bonded, and under mortgage to secure those bonds, they go to a money lender and borrow money enough to buy the hundred or five hundred cars they need and must have; at an agreed rate of interest they borrow the money

with which to pay for the cars, but they say "we will lodge the legal title of these cars in a trustee," the car trust company or some other trustee, because if the legal title to the car when built for the company passes into the hands of the company, the mortgage upon the effects, franchises, and assets of the company takes effect upon these cars. They are held by the trustee as security to the money lender until the railroad company has been able to pay back by installments the money with which it bought and became the owner of the cars.

There is no mileage rate allowed to any such trustee or to the car trust, as it is called. The only mileage rate that is recognized at all for the use of cars is a mileage rate between railroads themselves—connecting lines. When in the matter of through freight the car of one company passes over the road of another company, it is at a universally understood rate of three-fourths of 1 cent per mile. These cars are interchangeable, so that the connecting railroads have an accounting amongst themselves and pay the difference between the mileage rate that has occurred in passing the cars over the lines of each other.

Now, in order that the RECORD may show the exact state of fact in regard to the matter, I ask to have read a paper from Mr. E. B. Stahlman, the commissioner of the Southern Railroad and Steamship Transportation Association, and also a communication from Mr. Knott, of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLPH in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee desire to have the letters read or merely printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HARRIS. Let them be read, because I want the Senate to understand the exact fact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The letters will be read, if there be no objection.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 10, 1893.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been called to the remarks made by Senator McPHERSON, of New Jersey, in the Senate yesterday on the question of car-couplers and air brakes.

The statement made by the distinguished Senator, as I read it from the RECORD, is in substance that it makes no difference to the railroads of the country whether they are asked to apply automatic couplers to freight cars or not, because the railroads do not own their cars, that the cars belong to what is known as car trust companies, which companies furnish such cars to be run on mileage, and that the mileage, three-quarters of a cent per mile, is the same on cars equipped with all the modern appliances as on cars without such appliances, and that therefore it would be no hardship upon the roads to set aside their old equipment and demand from the car trusts new equipment with the modern appliances.

I am sure the distinguished Senator would not have made this statement but for the fact that someone assuming to be familiar with railway matters had given him this information. If the statement were true it is somewhat remarkable that this fact was not elicited by the Senate committee in its investigation of this question. If it were true, why would the poorer railroads of the country be urging Congress not to enact this law? I stated before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce when this measure was pending that if this legislation were enacted it would practically bankrupt many of the railroads of the South.

Is it to be presumed that such a statement would have been made if the facts are as is claimed by Senator McPHERSON? If Senator McPHERSON has not been misled would we, who represent the poor railroads of the country, not be asking the passage of this bill rather than its postponement? If we could secure from car trusts a line of cars thoroughly equipped with air brakes and automatic couplers, and pay no more for them than we are now paying for old cars, would we not at once sidetrack the old cars and demand the new improved equipment?

A car trust is not what the distinguished Senator claims it to be. It does not furnish cars upon a mileage basis of three-fourths of a cent per mile for the mileage run. Car trusts were devised to enable roads to secure equipment upon payment of given sums at stated periods. Many roads of the country formerly paid cash for their cars or bought them on short time, payable within six or twelve months. Others not so able availed themselves of the car-trust method, which is arranged upon the following basis: Say, for example, a car is worth in cash \$400. A road not able to pay the cash within six or twelve months arranges with the car-trust company to furnish its cars upon a basis of the cash value, to which is added 5, 6, 7, 8, or 10 per cent as interest extending through a period of time when the obligation is to be discharged.

Some trusts provide a payment of a given sum per month; others every three months; others again every six months. These trusts run for from five to ten years and the payments required to be made at the periods stipulated will at the end of the trust have liquidated not only the interest but the principal, the cars at the termination of the trust thus being the property of the railroad companies. A large majority of the railroads of the South have secured their car equipment in this way, and while many of the trusts have been discharged and the cars now belong to the railroad companies, there are others only partially discharged and the obligation to pay the remainder still rests upon such companies.

It is proper to state that a car trust provides for a lien upon the cars until the obligations of the trust have been met and fully discharged, so that if the railroads of the South and elsewhere were called upon to-day to comply with the proposed legislation they would be compelled to abandon much of their equipment already paid for and still have resting upon them many car trust obligations which have only been partially met.

There are no car trust companies which supply cars upon a basis of so much per mile. Every car trust of which I have any knowledge provides a stipulated sum, to be paid at stated periods, with a view to the ownership of the cars by the railway companies at the expiration of the trust. It is true that in an interchange of cars between connecting lines three-fourths of a cent per mile is paid by one road which may use the cars of another, and *vice versa*; but this mileage is an enormous tax upon any railroad which has not a sufficient equipment of its own which shall in an interchange of cars equalize the mileage collected with the mileage paid.

Moreover, railways owning equipment of their own need their equipment for their own use, and do not care to furnish cars to connecting roads which fail to furnish a quota of cars sufficient for a fair interchange, and even if

the wealthier lines were to agree to furnish the cars, the cost to the weaker and poorer lines upon the basis of three-quarters of a cent per mile would largely increase the cost of the cars to such weak lines as compared with the car-trust method of purchase.

The distinguished Senator also referred to the subject of air brakes, stating that it was not necessary for the brakemen to go under the cars in order to fasten or unfasten the brake tubes. In this he is mistaken. There is no air or steam brake invention, so far as we are now advised, which does not require the tube appliance to run underneath the center of the car. I presume this is done in order to equalize the pressure on the wheels on both sides of the car. It is therefore not possible that hand holes or any other contrivance can be utilized in making these tube connections.

Respecting the utility and safety of the car-coupler appliances provided for in H. R. 8350, I quote from a telegram received to-day from President Roswell Miller, of the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway, which says: "This company has had seven freight trains wrecked within a year by automatic couplers, so imperfect are they."

I am, with great respect,

Very sincerely, yours,

E. B. STAHLMAN,

Commissioner, Southern Railway and Steamship Association.

HON. ISHAM G. HARRIS,
United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 10, 1893.

DEAR SIR: I find in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 10 certain statements made by Senator MCPHERSON bearing upon the question of the cost of the so-called safety appliances and the tax proposed to be imposed thereby upon the railways of the country. I quote:

"There are scarcely any of the trunk lines which are not always ready and able to furnish cars to poorer lines, which I call feeders, for usually they are the poorer lines, at a regular fixed rate."

It is true there is an agreed rate of three-quarters of a cent per mile paid by one railroad company for the use of another railroad company's cars on its own tracks. This compensation was fixed however on the assumption and with the understanding that the interchanges of cars from one line to another would, taking it month in and month out, equalize itself. In other words, that the shorter, or what may be termed the poorer lines, are under necessity of furnishing in proportion to their mileage as many cars as the so-called trunk lines. But the statement "that the trunk lines are always ready and able to furnish the poorer lines cars" is not borne out by practical operations in any part of the country to which my experience in railway matters extends.

There is no arrangement whatever by which one road undertakes to furnish cars for the use of other companies, and a uniform rule wherever railroads undertake to exchange cars one with the other is that the cars of one company shall in no case be used upon the road of the other company for that company's business. When a railway consents to allow its cars to go upon the line of another railroad to secure at times certain specified freights, it is on condition that its cars are to be immediately returned to the road owning the same, and not used for the business of the road on which such cars are sent.

It is no unusual thing for the so-called trunk lines referred to by Senator MCPHERSON to issue positive orders prohibiting their cars from going to the lines of certain connections, which may unfortunately from financial difficulties or otherwise be not properly supplied with their own equipment, knowing in that case the cars so furnished by the richer and more powerful line will be diverted from its own traffic to that of its poorer connection.

I find the further statement referring to car trusts:

"Car trusts receive three-fourth cents per mile, which I believe is the rate fixed for transportation by the railways, the road itself furnishing the motive power only, the car trusts furnishing the cars."

The deduction from this statement evidently intended is that when cars are to be equipped with safety appliances at an expense of \$80 to \$100 per car that the tax will not fall upon the railway companies, but upon certain other institutions known as car trusts, the railway companies continuing to pay the present rate. So far as my knowledge extends there is no arrangement between railroad companies and so-called car trusts for the payment for use of cars limited to three-fourth cents per mile. The term "car trusts" conveys to a degree at least an incorrect impression.

A car trust is simply an arrangement by which a railway company borrows money for payment for a certain designated number of new cars 500, 700 or 1,000, which the necessities of its traffic compel it to have, and a mortgage or trust is made upon those cars to the party furnishing the money, the agreement specifying that the cars shall be paid for within such periods of time as may be designated, annual or semi-annual payments, in amounts agreed on. You will see that the railroad company borrows the money and pays it off in fixed instalments, of course paying interest at the same time.

The railway company having secured the money with which to purchase the equipment makes its own contracts, and if it can purchase an ordinary car at \$400, it arranges for the money accordingly. With the addition of the so-called safety appliances, the same car will cost \$500, and that \$500 will have to be paid by the railroad company, and not by a car trust, nor will it be liquidated in the shape of mileage, but will be an actual payment to the manufacturer of the cars, and of course will include the royalty to the owners of the patents or devices.

My desire that you should have proper information bearing on this important subject, and not be placed in the attitude of having received incorrect advice or having been imposed on, is my excuse for writing this somewhat extended communication.

With great respect, I am, yours, very truly,

First Vice-President.

HON. JOHN T. MORGAN,
United States Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. The original of the last letter is signed by Vice President Knott, of the Louisville and Nashville Company.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, a single word in respect to these letters; and I am indeed glad that criticism has been provoked. I do not understand, with the exception of one item, that there is any express denial of anything I said on yesterday. I may, however, have confounded car trusts somewhat with car companies. Criticism is made here with respect to my statement about air brakes. I do not know what information other Senators have, but I have witnessed couplers on vestibule trains right here in the city of Washington, and in the past four or five days, take hold of the two ends of the coupling pipe and draw them to-

wards them, and while standing outside all danger, couple and uncouple them.

In the vestibule trains it would be impossible to go between the cars because a vestibule train is a solid train. It has only a front end and a rear end to the entire train. If this is possible in a vestibule train, why is it not possible also on a freight train? I say now, as I stated yesterday, that it is possible to do it, and if railroad companies would show some willingness to try, we should have no reason for this legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator was understood as saying on yesterday that these appliances, whether they cost much or little, would be furnished by the car trust, and that the mileage rate to the roads using them would be the same with or without these appliances; that it was a matter to be done at the expense of the car trust and not at the expense of the railroads. There is an explicit denial in both communications as to the truth of that conclusion.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Now I will answer this criticism, and I will answer it as I did yesterday, by stating facts within my knowledge. I brought to the attention of the Senate yesterday the fact that prior to 1878, which I think was the year in which we made legislation affecting the transportation of live animals—up to that period of time, and knowing personally whereof I speak, I had never seen a stock car having springs under it in my experience in the transportation of live stock. I had never seen a car with anything but the link coupler, the old-fashioned link coupler. I had never seen a car provided with air brakes. I had never seen a car provided with appliances where animals could be fed and watered in the car. To-day nine-tenths of all the live cattle shipped from the West to the East, especially from Chicago east, and I think the same rule applies west of Chicago, are coming to market in cars provided with air brakes, with springs, with automatic couplers, and really without a brakeman.

Prior to 1874 or 1878 the general rate paid by railroads for transportation in exchange of cars between themselves was 1 cent a mile trackage. The rate was changed to three-quarters of a cent a mile, and as the owner of these cars I know personally I have been obliged to pay the railroads three-quarters of a cent a mile, or rather they have been obliged to pay me, I furnishing the cars and they providing the motive power. With all these appliances to-day the cost of the transportation of live cattle has not been increased by reason of the extra cost of these humane and necessary improvements in the car, but diminished.

I said there were certain corporations in this country known as car companies, who own thousands of these cattle cars, and they lease them to the public. If you go into the switch yards in the city of Chicago you can have your choice between half a dozen different companies that are providing cars on various models for the transportation of cattle. It does not cost one single cent more to transport cattle in those cars than it did or than it does to-day in the old-fashioned cars, they receiving the three-fourths of a cent trackage from the railroads, and no other additional compensation.

Mr. GEORGE. Are the cars used for any other freight except cattle?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Yes; all these cattle cars may be loaded back to Chicago—with coal, coke, iron—and in short all kinds of merchandise.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator refers, I suppose, in that case to what is known as the palace cattle car with all the improvements. If the Senator becomes the owner of that car—and he must become such owner before he can get the trackage of which he speaks—

Mr. MCPHERSON. No and yes. I will explain.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator becomes the owner of that car, he does so after having paid for all of these improvements to that car, does he not? And is not that an exceptional and a special service wholly independent of the 1,100,000 freight cars that are running upon the various railroads of the country?

Mr. MCPHERSON. The railroad companies, I presume, could have furnished all of these devices. They could have furnished these improved cars for this particular character of transportation, but they have not done it; they prefer to pay the mileage. There is a great industry which has grown up in this country that prior to 1880 had no existence. They are moving dressed meat to-day from Kansas City, from the great West, through to New York in refrigerator cars. It goes from the cars directly on board the refrigerating ship, and so reaches the table of the consumer in London in the same condition in which it entered the refrigerator car at Kansas City. The railroad companies do not supply these cars. Great companies have been organized for the purpose of building them.

Every railway company transporting the cars over their line pay a certain amount of mileage to the owners of the cars. They do not pretend to own them. They say "it is a new kind of construction, it is a car which can only be devoted to a certain use,

and as the cars we prefer to build can be devoted to all uses and to all purposes, either for grain, for cattle, for merchandise, or all other things save and except the facilities and the conveniences and appliances necessary to preserve meat, therefore we will let you build your own cars."

Mr. GEORGE. They are not built for any other sort of freight?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I want to ask the Senator why should it not apply to other kinds of freight as well?

Mr. GEORGE. But does it actually do it?

Mr. MCPHERSON. There exists no reason why these cars also shall not be loaded with merchandise on the return trip. As I understand the rule which exists between the railway companies to-day, it is this. Let me illustrate, because after all that is the best way of stating the case. Take, if you please, the Pennsylvania Railroad. It starts from New York, Philadelphia, and Washington. It runs through to Chicago with connections beyond Chicago.

Look at the multitude of feeders that come into the Pennsylvania Railroad along its line, some long and some short. There is traffic upon the line of the feeder. The Pennsylvania Railroad Company, always supplied with a large number of cars, will supply the feeding roads with the necessary equipments in the form of cars for carrying the freight, the feeding roads furnishing the motive power themselves. When you come to a station or junction where the feeder unites with the main trunk line, the car is switched on to the main line. It is loaded with corn, cattle, hogs, cotton, or whatever may be the freight. It is moved by the motive power of the feeding road to the trunk line. There it is taken in charge by the trunk line and moved eastward. It has been the practice of the railroads to supply the feeding road with cars, and why?

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator allow me a few words just upon that point, for that is the exact issue between him and what I understand to be the facts of this case? The feeder brings its loaded car of its own to its junction with the Pennsylvania road. That loaded car runs upon the Pennsylvania road to the point of destination. The Pennsylvania road brings its loaded car to the junction of the feeder. That loaded car passes upon the road that the Senator calls the feeder and runs to its destination. Now, each of these roads allows a mileage rate or a trackage rate of three-fourths of 1 cent a mile to the other, but the fact that either road undertakes to furnish the rolling stock to another road for the traffic of the roads so furnished is the mistake the Senator has made.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I have never made any such statement, because I knew better than to make such a statement. The trunk line has usually nine-tenths of the mileage between the point of shipment and point of destination, and the feeder one-tenth, and the trunk line always prefers to get mileage for the short haul than pay it for the long haul.

Mr. HARRIS. Then I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I think if the Senator will refer to the RECORD it will be shown that I have never made such a statement. I have not myself examined what I said yesterday, but I have never held that the main trunk line of road that furnished the freight cars, if you please, furnished the motive power to run over that road.

Mr. HARRIS. I do not mean the motive power. I refer to the freight car, the rolling stock.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Now, let me take the Senator on his own proposition. Which is most profitable, we will say to the short and the poorer road, to scatter their cars from Tennessee to New York to engage in through business, or to keep them at home to carry local business? No railroad man would be long in answering such a question.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator will allow me, I am not inquiring as to the profits or losses of one road or the other. I am looking for a fact, as to what is the present condition of the business affairs between the various railroad companies.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I am stating the case exactly as I understand it. The trunk line will furnish cars to the feeding road. The feeding road will pay the trunk line three-quarters of a cent a mile trackage upon the cars for the short distance as a matter of course. If the cars of the road which is the feeding road should run onto the main line and thence to the seaboard, the main line would pay them three-quarters of a cent mileage for the thousand miles of track, we will say, or from wherever the junction is, to the seaboard. If the complaint is that the feeding road, the short line, the poorer road, can not get a supply of cars, why is it not in fact better for them to hire the cars from the trunk line than it is to scatter them all over the world by running them a thousand miles from their own line?

Mr. GEORGE. May I ask the Senator from New Jersey a question for information?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I heard a statement made by him yesterday to the effect, I understood, although I may be mistaken, that there are companies called car-trust companies not engaged in railroading but in making cars, whose business it is to make cars and to rent them to railroad companies at the rate of three-quarters of a cent a mile.

I understood that to be the statement of the Senator from New Jersey, and therefore the conclusion was that the argument pressed by the Senator from Tennessee and others against imposing this cost upon the weaker roads was met by the suggestion that they did not have to buy these cars, did not have to pay for these improvements, but that they could rent cars from the trust car company. That is the way I understood the Senator yesterday.

Mr. MCPHERSON. In order that I may explain the matter more fully to the Senator from Mississippi, I will state that there are such things as car trusts and car companies. A car trust differs from a car company. A company rents its cars indiscriminately to all railroads. I speak about all companies without speaking of the cattle cars and the dressed-beef cars, but cars of all kinds, as you will see them here upon the tracks and switches in the yard below the Capitol. You will find private cars owned by different people. You will find the name upon the car. A car trust I understand is one that is formed in this way: The manufacturer of cars holds in some way through a trust a control of the car that is bought by a railroad corporation to put upon their line.

Mr. GEORGE. That is exactly the point.

Mr. MCPHERSON. He holds alien for the deferred payment that is required, whether it be a certain annual payment or a certain amount of mileage, whichever the contract may happen to be.

Mr. HARRIS. He holds a lien upon it to secure what the car costs and that is all.

Mr. MCPHERSON. He holds a lien upon it. No railroad company should complain if a trust can be formed that will enable them to pay for a car over a period of five, six, or ten years, as the case may be, and if it is paid by mileage the more they use the car the faster the mileage increases and the sooner the car is paid for. I know of no way in the world in which a railway company can get a credit any greater or better or any way more useful for them than to simply have a car trust provided and they pay for the car in proportion as the car earns money upon the road.

Mr. GEORGE. But is it not the actual fact that the poor companies not having the means to pay for the cars and being on that account compelled to buy on credit through the agency of this car-trust company, have to pay the additional cost required to put on these improvements, as was alleged by the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I would naturally suppose that in that regard the Senator from Tennessee is exactly right. I would suppose that the car trust would require a larger amount when they retain a lien than if they sold the car for cash, because they would get through with the transaction, take their profit and that would be the end of it; but then I think it is not a matter of very great importance one way or the other. The purchase, owing to competition between carbuilders, is always made easy to the solvent roads.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator will allow me to suggest the error into which he falls. The impecunious railroad company must either borrow money from somebody with which to pay for the cars it buys or it must buy them upon an unusual length of credit, and it pays an agreed rate of interest upon the postponed payments if it buys from the manufacturer on credit. It pays a fixed rate of interest to the party of whom it borrows the money, but the legal title of the car is held in the hands of a trustee to secure the payment.

The railroad company buys and owns the car, except the legal title is lodged in a trustee to secure the ultimate payment; but it is in every other respect owned by the railroad company that bought it, and is used by the railroad company that bought it. It pays the fixed rate of interest as it can earn the money to pay it, but no mileage rate is paid upon any such car.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Now, Mr. President, I will not attempt to argue that if a railroad has neither money nor credit with which to purchase cars, the rate will be a cheap one.

Mr. BRICE. If the Senator from New Jersey will allow me—

Mr. MCPHERSON. Certainly.

Mr. BRICE. As I understand the practical operation of the car companies and what are car trusts, in so far as the Senator from New Jersey has spoken of car companies he is correct in the statement he has made. A car trust, however, gives no ownership except a lien to secure a deferred payment. It gives control. There is no mileage account whatever. The purchaser of the car has as absolute control over it as you have

over your own house which you have bought and which you are occupying, although you may not have paid the deferred payments for its purchase and the seller may have retained a lien. The railroad company, in other words, owns in every sense; so far as the bill is concerned, all the cars for which it has executed car-trust agreements.

The case is quite different, and the Senator from New Jersey is strictly correct in what he says in reference to car companies or cars owned by car companies. Those car companies, however, only operate over the trunk lines between New York and Chicago, or between Chicago and this city. There are no car companies in the South. There are no cars owned by car companies south of the Potomac and the Ohio Rivers, with the exception of a few hundred river cars, which are owned by car companies. In no sense is any car operated or used south of the Potomac or the Ohio Rivers, or any of the 1,100,000 cars which are spoken of in this debate owned by any other than the railroad company, which has either paid cash for them or executed its car-trust notes for them. They are simply evidences of its indebtedness, for which a lien is reserved by a technicality known as a car trust.

Mr. HARRIS. That is exactly as I understand it.

Mr. BRICE. In what the Senator from New Jersey said as to cattle car companies and palace car companies there are freight cars owned by those corporations, and he is strictly correct in what he has said about them. They do not, however, form any important element in the consideration of this question. I speak of this simply to eliminate it from consideration, as I do not consider it a very important question except for purposes of illustration.

Mr. HARRIS. Of course they form no element in this proposed legislation, for the reason that the bill refers to freight cars only.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Let us get at the exact facts. The Senator from Tennessee is right as to all the cars now employed, whether purchased through a trust or purchased directly by the railroad companies, which do not contain these devices. The railroad companies unquestionably would be required to supply them, while as to the new cars that may be made from now on, I do not think it would cost the railroad companies or the trust any large amount to place the devices on those cars. But you must remember the bill grants five years in which to remodel these cars—almost the lifetime of a freight car—and as to all new cars they must contain the new appliances.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the Senator think that the addition of these appliances upon a car being constructed to-day would not increase the cost?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I do not think so. When a car is being constructed these appliances can be adjusted to it without difficulty; but the great difficulty is in reconstruction. It is very expensive to reconstruct a car not fitted with these appliances and to put the appliances on; but it is a very simple thing to construct a car originally so that the appliances can be put on without any considerable expense.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I have a telegram which I think it my duty to read to the Senate. It is as follows:

HON. WILKINSON CALL,
United States Senate:

I note that railway safety appliance bill is now up in the Senate, and as president of American Railway Association I have given this matter much attention. So far as safety to employes is concerned there is only one side to the question and we are all on that side. The action taken by our association is the result of intelligent and careful investigation by those who are responsible in pecuniary damages for their welfare as well as for humane reasons. It is because we know that the passage of this bill will hinder the progress we are now making in the introduction of efficient appliances that we oppose it. I hope that your personal knowledge of me will give weight to this statement.

H. S. HAINES.

While I do not agree with Mr. Haines, I think it is due to him, however, to give this telegram to the Senate and the public, and to say that if I had the power to make Mr. Haines the director-general of all the railroads in the United States I should have no hesitation in doing so. I have no doubt that he, with his great ability, his rare integrity and humanity, would administer that great trust to the advantage and the satisfaction of the people; but I would not give to anyone an unlimited discretion, a power over the commerce of this country, without responsibility to the American people and to Congress, a power to tax twelve or thirteen hundred million dollars out of the people of this country without any responsibility to those in whom the people have vested the sovereign powers of the Government.

If this body is incapable of that trust, and it is better to have a government composed of these gentlemen, unrestrained and unlimited, let the Government be changed and put into that shape. What is it? What argument has ever been made so powerful to advance the claim of those who believe, as I do not

believe, in the nationalization of these roads as the opposition to this simple little bill?

What is the result of the argument made here that there are corporations in this country too poor to provide the necessary appliances for the protection of life and for cheap transportation? Do Senators seriously insist that they can prove to the people of the United States that under the present administration of the railroad system of the country these corporations are unable, whether from want of skill or from want of money, to provide for the great trust reposed in their hands by putting even a simple appliance of an automatic brake or of an automatic coupler, which the common consensus of the mechanical talent of this country has decided to be the one and the necessary thing? Has not the Committee on Interstate Commerce been sitting here for years hearing from these gentlemen, and this distinguished railroad manager himself says that the railroads have investigated this question of safety appliances constantly, and he thinks—what? He thinks that it is better that Congress should not adopt any method of this kind. Why? Because it may interfere with the investigation and the adoption of something yet undiscovered.

Mr. President, that is the argument which has been made before the Senate, that there is something yet to be discovered which may be better than anything else, and therefore twenty-six thousand men must be disabled and two or three thousand of them killed every year because of the possibility that something better than this simple and easy device may be accepted. If these gentlemen are right, and these weak railroad companies are unable to provide safe transportation for the people of this country and for their employes, let us give them the money out of the Government Treasury.

The question of transportation, involving four times as great a sum of money as is annually charged for the support of the Government of the people of the United States, is a question which the people of this country will have considered, and all attempts to interpose any objection in the way of that tide of public opinion, which demands an investigation and that the light of day and the judgment of the American people be passed upon all this management, will be an impracticable effort and only bring about that which I for one deplore—the assumption of the entire control of this great interest by the people of this country.

Mr. President, the simple question here is, shall that which, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] has read time and time again, by all the evidence has been decided everywhere to be one thing, an automatic coupler, easy of construction, plain in its type, shall be applied within a reasonable time to all the railroads in the United States. Everyone has concurred in that necessity, and yet we have argument after argument, and proposition after proposition, that that simple thing can not be done. One reason urged is that it is going to lead to a class of legislation which will authorize Congress to determine the size of every timber in a car, of every nail, and the place where it is to be put; but the argument as to the danger of abuse of constitutional power is nothing. Every power may be carried to an abuse. Its proper use rests in the discretion of the men who are sent here to represent the people. It is the same with one power as with another.

I prefer the bill as it came from the House. I prefer the assertion, without any kind of equivocation, by the people in Congress assembled of their power to control every man within the limits of the constitutional delegation of power, and of every interest for the benefit of the people of this country; but I do not want to do injustice to any interest; I do not want to see the details of this management taken away from those to whom it has been intrusted by our previous history, but I should have preferred to see this body adopt the amendment of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]; I should not object to that.

The patent law is the creature of Congress. It may be modified in its details. There is no reason why a patent should not be condemned by an act of Congress, its value being ascertained by judicial process, and the payment required to be made in the shape of a royalty by those who shall use it. The whole subject of the patent law may be formed in respect of this special case by this legislation upon this bill; but the Senate have decided otherwise.

Upon the question, however, whether or not the present advanced state of mechanical science shall be required to be applied for the safety and protection of the passengers upon the railroads and of the men who are employed on them is a question which seems to me too clear for argument. Why should it not be? Is it because it is going to be too great an expense? Who are to bear it? The people of this country. Nobody else will ever pay one single cent of the cost of this legislation, and they will have to bear up the credit of these corporations, running for years and years and resting upon the development of the country.

But there can be nothing in the objection that a great system of transportation of over 63,000,000 of people, upon which every man's home, his comfort, and his prosperity depend, should be under the control of Congress and the people should govern it in some form. While we allow, as the Supreme Court said, this public use to be confided to individuals, unquestionably the law should require that that public use should be with due regard to the safety of the people and to the expedition and cheapness with which business shall be transacted. All those matters are subjects for the enlightened and the just consideration of Congress.

This bill simply provides one thing, and that is that the mechanical talent of the world has arrived at the particular point that an automatic coupler in some form or another is the proper and the safe and the expeditious method of transportation, and for the protection of those engaged in transportation, and that that shall be applied; and the time has been so fixed as to make it reasonable.

Mr. President, I can see no reason whatever for changing the bill as it stand and leaving the obligation to put an automatic coupler, the only possible method, the only thing known to mechanical science and accepted everywhere, as the proper obligation to rest upon the railroad companies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The question is on striking out section 5 of the committee as amended.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope the section will not be stricken out. I do not desire to discuss it further.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McPHERSON. I move an amendment to section 2, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 2, line 5, after the word "couplers," it is proposed to strike out "coupling automatically by impact, and which can be uncoupled without the necessity of men going between the ends of the cars," and insert "which can be coupled or uncoupled without requiring, or which in practice would result, in persons using them or operating the same, going between or placing the body between the cars;" so as to read:

That on and after the first day of January, 1893, it shall be unlawful for any such common carrier to haul or permit to be hauled or used on its line any car used in moving interstate traffic not equipped with couplers which can be coupled or uncoupled without requiring or which in practice would result in persons using them or operating the same going between or passing the body between the cars.

Mr. McPHERSON. This answers, as I understand, the technical criticism made by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Massachusetts. I invite their attention to the phraseology of the amendment. My intention was simply to require the use of a car where the operative would not be required to expose himself to danger between the ends of the cars, and I think the phraseology will do that. I propose to leave to the railroad companies the adoption of such devices as they in their better judgment may see fit to adopt.

Mr. CULLOM. It is very difficult to understand exactly what is couched in the language of an amendment offered in the Senate, and I hope the Senator will not insist on his amendment. Let the bill go through, and then I shall be very glad to consider the proposition as critically as possible with whatever light I can get from experts on the subject; and so far as I shall have anything to do with it, I shall endeavor in conference to arrange the matter properly.

Mr. McPHERSON. This amendment removes the objection which I have to this entire legislation, because you are attempting here to prescribe a certain kind of improvement which railroad companies must use, whether it is the best thing for them to adopt or not. If they can adopt any kind of a device which will prevent the loss of life by not requiring a brakeman or a man who couples cars to go between the trains, why not give them the opportunity of doing it?

Mr. CULLOM. The amendment of the Senator would leave the amendment reported by the committee so that the coupling business may go on with sticks as heretofore. I want to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that common carriers now have rules by which the switchmen employed in coupling cars shall use these sticks or whatever they may be called. That rule is adopted, as I have understood, as a precaution against their being liable for damages in case a man happens to go between the cars and is injured. So I think the Senator had better allow the section to remain as it stands. I shall be very glad, so far as I am concerned, to change it later on, if it seems to me a safe thing to do.

Mr. McPHERSON. I do not wish to permit myself to neglect improving a bill as it ought to be improved in the Senate before it reaches a committee of conference.

Mr. CULLOM. Let the vote be taken on the amendment, then.

Mr. McPHERSON. Therefore I think a vote had better be taken on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to offer an amendment to the bill. In section 5, line 2, I move to strike out the words "American Railway Association," and insert "Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will report the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 5, line 2, it is proposed to strike out the words "American Railway Association" and insert "Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen;" so as to read:

That within ninety days from the passage of this act the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is authorized hereby to designate, etc.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I dislike at this stage of the proceedings to further engage the attention of the Senate by offering amendments to this very imperfect bill, but with my conception of my duty to the very large and respectable class of my countrymen in whose interest the bill is supposed to have been introduced and pressed, I feel that it is my duty to urge upon the consideration of the Senate the amendment which I have offered.

The title of the bill is "to promote the safety of employes and travelers upon railroads," etc. We have heard from the learned Senator who has charge of the bill [Mr. CULLOM] very earnest and very eloquent remarks in behalf of the poor laborers whose lives are imperiled, it is said, by service upon railroads imperfectly and improperly equipped, and the sympathies of the Senate have been invoked to take sure and certain measures of precaution against the repetition of the slaughter and murder, I believe it is stated, of about 2,000 American citizens each year by the negligence or the stinginess of railroad companies in not equipping their cars as they should be equipped. Really at one time I was so much affected by the eloquent and feeling remarks of the Senator from Illinois that I had almost got my consent to support the measure which he has introduced and which is now before the Senate.

Taking the substance of the remarks made by the Senator from Illinois in support of this bill—and I am pretty well assured that he states it correctly—we have in the large transportation interests of the country, wherein hundreds of thousands of our citizens are engaged, a case of rapacity, of greed, of carelessness of human life and human suffering on the part of the railroad companies, and death, destruction, and maiming inflicted upon the innocent employes of those companies.

The bill is professedly in the interests of the poor employes of the railroad companies. We have the picture presented to us by the learned Senator from Illinois, that the railroad companies of this country have been negligent of their duty; that they have so equipped their cars as to imperil the lives of the unfortunate men who are compelled to accept employment from them, and that, as a result of that negligence, thousands of widows and orphans are made every year, and our sympathies are invoked for the purpose of stopping this nefarious conduct.

Mr. President, this is a singular bill. It professes one thing and it does another.

Mr. CULLOM. To what portion of the bill does the Senator object?

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator will be patient he will find out.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to explain my position in reference to the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. I was called out for a moment, and I thought the Senator was speaking in reference to a particular paragraph of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I have moved to strike out the words "American Railway Association," and insert in their place "the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen."

Mr. CULLOM. Does the Senator's amendment waive or get rid of the constitutional objections the Senator raised in relation to the American Railway Association being named in the bill?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator certainly has not the logical mind which I thought he had. I am bound by the decision of the Senate that they are going to refer this question to an outside and private party, and not to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. CULLOM. Would the Senator be willing—

Mr. GEORGE. Please stop; I do not wish to be interrupted in the midst of a statement.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi declines to be interrupted.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator will have plenty of time to reply to me, and I hope to bring forward enough to require his attention.

Mr. President, the bill I will call the prince of shams. During my long service in this body it has never been my fortune or misfortune to have encountered a bill which thundered so much in the index and performed so little in actual work and operation. We have been engaged for days, under the leadership of the Senator from Illinois, in trying to perfect a bill which might properly be termed a bill to promote not the safety of railroad employes, but to encourage the slaughter of railroad employes.

There are, I understand, of the railroad employes in the country who are liable to be killed by the improper equipment of railroads, some half million or more of voters; and it is an important matter on the part of politicians that such action shall be taken in this body and in the other end of the Capitol as will satisfy this half million of voters that the promoters of certain measures are their exclusive and devoted friends.

The Senator from Illinois has posed here in quite eloquent and appropriate language as the peculiar friend of the unfortunate men who are slaughtered by the thousands by these rapacious and unfeeling corporations who, for the purpose of saving money—yes, saving "filthy lucre"—decline to equip their cars in such a way as to save the lives of the men whom they have employed, and we are asked to take very extraordinary measures and precautions in order to protect the innocent, the unfortunate laborers on the railroad trains from murder and maiming.

The railroad companies have been described as the wolves who are eating up and destroying the lambs whom they have engaged in their service. We are asked to protect the lambs against the ferocity of the wolves; and how are we asked to do it? In a most extraordinary manner. We are asked by this bill, in fencing out the dangers to the unfortunate lambs, to ask the wolves to prescribe the kind of fence by which that operation is to be performed.

We are told in one breath that we must pass this bill to protect innocent employes from the greed of the railroad companies, and in the very next sentence we are invited to pass a law requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission not to consult the railroad companies, not to take advice from them, but absolutely without any discretion upon their part to adopt a measure which the railroad companies shall prescribe, or, in other words, we are asked to protect from these railroad companies their innocent employes by requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to consult, and not only to consult but to follow implicitly, what the railroad companies themselves shall prescribe!

I do not think that is the right way to do it. If the railroad companies are not to be trusted in the carrying on of their business, if they are not to be trusted without the sanction of this proposed law, then I do not think they can be trusted in furnishing to the Interstate Commission the means, and the only means so far as that section of the bill is concerned, by which these parties are to be protected.

Does the Senate understand that the Interstate Commerce Commission has nothing in the world to do with the equipment provided for in the fifth section, except to adopt the judgment, the dictation of the railroad companies? Yet that is exactly what it is. It seems to me that if we are, as the Senator from Illinois reminded us, to stretch our constitutional powers and go outside of the regularly organized and sworn officers of the United States to prescribe a rule as to these drawbars—if we are compelled to do that, as the Senate has decided, I think we ought to consult the men whose lives and whose persons are to be protected by our legislation, and not the men whom we have adjudged, in proposing to pass this bill, are so reckless with the lives of their employes as to require restrictive legislation.

How does the question stand? The Senator comes here and says to us: "You must interfere with the business of these railroad companies; you must require them to spend from fifty to one hundred million dollars in order to equip their roads so as to preserve and protect the employes;" and then, instead of leaving the device to the employes by which this protection is to be afforded them, we turn around and say to the railroad companies: "Furnish us the device yourselves." Mr. President, I think that is not the proper way to do it.

I want to show the Senate, after that remark, who the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen are. They are composed, says a witness who was examined before the Interstate Commerce Committee, of conductors, of brakemen, of switchmen, of yardmasters, of baggagemen, passenger brakemen, etc.; in other words, it is an organization exactly like the organization of the American Railway Association; it is a voluntary association, which happens to be composed of the very men whose rights, whose interests, whose lives, and whose persons are sought to be protected by the bill.

Why should they not be consulted? I should like to know

why it is that only the railroad companies, whose malconduct, as alleged by the Senator from Illinois, is the occasion for this legislation, are to be consulted, whilst the innocent persons whose lives and whose limbs are imperiled by the bad conduct of the railroad companies are to be overlooked?

I wish to read to the Senate some testimony taken upon that subject. We are asked to do this thing in the interest of the railroad employes, and I want to read to the Senate their claims upon this subject. They were a little modest, but here is the testimony of Frank P. Sargent. He says:

I am speaking for the employes, and I want them to feel confidence and have confidence and feel assured that their interests are being protected. The railroad employes of this country to-day are looking to you, gentlemen, who have come here, who in a measure represent their interests, and when they feel confidence in what is being done, let men be selected from the rank and file, who do the work, to act in conjunction with the men who might be selected from the management of the roads to apply these tests.

That is all they claim. They made that claim before the Committee on Interstate Commerce. They came here and pleaded "We know something about this matter, we have actual experience, and we should like to be consulted; we should like to have something to say as to what shall be our protection." But that is all disregarded.

Will it be said that these men are not competent? Will it be said that the association to which I have alluded, composed of conductors, of brakemen, of switchmen, yardmasters, etc., are not competent to suggest what will protect them, and that we must go to the magnates, to the men who own the roads, and to the men against whose misconduct this bill is aimed and to correct whose misconduct this bill is to be passed?

Mr. President, I submit to this honorable Senate if we are to pass this bill in the name and for the protection of that large class of our countrymen who are laborers upon these railroads, should we fix it as this bill fixes it, that the lives and interests of those men shall be absolutely put at the disposal of the men against whom they make complaint here? Yet that is exactly the attitude in this case. I suppose the men who are in daily connection with the working of these railroads, the men who go between the cars and fix the couplings, the men whose lives and limbs are exposed every day to danger from the imperfect equipment of the roads, ought to be consulted, if we are to go outside of the regular, sworn, constituted authorities of the land.

But that is not the only instance in which the substitute reported by the Senate committee shows a contempt for the rights and interests of the very men in whose name and for whose protection the powers of the Government are invoked. The Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate could not see a single line, a single paragraph, a single section of the House bill, which did not deserve, in their opinion, to be erased. They come in here with an amendment which means to strike out every word of the bill as it came from the House.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to section 11 of the bill as it came from the other House, which the Interstate Commerce Committee have run their pen through and ask us to strike out, and have provided no substitute for it. I will say that the Senate will discover as soon as I do read it that without the eleventh section of the bill as it came from the other House there is but little if any protection to the employes. Now let us see what section 11 is, which the Interstate Commerce Committee ask us to strike out:

SEC. 11. That any employe of any such common carrier who may be injured by any locomotive, car, or train in use contrary to the provisions of this act shall not be deemed guilty of contributory negligence, although continuing in the employ of such carrier after habitual unlawful use of such locomotive, car, or train had been brought to his knowledge.

The learned Senator from Illinois, in advocacy of the bill, brought before us a very recent decision of the Supreme Court, which he was kind enough to loan to me this morning, a part of which I will read and comment on to the Senate, showing the absolute necessity of section 11.

I read from *Kohn vs. McNulta*, in the Supreme Court of the United States, October term, 1892. The case was this:

The intervenor—

Who was the complainant in the case—

was 23 years of age; he had been working as a blacksmith for about six years before entering into the employ of the defendant.—

That is, the railroad company—

He had been engaged in this work of coupling cars in the company's yard for over two months before the accident—

An accident by which he got his arm broken and the jury allowed him \$10,000 damages—

and was therefore familiar with the tracks and condition of the yard, and not inexperienced in the business. He claims that the Wabash freight cars, which constituted by far the larger number of cars which passed through that yard, had none of these deadwoods or bumpers;—

which are deemed, I suppose, to be necessary equipments of

a railroad train in order to protect the lives and limbs of the employés.

But inasmuch as he had in fact seen and coupled cars like the ones that caused the accident, and that more than once, and as the deadwoods were obvious to anyone attempting to make the coupling, and the danger from them apparent, it must be held that it was one of the risks which he assumed in entering upon the service.

That being the rule of law settled by the highest court in the country, the Democratic House saw fit to insert a provision in the bill which would protect the employés. What does the Interstate Commerce Committee ask us to do? After furnishing a sham protection, no real protection, then the only real benefit to accrue to these unfortunate fellow-citizens of ours, in whose name and for whose interest this bill is supposed to be pressed here, after furnishing them no protection or next to none, the Committee on Interstate Commerce strike out the only thing which could be of essential service.

