

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator to withdraw the motion for the purpose of enabling me to move to take up the bill (H. R. 51) to change the boundaries of the judicial districts of the State of Florida.

Mr. HARRIS. That question is very much too large to be taken up this evening, and I decline to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee moves 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 fifteen minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 3 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 7, 1894, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1, 1894.

POSTMASTERS.

Andrew Simonson, to be postmaster at Racine, in the county of Racine and State of Wisconsin.

W. K. Sims, to be postmaster at Brinkley, in the county of Monroe and State of Arkansas.

Moses R. Yowell, to be postmaster at Sidney, in the county of Fremont and State of Iowa.

Kent R. Burt, to be postmaster at Lake City, in the county of Calhoun and State of Iowa.

Charles Scheerer, to be postmaster at Galena, in the county of Jo Daviess and State of Illinois.

James M. Babcock, to be postmaster at Niles, in the county of Berrien and State of Michigan.

George A. Aldrich, to be postmaster at Homer, in the county of Calhoun and State of Michigan.

John D. Northcutt, to be postmaster at Marietta, in the county of Cobb and State of Georgia.

Patrick Briody, to be postmaster at South Bethlehem, in the county of Northampton and State of Pennsylvania.

Alfred Young, to be postmaster at Leslie, in the county of Ingham and State of Michigan.

Levi J. Law, to be postmaster at Cadillac, in the county of Wexford and State of Michigan.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, March 6, 1894.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. E. B. BAGBY.

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

VACANCY IN BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The Speaker laid before the House Senate joint resolution (S. R. 62) to fill a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

REPORT ON HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House Senate concurrent resolution—

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 6,000 copies of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, No. 227, with the additional views of members of the committee and the testimony; 2,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 4,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives;

which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

TARIFF STATISTICS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House Senate concurrent resolution—

Resolved by the Senate, etc., That there be printed 1,500 copies of the Senate Report No. 2130, Fifty-first Congress, second session, "Rates of duty on imports in the United States, from 1789 to 1890, inclusive, together with the statistics relating thereto," of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, and 500 copies for the use of the Senate; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE SENATOR STANFORD.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following concurrent resolution of the Senate:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed of the eulogies delivered in Congress upon the Hon. Leland Stanford, late a Senator from the State of California, 8,000 copies; of which 2,000 copies shall be delivered to the Senators and Representatives of that State, and of the remaining number 2,000 shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,000 copies for the use of the House, and of the quota of the Senate the Public Printer shall set aside 50 copies, which he shall have bound in full morocco with gilt edges, the same to be delivered when completed to the widow of the deceased; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to have engraved and printed at the earliest day practicable a portrait of the deceased to accompany said eulogies;

which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

APPOINTMENT OF NAVAL CADET FROM FIFTH DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House joint resolution (H. Res. 128) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a cadet at the United States Naval Academy from the Fifth district of South Carolina.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint a cadet to the Naval Academy of the United States at Annapolis, for the Fifth Congressional district of South Carolina, to be nominated on or before the 1st day of July, 1894, by the Representative in Congress of said district.

Mr. BURROWS. I would like to have some explanation of that.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the gentleman from Mississippi can make a short explanation.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. Speaker, this is a case in which there was a vacancy in the corps of cadets of the Naval Academy which should have been filled from the Fifth South Carolina district. The usual notification was given by the Secretary of the Navy on the 6th of March, but I believe was never received by the Representative from South Carolina. That gentleman afterwards addressed two communications to the Department, to which replies were given, but the gentleman from South Carolina never received those replies. Following a uniform practice the Secretary of the Navy, upon the failure of the gentleman from South Carolina to appoint a cadet to the Naval Academy, appointed one, but not from the Fifth district of South Carolina or from that State. He followed what seemed to be, upon examination, the uniform precedent by making an appointment at large when a vacancy has existed by the failure of a Representative to appoint.

Now, all the law contained upon this subject is contained in section 1513, as amended by the act of June 17, 1878, and sections 1514 and 1517 are the only sections which give to the Representative the right to nominate a cadet; but the law provides that the cadet shall be an actual resident of the district, the intention of the law being that no district in the United States shall be unrepresented in the Naval Academy. Upon failure, however, to appoint, the duty devolves upon the Secretary of the Navy to do—what? To do what the Representative had failed to do. What could he do? He could appoint a man who was an actual resident of his district. The Secretary of the Navy has no other power. The law declares that all appointments at large shall be made by the President of the United States, and not by the Secretary. There is not a line anywhere that authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a man at large. Not only that, but the law limits the number of those to be appointed at large, and says that there shall not be more than ten cadets-at-large in the Academy at one time.

Now, as it happens, this man was appointed from a district in Alabama. That district was without a representative for the very reason that the South Carolina district was without a representative—that there had been a failure, from misinformation or something of the kind, on the part of the Representative from the Alabama district, and the appointment was made by the late Secretary. Now, in consonance with the uniform practice, he made an appointment elsewhere, out of the State, and this appointment simply fills up the gap in the Alabama district and gives it now to the Fifth South Carolina district. The object of that is to prevent any district in the United States being without representation in the Naval Academy, and the vacancy that would have been filled by an appointment from the Alabama district falls to the Fifth district of South Carolina. This is to permit the Secretary to appoint a man to be nominated by the Representative from the Fifth South Carolina district.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I desire to make a little statement in connection with this subject. I think that a practice has grown up in the Department that ought to be discountenanced by Congress. Whenever the Representative, through his own fault or through the fault of the Department, fails to nominate a candidate within a certain time the Secretary or the officials of the Department have taken it upon themselves to fill the vacancy, and to fill it from favorite followers of their own.

Now, I am opposed to the principle of special legislation allowing a candidate to be placed in nomination as provided in this resolution, but I think that under the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] the Secretary should be instructed to transfer the nominee from Alabama who is now credited to this district in South Carolina to the Alabama district, which the gentleman says is still unrepresented, so that that district will be represented, and then let the Repre-

sentative from the South Carolina district nominate in accordance with the provisions of the law. This is not a solitary case. I know of similar cases in Illinois and in other States, and I think it is high time that the Department should understand that these nominations should be made by the representatives of the people and not by the Department officials.

Mr. MONEY. The Alabama district is not now unrepresented. In reply to the gentleman from Illinois I will say to the House that, in the first place, we have provided for the discontinuance of the practice of which he speaks by amending the law so as to make it so plain that it can not possibly be misconstrued by any Secretary, providing that whenever the Representative shall fail to nominate the Secretary shall nominate from the actual residents of the district. Now, as to that district being unrepresented, there is a man from another State representing that district until this man was appointed from Alabama. This resolution is simply to provide that the only district now unrepresented shall be represented by a nomination made by the Representative from the South Carolina district.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. The gentleman agrees with me that the candidate should be a bona fide resident of the district from which he is appointed?

Mr. MONEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. And that the member of Congress has no power or authority under the law to select an appointee from the State at large, or from another State?

Mr. MONEY. The gentleman is correct in that.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. And the Secretary of the Navy has no further or different authority in that respect, has he?

Mr. MONEY. That is the point that we provide for by this amendment.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Well, I contend that the Secretary of the Navy has violated the law.