The committee provide for a fine. What does that mean? It means you have to secure an indictment, you must have a grand jury, then you must have a trial before a petit jury, and then you must have a district attorney, and all that, and then the money is to go into the Federal Treasury.

When the poor man whose leg or whose arm has been destroyed, or his widow or personal representative in case his life is lost, complains, they are to be turned out of court upon what idea? That the employé knew that the railroad company whom he was serving had not complied with the law of Congress upon that subject. Is that fair? Is that just? These men are not financially able, although legally they are at liberty, to quit the service of the railroad companies at any time they see proper. Because in winter, when no employment can be had, when their wives and children need every dollar of their earnings to keep the wolf from the door, because at that season of the year they are financially unable to quit the employment of the railroad company and go out into the world to starve and freeze, by the striking out of the eleventh section of the bill they are denied redress.

It is not disputed that the company are in fault; that they have treated the law of Congress with contempt; that they have refused obedience to the law of the land. That is not the defense; but having done all this, having refused to comply with the law of the land, having declined to put the safeguards upon the cars which are necessary to protect the lives and limbs of their employés. That is conceded; but because the employés are unable to quit the employment of the company, and know of the defective machinery, they are to be turned out without remedy.

I think that section 11 stricken out by the Senate committee was the most beneficial part of the entire bill. The party whose leg is mashed, whose arm is destroyed, is very prompt to assert his claim against the railroad company, as he ought to do; and I thank God that my countrymen, who serve on juries in the courts, are very prompt to give a remedy in such cases; but because the railroad companies have continued their violation of law for so long a time that the employés know of the violation they are turned out without remedy. Is the Senate prepared to do that? The other House inserted it, but the Senate committee struck it out; and it is intimated that those of us who can not accept the substitute reported by the Senate committee as the very perfection of human reason are supposed to be unfriendly to railroad employés.

Mr. President, in short this bill as it now stands, unless remedied by my amendment, leaves the kind of guard or equipment which is to protect the lives of these unfortunate fellow citizens of ours, to the dictation of the very men for whose assumed misconduct the necessity of this bill exists. That is the first proposition the Senate ought to understand.

After the railroad companies have adopted their equipment to suit themselves, however defective it may be, or when they have failed to do it, the innocent employé, because he could not quit them, is denied any remedy in the courts.

I do not think the American Senate will give its consent to the passage of a bill of that kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] to the substitute reported by the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. I call for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. CULLOM. Let the amendment be stated from the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 5, line 2, of the amendment of the Committee it is proposed to strike out "American Railway Association" and insert "Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen;" so as to read:

SEC. 5. That within ninety days from the passage of this act the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is authorized hereby to designate to the Interstate Commerce Commission the standard height of drawbars for freight cars, etc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi asks for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. PASCO (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CASEY]. If he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. HAWLEY (when Mr. PLATT's name was called). My colleague [Mr. PLATT] is necessarily absent in committee. He is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTON]. If my colleague were here he would vote "nay."

Mr. QUAY (when his name was called). I am paired generally with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER]. I do not know how he would vote on this question; but if he were present I should vote "nay."

Mr. TELLER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], who is detained from the Senate on account of sickness in his family. I do not know how he would vote on this question, and, therefore, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. FRYE. The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. HUNTON] desired me to announce a pair between him and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] on this bill.

Mr. HISCOCK (after having voted in the negative). I inquire if the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] has voted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted?

Mr. HISCOCK. Will his colleague advise me how he would vote if present?

Mr. BERRY. I do not know how my colleague would vote on this proposition.

Mr. HISCOCK. Then I withdraw my vote, as I am paired with the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McMILLAN (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE]. I did not notice that he was absent when I voted. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CAMDEN (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], who is not in his seat. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANDERSON. I should like to be informed whether the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not voted.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am paired with that Senator, and therefore abstain from voting; otherwise I should vote "nay."

Mr. BERRY. If the Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK] desires to vote to make a quorum, I am satisfied it will be entirely agreeable to my colleague [Mr. JONES of Arkansas].

Mr. HISCOCK. Then I vote "nay."

Mr. PASCO. Upon consultation with the colleague of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CASEY], with whom I am paired, I am informed that the Senator from North Dakota, if present, would vote "nay." I therefore feel at liberty to vote on the amendment, and vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 37; as follows:

YEAS—10.			
Berry,	Daniel,	Mills,	Voorhees
Brice,	George,	Pugh,	
Coke,	Harris,	Turpie,	
NAYS—37.			
Bate,	Dolph,	Irby,	Sherman,
Blodgett,	Dubois,	Jones, Nev.	Squire,
Caffery,	Felton,	Kyle,	Stewart,
Call,	Frye,	McPherson,	Stockbridge,
Carey,	Gallinger,	Morrill,	Vilas,
Chandler,	Gray,	Palmer,	Washburn,
Cockrell,	Hansbrough,	Pasco,	White.
Cullom,	Hawley,	Peffer,	
Davis,	Hiscock,	Proctor,	
Dawcs,	Hoar,	Sawyer,	
NOT VOTING—40.			
Aldrich,	Faulkner,	Manderson,	Sanders,
Allen,	Gibson,	Mitchell,	Shoup,
Allison,	Gordon,	Morgan,	Stanford,
Blackburn,	Gorman,	Paddock,	Teller,
Butler,	Hale,	Perkins,	Vance,
Camden,	Higgins,	Pettigrew,	Vest,
Cameron,	Hill,	Platt,	Walthall,
Casey,	Hunton,	Power,	Warren,
Colquitt,	Jones, Ark.	Quay,	Wilson,
Dixon,	McMillan,	Ransom,	Wolcott.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARRIS. There have been a good many amendments agreed to by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole to the bill, and exactly what the bill amounts to in its present shape I doubt whether anyone can tell, unless it be the chairman of the committee, and I am not absolutely sure that he could now tell

the Senate exactly what the bill means in the shape in which it has been put; but certainly with many of us it is desirable that the bill should be printed as amended in order that we may see exactly how it stands to-day while it is yet open to amendment in Committee of the Whole. For that reason I appeal to the Senator from Illinois to allow an order to be made that the bill be printed as amended, so that to-morrow morning we may see precisely how it stands.

Mr. CULLOM. I think if the Senator and the Senate will give attention to the reading of the bill, with the amendments proposed and adopted, it will be perfectly apparent to every one exactly how the bill stands and what its effect will be. I should be very glad to accommodate the Senator, but this bill has been in the way of other legislation for several days, and important bills are pending upon the Calendar which Senators are anxious to get before the Senate for consideration. Under those circumstances I hardly feel at liberty to allow the bill to go over by my consent; I think we ought to act upon it now. I think every Senator, if the bill is read, will see exactly what we have finally agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. There is not a Senator here who does not recognize the fact that the mere reading from the Secretary's desk utterly fails to give a very clear and distinct understanding of the purport and meaning of a bill.

Mr. CULLOM. That is true, ordinarily.

Mr. HARRIS. Modified and amended as this bill has been, before the Senate shall commit itself to it in its present shape, it is due to the Senate and to every Senator that we have it printed in the form in which it now stands, so that we can look at it and have it under the eye of every Senator when it is to be finally acted upon.

Mr. CULLOM. So far as I am personally concerned, I am willing to accept the suggestion of the Senator, if the Senate will agree to take a vote on the bill to-morrow at some time, 2 o'clock for instance, so that we may get it out of the way.

Mr. HARRIS. I chance to know that there are amendments intended to be offered, not by myself but by other Senators.

Mr. CULLOM. They can be offered now.

Mr. HARRIS. I understand all the rights a Senator has when a bill is reported to the Senate, but I think we ought to see before this bill goes out of Committee of the Whole exactly the attitude and position in which the Senate has placed the bill in committee.

Mr. CULLOM. I will consent to the proposition of the Senator from Tennessee if we can get an hour fixed to dispose of the bill to-morrow. If taking the vote at 2 o'clock will not give sufficient time, let us say 3 o'clock.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest to the Senator that we order the printing of the bill as amended, and he may make that suggestion to-morrow morning.

Mr. CULLOM. I should rather have that settled now, so that Senators may know when we are going to reach a vote.

Mr. HARRIS. I have just sent word to a Senator who I know wishes to offer some additional amendments, and who I suppose will be here in a moment. He is engaged in committee.

Mr. CULLOM. I am willing to wait for him.

Mr. HARRIS. I suggest that the Senator agree that the bill be printed as amended. Then to-morrow morning additional amendments, if there be any, may be offered.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator name an hour to-morrow at which the vote may be taken?

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator will not.

Mr. CULLOM. Then I think we ought to insist on disposing of the bill to-night.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the bill be printed as amended.

Mr. HOAR. That is not now in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks the motion made by the Senator from Tennessee is not in order at this stage of the bill. Is unanimous consent given to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to say that I do not desire anything unreasonable about the matter. I certainly should not desire anything I thought unreasonable. I only appeal to the honorable Senator, who is a member of the committee, that we agree to fix a time to-morrow when we can dispose of the bill. If the time I suggest is not satisfactory, I appeal to the Senator to name a time which will be satisfactory to him.

Mr. HARRIS. I have just sent word to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], who I know wants to offer one or more amendments.

Mr. GORMAN entered the Chamber.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Maryland is now present.

Mr. CULLOM. I shall be glad to hear from him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Maryland that unanimous consent has been asked that the pending bill be printed as amended.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I do not desire to interfere with the request.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator from Maryland will allow me, I will say that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] asked that the bill go over and be printed, so as to be laid upon the tables of Senators to-morrow. I say, as chairman of the committee, so far as I am concerned, I am content that that order shall be made if we can have a time fixed to-morrow for the final disposition of the bill. I think that is reasonable, and I think the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Tennessee ought to agree to it. I am not particular about the hour. I suggested 2 o'clock. If a later hour than that is desired, let it be stated. That is all I have to say.

Mr. HARRIS. I desire that the Senator from Maryland shall have the opportunity of offering such amendment or amendments as he desires. I prefer that he should have that opportunity in Committee of the Whole, but I am not prepared myself to express an opinion. I might appeal with absolute confidence to the Senator from Illinois as to whether he would not be better satisfied as to exactly what this bill means in its present shape if it were printed with all the amendments which have been agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM. I think I know what the amendments are, but I am not trying to avoid the printing of the bill or to prevent the Senator from Maryland or anybody else offering amendments. All I desire is that in the interest of legislation on other subjects we fix a time to-morrow at which we can vote upon the bill and amendments.

Mr. HARRIS. When the Senator from Illinois appealed to me to name a time I declined to do so, but I have not generally been, and I do not remember a single occasion where I have been, captious about such matters. I am generally acquiescent, and desire to accommodate the views of a majority of the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. Say 3 o'clock.

Mr. HARRIS. But I intended to secure to the Senator from Maryland such opportunity as he is entitled to enjoy in the way of offering such amendments as he may wish to propose.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask that we fix, say, 3 o'clock, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Maryland, or any other Senator who has amendments to offer.

Mr. GORMAN. I did desire to offer several amendments to the bill, but owing to the fact that I have been engaged in the Committee on Appropriations in the consideration of a very important bill, I have not been able to be in the Chamber either yesterday or to-day for fifteen minutes continuously at any time. I confess I do not know the condition of the bill now, as it has been amended in some particulars, and therefore I should like to have it go over until to-morrow and be printed, so that I may have the opportunity of examining it in the morning. I suggest to the Senator from Illinois that we can dispose of the bill by 4 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. CULLOM. Very well; I agree to that. I ask that an agreement be made to take the vote at 4 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] asks that the bill lie over and be printed as amended. That order will be made in the absence of objection.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] asks that unanimous consent be given that the bill shall be voted on at 4 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FRYE. What order, if any, has been made in relation to the hour of meeting to-morrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. None whatever. The Senate will meet at 11 o'clock, unless otherwise ordered.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and, on motion of Mr. VILAS (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, February 11, 1893, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 10, 1893.

INDIAN AGENT.

Charles A. Ruffee, of Brainerd, Minn., who was appointed October 18, 1892, during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the White Earth Agency, in Minnesota, vice Benjamin P. Shuler, resigned.

ASSISTANT SURGEON MARINE HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Rupert Blue, of South Carolina, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine Hospital Service of the United States.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Infantry Arm.

Second Lieut. Henry C. Keene, jr., Twenty-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, February 4, 1893, vice Druen, Seventeenth Infantry, appointed regimental quartermaster.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 10, 1893.

POSTMASTER.

Horace K. Warren, to be postmaster at Kentland, in the County of Newton and State of Indiana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 10, 1893.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

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

MILITIA FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting an abstract of the militia force of the United States according to the latest returns received at the office of the Adjutant-General; which was referred to the Committee on the Militia, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM C. MOORE, DECEASED.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of the court in the case of William C. Moore, deceased, against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

COMMUNICATIONS TO THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY RELATIVE TO REPEAL OF SHERMAN SILVER ACT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to House resolution dated February 7, 1893, information relating to the organizations that have communicated with the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the repeal of the Sherman silver law; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR AND RAILROAD COMPANY.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the President of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator and Railroad Company, transmitting the annual report of said company; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House letters from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the findings of the court in the cases of the following-named persons against the United States: T. V. Atchley, deceased; J. W. Clark, deceased; B. C. Crafton, deceased; Elijah Holtzelaw, deceased; which were severally referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

COLLECTION OF FEES FOR FURNISHING CERTIFICATES OF TITLE TO VESSELS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 3358) providing for the collection of fees for furnishing certificates of title to vessels; which was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO RAILWAY BRIDGE ACROSS THE BIG SANDY RIVER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 3843) to authorize the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company to renew its railroad bridge across the Big Sandy River upon such plans and location as may be approved by the Secretary of War.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration and passage of that bill. I will state to the House that it is simply granting permission to the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company to reconstruct its bridge across the Big Sandy River, in West Virginia and Kentucky. It is a corporation authorized by both States.

Mr. BURROWS. Has the bill been considered by the House?

Mr. WISE. No, sir; but it has passed the Senate, and simply grants this company authority to reconstruct its bridge.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the States of Virginia and West Virginia, and now existing therein, be, and it is hereby, authorized to renew and operate its railroad bridge across the Big Sandy River near the site of its present bridge, upon such location and plans as may be approved by the Secretary of War: *Provided, however,* That the said bridge shall be so constructed as to cause the least obstruction to the navigation of the said river, and upon plans to be approved by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

On motion of Mr. WISE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SHOALING IN HORN ISLAND CHANNEL, MISSISSIPPI SOUND.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a joint resolution (S. R. 147) asking information as to the shoaling in Horn Island Channel, in the Mississippi Sound; which was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH YUMA INDIAN RESERVATION, CALIFORNIA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 3788) granting right of way to the Colorado River Irrigation Company through the Yuman Indian Reservation in California.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill. The bill is unanimously reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs to the House. It has the cordial indorsement of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who says in a letter addressed to the Secretary of the Interior:

I have the honor to state that I have been on the ground and know from personal observation that the Yuma Indian Reservation is greatly in need of a system of irrigation. Any adequate system attempted by the Government would necessarily involve a large expense, and I think it would be very wise indeed for the Government to take advantage of the opportunities offered by this proposed private enterprise. It seems to me that the Indians will be fully compensated, at least for the lands that will be taken in the construction of the canal, by receiving a supply of water therefrom sufficient for all their purposes, domestic and agricultural, including irrigation, so there need be no objection to the grant on that score. Any permanent buildings that individual Indians own will be fully protected. For that matter, however, there is not, I believe, an Indian habitation of any considerable value on the reservation.

For these considerations I not only raise no objections to the passage of the bill, but strongly recommend its enactment.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered at this time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted unto the Colorado River Irrigation Company, incorporated under the laws of the State of Colorado, its successors and assigns, a right of way for an irrigating canal through the Yuma Indian Reservation in California to the extent of the ground occupied by the water of the canal and its ditches and laterals, and 50 feet on each side of the marginal limits thereof, beginning at a point near where the northeast boundary line of the said reservation joins the Colorado River and running thence south and west through the said reservation to and beyond the limits thereof. The plats of the ditches of said company through said reservation shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and such ditches shall be so located, or the rights of way herein granted so used, as to not in any way interfere with any permanent buildings upon said reservation, except with the express consent of the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. That the rights herein granted are upon the express condition that the grantee or grantees thereof shall at all times during the continuance thereof furnish the Indian occupants of the land situated on the lower side of the canal with water sufficient for all domestic and agricultural purposes and purposes of irrigation on such terms and under such rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage; but the right to amend or repeal it at any time is hereby reserved to Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

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

On motion of Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

GEORGE M'ALPIN.

Mr. AMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8200) for the relief of George McAlpin, to repay to him moneys unlawfully collected from him by the United States.

The bill was read, as follows:

Whereas George McAlpin was the sutler of the Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry during the years 1862, 1863, 1864, and 1865, and was during those years required by the United States at the United States custom-house at Baltimore, Md., to pay the sum of 3 per cent on the value of all of the supplies shipped to him during said years within the lines of the Army; and Whereas he was thus unlawfully and unjustly required to pay to the United

States, and did thus unlawfully and unjustly pay, the sum of \$6,906.18, being 3 per cent on \$230,206.29 to the United States, as appears by the books of the custom-house at Baltimore, Md.: Therefore

Be it enacted, etc. That the Treasurer of the United States is hereby directed to pay to the said George McAlpin, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$6,906.18.

Mr. DOCKERY. Is this a bill which proposes to pay interest on a claim?

Mr. AMERMAN. It does not propose to pay any interest.

Mr. DINGLEY. I reserve all points of order on the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. Let the report be read.

Mr. DINGLEY. Let it be read subject to objection.

Mr. WATSON. If it is read subject to objection I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. The report can be read subject to objection.

The Clerk proceeded to read the report.

Mr. WATSON (interrupting the reading of the report). To save time, I will have to object to the consideration of that bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia objects.

BRIDGE AT WEST ELIZABETH, PA.

Mr. SIPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the West Elizabeth Bridge Company, a corporation duly organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge over the Monongahela River, in accordance with charter, between a point at or near the foot of Plum street, in the borough of Elizabeth, to a point in the borough of West Elizabeth on the opposite side of the said Monongahela River, all within the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania. The said West Elizabeth Bridge Company shall not commence the construction of its bridge, bridge piers, abutments, causeway, and other works over or in said Monongahela River until the location and plan of the same shall have been submitted to and approved by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 2. That any act of Congress or part of an act inconsistent herewith, so far as it affects the same, is hereby repealed.

The amendments recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce were read, as follows:

Section 1, line 7, after the word "river," strike out "in accordance with its charter."

After section 2 add the following:

"SEC. 3. That any bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be built and located under and subject to such regulations for the security of the navigation of said river as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and to secure that object the said company or corporation shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawing of the bridge and a map of the location, giving, for the space of one-half mile above and one-half mile below the proposed location, the high and low water lines upon the banks of the river, the direction and strength of the currents at low and at high water, with the soundings, accurately showing the bed of the stream and the location of any other bridge or bridges, such map to be sufficiently in detail to enable the Secretary of War to judge of the proper location of said bridge, and shall furnish such other information as may be required for a full and satisfactory understanding of the subject; and until the said plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War the bridge shall not be commenced or built; and should any change be made in the plans of said bridge during the progress of its construction such changes shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War."

"SEC. 4. That said bridge herein authorized to be constructed shall be so kept and managed at all times as to afford proper means and ways for the passage of vessels, barges, or rafts both by day and by night, and there shall be displayed on said bridge by the owners thereof from sunset to sunrise such lights or other signals as the Light-House Board may prescribe; and such changes shall be made from time to time in the structure of said bridge as the Secretary of War may direct, at the expense of the said bridge company, in order the more effectually to preserve the free navigation of said river."

"SEC. 5. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date hereof."

"SEC. 6. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

THOMAS L. HIGGINS.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1407, to grant relief to Thomas L. Higgins.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to Thomas L. Higgins, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$6,970, damages incurred under a contract made with the United States Government July 1, 1864, to furnish wood and ties for the United States military railroads: *Provided*, That said sum be accepted as full payment under said contract.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BRETZ. Mr. Speaker, I should like to hear the report in that case read.

Mr. HOOKER of New York. The report is quite long, and if there be no objection I can state the facts in less time than would be required to read it. In 1864 this claimant, Thomas L. Higgins, entered into a contract with the Government by the terms of which he was to furnish wood and ties to the Government for

delivery at its military road near Chattanooga. The contract provided that he should receive so much per cord for the wood and so much for the ties.

It also provided that the Government would furnish him, free of charge, transportation for himself and his teams, machinery, and whatever was necessary for the completion of the work. It further provided that either party could terminate the contract by giving thirty days' notice. Mr. Higgins went on and furnished some wood and ties. The Government then decided to abandon the road, and he was given two or three days' notice of their intention of abandoning this military road. He asked for transportation for his machinery, horses, mules, etc., which he had necessarily employed there, and for which he had expended a large amount of money, many thousand dollars.

He asked for transportation and they gave him some cars. He immediately began to load his property upon the cars, but it was then decided to be necessary in order to get the Government supplies away that those cars should be used for that purpose. Accordingly his property was unloaded from the cars and the Government property was loaded on and saved. This bill provides only for compensation for the value of the property that he actually had and was compelled to have there in order to carry out his contract, his horses, mules, machinery, etc.

Mr. COX of Tennessee. What railroad was that?

Mr. HOOKER of New York. From Chattanooga to Atlanta, I suppose—a military road.

Mr. BRETZ. Can the gentleman tell us how the amount of this damage was estimated?

Mr. HOOKER of New York. It was estimated upon proofs filed in the Department.

Mr. BRETZ. Why could not the claim be allowed in the Department instead of coming here?

Mr. HOOKER of New York. It could not be allowed there, as I understand, and it has been pending here for a long time. I do not know why the bill was introduced in its present form, but it has had the unanimous report of the Committee on War Claims for eight or ten Congresses.

Mr. BRETZ. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to the consideration of this bill until I examine it further.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KILGORE. How would it do to have the regular order at this time? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands the regular order.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of standing and select committees for reports. The Clerk will call the committees.

TREASURY NOTES UNDER ACT JULY 14, 1890.

Mr. BACON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 10422) in relation to Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, NEW MEXICO.

Mr. JOSEPH, from the Committee on the Territories, reported back with a favorable recommendation the joint resolution (H. Res. 202) extending the session of the Thirtieth Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico from sixty to seventy days; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PENSIONS FOR KENTUCKY MILITIA.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported, as a substitute for House bill 7554, a bill (H. R. 10468) granting pensions to certain battalions of Kentucky State militia; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SCHOOL AT WARRINGTON, FLA.

Mr. CUMMINGS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported, as a substitute for the bill H. R. 2651, a bill (H. R. 10468) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to establish and cause to be maintained a free public school for children under 17 years of age at the village of Warrington, on the naval reservation on Pensacola Bay, in the State of Florida; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the

Whole (Mr. WILSON of West Virginia in the chair), and proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10345) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I ask that the Clerk read the bill, omitting the amendments, which are printed in italics.

Mr. BURROWS. That is not the bill.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I say, let the Clerk read the bill, omitting the amendments.

Mr. BURROWS. But the amendments are not in the bill.

Mr. MUTCHLER. My proposition is that he shall omit them.

Mr. BURROWS. Then the proposition is that the Clerk read the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. GROUT. Let the bill be read from the bill proper, not from the printed document.

Mr. BURROWS. There is but one bill here.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for other purposes, namely:

For Army and Navy pensions, as follows: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, Army nurses, survivors and widows of the war of 1812 and with Mexico, and the survivors and widows of the Indian wars of 1832 to 1842, inclusive, \$165,000,000: *Provided*, That the appropriation aforesaid for Navy pensions shall be paid from the income of the Navy pension fund, so far as the same may be sufficient for that purpose; *And provided further*, That the amount expended under each of the above items shall be accounted for separately.

For fees and expenses of examining surgeons for services rendered within the fiscal year 1894, \$1,000,000. And each member of each examining board not receiving an annual salary shall, as now authorized by law, receive the sum of \$2 for the examination of each applicant whenever five or a less number shall be examined on any one day, and \$1 for the examination of each additional applicant on such day: *Provided*, That if twenty or more applicants appear on one day no fewer than twenty shall, if practicable, be examined on said day, and that if fewer examinations be then made, twenty or more having appeared, then there shall be paid for the first examinations made on the next examination day the fee of \$1 only until twenty examinations shall have been made: *Provided further*, That no fee shall be paid to any member of an examining board unless personally present and assisting in the examination of applicants.

That from and after July 1, 1893, no pension shall be paid to a nonresident, who is not a citizen of the United States, except for actual disabilities incurred in the service.

That from and after the passage of this act the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers shall deduct the excess above \$5 monthly of the pensions of all inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and cover the same into the Treasury: *Provided*, however, That the above provision shall not apply to any inmate of said home who, having wife at the time of his admission to said home, minor child, or parent, dependent upon him for support, shall apply the excess of his pension above said \$5 each month to said support. The said Board of Managers shall annually report the amount of pension money received by them under the above provision.

That the act of February 5, 1867, and all acts supplemental thereto, relating to the establishment of pension agencies and the payment of pensions by pension agents, be, and the same are hereby, repealed; and that from and after the 1st day of July, 1893, all pensions shall be paid directly from the Treasury of the United States, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury; and for the necessary clerical force in the Treasury Department and other expenses hereunder, there is hereby appropriated \$400,000; and hereafter the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit in detail estimates for necessary clerical and other expenses hereunder.

That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior, whenever any citizen or citizen shall request permission to copy the pension roll at any pension agency in the United States, to grant such permission: *Provided*, That the costs of such copying shall be paid by the person or persons desiring such copies, and the work in copying shall be done at such times as will not interfere with the regular work of the agencies.

That a committee, consisting of five members-elect to the House of Representatives of the Fifty-third Congress, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Fifty-second Congress, shall, prior to the first Monday of December next, inquire into and investigate the operation of all laws granting pensions to soldiers, sailors, and others; whether the rates of pension thereunder are excessive, and, generally, whether there should be any modification of said laws.

Said committee shall have power to send for persons and papers and appoint a clerk and stenographer; and the committee may report, by bill or otherwise, to the Fifty-third Congress. All necessary expenses of said committee shall be paid out of the appropriation for miscellaneous items of the House of Representatives on drafts to be drawn by the chairman of said committee, in sums not exceeding \$500 at any one time.

Mr. MARTIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. As to some portions of this bill points of order have been reserved. When will be the time to present such points?

The CHAIRMAN. When those parts of the bill are reached in the consideration of the bill by paragraphs.

Mr. MARTIN. Then this first reading does not waive any points of order?

Mr. DINGLEY. Oh, no. They do not come up until we consider the bill under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations, or a majority of that committee, to submit several amendments to this bill—

Mr. DINGLEY. But, Mr. Chairman, they are not in order at the present time. No amendments are now in order.

Mr. MUTCHLER. If the gentleman will hear me, I think he will agree to what I am going to say. In order that these

amendments may be pending, I ask that the Clerk read them now. They are printed in italics. I do not ask that the amendments be considered at this time. I only present them as coming from a majority of the committee, in order that they may be pending and taken up in their order.

Mr. GROUT. One of these amendments printed in the bill the gentleman certainly will not claim has the approval of the committee.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I think they all meet the approval of the committee.

Mr. BYNUM. I desire to reserve the right to raise the question as to the right of the committee to present these amendments.

Mr. DINGLEY. They can only be presented now for the information of the House; they can not be considered as pending. They can not be pending until actually offered.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I offer them now.

Mr. DINGLEY. But they can not be offered now to be pending, because the general debate is not closed yet.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I ask, then, that these amendments be read now for information, if the Chair holds they can not be pending. But I see no reason why they can not be presented by the committee and be pending until they are reached.

Mr. PICKLER. I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments which the committee will offer at the proper stage in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Is it not true that the amendments reported by the committee will come up for consideration under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. They will.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Then, why is it proper to read them now? Why will they not more properly come up after we have reached the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks to have them read so that they may be pending for the information of the House.

Mr. BURROWS. But, Mr. Chairman, they can not be pending at this stage of our proceedings. This bill is in Committee of the Whole now for general debate. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will have no difficulty in having the amendments read in his own time. He has the floor for an hour and can have the amendments read as a portion of the debate. But to offer them at this time as amendments of the committee is, I submit, not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not held at all that they are in order to be considered as committee amendments at this time.

Mr. DINGLEY. Nor can they be offered now at all. The bill is not now open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. They can not be offered for any purpose except to have them pending for information.

Mr. GROUT. But we object to that. The gentleman can present them in his own time as a part of his remarks.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Is there any objection to having them read now?

Mr. BURROWS. Not the slightest, if you have them read in your own time. You have the right to make any speech you desire to make.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I did not propose to print the amendments in my speech. It is unnecessary. I can offer the amendments in another way. But I desire to have them submitted now and read for the information of the House.

Mr. BOWERS. Submit them in the way the rest of us would have to do.

Mr. BURROWS. The bill is not yet open for amendment; it is open for general debate only.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Does the Chair decide that the amendments can not be offered now?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair submitted the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania for unanimous consent that the amendments be now read, before debate begins upon the bill, for information.

Mr. BURROWS. And to that I object.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman can have them read as a part of his remarks.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I ask then that these amendments be read in my time.

The amendments proposed were read, as follows:

Insert the following:

"1. That on the 30th day of June, 1893, the Bureau of Pensions, with all of its remaining officials and employes, and all of its records, files, and property, shall be transferred to the War Department, and shall thereafter form a part of the Record and Pension Office of that Department; and the Board of Pension Appeals, now in the Interior Department shall at the same time be transferred to the War Department; and the Secretary of said Department

shall thereafter exercise all the powers and perform all the duties under the pension laws that are now exercised and performed by the Secretary of the Interior; and the President of the United States shall designate an officer of the Army, whose rank and pay during such designation shall be that of a colonel, who shall exercise all the powers and perform all the duties that are now exercised and performed by the Commissioner of Pensions, and he shall likewise designate two officers of the Army, whose rank shall not be below that of captain, who shall perform such duties as may be assigned them by the Secretary of War; and while so employed they shall receive no compensation additional to their Army pay and allowances: *And provided further*, That the offices of Commissioner of Pensions and First and Second Deputy Commissioners of Pensions be abolished on and after said 30th day of June, 1893.

"2. That the Secretary of War, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is authorized, during the fiscal year 1894, to detail from time to time from the medical examiners in the Record and Pension Office, for the purpose of discharging the duties in all respects heretofore imposed upon and exercised by examining surgeons of pensions; and there may be appointed by the Secretary of War an additional force of one hundred and twenty special medical examiners for the fiscal year 1894, at annual salaries of \$1,500 each, and the Secretary of War shall require that all of said special medical examiners shall be surgeons of education, skill, and experience in their profession, and shall impose upon them the powers in all respects now exercised under the law by examining surgeons of pensions; and the examination and certificate of any one of said special medical examiners or medical examiners so detailed in conjunction with one examining surgeon of pensions shall have the same force and effect as those of the present boards of examining surgeons. The said medical examiners and special medical examiners shall be assigned by the Secretary of War to such locations within the United States as he may deem most convenient for pension applicants; and they shall receive, when absent from home and traveling on duty outside of the District of Columbia, in lieu of expenses for subsistence, \$3 per day, together with an allowance for actual and necessary expenses for transportation and assistance: *Provided*, That no such special medical examiner or medical examiner shall be assigned to any county, city, or Congressional district of which he may at any time have been a resident: *And provided further*, That the boards of examining surgeons as now constituted be, and they are hereby, reorganized so as to consist of but one examining surgeon, to be designated by the Secretary of War, acting in conjunction with one medical examiner or one special medical examiner detailed for that purpose as above provided. For salaries of the one hundred and twenty special medical examiners above authorized, \$180,000. For per diem, when absent from home and traveling on duty outside of the District of Columbia, for special medical examiners or medical examiners detailed for service as herein provided, in lieu of expenses for subsistence, and for actual and necessary expenses for transportation and assistance, \$175,000; in all, \$355,000. Also, in line 5, page 5, strike out the words "one million" and insert "\$335,000."

Also insert, after the word "board," in line 6, page 5, "not receiving an annual salary."

Also insert the following:

"5. That the rating of all pensions for like disabilities shall be uniform, and that all pensions heretofore granted or hereafter to be granted in pursuance of the act of June 27, 1890, shall be rated upon the inability of the pensioner to earn a living by manual labor.

"6. That from and after July 1, 1893, no pension shall be paid to any person drawing a pension under the provisions of chapter 634 of the act of the year 1890, unless he shall show that he is disabled for manual labor, and unless he shall show to the satisfaction of the Pension Office, by proper affidavits, that his annual income is less than \$800 a year.

"7. That from and after July 1, 1893, no person shall be paid a pension, under any general law, as the widow of a soldier of any war, unless said widow was married to the soldier as the widow of whom she draws a pension within five years after the close of the war in which her husband served."

Mr. MUTCHLER. Will my colleagues on the committee on the other side indicate what length of time they will desire for general debate?

Mr. GROUT. It is quite impossible at this time to tell how long the general debate will probably run. These amendments are remarkable in their character and there has been a desire on the part of a large number of members to be heard on the questions presented. I am not prepared, therefore, to state that we can agree upon any limitation of time at present. Later, after the debate has run for a while, we may be able to come to some understanding. We do not want any unreasonable length of time.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Does the gentleman desire more than today for general debate?

Mr. GROUT. We are not prepared really to come to an understanding on that point. I can not say. I have had a large number of requests for time, and perhaps after the debate has continued for a while we may be able to reach some understanding.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill appropriates for the payment of pensions—invalid pensions and Army and Navy pensions—the sum of \$165,000,000. It is the full amount of the estimate made by the Secretary of the Treasury. The amount appropriated for this purpose for the current fiscal year, including pensions and the expenditures appropriated under the pension bill for conducting the Pension Office, was one hundred and forty-seven million and some odd hundred dollars, being also the exact amount estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury.

It was stated before the Committee on Appropriations last year that \$147,000,000 would be deemed sufficient to defray all of the expenses for the current year. But we find that there has been a deficiency, which has been already appropriated in the general deficiency bill, of over \$14,000,000, making the entire expenditure for the current year \$161,000,000 in round numbers.

The bill now under consideration therefore carries about \$4,000,000 in excess of the amount that will be expended during the current year. It is admitted by both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Pensions—certainly by the Commissioner

of Pensions—that if the Pension Office shall be conducted in the next fiscal year with the same energy and according to the same methods and with the same force that it is being conducted now the amount required for the next year will be somewhere in the neighborhood of \$178,000,000, instead of \$165,000,000.

But the Commissioner of Pensions also says that, there having been a change of administration, and as the methods of conducting the Pension Bureau may be somewhat modified, he thinks probably the \$165,000,000 will be sufficient; and that if that sum is not sufficient Congress will have ample time to make the necessary appropriations before the sum is exhausted.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the heaviest appropriation bill that has ever been presented before the American Congress. No bill, I venture to say—I do not speak from figures now, but only from memory—no bill during the war period, with all of the vast expenditures attending its payments and operations, carried as heavy an appropriation as does the present bill.

I believe, too, if I am correctly informed, that there were only three years in the history of this Government when the expenditures for a single year—and I include the years of the war of the rebellion—were greater than will be the expenditures of this Government during the next fiscal year. I mean the appropriations for all expenditures.

Now, it is a startling fact that the pensions paid, exclusive of this appropriation, have been and are now in excess of the entire appropriations made during the life of this Government from 1789 to 1860.

According to the official Treasury statement the total expenditures of the United States from 1789 to June 30, 1860, excluding only pensions and public debt items, was \$1,445,124,685.10. This sum sufficed to carry on the war of 1812, the Mexican and Indian wars, and for the purchase of sufficient territory to increase the area of the United States from 827,844 square miles to 3,603,884 square miles, besides running the Government in all its Departments, Army, Navy, civil, judicial, and legislative.

The total amount of pensions paid from 1861 to 1892 footed up \$1,450,886,211.17. The amount of pensions that we are now paying is within a trifle of as much as it costs to support the combined armies of Germany and France. I do not include pensions alone, but also the appropriations made for the military service. These figures are startling, and a majority of the Committee on Appropriations have come to the conclusion that there should be some retrenchment, that a reform in the granting of pensions must begin somewhere, and that the time has come when that reform should be instituted.

Now, it is not the desire of any member of the committee, nor do I believe it is the wish of a single member of Congress on either side of this House, to have a Union soldier who is deserving of a pension, deprived of the pension which he now receives. Nobody wants to take pensions away from deserving soldiers, nor is there anything in this bill that will take one single penny away from the pension that has been granted to a deserving soldier who sustained actual disabilities, either from wounds or sickness, during his service in the Army.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to ask the gentleman a question. The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUTCHLER] yield?

Mr. MUTCHLER. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not your purpose in this appropriation bill to repeal existing law?

Mr. MUTCHLER. Well, that is a point of order which the gentleman can raise when the time comes. We have the authority and the right, in some instances, to repeal existing law. The committee has recommended several provisions in the bill, and also the amendments which have just been read from the desk, which we think, if adopted, will institute a reform, will lessen the amount of money that is being appropriated year after year for pensions, and will not deprive one single deserving soldier of the pension which he now has or which he may hereafter obtain.

The first, and I consider it the most important proposition that will be pending, and which has already been read from the desk, is the proposition to transfer this Bureau from the Interior Department to the War Department. The truth is, it should never have been anywhere else. There is where it properly belongs, and as there are but few soldiers now living who are not either applicants for pensions or who have not already been granted pensions, it seems to me there can not be any objection to our curtailing the expense of the Bureau by abolishing the offices of Commissioner and Deputy Commissioner of Pensions and placing that work in the hands of army officers.

But there is a more important reason for it than that, Mr. Chairman, and it is this, that never can you get this Pension Bureau out of the arena of politics until you put it where political influence does not count. I am bold to say that it has always been in politics. It is in politics now, and will continue to be in politics so long as it is a bureau of the Interior Department.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. Will my colleague permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MUTCHLER. Certainly.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. Could not the gentleman postpone this proposition to dispense with the pension agencies, and the matter of politics in granting pensions until Mr. ex-Commissioner Black takes his seat in the next House? He will then be able to tell us whether politics have been in the Commissioner's office or not. He is a good authority on that subject.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I am not here to defend Mr. Commissioner Black, nor am I here to defend any person who has been Commissioner of Pensions; but I say, and I say it boldly for myself, that this Pension Bureau has been a factor in the political arena of this country from the date of its organization down to the present time.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is very hard on Mr. Black, who is not here to defend himself.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I do not yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is one point, and I consider it the most important of all the propositions pending. There are a number of others of minor importance.

Mr. MARTIN. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I will ask the gentleman to please not interrupt me. He shall have his hour.

Referring to the statement which was made by my colleague [Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania] that it would be better to postpone the abolition of the pension agencies until Mr. Black comes in, I want to say for that proposition we have the indorsement of no less an official than the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask my colleague just one question. I do not desire to interrupt him. Has he read the very exhaustive letter of his friend, Gen. W. H. Davis, of Pennsylvania, formerly the pension agent in our State; a very exhaustive letter, disapproving entirely the advisability of abolishing the pension agencies?

Mr. MUTCHLER. I do not want to read the letter of any man who is a pension agent or expects to be one. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. There is no doubt as to the ability and uprightness of Gen. W. H. Davis, and there could not be appointed a better pension agent than he was and would be in the next Administration. He is a sound Democrat, but was a good pension agent.

Mr. MUTCHLER. In answer to that proposition I ask the Clerk to read the letter of Secretary Foster.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, Washington, January 27, 1893.

MY DEAR SIR: In answer to your request for the views of this Department upon the proposition of paying pensioners directly from the Treasury, and the cost of such mode of payment, I submit herewith a statement made by Mr. Whelpley, assistant treasurer.

In view of the necessity of placing this information before you at the earliest practicable moment, I have not made inquiry of the Commissioner of Pensions as to what is involved in the paragraph on page 7 of Mr. Whelpley's report.

If the laws are so changed as to permit the check to have the force and effect of a voucher, as is the case with checks for the payment of interest, and to which I see no objection, a further material saving may be obtained.

Very respectfully, yours,

CHARLES FOSTER, Secretary.

Hon. W. S. HOLMAN,

Chairman Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

Mr. COGSWELL. Right there, will the gentlemen from Pennsylvania allow me a question?

Mr. MUTCHLER. Well, now, you have your time, and I do not want to be interrupted. My time is limited.

Mr. COGSWELL. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. MUTCHLER. It will be seen, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this proposition does not come exactly from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COGSWELL. It was right there where the pertinency of my question would have been shown.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. COGSWELL. I would like the gentleman to allow me to ask him to point out in that letter which has just been read by the Clerk, one single word from the Secretary of the Treasury favoring this transfer.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I am not speaking about the transfer. I am speaking about the abolition of the pension agencies.

Mr. COGSWELL. I mean the abolition of the pension agencies and that to which "I have no objection," applies. "No objection" to the checks serving as vouchers, as in other cases. Not a word about approval.

Mr. MUTCHLER. The Clerk has not read the letter.

Mr. COGSWELL. He read the letter from Secretary Foster.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Let him read the whole letter. The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE TREASURER, Washington, D. C., January 27, 1893.

SIR: In accordance with your personal request of recent date for the views of this office on the proposition of paying pensioners directly from the Treasury and on the cost of such mode of payment I submit the following statement:

On December 31, 1892, the Pension Bureau carried on its rolls the names of 931,224 persons. Estimated by the average rate of increase during the first four months of the current fiscal year the number will exceed 1,000,000 on the 1st of July next, and, judging from the mass of original cases still pending, will continue to increase for some time. The Commissioner is of the opinion that the greatest number under all laws will be 1,200,000, at a cost of \$188,000,000 per annum.

No tables are at hand throwing light on the question when the pension list will attain its maximum, how long it will maintain its height, and at what rate after its turning point it will decrease from year to year.

For the purpose of this statement 1,000,000 is assumed as the number of pensioners.

The requirement of quarterly payments calls for the preparation of 4,000,000 vouchers and checks during the year, or 335,000 per month, and as it is of the utmost importance that the pensioner should not suffer delay provision must be made for a force large enough to write and dispatch that number of checks within fourteen days after the pension becomes due, or at the rate of about 24,000 per day.

The labor of keeping the roll books and examining the returned and executed vouchers it is proposed to assign to the auditors who are now charged with such duties in connection with the auditing of the pension agents' accounts.

There are in use at each agency sets of roll books containing the names and addresses of pensioners and the essential data for identification and payment of amounts due in each case. Like records are kept by the auditors, and whatever action is taken by the Pension Office affecting the status of a pensioner is reported simultaneously to the agency and to the proper auditor.

When the agent forwards his monthly abstract of payments to the auditor the accompanying vouchers containing the information for identification of the pensioner, the time covered by the payment, the amount paid, and the number of the check issued are examined and compared with the official rolls, and if the account is found correct it is passed on for revision to the Second Comptroller.

Under any system the labor of keeping the rolls and examining the vouchers must be performed by the auditors. The plan in view contemplates the examination of the vouchers by these officers before payment is made, the discontinuance of the agency set of roll books, which may be transferred to the auditors, and the adoption of a new set of books on which the classes of army pensioners are arranged by amounts.

The great advantages in the economy of labor and expedition of the work gained by the proposed arrangement, which will be duplicated in the Treasurer's office by a system of cards, will be obvious when it is considered that according to the Commissioner's report for 1892 out of 828,000 army pensioners 92 per cent, or 765,000, receive quarterly checks of the following amounts: 22,000 for \$72; 27,000 for \$51; 18,000 for \$48; 20,000 for \$42; 312,000 for \$36; 46,000 for \$30; 174,000 for \$24; 98,000 for \$18; and 48,000 for \$12.

The cards prepared by the several agencies on which are written the names of pensioners, with a full history of each pensioner as given in his certificate, and also his last known address, should be transferred to the Treasurer. By means of these cards, arranged in the order indicated above to correspond with the books of the Auditors, it is intended to employ constantly a portion of the clerical force in preparing vouchers and addressing envelopes in advance of the quarterly payments.

If the further condition is agreed to, that all work and correspondence relating to the individual accounts of the pensioners be attended to by the Auditors; that the examined and approved vouchers will be so delivered that there will be no interruption or delay in the drawing and mailing of the checks, and that the latter will be made payable at the New York office only, or, like interest checks, at any subtreasury, it is estimated that for the work in this office of preparing and forwarding monthly 335,000 checks within fourteen days succeeding pension day, recording payment on return of checks, filling in vouchers, and addressing envelopes in advance, preparing accounts for the Auditors, and attending to correspondence and inquiries directly connected with the issue of checks and vouchers, the following force would be required:

	Number of persons.	Amount of salary.
Treasurer United States, additional	1	\$1,000
Assistant treasurer United States, additional	1	500
Superintendent	1	3,500
Assistant superintendent	1	3,000
Chiefs of sections, at \$2,200	12	26,400
Clerks on general work, at \$1,600	12	21,600
Writing vouchers, at \$900	48	43,200
Examining vouchers:		
Eight, at \$1,000	16	15,200
Eight, at \$900	32	28,800
Addressing envelopes, at \$900		
Examining envelopes:		
Ten, at \$1,000	20	19,000
Ten, at \$900	6	5,400
Selecting envelopes, at \$900		
Writing checks:		
Twelve, at \$1,400	48	55,500
Eighteen, at \$1,200		
Nine, at \$1,000		
Nine, at \$900		
Examining checks:		
Five, at \$1,600	10	15,000
Five, at \$1,400		
Registering checks (issued and paid):		
Three, at \$1,400	10	11,800
Three, at \$1,200		
Four, at \$1,000		
Countersigning checks, at \$900	6	5,400
Separating checks, at \$660	2	1,320
Inclosing and sealing:		
Five, at \$1,600	15	13,700
Five, at \$900		
Five, at \$840		

	Number of persons.	Amount of salary.
Card clerks, at \$1,000	18	\$18,000
Examining abstracts and indorsements of paid checks and preparing accounts for auditors:		
Four, at \$1,000		\$6,400
Four, at \$1,400	12	16,800
Four, at \$1,200		4,800
Stamping check numbers on vouchers, at \$720	6	4,320
Messengers:		
Six, at \$840		\$5,040
Four, at \$720	14	10,560
Four, at \$660		2,640
Total	289	320,000

If to this estimate 10 per cent be added for absence allowed under the rules of the Department, the number of persons required would be increased to about 320 and the cost to \$350,000.

The foregoing estimate is based mainly on experience acquired in payment by check of the interest on United States registered bonds, and is the result of such consideration as, with the data at hand, I have been able to give the subject since my attention was called to it.

If considerable additional labor not foreseen at present be involved in the change, or if the Treasurer be expected to take charge of the agency roll books; to continue the work pertaining thereto; to compute the amounts due in original, increase, and reissue cases; to examine all returned vouchers, and, in short, to conduct the business essentially in the same manner as it is done now at the eighteen agencies, an addition to the working force would be necessary.

Without familiarity with the details of the labor performed now at the agencies, outside of the preparation and mailing of the check and vouchers, I am unable to give any well-grounded opinion as to the additional number of clerks required.

It is presumed that you will desire to obtain information on this point and others from the officers affected by the proposed change and by the plan outlined.

After the business has been organized and fully systematized, improvements in methods may be discovered tending to reduce the labor without impairing accuracy and dispatch.

No provision is made in the foregoing estimate for the expenses of furniture, stationery, etc., or of rent, fuel, and light, in case accommodations can not be secured in the Treasury or other Government building.

Respectfully, yours,

J. W. WHELPLEY,
Assistant Treasurer United States.

HON. CHARLES FOSTER,
Secretary of the Treasury.

During the reading of the letter

Mr. MUTCHLER said: It is not necessary for the Clerk to read the whole of it; but I will ask leave to print the whole of it with my remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Now, the estimate of the Assistant Treasurer of the United States, Mr. Whelpley, is \$80,000 below the appropriation. Now, if the pension agencies are abolished and the pensions paid directly from the Treasury, we will not only save \$80,000 for clerk hire, according to the estimate just given, but will save, in addition to that, \$72,000 which we now pay to the pension agents.

Now, there are a few words I want the Clerk to read from the statement made by Secretary Foster before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having in consideration the pension appropriation bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It does seem to me if we can abolish these eighteen agencies we can take one-half of that clerical force and concentrate it here under a good man to do the work, and we will save the salaries of those eighteen agencies and the cost of one-half of this clerical hire. I will say this to you, I have looked into this the best way I can, and it is my conclusion that we could do it. It will be a benefit to you, too, with regard to depositories; you will always have your funds under your own command.

Secretary FOSTER. It would add \$1,000,000 to the actual cash in the Treasury and take that much out of the banks. It seems to me that an improvement can be made in the matter of disbursement of public moneys. The number of disbursing officers is very large, and I think it is practical to establish a chief disbursing officer in the Treasury Department, through whom all these disbursements might be made. I have not followed out the details sufficiently to determine exactly how this might be accomplished. I believe, however, that it would be possible to effect such a system and that it would work satisfactorily.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand you to say the smaller the number of disbursing officers the greater the security of the Government against losses?

Secretary FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is one good reason why the number of disbursing officers should be reduced and made as small as possible?

Secretary FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You also say you believe that one additional disbursing officer, having the right to print his name on the checks, could distribute this pension money directly from the Treasury Department, of course by allowing an increase of force there?

Secretary FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, my time is limited and I must hurry along with my remarks. I want to call attention to a few facts with regard to the number of soldiers not pensioned now living. Last year the Commissioner of Pensions stated emphatically before the Subcommittee on Appropriations that we had reached the high-water mark, as he termed it. During the present fiscal year that the number of pensioners there would have been put upon the rolls was 1,050,000; that at no time would the appropriation exceed, in his judgment, \$160,000,000.

He now comes before the Appropriations Committee, only nine

months later, and tells us that the probable number that will be on the pension rolls next year, when the limit is to be reached, would be 1,220,000, an increase in the number of pensioners in that time of 170,000, and the amount of appropriations about \$28,000,000. Now, I want to call the attention of this House to certain facts in regard to the liberality of granting pensions. I do not attempt to explain it, but those who can explain it, if anybody can, may explain for themselves.

According to the Eleventh Census, there were living in June, 1890, 1,073,857 soldiers and 26,650 marines who served in the late war. These figures include the emergency men and deserters.

The Commissioner of Pensions stated that if the granting of pensions should be continued upon the present system, there would be upon the rolls by the 1st of next July 989,896 pensioners; and Secretary Foster a few days ago estimated the number on the rolls now at 1,000,000, which, I think, is about correct.

Mr. PICKLER. That includes widows and orphans.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I am coming to that. Mr. Chairman, it will be three years on the 1st of next June since the last census was taken. If we estimate the death rate of these soldiers according to the Carlisle tables, assuming that the average age was 28 in the year 1864, there will be living on the 30th of June, 1893, but 965,010 soldiers.

There will be living 23,950 marines, making 988,960 soldiers and marines living. So, on that day, if the Superintendent of the Census Office is correct (and I have it over his own signature, because I wrote him for the information), there can not be living on the 30th of next June more than 988,960 soldiers and marines. According to the report of the Secretary of War made in 1866 there were 120,000 emergency men, men who served less than three months, and who are not entitled to pensions under any law. Assuming that those men were also 28 years of age on an average in 1864, there will be 80,283 of them living in 1893. There were also 199,045 deserters, who are not entitled to pensions.

Assuming that nearly one-half of that number have had their disabilities removed, and that there are only 100,000 of them not entitled to pensions—and I think that is a fair assumption—there would be of those men living and entitled to pensions on the 30th of June, 1893, 66,886. The total of the emergency men and deserters living would be 147,109. The soldiers and marines living and entitled to a pension July 30, 1893, would be 841,791. Now, according to the statement of Mr. Raum, the number of pensions that will have been granted at that date is 989,896. I say the number is considerably higher; I say I believe there are a million pensioners now on the roll.

The number of widows' pensions granted is 172,826. The number granted to survivors of the war of 1812 is 165, and to survivors of the Mexican war 15,215. Those must be deducted, because they are not ex-Union soldiers. Therefore the number of soldiers in the late war who will have received pensions on the 30th of June, 1893, will be 801,690, and if the report of the Census Bureau is correct, there will be living at that time only 40,101 Union soldiers not pensioned. Yet the Commissioner of Pensions reports that there were pending on the 12th of October, 1892, 426,000 applications. Now, there is a great discrepancy in these figures; I do not know where it comes in.

Mr. PICKLER. That number which the Commissioner states includes all applications for increase, does it not?

Mr. MUTCHLER. No, sir; it does not include the applications for increase.

Mr. PICKLER. Oh, it certainly does.

Mr. MUTCHLER. No, sir; if you will turn to the Commissioner's report you will see that it does not include the applications for increase.

Mr. WAUGH. Is that the number of original applications?

Mr. MUTCHLER. The number of original applications.

Mr. WAUGH. Not including increases?

Mr. MUTCHLER. Not including increases; it is the number of applicants not on the roll.

Mr. Chairman, there are several other things that I desire to bring to the attention of the committee, but my time is limited and I must hurry along. I say this, however, that one of two things is certainly true; either the enumerators who enumerated the soldiers living in June, 1890, missed an enormous number of them, or else there is an enormous number of soldiers now reported living and applicants for pensions who have no existence.

Now, in this bill there are propositions to amend the pension laws in one or two respects. One proposition is to make the pensions hereafter granted uniform. Another is that the rating of pensions under the act of June 27, 1890, shall not be upon the same system as the rating under the original law. That is the present practice of the Pension Bureau, and it is a most vicious practice, which I say here now costs this Government not less than \$25,000,000 a year. The act of June 27, 1890, is in these words:

That all persons who served ninety days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion and who

have been honorably discharged therefrom, and who are now, or may hereafter be, suffering from any mental or physical disability of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, which incapacitates them from the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to render them unable to earn a support, shall, upon making due proof of the facts according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners of the United States, and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$12 per month and not less than \$6 per month.

Now, it will be seen that the intention of Congress in the enactment of that law was that any soldier having served three months and having become incapacitated for earning a support by manual labor should receive \$12 a month, and if not totally incapacitated he should receive a smaller sum—not less than \$6 a month. Now, what has been the custom of the Pension Bureau in rating these applicants? Under Order No. 145, I think it is, of the Secretary of the Interior, the medical division of the Pension Bureau is directed to ascertain all minor disabilities that are pensionable under the original law and to add them together until the amount reaches \$12.

Consequently an applicant for pension who may have had the misfortune to lose his little finger is rated at \$2 a month for that; if he has lost his index finger he is rated \$6 a month for that, because those are the rates allowed to pensioners under the original law who suffered those disabilities while in the service. These two allowances together make \$8 a month. Now, if it can be found that the applicant is slightly deaf, or that his vision has been slightly obscured, or that there exists any other minor disability which might be considered pensionable and which would amount to \$4 a month, the \$4 are added; and he gets \$12 a month. Yet he may not be incapacitated for working a single hour in his life.

Again, under the original law an applicant for pension who has lost the sight of an eye is rated at \$12. Now, the loss of the sight of an eye under the law of 1890 also is rated at \$12. Yet everybody knows that the loss of the sight of an eye in no way incapacitates a man from earning his support. Yet a man suffering this loss is rated at the highest possible figure. One of the provisions of this bill is intended to correct that abuse.

For loss of sight of one eye the schedule rate was \$8 per month. Under the Commissioner's ruling, No. 245, dated December 4, 1891, the rate for loss of sight of one eye was increased to \$12 per month. Those placed on the rolls since December 4, 1891, and those making application for increase, who were pensioned at \$8 for loss of sight of one eye, were given the rate of \$12 from December 4, 1891. Those, however, who were then receiving \$8 for loss of sight of one eye, who have not applied for increase, have not been notified of the change of rate, and, consequently, are as yet not receiving the benefit of this increased rating.

Those placed on the rolls prior to December 4, 1891, under the act of June 27, 1890, for loss of sight of one eye, are receiving \$8 per month, while those placed on the rolls since December 4, 1891, were given \$8 from date of filing to December 4, 1891; and \$12 thereafter.

At the same time complete inguinal hernia and femoral hernia, the rate of which was \$3 per month, was increased to \$10 per month, and incomplete inguinal hernia was increased from \$4 to \$6; double inguinal hernia, both complete, was increased from \$12 to \$14 per month; double inguinal hernia, one complete, the other incomplete, from \$10 to \$12; and double inguinal hernia, both incomplete, from \$6 to \$8 per month.

The same course has been pursued under both the general laws and the act of June 27, 1890, in the case of hernia. As in the case of loss of sight of one eye, those on the rolls when this change was made and not since having filed a claim for increase, are receiving the old rate of \$8, and those since granted the increased rate of \$12 per month.

There are, therefore, two sets of pensioners under both laws, one receiving \$8 per month for loss of sight of one eye, the other receiving \$12 for the same disability; while of those on the rolls for the different hernias, one portion receive the old rate and the other the increased rate.

The rate for nearly total deafness of one ear, from August 27, 1888, was \$10 per month. Ruling 245 reduced the rate to \$6 from December 4, 1891.

The rate for slight deafness of both ears was \$15 per month, and was reduced to \$6 from December 4, 1891.

Severe deafness of one ear and slight of the other, the rate was \$20, and was reduced to \$10 per month from December 4, 1891.

Nearly total deafness of one ear and slight of the other was \$20, and was reduced to \$15 from December 4, 1891.

Ruling 245 provides that:

In claims where the new rate for a minor degree of deafness is less than the rate the pensioner now receives, the rate shall not be reduced unless the disability has decreased.

Under this ruling (245) all who were on the roll for "nearly total deafness of one ear" on December 4, 1891, continue to

receive \$10 per month, unless under the claimant's voluntary application for increase it was shown in the certificate of medical examination that his disability has decreased. The same obtains with those then on the rolls for slight deafness of both ears; these continue to receive \$15 per month. So also with those then on the rolls for "severe deafness of one ear and slight of the other," or "nearly total of one and slight of the other;" they continue to receive \$20 per month.

Those placed on the rolls from December 4, 1891, to October, 1892, were granted, for "nearly total deafness of one ear," \$10, to December 4, 1891, and \$6 thereafter; those placed on the rolls from December 4, 1891, to October, 1892, for "slight deafness of both ears," were given \$15 to December 4, 1891, and \$6 thereafter; those placed on the rolls between these dates for "severe deafness of one ear and slight of the other," \$20, to December 4, 1891, and \$10 thereafter; and those for "nearly total deafness of one ear and slight of the other," \$20, to December 4, 1891, and \$15 thereafter.

In October, 1892, another change was made wherein these reductions were carried back to earlier dates.

Under this change those placed on the rolls "for nearly total deafness of one ear," subsequent to October, 1892, receive only \$6 from August 27, 1888; those for "slight deafness of both ears," \$6 from November 15, 1887; those for "severe of one ear and slight of the other," \$10 from August 27, 1888; those for nearly total of one ear and slight of the other," \$15 from August 27, 1888.

All who were placed on the rolls prior to December 4, 1891, under act of June 27, 1890, for "nearly total deafness of one ear" were granted \$10 from date of filing; those placed on the rolls after December 4, 1891, and prior to October, 1892, at \$10 from date of filing to December 4, 1891, and \$6 thereafter, while those placed on the roll after October, 1892, received only \$6 from date of filing claim. Those placed on the roll under act of June 27, 1890, for "slight deafness of both ears" were granted \$12 per month from date of filing claim if placed there prior to December 4, 1891; those placed on the roll between December 4, 1891, and October, 1892, received \$12 from date of filing claim to December 4, 1891, and \$6 thereafter, while those whose claims were allowed subsequent to October, 1892, received but \$6 from date of filing claim.

Again, under this act (June 27, 1890), for "severe deafness of one ear and slight of the other," prior to December 4, 1891, \$12 per month was given from December 4, 1891, to October, 1892, \$12 per month to December 4, 1891, and \$10 thereafter, while to those allowed since October, 1892, only \$10 is allowed from date of filing claim.

There are, therefore, now on the pension roll under the general laws, for "nearly total deafness of one ear," those who have received from August 27, 1888, and now receive \$10 per month; others who received \$10 from August 27, 1888, to December 4, 1891, and \$6 thereafter, and still others who receive only \$6 from August 27, 1888.

There are those now on the roll who for "slight deafness of both ears" have received from August 27, 1888, and now receive \$15 per month; others who received \$15 from August 27, 1888, to December 4, 1891, and \$6 thereafter, while others receive only \$6 from November 15, 1887.

Then there are those who for "severe deafness of one ear and slight of the other" now receive, and have received since August 27, 1888, or from the date of filing, if subsequent to August 27, 1888, \$20 per month; others who, under like conditions, received \$20 to December 4, 1891, and \$10 thereafter; and again, those who received not over \$6 at any time.

Again, there are pensioners who for "nearly total deafness of one ear and slight of the other" now receive, and have received since August 27, 1888, or from date of filing claim, if subsequent to August 27, 1888, \$20 per month; others who received \$20 to December 4, 1891, and after that only \$15, while others who at no time received more than \$15.

When the change of time of reduction of rates for these degrees of deafness was made, October, 1892, there were added to the schedule several minor degrees of deafness, so that now it is possible for all who heretofore had their pensions for deafness allowed from the date when first shown in a ratable degree, under the then existing schedule, to get a rerating and arrearages of from \$1 to \$2 from date of discharge if claim was filed prior to July 1, 1880, or from date of filing in those filed subsequent to July 1, 1880, to the date when under the former schedule and practice of the office the disability was shown in a ratable degree by a medical examination.

Mr. SEERLEY. Has the Department taken any action toward correcting these abuses where there has been an erroneous rating?

Mr. MUTCHLER. I understand they have done so since the election, not before.

Mr. SEERLEY. What I wish to know is whether the Department has taken any action for the correction of these abuses—not in cases already passed upon—but in cases still pending?

Mr. MUTCHLER. I ask permission to publish at length with my remarks these rulings, which are too long for me to go over now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to one other matter, and then I shall yield the floor. I wish to exhibit to the Committee of the Whole this vicious practice in reference to the rating of pensioners. If gentlemen will look at the report of the Commissioner they will see that there is such a thing as restoration; and there is also such a thing as a supplemental certificate. Now let me state as briefly as possible what these two things mean and how they operate to take out of the Treasury money which does not belong, never did belong, and never should belong to the applicant for pension.

A supplemental certificate, as it is called, is this: A pensioner under the general law at, say \$8 a month, files an application for increase, and at the same time files a claim under the act of June 27, 1890. These claims are filed, we will say, on the 1st of July, 1891. The claimant is examined by a local board, we will suppose, on the 1st of July, 1892; and the certificate of that board warrants an increase to \$14 a month. Under the law the pensioner can be granted that increase to \$14 only from the date of the certificate of the local board showing such increased disability; that would be in the case supposed July 1, 1892.

But the practice of the Department where two claims are filed under the act of June 27, 1890, is to grant a pension from the date of the filing to the date of the certificate, thus increasing the pension from \$8 to \$12 a month for that period. For this increase a supplemental certificate is issued, upon which payment is made. The increased pension certificate is issued from the date of the supplemental certificate, and the supplemental certificate is cancelled. The effect of this practice is to give the attorney two fees—\$2 for the increase claim and \$10 for the claim under the act of June 27, 1890.

Now that is a ruling of the Bureau directly and exclusively for the benefit of the pension attorney. Very often the amount received from the time of the filing of the claim until the date of the certificate under the act of June 27, 1890, is not more than enough to pay the attorney's fees, which is \$12; so that he gets every cent of the allowance. If the amount paid exceeds this sum the pensioner gets the balance, and then the increase of his pension commences from \$8 to \$14—

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I would like to ask the gentleman in what way the amendments which the majority of the committee propose will remedy the evils of which the gentleman is speaking?

Mr. MUTCHLER. I can not discuss that question now. I will discuss it when we come to the amendment.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COGSWELL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUTCHLER] may have sufficient time to complete his remarks.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and the Committee of the Whole for this courtesy, and this, Mr. Chairman, is what restoration means. I put a hypothetical case. John Smith applies for a pension for chronic diarrhea under the general law of July 1, 1880. Gentlemen know what that means. If he gets a pension, then it goes back to the date of his discharge. On examination by several local boards no pensionable disability is shown to exist. If he proves continuance from the date of his discharge to the date of his application, the minimum rate of \$2 is allowed from the date of his discharge to the date of his certificate.

That is to say, that although a number of local boards have examined that applicant for pension, and discover no pensionable disability as a result of his service, and so certify, he is nevertheless allowed a pension of \$2 a month up to the time that his claim is rejected. Then his pension stops.

Mr. TUCKER. He gets that, I suppose, for applying.

Mr. MUTCHLER. He gets that for the trouble he has gone through trying to get more.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. In other words, a premium on an application for increase.

Mr. MUTCHLER. He is then dropped from the rolls and the pension ceases.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the mean time several applications for restoration are made. The claim is always rejected because no pensionable disability is shown to exist. In 1890, however, after the passage of the act of June 27 of that year, he again comes forward and makes his application under the provisions of the last-named law. The certificate of examination this time shows

the existence, we will say, of piles to a pensionable degree, with other disabilities warranting a rating under that act, and he is put on the roll for disability, including the piles. He now makes application for restoration, and because the piles was included in the pension under the act of June 27, 1890, he is restored to the rolls under the general law from the date that he was dropped, because piles had supervened, at the rate he got when he was dropped.

The Department says that the regular examining board were certainly mistaken, because twenty-six years before that he alleged that he had chronic diarrhea, and now it is evident that he has piles, and consequently he must have had chronic diarrhea at that time or he would not have the piles now. [Laughter.]

By this kind of ruling, as I have said before, of the Department—not the law itself—one of the examiners, a member of the board of medical examiners in the office, has himself declared that the Government has been robbed of \$50,000,000. I propose, Mr. Chairman, that we should take one step at least toward stopping that.

There are other things to which I would like to call the attention of the House.

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

Mr. MUTCHLER. Yes.

Mr. WAUGH. If there are abuses in the pension system, does the gentleman believe that they have not grown out of special acts of Congress, rather than the granting of pensions under the rulings in the office?

Mr. MUTCHLER. I will say to my friend, that in my judgment, in this country at no time was there ever a law enacted more vicious, and which has robbed the people to a greater and more unwarrantable extent, than the act of June 27, 1890. And I say further that with a Pension Bureau construing that act as it has been construed—

Mr. WAUGH (interrupting). But the gentleman's argument is against the Pension Bureau. My question is this: Does not the gentleman believe that greater abuses, if any at all have been perpetrated, have been perpetrated in this House in the granting of special acts for the relief of soldiers and the increase of pensions than have resulted from the rulings by the office?

Mr. MUTCHLER. Well, that is a matter foreign to the subject under consideration now.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. RAINES. I wish to ask a question in connection with the statement which the gentleman from Pennsylvania has just made.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAINES. Do I understand that somebody has stated that by that process to which you have just referred the Government has been robbed of fifty millions?

Mr. MUTCHLER. I understand so; and I hope the gentleman will ask me no further questions. I had that information from the very best authority.

Mr. RAINES. Allow me simply to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that in 1887 the annual value of the pension roll was only \$53,000,000, and consequently that it was a big steal that year to get \$50,000,000 out of the fifty-three millions.

Mr. MUTCHLER. It certainly was, and it will be bigger yet unless stopped. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another important proposition pending in this bill, and it is this: The committee propose by their bill to abolish local boards of examining surgeons, and to substitute in their place a single surgeon who is to be assisted by surgeons detailed from the Pension Bureau. These propositions come to us from the medical referee of the Pension Bureau, Dr. Ingram. He has written me a letter about it. I notice now that he forgot to append his name to it, although he was before the committee and handed me the letter in person. I will have him attach his name to it, and I ask permission to publish the letter with my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1893.

HON. WILLIAM MUTCHLER,

Chairman of Subcommittee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: Referring to our conversation of this morning concerning your proposed bill for the abolishment of local boards of examining surgeons, and directing that such examinations shall be made by surgeons detailed from the Bureau of Pensions as special medical examiners, and provided for in the same manner as special examiners of the Bureau have been heretofore provided for, I desire to add some further suggestions.

In the first place, I believe the scheme that you suggest, while a step in the right direction, is, possibly, too radical a change to secure for it the best

success. I have, in a communication dated December 8, 1892, addressed to the honorable Commissioner of Pensions, set forth some proposed changes in the method of organizing examining boards, which I believe might well be considered in connection with your proposed bill, since the two propositions are evidently aiming toward the same much-needed reform in this work.

You have embodied in your bill the scheme of having men qualified and trained in the Pension Bureau, detailed to make the examinations now made by boards. I have gone so far as to suggest that one member of each board should be detailed from this Bureau to meet with two local members and make the examinations. I believe there are many reasons why we should not deviate so widely from the present plan as you suggest. I am willing to concede that one local member, having an office in the town, would be sufficient, to which place all mail should be directed, and where the soldiers should be directed to go to be examined by the board made up of one member from the Bureau and one local member. In many places from five to fifteen, and sometimes twenty, soldiers appear for examination upon one day. I do not believe it would be possible for one person to conduct these examinations properly and make notes of his findings in a satisfactory manner. I will concede, however, that two surgeons could do this work quite as well as three.

In my communications to the honorable Commissioner, I have urged that the member from this Bureau should not be connected with any one board, nor should he be connected with any series of boards in one locality; but he should be under the constant control of the medical referee, and be directed to move on from one board to another. That he examine with a board in one city upon an examination day or days allotted to that board, and should then go on to a neighboring city or town to examine with another board on the succeeding day or days. His route should be marked out, and he should be followed in another week, or a fortnight, as should be necessary, by another examining surgeon; thus the member from the Bureau would scarcely ever meet with the same board successively, and could in no manner be subjected to any local influences.

I look upon this as of vital importance, and as remedying a very grave fault which may now be found in the system of detailing special examiners. There would be no more expense attending the fact that the examiner moved on in a continuous route than there would be in having him identified with a series of local boards, while many advantages would be gained.

Let there be nothing in your new arrangement that will arouse the question of who should be detailed to certain localities. Let long routes and frequent changes of these routes outline the fields of work, so that no possible local or outside influences may interfere with the duties of these men.

In my communication above referred to I have urged that this method of providing for medical examinations will secure for us much more uniform examinations and descriptions, and that the certificates will be recognized by the Bureau with a greatly increased respect, and that the work of the Bureau in adjudicating pension claims, whether original or increase, will be greatly facilitated thereby. It has been in my mind that the member of the board detailed from this office should be considered as the one being most familiar with its requirements, and consequently the one to whom all communications should be addressed, and under whose direction the examinations should be made.

We should soon, from this plan, have a series of reports which would have a uniform character, and at the same time would answer those matters which the provisions of the pension system demand, while less important subjects, which are now dwelt upon by examining boards, would receive less consideration.

I have urged that with the adoption of this plan a large number of special or test examinations now required would be found unnecessary. I have still further urged that many cases now being ordered for special examinations through the special examination division, wherein the questions to be determined are wholly of a medical nature, could be much better disposed of by these men at our command than can be possibly done by men in the field having no knowledge of medicine.

I have urged this reform on the score of economy; and if you will drop out one member of the board, making two members sufficient, surely more than one-third of the present cost of examinations will be saved.

But I have also been led to believe that when there is to appear in a community a representative of this office who will see that every deserving claimant shall have his full rights assured, and at the same time will stand firm against those whose claims are without merit, there will be much less pressure for increases of pension where there is not the least evidence that they are deserved. I would not feel free to make this remark were it not true that this Bureau, and especially the medical division, finds in the adjudication of claims that a steadily increasing number of claims for increase must be disallowed.

I have urged the adoption of this scheme because I believe it is a step in the direction of giving our work a more business-like character, and of placing the pension system where it will be respected and will be above suspicion. I believe its adoption by your committee will lead to a much needed reform.

I believe the compensation of medical examiners while in the field, should not be less than at the rate of \$2,000 per year, in addition to the per diem and traveling expenses named in your bill.

Very respectfully,

THOMAS D. INGRAM,

Mr. MUTCHLER. The medical referee says that by reason of the incompetency of the local boards of examiners it frequently happens that certificates which they send must be returned to them twice, three times, and sometimes four times for correction; that if a person who understands the routine of the office could be present at these examinations and make these certificates a great deal of time would be saved and great expense to the Government, and the examination would be much more satisfactory.

Mr. PICKLER. And the pensions principally cut off.

Mr. MUTCHLER. We have 1,235 of these boards, I think, composed of three surgeons in each board. They are located where they live. They examine their own friends, in fact their own patients.

Mr. PICKLER. Do you want the enemies of these men to do the examining?

Mr. MUTCHLER. They have as big an interest sometimes as anybody else in the granting of the pensions; and as the medical referee says, as a rule they are incompetent to perform their duties. Now we have the estimate for these local boards for the coming fiscal year, which amounts to \$1,250,000.

If we accept the proposition of the medical referee and ap-

point but a single surgeon in place of the boards as they are now constituted, and allow him to detail from his office as many surgeons as he can spare—and he says he can spare 15—and if there are appointed in addition to them 15 more, making 130, the expense would be reduced from \$1,250,000, the amount estimated, to about \$690,000. That would be a saving of \$310,000 on this item alone. And I want to call the attention of gentlemen, particularly on that side of the House, to the fact that this comes to us earnestly recommended by the highest medical authority in the Pension Bureau.

Why shall we not adopt it? Dr. Ingram says that it will not only greatly improve the service, but that it will expedite the granting of pensions, and in addition to that will save more than a half million dollars every year in the way of appropriations. As I have heretofore stated, I hold in my hand a letter from Dr. Ingraham, the medical referee, which I hope every gentleman interested in this bill will read.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to his colleague [Mr. O'NEILL]?

Mr. MUTCHLER. Certainly.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. There is no one in this House who has a higher opinion of the medical and surgical ability of Dr. Ingram than I have. He is a gentleman well suited in every way for the position he holds; but I do not think it comes with good grace from him to criticize the ability of the examining surgeons. I take it, sir, that some of these examining surgeons have had more practice in their profession, both as physicians and as surgeons, than my friend Dr. Ingram has had, and that they are just as capable of judging, as examiners, as Dr. Ingram, the principal medical director of the Department.

Now, understand, Mr. Chairman, I do not wish in any way to depreciate the ability of Dr. Ingram, for I know him well, esteem him highly, and know his efforts to conscientiously perform his duty. But he must not criticize the examining surgeons as men unfitted for their places, as a general thing.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Mr. Chairman, if my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. O'NEILL] has any quarrel with Dr. Ingram, I hope it will be carried on up in the Pension Bureau and not here.

Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania. I have not the slightest quarrel with him. On the contrary, I am on the best of terms with him. I see him frequently and consult with him; but I am speaking of the ability, as a general thing, of the surgical examiners appointed by the Commissioner of Pensions to perform their duties.

Mr. ENLOE. But he knows more about that than you do, because he is in charge of the business.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUTCHLER], in fairness to the local boards, state the qualifications that are required of them?

Mr. MUTCHLER. Well, I am not now attempting to defend Dr. Ingraham. I am telling you what he says, and I believe it to be true.

Mr. PICKLER. It will be no more than fair to state what the regulations of the Department are which must be complied with before one of these local boards can be appointed.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Oh, well, I know what the regulation of the Department is.

Mr. PICKLER. The local boards say that these fellows down here in the Department are running in a rut.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I know, too, that in my county, which gives several thousand Democratic majority, we have a board of examining surgeons who are Republicans, and the board has been Republican for several years.

Mr. ALDERSON. The qualification necessary for the appointment of a local examiner is that he be a Republican. That is all the qualification he has to have.

Mr. MUTCHLER. They are appointed because they are good, active politicians.

Mr. PICKLER. That is not the thing. They are required to be graduates of a medical school, or in practice for so long, before they can be appointed.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I have spoken about these two systems of restoration and supplemental service. I hurriedly made an estimate this morning from the report of the Commissioner, and I find that the amount of money expended in pursuance of those two systems during the last year was \$712,370.21, which was just that sum more than any law on the statute books justifies or permits.

I want to call attention to another matter, a practice of the Bureau. "John Smith" applies for a pension under the act of June 27, 1890. He alleges that he has rheumatism, we will say. He is examined by the local surgeons. Now, they are directed to examine him not only for rheumatism but for any other disability he may have. The local board finds that "John Smith" has not rheumatism and never had; but they find that the sight of one eye is affected. They certify that fact to the Pension Bu-

reau. He has not the disability which he alleges in his application, but he has a disability which he does not know he ever had, but which the local board has discovered and certified.

Now, what do they do? They immediately write back to "John Smith" telling him: "John, here; you have not any rheumatism. John, you know that you can not see well out of your left eye. Send up another application for impairment of sight." Well, Smith did not know that he could not see well out of his left eye; but he immediately makes up another application, sends it in, and he is granted a pension.

Now, the Bureau can not grant a pension without an application. The nature of the disability must be set forth in the application; but if a disability is discovered which the applicant does not know exists, and it is not set forth in his application, he is immediately invited by the Pension Bureau to make out another application and allege that disability, and they will give him a pension. There are thousands of cases of that kind. This is another evil practice of the Bureau which I say ought to be abolished.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I repeat that no more vicious legislation was ever enacted by the American Congress, and I dare say by no other legislative body on God's earth, than the act of June 27, 1890. It enables applicants for pension who never saw the enemy or heard the roar of his cannons; who never got beyond the limits of the State in which they enlisted; who went out with \$2,000 subsidy money in their pockets, or from \$1,200 to \$1,500 of bounty, to come back upon the Government to ask it to give them pensions of \$12 a month. And it is said by the friends of the soldier, "They are veterans and are entitled to pensions, and it will not do to deprive the poor soldiers of this little bounty they receive."

I say there are thousands—and many thousands—of pensioners upon the roll to-day who made more money during the three months in which they were enlisted than they ever made before or since in their lives, who never bared their breasts to the enemy's guns, who in fact never saw him, or heard the roar of his artillery, who are to-day getting pensions as "veterans."

Why, Mr. Chairman, during the year 1864, when we were paying enormous bounties in the North, men flocked from other countries, came here and entered our service, took the bounty which was offered, took the money they got as subsidy, and now live in foreign countries. Over three thousand of these people are pensioners; and we are paying pensions to-day to men who never were citizens nor residents of the United States, but who staid here only long enough to be discharged from the armies and then return, amounting to very nearly \$500,000 a year. The amount I do not remember exactly.

Mr. TUCKER. Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. MUTCHLER. My friend from Virginia says \$350,000. It is more than that. It is \$490,000, I think, a year. Now, then, to-day we know we support thousands of paupers of European nations here who have come here since the war; but we are supporting thousands of those who live at home and never were here except long enough to accept the bounties paid, to be mustered into the service, not going beyond the State lines where they enlisted, to be discharged and go home and say they have got rheumatism, and to say that the American Government must support them abroad. We are paying thousands abroad to-day to widows of those soldiers in foreign countries who never put foot upon American soil, and many of them, I venture to say, were unborn when their husbands were in the war in the United States.

Now, I ask are these things right? If they are not right will you help us to reform them? I do not object to our granting a pension to a foreigner who suffered actual disability while in the war. Any foreigner or nonresident who went into our war and was wounded, or suffered any other disability, although he may never have been a resident of this country, and is not now, is, in my judgment, entitled to receive the same pension as the American soldier.

Several MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MUTCHLER. But for the man who never was in a battle, who never saw the enemy, who went home with his pockets full of money which he acquired either as a substitute or from the bounties paid by local governments, for such a man to be put on equality with the American soldier and to be supported by us abroad, and not only himself, but the widow who survives him, is an outrage, and I ask this House to help us to rectify that outrage. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS].

Mr. SAYERS. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a communication from the Commissioner of Pensions which shows the operations of the Pension Office during the present fiscal year, giving the number of pensioners in each State and Territory and in foreign countries, the amount disbursed in each State and Territory and in foreign countries, the number of applications on file at the beginning of each month, and the number on file on the 1st day of last month. I do not wish to take the time of

the committee to have this statement read by the Clerk, but I ask consent that it be printed in the RECORD for the information of the House.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The letter and accompanying tables are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, January 14, 1893.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter of the 3d instant, in which you request to be furnished with certain information in connection with the business of this office, I have the honor to reply that the annexed tables, numbered consecutively from 1 to 5, will give you the desired information.

No. 1 is a statement "showing the number of pensioners in each State and Territory of the United States and in each foreign country on the rolls December 31, 1892."

No. 2. "The number of pensioners in each State and Territory of the United States and in each foreign country on the rolls June 30, 1892, and the amount paid for pensions during the fiscal year 1892 in each State and Territory and in each foreign country."

No. 3. "The number of pensioners on the rolls on the first day of each month, beginning January 1, 1892, and ending January 1, 1893."

No. 4. "A statement of the number of pension claims of all kinds on file in the Bureau of Pensions January 1, 1892, with the number on file each month from that date to January 1, 1893."

No. 5. "The monthly expenditures for pensions from January 1, 1891, to January 1, 1892, inclusive, and from January 1, 1892, to January 1, 1893."

I also hand you herewith a copy of the six months' statement of the business operations of the office for the first six months of the fiscal year. The figures for the number of pensioners on the rolls December 31, 1892, upon which this printed statement is based, were received by telegraph and made up hastily by the pension agents. The official report, which followed some days later, when brought together, showed a discrepancy in the number of pensioners on the rolls, which has been amended in the copy of the report I herewith hand you.

The figures in the table I send you as to the number of pensioners on the rolls December 31, 1892, is the correct number.

Very respectfully,

GREEN B. RAUM, Commissioner.

Hon. JOSEPH D. SAYERS,

Chairman Subcommittee on Deficiencies, House Appropriation Committee.

No. 1.—Statement showing the number of pensioners in each State and Territory of the United States and in each foreign country on the rolls December 31, 1892.

UNITED STATES.