Mr. BAILEY. Undoubtedly he has.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. And that it is the duty of Congress to call his attention to the law and to vacate that appointment from South Carolina and allow the member to make his own appointment, because this system of favoritism has gone far enough.

Mr. BAILEY. If the gentleman from Illinois will permit me—

Mr. MONEY. The gentleman from Illinois has not the floor except by my consent. I have the floor.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to reply to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MONEY. Well, I desire to reply to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois myself. [Laughter.] Mr. Speaker, the committee has gone just as far as the gentleman from Illinois indicates that he would like it to go. It has provided by an amendment to the statute that hereafter, in case of the failure of a Representative to nominate, the Secretary shall nominate a man who shall be an actual resident of the district in which the vacancy occurs. That was the obvious intent of the law as it stands, and it is a mystery to the committee who make the report how it should have been so misconstrued as to have built up a uniform practice of nominating from the country at large.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. You hold, then, that this appointment made by the Secretary was illegal?

Mr. MONEY. No, I do not go so far as that.

Mr. COBB of Alabama. Do you propose to allow this man who was appointed by the Secretary to retain the appointment?

Mr. MONEY. Yes, sir; I do. Now, I want to say further that I do not desire—

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the further consideration of this resolution at this time.

Mr. MONEY. Well, Mr. Speaker, I claim the right to have it considered as a matter of privilege. It is a privileged matter, affecting the rights of a member of this House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to make a statement in reference to this matter.

The SPEAKER. It is not now before the House.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. Speaker. This is evidently a privileged matter. I call it up as a matter of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi claims that this resolution presents a question of privilege. The Chair will hear the gentleman on that point.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. Speaker, under Rule IX of this House any question which affects the rights of a member of this House is a question of privilege. The law gives to this member from South Carolina the right to nominate a cadet for the Naval Academy. He has been deprived of the exercise of that right; and it is not too late now to claim that the Secretary of the Navy should secure to this gentleman the enjoyment of that right. I do not know that there is anything more to be said on the question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. But the Chair calls the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this resolution proposes merely a change of the law; it is no assertion of an existing right.

Mr. MONEY. This is not a change of the law.

The SPEAKER. This resolution proposes to authorize the appointment of an additional cadet beyond those now authorized by law.

Mr. MONEY. I beg the Chair's pardon; not beyond those authorized by law.

The SPEAKER. The Chair so understood the resolution.

Mr. MONEY. The resolution proposes to secure to the member from South Carolina the enjoyment of a right granted to him by law. The committee that has had the honor to consider and report this resolution claims that this right has been violated by the Secretary of the Navy—not wittingly, but by following a precedent; and it is held by the committee that the member from South Carolina can not be denied the right to have his district represented.

If the Secretary had appointed a man from that district, then the question now raised would not be urged, because the right is but the right of the district. It was the intention of the law, and it is in accord with sound and most obvious policy, that every district in this country should be represented in the Navy. I claim that this is a question of privilege, because it affects the enjoyment by a member of a right under the law which provides that his district shall be represented in the Naval Academy. No man can claim that the district is to-day represented there.

Until the Chair has decided the question of order, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana. In reference to the cadet appointed to represent this district, I would like to know where he is from.

Mr. MONEY. From Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Nothing in this resolution seems to the Chair to raise a question of privilege. It provides—

That the Secretary of the Navy be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint a cadet to the Naval Academy of the United States at Annapolis from the Fifth Congressional district of South Carolina, to be nominated on or before the 1st day of July, 1894, by the Representative in Congress of said district.

There is nothing in the language of this resolution to indicate that the member in question has not enjoyed all the rights accorded to him under the law.

Mr. MONEY. The report accompanying the resolution shows that he has not enjoyed this right.

The SPEAKER. If this resolution should be passed, would not its effect be to authorize an additional appointment?

Mr. MONEY. Not from that district.

The SPEAKER. Not from that district, but from the whole country at large?

Mr. MONEY. The only right that is now claimed by this resolution is that this district should be represented. It does not deal with the question whether the number of cadets at large shall be increased.

The SPEAKER. But the effect of the resolution, if passed, would be that, instead of there being only 356 appointments from the States and 10 additional, there would be 1 more, not covered by the existing law.

Mr. MONEY. But that does not affect this question of the right of a member of the House. As shown by the report on this resolution and by the resolution itself, the Secretary of the Navy has deprived the Fifth South Carolina district, now represented in this House by Hon. T. J. STRAIT, of the right to name a cadet to be appointed to the Naval Academy. It is because this resolution seeks to do justice to that gentleman and his district in the enjoyment of a legal right that I claim this is a question of privilege.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Upon the question of order I wish to say only one word. The law provides that this Representative from South Carolina shall appoint one of the cadets at that Academy—

The SPEAKER. Then why the necessity for this joint resolution?

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Simply because the Secretary of the Navy, instead of the member, has made the appointment, and now the member claims his right.

The SPEAKER. If the Secretary of the Navy had no authority to make the appointment his act is void.

Mr. MONEY. But this resolution is designed to settle that question. The Secretary of the Navy will not recede from his action on his own motion; and in the mean time the Representative from South Carolina is deprived of his legal right.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Under the law the member from South Carolina is clearly entitled to appoint one cadet.

Mr. PENDLETON of Texas. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The pending question is the question of order which has been raised, whether this resolution constitutes a

question of privilege. The merits of the resolution do not enter into the discussion at all.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, as to whether the resolution is a matter of privilege or not, if it turns upon the proposition as to whether it affects the right of one or more members upon this floor, and if the Chair can get that information from the resolution, why of course the Chair can determine the matter without any statement by a member from the floor; but if the Chair will go outside of the resolution and allow any member upon the floor to state facts within his knowledge, interpreting the resolution, I desire to state to the Chair that not only the district suggested in South Carolina, but several other districts in the United States, have had representatives nominated by the Secretary of the Navy and sent to Annapolis, even where the member from the district had nominated a candidate. The candidate having failed, the Secretary nominated the alternate. And from one district, if not more, within my personal knowledge, the Secretary has nominated that alternate outside of the State in which the district is situated.

I claim that it is a violation of the law, and this is a matter of great importance, which ought to be taken up and carefully considered by this House, and the law ought to be interpreted in such a way that never again in the future will a Secretary of the Navy undertake to fill a vacancy at Annapolis for the State of South Carolina from the States of Alabama or Mississippi, or Oregon, or Maine, and we ought to take it up and make this resolution broad enough to interpret the law.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a single suggestion on the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that in determining whether this resolution is privileged the Chair can not go beyond the resolution itself.

Mr. STOCKDALE. That is what I want to suggest, that the resolution shows, as I understand, that a district in South Carolina has no representative at Annapolis.

Mr. COOMBS. The resolution does not show it.

The SPEAKER. It does not so allege.

Mr. MONEY. The report states that.

The SPEAKER. The resolution simply directs the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a cadet to the Naval Academy from the Fifth Congressional district of South Carolina on the nomination of the Representative.

Mr. STOCKDALE. I thought the resolution showed that there was a vacancy.

Mr. MONEY. There is a vacancy.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think the resolution on its face is privileged. It alleges no violation of any right of a member.

Mr. SAYERS. I demand the regular order.

Mr. MONEY. I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] to withdraw his objection.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. BOATNER. I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] to withdraw his request for the regular order for a moment, while I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SAYERS. I will withdraw the demand for the regular order.

Mr. BOATNER. I will wait until after the committees are called for reports.

COMMITTEE REPORTS.

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

The committees were called for reports, when bills of the following titles were severally presented, read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying reports, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Calendars named below:

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

By Mr. WOLVERTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary: A bill (H. R. 5836) to define the crimes of murder in the first and second degrees, and manslaughter and rape, mutiny and desertion, and providing punishment therefor, and to abolish the death penalty for other crimes—to the House Calendar.

OFFICERS OF THE NAVY.

By Mr. MONEY, from the Committee on Naval Affairs: A bill (H. R. 6121) as a substitute for the bill (H. R. 3656) to amend section 1379, chapter 1, Title XV, Revised Statutes of the United States—to the House Calendar.

LAND IN HOT SPRINGS.

By Mr. MOON, from the Committee on the Public Lands: A bill (H. R. 6042) to authorize the sale of lot 8, block 93, city of Hot Springs, by school directors thereof, and use of proceeds for school purposes—to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

JUDICIAL ACTION CONCERNING RAILROAD STRIKES.

Mr. BOATNER. I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution.

The SPEAKER. If the demand for the regular order is withdrawn, the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. SAYERS. I withdrew the demand.

Mr. BOATNER. By direction of the Judiciary Committee, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, which was reported several days ago.

Mr. BURROWS. I do not know the character of this resolution, but I understood the regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair asked if it was withdrawn, and understood the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SAYERS] to say that it was. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, having had this resolution under consideration, respectfully report, that from an examination of the petitions, affidavits, and orders of injunction in the cause of the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company against the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, now pending in the United States circuit court for the eastern district of Wisconsin, and the writ of injunction issued therein pursuant to the orders of the judge of said court, Hon. J. G. Jenkins, they are of opinion that the questions at issue are of sufficient gravity to justify the investigation suggested by the resolution, and therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Judiciary of the House be, and is hereby, authorized to speedily investigate and inquire into all the circumstances connected with the issuance of writs of injunction in the case of the Farmers' Loan and Trust Company, complainant, against the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, defendant, in the United States circuit court for the eastern district of Wisconsin, and the several matters and things referred to in the resolution introduced on the 5th day of February instant, charging illegalities and abuse of the process of said court therein and report to this House whether in any of said matters or things the Hon. J. G. Jenkins, judge of said court, has exceeded his jurisdiction in granting said writs, abused the powers or process of said court, or oppressively exercised the same, or has used his office as judge to intimidate or wrongfully restrain the employes of the Northern Pacific Railway Company, or the officers of the labor organizations with which said employes or any of them were affiliated, in the exercise of their rights and privileges under the laws of the United States, and, if so, what action should be taken by this House or by Congress.

Be it further resolved, That for the purposes aforesaid the said committee, or a subcommittee thereof if authorized by the full committee, shall have power to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to sit during the sessions of the House. Said committee shall have authority to report at any time; and the sum of \$500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to defray the expenses of said investigation."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to consider this resolution. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. REED. Does it come from any committee?

Mr. BOATNER. It is a unanimous report from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. TRACEY. Is not there an appropriation involved?

The SPEAKER. There is an appropriation of \$500.

Mr. TRACEY. Then should it not be considered in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. The request for unanimous consent was to consider it in House, as the Chair understood. And the appropriation is out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. TRACEY. The request was for consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. It was.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. BOATNER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO THE CITY OF SAGINAW, MICH.

Mr. LINTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 5) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer a certain piece of land in the State of Michigan to the city of Saginaw.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be transferred to the city of Saginaw, in the State of Michigan, the following piece or parcel of land, described as follows: Beginning at the southwest corner of Germania and Warren avenues; thence running 245 feet 4 inches along the west side of Warren avenue; thence running 90 feet, at right angles to Warren avenue, along the boundary between the grounds belonging to the United States and the grounds belonging to the Hoyt Library; thence 245 feet 4 inches, northerly, parallel to the line of Warren avenue, to Germania avenue; thence 90 feet along the line of Germania avenue, easterly, to the point of beginning; which was transferred by the city of Saginaw to the Government of the United States, in connection with other lands, for the purpose of erecting thereon a Government building. This parcel of land is not required by the Government for that purpose.

The amendment recommended by the committee was read, as follows:

After the word "purpose," in line 20, page 2, amend by adding:

Provided, That neither the land itself, nor any building or buildings erected thereon, shall ever be put to any use or uses detrimental or objectionable to the Government."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of this measure?

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to hear the report read.

Mr. SAYERS. It is all right.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the report will be read.

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

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 5) entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer a certain piece of land in the State of Michigan to the city of Saginaw," having had the same under consideration, respectfully recommend that the same be amended as follows:

After the word "purpose," in line 20, page 2, amend by adding:

"Provided, That neither the land itself, nor any building or buildings erected thereon, shall ever be put to any use or uses detrimental or objectionable to the Government."

And when so amended your committee recommend that the same be passed.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., October 28, 1893.

GENTLEMEN: In response to the request of Hon. JOHN L. BRETZ, dated the 11th instant, I have the honor to submit the following statement in regard to the advisability of the adoption of House resolution 5, entitled "Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer a certain piece of land in the State of Michigan to the city of Saginaw," etc.:

Under date of October 20, 1893, an agent of this Department was directed to proceed to Saginaw for the purpose of making an inspection of the property embraced in said joint resolution, and submitting his report in the case.

The report of the agent, dated October 25, 1893, has been received, in which he recommends that the land described in said joint resolution be redonated by the Government to the city of Saginaw.

In view of the facts in the case and the report of said agent, it is the opinion of this Department that the interests of the Government will not suffer in any manner by the retransfer of said property to the city of Saginaw, provided that neither the land itself, nor any building or buildings erected thereupon shall ever be put to any use or uses objectionable to the Government: and I would respectfully suggest that said resolution be so amended.

Therefore I have the honor to state that this Department sees no objection to the adoption of said House joint resolution 5, if amended in the manner above recommended.

Respectfully yours,

C. S. HAMLIN, Acting Secretary.

The COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,
House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for consideration?

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to ask, Was this land given to the Government by the city of Saginaw?

Mr. LINTON. The land was originally donated by the city of Saginaw to the Government; and this is to retransfer the land from the Government to the city the land that was given by the city in excess of the needs of the Government.

Mr. SPRINGER. Was any consideration paid by the Government to the city?

Mr. LINTON. No consideration whatever was given by the Government.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

EULOGIES ON THE LATE SENATOR RANDALL L. GIBSON.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the passage of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That Saturday, the 7th day of April, beginning at 2 o'clock p. m., be set apart for eulogies on the late Randall L. Gibson.