States and Territories.	Number.	States and Territories.	Number.
Alabama.....	2,986	Nebraska.....	17,628
Alaska Territory.....	15	Nevada.....	309
Arizona Territory.....	503	New Hampshire.....	9,226
Arkansas.....	9,757	New Jersey.....	19,069
California.....	11,385	New Mexico Territory.....	1,034
Colorado.....	4,582	New York.....	83,311
Connecticut.....	10,743	North Carolina.....	3,769
Delaware.....	2,626	North Dakota.....	1,430
District of Columbia.....	8,578	Ohio.....	98,916
Florida.....	2,167	Oklahoma Territory.....	3,247
Georgia.....	2,006	Oregon.....	4,212
Idaho.....	882	Pennsylvania.....	92,563
Illinois.....	66,648	Rhode Island.....	3,774
Indiana.....	67,420	South Carolina.....	1,359
Indian Territory.....	1,720	South Dakota.....	5,084
Iowa.....	37,131	Tennessee.....	18,047
Kansas.....	45,038	Texas.....	6,848
Kentucky.....	29,258	Utah Territory.....	747
Louisiana.....	3,701	Vermont.....	9,911
Maine.....	19,080	Virginia.....	7,265
Maryland.....	12,926	Washington.....	4,901
Massachusetts.....	40,003	West Virginia.....	13,184
Michigan.....	44,048	Wisconsin.....	27,481
Minnesota.....	15,206	Wyoming.....	599
Mississippi.....	3,169		
Missouri.....	51,079	Total.....	927,650
Montana.....	1,078		

FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Country.	Number.	Country.	Number.
Algiers.....	1	Malta.....	2
Argentine Republic.....	1	Mauritius.....	2
Australia.....	23	Mexico.....	39
Austro-Hungary.....	16	Miquelon.....	1
Belgium.....	8	New Zealand.....	3
Bermuda.....	2	Nicaragua.....	2
Brazil.....	5	Norway.....	17
British Columbia.....	32	Peru.....	4
Bulgaria.....	2	Portugal.....	1
Canada.....	1,854	Roumania.....	1
Central America.....	1	Russia.....	2
Chile.....	9	Slam.....	1
China.....	7	Spain.....	5
Corea.....	1	South African Republic.....	1
Cuba.....	4	Sweden.....	33
Denmark.....	15	Switzerland.....	68
Fiji Islands.....	1	Turkey.....	2
France.....	56	West Indies.....	2
Germany.....	611		
Greece.....	1	Total.....	3,535
Great Britain.....	635	Addresses unknown.....	39
Hawaii.....	17	Number in the United States.....	927,650
Holland.....	11		
Honduras.....	1	Grand total.....	931,224
India.....	3		
Italy.....	23	Average annual value of each pension.....	\$133.96
Japan.....	8		
Liberia.....	1		
Madeira.....	1		

No. 2.—The number of pensioners in each State and Territory of the United States and in each foreign country on the rolls June 30, 1892, and the amount paid for pensions during the fiscal year 1892 in each State and Territory and in each foreign country.

	Number.	Amount.
UNITED STATES.		
Alabama	2,775	\$400,729.44
Alaska Territory	16	2,226.80
Arizona Territory	412	65,268.07
Arkansas	8,835	1,470,903.77
California	11,292	2,204,934.69
Colorado	4,092	656,697.98
Connecticut	10,956	1,238,256.83
Delaware	2,527	433,252.69
District of Columbia	8,581	1,632,861.88
Florida	1,947	319,021.32
Georgia	1,808	274,117.65
Idaho	789	113,628.50
Illinois	63,230	9,343,996.80
Indiana	65,120	10,435,529.43
Indian Territory	1,590	244,621.89
Iowa	35,642	5,310,988.96
Kansas	42,402	6,986,591.03
Kentucky	27,708	4,465,812.11
Louisiana	3,099	494,120.08
Maine	18,256	3,272,112.77
Maryland	12,212	2,154,775.56
Massachusetts	34,787	6,319,957.66
Michigan	42,258	7,471,548.90
Minnesota	14,623	2,155,065.80
Mississippi	2,769	353,432.37
Missouri	47,845	7,780,516.86
Montana	977	143,259.83
Nebraska	16,746	2,489,030.03
Nevada	215	39,409.30
New Hampshire	8,994	1,297,415.40
New Jersey	18,779	2,937,656.31
New Mexico Territory	918	149,340.88
New York	77,920	11,782,390.64
North Carolina	3,461	495,187.91
North Dakota	1,366	193,696.79
Ohio	93,386	16,113,541.34
Oklahoma Territory	2,984	468,891.63
Oregon	3,452	425,063.97
Pennsylvania	85,370	12,506,167.92
Rhode Island	3,860	437,880.18
South Carolina	1,209	171,123.27
South Dakota	4,756	711,343.03
Tennessee	17,031	2,434,508.73
Texas	6,388	905,230.94
Utah Territory	692	89,737.84
Vermont	9,662	1,406,633.79
Virginia	6,078	1,047,952.16
Washington	4,238	524,137.32
West Virginia	12,290	2,158,703.12
Wisconsin	26,382	3,977,258.60
Wyoming	505	83,648.14
Total	872,621	138,564,201.91
FOREIGN COUNTRIES.		
Argentina Republic	1	645.33
Australia	21	3,149.20
Austria-Hungary	1	144.00
Belgium	11	1,650.00
Bermuda	2	311.00
Brazil	4	478.13
British Columbia	27	1,927.60
Bulgaria	3	480.00
Canada	1,759	246,980.75
Central America	1	72.00
Chile	8	797.93
China	8	565.87
Cuba	7	744.00
Denmark	17	2,099.20
Fiji Islands	1	96.00
France	67	8,747.15
Germany	583	80,854.27
Great Britain	618	85,004.02
Guatemala	1	96.00
Hawaii	17	2,124.00
India	1	111.47
Italy	29	3,845.91
Japan	6	432.00
Korea	1	360.00
Liberia	1	360.00
Madeira	2	288.00
Malta	2	144.00
Mauritius	3	456.00
Mexico	41	4,860.25
Netherlands	14	1,954.00
New Zealand	4	324.00
Nicaragua	2	351.00
Norway	22	2,246.00
Portugal	1	54.00
Roumania	1	240.00
Russia	1	207.00
Spain	6	855.00
South African Republic	1	288.00
Sweden	33	4,221.47
Switzerland	70	9,302.10
West Indies	14	1,890.00
Total	3,412	469,256.65
Addresses unknown	35	2,154.12
Grand total	876,068	139,035,612.68

No. 3.—The number of pensioners on the rolls on the first day of each month, beginning January 1, 1892, and ending January 1, 1893.

	Number.		Number.
January, 1892	773,330	August, 1892	883,926
February, 1892	783,132	September, 1892	894,559
March, 1892	807,039	October, 1892	900,648
April, 1892	827,367	November, 1892	908,942
May, 1892	840,185	December, 1892	920,885
June, 1892	856,087	January, 1893	931,224
July, 1892	876,068		

No. 4.—A statement of the number of pension claims of all kinds on file in the Bureau of Pensions, January 1, 1892, with the number on file each month from that date to January 8, 1893.

Date.	Original invalid.	Original widows.	June 27, 1890.*	Increase	Accrued.	Nurses.	Total.
1892.							
Jan. 1	315,133	151,163	191,833	208,270	7,402		873,801
Jan. 30	304,697	151,328	188,528	228,410	7,659		880,622
Feb. 27	292,458	151,307	179,717	233,772	8,180		865,434
Apr. 2	287,454	151,651	168,778	235,512	8,851		852,246
Apr. 30	286,720	152,636	163,041	233,738	9,127		845,262
May 28	278,732	152,987	159,248	233,407	9,369		833,743
July 2	270,442	153,000	150,730	233,500	9,757		817,429
July 30	266,874	152,498	146,196	236,631	9,798		811,997
Sept. 3	268,483	150,690	140,710	237,100	9,914		806,897
Oct. 1	266,610	150,206	138,572	241,517	10,069	203	807,177
Oct. 29	250,823	157,801	153,653	239,272	4,610	281	796,440
Dec. 3	241,654	156,652	145,504	231,569	4,684	362	780,425
Dec. 31	236,322	155,590	138,972	234,124	4,729	688	770,425

* Also filed under former acts.

No. 5.—The monthly expenditures for pensions from January 1, 1891, to January 1, 1892, inclusive, and from January 1, 1892, to January 1, 1893.

	1891.		1892.
January	\$2,943,956.15	January	\$10,928,162.02
February	2,647,859.25	February	13,038,879.54
March	2,038,677.15	March	13,418,084.09
April	3,712,787.73	April	12,179,744.81
May	3,038,739.31	May	13,327,852.60
June	25,480,791.95	June	13,007,216.54
July	6,630,658.39	July	12,007,531.75
August	9,232,084.29	August	13,844,415.86
September	10,928,022.54	September	12,377,890.60
October	11,888,412.85	October	12,084,416.45
November	12,511,080.68	November	14,617,691.79
December	11,875,434.33	December	13,702,699.58
	122,928,484.62		154,454,588.63

Grand total, \$277,383,073.25.

Amount disbursed from July 1, to December 31, 1892, \$78,484,649.03.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just taken his seat calls attention to the large amount carried by this bill and bewails generally the large sum of money paid for pensions by this Government at the present time. It is true the amount required for the payment of pensions, \$166,000,000 in round numbers, is really very large, amounting to almost one-third of the entire current expenditures of the Government. But it should be remembered that this money goes to the men, and to the widows and dependent parents of the men, who saved from disruption this great American people, whose prosperity and wealth are now such that the payment of these pensions is but a feeble expression of the gratitude which they feel for the services rendered by these men in the perilous hour of battle.

Yes, the sum is large, but it is cheerfully paid by the great majority of the American people. There are those, however, who disapprove, who indulge in criticism of the methods of the Department in allowing pensions, and who criticize also the general system of laws under which pensions are granted, and the majority of the Committee on Appropriations seem to be of this number, for they have brought in certain amendments to this bill making a radical change in the whole pension system. They propose at the same time, by a blind plunge at the present system of administration, to make radical changes in that also. I say a blind plunge, for I have not yet been intelligently informed how the changes which they propose will really make the administration of the law any nearer what it ought to be or any nearer what the framers of it intended it should be. Nevertheless, these amendments are brought in.

The first is an amendment proposing to transfer the Pension Office bodily to the War Department. Mr. Chairman, I do not think this as bad an amendment as some of the rest. I have thought that at a seasonable time and under proper conditions, and in point of time this proposition is not unseasonable if it were not associated with others which arouse the suspicion of the old soldier and of the friends of the old soldier, that something besides an honest administration of the law is aimed at—I say, for one, I have felt that the transfer of the Pension Office to the War Department, under suitable restrictions and in a proper way, might be attended with no disadvantage to the pensioner and with decided advantage to the public.

Indeed, I may add that I have thought it might even be at-

tended with advantage to the pensioner himself, because it would take the subject of pensions out of the domain of politics and would disarm much of the criticism which is now directed against the present system upon the ground that it is continually in politics, and affected by political considerations. But the amendment proposed by the majority of the committee does not, it seems to me, take the Pension Office out of politics. In fact, under this amendment it would be just as much subject to political influences as if the administration were left where it is now.

The proposed amendment transfers the Pension Office to the War Department, and then provides that the President may detail an officer, who shall, while he acts as Commissioner of Pensions, have the rank and pay of a colonel. Now, if this were law, the President might to-day appoint some citizen of the United States a second lieutenant, and to-morrow, after he is confirmed, might detail him to take charge of the Pension Office.

This proposition does not remove the administration of the office from politics. We have now a record and pension office in the War Department; and if the proposition were to transfer the pension business to the record and pension office of the War Department, to be administered by the present chief of that office, the effect of the amendment would be very different.

But that is not the proposition. The selection of the officer to take charge of this business is to rest continually upon detail by the President; and when one administration goes out and another comes in, do you suppose, Mr. Chairman, that the question of who should be detailed to administer the Pension Office for the succeeding four years would not enter into politics? Do you suppose that the President would not be belabored with applications and "influence" on all sides to make a change from the detail which had existed in the previous administration? Most assuredly such would be the case.

Now, what do gentlemen mean when they say that this amendment proposes to take this matter out of politics? My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUTCHLER] especially emphasized that proposition. It will be seen at a glance that the amendment leaves the matter right where it was. If the proposition, as I have said, were to transfer the pension business to the War Department, putting it in charge of the chief of the record and pension office, Col. Ainsworth, who has disclosed a wonderful aptitude for bureau work amounting almost to genius, and he were to be clothed with the authority now exercised by the Commissioner of Pensions, then it would be beyond the reach of political influence, for Col. Ainsworth's appointment is a permanent one.

The President alone could not make a change upon change of administration, although it would be competent, of course, for Congress to abolish the office or to modify the rank and pay of the person holding it, or at any time put the Pension Office wherever else it might think best. But if a lodgment were effected in that permanent way with the permanent head of the record and pension office, you might safely say the matter was out of politics and some good might be expected from the change; otherwise I can see none. Therefore, while I am willing, for one, that this office should be transferred to the War Department if done in such a way as to quiet it and place the administrator of the office beyond the reach of political influence, I am opposed to this amendment because it will not accomplish that result—

Mr. PICKLER. What would be gained by making this transfer to the War Department?

Mr. GROUT. Nothing except what I have suggested. The records of the service of the soldier are in that Department, the service was performed under that Department, and under such circumstances it has seemed to me that if the authority over this pension question were lodged in the hands of a permanent head of a permanent bureau in that Department—not subject to political influence—it might be an advantage to the pensioner, because the administration of the office would not then be liable to the imputation that it was subject to political influence. As often as this howl of political influence is raised the pensioner alone suffers.

Mr. PICKLER. Would not that necessarily result in no party caring anything about the soldier?

Mr. GROUT. The Republican party, always the friend of the soldier—that party solid would still be his friend—and I am willing to concede a considerable portion of the Democratic party as also his friends.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Is not the War Department a friend of the soldier?

Mr. GROUT. Undoubtedly.

Mr. WAUGH. So long as pensions are granted by acts passed by a popular vote of Congress, will not politics enter into the matter, transfer it where you will?

Mr. GROUT. Well, it is barely possible—

Mr. WAUGH. So long as Congress continues to pass acts giving pensions do you not keep the question in politics, whether

the administration of the law be transferred to the War Department or anywhere else?

Mr. GROUT. It is barely possible that politics might creep into the administration of the office, however you might change the method of administering the law. But I think less in the War Department than where it now is. But, mark you, I am not advocating this amendment; I am opposed to it. I am simply saying that an amendment could perhaps be drawn which might transfer this business to the record and pension office of the War Department, with Col. Ainsworth in charge, and obviate all objections.

But this amendment is full of mischief. It does not remove a single objection now existing to the administration of the law. I believe that the good sense of this House will condemn it. I believe that every friend of the soldier on this floor—the Republican party, as I said before, solid, with a considerable portion of the Democratic party who profess to be the friends of the soldier—will vote against this amendment. So much for that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the next amendment is that with reference to the abolition of the medical examining boards scattered throughout the country, of which there are 1,235. This is a scheme brought forth by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations engaged in the preparation of this bill, and not largely sympathized with even by the balance of their own political faith on that committee; a proposition barely carried in committee, if carried in committee at all, as an amendment to be proposed by them to this bill.

I did not understand that it was carried at all, I may be permitted to say; but I raise no question on that point. I understood the vote to be a tie, and think I am not disclosing any confidence of the committee when I so state. But at all events the amendment is here and we make no point as to the way it got here; we will take it with the indorsement of the committee, which does not make it any better. [Laughter.] This is a proposition to discontinue the boards of examining surgeons throughout the country. As I say it was conceived in the brain of this subcommittee, or evolved from the inner consciousness of the medical referee of the Pension Bureau, Dr. Ingram. It is impossible to determine exactly which. What is there to support it before this House? Nothing whatever.

Now, let us look just a moment at the amendment before examining the proposition itself point by point and see what it amounts to. Dr. Ingram says he thinks it would be a good thing. He says, as I understood my friend from Pennsylvania to read from his letter on the floor here, that the local boards are incompetent, that they do not perform good work, and for that reason that they should be abolished entirely, though he consents finally to a reduction of the boards to one man on each, and that there should be a number of persons appointed and others detailed from the medical force in the Department to go out and act with the single member of the board and make these examinations.

Now, here is the opinion of the medical referee with which we are confronted. They tell us that he is of our own party, of our own Administration. Yes, that is true. But, then, Mr. Chairman, the sun of this Administration is fast going down behind the western hills; and perhaps Dr. Ingram is afraid of the dark. Whether that has and significance in this connection we need not stop to determine. But here is the opinion of this medical referee to be taken for what it is worth.

I should be inclined to give this opinion great weight were it not for the testimony of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. O'NEILL], who says that he knows this medical referee, that he is well acquainted with him, that he is in frequent consultation with him, and that he knows also the local boards, and O'NEILL says that in his opinion the local boards know just as much as the medical referee on this subject.

A MEMBER. He said more than the medical referee.

Mr. GROUT. Was it more? I am prompted, Mr. Chairman, to make the amendment on the authority of gentlemen who probably listened more carefully than myself, that the testimony of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. O'NEILL] is that the local boards know more than the medical referee. But whatever the record may be on that point let it stand.

Now, Mr. Chairman, think for a moment of this proposition. In the first place it is an indictment of three times 1,235 physicians scattered throughout this entire country, in every part of it. It is based on the allegation that they are ignorant, that they do not know how to discharge their duty or that they do not discharge their duty faithfully. Then it is coupled with the further proposition that they act dishonestly, and if we adopt this amendment we convict this large number of professional men, these 3,700 gentlemen scattered over the entire land without a hearing.

The charge is that they examine their patients, they examine their friends and give pensions to persons not entitled to them.

That is what is alleged against them. In the name of the boards of examining surgeons in my State who are foremost in their profession and worthy citizens, all of them, I denounce the charge. As a matter of fact not one per cent of certificates issued by the Commissioner of Pensions are issued on a single medical examination. It will be found that such cases are rare indeed. It is possible that there may be one per cent so granted, but there are frequently three or four examinations.

If the Department is not satisfied with the first examination the case is sent to a neighboring board, and the applicant is sometimes sent far away, as all gentlemen know who have pension correspondence, frequently to the great inconvenience of the pensioner who is compelled to travel so far and undergo these medical examinations. It is a fact that in most cases repeated examinations are had by different boards, and the average of the findings of the boards is taken as the disability of the pensioner, and by that average his rating is established.

I repeat, I denounce this charge against the examining boards; there is no truth in it. It is a mere assertion. It is a false indictment; not a word of proof has been furnished to support it. But let us see what they propose to substitute for these boards. They propose to appoint in the first place one hundred and twenty men gathered up wherever the Department chooses to take them, by the Secretary of War, if this is transferred to the War Office; medical men "eminent in their profession," who shall come to Washington on a salary of \$1,500 a year. Who believes that "men eminent in their profession" will leave their business and homes and come up to Washington or go out upon the road putting in their entire time for \$1,500 a year?

It would necessarily result in the appointment of a set of second or third rate men; the kind of physician that no gentleman on this floor would send for in case of severe illness. And yet it is proposed to reform this Pension Bureau by detailing one hundred and twenty such fellows from all over the country to come here at \$1,500 a year, and then to go out over the whole country and meet with a single medical man here and there and make the medical examinations.

Mr. PICKLER. And carry out the instructions received from Washington?

Mr. BOUTELLE. What superior source of appointment are we to have under this amendment?

Mr. GROUT. None but an ordinary mortal "dressed in a little brief authority," the head of a Department; the Secretary of War, if the office is transferred, or the Secretary of the Interior, if it is left where it is. It is all in his breast. I say, upon the very face of it, it is preposterous to suppose that any reform is to come of an arrangement like this.

But, Mr. Chairman, these 120 men will not be able to do the work of these 1,235 boards, and can it be that this is a skillful device to prevent the allowance of pensions? Whether intended so or not it will surely have that effect, for it will be a physical impossibility for these 120 men to make the examinations necessary for the proper rating of the pensioner and for which the settlement of the claim must always be delayed.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will the gentleman permit me to call attention to one fact right there, in regard to taking this matter out of politics? Do I understand these appointments are to be made by the Secretary of War?

Mr. GROUT. By the Secretary of War, if the office is to be transferred.

Mr. BOUTELLE. It is to be understood that under the new Administration, the Secretary of War is to be taken out of politics? If so, the newspapers are greatly misinforming an expectant country.

Mr. GROUT. That is a conundrum I will leave to the other side of the House.

Mr. MUTCHLER. Gentlemen know very well that the bill provides that an army officer not below the rank of a colonel shall be Commissioner of Pensions, that an army officer not below the rank of captain shall be the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Who is to make the selection? Is he to be out of politics in the next Administration?

Mr. MUTCHLER. These army officers will be independent of members of Congress.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. Do I understand they may be appointed by the Secretary of War?

Mr. BINGHAM. Appointed by the President, according to the amendment.

Mr. BOUTELLE. My question to my friend (the gentleman from Vermont) was on another matter altogether, about the appointment of these special examiners.

Mr. GROUT. The special examiners are to be appointed by the Secretary of War, if the office goes to the War Department, and, of course, by the Secretary of the Interior, if it stays where it is.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And he is to be a nonpolitical Democrat. [Laughter].

Mr. GROUT. I give it up, Mr. Chairman. The Democracy alone can solve that problem. But seriously, sir, the question of the gentleman from Maine well suggests the danger to the pensioner in this proposed change. Think of the disastrous work in reducing pensions or cutting them off altogether, which these 120 fifteen-hundred-dollar men, travelling all over the country could do, acting under the instructions of some hostile Secretary, who, we are already told, is to have a place in the Cabinet of the incoming Administration for the special purpose of overhauling the pension list.

Now, this is in brief a presentation of the character of this amendment. As I said with reference to the others, there is no friend of the old soldier upon this floor who believes that we should not only vote pensions to the defenders of the flag in the late war and in all wars, as we have done, but that we should pay the pensions after we have voted them, who will favor this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, another amendment proposed by the gentlemen of the subcommittee is that the rating of all pensions for like disabilities shall be uniform. Now, I will not enter into this in detail, but will simply say that it provides for a radical change of the law of 1890, substituting another kind of disability or ground upon which a pension shall be allowed, thereby making necessary the readjustment of all claims already allowed under that act, some 200,000 in number, and really upon a basis not as equitable as that now prescribed.

Mr. GROUT. Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the other amendment of which the gentleman spoke, concerning nonresidents, I will say that his statement of the number of those residing abroad who are drawing pensions, is correct, but it is not that number that will be affected by this amendment, as many of these pensioners now residing abroad are actually citizens of the United States.

I make no special objection, however, to this amendment. If the Democratic party want it let them have it.

Mr. MILLIKEN. What amendment is that?

Mr. GROUT. With reference to nonresidents. But I want it distinctly understood that no such amount of money would be saved by this amendment as is claimed. It would not necessarily cut off all who live abroad now, or who are being paid their pension abroad, because, as I have said, they may have become citizens of the United States before they went abroad; or they may be temporarily abroad.

Mr. PICKLER. From the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, we will be left to infer that all those nonresidents drawing pensions received large bounties. Now, I would like to know what evidence there is, if any, of such being the fact?

Mr. GROUT. There is no evidence. This statement is from the inner consciousness of the gentleman alone, like most of the other material here presented. But what I want to have the House and the country understand is this: That this amendment will not cut off 3,500 pensioners, probably not one-quarter of that number; and it is a mere bagatelle—the amount that would be saved by this means. But if gentlemen want to disport themselves by saving that morsel and say that the man who came here and followed the flag up to the very mouth of the enemy's guns, per chance receiving a wound—

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. It does not touch them.

Mr. GROUT. The gentleman is right.

Mr. MORSE. Like Lafayette, whose picture hangs here before us.

Mr. GROUT. Yes; like Lafayette and the French soldiers who came here with him—is not entitled to a pension because he is not a citizen and resides abroad; I am not going to quarrel with them; for we must concede something to the ravenous appetite of our Democratic friends on this subject, and it may as well be this as anything else.

In reference to the widows, I simply say that I protest in the name of common decency against that amendment. Who can fairly say that it makes any difference when a woman married a soldier, so far as her right to a pension as his widow is concerned? The theory of the law is that when a woman marries her legal existence is merged in that of her husband, and when he dies she is a relict of him simply; she is what there is left of him; his widow; and it is not only a most ungallant thing, but an unchristian act as well, when the command is to "visit the widow and the fatherless," for a great nation to stand up and take the bread out of the mouth of a soldier's widow because, perchance, she married him more than five years after the close of the war.

Mr. PICKLER. Would not this take from the pension list the widows of the soldiers of the Revolutionary war, the war of 1812, and the war with Mexico?

Mr. GROUT. It would the way the amendment is now framed. As originally drawn it only cut off the widows of the late war.

Mr. PICKLER. How old are they generally?

Mr. BINGHAM. They never tell their age.

Mr. GROUT. That is a question of vital statistics that I will leave to some insurance company. Perhaps, however, I might refer the gentleman to the widows themselves for this information.

Mr. COGSWELL. The widows never will tell.

Mr. GROUT. Now, there is another amendment proposed more mischievous than any I have yet spoken of. It is proposed, in the interest of economy and for the sake of better administration, they say, to abolish the pension agencies, eighteen in number, and pay pensions directly from the Treasury Department. There is no pretense that the work can be done with less delay from the Treasury; on the contrary, it is perfectly clear that pensioners in parts of the country remote from the Capitol can not be as promptly paid as under the present system.

In no instance can the pensioner execute his voucher before the day to which he is paid. It is then sent to the agency and in due time his check is returned. Now, for instance, a voucher executed in California or anywhere on the Pacific Slope on the 4th of September and sent to Washington will take a full week on the way here and another week for the return of the check two weeks at least in all, and if some error in the voucher should be found, as frequently happens, it would be returned for correction, causing as much more delay; whereas if paid from San Francisco as now, there would be practically no delay whatever, and with the old soldier depending upon his pension money to buy flour and coal, prompt payments is no small matter.

Not only will it cause delay, but it will be more expensive than the present system, though it is claimed by those pressing the amendment that it will save money. But I say there was nothing before the committee and there is nothing before the House sustaining this view. They introduce here a letter from Secretary Foster, transmitting to the House a communication to him from Assistant Treasurer Whelpley, making an estimate of the expense of doing this work (really, however, only a part of it) in the Department. If you take that letter and examine it carefully you will see upon its face that it falls very far short of showing that this work can be done with less expense at the Treasury than under the present system. On the contrary, from that letter and other data which I will submit it is reasonably certain that it will be attended with more expense. Toward the end of the letter the Assistant Treasurer says:

If considerable additional labor not foreseen at present be involved in the change, or if the Treasurer be expected to take charge of the agency roll books; to continue the work pertaining thereto; to compute the amounts due in original, increase, and reissue cases; to examine all returned vouchers, and, in short, to conduct the business essentially in the same manner as it is done now at the eighteen agencies, an addition to the working force would be necessary.

On the second page of the latter he says:

If the further condition is agreed to, that all work and correspondence relating to the individual accounts of the pensioners be attended to by the Auditors; that the examined and approved vouchers will be so delivered that there will be no interruption or delay in the drawing and mailing of the checks.

Mark you, Mr. Chairman, he says, if it be agreed that this work shall be done by the Auditors. But, sir, the committee have brought in no estimate from the Auditor as to the force required to do this additional work in his office, and there is not a syllable from the Auditor in any shape or form as to the increased force that will be necessary for doing this work in his office. So it will be seen from the letter of the Treasurer itself that it is very indefinite and wholly fails of the purpose for which it is produced here, viz, to show that payments can be made from the Treasury with less expense than through the agencies.

These pension agencies are now distributed all over the country, at convenient intervals for reaching the old soldiers in the different parts of it, and making payments to them promptly when due. The system has been continued some twenty years, more or less, and it is worthy of remark that there has never been a dollar lost to the Government under this system of disbursement. It is, as I have said, a system well established, a system with which the pensioners are well acquainted; the channels for doing the business are all well understood by those connected with the work and by the beneficiaries of the work, and it goes forward regularly and in order.

And, Mr. Chairman, so economical is this system to the Government that it costs to disburse the money for the payment of pensions through these agencies only thirty-two one-hundredths of 1 per cent. That is all; about 3 mills on the dollar. No other Department of the Government disburses its money at any such low rate. In the Army the cost of disbursement, as I have it, under the hand of the Paymaster-General is one and six-tenths of 1 per cent.

If still other Departments of the Government were examined

it would be found, I think, that not one of them disburses its money at any such small percentage of cost as these pension agencies. It is a settled system, one with which all the parties concerned are familiar, one that has been tried and has proved safe to the Government, satisfactory to the pensioner, satisfactory to everybody except the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, if I had time to go into the details of this work at the agencies it would become more and more apparent that that plan of disbursing pensions ought not to be disturbed. I have said that the Secretary of the Treasury, in the letter which he transmits from Assistant Treasurer Whelpley, gives no information as to what would be the cost of doing this work in the Auditor's office. He does, however, submit an estimate of the cost of the work that would be done in his department, which he puts at \$320,000. This is merely for the clerical work.

Let us see what a careful estimate made by a public officer intimately acquainted with all the details of this work shows it would cost to do the additional work in the Auditor's office. I refer to the pension agent in this city, Col. S. L. Wilson, who has been long in that office, who understands all its details, and who is well known to be a gentleman of high intelligence and candor. So estimable was he in the judgment of Mr. Cleveland that under his late Administration he was appointed by him to be pension agent in this city, and I think that any word from him ought to be received with equal credit by both sides of the House.

Now, Col. Wilson makes an estimate in a letter which I will append to my remarks without taking time now to go into the details; but I will state the sum total. His estimate for the cost of the work in the Auditor's office is \$409,970. Really, therefore, more than one-half of the work is not estimated for by the Assistant Treasurer, more than one-half the cost of the necessary work is not presented by him at all, and the strange thing to my mind, Mr. Chairman, is that, if these gentlemen wanted to bring in a proposition here which they expected the cool judgment of this House would approve, why they did not procure an estimate from the Auditor of what additional amount of clerical force would be required to do the work in his office, together with the expense of it.

This estimate of Col. Wilson's, together with the work estimated for by the Assistant Treasurer, makes a total of \$778,933 as the cost of doing the work here, whereas under the present system all the appropriation that is asked for is \$581,300, which would really make the expense of disbursing this money from the Treasury direct \$197,633 more than under the present system, and this does not include rent, lights, fuel, or stationery, estimated under the present system at \$59,350, making a total of \$256,983, greater expense than through the existing agencies.

This represents the difference in case rent for a place in which to do this business would cost no more in this city than it does now at the several agencies. But it would inevitably cost more, for eleven of the agencies are in public buildings without expense for rent.

Confessedly, there is no room for this work at the Treasury Department. There is really not sufficient room in the Treasury building for the work of that Department, now, as is shown by the last legislative appropriation bill just passed the House, which contains an item for rent of room outside. So that to the above sum of \$256,983 there should be added a further considerable sum for rent.

Mr. Chairman, beyond all question this change, if made, would cost the Government a quarter of a million dollars more annually than now. And one of the reasons why it would cost more under the change proposed is that the clerks here would do less. The clerks in the Departments at Washington do not begin to do the work that the clerks at the pension agencies do. The hours at the agencies are, a part of the time, especially on the first day of the payment of pensions, from 6 in the morning—think of it, you gentlemen who have had the question of clerical work under consideration—from 6 o'clock in the morning until 5 in the evening; and after that—after the first day—the hours are for some ten days, from 7 to 9 o'clock in the morning until 11 o'clock at night. And during the balance of the year the hours are from 9 till 5 (one hour longer than any clerk works in the Departments), except during a small portion of the time when the pension agent allows his clerks to leave at 4 o'clock, the same hour as clerks in the other Departments; but that is for only a few days in the year, and the leave at the agency in this city is limited to fifteen days, instead of thirty days, as at the Departments.

Mr. DOCKERY. I am glad to hear the gentleman from Vermont make that statement, in view of the action of the House yesterday on the question of increasing the working hours of the clerks in the Departments.

Mr. GROUT. This is rather late to affect the action of the House yesterday.

Mr. DOCKERY. It can affect it only by way of indorsement. I am glad we have the indorsement of the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. GROUT. Now, Mr. Chairman, what else would this mischievous abolition of the pension agencies accomplish? There are now from 75,000 to 80,000 pensioners paid over the counters by the agents themselves. There are 8,000 so paid in this city; 10,000 in Boston, the city where my friend from Massachusetts, an honorable member of the subcommittee resides; 15,000 in Philadelphia; sixteen, or eighteen, or nineteen thousand—I can not say just how many—in New York; and approaching that number at various agencies; making a total of about 75,000 or 80,000 pensioners who are paid over the counters at the different agencies.

These men form a line in the street at these agencies at 6 o'clock in the morning. They are anxious to get their money early, so that they may not lose half a day's time from their daily work, because many of them are laboring men.

The vouchers are prepared for them at these agencies without expense to them. Not only is the voucher prepared, but an acknowledgment is taken without expense also. The voucher is also prepared and sent to every pensioner who is paid at a distance, without expense to him. But he must have it acknowledged, and this acknowledgment costs from 50 cents upward.

It has been the subject of complaint that in some States the local laws regulating magistrate fees allow a larger sum. It has been reported to the agency here that in some cases a dollar has been claimed for the acknowledgment of these papers. The charge is not uniform in the different States. Now, if our State's rights friends would not think it would be interfering with local home rule to undertake to regulate the price at which a pension voucher should be acknowledged, this is something to which they might address themselves with great propriety.

Fix in your minds that these 80,000 pensioners get their pensions at present at the agencies without a dollar or even a penny of expense to them. The acknowledgment of the voucher, at the lowest price, 50 cents, would amount to \$2 a year, which would be \$160,000 a year taken out of the pockets of these poor men who now form a line on pay days at 6 o'clock in the morning for the sake of obtaining their money promptly and going about their day's work without loss of time.

The proposed change would take that amount of money, \$160,000 annually, out of the pockets of these hard-working men. And in this is one feature of the reform here proposed. Mr. Chairman, this letter from Col. Wilson bristles with information on this subject, and there are many points in it which I wish I had time to present; but I have already spoken longer than I intended, and, with the leave of the House, will print it in full with my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I am not unmindful of the fact that many gentlemen on the floor want a word in this debate, and are waiting to declare themselves against these pernicious amendments, and, asking a careful reading of the subjoined letter from Pension Agent Wilson, I yield the floor, reserving the balance of my time.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES PENSION AGENCY FOR PAYMENT OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1893.

SIR: Respectfully referring to the letter of the honorable Secretary of the Treasury of the 27th ultimo, addressed to the Hon. W. S. HOLMAN, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, submitting a statement made by Hon. J. W. Whelpley, Assistant Treasurer of the United States, relative to the proposition to pay pensions directly from the Treasury, and in compliance with your verbal request that I submit my views upon the proposition, also an estimate of the expense consequent upon the transfer, I have to submit the following:

It will be observed that Mr. Whelpley's estimate is confined to the additional clerical force that will be required in the Treasurer's office, based upon the conditions he mentions, which are as follows:

"The labor of keeping the roll books and examining the returned and executed vouchers it is proposed to assign to the Auditors." (See second paragraph, on page 2 of letter as printed.)

In the fifth paragraph of same page he says:

"Under any system the labor of keeping the rolls and examining the vouchers must be performed by the Auditors. The plan in view contemplates the examination of these vouchers by those officers (the Auditors) before payment is made."

In paragraph 8, on same page, he says: "If the further condition is agreed to, that all work and correspondence relating to the individual accounts of pensioners be attended to by the Auditors; that the examined and approved vouchers will be so delivered that there will be no interruption or delay in the drawing and mailing of the checks, and that the latter will be made payable at the New York office only, or, like interest checks, at any subtreasury, it is estimated that for the work in this (the Treasurer's) office, of preparing and forwarding monthly 335,000 checks within fourteen days succeeding pension day, recording payment on return of checks, filling in vouchers, and addressing envelopes in advance, preparing accounts for the Auditors, and attending to correspondence and inquiries directly connected with the issue of checks and vouchers, the following force will be required."

The number of checks which will be issued monthly (335,000) is probably approximately correct, and the additional force necessary in that office

upon the conditions he states is perhaps nearly so, except as to the following items, which should be increased as follows:

Writing 335,000 vouchers, 200 per day, 25 days per month, will require sixty-seven clerks, an increase of nineteen, at \$900	\$17,100
Selecting envelopes, twenty-four clerks will be required, an increase of eighteen, at \$900	16,200
Comparing checks, sixteen will be required, an increase of six—three at \$1,600 and three at \$1,400	9,000
Countersigning checks, seven will be required, an increase of one	900
Comparing and correcting the address of envelopes, ten will be required—five at \$1,000 and five at \$900	9,500

(NOTE.—At least 5 per cent, or about 17,000, pensioners change their address from one payment to the next.)

Increase on Mr. Whelpley's estimate	52,700
To which add Mr. Whelpley's estimate	320,000
	372,700
Add 10 per cent for absence	37,270
Total	409,970

If the 8,000 pensioners in this city are paid in person, as at present, a temporary force of thirty-five clerks from three to five days will be required.

The following is an estimate of the additional clerical force that will be required by the Auditors in the event the duties suggested by Mr. Whelpley shall devolve on those officers. If the Treasurer should perform those duties this additional force will be required in his office:

For examination and computation of 1,000 certificates per day	15
Writing vouchers for new certificates	8
Entering new issues on roll-books	7
Writing cards for new issues	7
Opening 335,000 envelopes per month and putting vouchers in order by amounts	30
Examination of execution of vouchers	12
Charging vouchers on roll-books	50
Miscellaneous correspondence with 1,000,000 pensioners	18
Making daily abstracts for Treasurer for payment	50
Examining abstracts	20
Footings abstracts	6
Returning from 17,000 to 20,000 imperfectly executed vouchers each month, calling attention to errors, and in most cases transmitting new ones for execution	5
Total	228

If the present system of making monthly abstracts of all payments for the accounting officers is continued an additional force will be required of—

At the average compensation estimated by Mr. Whelpley, of \$1,107 each—	303
---	-----

The salaries of this additional force would amount to	\$335,421
Add 10 per cent for absence	33,542
	368,963

Add estimate for Treasurer's office	409,970
-------------------------------------	---------

Total for additional clerical force	778,933
-------------------------------------	---------

In addition to the abstracts above referred to, payments made to the national military homes are abstracted in duplicate, one abstract for the treasurers of the homes, the other for the accounting officers. There are also about 5,000 payments made to examining surgeons which are abstracted.

It is evident from Mr. Whelpley's statement that he made his estimate to a great extent from the standpoint of payments of interest in Government bonds. He anticipates great advantage in the economy of labor and expedition of work under the proposed arrangement, by having the names of the Army pensioners arranged in the new roll books according to the amount of their pensions. While books of records of Government bonds that do not change in amounts may be so arranged, it would be utterly impracticable to arrange pension roll books in that manner.

The rates of certificates are liable to change, and most of them have been changed since their first issue—any of them several times, either by increase or reduction. The system suggested would necessitate the transfer of pensioners' names from one book to another as the rate is changed, involving a great amount of labor in the transfer as well as additional labor in searching the records for the pensioners' names.

There are other elements in which the payment of interest on bonds differs materially from payment of pensions. In the former case the parties with whom the business is transacted are business men, living at business centers, and whose residence does not change as frequently as that of pensioners. In case a legal document is required of them there is comparatively little difficulty in obtaining it properly executed. With a large portion of pensioners, the case is different. They are frequently changing their residence.

In a large number of cases it is difficult to obtain a properly executed voucher, which necessitates a large amount of correspondence. Very often the officer who attempts to assist the pensioner in the execution of his voucher is scarcely more competent to properly prepare it than the pensioner himself. At least 5 per cent of vouchers are returned for correction every month, and frequently a new one is forwarded for proper execution, the error in the old one being pointed out. About the same per cent of pensioners change their residence from one payment until the next, which necessitates the correction of that number of envelopes.

Under the present system ample checks are provided for the protection of the Government against loss, either by errors of the pension agents or otherwise. The agents are heavily bonded, their bonds aggregating several millions of dollars. They are required to submit their accounts monthly to the Auditors, and if any error is discovered it is promptly reported, and if an overpayment has been made it is promptly refunded. The result is that not a dollar has been lost to the Government of the many millions disbursed.

Can it be contended that the Government will be more secure in intrusting the disbursement of this immense sum to one disbursing agent with one bond than with eighteen agents each with a bond? Besides, if the Auditors are to transact the most important part of the duties now devolving upon pension agents, who will review their work as they now review the agents? Is this check of one office over another which has so long prevailed in every branch of the public service to be eliminated? If the Treasurer pays vouchers upon the certificate of the Auditors that they are correct, can he be held responsible if there has been an error in computation or in the preparation of a voucher? It would seem not, and if not, who will be responsible to the Government in case of an erroneous or over payment?

Will the Auditor in whose office the error occurred be liable? If so, and such error exceeds the ability of the Auditor to meet it, what recourse has the Government? These are questions, it seems to me, that should be carefully considered before the proposed departure from the system of checks which has so long prevailed in the Government is entered upon.

There are items of expense other than that of clerks that should be taken into consideration in connection with the question of transfer. One is of rent. Eleven of the eighteen agencies now occupy Government buildings, of course free of rent.

It will not be claimed that the Treasury building or any other public building in this city can accommodate the records of the eighteen agencies and the clerical force necessary to transact the business. Every public building is now full to overflowing. Several of the Bureaus of the Treasury are now occupying rented buildings. It will be necessary that quarters be provided sufficiently large to accommodate all the records and all the clerks engaged on pension payments. This building must be furnished. The furniture of the agencies scattered over the country will not be available. The furniture must be new.

New roll books must be provided and cards to a great extent, as all agents do not now use cards. The purchase and writing up of these books and cards will involve an expense not less than \$50,000.