The SPEAKER. Without objection this resolution will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. SAYERS. Regular order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 2627) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Franklin, alias Andrew McKee.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment, the bill (H. R. 4571) to make service connections with water mains and sewers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 16) granting a pension to Nettie N. Seaver;

A bill (S. 17) granting a pension to Julia A. Hill;

A bill (S. 305) granting a pension to Annie M. Greene;

A bill (S. 307) granting a pension to Ernest C. Emerson; and

A bill (S. 1460) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish the Smithsonian Institution for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men," being Title LXXIII of the Revised Statutes.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. STRAIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STRAIT. Mr. Speaker, under a clause of the laws of the United States every district in this Union has a right to appoint, or to have appointed, a naval cadet. Last spring, about a year ago, having received no intimation of a vacancy, and knowing that one existed in my district, I communicated with the Secretary of the Navy, and received no reply. Having waited about a month, I communicated a second time, but received no reply. I had written him that I desired to obtain the proper papers and instructions necessary for the appointment of a cadet. When I came here in August, I called upon the Secretary, but he was absent. I notified his clerk of my intention, and some time in September I wrote to the Secretary asking him in reference to this appointment. He stated that he had notified me in March, but that I had declined or neglected to make a recommendation, and that he had already appointed a man from another district and from another State.

Some time ago I introduced a resolution of inquiry, to know the reason why, and to know under what authority, this man was appointed. From a construction of the law, I take that the Secretary of the Navy had no right to go outside of that district to appoint any man, even if I had refused to recommend one. Section 4 of the law states that the candidates for cadets from each Congressional district, from the Territories, and District of Columbia must be "actual residents of the districts and Territories respectively from which they are nominated;" and under that construction I take it that the Secretary had no right to do it; and I appeal to this House, as it affects the privilege of every member of this House, that a law should be enacted or some step should be taken by which a district should not be deprived of its rights under this law.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to offer a resolution declaring this place vacant, under the law, and asking that it be filled by the Representative from the district.

Mr. CUMMINGS. If the gentleman will allow me, I desire to say, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution to which he refers was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the Committee on Naval Affairs agreed with the gentleman; and we have reported a bill amending, or interpreting, the law, so that it will be impossible for such appointments to be made by the Secretary of the Navy hereafter.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest to the gentleman from New York that they did not go far enough. I think we ought to right the wrongs that have already been done by the action of the Secretary. [Loud applause.]

Mr. CUMMINGS. I will say to the gentleman that the resolution which was offered for consideration this morning righted the wrong so far as the gentleman from South Carolina was concerned.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina offers this as a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the appointment of a cadet at the Naval Academy of the United States for the Fifth district of South Carolina from the State of Alabama was without authority of law and was void.

Mr. STRAIT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BAILY. Mr. Speaker, I sought a few moments ago to interrupt the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] in order to reply to a remark of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS]. I had not then observed that the gentleman from Alabama, whose district is affected by this appointment, was in the Hall. I have since discovered that he is here, and I will ask the gentleman from South Carolina to yield to him for the purpose of making a statement as to how this vacancy happened and this appointment was made.

Mr. STRAIT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, under the law as it has been interpreted by Secretaries of the Navy for a great many years, the Representative of a district is required to nominate a cadet for appointment on or before the 20th day of June after having received the notice about the 4th of March. Two years ago, when Mr. Tracy was Secretary of the Navy, I received notice that a vacancy existed in the Sixth district of Alabama, and I received that notice in time to have made the nomination. About the 20th of June I called on the Secretary of the Navy, and told him that it was an important matter; that I had not considered it carefully; that I was going home, and desired a few days in which to make a selection and a nomination. He very promptly replied that time sufficient would be given me for that purpose.

After going home and canvassing the matter I made a nomination which reached the Secretary of the Navy, as the papers show, on the 6th day of June. I had no reply, but about twenty

or thirty days later I addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Navy inquiring about it, and he responded that I had failed to make the nomination by the 1st of June, as the law required, and that he, exercising the authority vested in him by the law, had made a nomination and had nominated the son of a naval officer in the District of Columbia of the name of Woods, as I remember it. Therefore my district was without representation in the Academy for twelve months, and I sought to have that corrected, but failed. The Secretary refused to permit me to nominate an alternate.

A year later I applied to the present Secretary of the Navy to appoint a cadet from my district, under what was supposed to be his authority to appoint at large, or to fill vacancies, and he appointed one from that district. I have no information that he was appointed from the Fifth district of South Carolina, and I want to say here now, that I think the gentleman from South Carolina ought to be permitted to have a cadet appointed from his district, and I certainly have no desire whatever to interfere with his rights.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are two or three other districts in precisely the same position, and of course if relief should be extended to the district of the gentleman from South Carolina, it could not with justice be withheld from the others.

Mr. STRAIT. Of course not.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. But this is the only case that was brought to the attention of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That may be; but inasmuch as the subject is up it is not improper that the House should be placed in possession of the facts.

Mr. CUMMINGS. The present Secretary of the Navy, as I understand, has appointed this cadet from Alabama under the same construction of law by which the former Secretary appointed the cadet that belonged to the district of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Precisely.

Mr. CUMMINGS. He was acting upon precedent. I enjoyed the same felicity when I was a member of the Fifty-ninth Congress. My cadet failing to pass the examination, Secretary Tracy exercised what he called his authority and appointed the son of a naval officer who lived in Philadelphia.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that the Secretary has followed the precedent, unbroken for at least twenty years, and I take this now to be the situation, that if the appointment made by the Secretary of the Navy from the Sixth district of Alabama should be declared void, as this resolution proposes, then that district would be entitled to make a nomination and to have an appointment made.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. All that was considered in the Committee on Naval Affairs, and as this was the only case that was brought to the attention of the committee, or of which they had knowledge, they thought the easiest way out of the difficulty was to provide by a substitute to give the gentleman a cadet, and then to recommend an amendment to the law, which would make it plain that the Secretary of the Navy could not hereafter make these appointments except from the districts entitled to them.

Mr. TATE. But what about the fellows who are in, and who are not entitled to be there?

Mr. CUMMINGS. How far back would the gentleman go?

A MEMBER. Turn them out if they have no right there.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. That would not be fair, because it is not the fault of these young gentlemen who are in the Academy; they did not know they were going there in violation of law, and the officers are in the same fix. If the House adopts the resolution that the committee have reported, it will take care of the gentleman from South Carolina, and, so far as the committee know, his is the only district without a cadet. He has no cadet from his district, and the object is to secure to him his rights in that respect.

Mr. HATCH. The gentleman is very much mistaken if he supposes that one district is to be the only district to which his remarks apply. There are several districts in which substantially the same state of facts exists, and those districts would be heard from if opportunity offered.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STRAIT] yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] wished to ask me a question. I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. As I was saying, I think that if anybody is subject to criticism in the matter now complained of, it is the gentleman from Alabama, who did not promptly bring the case to the attention of Congress; because, according to the facts as he now states them, the rights of his district were in-

vaded by the then Secretary of the Navy. But he slept upon his rights; and now another wrong is done in another district. The trouble, however, about taking up these cases in an individual manner is this: One of my colleagues from Illinois is placed in almost exactly the same situation as the gentleman from South Carolina. He has an intelligent constituency with plenty of ambitious boys who are desirous of acquiring an education at Annapolis or West Point; but he failed, as the gentleman from South Carolina failed, to receive notice; and the first thing he knew this position, which should have been filled from his district, was filled by an appointment from the State of Kentucky.

Now, what I contend is, that if this matter is to be remedied it should be by a general law, which will secure representation in the Naval Academy to Illinois as well as South Carolina and Alabama. If anything is to be done, let these places which have been filled unlawfully, as I contend, by the Secretary of the Navy, be made vacant; or, if these young men are to hold those places, then let us have legislation that will stop any action of this kind in the future without giving South Carolina an additional cadet when Illinois is deprived of one by the appointment of a cadet from the State of Kentucky.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I desire now to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] what was the point on which he desired to ask me a question. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOPKINS of Illinois. I did not say that I rose to ask the gentleman a question. I interrupted him to make a suggestion.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield a moment to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY].

Mr. MONEY. The trouble about the plan proposed by my friend from Illinois is simply this: When you begin to unravel this thing there will be no stopping it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understood the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. STRAIT] to yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. The gentleman from Alabama can not yield. [Laughter.]

Mr. STRAIT. I now move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. CULBERSON. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Is this a joint resolution or simply a resolution of the House?

The SPEAKER. A resolution of the House.

Mr. CULBERSON. I would like to say, if I can have the opportunity, that the Secretary of the Navy holds he has the law and the precedents on his side in this matter.

The SPEAKER. Debate can only proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. CULBERSON. Then I withdraw what I said. [Laughter.] The question being taken on agreeing to the resolution, it was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. STRAIT, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. O'NEIL. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of the pension appropriation bill; and pending that motion I ask that all general debate on the bill in Committee of the Whole close at 4 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. REED. I do not think that ought to be done. There are several gentlemen who desire to speak.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. O'NEIL. Then I make the motion that general debate close at 5 o'clock; and on that motion I call the previous question.

Mr. GROUT. Will not the gentleman allow just a word on this question of time? I think I can give him some information concerning it.

Mr. O'NEIL. I withdraw the previous question so as to allow the gentleman from Vermont to say a word.

The SPEAKER. The motion is not debatable; discussion can only proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. O'NEIL. Then I ask unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. If gentlemen desire to make some arrangement it can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. O'NEIL. I wish to say to gentlemen on the other side that I have examined the list in the possession of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and that if the debate be closed at 4 o'clock this afternoon ample time will be given for all the gentlemen named on that list; but to cover contingencies I have named in my motion 5 o'clock, and it seems to me there ought to be no objection to it.

Mr. GROUT. Yes, Mr. Speaker; but I have a list which the

Chairman of the committee has not of gentlemen who desire to speak. And I will say for the information of the House that that covers four hours and thirty minutes' time. I went to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole [Mr. OUTHWAITE], and learned from him the name of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COUSINS], which I had not on my list. Putting that name on extends the time to four hours and a half. That includes all the names which the Chairman has as well as those who have made their requests to me. Now, 4 or 5 o'clock would evidently be too short a time. I know the debate has run for some time—

Mr. O'NEIL. Say 3 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. SAYERS. Two o'clock.

Mr. BURROWS. Three o'clock to-morrow will do.

Mr. GROUT. I think general debate ought to be closed at 3 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. O'NEIL. Then I will withdraw the former motion and ask unanimous consent that general debate be closed to-morrow at 3 o'clock.

Mr. GROUT. Personally I am inclined to do everything to expedite the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that general debate on the pending bill close at 3 o'clock to-morrow afternoon. Without objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEIL. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5482) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1895, and for other purposes, with Mr. OUTHWAITE in the chair.

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have read for information the amendment of which I gave notice yesterday, so that those who debate the question may address themselves, if they desire, to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. It is offered merely for information at this time.

Mr. ENLOE. Read for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert at the end of the bill the following section:

SEC. 2. That the act approved December 21, 1893, entitled "An act making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes," shall not be construed to prevent the temporary withholding of payments to pensioners upon clear prima facie evidence that their pensions were obtained by forgery, perjury, or other actual fraud upon the United States: *Provided*, That no pension shall be suspended until the thirty days' notice prescribed in said act shall have been given, and that cases of suspended pensioners shall be given priority upon request of the pensioner.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read the extract which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

The American people are generous and grateful, and they have impressed these characteristics upon their Government. Therefore, all patriotic and just citizens must commend liberal consideration for our worthy veteran soldiers and for the families of those who have died. No complaint should be made of the amount of public money paid to those actually disabled or made dependent by reason of army service.

But our pension roll should be a roll of honor, uncontaminated by ill design and uninvited by demagogic use. This is due to those whose worthy names adorn the roll, and to all our people who delight to honor the brave and the true. It is also due to those who in years to come should be allowed to hear, reverently and lovingly, the story of American patriotism and fortitude, illustrated by our pension roll.

The preferences accorded to veteran soldiers in public employment should be secured to them honestly and without evasion, and when capable and worthy their claim to the helpful regard and gratitude of their countrymen should be ungrudgingly acknowledged.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, that is the text of the remarks I have to make on this bill and the questions growing out of it. It is, as gentlemen will recollect, an extract from the letter of President Cleveland, accepting the nomination conferred upon him by the Chicago convention, dated in September, 1892. Upon that platform, as to soldiers' rights, the Democratic party stood in the canvass of 1892, and upon that platform it stands to-day. Upon that solemn declaration many thousands of soldiers voted for the Democratic candidate. I would invite especial attention to what the President so happily said as to the rights and equities of soldiers for preferment in all public employments for which they are capable.

I believe, sir, that if that declaration had been borne in mind in filling up the lists of employés in the Pension Office, very much of the irritation and complaints that have been heard would have disappeared. That brigade of clerical force they have there, and those battalions of examining surgeons and examiners in the field, should be made up as largely as possible of veteran soldiers and officers of the war, familiar with all the exigencies of service, who would be largely acquainted with the rank

and file of the Army, who would sympathize with the honest claims of worthy men, and who would be especially able to discriminate between the worthy and the unworthy. This would be a measure of gratitude towards Union veterans; it would be a measure of justice to all applicants for pensions; it would give great satisfaction to the people of this country. This remedy lies in the hands of the President.

Gentlemen familiar with the pension laws will remember that in the creation of the Pension Bureau Congress, with tenderness toward the veteran soldiers of the Union, was careful to provide that the duties of the Pension Commissioner should be executed under such rules and regulations as should be prescribed by the President of the United States.

This exceptional provision, placing a bureau of the Government under this immediate supervision of the President of the United States, marks in a signal way the desire of Congress to place upon the Executive a high degree of responsibility for all the transactions of that great office.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House is one that commands the approval of all parties and of all sections of our land.

Justice to the Union soldier is now the one question upon which all parties and all sections of our country are united and should unite. There is not a pension law upon our statute book which has not been voted for by all parties and all sections; and so may it ever be. This bill appropriates for the payment of pensions \$150,000,000, a larger sum than has ever been given in any one year for such a purpose by any government except our own. Republics, we may justly claim, are not ungrateful. It is good policy. If you would have good soldiers for the next war, take good care of those you had in the last war. [Applause.] Nobody proposes to take a dollar from the appropriation. There is no occasion to add a dollar more to the large amount appropriated. In the presence of such a fact, it can not be fairly said that the sentiment of justice for the soldiers of the Union is narrowed or defined by sectional or party lines.