There are now paid at the several agencies from 75,000 to 90,000 pensioners in person. The vouchers in these cases are executed free of expense to the pensioner, before agency clerks who are by law authorized to administer the oath. This results in a saving to those pensioners of about \$150,000 per annum in notarial fees. Under the proposed system, with the possible exception of the pensioners in this city, the pensioners will be obliged to pay those fees.

In addition to this, those pensioners will be obliged to wait from one to three weeks, depending upon the distance they are from Washington, before they can receive their pensions, instead of receiving them on the first day of payment, as most of them now do. This to one whose family depends on his pension for their bread is a matter of no small moment.

By the proposed arrangement the agencies will close on June 30 next. On the 4th of that month several agencies, this among the number, will commence the payment of quarterly pensions. It will be expected that payments will be continued until the 30th, when the rolls and records are to be turned over to the Treasury. I desire to inquire what provisions it is proposed to make for agents' salary, clerk hire, rent, use of rolls, etc., to enable them to make their monthly and annual reports to June 30. They will have no clerks, offices, or records.

The promptness with which pensioners have been paid under the present system, the absence of loss to the Government, and the economy of expenses in the disbursements compare favorably with any other branch of the public service. I believe I am justified in saying that no other claims against the Government are paid as promptly. I am not aware of the loss of a dollar to the Government under the system. A careful computation has recently been made by which it is shown that the expense of disbursing the great amount for pensions is only 32 cents on \$100, or less than one-third of 1 per cent.

In what other branch of the public service can a parallel be shown? And with the record for promptness, safety, and economy which the system has made, what more can be asked?

Very respectfully,

S. L. WILLSON,
United States Pension Agent.

Hon. WILLIAM W. GROUT,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. TARSNEY. Mr. Chairman, were the question asked here, what is the most pressing and important problem challenging and demanding the immediate attention and action of the Government, the answer from most members would probably be, a reform of the tariff. From many others the answer might come, a reorganization and remodeling of our monetary system. But were that question propounded to me individually, I would unhesitatingly answer that, in my judgment, the most important and pressing problem that confronts us is that which is involved by the necessity for a just and patriotic revision of our pension system, and the proper scope and limitation of measures that should be enacted to secure such revision. Its solution demands the best, the most conservative and patriotic thought of the representatives of the people. In its consideration there should be no aisle of division in this Chamber.

Twenty-five years of legislation, marked, measured, and molded by considerations of partisan advantage, have resulted in conditions now imperatively demanding change and reform, and it is as patriots and not as partisans that we should apply ourselves to the task of revising the system and correcting the abuses of administration thereunder, if abuses exist; and, while relieving the people from such part of the burden of the system as may be found to be clearly unjust and which ought not to be borne by them, we may at the same time, not alone with absolute justice but with grateful liberality, guarantee that every soldier of the Union whose name is borne upon our pension rolls or who merits that his name should be enrolled thereon as entitled to the grateful consideration of his country, shall not be deprived of one tittle of the full measure of gratitude and consideration which is his due.

Mr. Chairman, 989,896 pensioners on the pension roll, at an annual charge to the country of nearly \$200,000,000, and the number of such pensioners being increased at the rate of about 220,000 annually, with a corresponding increase in the aggregate of the annual expenditures twenty-eight years after the close of the war, are among the most extraordinary and startling incidents of modern history—more extraordinary and startling when we contemplate that the number of the surviving soldiers of the Union armies of the war of the rebellion is estimated at less than 1,200,000, and that of these 1,200,000 survivors 750,000 are now enrolled upon the pension rolls and upwards of 300,000 ad-

ditional are claimants for enrollment thereon and for allowance of pensions, and all on account of mental or physical disabilities.

So extraordinary and startling are these incidents that, having challenged the attention of the press and people of the whole country, they have led to a popular conviction that not only was the gratitude of the nation to its defenders being preyed upon and the Treasury robbed in the name of patriotism, but that the very machinery of government, created as an instrumentality to convey its bounty to such deserving defenders, was being prostituted and used to distribute a large part of such bounty to those who had no meritorious claims to the gratitude or reward of the country.

Such incidents may well challenge the serious consideration of this House to the question whether it is not the imperative duty of Congress to give heed to such popular conviction, to ascertain the truth, and, without delay, to correct abuses if abuses exist.

Sir, in view of the extraordinary and amazing facts and figures stated, may I not with confidence believe that the time has now come when a representative of the people who bear the burden of this condition may be permitted to discuss the system and methods of administration that have produced such conditions, without being subjected to the charge or criticism of a want of patriotic devotion to the welfare of the country or of a spirit of hostility for, or a want of appreciation of, the consideration due to the heroic defenders of the nation's life whose names are justly borne upon the pension roll.

Mr. Chairman, as early as 1888, when the annual cost of our pension system was not two-fifths of its present annual cost, a distinguished Representative in this House from Michigan, Mr. Cutcherson, speaking of the system as it then was, said:

With all its faults and incongruities this is still the most generous pension system, especially to the private soldier, that has ever existed under any government.

And it was, even as it then existed, the most generous pension system that had ever existed under any government, for no government had ever before granted pensions for disabilities other than those resulting from wounds received in action, while this system granted pensions for every conceivable disability, no matter how occasioned, whether by wounds, by disease, or casualty, provided the same was incurred in the line of duty, and no disability was so slight as to be excluded from its compensation.

I do not criticize this system as it existed prior to 1890 nor inveigh against its generosity. Great was the achievement of those designed as its beneficiaries, great was the result of such achievement upon the destinies of the people of this nation and of mankind throughout the world, and great should have been the generosity that would measure the nation's appreciation of the achievement. It had its faults and incongruities, but they were not of the design of the legislators who framed and enacted the system—they were rather the results of the misconstructions, errors, and faults of those charged with its administration.

That fraud and crime were perpetrated under its provisions, resulting in the robbery from the Government of vast sums of money, none will deny. That the least meritorious claimant for its bounty was often the preferred claimant, is attested by the records of the Pension Office, which show the claims of maimed heroes for years pending and unallowed, while in every hamlet of the land men who were soldiers only in name, and who never saw a day of service either in camp or field, have lived for years upon its bounty; that while its rolls were designed to be rolls of honor, and a record of disability from honorable service in the field, they often presented the spectacle of bearing side by side the names of brave soldiers and cowardly deserters; of maimed and crippled heroes with those who were dishonorably discharged from the service of the country, and this is proven by the official decisions of high Department officers, by whose orders and decrees such rolls were thus contaminated.

That it has had a tendency to lessen the manly self-dependence, the virility, and the chivalry of the people; that it has increased the sum of mendicancy, and has caused patriotism to be rated at a money price, I firmly believe; and at the risk of offending professional soldiers and professional patriots, I here unhesitatingly so declare.

Mr. Chairman, though these evil results, these wrongs, these frauds and crimes have come because of this system, they are not the necessary result of the system. The fault was not in the law or the system of laws, but in the administration of those laws. The laws, though generous, were yet just, but in their administration they were so misinterpreted and perverted as to bring reproach and scandal upon the system in such degree that public sentiment began to crystallize in the thought and belief that there was more of evil than of good in the results of the system, and it became apparent that, unless the frauds and abuses of the system and the public robbery that was being perpetrated in the name of these laws were checked and prohibited, the sense of pub-

lic wrong would develop a popular sentiment of hostility toward the whole system that would culminate in wrong and injustice to the deserving and meritorious pensioners of the country. Showing that these wrongs and abuses were believed to exist by those most friendly to the deserving pensioners, and that their existence were a menace to the rights of such pensioners, let me quote from the language of a distinguished citizen, himself an ex-soldier and a member of the Grand Army of the Republic. Addressing that organization he said:

In view of the various and unjustifiable abuses to which those laws have been directed, the perjury and fraud and the public robbery that has been perpetrated in their name, can the order in decent self-respect and in the honest and legitimate administration of the pension laws afford to withhold its public and vigorous protest against that system of public robbery, perjury, and fraud that is bringing public discredit upon every true, honest, fighting soldier on the pension rolls.

Practically all the barriers and safeguards against false pretense and fraud are broken down. The prosecution of pension claims has been so thoroughly reduced to a business scheme by professional claim agents, and the granting of them by the Pension Office and by Congress has been so thoroughly reduced to a condition of systematic demagoguery in which a bill granting a special pension has come to be equivalent to so many votes for a return to Congress at the succeeding election, that the public conscience and the independent, manly instincts of the country have become blunted, and the people are being taught that it is honorable to live upon charity, no matter by what species of legerdemain or false pretense or perjury obtained.

These pension laws have been so promiscuously used as a cloak to cover the most shameless impositions upon a generous and confiding tax-paying public, through perjury and fraud, by gangs of bounty men, substitutes, etc., that the thought of seeing their names placed upon the pension roll, that should be a sacred roll of disability from honorable service in the field, side by side with those, is enough to crimson with indignation and shame the cheek of any honest fighting soldier.

A MEMBER. Who said it?

Mr. TARSNEY. The gentleman asks, who said it? I respond that it was a man whose learning and talents once adorned the other Chamber.

Mr. Chairman, if the conditions and evils to which I have called the attention of the House as resulting from or existing under our pension system had, prior to 1890, aroused a public conviction that great wrongs were being perpetrated thereunder and had created a public sentiment demanding legislative and administrative reform in the system, has the necessity and demand for such a reform been lessened or increased by subsequent changes of laws and methods?

The expenditures on account of pensions for the year 1889 was \$87,624,779.11. The expenditures on account of pensions for the year 1894 will not be less than \$190,000,000, and probably will reach the full measure of \$200,000,000. True, the estimates of the Department for the pension service for 1894 are \$166,831,350, and the appropriations carried by the bill we are considering are \$165,400,000. But with the light we have upon this problem, with the knowledge concerning facts and conditions which we possess, we can not deceive ourselves, and we ought not to deceive the country.

The amount carried by this bill will not be adequate or nearly adequate to meet our pension charges for the fiscal year 1894, and there is not one member of the Committee on Appropriations who does not believe and know that many millions will have to be provided by a deficiency bill to make up for the inadequacy of the amount carried in this measure.

Mr. DOKERY. Will it interrupt my colleague to say that even now the Commissioner of Pensions concedes that if the present force is maintained the liabilities on account of pensions for the ensuing fiscal year will be \$173,937,265.35.

Mr. TARSNEY. For the fiscal year 1894?

Mr. DOKERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TARSNEY. And that will not be sufficient.

Mr. DOKERY. Undoubtedly not.

Mr. TARSNEY. The report of the committee accompanying this bill reports appropriations on account of pensions for the fiscal year 1893 as \$146,737,350. But it must not be forgotten that since that report was made the general deficiency bill which passed this House on the 3d day of this month carried an item of \$14,149,437.35 to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for pensions for the year 1893, so that the pension charges for this fiscal year 1893 are \$160,886,787.35, and not \$146,737,350.

The increase of pension charges for the year 1891 over those for the year 1890 was \$17,479,096.33. For 1892 over 1891 \$10,187,101.39. For 1893 over 1892 \$25,998,734.56. With the number of pensioners increasing at the rate of 200,000 or 220,000 per year, is there a Representative upon the floor who believes that the increase of pension expenditures for 1894 over those of 1893 will not greatly exceed \$5,000,000, and that the sum of \$165,400,000 will fall far below the amount that will be required to meet the expenditures of the year? With 770,425 applications for pension and increase of pension on file in the Pension Office on the 31st of December, last, as compared with 873,801 applications on file on the 1st day of January, 1892, how can it be expected that there will be any decrease of the issuance of certificates for pensions for the next three or four years?

Mr. Chairman, the enormous increase in the pension list and of pension expenditures for the past three years is the result of legislation enacted within those years, and to that legislation and the necessity for its revision I now desire to call the attention of the House.

In 1890 Congress made a new departure in the principles of pension legislation. The basic principle of pension legislation, unchanged through the centuries since the heroes of Marathon were first made the recipients of a nation's gratitude by money pensions, as compensation for disabilities the result of wounds received in action, was, by the broader philanthropy and more generous gratitude of the American people and Government, in 1862 extended to include disabilities resulting from disease or casualty contracted or incurred by soldiers while in the service of the country and in the performance of duty, and such remained the limitations of the principles of pension legislation until 1890, when Congress extended the benefits of such legislation to all, whether citizen or foreigner, whether residing within the country or in foreign lands, who were suffering from disabilities regardless of when or where or how such disabilities were occasioned or incurred, provided the claimant for such pension could show that at some time during the war of the rebellion he had for a period of ninety days been enrolled in the Army or Navy of the United States and that his disabilities were not the result of his own vicious habits. No meritorious or actual service to the country was required to be shown.

The second section of the act of Congress of June 27, 1890, reads as follows:

SEC. 2. That all persons who served ninety days or more in the military or naval service of the United States during the late war of the rebellion and who have been honorably discharged therefrom, and who are now or who may hereafter be suffering from a mental or physical disability of a permanent character not the result of their own vicious habits, which incapacitates them from the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to render them unable to earn support, shall, upon making due proof of the facts according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide, be placed upon the list of invalid pensioners of the United States and be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$12 per month and not less than \$6 per month, proportioned to such degree of inability to earn a support, etc.

The third section of this act provided a pension of \$8 per month for the widow of every such soldier who had died or might thereafter die, provided such widow should show that she had no other means of support than her daily labor.

Under that act, and within ninety days of its passage, more than three-quarters of a million of applications for pension were filed in the Pension Office. Upwards of four hundred thousand of such applications have already been granted, that number of pensioners having been added to the rolls, and fully \$50,000,000 annually have been thereby added to the pension charges of the Government, a very large percentage thereof being, as I propose to demonstrate, notwithstanding the liberality of the law, clearly and absolutely unwarranted by the letter or the spirit of the law, the validity of such pensions resting solely upon executive legislation; upon a confessedly erroneous interpretation by the officials of the Department.

It will be remembered that when that act was under consideration the propriety of its enactment was based upon arguments urging that many meritorious and deserving soldiers, suffering from disabilities which wholly incapacitated them from obtaining a support by manual labor, were inmates of the almshouses of the country; that their disabilities were of service origin, but that, by reason of the lapse of time and the casualties of life, they were unable to establish the fact that their disabilities originated from their service while in the line of duty, hence they were unable to avail themselves of the benefits of existing laws to which they were justly entitled, and that rather than that these deserving ones should be left without relief, it were better to abolish the requirement that service origin be shown, and that all disabilities of a permanent character, without regard to origin, should be made pensionable, provided that they were not the results of the vicious habits of the claimants and were of such degree as to incapacitate from earning a support by manual labor.

It was the intent of the law to pension only those who were wholly incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, or to a degree approximating total incapacity, proportionate to the difference between the minimum and maximum rates of pension fixed by the act; in other words, to entitle a claimant to pension at the maximum rate of \$12 per month, he should show that he was wholly incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and to entitle him to the minimum rate of \$6 per month, he should show that his natural capacity to earn a support by manual labor had been impaired and diminished one-half by reason of his disabilities.

But, Mr. Chairman, scarcely had the law been enacted when an entirely different construction from that intended by Congress was placed upon it by the Pension Office, and its scope was so en-

larged by an executive order of the Department as to make eligible to the benefits of its provisions all persons who could show enrollment for ninety days in the Army or Navy, an honorable discharge therefrom, and an existing disability, without consideration of the resulting effect of such disability upon the capacity of the claimant to earn a support by manual labor.

By the pension laws in force prior to June 27, 1890, every person disabled in the military or naval service of the United States and in the line of duty, no matter how slight the disability might be, was entitled to a pension, and this regardless of whether such disability in any degree incapacitated the pensioner from earning a support by manual labor. Many of these disabilities and the rate of pension to be allowed therefor were specified in the law, as follows:

Rates and disabilities specified by law.

Total disability in both hands.....	\$72.00
Loss of both hands.....	100.00
Loss of both feet.....	72.00
Loss of both eyes.....	72.00
Loss of an eye, the other lost before enlistment.....	72.00
Regular aid and attendance (first grade).....	72.00
Amputation at shoulder or hip joint, or so near joint as to prevent use of artificial limb.....	45.00
Total disability of arm or leg.....	36.00
Loss of one hand and one foot.....	36.00
Total disability in one hand and one foot.....	36.00
Amputation at or above elbow or knee.....	36.00
Loss of a hand or a foot.....	30.00
Total disability of one hand or one foot.....	30.00
Inability to perform manual labor (second grade).....	30.00
Disability equivalent to loss of hand or foot (third grade).....	24.00
Total deafness.....	30.00

Many other disabilities not specified by law were established and specified, and the rate therefor was fixed and scheduled by the Commissioner of Pensions, as follows:

Tables of rates fixed by the Commissioner of Pensions for certain disabilities not specified by law.

Anchylolysis of shoulder joint.....	100.00
Anchylolysis of elbow joint.....	100.00
Anchylolysis of knee joint.....	100.00
Anchylolysis of ankle.....	100.00
Anchylolysis of wrist.....	100.00
Loss of sight of one eye.....	72.00
Loss of one eye.....	72.00
Nearly total deafness of one ear.....	30.00
Total deafness of one ear.....	30.00
Slight deafness of both ears.....	30.00
Severe deafness of one ear and slight of the other.....	30.00
Nearly total deafness of one ear and slight of the other.....	30.00
Total deafness of one ear and slight of the other.....	30.00
Severe deafness of both ears.....	30.00
Total deafness of one ear and severe of other.....	30.00
Deafness of both ears existing in a degree nearly total.....	30.00
Loss of palm of hand and all the fingers, the thumb remaining.....	30.00
Loss of thumb, index, middle, and ring fingers.....	30.00
Loss of thumb, index, and middle fingers.....	30.00
Loss of thumb and index finger.....	30.00
Loss of thumb and little finger.....	30.00
Loss of thumb, index, and little fingers.....	30.00
Loss of thumb.....	30.00
Loss of thumb and metacarpal bone.....	30.00
Loss of all the fingers, thumb and palm remaining.....	30.00
Loss of index, middle, and ring fingers.....	30.00
Loss of middle, ring, and little fingers.....	30.00
Loss of index and middle fingers.....	30.00
Loss of little and middle fingers.....	30.00
Loss of little and ring fingers.....	30.00
Loss of ring and middle fingers.....	30.00
Loss of index and little fingers.....	30.00
Loss of index finger.....	30.00
Loss of any other finger without complications.....	30.00
Loss of all the toes of one foot.....	30.00
Loss of great, second, and third toes.....	30.00
Loss of great toe and metatarsal.....	30.00
Loss of great and second toes.....	30.00
Loss of great toe.....	30.00
Loss of any other toe and metatarsal.....	30.00
Loss of any other toe.....	30.00
Chopart's amputation of foot, with good results.....	30.00
Pirogoff's modification of Syme's.....	30.00
Small varicocele.....	30.00
Well-marked varicocele.....	30.00
Inguinal hernia, which passes through the external ring.....	30.00
Inguinal hernia, which does not pass through external ring.....	30.00
Double inguinal hernia, each of which passes through external ring.....	30.00
Double inguinal hernia, one of which passes through the external ring and the other does not.....	30.00
Double inguinal hernia, neither of which passes through the external ring.....	30.00
Femoral hernia.....	30.00

Although the pensionable status fixed by the laws existing prior to June 27, 1890, was essentially different from that fixed by the latter act—under the former the disability being pensionable without regard to its effect upon the capacity of the pensioner to obtain a support by manual labor, while in the latter the essential element was a disability incapacitating for the performance of manual labor to an extent causing inability to obtain a support. The Department by order No. 164, dated October 15, 1890, directed the Commissioner as follows:

That all claimants under the act of June 27, 1890, showing a mental or physical disability or disabilities of a permanent character not the result of their own vicious habits, and which incapacitates from the performance of manual labor, rendering them unable to earn a support in such a degree as would be rated under former laws at or above \$6 and less than \$12, shall be

rated the same as like disabilities of service origin, and that all cases showing a pensionable disability which, if of service origin, would be rated at or above \$12 per month, shall be rated at \$12 per month.

Mr. Chairman, what was the effect of that order, and to what extent did the practice of the Bureau under it change and enlarge the intended scope and effect of the act of June, 1890? Sir, it established a practice in the Bureau by which the essential requirement of the law was disregarded and held for naught, and under which hundreds of thousands of pensioners were placed upon the rolls as under that law whom Congress never contemplated should be considered as within its purview. I realize that this is a strong and broad statement, but, sir, I propose now to demonstrate its literal truth.

The terms of the order were express, that, when the claimant's disability was such as under former laws would have been rated at or above \$6 per month, they should be rated the same under the law of 1890, provided the rate should not exceed \$12 per month. Now of the fifty-one specific disabilities not specified by law, but fixed and rated by the Commissioner of Pensions under former laws, as shown by the schedule which I have read, twenty-one of such disabilities are rated under such former laws at \$12 and upwards per month, and by this order were rated under the law of 1890 at \$12 per month.

I want to make this clear. If, under the old law, the loss of a thumb, a finger, or a toe was rated at \$12 or more per month, then the command of that order was, and the practice of the Bureau under it was, that if a claimant under the law of 1890 could show the loss of a thumb, a finger, or a toe he should be and was rated at \$12 per month, although the intent of Congress was that no man should receive \$12 per month except for disabilities which wholly incapacitated him from obtaining a support by manual labor.

Mr. Chairman, I would challenge the judgment and knowledge of all the skilled physicians and surgeons of the world for an opinion that any one of these twenty-one scheduled disabilities that are rated at \$12 and upwards would wholly incapacitate a man from earning a support by manual labor.

"Anchylolysis of shoulder joint" (a stiffening of the shoulder joint), "of elbow joint," "of knee joint," "of ankle," "of wrist," do any of these disabilities wholly incapacitate from the performance of manual labor? Does the loss of one eye or partial deafness, the loss of a thumb and finger, or of a finger and one toe, destroy all capacity for manual labor? The Pension Office answers in the affirmative, and such has been the orders and practice of that Bureau under which millions of dollars of the people's money has been paid out, and claims for other millions to be paid in the future have been established.

Of the remaining thirty of these fifty-one specific disabilities twenty-five are rated at \$6 and upwards, so that we have the opinion and practice of our Pension Office to establish the fact (if in its practice there be any purpose to be governed by the intent of the law) that but five out of fifty-one ratable disabilities are so slight in character as not to diminish by more than one-half the capacity of a man to perform manual labor.

But, sir, this is not all. It was not intended by the Bureau in the administration of this law that there should be any exclusion of claimants. The mere absence of a pensionable disability was to be no bar. "Ask and thou shalt receive," was the motto of the office, and though the minimum could not be less than \$6 per month, the office stood ready to purchase with the people's money lesser disabilities when presented in job lots, and therefore claimants who could not show the loss of a finger or a toe or other disability of like grade and character destroying, according to Bureau construction, half their capacity for the performance of manual labor, were permitted to consolidate and group together any two or more of the five lesser disabilities to bring their labor capacity to the diminished standard compensated by the minimum rate of the law.

Showing that this was the practice, I read from an order of Mr. Assistant Secretary Bussey, of date January 7, 1893. After reciting Order No. 164, of October 15, 1890, he says:

The foregoing order has governed the practice of your Bureau in the matter of rates under the act of June 27, 1890, since the date of its issue. It appears, however, that the purpose of said order, as intended by the Department in approving it, has been misconstrued by your Bureau so far as it has been your practice to add the separate nominal and schedule rates allowed for several disabilities in making a rate under this act. This has resulted by reason of the fact that it has been your practice under the old law to combine these rates. * * * It is deemed proper to state that the Department, in approving said Order No. 164, did not intend that small rates shall be added together.

A correction made after 400,000 pensioners had been placed on the rolls upon an admitted mis-construction of the intent of Congress in framing the act.

Mr. SEERLEY. Has there been any ruling made by the Department since the last order was issued to undertake the correction of this matter?

Mr. TARSNEY. None of which I have any information.

It thus appears that from the date the Pension Bureau commenced the issuing of certificates of allowance of pensions under the act of June 27, 1890, and continuing until subsequently to January 7 of the present year, during which time more than four hundred thousand pensions were granted under that act, the intent of the law relating to the pensionable status required to be shown was totally disregarded. And in addition, that an order of the Department in which it was assumed to give construction to the law, and which construction was clearly erroneous, was itself misconstrued and misinterpreted by the subordinate officers of the Bureau, whereby a large number of claimants were granted pensions whom the Assistant Secretary now admits had shown no disability pensionable under the law.

I would gladly believe that these perversions of the law were the result of error or mistake, or even that they were due to the ignorance or incompetency of officials, but the facts warrant no such charitable conclusion. Sir, I speak not in jest, but in sober truth and from the record, when I declare to this House and to the country that pensions have been granted under the law of 1890 on account of the loss of the hair—on account of baldness. [Laughter.] Think of the diminishing effect upon a man's capacity to earn a support by manual labor that must result from the disability of baldness.

Mr. Chairman, I have said that if, under our pension system as it existed prior to 1890, wrongs, injustice, and robbery were perpetrated, the fault was not in the laws, but in the administration of the laws. If men were borne upon the rolls who ought not to have been, it was not because of the law, but because of crimes against the law. If meritorious soldiers deserving pensions were denied justice it was not the law which denied them, it was the administration of the law. But this can not be said of the system as it now exists.

The laws that have been enacted recently are in and of themselves in a measure vicious, fraught with injustice, and the substantial cause of much of the existing popular discontent and dissatisfaction with the system. I do not believe that the law of June 27, 1890, should have been enacted. I do not think there was any necessity to justify its enactment or for any enactment then extending the system. But be that as it may, that measure was vicious in its principle and more vicious in its scope.

Mr. PICKLER. Does the gentleman advocate the repeal of that act now?

Mr. TARSNEY. When I get through with the suggestions I am about to make the gentleman will know more of my opinion than he does now.

I have heard men here and elsewhere assert that the Government was under obligation to provide liberally for the support of all who served it as soldiers in time of war. I have heard men here talk of a promise of the Government, of a contract by which the Government was to pay pensions to its soldiers. I have heard them talk of what the Government owes the soldiers as though it were a mere debt, measured by stipulated dollars and cents. I deny any such obligation. I deny any such contract liability. I deny any such debt relation.

These are inconsistent with the true relation of Government and citizen, and inconsistent with the great principle and sentiment on which military pension systems have ever been founded. The Government protects the citizen in his rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of his happiness. It is the duty of the Government to protect the life of the citizen. It is the duty of the citizen to protect the life of the Government. This duty is not a hireling service—it is a holy sacrifice.

The citizen who hazards his life for his country because of love of country and the sense of duty of citizenship is a patriot. The man who hazards his life in war for any government or in any cause under contract for hire is a hireling merely, and every obligation of the employer ceases when the stipulated hire is paid.

In the name of the hundreds of thousands of patriots who, in 1861 and 1862, not stopping to inquire what wage or bounty would be paid or what life pensions would be granted, before pension law or bounty law had been enacted, impelled only by love of country and a sense of patriotic duty, went forth and hazarded their lives that the Government might live, and that that flag might rest there to-day, I denounce as impious this doctrine of contract relation between them and their Government.

Pensions are gifts—free offerings, expressing and measuring the gratitude of a nation for the meritorious services and patriotic sacrifices of those who have served it in time of war, and should be accepted as testimonial of such service and sacrifice, and not as payment of pecuniary debt. The law of 1890 was vicious in principle because it disregarded or violated these sound principles in the relation of government and citizen. Its gratuities were not measured by the meritorious service of its beneficiaries, for meritorious service was not required to be shown by its claimants.

Sacrifice in defense of country was not considered as an element; for the loss of health or impairment of capacity for obtaining a support by the pensioner was not required to be shown as resulting from service. It was vicious in its scope, because it did not discriminate between those who performed meritorious service and those who performed no service; and under it the average value of the pensions allowed is greater than the average under the old laws for wounds or disease contracted in the line of duty.

Mr. Chairman, nearly three years ago, standing upon this floor discussing this pension system as it then existed, I used this language:

Sir, the country has marked with growing disfavor the facts apparent that a great department or bureau of the Government, furnished \$100,000,000 annually of the people's money to provide for the wants of the deserving defenders of the nation's life, who, by reason of their heroic devotion to the cause of their country, are rendered unable to provide for their own wants, is recklessly scattering such funds to the deserving and undeserving alike; that the least meritorious claimant is the preferred claimant; that at each recurring election the treasure of that Bureau is offered by political parties (as bidders in front of the auction block make offer for any commodity) in purchase of what should be the unbought suffrage of the people.

The half-million pensioners now on the roll do not constitute one-twentieth of the voting and taxpaying population of the country, and the other nineteen-twentieths who bear the burdens of the system are becoming dissatisfied and discontented. They would not have the name of one deserving soldier stricken from the rolls, nor would they have his allowance reduced one farthing. They would rather it should be increased. But they have a right to protest, and they do protest, against being taxed to support those who have no claim to the gratitude of the country, who are wrongfully upon that roll, and who doubt that a large percentage of those who are on that roll are men who never saw a day of active service in the Army, camp or field.

Who doubts that many of those who are drawing pensions for disabilities incurred in the line of duty were never in the line of duty, and that they have established their claims by the most flagrant perjury? There are tens of thousands of men on the pension rolls who should not be there, who, by being classed as soldiers, are robbing real soldiers of all there is of honor in the name of soldier; and if you would deal out exact justice to this class instead of granting to them reratings and increased pensions you should strike them from the rolls—

"And place a whip in every honest hand
To lash the scoundrels, naked, through the land."

Sir, unless this unmerited and indiscriminate pensioning be stopped the dissatisfaction and discontent of the taxpaying citizens of the country will grow until it culminates in wrong and injustice to the meritorious and deserving pensioners, and it is for them and in their names I cry you, halt!

Mr. Chairman, contrast the conditions existing when that language was uttered with the conditions of to-day! The half-million pensioners of that day has in that brief time grown to be a million. The annual cost of \$100,000,000, then deemed enormous, has now increased to \$200,000,000. The tens of thousands of undeserving then on the rolls by fraud and perjury has been supplemented by other tens of thousands by the same methods, and still increased by hundreds of thousands through vicious legislation and still more vicious administrative action.

Sir, with far more reason and emphasis than then, I stand here now, and not alone for the just rights of the tax-burdened people, but in defense of the deserving pensioners of the country. I not only call you to halt, but beg you to turn back, and, by an intelligent, conservative, and patriotic revision of the system, bring its cost within the bounds of reason and to a basis of justice to the taxpayers, while with jealous care we guard every right of the deserving pensioners.

The present cost of our military system, including pensions, soldiers' homes, Military Academy, and our little regular Army, exceeds the combined cost of the military establishments of both France and Germany, as kept upon a war footing.

The present cost of our pension system would under a service pension system pay a pension, at the rate of \$14 per month to every surviving soldier and sailor of the Army and Navy of the United States who were engaged in the war of the rebellion. We are told that the maximum of expenditure will be reached in 1894, and that thereafter such expenditures will rapidly decrease. Can this be so, with some 300,000 original claims pending that, when allowed, will carry the arrearages of years with them; with some 500,000 cases pending for increases and rerating; with the history of the past to demonstrate that no sooner is a pension allowed or an increase granted than a new claim is filed for increase or additional increase; with no check or limit thereto, with the fact existing that nearly all ex-soldiers are men of families, and that ordinarily when a soldier dies his death increases rather than diminishes the pension charges of the country, for while he may have drawn pension at the rate of \$2, \$4, or \$6 per month, by his death the right inures to his widow to a pension at \$8 per month and the minor children each at \$2 per month? How can we determine when or at what limit the maximum will be reached? Mr. Chairman, if my recitals of facts and history and deductions therefrom be correct, or approximately correct, what then is our duty? Can it be questioned that it is our duty to proceed without delay to revise the system in such measure and to the end—

First. That there shall be equality and not discrimination as to meritorious soldiers in the measures of its bounty.

Second. That the meritorious soldiers entitled to pensions

whose cases have for years been relegated to oblivion in the Pension Office, there to remain until those of less merit but commanding more favor had been disposed of, shall have their names placed upon the pension rolls at the earliest moment possible.

Third. That the name of every pensioner on the rolls to whom under just and proper laws pensions would not be granted or who under existing laws were not entitled, but who have been placed thereon because of their own fraud and crimes or because of the errors, frauds, or crimes of the administrators of the laws, shall, to the fullest extent possible without hazarding the just rights of others, be stricken therefrom.

Individuals may well differ as to the scope and detail of a measure of revision looking to these reforms, and a better and fuller knowledge concerning the present system and the results of its operation as construed and applied under present administrative methods may be and undoubtedly are required to enable Congress to enact a proper revision.

For these reasons I believe it to be the part of wisdom that the committee recommended in the report accompanying this bill and provided for in the bill be authorized—that that committee during the vacation make a thorough examination of all our pension laws and investigation of their workings, and at the next session of Congress they report or recommend that the Committee on Invalid Pensions report a measure of thorough revision of our pension system. I believe that the action of the Committee on Appropriations in recommending the pending amendments to this bill was courageous, wise, and patriotic, although I can not concur that they should be incorporated into this bill.

I have not sufficient knowledge of facts to warrant me in a conclusion as to the necessity or propriety of the provisions relating to the abolition of the system of paying pensions through pension agencies or the changes in the medical examining boards or that relating to the granting of permission to individuals to make copies of the pension rolls, and think these matters may wisely be left to the consideration of the committee on revision, should such committee be authorized.

That I can not concur with the committee that the other amendments looking to substantial changes in the pension laws should be adopted and made a part of this bill is not because I can not concur with the committee that such changes should be made, for I do most cordially and earnestly concur that substantially the changes suggested should be made; but I believe they should be a part of the general revision contemplated and not be made a part of an appropriation bill.

I believe that the law of June 27, 1890, should be repealed by the substitution substantially of the bill now pending in this House introduced by myself at the last session, which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of the Congress of the United States approved June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," be, and hereby is, repealed, and all pensions allowed or granted under said act prior to the approval of this act, and all claim or right to any such pension, or the allowance or payment of any such pension, shall cease and be determined upon the approval of this act, except as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension rolls of the United States the name of any person specified in the following section, and grant to such person a pension as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 3. That the persons to whom this act shall apply, and who shall be entitled as beneficiaries hereunder, are as follows: Any officer or enlisted man who shall have served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States, including regulars and volunteers, subsequent to the 12th day of April, 1861, and prior to the 1st day of July, 1898, and who shall have been honorably discharged from such service. Also the widow of any deceased officer or enlisted man who shall have served and have been discharged as aforesaid: *Provided*, That the marriage of such widow to such officer or enlisted man shall have occurred prior to said 1st day of July, 1898. The provisions and benefits of this act shall not, however, apply to any officer or enlisted man who shall heretofore have been granted or who may hereafter be granted a pension under any other law for or on account of wounds or disabilities incurred while in the line of duty unless such officer or enlisted man shall first surrender or relinquish all claim and right to such pension under such other law.

SEC. 4. That the rate of pension to be allowed and paid to any person whose name shall be placed upon the pension rolls under the provisions of this act shall be at the rate per month of 1 cent per day for each and every day such officer or enlisted man may have served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States; and any widow entitled to pension hereunder shall be allowed and paid at the rate per month of 1 cent per day for each day her husband shall have served as aforesaid.

SEC. 5. That the period of service shall be computed from the date of enlistment into the service of the United States to the date of discharge therefrom: *Provided*, That when any officer or enlisted man shall have served under more than one enlistment and shall have received more than one honorable discharge, the rate of pension shall be fixed and determined by the aggregate of the time of such cumulative periods of service.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed, immediately upon the approval of this act, and without any additional application or proofs, other than the proofs now on file in the office of the Commissioner of Pensions and the records of the office of the Adjutant-General of the Army, to ascertain the length or period of service of each and every officer or enlisted man to whom a pension has been allowed under the said act, approved June 27, 1890, or to whose widow any pension has been granted thereunder, and to continue the name of such officer, enlisted man, or widow upon the

pension rolls of the United States, and to cause such officer, enlisted man, or widow to be paid a pension thereafter at the rate specified in this act.

SEC. 7. That any officer or enlisted man of the Army or Navy or Marine Corps of the United States, having served as aforesaid, and the widow of any officer or enlisted man who may have served as aforesaid, may avail themselves of and have the benefits of this act without any formal application therefor. The filing with the Commissioner of Pensions of an honorable discharge from the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States, which discharge shall show service within the period aforesaid, together with satisfactory proof of the identity of the person claiming pension hereunder, as the person named in such discharge, or as the widow of the person named therein, and of her marriage prior to said 1st day of July, 1898, shall be deemed and held sufficient application and proof to entitle such person to the benefits of this act; but no pension shall be granted to any officer or enlisted man who shall have deserted from the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States, nor to the widow of any such officer or enlisted man, until the record of such desertion shall have been removed or amended by the issue of an honorable discharge, covering the period of enlistment from which such officer or enlisted man shall have deserted.

SEC. 8. That no fee or compensation shall be allowed or paid to any attorney or agent for any service in procuring or aiding in procuring the allowance of any pension under this act, and it shall be unlawful for any person to solicit, accept, or receive any compensation, gratuity, or reward from any applicant for pension hereunder for any service or pretended service relating to the application or allowance of such pension.

Mr. MORSE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. TARSNEY. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. I want to see if I understood the remark of the gentleman clearly. I understood him to say that there was no contract made or implied with the soldiers of the Union prior to or during the war antedating their enlistment.

Mr. TARSNEY. I meant to say that in the sense of a legal contract no such obligation was created. What I said was that there is a higher and a holier obligation resting upon the citizen to defend his country than that of a contract for hire.

Mr. MORSE. Well, will the gentleman allow another question?

Mr. TARSNEY. I regret that I can not yield further. My time is exhausted.

Mr. Chairman, by the enactment of that measure the principles of equity, considerations of merit, regard for the value and length of service would for the first time find place as elements of consideration in our pension system. And while dealing liberally, equitably, and justly according to the merit of the pensioners, it would reduce the cost of our pension system by from \$50,000,000 to \$60,000,000 a year. This may seem an astounding proposition, but it is nevertheless true.

There would under that measure be about 800,000 pensioners to-day. The average period of service of this 800,000 men is estimated at one year. The average rate per month for each would then be \$3.65, and the total for the 800,000 would be \$2,920,000 per month, or \$35,040,000 annually, while the annual charge under the act of June, 1890, will, when it reaches the maximum, approximate \$100,000,000. Should this repeal and substitution not be made, then the act of 1890 should be amended so as to more clearly define the pensionable status that would entitle to a pension under it and avoid any excuse for further misconstructions or misinterpretations, such as those contained in the Order No. 164 from the Interior Office; and provision should most certainly be made for dropping from the rolls those wrongfully placed thereon under said order.

The act of 1890 contemplated providing a support for those who by reason of disability were incapacitated from obtaining a support by manual labor. It contemplated that the claimant had no support or means of support. Therefore provision should be made to exclude from the rolls those provided with ample means of support independent of their ability to contribute thereto by manual labor.

The granting of pensions to widows unmarried and unborn years after the close of the war should not be continued. That woman who, being the wife of a soldier during the war, is by his death now left a widow should be granted a generous pension. The anxiety, the mental distress, the labors, struggles, and privations of the wife at home oftentimes outweighed the perils and hardships of the camp or field, and should be generously compensated; but I can not make myself understand how the granting of pensions to women who knew nothing of the war or of the mental or physical suffering it occasioned can be justified. That pensions ought not to be granted or paid to non-residents who are not citizens of the United States, unless for disabilities actually incurred in the service of the United States, needs no argument.

No person should be granted a pension unless his service was honorable and he was honorably discharged therefrom. Our pension rolls are dishonored and the meritorious pensioners of the country are dishonored because these rolls bear the names of men dishonorably discharged from the service. This dishonor is not lessened by the fact that that class of pensioners are on the rolls by the order and decision of a high official of the Government authorized to construe and interpret the pension laws of the country. I read from an official communication

from Mr. Assistant Secretary Bussey to Mr. Commissioner Raum, of date November 22, 1890, as follows:

It has been held, as now, by the Department that under the aforesaid general acts of July 22 and July 14, 1862, providing for invalid pensions based upon disabilities incurred in the line of duty in the service, a discharge from the service was a prerequisite to pension, but that the claimant's title thereto is neither impaired or otherwise affected by either the nature or the character of the discharge itself. It is held furthermore under said acts that a dishonorable discharge from the service should be regarded as only a penalty imposed by competent authority for an offense against the regulations of the service, and that such a discharge does not involve the forfeiture of a soldier's pensionable rights. (See decision in the case of Daniel B. Kaufman, volume 3, Pension Decisions, page 137.)

Sir, if that be a good interpretation of a bad law, and not the bad interpretation of a good law, the sooner that law is changed the better, and the sooner those dishonorably discharged from the service are dishonorably discharged from the pension rolls the better.

Mr. Chairman, the conditions which I have recited certainly involve sufficient gravity to put this House upon inquiry, and by authorizing the committee suggested to make that inquiry thorough, that the House and the country may know officially if there be need of reform in our pension system; and if so, to what extent that reform should go.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, let me say that no higher sentiments of patriotism to my country or greater degree of respect, kindness, sympathy, or love for the true, brave, heroic soldiers of the Union, my comrades, actuated me when together under that flag we stood upon the bloody fields of Fredericksburg, Chancellorsville, and Gettysburg, or suffered together in the prison pens of Belle Isle, Andersonville, and Milan, or rejoiced with each other in the sunlight of final victory at Appomattox, than now actuates me as I stand here and in the name of country and comrade, pleading for the honor of both, beseech of this House patriotic consideration of this problem. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, the question we are discussing to-day is one of very great importance, both to the soldiers who fought in the army of the Union, and to the people and taxpayers in general of this country. There is no doubt that the pension laws that are now upon the statute books may have been wrongly interpreted in many cases.