If there be any just ground for criticism in regard to our pension laws, it must be acknowledged that they are liberal; and it must be confessed that they have been supported cheerfully by all parties. In all the years since the war, the Representatives of the Democratic party in Congress have voted to establish the system of pension laws written to-day in our statutes. They have heretofore voted, and will vote now and again for all appropriations necessary to execute these laws. Justice to the soldier is no longer a party question. The administration of the Pension Bureau should be nonpartisan. Whatever criticism may be justly made, is, I believe, confined to the execution of the laws, from time to time, in the Pension Bureau. The pension roll to-day contains nearly a million names. The pension roll will never be larger. Death will diminish it faster than additions will be made to it. To the Commissioner of Pensions is confided a vast trust and a great responsibility. In the nature of things it is impossible for that officer, exercising quasi-judicial powers, to pass personally upon the cases before him, numbering thousands and hundreds of thousands in the year. He must of necessity confide very much of his duties to subordinate officers. They may not always have the judicial faculty in a high degree. They may not always be diligent in the examination of cases.

An injustice may often be done—unavoidably done—but we have a right to exact from the Commissioner of Pensions, in the duties especially charged upon him, a high order of intelligence and a faithful regard to the interests of the wards of the nation confided to his care. We have a right to expect from his superior officer, the Secretary of the Interior, a watchful and patient supervision of his acts; and above all, we have a right to expect from the President of the United States, charged by the law of Congress with the especial duty of supervising the transactions of the Pension Bureau, a fulfillment of those patriotic and wise sentiments enunciated by him to the country in his letter of acceptance of the great trust to which he was chosen. [Applause.]

I am not able to agree with the Commissioner of Pensions, neither in his interpretation of the law nor in his way of treating the legislation of this Congress. In a communication to his chief, in answer to a resolution of this House, he says, in substance:

The statement in the preamble to the resolution declaring a pension to be a "vested right" is inaccurate, inapt, and inappropriate in the use of those two words.

That is not a decorous way to treat an act of Congress, in a communication to a superior officer, and before it was sent to this House in answer to a resolution of inquiry. The Secretary of the Interior should have returned it to the Pension Bureau with an admonition to treat this House and its legislation with due respect. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Those two words "vested right," are not "inaccurate," "in-

apt," nor "inappropriate." The Commissioner is as unfortunate in his law as he is in his manners. [Applause.] He had only to go to a law dictionary to find out what is "a right" and what is "a vested right;" and for his information I will read from Bouvier's Law Dictionary: "A right is defined to be a well founded claim." And while I am in the law line I will read a little more. "If a man demands his property, which is withheld from him, the right that supports his demand is a perfect one." Now, when a pensioner demands that his pension be paid to him, which the law of the land says he is entitled to, and which has been withheld from him without authority of law, that right is a perfect right.

Rights are absolute and qualified. "A man has the absolute right to recover property which belongs to him."

Therefore, a pensioner has an absolute right to demand the payment of the pension the law of the land has given to him.

Now, what is a "vested right?" That is defined with equal clearness.

"To vest" is to give to you a fixed right; "an estate is vested in possession when there exists a right of present enjoyment."

The pensioner has a right to the present enjoyment of his pension, vested in him by the law of the land. Therefore, it is a "vested right;" and the use of those words was apt, appropriate, and correct [applause], the law of the Pension Office to the contrary, notwithstanding. [Laughter and applause.] So we have not only bad manners, but bad law from that Bureau. [Renewed laughter and applause.]

The chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions of this House, with the sanction of his committee, brought in the amendment to the urgent deficiency bill passed December 21, 1893. There was occasion for it, sir. An army of 12,000 men had been denied their pensions, without authority of law, by a subordinate official; and so far as I know, without interference from his superior officer. There was occasion, I repeat, for that law, and it was proper and necessary for Congress to place those rights on a basis which would secure to them recognition in the proper bureau; and therefore the Committee on Invalid Pensions was entirely correct in describing those rights of pensioners as "vested rights."

The remonstrances made all over the country against the action of Commissioner Lochren in suspending pensions were manifestly just, in the judgment of Congress. To stop the pensions of an army of men, without a hearing, was wrong. It was cruel to hold a threat of impoverishment over every soldier and every widow on the pension roll.

Mr. Chairman, I can give the committee abundant reasons, drawn from the compilation of the pension laws published by the Pension Bureau, for the act of December, 1893. They print them for other people to read; they ought to read them themselves. [Laughter and applause.] These laws declare that upon a certain state of facts being shown the applicant "shall be entitled" to receive so many dollars a month from the Government. The whole pension system, as embodied in this volume, rests upon the solid ground of the right and title in the pensioner to the amount awarded to him by law. "Shall be entitled" is the language of the law in more than a dozen statutes. The most precious rights of the citizen are vested in him by statute. The right of suffrage is enjoyed by statute.

The right of inheritance is enjoyed by statute. These are "vested rights." The civil rights of men, in this country and everywhere, rest upon statute. You would awaken a very serious response from the American people if you told them these were not "vested rights." But there is more in this compilation. It is good reading for the Pension Bureau, if they would look through it. Section 4734 of the Revised Statutes enacts that "the provision of law which allows the withholding of compensation of any person who is in arrears to the Government shall not be construed to authorize the pension of any pensioner of the United States to be withheld."

That shows the spirit of our statutes in regard to withholding pensions from pensioners even if they are indebted to the United States. The United States does not permit any of its officials to deduct that debt from a pension. Section 4718 of the Revised Statutes places pensions beyond the reach of any creditor. It is declared by law that an accrued pension of a pensioner is no part of his assets; it can not be reached by any process of law; it is sacred, unapproachable by any hand on earth, except the hand of the soldier to whom the pension has been awarded. [Applause.]

Let me invite attention to the solemn declaration of the act of June 21, 1879:

But in no case shall a pension be withdrawn or reduced except upon notice to the pensioner and a hearing upon sworn testimony.

Coming, sir, to the act of 1890, under which so much of this mischief has been done, I read from section 4:

Any person who shall wrongfully withhold from a pensioner or claimant

the whole or any part of any pension or claim allowed or due such pensioner or claimant under this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both.

The Commissioner of Pensions has withheld many thousands of pensions during the past year; that they were wrongfully withheld is proved by the fact that most of them have been restored; most of them had been granted under this act; the act of withholding these pensions is declared by law to be a misdemeanor, no matter by whom the act is done. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I affirm that there was occasion for passing the act of December 21, 1893. All parties in this House voted for it. It was passed by a Democratic Congress and signed by a Democratic President. It expresses the just sentiment of the country from one end to the other. That act, sir, will stand. [Applause.] It ought to stand.

The country looked with frowns when they saw the maxims of common justice violated by the Interior Department in the treatment given to the wards of the nation by their guardians in that Department. The country demanded justice for these men, at least common justice, and Congress with remarkable unanimity and promptness passed that act and embodied it in our statutes. There let it stand. I have overlooked the fact that every certificate signed by a Commissioner of Pensions declares in the name of the United States of America that the pensioner named in the certificate "is entitled to a pension" for the amount specified. The certificate given to a pensioner is the bond of this Government. It is a debt. It can not be repudiated without dishonor. It can not be suspended without authority of law. Every pensioner is a bondholder. So much for the law of this case.