I have no doubt that the decision of the Interior Department with regard to the act of June 27, 1890, was wrong. I have conversed with many of the leading employes of the Pension Department, men who have been there for many years, who are well versed in the law and in the decisions of former Secretaries of the Interior, and I have found it almost a unanimous sentiment in that Department that a wrong interpretation was placed upon the law of 1890.

However, within a short time that decision has been reversed, and it has been decided that the first decision was wrong, and that hereafter pensions shall be granted under the law of 1890 on a different basis from what they have been granted up to the present time. It is true, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARNER] has just said, that during the existence of the first interpretation of that law about 400,000 soldiers were added to the pension rolls. If we will consider them as having been granted the maximum rate of pensions allowed under that law, it would amount to about \$60,000,000. Under the new interpretation of that law, if those pensions had been granted and the pensioners had received the minimum amount allowed under the law it would have saved the Government about \$30,000,000 a year.

Now, we all recognize these facts. There is probably no one upon the floor of this House, no one who is versed in regard to the pension laws now upon the statute books and who has given any proper consideration for their enforcement, who does not say that we need reform in this matter; that our pension administration should be reformed. And yet I think, Mr. Chairman, that a proper administration of those laws, a proper interpretation of the law of 1890, is in the power of the proper authorities at the present time, and that they can largely remedy this evil that now exists and save many millions of dollars annually to the Government of the United States.

But I am not here for the purpose of discussing on general principles the pension laws of our country, neither to condemn them, but to say a few words with regard to this bill that has been presented to this House by the Committee on Appropriations, and the amendments that the committee have given notice that they will offer to the bill when the proper time arrives.

Now, it has been objected by my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUTCHEER], who has charge of this bill, that under the present system the Department has been largely a political organization or a political department. I am not ready to say that there is not some truth in that statement. I am not ready to believe that there is any great department in a government like ours, where the administration is placed in power by the

will of the people, that is not somewhat of a political department. It is impossible under our system of government ever to eliminate politics from the administration of any department of the Government. Yet my friend believes that if this Bureau is transferred to the War Department and put in charge of the Army politics will be eliminated from the pension system.

I call the attention of the gentleman to what I believe to be a fact, that instead of eliminating politics from the pension administration of this Government, you will simply bring politics into the regular Army, and I believe there is no true citizen, no true representative of the American people upon the floor of this House or any other place in our country, who desires to introduce a political power into our standing Army.

We ought to guard jealously the rights of our people. We ought to be careful about putting more power in the hands of our Army than it possesses to-day. We are a great and mighty free people, able to govern and control ourselves, and I am utterly opposed to putting any of our civil departments under the department of the military.

But I will pass from that, for I am sure that that point will be discussed in an abler manner than I am able to discuss it. It is a fact that we have upon the pension rolls at the present time, or, according to the Commissioner of Pensions, will have, when this amendment will go into effect, if passed, on the 1st of July next, about one million of names, or in exact numbers as the Pension Commissioner gives it, 998,000 and some hundreds. It is proposed by an amendment, which will be offered, to turn over to the Treasury of the United States the payment of this 1,000,000 of soldiers, to pay them direct from the Treasury Department, to do away with the eighteen pension agencies that we now have in this country, through which the pension funds are now disbursed.

This amendment is offered on the plea that it will reduce the expenditures of the Government. Now, I am sure that there is no man upon the floor of this House who is more ready than myself to reduce the governmental expenses. As a representative of my people I deem it my duty always to vote for economy, keeping in view at the same time a just administration of the laws.

It appears from the examination of the Secretary of the Treasury, and also from the report which the Assistant Treasurer has sent to the committee, that the Treasury Department is somewhat in favor of having this Department of the service transferred direct to the Treasury. They give a list of the number of clerks that will be necessary to carry out this work and claim that they will save, as the chairman has stated, about \$80,000; and yet, if he will read fully the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury, he will find that he is making a mistake of \$30,000. We have eighteen pension agents, who receive a salary of \$4,000 a year each. We employ in those agencies at the present time about four hundred and eighty clerks.

Now, I want to call attention to this fact, and one that is important that every member upon this floor should consider, that these agencies are scattered throughout the country at the points most convenient for the payment of soldiers' pensions. These four hundred and eighty clerks are employed by the pension agents direct. I want to call your attention to the fact that these clerks are employed in those agencies at a salary rating from \$40, \$60, to \$70 a month. I want to call your attention to the fact, also, that they do not come under the civil-service law; that they are not under the eight-hour law, or the six-hour law, as practiced in the Departments in the city of Washington.

I also want to call your attention to the fact that when the time comes for the payment of the pensions these clerks readily and willingly work ten and fifteen hours a day in order that they may accomplish the work necessary for the payment of the soldiers' pensions. Now, I refer you to the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury. I want to call your attention to the salaries he proposes to pay those clerks to carry on this work. In the first place, he proposes to increase the salary of treasurer \$1,000 a year.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What has that to do with the payment of pensions?

Mr. McKINNEY. He proposes to pay the Assistant Treasurer an increase of \$500. He proposes the superintendent shall have a salary of \$3,500 a year, the assistant superintendent a salary of \$3,000, the chiefs of sections \$2,200 apiece, and twelve of them; clerk's on general work \$1,800 apiece, twelve of them; for those engaged on writing the vouchers \$900 apiece, and forty-eight of them; and so you will find, if you will read over this list, that there are only two clerks of the entire number the Treasurer proposes to employ at less than a salary of \$900 a year, and they at \$660 a year.

Now, then, summing up, he says it will take these 289 clerks to perform the work at an expense of \$320,000. This is a saving of \$80,000 from the amount appropriated by the committee in

this bill. But I call the attention of the committee to the statement of the Secretary:

If to this estimate 10 per cent be added for absence allowed under the rules of the Department, the number of persons required would be increased to about 320, and the cost \$350,000.

Now, he says:

The foregoing estimate is based mainly on experience acquired in the payment by check of the interest on the United States registered bonds.

I do not see how even the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Treasurer himself, can make an estimate on that basis, because, in the payment of soldiers, it is in different sums, from \$12 to \$15, \$50 and \$100, in checks, all over the country, while the payment on the interest bonds is paid in large sums. And Secretary Foster, when he was before the committee, practically said that he could not make an estimate of the saving on account of the difference in the amount of money paid under the respective checks.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. But he admitted the general proposition that quite a sum of money would be saved.

Mr. MCKINNEY. He admitted, according to his judgment, there would be a saving. Now, I will give the judgment of the Assistant Treasurer in his own language:

If considerable addition of labor, not foreseen—

He had made his estimate, but he put an "if" in, which practically says that he does not know anything about it.

If considerable additional labor, not foreseen at present, be involved in the change, or if the Treasurer be expected to take charge of the agency roll books; to continue the work pertaining thereto; to compute the amounts due in original, increase, and reissue cases; to examine all return vouchers. * * *

An addition to the working force would be necessary.

Without familiarity—

Now, I call your attention to this fact—

Without familiarity with the details of the labor performed at the agencies—

That is as much as to say "I know nothing about it"—

Outside of the preparation and mailing of the checks and vouchers, I am unable to give any well-grounded opinion as to the additional number of clerks required.

Our Assistant Treasurer practically says, when he comes to this matter, he can not even give a practical guess at the matter.

It is presumed that you will desire to obtain information on this point and others from the officers affected by the proposed change and by the plan outlined.

We have got some information from those who have had the enforcement of the law through the gentlemen from Vermont [Mr. GROUT], and their information is far more valuable to the members of this House than the information of a man who practically says he knows nothing about it.

After the business has been organized and fully systematized improvements in methods may be discovered tending to reduce the labor without impairing accuracy and dispatch.

No provision is made in the foregoing estimate for the expenses of furniture, stationery, etc., or of rent, fuel, and light, in case accommodations are not secured in the Treasury or other Government building.

It is plain that this estimate practically amounts to nothing. It is so admitted by the Assistant Treasurer himself in his testimony which the committee has brought in here to convince this House that we ought to make this change—a change proposed to be made on the testimony of a man who practically testifies that he does not know exactly what he is talking about, but he thinks it probable that things may be so and so.

Now, I want to call attention to another fact, and that is that under the present system the soldiers are paid off four times a year. There are 1,000,000 soldiers to be paid, requiring 4,000,000 vouchers, 4,000,000 checks, 4,000,000 letters to be written and addressed in order to carry on this work. I want to call attention to the fact that if you divide the payments up so that one portion of them will be paid every month in the year it will be necessary to examine 333,000 vouchers, to make out and sign 333,000 checks, and to put letters into and address 333,000 envelopes every month in the year.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is not that done now?

Mr. MCKINNEY. No, sir; not altogether that, because many of the soldiers receive their money direct. However, they get it by check, so I will admit that that is practically done now. Gentlemen talk here about dividing this work up so as to pay a certain portion of the pension roll every month. Now, if 480 clerks in the eighteen existing agencies are barely capable of performing this service, working ten hours a day all the time and during the busy season fifteen hours a day, what evidence have we that 320 clerks, the highest estimate made by the Treasury Department, will be able to do the work here in Washington?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The Secretary says—

Mr. MCKINNEY. Oh, the Secretary says he does not know whether it is so or not. He gives that as an estimate, but says that the practical result may prove that the estimate is not correct. I call the attention of the members of this House to the

further fact that these 480 clerks now employed in the eighteen pension agencies of this country are young men and young women who are living at home in their families. They are not employed here in the city of Washington under the civil-service law; they are young men and young women who can not go away from home to earn a living, but have to remain with their families, and they are working for less than half the pay received by clerks in the Treasury.

Now, is this House prepared to drive those 480 young men and young women out of that service and bring here to the city of Washington that number of additional clerks, to be put under the operation of the civil-service law, at twice the salaries they are now receiving, and to live here in this city, where the money they do receive will not be of near so much benefit to them as the smaller amounts which they get at their homes?

I want to call attention also to another fact. There is a good deal of talk here about saving rent, and there is an estimate of the amount that will be saved. I suppose members are aware that eleven of the pension agencies out of the whole number of eighteen are in public buildings owned by the Government of the United States, where there is no rent to pay. The Treasurer of the United States says that it will be necessary, if this business is transferred to the Treasury Department, that the payments shall be made direct from the Treasury building. I asked him where he would get room. "Oh," said he, "we shall have to move out one or two bureaus from the Treasury building in order to make room for the clerks to pay off the soldiers."

Now where are you going to put those Treasury bureaus? Shall we do as we are doing now, hire blocks where the land is worth from \$30 to \$50 per square foot and pay the owners of those blocks 10 per cent on the investment, and thus pay out more rent for the accommodation of bureaus that will be driven out of the Treasury building than we are now paying for the seven agencies that are not in Government buildings throughout the country?

I believe that every man on this floor who will investigate the facts, who will examine the statement of the Treasurer in this report, will at once conclude that this is not a matter of economy, but that it will increase the expense to the Government, and will operate greatly to the detriment of the soldiers who are drawing pensions.

Let me call your attention, gentlemen, to a fact. Of course you all know that a soldier's voucher can not be made out and signed until the day that the pension is due.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. Every single voucher can be signed as it is now in the payment of coupons. The name can be printed on the voucher and a million of them printed at one time, if necessary.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Oh, no, my friend.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is done now.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Not under the present law. No voucher can be sent in before the day the pension is due. A man can not make a voucher until the time arrives for the payment of the pension. If he should make the voucher in advance he might be dead when the time for the payment of the pension comes. The law is plain.

Mr. MUTCHLER. The pensioner does in fact make out the voucher before the time arrives for payment—long before.

Mr. MCKINNEY. And sends it in?

Mr. MUTCHLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. He might send it in three months ahead as well as three days.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Send in his voucher in advance, without knowing whether he is going to be alive on the day when the pension is to be paid! How can a widow send in a voucher certifying that she is not married on the day when the pension is paid? If the voucher is made in advance she may, when payday arrives, be married, and may have taken a European tour, and may have got home again.

Mr. MUTCHLER. I only state the fact that the soldier sends in his voucher before his pension is due; and when the pension is due he receives his check.

Mr. MCKINNEY. I think the gentleman is mistaken. I have not the law here; I wish some gentleman would look it up, so that we may have this matter settled.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The voucher is sent out in blank to the pensioner; it is filled up and sent back to the agency before the check starts from the agency.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Certainly; but does the pensioner fill it up before the pension is due?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. He does; he must do it.

Mr. MCKINNEY. How can he make a voucher certifying to a thing which is not the fact at the time?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Because he knows the facts.

Mr. MCKINNEY. But he does not know what is the fact. He must be identified, and it must be shown that he is living on the day when the pension becomes due.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I suggest to the gentleman that the pro-

ceeding is the same as that which we go through here in regard to our salaries.

A MEMBER. Oh, no.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We receipt for the salary before it is due; that receipt goes in as an estimate, and the money is put into the hands of the Sergeant-at-Arms before it is due for the purpose of paying members of Congress.

Mr. MCKINNEY. The law emphatically forbids any voucher being made out until the 4th day of the month on which the pension is due. That is the requirement of the law. I am not a lawyer, and do not like to dispute with lawyers on a point of this kind. But I think I know this to be the fact.

A MEMBER. A pensioner making out a voucher beforehand may die before the time arrives for the payment of the pension.

Mr. MCKINNEY. The law expressly says that no voucher shall be made until the 4th day of the month on which the pension is due—that is, the day the soldier is entitled to receive the pension from the Government.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. The gentleman is clearly right; there is no question about that.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Now, that proposition being true, take the cases of the pensioners scattered all over this broad land. The 4th day of the month arrives and the pensioner is entitled to his check on that day. He forwards his voucher to the Treasurer of the United States on the 4th day of the month, when the pension is due.

How long will it take that voucher to come from California, or Oregon, or the State of Washington, or Kansas, or any of the Western States, or the State of Maine, or New Hampshire, in the East?

Mr. MORSE. In many cases it would take ten days for the transit each way.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Then that voucher must be examined and approved in the Treasury Department. Then the check must be inclosed and sent to the pensioner; and if there is no delay whatever, if everything is ready when the voucher arrives, there are many of these soldiers who will not receive their pensions in less than twenty or thirty days after they are due from the Government.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The Treasury Department does not agree with the gentleman from New Hampshire on this point.

Mr. MCKINNEY. I want to state what the Treasurer says. I have access to the Treasury Department as well as other men; I have been up there investigating a little. The Treasurer says that one advantage of this law will be that the checks will be so long getting around to the Treasury that the money will remain in the Treasury of the United States so much the longer. That is what the Treasurer says.

In other words, a part of this policy is, after you give a man his pension, to keep it out of his hands just as long as you possibly can by piling it up here in the Treasury in the city of Washington. That is the policy that has been inaugurated by your Treasury.

Now, I want to know if there is a man here who believes that a poor pensioner, who is entitled to a pension at all, ought to be kept out of it just as long as you possibly can, and deprive him of that money which he so badly needs, as long as you can do it? I would treat the soldier as honestly as I would treat any other man—as I would treat the poor man who performed a ten-hours-day labor for me for his dollar or two dollars, as the case may be.

But furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary, when he appeared before this Appropriations Committee, said the probabilities were that the banks in far-off States would charge a small percentage to the soldier for the cashing of his pension check. You are advocating, then, a policy which will make the soldier pay his contribution to the banks for the purpose of getting his pension cashed, without giving him the privilege of getting it without such charge for the benefit of himself or his family. I do not believe you gentlemen would be willing to do anything of this kind when the matter is called to your attention.

I assert here and now, by way of prophecy, and you will find that the prophecy is true, that if you turn this payment of the soldiers' pensions over to the Treasury Department, you will largely increase the expenditures of the Department of this fund to the soldiers. You will also find every soldier in this broad land rising up to condemn your action, because it deprives them of their pension when they ought to receive it.

But my attention has been called to the law on this subject, and I want to read a little of that now for the benefit of the gentleman from Georgia. I am glad that I have got at last to where I can read the law:

Within fifteen days immediately preceding the 4th day of March, June, September, and December in each year, the several agents for the payment of pensions shall prepare a quarterly voucher for every person whose pension is payable at his agency, and transmit the same by mail, directed to the address of the pensioner named in such voucher, who, on or after the 4th

day of March, June, September, and December next succeeding the date of such voucher, may execute and return the same to the agency at which it was prepared, and at which the pension of such person is due and payable.

I trust the gentleman from Georgia heard that. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. How is that?

Mr. MCKINNEY. Here is the law that I have been reading. I will read it again for the benefit of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You mean that is a regulation of the Pension Office?

Mr. MCKINNEY. Oh, no; not at all. That is the law of the land.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. What do you mean by law?

Mr. MCKINNEY. I mean that it has passed this House and the Senate, and has been approved by the Executive. Here it is. The gentleman will find it in the codification of the laws relating to pensions.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The question I asked the gentleman was, Is that an act of Congress?

Mr. MCKINNEY. I answered the gentleman specifically that it was an act of Congress.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Is it not a regulation of the Pension Office, put into the codification there by the committee?

Mr. MCKINNEY. No, sir; it is not. It is an act passed by both Houses of Congress—the House and the Senate and approved by the President.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The gentleman is sure that it is the law.

Mr. MCKINNEY. I know it is.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. But whether it is or not, we were discussing the practice of the office and not the law, and I say that the practice is as the chairman of the committee and myself have asserted it to be. I do not care what the law is. We assert that practice is established there and prevails.

Mr. BURROWS. If the gentleman from New Hampshire will permit me, the gentleman from Georgia will find the act just read by the gentleman from New Hampshire is a part of the Revised Statutes, section 4764.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Very well. Now, if the gentleman will look on page 25 of the report, at the statement of the Hon. William H. Hart, Third Auditor, who corroborates exactly what I say, he will find that I am correct.

Mr. MCKINNEY. I do not know how that may be. I only quoted the law of Congress on this subject. And if they are not carrying out the law, here is a general appropriation bill, assuming to legislate for the entire country, and it ought to be fixed so in that bill that it would compel the carrying out of the law.

Mr. HOUK of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

Mr. MCKINNEY. I will, if necessary.

Mr. HOUK of Ohio. I merely wanted to quote a little information I received this morning.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Very well.

Mr. HOUK of Ohio. It is in the line of your present remarks and I would like to submit it to the House. It is from the pension agent at the Columbus agency.

Mr. MCKINNEY. I have no objection to the gentleman's reading it.

Mr. HOUK of Ohio (reading):

The rolls of this agency contain over 10 per cent of the entire pension list. These rolls comprise about one hundred huge volumes giving the military and disability history of each pensioner, over 96,000 in number. This entire list have their checks mailed to them during the first ten days of payment. The enormous labor connected with a payment as well as the laborious details required to get ready for such payment can neither be described nor understood without actual personal observation. For instance during my incumbency of this office I have paid out \$40,000,000, without the loss of one cent to the Government.

Our ordinary daily mail contains an average of over one hundred letters from pensioners asking some question important to them. They are answered with care and exactness. During the time of payment the pay department is open at 4 o'clock a. m. and kept open till 10 at night.

Every voucher that is paid passes through thirty-two separate examinations before it goes to the Third Auditor. We have 10 per cent of the whole list at this agency. Multiply the work by 10 and you have some idea of the aggregate. My deliberate judgment is, with some idea of the working power of the Department clerk in Washington, that neither the War Department nor the Treasury could attempt to add the paying of pensions to their other labors without an addition of at least 600 clerks to their present force, or an addition of at least 50 per cent to the cost as administered under the agency system. Do you notice that not a single witness was called before the subcommittee who had the slightest knowledge or experience of the present system? You have in your district thousands of pensioners who would be seriously inconvenienced and delayed by the proposed change.

The gentleman can have the benefit of that. It is from Gen. John G. Mitchell, a very reputable gentleman and a very able man, who is at the head of the pension office in Columbus.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Now, Mr. Chairman, you will see that in the pension office at Columbus, where the money is disbursed from that agency, during the time that the payments are being made, those clerks, who are getting from \$40 to \$60 per month, absolutely work sixteen hours a day, and we have a law upon our statute books here that prohibits the Treasury of the United

States from employing any clerk over eight hours a day. Now, you can readily see what the extra expense will be, and the extra help which will be necessary.

Now, remember another thing. They employ extra clerks only when they are paying off for a few days, and then they are discharged. I would like to see you get a man or woman into any place under this Government under the civil-service law and ever get rid of them. If they are only needed for forty days in the year they will remain for the whole three hundred and sixty-five days, being paid for the time that they take for their annual vacation.

Now, I call your attention to another point. There is not in the history of this country a great bureau like this, which has the disbursing at the present time of more than \$150,000,000 a year, that ever disbursed that amount at as small an expense to the Government as does the Pension Bureau. Recollect that it only costs 3.2 mills on the dollar, or 32.2 cents per \$100, to disburse that money; and in the War Department it costs 1.4 cents on the dollar, or more than four times as much, to disburse the money for that Department as it costs in the Pension Department. Remember, gentlemen who cry economy, I warn you to-day that if you pass this amendment and allow it to become a part of the law of this country you will largely increase the expenses of this Government.

But, Mr. Chairman, I do not care to occupy further time. This question will be thoroughly discussed before this debate is closed by many able men upon the floor of this House. I simply want to call the attention of the House to this fact: I believe it is the general sentiment of this country that we want some changes made in the administration of our pension laws. Go out through the country and talk to the honest soldier, to the men who stood upon the field of battle and bore the brunt of the contest, to the men who suffered in prison and in the hospitals, to the men who were the defenders of this great country, and you will find these men believe there should be a reform in our pension administration.

Mr. PICKLER. What part do you think ought to be reformed?

Mr. MCKINNEY. In the first place, the wrong interpretation of the law of June 27, 1890, that the old soldiers all over this country are complaining about, which gives to the men who got the benefit of that interpretation an equality often with the soldiers who fought upon the field of battle and who earned their disability in honorable warfare. But I do not care to discuss that. I am only making a point of it.

Now I submit that the proper way to accomplish this reform is to bring in a proper bill, after due consideration, before this House, and have it properly discussed, and to make such changes in the pension laws or in their interpretation, if any is needed, as the wisdom of the Congress of the United States may suggest.

I submit that it is hardly courteous to other committees of this House, and hardly courteous to the membership of this House, or to the people of this country, for the Committee on Appropriations to assume the right to legislate upon every question that their mighty wisdom suggests to them ought to be legislated upon.

I shall oppose these amendments, first, because the Appropriations Committee have no business with them. I shall oppose them, secondly, because I believe they are extravagant, because I think they will increase the amount of the expenses of the Government in this hour, when we, and especially the Democratic party, must attempt to economize, and when the cry of economy is going up all over the country. Let us look well to each case and not pass these amendments; and if they become the law let it be after the country and the Congress has the proper time for the consideration of these great questions that are of interest, as I said in the start, both to the soldier, the people, and the taxpayers throughout our country.

Mr. MORSE. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MCKINNEY. I will.

Mr. MORSE. I desire, Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the gentleman, to ask the question which I tried to ask the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARSNEY]. The gentleman heard the remark of the gentleman from Missouri that no promises were made to the soldiers?

Mr. MCKINNEY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that in our section of country, at the war meetings, certain unwritten promises were made to the soldiers, with a view to promoting enlistment? Were not those promises for pensions if disabled, or for pensions to widows if we died in the war? Were not these promises made at war meetings?

Mr. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, in answer to that question, I will say to the gentleman that I was not in our section of the country at the beginning of the war. I was an Ohio man, and

went as a soldier from the State of Ohio. I enlisted in 1861. There was only one promise made to us and that was, our monthly pay and \$100 bounty.

In the wisdom of Congress, as soon as they got us enlisted they passed a law that we should not have the \$100 bounty promised. Our pay, then, was the only promise we got. There were promises made all over the country, very liberally, by men who had no power to enforce them; made largely by men who did not care to go to war themselves, but who made these promises in order that they might save themselves, even at the sacrifice of their friends. So far as I look at pensions, I will say that I believe a pension is not a debt, but a gratuity, given by the generous American people to the soldier who deserved it for his service to his country.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, as one of the subcommittee which is in part responsible for some amendments which are proposed to be made to the pension laws, I desire to make a few remarks on the bill at the present time, and to state why it is that the subcommittee have been induced to report the amendments we wish incorporated into this bill.

There can be no question that all over this country a feeling has been growing that the pension list has exceeded all proportions and that a halt is demanded until it can be shown that the name of no person will appear on the pension roll who, first, does not deserve it; and after those who deserve it that those who need it shall get a pension from the Government.

Now, there is not a line nor a word in the amendments proposed by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which would take away one cent from anybody entitled to receive a pension either on account of wounds received or disability contracted in the service, or a cent from anybody in necessitous circumstances who needs relief from the Government and who served faithfully in the war. Our subcommittee thought this as far as the pension laws ought to go. They believed the people of the United States, without regard to party, thought as they have endeavored to report.

This bill as presented to the House carries in it an appropriation of \$165,000,000. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARSNEY] well says, that if the present system of granting pensions is carried on that that will not be near enough to meet the expenses during the year 1894.

In the report of the Commissioner of Pensions, submitted to this House, he says:

I estimate that the greatest number of pensioners under all laws will be 1,200,000, and that it will take \$188,000,000 to pay that amount.

In another portion right before that he says:

I am of the opinion that if this policy—

That is, the policy which he has been pursuing—is carried out, the adjudication of original claims will be substantially completed and made current at the close of the fiscal year 1894, and the highest number of pensioners ever to be on the rolls will have been placed there.

It is true that since he made that report he comes in with a modification of his statement and says that it will take several months beyond the 30th of June, 1894, to reach the highest number on the roll, but if you take his report with the large number of completed cases on file to-day, and the absence of any reason why there can not be as much work done under the new Commissioner as under him, you find that you will need between one hundred and ninety and two hundred million dollars to pay the pension roll of 1894, and I say that is too much money, and that the people of this country demand a halt.

One amendment proposed by the committee is an amendment which was adopted in Committee of the Whole when the pension appropriation bill was under discussion in the first session of the present Congress. It provides that:

That from and after the passage of this act the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers shall deduct the excess above \$5 monthly of the pensions of all inmates of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and cover the same into the Treasury: *Provided, however*, That the above provision shall not apply to any inmate of said home who, having a wife at the time of his admission to said home, minor child, or parent dependent upon him for support, shall apply the excess of his pension above said \$5 each month to said support. The said Board of Managers shall annually report the amount of pension money received by them under the above provision.

That same amendment was offered to the last pension appropriation bill by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] and was adopted in Committee of the Whole, but was stricken out by the House. I favored that amendment then; I favor it now. Since the first session of this Congress the subject has been taken up by other people, and I have here a copy of the proceedings of the convention of the National Woman's Relief Corps, in which they discuss this question and ask that that provision which was incorporated by the Committee of the Whole in the appropriation bill at the first session of this Congress and stricken out by the House, be inserted in this bill.

Not only do they indorse it, but I have also, and will print with my remarks letters of indorsement of the amendment from

the present Commissioner of Pensions, Gen. Raum; from his predecessor, Gen. Black; from the president of the Board of Managers of the National Home, Gen. Franklin; and also from six of the heads of the present homes; the only one not committing himself on the subject, I believe, being the manager of the home where my friend from Ohio [Mr. HOUK] lives.

Mr. HOUK of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. HOUK of Ohio. I understood the gentleman to say a few minutes ago that this bill did not propose in any of its provisions to take one cent from any pension that was enjoyed by a deserving soldier.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. That is exactly what I said and what I meant.

Mr. HOUK of Ohio. And I think I understood the gentleman who presented this bill this morning [Mr. MUTHLER] to say the same thing. Now, the provision which the gentleman has just read takes away from these pensioners—every one of whom is a disabled soldier—takes away absolutely his entire pension with the exception of \$5 a month. I would like to know how the gentleman reconciles that with his statement that there is nothing in this bill which takes away any portion of the pension of any deserving soldier.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. The average rate of pensions paid to soldiers throughout the country who are outside of the homes is about \$132 a year. These men who are in the homes are fed, clothed, and taken care of in addition to their pensions. There is not an inmate of a home to-day who is qualified for admission to a national home who is not also qualified to receive under the law a pension of \$12 a month, and this provision does not save much money to the Government, in my judgment, but what it does is this: It compels these men, if they have wives or children or dependent parents, to send them all of the pension over \$5 a month. We take good care of these men and certainly they are not entitled to any more than other soldiers.

Mr. HOUK of Ohio. You take care of them and you make them pay for it. You board them and they pay for it.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. All they have to do to avoid that is to pay their pension over to their wives, children, or dependent parents.

Mr. POWERS. Does not this bill provide that all over \$5 per month shall be covered back into the United States Treasury?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Yes; unless it is sent by the soldier to his wife, children, or dependent parents.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Suppose he has no wife or children or dependent parents.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Then the Government is doing very well by him when it houses him, feeds him, and clothes him, and allows him a month's spending money—all that the people of this country are willing shall be done.

Mr. WAUGH. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. WAUGH. That amendment applies to all cases in the home, even where the soldier may be applying his money faithfully to the support of his family, so that he must suffer for the sins of the guilty.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Oh, no.

Mr. WAUGH. Certainly. You put them all under the same ban, and in such a case as I have supposed the man who is not guilty must suffer for those who are.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. There is nothing in this provision to prevent a man sending every dollar to his family. He is allowed \$5 a month, and if, instead of spending that, he chooses to send it to his wife or to his people, there is nothing in this to prevent him. This provision has the indorsement of the best men in this country and of the best women, too.

Mr. BUSHNELL. I observe that this \$5 a month is left to disabled volunteer soldiers in the homes. Why is a distinction made between disabled volunteers and disabled soldiers of the regular Army?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Because the homes for regular Army soldiers are supported by all the soldiers in the regular Army, who have a certain amount deducted from their pay; and such homes are supported out of that fund—not out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BUSHNELL. Then, if I understand the gentleman correctly, there is no such deduction made as applicable to pensioners of the regular Army.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Oh, yes, there is.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. I know that there was a bill of that kind introduced in the last Congress by a distinguished Republican ex-Cabinet officer; I do not know whether that bill went through or not. But everybody is moving along in this line; and it is a movement in the right direction.

Mr. BUSHNELL. Does the gentleman from Ohio say—

Mr. OUTHWAITE. My recollection is that the same provi-

sion applies to the National Soldiers' Home for soldiers of the regular Army. At any rate, the statement is correct that the soldiers in such home pay a certain sum out of their pensions to the support of the institution.

Mr. BUSHNELL. I simply wanted to know whether any distinction was made between volunteer soldiers and regular soldiers who are inmates of these homes.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. This pension bill does not relate to that matter.

Mr. BUSHNELL. I know it.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Chairman, another of the provisions to which not much objection is made is the provision that, on and after July 1, 1893, no pension shall be paid to a nonresident, not a citizen of the United States, unless he was wounded or disabled in the service.

Mr. MORSE. I will vote for that.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman from Vermont that this will probably not cut down the vast appropriation a great deal, but it will cut it down some.

A MEMBER. How much?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. I have not any estimate on that point.

Mr. BOUTELLE. As the gentleman from Massachusetts looked at me, I suppose he wanted my particular attention on this point. I will simply ask him whether he thinks that a man who came over here from some adjacent region—Canada, for instance—and did the duty which the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who preceded the gentleman from Massachusetts, failed to perform, and which the gentleman from Massachusetts was probably too young to perform—

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Rather.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Is any less entitled to a pension than either of those gentlemen would have been if they had entered the service and fought for their own country?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. If the man was wounded or disabled in the service this does not prevent him from drawing a pension. The history of these foreigners who came over here—almost one-half of them from Canada—is that they came over in the last year or eighteen months of the war, when big bounties were being paid, and that many of them after enlisting never got beyond the State limits.

Mr. PICKLER. There were a great many exceptions to that remark.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. I admit it.

Mr. WAUGH. What objection should there be if the soldier was a citizen of the United States at the time of his enlistment, and served faithfully in the Army for a period of two years—

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. This would not affect him, but would protect him.

Mr. WAUGH. Not unless his disabilities accrued during the war.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Now, I would like to have the floor myself for a little while.

Mr. BOUTELLE. How much money does this proposition save?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. There has been no estimate made, so far as I know.

Mr. TUCKER. Five hundred thousand dollars.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Do you not think this is a pretty small business unless it is going to save a great deal of money?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The question is whether the principle is right, not the amount of money that is involved.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield for a minute until I can read the law on the subject referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BUSHNELL]?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Will not my friend from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] go over and whisper that matter into the ear of the gentleman from Wisconsin while I talk to the other members for a while? [Laughter.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE (to Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts). The law sustains your position in regard to these national homes.

Mr. HOLMAN. Let us have it read.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Very well.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I read from section 4 of an act of March 3, 1883:

That any inmate of the home who is receiving a pension from the Government and who has a child, wife, or parent living shall be entitled, by filing with the pension agent from whom he receives his money a written direction to that effect, to have his pension, or any part of it, paid to such child, wife, or parent. The pensions of all who now are or shall hereafter become inmates of the home, except such as shall be assigned as aforesaid, shall be paid to the treasurer of the home. The money thus derived shall not become a part of the funds of the home, but shall be held by the treasurer in trust for the pensioner to whom it would otherwise have been paid, and such part of it as shall not sooner have been paid to him shall be paid to him on his discharge from the institution.

Mr. HOUK of Ohio. Does not that recognize the ownership

of the pensioner in the pension all the time, and never takes it away from him to cover it into the Treasury.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which will probably excite a great deal of opposition is that which provides:

That from and after July 1, 1893, no pension shall be paid to any person drawing a pension under the provisions of chapter 634 of the act of the year 1890, unless he shall show that he is disabled for manual labor, and unless he shall show to the satisfaction of the Pension Office, by proper affidavits, that his annual income is less than \$600 a year.

Mr. MORSE. We are not going to enact it, though.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Well, you will not strike it out without a fight.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, then, we will have a fight.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. I believe that will meet the suggestions of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. TARSNEY] in his remarks to-day, and that it exactly means what the people of this country meant and what they desired to do for the soldiers of the country, and what was intended to be accomplished by the act of June 27, 1890. It never was intended when that act was passed here that able-bodied men should go to the Pension Department and draw pensions.

Mr. PICKLER. Neither can they.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. And it can not be denied that there are thousands of able-bodied men drawing pensions to-day, men who are as well able to earn a living by their own manual labor as my friend from South Dakota or myself.

Mr. PICKLER. Your doctors, commissioners, and everybody else who knows anything about the matter deny that.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. They are yours, you mean. [Laughter.]

(Several members addressed questions to Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to the floor, and declines to be interrupted. Business will be suspended until gentlemen resume their seats.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Now, Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many there are in this House who have ever considered how unequal, how unjust and inequitable are the pension laws as they are on our statute books to-day? No man, under the act of June 27, 1890, draws a less pension than \$6 a month, and the great majority of them are entitled to \$12 a month. If they die their widows can draw a pension of \$8 a month, if she was married to the soldier before the 27th day of June, 1890; and yet on the pension roll on the 30th day of June, 1892, we find a very singular condition of affairs.

Let me call your attention—the attention of men claiming to be the only friends of the soldier—to the condition of affairs as they appear on that roll, drawing pensions under the laws passed previous to June 27, 1890.

On the 30th day of June, 1892, 13,000 pensioners were on the roll drawing only \$2 a month.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Well, let us set them up.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. And you can not do it until you have purged the list of frauds and only give as far as possible to deserving soldiers pensions, for the Treasury is nearly bankrupt now.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Well, make a motion to that effect and you will get all the votes on this side of the House and none on the other.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Until this list is purged you can not expect that the deserving soldier shall receive the pension to which he is entitled.

Mr. PICKLER. Have you any fraudulent pensioners in your district?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. I do not know.

On that list, Mr. Chairman, to which I have called attention on the date mentioned, there were 106,916 soldiers on the pension roll of \$6 a month or less; you have 181,157 drawing \$8 or less; you have 215,969 drawing \$10 or less, and you have 266,684 drawing \$12 or less. On this roll you have also 102,000 women drawing pensions at the rate of \$12 a month. I want to say that the amendment proposed in this bill will affect hardly one of them.

Now, sir, the man who was wounded or who contracted disease in the service is entitled to a pension; but the man who came out of the service safe and sound and afterwards, in the battle of life, by some accident in the walks of life has been injured, is not entitled to a pension if he is able to earn a living. I say he has no claim whatever on the nation or on the Treasury of the people for a pension. The whole history of pension legislation, from the beginning until the act of June 27, 1890, is in an exact line with the provision which we seek to incorporate in this bill.

There is a great deal of fault found because the committee have brought in a provision which they want incorporated in the bill which deprives the widows from drawing pensions

unless they married within five years after the close of the war. I have been asked a number of times why it was that we did not make that apply to the close of the war.

The war of the rebellion drew young blood, as well as the men of mature age, into the Army, and the records show that a great number of men between 16 and 25 went to the front.

I believe that the woman who allowed her husband to go to the front is worthy of receiving a pension from a grateful country. I believe that the dependent mother or father who allowed her or his son to go to the war is worthy of a pension. I believe that the young girl engaged to be married to a young man who went to the war, and who, after the war was over, kept her engagement, is as much entitled to a pension as either of the others, and the provision which we seek to incorporate into this bill takes care of those three classes; and I say that the sentiment of the country is against going one jot further than that.

Let me call the attention of the committee to a little historical legislation on this very subject, enacted shortly after the war of the rebellion.

When the country was teeming with gratitude, and when there were not so many millions of people in the country as there are to-day who were not alive when the war was going on, a bill came up pensioning the widows of the war of 1812, and I particularly want to call the attention of my friend from Indiana to this—

Mr. BINGHAM. Who is your friend from Indiana?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. HOLMAN]. They are all my friends, for that matter, but my particular friend, Mr. HOLMAN.

Mr. TUCKER. Who is in favor of economy, and therefore in favor of this bill.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. This amendment was offered to the act pensioning the soldiers and widows of the war of 1812:

And the surviving widows of such officers and enlisted and drafted men who are in like dependent circumstances: *Provided*, That such widows shall have been married, prior to the treaty of peace which terminated said war, to an officer or enlisted or drafted man who served in said war.

That amendment was offered by the distinguished present chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. HOLMAN, in 1870, and unanimously adopted by the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. DINGLEY. I am unable to see that the amendment that is proposed is in the line even of the gentleman's argument. It provides that no person shall be paid a pension as the widow of any soldier of any war—

unless said widow was married to the soldier within five years after the close of the war in which her husband served.

What becomes of the widows who married during the war?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Oh, my adroit friend from Maine—

Mr. BINGHAM. But that is the wording of your amendment.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Then we will fix that.

Mr. DINGLEY. It only shows the looseness with which this amendment has been framed.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. It has not been offered yet.

Mr. MILLIKEN. It has been pretty thoroughly discussed, if it has not been offered.

Mr. HOLMAN. Who had that bill in charge, with reference to pensions of the war of 1812?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Mr. Willard. I want to say that this amendment was drawn all right in the first place, but in deference to the views of other men on the committee who thought it would be an outrage to take in only the widows of the war of the rebellion—

Mr. BINGHAM (interrupting). And it would have been.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts (continuing). And not include the widows of the war of 1812 and the Mexican war, an amendment was offered, which amendment to the amendment was loosely drawn, I admit, and it may not be in as good shape as it will be when offered for consideration by the House.

That is the history of that legislation of 1870. Five years after the war Congress thought that a woman ought not to receive a pension unless she was married to a soldier before or during the war. There could not, of course, have been any question at that time about the widows of the war of the rebellion, because it was very shortly after.

Now, I say that the other amendment in relation to cutting off the pensions of those who were not actually wounded or disabled is in the line of the pension legislation of this Government for all time. I want to send to the Clerk's desk and have read a section from the very excellent compilation made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. PEARSON], and which I hope every member of the House will take a copy of, which shows the invalid pension act for the Revolutionary war.

The Clerk read as follows:

Invalid pensions for known wounds: Any commissioned officer, or non-commissioned officer, musician, soldier, marine, or seaman disabled in the actual service of the United States while in the line of his duty, by known wounds received during the Revolutionary war, and who did not desert the service, or who in consequence of disability as aforesaid, resigned his commission or took a discharge, or who after incurring disability as aforesaid was taken captive by the enemy, and remained either in captivity or on parole until the close of said Revolutionary war, or who in consequence of known wounds received as aforesaid, has, at any period since, become and continued disabled in such manner as to render him unable to procure a subsistence by manual labor, whether such officer, musician, soldier, marine, or seaman served as a volunteer in any proper service against the common enemy, or belonged to a detachment of the militia which served against the common enemy, or to the regular forces of the United States, or of any particular State, shall, upon substantiating his claim, be placed on the pension list of the United States during life, or the continuance of such disability, and be entitled to receive such sum as shall be found just and proper by the testimony adduced.—[Section 1, act of April 10, 1806, vol. 2, p. 378.]

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Now, sir, that act provided that pensioners only should be paid in case of wounds or disabilities incurred in the service.