In a larger and broader sense, before the pension laws were passed, the American people decreed that the soldiers of the Union are entitled to receive and shall receive from our Government such grants of money as shall bear testimony to the appreciation in which a grateful country holds their services. This solemn decree of the people is expressed in our pension laws. That decree is as plainly written in the hearts of the people to-day as when it was made. That decree will never be modified, rescinded, or revoked as long as one soldier of our wars survives. [Loud applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee rose informally; and Mr. SPRINGER having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, a message from the Senate by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to return to the House of Representatives, in compliance with its request, a duplicate engrossed copy of the bill (S. 1217) "to continue in force the provisions of an act approved March 2, 1885, and entitled 'An act to protect the fish in the Potomac River in the District of Columbia, and to provide a spawning ground for shad and hering in the said Potomac River.'

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5646) "making appropriations to supply further urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, and for prior years, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had disagreed to by the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. COCKRELL, Mr. BRICE, and Mr. HALE as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee again resumed its session, Mr. OUTHWAITE in the chair.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to speak at this time, and hope not to detain the committee very long. I do not purpose to discuss in detail the operations of the Pension Bureau. After the very full and very able remarks to which I have listened from one of the most distinguished veterans of the Union Army, Gen. SICKLES, who exhibits in his person the evidences of his gallant services, which are an honor to him now and will be an honor to his memory in the great hereafter, I do not deem it necessary or useful to go over the ground that he has so well covered.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a matter of any importance to me that the Commissioner of Pensions is a Democrat. I care nothing about that. All that I desire is that there shall be such an administration of the Pension Office as shall give to every Union veteran, to his widow, to his orphan children, and to his dependent parents that consideration to which, by the laws of a grateful country, he and they are entitled.

Whoever will so administer that important office as to achieve that result shall receive my approval and gratitude, whatever be his politics, his nationality, or religion. [Applause.]

Indeed, I have deplored the unjust attacks which have been made in years past upon the worthy predecessors of the present

head of the Pension Bureau, and which have not failed to crop out in this debate upon the other side of the House.

I have too much respect for positions of public trust, too much regard for those who occupy them, to assail them recklessly or without what I feel assured to be a well-grounded reason for doing so.

Besides the injustice to the official so assailed there follows a wrong and an injury to the people. It is not well for them that their confidence in those whom they have intrusted with power and responsibility should be shaken without good and sufficient cause for it, and they have no more dangerous enemy than the reckless and irresponsible slanderer of their trusted public servants.

He is a demoralizer of themselves. His wretched and cowardly work can not fail to have that effect, for it is but natural that they should ask themselves why, if they who occupy positions of eminence and influence, and who are bound by their official oaths as well as by the claims of common honesty to be just and clean, disregard the rules of integrity, should they themselves, occupying more obscure positions where their examples are less observed, be altogether scrupulous?

The asseveration made here upon the Democratic side of the House in days gone by, when a Republican occupied the office of Commissioner of Pensions, that the Pension Office was honeycombed with fraud and corruption, has not only been a falsehood and a slander, but it has conveyed to the country such a wrong impression as has done great harm and injury; and I denounce it now, as I have done in the past, as being as wicked as it is false and as harmful as it is wicked. It is a disgrace to those who have sent it forth to the country and to the political party which sustained them in doing it. It served the purpose of affording an excuse for cutting off and withholding pensions, and of resisting sufficient appropriations for their payment, but it scandalized the Government at the same time that it slandered the administration of the Pension Office. That Republican Commissioners of Pensions have given the benefit of the doubt in favor of the claimants for pensions, where doubt has existed and could not be removed by evidence, is all that can justly be said upon that subject. Their bias to that extent, if it can be called a bias, I unqualifiedly indorse. If they, who in the perilous days of the Republic, placed themselves in positions to make them eligible candidates for the peoples' warmest gratitude and the Government's especial care are not entitled to a presumption in their favor, I know not who is. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In the same spirit which restrains me from making unjust charges against others, I protest against the reckless attacks which are made against the Union veterans of the war. As I would scorn to misrepresent the Commissioner of Pensions or any other public officer, so I will not listen, without entering my objection, to the slanders which, without conscience or considerations of decency, are uttered upon the Democratic side of the House against those men whose gallant services and great sacrifices made possible upon this continent to-day the most beneficent Government, the strongest and grandest nation that the world has ever known. [Applause.]

I am tired of the cant and hypocrisy of those who loudly protest their love of the Union soldiers at the same time that they defame their characters, and lose no opportunity to resist the allowance of their just claims upon the Government.

He who declares that in hundreds and thousands of neighborhoods fraudulent pensioners are known, and seeks to give the impression that pension frauds are common in all parts of the country, is a malignant enemy of the veterans of the Union armies, whatever his pretensions of friendship to them may be, because he declares against them what every intelligent man in the country knows is not true. I denounce that assertion as a base and vicious slander, whatever the source from which it comes. It is an injury and an insult to the living soldiers and to the widows and children of their dead comrades. I was not a little surprised that the gentleman from Illinois [Gen. BLACK], to whose gorgeous and glowing description of the battle of Gettysburg and the part taken in it by the present Commissioner of Pensions I listened with so much gratification, should let the occasion pass when he had unlimited time accorded him to speak in, without rebuking that disgraceful slander upon his old comrades, but, on the contrary, gave to it at least the consent of silence. I am constrained to think that his neglect to say even one word in defense of the character of those who stood with him upon the perilous edge of battle in defense of their country, in defense of the great home and fortress of human liberty on the face of the earth, and whose victories were the triumphs of mankind, must have been a lapse of memory. I can not believe it suited his purpose, while defending his friends, the Commissioner of Pensions and the Secretary of the Interior, to leave this baseless and malignant slander resting upon his old com-

rades without a syllable uttered in their defense. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that this infamous slander of the old soldiers has never come from this side of the House; that Republican lips have never spoken it here; that Republican officials have never declared it; that the Republican press of the country has never heralded it.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] reached the conclusion in the course of his argument on Saturday last that one who had been a brave soldier could not be other than the soldiers' friend. That ought to be a correct conclusion. It would seem that it could not be otherwise. But while I am glad to say that in almost all instances it is correct, there are some unfortunate cases where it is not, and misrepresentation of the Union soldiers and efforts to prevent his receiving that consideration which a patriotic spirit demands for him, and which a great, self-respecting nation can not afford to withhold, are the same, the same in character and the same to him, whether they come from one source or another; only they seem worse and more offensive when they come from those who, by the ties of comradeship and mutual participations in hardships, dangers, and victory, should be held by the strongest bonds of friendship and affection that can ever bind together the hearts of men.

One of the bravest, most intrepid, and brilliant soldiers of our Revolutionary war, whose energy was tireless, whose prowess was unmatched, and for whom no enterprise was too great or hazardous to undertake, the projector of the plans that insured the capture of Ticonderoga, and the hero of Saratoga, for which he never received credit, as heroic as Cæsar and as daring as Alexander the Great, the idol of his men, and holding the confidence of Washington, became the fierce and inveterate enemy of his old comrades who had fought beside him in many a hotly contested battle and shared with him the honors of victory upon more than one field of war. Had he been shot at the close of the battle of Saratoga he would have gone down in the pages of history as one of the brightest stars in that constellation of grand characters who made the American revolution glorious for all time. For his own reputation and the honor of the American name I am sorry that he did not end his career in the fullness of his patriotic achievements.