Mr. WAUGH. Will not the gentleman give us the year? Was it not in 1806?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. If you will look a little beyond that, you will find they went even further. These acts were only for a period of five years. They were continued on and on until 1818, when they were made permanent.

After the passage of the act of 1818, the payments for pensions doubled, so that in the next Congress they put a provision in the law which compelled every applicant for a pension to go before his county clerk and make affidavit as to what his effects were worth, and what his income was; and unless he could show that he needed a pension he could not get it. That legislation was passed thirty-seven years after the Revolutionary war was over.

Now, sir, we have a little more recent legislation even than this. Yes; by this very House of Representatives. We have passed an act here increasing the pension to Mexican veterans from \$8 to \$12 a month. Just look a minute what must be proven before these men can get that increase:

On account of service in Mexican war, and who is wholly disabled from manual labor, and in such destitute circumstances that \$8 a month are insufficient to provide him the necessities of life.

Then the pension is increased to \$12. You have no such provision proposed by the Committee on Appropriations to-day. They merely say that if the applicant is unable to earn his living by manual labor, not wholly disabled, and can prove that his annual income is less than \$800 a year he shall be entitled to a pension. That takes care absolutely of every veteran in the war; because this does not touch the men who were wounded or diseased in the service. It does take care of the men who to-day are in reduced circumstances and unable to earn a living, even though they were not wounded or disabled in the service.

Another incongruity in the law is the fact that when, in 1886, the pension of widows was raised from \$8 to \$12 a month, it was provided in the act that the increase to \$12 should not be paid to any widow unless she married the soldier previous to 1886. So you see that these limitations proposed by the committee are not new subjects at all; they are merely in the line of other limitations made heretofore. Now, while a woman could get a pension of \$12 a month if married previous to 1886, if she marries a soldier from now out she is entitled to a pension of \$8 a month under the law. It did not give her \$8 a month, but merely said that if she married after 1886 she should only be entitled to \$8. I have here a telegram from the Commissioner of Pensions affirming that fact.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that this is not a popular thing to do. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. HOLMAN] will bear me out that after I had been appointed on that committee I asked one favor of him. That was, that I should not be put upon the subcommittee on pensions. In his wisdom, however, he saw fit to put me there; and, having been put there, I could see nothing for me to do except my duty as I saw it. When I saw this enormous pension roll growing, getting out of sight; when I heard complaints from Democrats and Republicans—why, I could hold this House for hours reading letters from gallant soldiers, from men who were fighters during the war, favoring the cutting off of improper names from the list.

Mr. PICKLER. We are all in favor of cutting them off.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. I do not think so, from the way some people act.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman tell us of any improper names on the list? Will he give us just one? You are masquerading before the soldiers as to those who have improperly received pensions. Let us know who they are.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Why, the men who came out of the war safe and sound in health and limb, and who to-day are able to earn a living.

Mr. PICKLER. No such man is drawing a pension. There is not an instance in the country where such a man is drawing a pension.

Mr. DICKERSON. About half of them are.

Mr. PICKLER. I defy anybody to name such a man.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I had sent to me the platform adopted by the Veterans' Patriotic League, which is as follows:

VETERANS' PATRIOTIC LEAGUE.

The undersigned, who served in the Army or Navy of the United States in the civil war, viewing with pain the growth of demoralizing ideas in reference to pensions, associate ourselves together under the name of the Veterans' Patriotic League, for the purpose of cherishing the spirit of unselfish patriotism, and subscribe to the following expression of belief:

We believe that every American owes to his country in time of war, military service as the simple duty of a citizen and as a debt, in return for the protection and blessings of free government.

We believe that the utmost which the country owes in return is the payment of pensions to those who were disabled in the service and to their families after their death.

We believe that in view of the munificent system of pensions already in operation, together with the establishment of soldiers' homes, and the preference given to veterans in public employment, to ask anything further is ungracious and ungrateful.

We believe that for all veterans who were not disabled in service the good fortune of having lived in such stirring times, the opportunity of serving their country in the hour of need, the glory of participation in so momentous a struggle, and the consciousness of having discharged the highest duty of American citizenship constitute a sufficient reward for the sacrifices they were called upon to endure.

We believe that every American owes to his country in time of peace, the duty of earning his own living; and that this obligation is not canceled or weakened by army service.

We believe that every veteran (not disabled in the service) who accepts a pension while able to support his family is lowering the tone of American independence and patriotism and selfishly increasing the burden of taxation upon his fellow citizens.

We believe that Congresses, Legislatures, and veteran organizations, in all measures pertaining to soldiers, are bound to consider the interests of the country first, and of the soldier second.

We believe any extension of the pension system beyond the point already reached, especially in the direction of a "service pension," to be unnecessary, demoralizing, and pernicious.

BOSTON, January 30, 1893.

I hereby certify that I have in my possession the signatures of over sixty veterans who subscribed to the above declaration.

A. D. HODGES, JR.,
Acting Secretary, V. P. L.

Box 1857, Boston.

And I ask members of this House to read that platform adopted by the veterans of the Union Army, and to notice that the amendments proposed to this bill by the Committee on Appropriations are almost in a line with that platform. When this act of 1890 was passed, I voted for it, as I have voted for almost every bill in the interest of the soldier.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will pardon a suggestion, I do not think he voted for the conference report, because he was paired with his colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. I do not remember that.

Mr. BINGHAM. But I do not suppose for a moment that the gentleman was against it. I merely wish to refresh his recollection as to the fact.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, when that bill was considered by the Grand Army of the Republic in convention, while they thanked the Congress of the United States for passing it, they explicitly declared a preference for a service pension bill.

Now, I want to call attention to the fact that all the soldiers who are alive to-day are not members of the Grand Army. The latest report from their adjutant-general shows under four hundred thousand enrolled members in good standing in the Grand Army. There are about eleven hundred thousand veterans of the war alive to-day, and with the Grand Army itself divided as to the best kind of a pension to be given, I protest against their being brought in here as favoring the law of 1890, or if they do, I deny that they represent all the veterans of the war.

I want to read a word from the journal of the National Encampment Grand Army of the Republic, quoting Secretary of the Navy Tracy, when he said:

While I believe that we should not be carried away even by a generous sentiment to a liberality beyond our means, I for one can not refuse my assent to the principle which our pension legislation has enacted into law, that no man who risked his life in the defense of the Union should ever want for bread.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a man on this side of the House, there is not a loyal American citizen anywhere, who will not indorse every word of that sentiment of Secretary Tracy, or who will not stand up with voice and vote in favor of preventing any man who fought for his country from ever wanting bread.

The thing that we protest against is charity, a gratuity given to those who neither deserve it nor need it; because there is no man who is entitled to a pension, no man who served his country and suffered from wounds or diseases, no man to-day who is so reduced that he can not earn his living but is entitled to a pension from the Government, and for one I scorn and repudiate the notion that any such gift as that is charity, but deserving men are dragged down when undeserving names are placed on the pension roll. He ought to be supported by the Government he saved.

But the men who are strong and able-bodied ought not to fasten like leeches on the purse strings of the Government and draw from the Treasury what they do not need. Why, sir, did you, my colleague from Massachusetts (addressing Mr. COGSWELL), who when but 22 years of age turned your law office into a recruiting office and formed one of the first companies that went to the front, the first company in the Union, I believe, that enlisted for the war—did you have any thought then of a pension? What thought of that kind had a single man in your command? What man of you all during your four years of gallant service ever thought of anything but the salvation of his country and the preservation of the Union? And you, my colleague on the committee (addressing Mr. BINGHAM) who are to follow me, I presume, graduating in the morning from your college, not even turning your steps homeward to see the parents who had sent you there, but with sixty-three of your classmates enlisting on the afternoon of the day you graduated and going to the front, did you then or afterwards ever think of asking the Government for a pension?

During all your gallant service in the war did you or the men under you think that you ought at some time or other, whether you needed it or not, to fasten yourselves on the Treasury of the Government and draw from it what you did not need? You never did. Nor my other colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT]. Nothing was further from his mind, I will aver, than the thought that one day or other he would demand a pension from his Government. The men who went to the front went there to save their country. They paid a debt they owed to her.

The wives whom they left behind and who possibly might become widows were promised by the Government that they would be taken care of; but I deny that there ever was any promise made that the women who married these men twenty years after the war should have pensions. We have one of the three great war governors in my native State. Let me read a word addressed by him to the volunteers at that time. His son is to-day an honored and worthy member of this House. This is what Gov. John A. Andrew said at that time when he was sending these men to the front:

We stay behind to guard the hearthstones you have left; and whatever may be the future, we will protect the wives and the children you may leave. As you will be faithful to the country, so will we be faithful to them.

Faithful to those they left then—not those who might be left twenty-six or fifty-six years afterward. Let me read one other quotation from a gallant ex-governor of Massachusetts, Mr. Clifford, as he bid the New Bedford Guards godspeed on their way to the front:

Disturb not your minds about the care of your families. Your fellow-citizens will see to it that those you leave behind shall need nothing while you are gone.

And well was that promise kept. Not only in Massachusetts, not only in Indiana, but in every Northern State organizations were formed for the purpose of taking care of the families left behind by the gallant men who went to the front.

Let me contrast the action of the women who, twenty-six or thirty years after the war, marry soldiers and draw pensions from the Government, with that of the old widow lady in a town of your district [addressing Mr. COGSWELL], who, in order to do her little mite toward helping the families of the soldiers who had gone to the war, walked 4 miles to contribute 5 cents toward the support of those families.

Contrast that with the system which has grown up to-day. Why, sir, these people believe that they have a right to this thing; and they never so considered until the legislation of these later days instilled that doctrine into their hearts.

Oh, no! patriotism ought to come higher than dollars. You never can impress upon the youth of this country that the preservation of this great land is a patriotic duty when they can look around and see a pension list growing in five years from one hundred to two hundred million dollars.

Will you pardon me, Mr. Chairman, if I make one other suggestion? Gallant as were the services of these men who went to the front, yet, as was well said by the gentleman from Missouri, they merely performed their duty. They owed it to the land which gave them birth or the land which they had adopted to preserve it with life if necessary. And after all, Mr. Chairman, when we look at the legislation on the statute books of the country it must be conceded that pretty good care has been taken of the soldier to-day.

One of the last acts signed by President Lincoln was an act giving preference in civil appointments to the men who had been disabled by wounds or disease incurred in the war for the Union. In almost every State of the North similar legislation is enforced in regard to State appointments. In the State of Massachusetts a veteran is entitled to the preference over every private citizen for appointment to any place for which he is competent; and his competency may be determined after he is appointed.

The other day a Democratic Senator had passed at the other end of this building a bill giving still greater preference in reference to national offices to soldiers of the rebellion. A Democratic committee of this House has reported a bill very similar in its character, enlarging the privileges granted to ex-soldiers in reference to the national offices. When we look around and see my friend from Massachusetts, my friend from Vermont, my friend from Pennsylvania, and many other gallant soldiers serving in this House, it is hard for us to believe that republics are really ungrateful.

It does seem that this age of ours is keeping pace with the ages that have rolled away; for the people here, as in all time, revere the man who shows his pluck upon the battlefield. They are willing now, as they have always been, to give to such men special privileges. The bill which we propose, with the amendments which we ask you to incorporate in it, takes away none of these just privileges. It merely says that if a man is able to earn a living he should not draw a pension from the Government, except for actual wounds or disabilities contracted in service. It does not retract or attempt to retract any of the laws now on the statute book giving preference in public employment to those who served their country faithfully in the war.

Why, sir, in my city a laboring man can not get a chance to dig in the streets of the city if there is a veteran on the list ahead of him. That is the case not only in the laboring department; it is so through every rank and every station of official life. From the laborer to the highest-paid clerk the veteran has the preference. I have voted for bills giving such preferences, and I will vote for them now.

But why should objection be made when we come in here and say to you that if a man has an income of \$600 a year he should not be entitled to a pension? When every man in this House knows that in 1880 the average yearly earnings of the mechanical and manufacturing workmen of the country was less than \$400, and when Mr. Porter to-day places the annual earnings at less than \$500, it does seem, Mr. Speaker, that in justice to the people of the country generally this bill is not asking too much.

I believe if these amendments were adopted and the law was carried out in accordance with them that we could very easily cut down this appropriation \$20,000,000. It would not cut a very wide swath amongst the widows. As I understand from the best information I can get, it would cut down 40,000 out of the 200,000; but the great saving would be in the widows that are to come. From the best information I can get as to the amendment providing that no man shall draw a pension unless he is disabled and in receipt of less than \$600 a year income, we can cut down the expenditures some ten or fifteen millions of dollars.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman allow this question right there? I believe Gen. Black, late Commissioner of Pensions, was drawing \$5,000 a year salary from the Government and at the same time was getting \$100 a month for pension. Would you cut that off?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Surely.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And cut off Raum's pension, too.

Mr. PICKLER. Will the gentleman allow me a moment? Suppose, now, that Gen. BINGHAM—and I presume the gentleman alluded to him a little while ago—returned from the Army and did not marry, or that some of his classmates did not marry for six months after they got home, do you not think that it would be a little unfair to their widows to refuse to grant them a pension under such an act?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. If you will tell me any reason why their widows should have a pension, perhaps I can answer your question a little better.

Mr. PICKLER. Under the law of June, 1890, they did not get a pension unless they married before the passage of that act.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. But Gen. BINGHAM carries four bullet wounds in his legs.

Mr. PICKLER. That not would help his widow any on your bill.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. If she did not marry the soldier previous to 1880, I do not propose that she should be entitled to a pension.

Mr. SCOTT. I want to ask, in connection with Gen. Black's pension, whether that was not provided by a special act of Congress.

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. I do not know.

Mr. SCOTT. I understand that is the fact.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman allow me a word further? Would you cut off Gen. Sickles's pension? Now, I am going to ask the gentleman if he does not think that a man who lost his leg in the Army and has to go about on crutches, as Gen. Sickles does, does not deserve the \$100 a month from the Government, although he may get \$5,000 a year for his services here, the same amount that a man gets who never went into the Army at all?

In other words, would not the gentleman himself much prefer to be a well man with two legs, and getting his \$5,000 a year without pension, than to be crippled like Gen. Sickles and go about on crutches and draw his pension of \$100 a month? Do you not think a man deserves something for his loss as well as for his services?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. The answer is that the gentleman has not read the proposed amendment, because that does not affect a man like him at all.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Why not?

Mr. MILLIKEN. If it would not effect him then, as I understand you, you do not cut off a man who gets \$5,000 a year, but you apply this to the smaller pensions and in the case of the men who have only an income of \$600 a year. Is there any aristocracy in your proposition?

Mr. WARNER. Let me ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if it is not true that the amendment will affect not so much the widows now married as those who are not yet even wives?

Mr. O'NEIL of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no use in trying to begot the House. The amendment as proposed applies only to the act of 1890. The other provisions I say do not affect anybody who is deserving of the consideration of the Government. It would cut off, as I have said, perhaps 40,000 widows. In the States in which these women live there are, perhaps 2,000,000 of other widows who did not happen to marry soldiers, but are in just as needy circumstances as these 40,000 women affected by this act.

When I have shown, as no one will deny, that Mr. Wright in his report of 1880, and Mr. Porter in his report in 1890, show that the average earnings of those engaged in mercantile and mechanical occupations is less than \$500 a year, it does seem to me that we ought to legislate a little for the men all over the land who toil and moil in the ditch and on the street, who work night and day on the farm, at the bench, or in the manufacturing establishment, who after they have worked and run down at sixty, have no pension to look forward to.

We all owe a duty to the Government. It is our duty in time of need to protect it; and in protecting the Government we are protecting ourselves. If you had not protected the Government in 1860, where would you be now? Every man here knows that the partial dissolution of the Union meant its gradual total dissolution; that if it had been divided in 1860 it was only a question of time when we would have had forty separate governments in this country. It is because we have one grand Government, that we have the best country in the world, and the best opportunities for advancement, financial, social, and political, for man, woman, and child.

It was that grand Government and that consummation that these men fought for, and when they fought they were working just as hard for themselves as they were for us and their children. It was not a one-sided duty. We were all interested, and they were all interested, those who went to the front and those who stayed behind.

Before I close let me again repeat that these amendments do not affect the men who were wounded or who contracted disease while in the service. It does not affect the pension of the wife, dependent mother, or father who allowed the husband or son to go to the front to fight their country's battles. It does not affect those who served honorably during the war and who came out safe and sound but since that time have become unable to earn a living and who need the help of the Government—they absolutely take care of all who deserve and who need pensions.

To-night being pension night, the House will take a recess at 5 o'clock, and I will not take up any more time of the House now, but I may have a word more to say when we discuss the bill under the five-minute rule. [Applause.]

I wish to call attention to the following documents, which I submit as a part of my remarks:

SALEM, MASS., January 28, 1893.

At the tenth national convention, Woman's Relief Corps, a resolution was passed "That the Woman's Relief Corps unite in a movement whereby the inmates of soldiers' homes shall be required to pay over a portion of their pension money each quarter for the support of wives and families dependent upon them."

A committee was appointed to confer with the management of the several homes and others relative to their views upon the matter, and to ask co-operation in presenting a measure to be enacted by Congress.

From responses received from letters sent out we now present this statement of the matter we would like embodied in the bill.

First. That all inmates of soldiers' homes, both national and State, be ordered, upon admission to the homes, to assign their pension money to the treasurer of said homes to be used—

1. For the maintenance of wife or dependent family where there are such dependents.

2. In the absence of such dependent family, that the money shall revert to the home for the maintenance of the home.

3. That the treasurer of the home may set aside a portion of the pension, not exceeding \$2 per month, for the use of the inmate for spending money, unless in the judgment of the superintendent of the home such money will be used for purposes injurious to the individual and the home.

The reasons for the assignment of the pension money to the treasurer of

the homes, as is now done in many of the homes, is that so divided the treasurers are better able to investigate the condition of these men and if they have families. In State homes this is especially true, and in national homes the governors state their willingness and ability to investigate all cases brought to their knowledge.

The recommendation that in the absence of dependent family the money shall revert to the home, is founded upon the intent of the pension law itself to pay to these disabled or destitute men a sum sufficient for their maintenance. If they are already maintained by the national and State governments in the homes, the money then set aside should revert to the home toward its maintenance.

Another reason is that in a large majority of cases the money is spent in ways detrimental to the homes and injurious to the men. (See letters from Gen. Stephenson, of Togus, and others.)

The provision for the reservation of a small sum for spending money is in accordance with the general usage already adopted at most of the State homes, and is found in a marked degree satisfactory.

This matter is no longer experimental in the State home, but is already successfully established, thus proving its wisdom and practicability; but notwithstanding the so-called rule of the National Home, there is constant evasion, and the need of a common law for all becomes apparent.

We therefore submit these matters to your consideration, believing the time has arrived for this important reform in existing pension laws.

Respectfully submitted,

EMMA B. LOWD,
Chairman of National Woman's Relief Corps Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, December 19, 1892.

DEAR MADAM: I acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 12th instant, calling my attention to the fact that the Woman's Relief Corps has united in the movement whereby the inmates of the soldiers' homes shall be required to pay over a portion of their pension money each quarter for the support of their wives and families dependent upon them, and that a committee was appointed by your corps to confer with the management of several homes and others relative to their views upon the matter, and to ask co-operation in presenting a measure to carry out this idea to be enacted by Congress.

In reply I beg to inform you that my attention has been brought to the general subject a number of times and I am heartily in sympathy with this movement. I have no doubt that many soldiers who avail themselves of the privileges of a soldiers' home dispose of their pension money with due regard to the interests of their families, but I am equally well satisfied that a great number of old soldiers who live at a home are neglectful in this regard and waste their money in drink and by other useless expenditures. I think that the management of the soldiers' homes should be fully invested with authority to require a reasonable proportion of the pension money to be transmitted to the wife for the benefit of the soldier's family where the soldier himself is kept at a home.

I beg to inform you that I have heard suggestions to the effect that where a soldier is supported at a soldiers' home and also receives a pension, a portion of the money should be turned over as part of the revenues of the home. Whether Congress would take this view of the case if the general subject was brought to its attention, is a question which, of course, I am not able to answer. It occurs to me, however, that if the officers having charge of the soldiers' homes would bring this subject to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and follow it up before the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, a proviso might be added to the appropriation bill making the proper enactment to cover this case; and I think it would be well for you to direct your energies to that point.

Very respectfully,

GREEN B. RAUM, Commissioner.

Mrs. EMMA B. LOWD,
Chairman of Committee, Salem, Mass.

CHICAGO, December 20, 1892.

DEAR MADAM: I have received your communication of December 18, with its inclosure, and have forwarded the same to Gen. William B. Franklin, president of the Board of Managers, National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, to be brought before the Board at its next meeting, for consideration. I beg to state that the Board has already provided by its regulations for the transfer to the family of inmates of the National Home of a large share of the pensions which may belong to such inmates, except in unusual cases, wherever we can obtain the consent of the inmate to such transfer, and my understanding is that usually they make such transfer through the treasurer without hesitation.

It occurs to me that if you are aware of instances in which such transfers have not been made, and will state the facts in a communication, addressed as above, to the president of the Board, the facts in each particular case will be sought for, and if a relief is deemed desirable the Board will do what it can to secure such relief. I beg you to bear in mind that we have generally found the veteran inmates of the home willing to do what they can toward the support of their families from the pensions. Further communications by you in relation to this matter should be addressed to Gen. Franklin.

Very respectfully, your fellow-citizen,

JOHN C. BLACK,
Second Vice-President and Manager.

Mrs. EMMA B. LOWD, Salem, Mass.

HARTFORD, CONN., December 23, 1892.

DEAR MADAM: Gen. Black has sent me your letters to him and his answer to you. Your statement that many members of the home who are pensioners send no portion of their pensions to their families is doubtless correct. But when a soldier applies for admission to the home he is required to state whether he has dependent relatives and who they are. If he says, as is too often the case, that he has none when he really has them, the matter is ended. But if it comes to the knowledge of a manager of the home or to that of the authorities of the branch of the home where the soldier is that he has such dependents and that he sends no portion of his pension to them, the matter is referred to me.

In every such case the governor is directed to call the man before him, learn the facts, and if he find that the statement is correct, he is to inform the man that if he does not authorize the treasurer of the branch to send a specific amount of his pension to his dependents he will be dishonorably discharged from the home, not again to be readmitted, without action of the Board of Managers. In some cases men make damaging statements about their wives to excuse their failings, but such statements are investigated and their truth or falsehood determined.

It may be that the punishment is severe, but the Board considers that a man who will keep and spend his pension on himself, when he has depend-

ents, he being well fed, clothed, and housed, "is worse than an infidel," and unfit for association with decent men.

In some cases the wife is in collusion with the pensioned husband, and when she receives the money from the pension immediately returns it to him. In such cases the husband would be dishonorably discharged, as above mentioned. Fictitious names are given, too, and the money then comes back to the man.

The home has no right to keep any portion of a man's pension without his consent. Its only redress for false statements and inhuman conduct by pensioners is dishonorable discharge.

I do not believe that a law can be passed at present that would give the apportionments of the pensions of the members of the home to the managers, nor would it be prudent. I think, for the Board of Managers to ask for such a law. There is an unfounded feeling that the Board is anxious to confiscate the pensions already.

A law that would require all pensioners above \$8 per month to pay a proportional part for their maintenance until the amount paid should reach the actual cost of maintenance, the proportion to be fixed by the Board of Managers, would be proper and just.

Perhaps a clause requiring the Board of Managers to stop out of the pension also such amount as in its judgment should be paid to dependents, and to pay that amount to the dependents, would go through, but I have great doubt of it.

I think a law requiring the pensioners to pay for their maintenance will be very unpopular with them, and would cause a depletion of the home temporarily, but they would come back again.

Respectfully yours,

W. B. FRANKLIN,
President Board of Managers, National Home
for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

EMMA B. LOWD,
Chairman of National Woman's Relief Corps Committee, Salem, Mass.

RHODE ISLAND SOLDIERS' HOME, Bristol, December 14, 1892.

DEAR MADAM: In reply to yours of the 8th instant, I have to say that I am personally in accord with the spirit of the proposed action of the Woman's Relief Corps in relation to the legislation for the division of pensions, so that the dependents of the pensioner (if he be an inmate of a soldiers' home, whether national or State) may be in a measure provided for.

I would go even further still and advocate the enactment of a law (general) that should provide that all pensioners, inmates of soldiers' homes, should be compelled to turn over all their pension to the boards of managers, who should control such sums received, to be disbursed to the pensioner or his dependents, or both, as in the judgment of the board may seem best.

If you have visited many of the soldiers' homes, and observed the working of the present system, you must have observed that the money received by a large number of the inmates is practically wasted, and the intent of the pension law is entirely lost sight of, and instead of a blessing the result is, in many instances, far from beneficial to the health and moral character of the beneficiary.

I send by same mail as this a copy of the report of S.B. S.R. of Rhode Island. You will find therein the rules adopted by the board in relation to pensions.

The subject of pensions has been a problem with all States that have established soldiers' homes, and the prime cause of most of the trouble among the inmates, so far as my observation reaches.

I am glad to see that your noble organization has taken up this matter, for it shows that no politics influence you, and you certainly can not be accused of disloyalty to the worthy veterans.

May God grant you wisdom in your good work.

Very truly yours,

BENJAMIN L. HALL, Commandant.

Mrs. EMMA B. LOWD,
Chairman Committee Woman's Relief Corps.

NORTHWESTERN BRANCH,
NATIONAL HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS,
Milwaukee County, Wis., December 29, 1892.

MADAM: In response to your letter of the 16th instant I desire to say that I am heartily in accord with the Woman's Relief Corps in their effort to procure relief for the families of soldiers pensioners, who are now or shall become members of the National Home, by the passage of a law compelling them to relinquish at least a part of their pensions for the benefit of their families.

From my observation I am satisfied that a very small proportion of the money paid out for pensions at this branch is used for the support of family or any other worthy object, and that on the other hand it has become a curse to the men who receive it. That there are many suffering families to whom this money would prove a great blessing there is no question, and I am certainly in favor of any law passed by Congress to bring about this much desired result.

I believe that if this matter is taken up in earnest by the Woman's Relief Corps and by the Grand Army of the Republic and presented to Congress there will be no difficulty in getting a proper law passed.

From a recent interview with Commander-in-Chief Weissert, of the Grand Army of the Republic, I know that he is heartily in favor of the movement and will give all possible aid towards its accomplishment.

Very respectfully,

CORNELIUS WHEELER, Governor.

EMMA B. LOWD, Salem Mass.

EASTERN BRANCH NATIONAL HOME
FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS,
Toqua, Me., December 29, 1892.

MADAM: I am in receipt of your letter of the 16th instant in relation to proposed action on the part of your organization in relation to the pensions of members of the National Home.

I would say that I cordially sympathize with the movement, having years ago become strongly impressed with the fact that the present custom of paying members of the home the full amount of their pensions while the Government was providing for their maintenance was not only unjust to the whole people of the country, but especially so to the veteran soldiers and sailors who are not receiving these benefits, but are compelled to assist in the support of the National Home.

The present membership of the Eastern Branch is 2,080; of this number 1,748 are receiving pensions. Under the act of June 27, 1890, 808 members of this home have received pensions, and I am certain that not one in five could have obtained a pension on account of wounds or disability contracted in the service. In a large portion of these cases disability arises from the violation of moral and physical laws since the war. Seven hundred and fifty-five members receive pensions of \$12 per month and upwards, say from \$12 to \$72.

During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, the pensions paid to members

of this home amounted to \$271,230.85, and of this amount, I am confident from information which I have endeavored to obtain, not over \$30,000 went for the support of dependent relatives. A portion was expended by men on furlough for personal expenses, but probably \$200,000 was squandered.

The remedy for this evil, it seems to me, lies in the passage of a law by Congress requiring that a portion of the pensions of members of the home shall be retained to assist in their support, provided it is not used for the maintenance of their families.

The home furnishes food, lodging, clothing, medical attendance, medicines, books, newspapers, and amusements. The passage of a law as above suggested would be beneficial in two directions. It would reduce the amount of appropriation required for the support of the National Home and lessen the number of members—for many of the men who are receiving large pensions would leave the home if their pensions were taken to assist in their support. As to the amount that should be allowed the pensioner if he had no dependent relatives, I should say that \$6 per month would be amply sufficient.

Very respectfully,

LUTHER STEVENSON, Governor.

Mrs. EMMA B. LOWD,
Chairman of National Woman's Relief Corps Committee, Salem, Mass.

NATIONAL MILITARY HOME,
Leavenworth County, Kans., January 8, 1892.

MY DEAR MADAM: Acknowledging receipt of your letter of recent date, asking for my views as to the projected effort of the Woman's Relief Corps to unite in a movement whereby members of soldiers' homes shall be required to pay over a portion of their pension money each quarter for the support of their wives and families dependent upon them, I desire to state that I am heartily in favor of such legislation as may be deemed necessary to provide for such contingencies.

It frequently happens that members in receipt of pensions fail to assist their needy families. Whenever such neglect comes to my notice I immediately arraign the party, and offer him the alternative of being dishonorably discharged from the home in default of ready acquiescence to an arrangement whereby his wife or family may be relieved from want. An order is required to be signed by the pensioner authorizing the treasurer of the home to deduct from his quarterly stipend a certain sum and remit the same by check.

While the arrangement which is authorized by the Board of Managers of the National Military Home is satisfactory in most instances, it fails of good effect in some. There being no statute requiring pensioners to thus assist their needy families, they can at any time demand their discharge from the home, draw their pensions direct from the agent located nearest to their selected residence, and under the present laws can not be compelled to donate a penny to the support of their families.

I trust that the Woman's Relief Corps may be successful in bringing about a reform in this matter.

Very respectfully,

ANDREW J. SMITH, Governor.

Mrs. EMMA B. LOWD,
Chairman National Woman's Relief Corps Committee, Salem, Mass.

KANSAS STATE SOLDIERS' HOME,
Dodge City, December 31, 1892.

DEAR MADAM: Your favor of the 16th instant received. In reply will say: After an observation of the workings of the matter of pensions to members of national and State homes, I think where a soldier is an inmate of either class of homes that he should be compelled to pay over to his wife or family a portion of the pension quarterly. In this home the wives of the soldiers are kept at the expense of the State; we have only one case where the soldier is here and his family out, and are satisfied the family ought to have all of his pension.

Very truly yours,

D. L. SWEENEY, Commandant,
JOSHUA MITCHELL, Adjutant.

EMMA B. LOWD,
Chairman National Woman's Relief Corps Committee, Salem, Mass.

CENTRAL BRANCH NATIONAL HOME FOR
DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS,
Governor's Office, December 20, 1892.

Respectfully returned to Mrs. Emma B. Lowd, chairman National Woman's Relief Corps Committee, Salem, Mass., with the suggestion that you submit the objects you have in view for ameliorating the condition of the families of soldiers who are members of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to Gen. W. B. Franklin, Hartford, Conn., president of the Board of Managers of the seven branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.

J. B. THOMAS, Governor.

MARION BRANCH, NATIONAL HOME FOR
DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS,
Marion, Ind., December 28, 1892.

Respectfully returned through Gen. W. B. Franklin, president Board of Managers.

The object of your committee is a worthy one. The board of managers requires that members who are pensioners and have families shall contribute to their support, and oftentimes are dishonorably discharged from the home for refusing to do so. But I have no doubt that there are many families of members who receive no assistance from the soldiers and do not make it known to the governor through fear of family disturbance. If a law is enacted that will do justice to all I am of the opinion that it would be beneficial.

JUSTIN H. CHAPMAN, Governor.

SOLDIERS' HOME IN MASSACHUSETTS,
OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT,
Chelsea, December 15, 1892.

DEAR MADAM: Your communication of December 12, informing me of the efforts that are being made to require the inmates of soldiers' homes to pay over a portion of their pension money each quarter for the support of wives and children dependent upon them, has been received, and I am most heartily in accord with any movement that will accomplish that end.

The trustees of our home in Massachusetts require all pensioners who are admitted to the home to turn over their pension checks to the treasurer. They are then allowed and paid by the treasurer \$2 per month, or \$3 for the quarter. If there is a dependent wife or children, the balance is sent to them by the treasurer. If there are no such dependent upon the pensioner the balance goes to the home.

There is no necessity for me to argue the question. There is, to my mind, no room for argument. If the pensioner is a member of a national home or

State home, he should be obliged to remit to his dependent family the larger share of his pension, or on his refusing to do so, he should be denied the privileges of the home.

I can see but one way to successfully move in the matter, and that is to draft your bill, such a one as should be enacted, and have it introduced in Congress by some one who will interest himself in its passage. Then ask the Board of Managers of the National Homes to recommend it; their recommendation or indorsement would have great weight with Congress. Also ask the superintendents of all the State homes to meet and give additional strength to your efforts by their indorsement. This, with the influence the Woman's Relief Corps could bring to bear upon Congress in the shape of petitions favoring such a bill, would in my judgment secure favorable action.

I send you with this an extract from the trustees report of the Minnesota home, which may be of some service to you.

I am, fraternally yours,

GEO. W. CREASEY, *Superintendent.*

Mrs. EMMA B. LOWD,
Chairman of Committee Woman's Relief Corps.

THE TRUSTEES OF SOLDIERS' HOME IN MASSACHUSETTS.
Office of Secretary, Boston, Mass., December 22, 1892.

DEAR MADAM: In reply to your communication of the 21st instant, asking my views and cooperation in relation to the matter of securing for the families of inmates of State or national soldiers' homes a portion of their pension money for the maintenance of said families, I beg leave to say that at the Soldiers' Home at Chelsea, Mass., such a rule has been in existence since June, 1891.

The rule adopted at the Chelsea home is as follows:

The pensioner, immediately upon receiving his quarterly check, turns the same over to the superintendent of the home, who deposits the same with the treasurer of the board of trustees, and it is then subject to the disposition of the said board. After all the pension checks for the quarter have been so deposited, the committee on pensions visits the home, examines each pensioner individually, and, if he has a dependent family, all the pension (less \$2 per month, which is allowed him for his own use) is turned over to said family. If the pensioner has no family, all over \$2 per month goes to the home, unless there is some satisfactory reason for allowing the pensioner some money for any other purpose.

The committee on pensions does not confine itself closely to the rule adopted by the Pension Office as to the dependence upon a pensioner, but if a man has an invalid father, mother or child, though the same would not come within the pension laws, the trustees allow the pension to such an invalid. The board of trustees desires to be very liberal with those in any way dependent upon a pensioner who is an inmate of the home.

I am of the opinion that a law should be enacted by Congress providing that all inmates of national homes be compelled to pay a certain amount of their pensions for maintenance while at such homes, and that in cases where a pensioner has a family or anyone dependent upon him all the pension, less a certain amount, go to said family or dependent ones. I think it is decidedly wrong for a pensioner to be cared for by the United States Government at a national home and receive all his pension money besides while his family are without necessities. I find many cases where veterans are well provided for in this way while their families are struggling for a bare existence.

The only way to bring about a better state of affairs is to lay the matter before the Pension Committee of Congress, presenting a bill covering the case, and I think the justice of the measure would commend itself to every member of Congress.

Since the rule referred to in the first part of this letter was adopted at the Soldiers' Home in Massachusetts we have been gratified to know that families of inmates have been much helped through it, as many families are now getting pension money who used to get no part of it, the pensioner spending it all. At first great dissatisfaction was expressed at the action of the board of trustees in this connection, but in our allotment of the pensions on the 19th instant, 102 cases coming before us, there was not a word of complaint spoken by any pensioner.

The trustees feel gratified to know that the Christmas homes will be brighter and the families of our men more comfortable from the fact that they have this week received the pension money which rightfully belongs to them.

Assuring you that I will be glad to cooperate with you and render you all the assistance in my power towards the enactment of some law covering the points alluded to in your letter, I am

Yours, very respectfully,

GEO. S. EVANS, *Secretary.*

Mrs. EMMA B. LOWD,
Chairman Woman's Relief Corps Committee.

THE TRUSTEES OF THE SOLDIERS' HOME IN MASSACHUSETTS.
Office of Secretary, Boston, Mass., June 1, 1891.

The following rule in relation to members of the home who are receiving United States pensions, or those who may be hereafter admitted, was adopted at the quarterly meeting of the board of trustees, held at the home September 4, 1890:

"PENSION RULE.

"If the applicant for admission to the home is a United States pensioner he shall file with his application a consent or agreement to transfer to the superintendent, immediately after receiving his quarterly pension, the whole amount received by him as such pension, the money so paid to be deposited with the treasurer of the home, subject to the disposition of the board of trustees, and that he will execute any power or vouchers for securing the same. This shall apply to all members of the home.

"Provided, That the trustees may in their discretion allow any portion of such pension for the support of the dependent family of the pensioner.

"And further, That there be allowed to each pensioner the sum of \$2 per month for his own use; but in any case where an improper use is made of such money, leading to misconduct or infraction of the rules of the Home, the payment of the amount to such pensioner may be suspended by vote of the committee on admissions."

By order of the board of trustees.

GEO. S. EVANS, *Secretary.*

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 4, 1893.

MY DEAR MADAM: Your letter of the 21 instant, with inclosure, is at hand. It will be my pleasure to cooperate with you in the direction you mention.

Yours in F., C., and L.,

A. G. WEISSERT,
Commander in Chief.

EMMA B. LOWD, *Salem, Mass.*

Mr. MUTCHLER. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. WILSON of West Virginia, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the pension appropriation bill (H. R. 10345), and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. LOUD, for this evening's session, on account of sickness.

To Mr. SCOTT, for this evening's session, on account of sickness.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9527) to restore to the public domain a portion of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona, and for other purposes.

It also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 3627) to grant to the Gainesville, Oklahoma and Gulf Railway Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, asked a conference with the House on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. JONES of Arkansas, Mr. PLATT, and Mr. DAWES as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

It also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 5504) to permit the withdrawal of certain papers and the signing of certain receipts by John Finn, or his attorney; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

It also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 9955) providing for sundry light-houses and other aids to navigation; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 214) providing for additional telegraphic and electric-light facilities in the city of Washington during the inaugural ceremonies on the 4th day of March, 1893.

It also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 3702) granting to the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railway Company the use of certain lands at Chickasaw Station, and for a "Y" in the Chickasaw Nation, Indian Territory;

A bill (S. 3165) to incorporate the Holstein Friesian Cattle Association of America;

A bill (S. 2130) for the relief of Mrs. Mary P. C. Hooper;

A bill (S. 1683) for the relief of Mrs. Fannie L. Belger;

A bill (S. 3446) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter Buckley;

A bill (S. 707) for the relief of George H. Plant, of the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 3297) granting to the Interstate Water and Electric Power Company of Kansas the right to erect and maintain a dam across the Kansas River, within Wyandotte County, in the State of Kansas;

A bill (S. 3510) to amend section 4347 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

Joint resolution (S. R. 102) to provide for the construction of a wharf as a means of approach to the monument to be erected at Wakefield, Va., to mark the birthplace of George Washington; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 108) directing the appraisalment of the library of Hubert Howe Bancroft.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 8340) to amend an act establishing a Court of Private Land Claims, and to provide for the settlement of private land claims in certain States and Territories, approved March 3, 1891;

A bill (S. 3787) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the St. Marys River, between the States of Florida and Georgia;

A bill (S. 3826) authorizing Velasco and Surfside Terminal Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Galveston and Brazos Canal;

A joint resolution (S. R. 134) authorizing the exhibition at the World's Columbian Exposition of the picture entitled "The Recall of Columbus," by Augustus G. Heaton; and

A bill (S. 3825) to authorize the Homestead and Pittsburg Bridge Company to construct a bridge over the Monongahela River from Pittsburg to Homestead.

LOAN OF FLAGS, INAUGURAL CEREMONIES.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution (S. R. 140) authorizing the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to loan to the committee on inaugural ceremonies, flags, etc. It involves no appropriation.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection to its consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy be, and they are hereby, authorized to loan to the committee on inaugural ceremonies such ensigns, flags, etc. (except battle flags), that are not now in use and may be suitable and proper for decoration and may be spared without detriment to the public service; such flags to be used by said committee under such regulations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the said Secretaries, or either of them, in decorating the fronts of public buildings and other places on the line of march between the Capitol and the Executive Mansion, and the interior of the reception hall: *Provided*, That the said committee shall indemnify the said Department, or either of them, for any loss or damage to such flags not necessarily incident to such use.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was ordered to a third reading; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

BUOYAGE ON THE WATER FRONT OF CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3707) making an appropriation for establishing buoyage on the water front of Chicago, Lake Michigan, Illinois.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. HOLMAN. Is there a report accompanying this?

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. There is a very short report.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to have the report read, subject to objection.

The report was read at length.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded, which is equivalent to an objection. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] will preside at the pension session this evening. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, in accordance with the rule, the Chair declares the House in recess until 8 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order, under the rule, by Mr. DOCKERY, as Speaker *pro tempore*, at 8 o'clock p. m.

WILLIAM F. ROBINSON.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 10333) to remove the disabilities of William F. Robinson, a citizen of the State of Alabama.

Be it enacted, etc., That all the disabilities imposed upon and incurred by William F. Robinson, of Eufaula, Barbour County, in the State of Alabama, under the provisions of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, be, and the same are hereby, removed.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Let us have the report read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will read the report, subject to objection.

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

The Committee on the Judiciary having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10333) entitled "A bill to remove the disabilities of William F. Robinson, a citizen of the State of Alabama," recommend the passage of the same, his request therefor being in due form.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that this is a bill of which I know nothing except what I learned when it was presented to me this afternoon by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES], who said that he would not be here to-night and asked me to present it to the House for consideration.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HULL. I want to ask, if it is to be called up by unanimous consent, if the roll is to be called alphabetically. If it is not, I think I shall object and we will stick to the Calendar.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Iowa objects.

Mr. HULL. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there further objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of business on the Private Calendar.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw that objection at the suggestion of three or four Democrats and one or two Republicans, so that there may be a similar request on the other side.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there further objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? [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, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof.

MRS. HELEN G. HEINER.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report, after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 2042) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Helen G. Heiner.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase and pay a pension of \$50 per month, in lieu of the pension now received, to Mrs. Helen G. Heiner, widow of the late Capt. Robert G. Heiner, now deceased, of Company A, First United States Regular Infantry, and who was formerly first lieutenant of Company K, Fifty-seventh Pennsylvania Volunteers, to be subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, from and after the passage of this act.

The committee recommend an amendment in line 4, by striking out the word "fifty" and inserting the word "forty."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I will have to object to that bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask the gentlemen from Texas to withdraw his objection and let the report be read. We have had one unanimous consent on that side of the House.

Several Republican MEMBERS. Not on this side.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We have had one unanimous consent, and I feel sure that the gentleman from Texas will be willing to allow another.

Mr. KILGORE. I will be willing that unanimous consent may be granted for the consideration of a bill of a similar kind, but not a measure that carries anything. The bill for which unanimous consent was granted carried nothing except a small matter of form, restoring a man whose Confederate record needed to be repaired a little.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection is made.

CHARLES G. PYER.

Mr. COGSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report; after which the Chair will ask if there be objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8450) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles G. Pyer.

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 Charles G. Pyer, as a member of Company D, Seventh Regiment of New Hampshire Infantry Volunteers, now deceased.

The committee recommend to insert at the end of the bill, the words "Provided, however, That no pay or allowances shall become due by reason of the passage of this act."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

Mr. COGSWELL. Will not the gentleman allow the report to be read before objecting?

Mr. KILGORE. There is no use reading the report; I will object.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of business on the Private Calendar.

The question was taken; and the Speaker *pro tempore* announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. KILGORE. Division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 51, noes 5.

Mr. ANTONY. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Texas makes the point that no quorum has voted. The Chair will appoint the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ANTONY] to act as tellers.

Mr. OWENS. I move a call of the House. There is no use of wasting time with tellers.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Ohio insist on the motion?

Mr. OWENS. I do.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is dividing at this moment.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 52, noes 3.

Mr. ANTONY. No quorum.

Mr. MARTIN. I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The roll was called and the following-named members failed to respond:

Abbott,	Cox, Tenn.	Johnson, Ind.	Reed,
Alderson,	Crain,	Johnson, Ohio	Reyburn,
Alexander,	Crawford,	Johnston, S. C.	Richardson,
Allen,	Culberson,	Kendall,	Rife,
Andrew,	Cummings,	Ketcham,	Robertson, La.
Atkinson,	Cutting,	Kyle,	Robinson, Pa.
Bacon,	Dalzell,	Lagan,	Rockwell,
Bailey,	De Forest,	Lanham,	Rusk,
Bartine,	Dickerson,	Lapham,	Sanford,
Beaman,	Dingley,	Lawson, Va.	Sayers,
Belden,	Dixon,	Lawson, Ga.	Scott,
Beltzhoover,	Dungan,	Layton,	Scull,
Bentley,	Dunphy,	Lester, Va.	Shell,
Bergen,	Durbinow,	Lester, Ga.	Shively,
Bingham,	Edmunds,	Lewis,	Shonk,
Blanchard,	Elliot,	Lind,	Simpson,
Bland,	Ellis,	Little,	Snodgrass,
Blount,	English,	Lockwood,	Sperry,
Boatner,	Enloe,	Lodge,	Springer,
Boutelle,	Enochs,	Loud,	Stahneck,
Bowers,	Fellows,	Magner,	Stephenson,
Branch,	Fitch,	McAleer,	Stevens,
Brawley,	Flick,	McCreary,	Steward, Tex.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Forman,	McKaig,	Stockdale,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Forney,	McRae,	Stone, W. A.
Brickner,	Fowler,	Meyer,	Stone, Ky.
Brown, Ind.	Funston,	Miller,	Storer,
Brown, Md.	Fyan,	Milliken,	Stout,
Brunner,	Geary,	Mitchell,	Sweet,
Buchanan, N. J.	Gillespie,	Montgomery,	Tarsney,
Buchanan, Va.	Goodnight,	Moore,	Taylor, Ill.
Bullock,	Grady,	Morse,	Taylor, Tenn.
Bunn,	Griswold,	Mutchler,	Taylor, E. B.
Bunting,	Groat,	Newberry,	Taylor, V. A.
Burrows,	Hall,	Norton,	Tillman,
Bushnell,	Hamilton,	Oates,	Townsend,
Bynum,	Hare,	O'Donnell,	Tracey,
Byrnes,	Harner,	O'Ferrail,	Tucker,
Cable,	Harries,	O'Neil, Mass.	Turner,
Cadmus,	Harter,	O'Neil, Pa.	Turpin,
Caldwell,	Hatch,	O'Neil, Mo.	Wadsworth,
Campbell,	Haugen,	Otis,	Walker,
Capehart,	Hayes, Iowa	Outwaite,	Warner,
Caruth,	Haynes, Ohio	Parrett,	Washington,
Castle,	Heard,	Patterson, Tenn.	Watson,
Catchings,	Hemphill,	Pattison, Ohio	Wever,
Cate,	Henderson, Iowa	Payne,	Wheeler, Ala.
Causey,	Henderson, N. C.	Paynter,	Wheeler, Mich.
Cheatham,	Henderson, Ill.	Peel,	White,
Clancy,	Herbert,	Pendleton,	Whiting,
Cobb, Ala.	Hermann,	Perkins,	Wike,
Cobb, Mo.	Hilborn,	Pierce,	Williams, Mass.
Cockran,	Hitt,	Powers,	Williams, N. C.
Compton,	Hoar,	Price,	Wilson, Ky.
Coollidge,	Holman,	Quackenbush,	Wilson, Mo.
Coombs,	Hooker, Miss.	Raines,	Wilson, W. Va.
Covert,	Hopkins, Pa.	Randall,	Wise,
Cowles,	Hopkins, Ill.	Ray,	Wright,
Cox, N. Y.	Huff,	Rayner,	

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Under the rule the doors will now be closed and the Clerk will again call the roll. Upon this call excuses may be offered for absent members.

Mr. HOOKER of New York (when the name of Mr. ATKINSON was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ATKINSON] be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER (when the name of Mr. ALDERSON was called). Mr. Speaker, Mr. ALDERSON boards in the same house with me, and I know personally that he is unable to be here this evening. He is unwell. I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HULL (when the name of Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague [Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa] be excused on account of sickness.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of Illinois (when the name of HENDERSON of Illinois was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague [Mr. HENDERSON] be excused on account of illness.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. LIVINGSTON (when the name of Mr. HOLMAN was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Indiana, Judge HOLMAN, be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. TERRY (when the name of Mr. MCRAE was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague [Mr. MCRAE] be excused.

Mr. OWENS. On what ground?

Mr. TERRY. He must be sick, as he is always present when he is well. [Laughter.]

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. CHARLES W. STONE (when the name of Mr. SCULL was called). Mr. Speaker, the health of my colleague [Mr. SCULL] does not permit him to be out at night, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. BROSIUS (when the name of Mr. SCOTT of Illinois was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Illinois be excused.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House before the recess excused the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SCOTT] from attendance at this evening's session.

Mr. WILSON of Washington (when the name of Mr. SWEET was called). Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from Idaho has been quite unwell during a large part of this session and unable to be out at night, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR (when the name of Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR] be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. CHIPMAN (when the name of Mr. WHEELER of Michigan was called). Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Judge WHEELER, went home this afternoon feeling quite unwell, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. WEADOCK (when the name of Mr. WHITING was called). Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Michigan, Mr. WHITING, is absent by leave of the House.

Mr. WAUGH (when the name of Mr. FYAN was called). Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from Missouri, Judge FYAN, be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The call being completed,

Mr. MARTIN said: Mr. Speaker, how many members are shown to be present?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The call discloses the presence of 83 members.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is perfectly apparent that in the time remaining for this evening's session it will be impossible to procure a quorum, and I therefore move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. OWENS. Oh, no; I want to get the Republican party on record this evening. They are all absent.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. No, they are not.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that all proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Debate is not in order.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OWENS] stated that he wanted it to go into the RECORD that the Republicans were all absent—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Well, that is not the fact.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Debate is not in order. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MARTIN] to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The question was taken; and the Speaker *pro tempore* declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 50, noes 27.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken on the motion to adjourn; and the Speaker *pro tempore* declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Several members called for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 46, noes 40.

Mr. HOOKER of New York and others. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 32 members voting in favor thereof.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 23, nays 62, not voting 239; as follows:

Antony,	Brosius,	Cogswell,	Doekery,
Arnold,	Brunner,	Curtis,	Epes,
Bretz,	Bryan,	De Armond,	Everett,

YEAS—23.

Fithian,
Greenleaf,
Houk, Ohio
Jones,

Kilgore,
Lynch,
Mallory,
Martin,

McGann,
McLaurin,
Moses,
Patton,

Reilly,
Sipe,
Terry,
Waugh.

NAYS—62.

Amerman,
Babbitt,
Baker,
Bankhead,
Barwig,
Belknap,
Bowman,
Brickner,
Broderick,
Brookshire,
Busey,
Butler,
Caminetti,
Chipman,
Clark, Wyo.
Clover,

Coburn,
Cooper,
Crosby,
Daniell,
Davis,
Doan,
Dolliver,
Donovan,
Gantz,
Geissenhainer,
Gorman,
Hallowell,
Halvorson,
Hooker, N. Y.
Houk, Tenn.
Hull,

Johnson, N. Dak.
Jolley,
Kem,
Kribbs,
Lane,
Livingston,
Long,
Mansur,
McClellan,
McKeighan,
Meredit,
Ohliger,
Owens,
Page,
Pearson,
Pickler,

Post,
Russell,
Smith,
Steward, Ill.
Stone, C. W.
Stump,
Taylor, J. D.
Van Horn,
Weadock,
Willcox,
Williams, Ill.
Wilson, Wash.
Winn,
Wolverton.

NOT VOTING—232.

Abbott,
Alderson,
Alexander,
Allen,
Andrew,
Atkinson,
Bacon,
Bailey,
Bartine,
Beeman,
Belden,
Beltzhoover,
Bentley,
Bergen,
Bingham,
Blanchard,
Bland,
Blount,
Boatner,
Bouteille,
Bowers,
Branch,
Brawley,
Breckinridge, Ark.
Breckinridge, Ky.
Brown, Ind.
Brown, Md.
Buchanan, N. J.
Buchanan, Va.
Bullock,
Bunn,
Bunting,
Burrows,
Bushnell,
Bynum,
Byrns,
Cable,
Cadmus,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Capehart,
Caruth,
Castle,
Catchings,
Cate,
Causey,
Cheatham,
Clancy,
Clarke, Ala.
Cobb, Ala.
Cobb, Mo.
Cockran,
Compton,
Coolidge,
Coombs,
Covert,
Cowles,
Cox, N. Y.
Cox, Tenn.
Crain,

Crawford,
Culbertson,
Cummings,
Cutting,
Dalzell,
De Forest,
Dickerson,
Dingley,
Dixon,
Dungan,
Dunphy,
Durborow,
Edmunds,
Elliot,
Ellis,
English,
Enloe,
Enochs,
Fellows,
Fitch,
Flick,
Forman,
Forney,
Fowler,
Funston,
Fyan,
Geary,
Gillespie,
Goodnight,
Grady,
Griswold,
Groat,
Hall,
Hamilton,
Hare,
Harner,
Harries,
Harter,
Hatch,
Haugen,
Hayes, Iowa.
Haynes, Ohio.
Heard,
Hemphill,
Henderson, Iowa.
Henderson, N. C.
Henderson, Ill.
Herbert,
Hermann,
Hilborn,
Hitt,
Hoar,
Holman,
Hooker, Miss.
Hopkins, Pa.
Hopkins, Ill.
Huff,
Johnson, Ind.
Johnston, Ohio.
Johnstone, S. C.

Richardson,
Rife,
Robertson, La.
Robinson, Pa.
Rockwell,
Rusk,
Sanford,
Sayers,
Scott,
Seerley,
Shell,
Shively,
Shonk,
Simpson,
Snodgrass,
Snow,
Sperry,
Springer,
Stahlnecker,
Stephenson,
Stevens,
Stewart, Tex.
Stoddale,
Stone, W. A.
Stone, Ky.
Storet,
Stout,
Sweet,
Tarsney,
Taylor, Ill.
Taylor, Tenn.
Taylor, E. B.
Taylor, V. A.
Tillman,
Townsend,
Tracey,
Tucker,
Turner,
Turpin,
Wadsworth,
Walker,
Warner,
Washington,
Watson,
Wever,
Wheeler, Ala.
Wheeler, Mich.
White,
Whiting,
Wike,
Williams, Mass.
Williams, N. C.
Wilson, Ky.
Wilson, Mo.
Wilson, W. Va.
Wise,
Wright,
Youmans.

Mr. ABBOTT with Mr. WILSON of Kentucky.

Mr. PENDLETON with Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee, for ten days.

The result of the vote was announced as above stated.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to, there being, on a division (called for by Mr. LIVINGSTON)—ayes 38, noes 31.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask whether it would be in order now to move to expunge the entire record of to-night—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It would not.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. By unanimous consent?

Mr. OWENS. You can not get that. [Laughter.]

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following-named members failed to answer:

Abbott,	Cox, N. Y.	Johnson, Ohio.	Reed,
Alderson,	Cox, Tenn.	Johnstone, S. C.	Reyburn,
Alexander,	Crain,	Kendall,	Richardson,
Allen,	Crawford,	Ketcham,	Rife,
Andrew,	Culbertson,	Kyle,	Robertson, La.
Atkinson,	Cummings,	Lagan,	Robinson, Pa.
Bacon,	Cutting,	Lanham,	Rockwell,
Bailey,	Dalzell,	Lapham,	Rusk,
Bartine,	De Forest,	Lawson, Va.	Sanford,
Beeman,	Dickerson,	Lawson, Ga.	Sayers,
Belden,	Dingley,	Layton,	Scott,
Beltzhoover,	Dixon,	Lester, Va.	Scull,
Bentley,	Dungan,	Lester, Ga.	Seerley,
Bergen,	Dunphy,	Lewis,	Shell,
Bingham,	Durborow,	Lind,	Shively,
Blanchard,	Edmunds,	Little,	Shonk,
Bland,	Elliot,	Lockwood,	Simpson,
Blount,	Ellis,	Lodge,	Snodgrass,
Boatner,	English,	Loud,	Sperry,
Bouteille,	Enloe,	Magner,	Springer,
Bowers,	Enochs,	McAleer,	Stahlnecker,
Branch,	Fellows,	McCreary,	Stephenson,
Brawley,	Fitch,	McKag,	Stevens,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Flick,	McKinney,	Stewart, Tex.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Forman,	McRae,	Stockdale,
Brown, Ind.	Forney,	Meyer,	Stone, W. A.
Brown, Md.	Fowler,	Miller,	Stone, Ky.
Buchanan, N. J.	Funston,	Milliken,	Storer,
Buchanan, Va.	Fyan,	Mitchell,	Stout,
Bullock,	Geary,	Montgomery,	Sweet,
Bunn,	Gillespie,	Moore,	Tarsney,
Bunting,	Goodnight,	Morse,	Taylor, Ill.
Burrows,	Grady,	Mutchler,	Taylor, Tenn.
Bushnell,	Griswold,	Newberry,	Taylor, E. B.
Bynum,	Groat,	Norton,	Taylor, V. A.
Byrns,	Hall,	Oates,	Tillman,
Cable,	Hamilton,	O'Donnell,	Townsend,
Cadmus,	Harmer,	O'Ferrall,	Tracey,
Caldwell,	Harries,	O'Neil, Mass.	Tucker,
Campbell,	Harter,	O'Neil, Pa.	Turner,
Capehart,	Hatch,	O'Neil, Mo.	Turpin,
Caruth,	Haugen,	Otis,	Wadsworth,
Castle,	Hayes, Iowa,	Outhwaite,	Walker,
Catchings,	Hayes, Ohio,	Parrett,	Warner,
Cate,	Heard,	Patterson, Tenn.	Washington,
Causey,	Hemphill,	Pattison, Ohio	Watson,
Cheatham,	Henderson, Iowa,	Payne,	Wever,
Clancy,	Henderson, N. C.	Paynter,	Wheeler, Ala.
Clarke, Ala.	Henderson, Ill.	Peel,	Wheeler, Mich.
Cobb, Ala.	Herbert,	Pendleton,	Whiting,
Cobb, Mo.	Hermann,	Perkins,	Wike,
Cockran,	Hitt,	Pierce,	Williams, Mass.
Compton,	Hoar,	Powers,	Williams, N. C.
Coolidge,	Holman,	Price,	Wilson, Ky.
Coombs,	Hooker, Miss.	Quackenbush,	Wilson, Mo.
Covert,	Hopkins, Pa.	Raines,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cowles,	Hopkins, Ill.	Randall,	Wise,
Cox, N. Y.	Huff,	Ray,	Wolverton,
Cox, Tenn.	Johnson, Ind.	Rayner,	Wright,
Crain,	Johnstone, S. C.	Reyburn,	

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move to dispense with all further proceedings under the call.

Mr. OWENS. The roll has not yet been called the second time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is in order.

Mr. OWENS. There may be a quorum here. This is not the proper time for that motion.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Is the motion debatable?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is not. The gentleman from Alabama moves to dispense with all further proceedings under the call.

Mr. OWENS. I rise to a question of order: Does the Chair hold that that motion is in order now?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The motion is in order.

Mr. OWENS. Before we have had a second roll call?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is.

Mr. OWENS. Just the contrary was held two days ago.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The present occupant of the Chair did not so hold.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. Is it in order to speak to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Ohio?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is not. The Chair has decided the question.

Mr. WILSON of Washington. I simply want to bring to the attention of the House the fact that we have not had a Friday-night session during this session of Congress.

So the House refused to adjourn.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. BRANCH with Mr. RIFE.

Mr. FORNEY with Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois.

Mr. GOODNIGHT with Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. MOORE with Mr. KETCHAM.

Mr. CAUSEY with Mr. BELDEN.

For this day:

Mr. DIXON with Mr. BUCHANAN of New Jersey.

Mr. HERBERT with Mr. DINGLEY.

Mr. WHITING with Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa.

For the rest of the day:

Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARUTH with Mr. VINCENT A. TAYLOR.

Mr. ALDERSON with Mr. LODGE.

Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. PAYNTER with Mr. STORER.

Mr. ELLIS with Mr. RANDALL.

Mr. RAYNER with Mr. BERGEN.

Mr. KENDALL with Mr. SHONK.

Mr. CALDWELL with Mr. CULBERSON.

Mr. CRAIN with Mr. RAY.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I did not hear the report of the Clerk as to the number present.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Ninety-one members answered on the first call.

The gentleman from Alaaama now moves to dispense with all further proceedings under the call.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Before that let me submit a parliamentary inquiry. Can we return to the Calendar after the fact has been disclosed that there is no quorum present?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair must take cognizance of the fact when the record discloses the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I hope, then, the members of this House—

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Debate is not in order.

Mr. HULL. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. If the point of no quorum is withdrawn, can we not proceed with the Calendar?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. We can not. The record discloses the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HULL. Then we ought to send for the absentees.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If I can get unanimous consent, I shall ask to expunge the whole record of the proceedings to-night.

Mr. ANTONY. You can not get that.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I ask unanimous consent to expunge from the record all of the proceedings with reference to the ascertainment of the presence of a quorum since the House convened to-night.

Mr. OWENS. I object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will proceed with the call of the names of absentees, during which call excuses are in order.

Mr. CROSBY (when Mr. ANDREW's name was called). I move that my colleague [Mr. ANDREW] be excused to-night on account of sickness.

There was no objection.

Mr. MALLORY (when the name of Mr. BULLOCK was called). I ask that my colleague [Mr. BULLOCK] be excused to-night on account of sickness.

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG (when the name of Mr. CULBERSON was called). I ask that my colleague, Judge CULBERSON, be excused from attendance to-night.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEISSENHAINER (when the name of Mr. ENGLISH was called). My colleague, Mr. ENGLISH, left here to-day quite ill. I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEM. I rise to a question of order. There is so much confusion on the floor that it is utterly impossible to hear a word of what is being said.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will endeavor to restore order upon the floor.

Mr. PAGE (when the name of Mr. LAPHAM was called). I ask that my colleague, Mr. LAPHAM, be excused to-night on account of sickness.

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG (when Mr. MOORE'S name was called). I ask that my colleague, Judge MOORE, be excused to-night on account of sickness.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARWIG (when Mr. PARRETT'S name was called). I ask that Judge PARRETT be excused on account of sickness to-night.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Ninety-two members have responded to their names.

Mr. MARTIN. I move that the House now adjourn.

Mr. PICKLER. Pending that I ask that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OWENS] be heard for what length of time he likes to speak.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I make the point of order that the pending motion is not debatable.

The question was taken on the motion to adjourn; and on a division there were—ayes 47, noes 33.

Mr. OWENS. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 42, nays 37, not voting 250; as follows:

YEAS—42.

Antony,	Brickner,	Caminetti,	Everett,
Bankhead,	Brosius,	De Armond,	Gorman,
Belknap,	Brunner,	Dockery,	Greenleaf,
Bretz,	Busey,	Epes,	Hare,

Johnson, N. Dak.	Martin,	Relly,	White,
Jones,	McClellan,	Sayers,	Willcox,
Kilgore,	McGann,	Sipe,	Williams, Ill.
Kribbs,	McLaurin,	Steward, Ill.	Winn,
Livingston,	McMillin,	Taylor, J. D.	Wolverton.
Lynch,	Meredith,	Terry,	
Mallory,	Page,	Waugh,	

NAYS—37.

Amerman,	Cooper,	Hooker, N. Y.	Post,
Arnold,	Crosby,	Houk, Tenn.	Russell,
Babbitt,	Daniell,	Hull,	Smith,
Baker,	Davis,	Jolley,	Stone, C. W.
Barwig,	Doan,	Kem,	Van Horn,
Bowman,	Gantz,	Lane,	Weadock,
Butler,	Geissenhainer,	Long,	Wilson, Wash.
Clark, Wyo.	Hallowell,	Ohliger,	
Clover,	Halvorson,	Owens,	
Coburn,	Hilborn,	Pearson,	

NOT VOTING—250.

Abbott,	Cox, Tenn.	Johnson, Ohio	Rayner,
Alderson,	Crain,	Johnstone, S. C.	Reed,
Alexander,	Crawford,	Kendall,	Reyburn,
Allen,	Culbertson,	Ketcham,	Richardson,
Andrew,	Cummings,	Kyle,	Rife,
Atkinson,	Curtis,	Lagan,	Robertson, La.
Bacon,	Cutting,	Lanham,	Robinson, Pa.
Bailey,	Dalzell,	Lapham,	Rockwell,
Bartine,	De Forest,	Lawson, Va.	Rusk,
Beeman,	Dickerson,	Lawson, Ga.	Sanford,
Belden,	Dingley,	Layton,	Scott,
Beltzhoover,	Dixon,	Lester, Va.	Scul,
Bentley,	Dolliver,	Lester, Ga.	Seerley,
Bergen,	Donovan,	Lewis,	Shell,
Bingham,	Dungan,	Lind,	Shively,
Blanchard,	Dunphy,	Little,	Shonk,
Bland,	Durbin,	Lockwood,	Simpson,
Blount,	Edmunds,	Lodge,	Snodgrass,
Boatner,	Elliott,	Loud,	Snow,
Boutelle,	Ellis,	Magner,	Sperry,
Bowers,	English,	Mansur,	Springer,
Branch,	Enloe,	McAleer,	Stahlnecker,
Brawley,	Enoch,	McCreary,	Stephenson,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Fellows,	McKalg,	Stevens,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Fitch,	McKeighan,	Stewart, Tex.
Broderick,	Fithian,	McKinney,	Stockdale,
Brookshire,	Flick,	McRae,	Stone, W. A.
Brown, Ind.	Forman,	Meyer,	Stone, Ky.
Brown, Md.	Forney,	Miller,	Storer,
Bryan,	Fowler,	Milliken,	Stout,
Buchanan, N. J.	Funston,	Mitchell,	Stump,
Buchanan, Va.	Fyan,	Montgomery,	Sweet,
Bullock,	Geary,	Moore,	Tarsney,
Bunn,	Gillespie,	Morse,	Taylor, Ill.
Bunting,	Goodnight,	Moses,	Taylor, Tenn.
Burrows,	Grady,	Mutcher,	Taylor, E. B.
Bushnell,	Griswold,	Newberry,	Taylor, V. A.
Bynum,	Grout,	Norton,	Tillman,
Byrns,	Hall,	Oates,	Townsend,
Cable,	Hamilton,	O'Donnell,	Tracey,
Cadmus,	Harmer,	O'Ferrall,	Tucker,
Caldwell,	Harries,	O'Neil, Mass.	Turner,
Campbell,	Harter,	O'Neil, Pa.	Turpin,
Capehart,	Hatch,	O'Neil, Mo.	Wadsworth,
Caruth,	Haugen,	Otis,	Walker,
Castle,	Hayes, Iowa	Outhwaite,	Warner,
Catchings,	Haynes, Ohio	Parrett,	Washington,
Cate,	Heard,	Patterson, Tenn.	Watson,
Causey,	Hemphill,	Pattison, Ohio	Wever,
Cheatham,	Henderson, Iowa	Patton,	Wheeler, Ala.
Chipman,	Henderson, Ill.	Payne,	Wheeler, Mich.
Clancy,	Henderson, N. C.	Paynter,	Whiting,
Clarke, Ala.	Herbert,	Peel,	Wike,
Cobb, Ala.	Hermann,	Pendleton,	Williams, Mass.
Cobb, Mo.	Hitt,	Perkins,	Williams, N. C.
Cockran,	Hoar,	Pickler,	Wilson, Ky.
Cogswell,	Holman,	Pierce,	Wilson, Mo.
Compton,	Hooker, Miss.	Powers,	Wilson, W. Va.
Coolidge,	Hopkins, Ill.	Price,	Wise,
Coombs,	Hopkins, Pa.	Quackenbush,	Wright,
Covert,	Houk, Ohio	Raines,	Youmans,
Cowles,	Huff,	Randall,	
Cox, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Ray,	

So the motion to adjourn was agreed to.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recapitulation of the vote.

The Clerk recapitulated the names of those voting.

During the recapitulation

Mr. KILGORE said: Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further recapitulation

Several members objected.

The Clerk resumed and completed the recapitulation.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. PAGE, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (H. R. 4990) for the relief of the heirs of William A. Burt, deceased. (Report No. 2460.)

Mr. COBB of Missouri, from the Committee on War Claims: In lieu of the bill H. R. 5801, a bill (H. R. 10491) for the relief of James E. Southard. (Report No. 2461.)

Ordered, That the bill (H. R. 5801) of the same title lie on the table.

Mr. PAGE, from the Committee on Claims: A joint resolution (H. Res. 205) for the more effectual carrying out of a provision of the act approved March 3, 1891, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1891, and for other purposes," in lieu of a resolution (H. Res. 194) of the same title. (Report No. 2462.)

Ordered, That the resolution (H. Res. 194) lie on the table.

By Mr. ELLIOTT, from the Committee on Naval Affairs: The bill (S. 3395) to remit the penalties on gunboat numbered three, the Concord, and gunboat numbered four, the Bennington. (Report No. 2463.)

By Mr. MANSUR, from the Committee on Claims: The bill (S. 1578) for the relief of the First National Bank of Newton, Mass. (Report No. 2464.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 1416) for the relief of Albert Wood. (Report No. 2465.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 6036) for the relief of Louis L. Williams. (Report No. 2466.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 1533) for the relief of David C. Haynes. (Report No. 2467.)

Also, the bill (S. 1357) to compensate Elihu Root for services rendered by direction of the Attorney-General. (Report No. 2468.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 906) for the relief of Henry Ayres. (Report No. 2469.)

Also, the bill (S. 114) making an appropriation for the benefit of the estate of William Moss, deceased. (Report No. 2470.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 1204) for the relief of William C. Watts, of Boone County, Ky. (Report No. 2471.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 6246) for the relief of Jacob Kern. (Report No. 2472.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 3663) for the relief of W. H. L. Pepperell. (Report No. 2473.)

Also, the bill (H. R. 4959) for the relief of Wilbert Bowen, of Denver, Colorado. (Report No. 2474.)

BILLS, MEMORIALS, AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, memorials, and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 10469) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act for the construction of a railway bridge across the Mississippi River at South St. Paul, Minn., approved April 26, 1890," which amendatory act was approved February 15, 1892—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALVORSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 10470) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the St. Louis River, between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COVERT: A bill (H. R. 10472) to incorporate the National Historical Society—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CRISP (by request): A memorial from the Legislature of Oklahoma, relating to certain lands about to be opened to settlement in Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also (by request), a memorial from the Territorial Council of Oklahoma, asking an extension of the term of this session of the Council—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BUNN: A resolution fixing a day for the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Claims—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A resolution to print annual report of the Chief of the Weather Bureau from July 1, 1891, to December 31, 1892—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BYNUM: A resolution calling on the Secretary of the Treasury for information—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG: A joint resolution (H. Res. 206) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer a certain described piece of land in the State of Michigan to the city of Saginaw—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were presented and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. HOLMAN: A bill (H. R. 10473) for the relief of William F. Poe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10474) granting an increase of pension to Richard C. Tiner—to the Committee on Invalid Pension

By Mr. WHEELER of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 10475) to pension William Gullatt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10476) for the relief of Dr. Green P. McAfee—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10477) for the relief of the heirs of James H. Ware—to the Committee on 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. BARTINE: Joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the payment by the Government of the United States of the rebellion war claims of the State of Nevada—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, against the repeal of the silver-purchase act of July 14, 1890—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BELTZHOVER: Petition of the council of the Order of United American Mechanics, of Mechanicsburg, Pa., in favor of a more rigid restriction on immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CASTLE: Petition of National Druggist Association, against increasing tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOMBS: Petition of the New Brooklyn Turnverein, for the repeal of the act closing the World's Fair on Sundays—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. CRISP (by request): Memorial of the Deep-Water Harbor Convention now in session at Mississippi City, Miss., looking to the improvement of Ship Island Harbor, on the Mississippi Sound, in the Gulf of Mexico—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Tacoma Chamber of Commerce, asking the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS: Two petitions of citizens of New York, one of Ellenville and the other of Mineville, both opposing the repeal of section 5 of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DE ARMOND (by request): Memorial of S. D. Carpenter, of Carthage, Mo., asking investigation of his invention—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DURBOROW: Petition of B. Prom and 81 others, of Milton, N. Dak., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 313 citizens of Chicago, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of W. S. Caleb and 2 others, of Chicago, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of J. M. Moore and 40 others, of Texas, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of J. A. Marion and 50 others, of North Dakota, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of M. E. Fox and 87 others, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., and vicinity, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of J. Turner Leftwick and 52 others, of Texas, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of W. C. R. Williams and others, of Texas, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of many citizens of South Dakota, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 44 citizens of Mount Pleasant and other places of Iowa, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 165 citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 35 citizens of Trenton, Iowa, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 13 citizens of Trenton, Iowa, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 97 citizens of Evansville, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 98 citizens of West Union, Iowa, for opening

the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 160 citizens of North Carolina, of Gaston County, St. Marys College, Belmont, and Raleigh, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Ella Goldsmith, of Trenton, Iowa, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 45 citizens of Pennsylvania, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 48 citizens of Allentown, Pa., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 44 citizens of Pittsburg, Pa., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, 46 citizens of Philadelphia, for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 41 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 43 citizens of Beaver Falls, Pa., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of 42 citizens of Allegheny, Pa., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of T. J. Murphy and 15 others, of Chicago, Ill., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of William Huth and 112 others, of Chicago, Ill., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Hugh McGovern and 56 others, of Chicago, Ill., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of A. Galitzki and 56 others, of Chicago, Ill., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of Jerome Wallace and 55 others, of Chicago, Ill., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of John Bates and 56 others, of Chicago, Ill., for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. ENGLISH: Ten petitions of citizens of New York, as follows: The petition of William S. Hubbell and others; of Robert C Booth and others; of Samuel S Brown and others; of J. Manning and Chas. Baxter and others; of John A. B. Wilson and others; of William A. Brown and others; of George S. Pratt and others; of Thomas M. Peters and others; of Norris D. C. Crawford and others, and H. A. Spence and others, all praying for the repeal of the anti-Chinese legislation—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITCH: Three petitions of associations of New York, as follows: The petition of officers and members of the Turnverein Varwarets; of the officers and members of the New York Schuetzen Bund, No. 1, and of the officers and members of the Central Turnverein of the city of New York, all asking for the repeal of the act closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, petition of merchants and manufacturers of New York City interested in the leather, hide, and skin trade, asking for the prompt repeal of the law which makes silver purchases obligatory—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GREENLEAF: Petition of the Baptist Ministers of Rochester, N. Y., in favor of the repeal or essential modification of the anti-Chinese legislation of May 5, 1892—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARMER: Petition of Daniel E. Thompson Council, Order United American Mechanics, of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of W. B. Crammer and 5 others, of Lanark, Ohio, for 1-cent letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOUK of Tennessee: Petition of M. A. Lewis, asking that his claim, with all the accompanying papers, be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of Frank Booker and wife and others, of Randolph, Cattaraugus County, N. Y., in favor of closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois: Two petitions of citizens of Illinois, one of the Aurora (Ill.) Turnverein, and the other of the Local Union 298, of Highland Park, both for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio: Petition of the German Turnverein of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against any action by Congress seriously restricting or altogether suspending immigration from other civilized nations to this country—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of several large firms in Cleveland, Ohio, relative to a change in the postal laws concerning newspapers and periodicals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LOUD: Resolution of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commandery of California, favoring the annexation of the Hawaiian Islands—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MANSUR: Petition of Powers & Moore and 15 other firms of Linn and other counties in Missouri, against an increase of tax on alcohol—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MITCHELL: Nine petitions of associations of Wisconsin, as follows: The petition of Maennerchor Eichenkrautz, of Milwaukee; of the Plattdeutsch Fritz Reuter Gilde; of the Barchen Maennerchor of Milwaukee; of the Maennerchor der Hermanns Soehne; of the Milwaukee Liedertafel; of the Union 159 of Milwaukee, Brotherhood of Painters and Decorators of America; of the Turnverein der Nordseite; of the Gesangerien Harmonic, and of the German Veterans, all for opening the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Pennsylvania: Concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, favoring the passage of the service pension bill, and protesting against any legislation that will prevent armless and legless veterans from making an exchange of their artificial limbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: Resolutions of the board of health of Columbus, Ohio, urging temporary restriction of immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PEARSON: Petition of Council No. 60, Order of United American Mechanics, located at Barnesville, Ohio, in favor of restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of banks and bankers in Iowa, South Dakota, and Nebraska, for the repeal of the Sherman silver-purchase act—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POST: Petition of members of the Peoria (Ill.) Academy of Sciences, and of the faculty of Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., in favor of the metric system of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of Charles G. Snag and others, of Philadelphia, asking for a commission to investigate the evils of immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Pennsylvania: Petition of J. H. Gans, of St. Louis, Mo., relative to the demands or wishes laid before the President of the United States by the commissioners sent to Washington from Honolulu—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of Bacon Council, No. 51, United American Mechanics, of Colchester, Conn., in favor of restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SCULL: Memorial of Rockwood (Pa.) Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, No. 569, in favor of restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SHONK: Memorial of Wyoming Council, No. 172, Order United American Mechanics, for restricting immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of 28 farmers of Massac, Ill., relative to a combination between the mills, railroads, and elevators for the purpose of depressing wheat, and praying for a Congressional investigation—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of the Medical Society of Morgan County, Ill., for an appropriation to aid in defraying the expenses of the Pan-American Congress—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CHARLES W. STONE: Resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, in favor of the passage of Senate bill 894, praying for a survey of a ship canal connecting the waters of Lake Erie and the Ohio River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. STOUT: House joint memorial of Montana to Congress, praying for the passage of Senate bill 2373, to amend sec-

tions 2474 and 2475 of the Revised Statutes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of E. Bethel, of Denver, Colo., in favor of using the metric system in the customs service after July 1, 1893—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. WILLCOX: Three petitions of the Order of United American Mechanics of Connecticut, as follows: The petition of Coginchang Council, No. 62; of Putnam Council, No. 19, and of Pioneer Council, No. 1, all for restricting foreign immigration—to the Select Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Frank A. Robinson and others, for repealing the act closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, February 11, 1893.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the Secretary of State transmitting, in pursuance of the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 3, 1887, certified copies of the final ascertainment of the electors for President and Vice President appointed in the States of North Dakota and Montana at the elections held therein on the 8th of November, 1892, as certified by him by the governors of those States; which were ordered to lie on the table.

INDIAN DEPREDAATION CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General of the United States, transmitting, in pursuance of law, a list of the final judgments rendered in Indian depredation cases since June 30, 1891, in favor of claimants and against the United States and not paid; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Select Committee on Indian Depredations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, favoring the passage of the bill to establish a military post at or near the city of Pierre, S. Dak.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BUTLER presented a memorial of the Charleston Ministerial Union, remonstrating against the opening of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, transmitted in a note from Mr. J. L. Stokes, the secretary of that organization; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro Centennial (Select).

He also presented a petition of the Lumber Trade Association of New York City, praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal under Government supervision; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Washington Council, No. 3, Order United American Mechanics, of Goffstown Centre, N. H., praying for the passage of legislation restricting immigration; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. KYLE presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, favoring the passage of the bill to establish a military post at or near the city of Pierre, S. Dak.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FELTON presented a petition of the trustees of the San Francisco (Cal.) Bar Association, praying for the establishment of a law library in San Francisco for the circuit court of appeals; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Flagstaff, Arizona Territory, praying for the construction of a deep-water harbor at San Pedro, Cal.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CAREY presented the petition of Rev. D. A. Snow and 28 other citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for a constitutional amendment prohibiting the manufacture, importation, exportation, transportation, and sale of all alcoholic liquors as a beverage in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the College of Physicians of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the passage of an act to place the quarantine at all our frontiers under national control, the prohibition for one year of the entrance into this country of steerage passengers, and the establishment at Washington of a national health commission; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

Mr. PLATT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Connecticut, praying for the passage of legislation restricting all immigration for one year; which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. HOAR presented a memorial of the Evangelical Alliance, of Boston, Mass., remonstrating against the sale of intoxicating liquors on the New Hebrides Islands; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FRYE presented petitions circulated by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and signed by Mrs. A. C. Clark, Miss A. A. Hicks, Mrs. H. B. Cook, and 16 other citizens of Maine; by Rev. C. W. Foster, H. L. Leonard, G. M. Morgan and 67 other citizens, of Maine; by James W. Clark, John Moore, Hattie A. Burkett, and 8 other citizens of Maine, and by F. C. Pendleton, H. C. Mahoney, Sallie Durham and 31 other citizens of Maine, praying for the passage of the bill providing for the appointment of a commission to investigate the social vice; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions circulated by the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and signed by C. H. Prey, J. W. Deering, Lucy C. Pitcher, and 11 other citizens of Maine; by Caleb Fuller, C. F. Barden, Lizzie E. Marshall, and 17 other citizens of Maine, and by F. C. Pendleton, H. C. Mahoney, Eunice B. Giles, and 29 other citizens of Maine, praying for the passage of the bill prohibiting the importation, exportation, and interstate transportation of alcoholic beverages; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. QUAY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3857) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Monongahela River, at the foot of Main street, in the borough of Bellevue, in the State of Pennsylvania, reported it without amendment.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the bills were postponed indefinitely.

A bill (S. 679) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of all outstanding claims against the District of Columbia, and conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear the same, and for other purposes."

A bill (S. 1102) referring to the Court of Claims the claims of Elias E. Barnes and others; and

A bill (S. 603) referring to the Court of Claims the claims of James W. Walsh and others.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Select Committee on Indian Depredations, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by himself on the 10th instant, intended to be proposed to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, reported it favorably and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and be printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3743) granting a pension to Julia E. Lock, formerly widow of the late Gen. Daniel McCook, reported it with amendments and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by Mr. POWER on the 10th instant, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported it favorably, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and be printed; which was agreed to.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by himself on the 10th instant, intended to be proposed to the Military Academy appropriation bill, reported it favorably, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and be printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am directed by the Select Committee on Failed National Banks, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3730) in amendment of the provisions of the Revised Statutes relative to national banks, to report it without amendment and to submit a report thereon. I desire to state that the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Carlisle, was a member of the committee, but he is not now in the Senate. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICE] consents that the report may be made, reserving the right to himself at a latter period to dissent from the whole or any portion of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. QUAY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by Mr. CAMERON on the 30th ultimo, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported it favorably, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and be printed; which was agreed to.