But having deserted the cause which he had so warmly espoused and earnestly fought for, and turned his arms against his old comrades and compatriots, all the splendor of his early exploits could not save him from the execration of his countrymen nor his name from the brand of infamy by mankind.

If so great a soldier, so brilliant a general, so ardent a patriot as Benedict Arnold unquestionably at one time was, could become the enemy of his old comrades in arms and of his country, and attempt before the war closed to compass their defeat, it may not be considered an absolute anomaly that in all the hundreds of thousands of brave men who took their lives in their hands and went forth to do heroic battle for their country, here and there one may be found, now since the war has ended and the victory has been won, who can be unjust to those who stood with him in the great fight. But let us be thankful that those instances are very rare. In citing them I refer neither to the Commissioner of Pensions nor to the gentleman who so eloquently championed his cause here last Saturday.

But I have seen them here. They were evidently put forward because, having been in the Union Army, they could speak with more effect and accomplish what others who stood behind them felt it neither wise nor decorous to attempt to do themselves.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] on yesterday, and the gentleman from Illinois [Gen. BLACK] on Saturday, and they who from time to time since I have been in Congress, have preceded them in the same line, prefaced their attacks upon the pension laws and upon the old soldiers, by saying they desired that the pension roll should be a roll of honor; that it should be untainted with fraud; that they wished to have it clean. Mr. Chairman, have those gentlemen ever found anybody to contend with them upon that proposition? Have they ever heard anyone say that he did not want a clean pension roll? Have they ever known any Grand Army post in this country to resolve that they wanted anything but a clean pension roll, or desired that it should be anything but a roll of honor? Have they ever seen any Republican platform, adopted in any national or State convention in this country, which has declared for anything but a pension roll that should be a roll of honor?

Mr. Chairman, when I was a student at school it used to be laid down in our elementary books that one of the most skillful and effective sophistries was to state first a self-evident truth, or something universally conceded, to get the mind to accept that, and then draw the mind to accept another proposition which in fact was by no means a logical consequence of the first. So our friends upon the other side of the House who attack the pension roll say, "We want the pension roll to be a roll of honor, a roll

that is not tainted with fraud; hence the existing pension roll is tainted with fraud." [Laughter.] But, Mr. Chairman, that does not follow by any means. The utter absurdity of such an argument no one, upon reflection, will fail for a moment to perceive. No honest man in the land, whether he be old soldier or always a civilian, desires that the pension roll should be anything other than a roll of honor, and they who are so loudly declaiming for it in this House are by no means those persons who desire it most.

Sir, every time in this House, during the last eleven years, when the bill making appropriations to pay pensions has been before us, we have heard this same old song sung, we have heard this same story told, we have witnessed these same attacks upon the pensioners. The attempt has been to stab the Union veterans through the Pension Office. To find an excuse for depriving them of their pensions by alleging fraud and corruption has been the endeavor. There has been no virulence of abuse, no vehemence of denunciation, no disgraceful odium that gentlemen on the other side of the House have spared the Union soldiers during these recurring debates upon bills making appropriations for pensions.

Now, no one doubts that in the great number of pension claims there are some fraudulent ones. It is inconsistent with human nature that it should be otherwise. And I have no doubt that the moral tone of each community where the pensioners live may have some effect upon the number of dishonest claims that are presented to the Pension Office. I should advise gentlemen who think they can find hundreds of such cases in their neighborhoods to do some vigorous missionary work in their districts. They can hardly make better use of themselves.

I am sure that no one knows more about the pensions and pensioners in my district than I do. There may possibly be some fraudulent cases there, but I do not know of one. And, Mr. Chairman, they do not exist extensively in anybody's district. I have never heard the charge of wholesale pension frauds made on this floor and sustained, or in any considerable degree sustained. Like the boy's ten thousand squirrels, when put to proof they dwindle down to one hundred, then to fifty, then to one, and then to only a suspicion of one. [Laughter.] They have never been shown in debate here to materialize. It is only the enemy of pensions or the entirely uninformed who utter and send broadcast these slanders upon the veterans of the Union armies.

Mr. Chairman, I could not but admire the assurance and effrontery of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK], who on last Saturday stood here before at least a fairly intelligent audience to advertise the Democratic party to the country as the friend par excellence of the old soldier and of pensions. Sir, no one in the world is more gratified than I am that any portion of the Democratic party stands by the old soldiers, and no one can be more ready to give them credit for it. But I think that the gentleman's confidence in the child-like simplicity of the American people must have been something more than sublime when he could venture to make such an assertion as that in the National House of Representatives. How many of the people of this country does he hope to make believe it? How deep an impression does he expect that statement to make upon the old soldiers of the Union Army? How deep an impression does he expect his assertion will make upon the neighbors of those old soldiers, when they see their pensions withheld or cut off and the veterans thereby plunged into destitution and suffering?

Does the gentleman suppose that the people will swallow his proposition that because Democratic Houses, as well as Republican Houses of Congress, have passed appropriation bills providing for the payment of pensions due under Republican laws, therefore the Democratic party has been the great champion of pensions? Do you take so much credit to yourselves because you did not stop the wheels of the Government in order to defeat the payment of pensions already declared by the statutes of your country to be due to Union soldiers?

What debt of the Government is more sacred than the soldier's pension, and what one should be paid if that should be repudiated? You may as well claim credit for providing for the payment of the expenses of the Army, the Navy, or any other branch of the Government, including your own salaries, as for making appropriations for the payment of pensions.

Why, Mr. Chairman, it might be well enough for us on this point to read some not very remote American history. I am afraid that the gentleman who made that statement has been negligent in the perusal of the recent history of his country, else he would not have made such a declaration.

When about eight years ago it was proposed in this House so to amend a pension act then pending as to repeal the limitation to the arrearage law and give arrearages to all soldiers alike, who was it that filibustered until suspension day came and then under a suspension of the rules put the bill through, making

that amendment an impossibility? Did anybody but Democrats do it? Ah, but my Democratic friends may say that that carried a big appropriation. That is true; but it must be remembered that that amendment was proposed at a time when Democratic incompetency and the threat of Democratic free trade had not depleted the Treasury of this country; and Uncle Sam had the dollars in his strong box to pay the bills. [Applause.]

I recollect, Mr. Speaker, that there was once before this House a dependent pension bill—a bill to pension the widows of the dead soldiers, and the sick and impoverished soldiers then living, 9,000 of whom, as it was then stated, were in the poorhouses of the country. I recollect that our friends on the other side of the House would not consent to the passage of that bill until we had agreed that we would help them pass the Mexican pension bill, the beneficiaries of which were, a very large majority of them, ex-Confederates. For the sake of passing the dependent pension bill we did agree to that. I agreed to it myself. I voted for the Mexican pension bill upon that consideration. I voted for both measures. Both passed this House. They passed a Republican Senate without trouble. Those two bills went together to a Democratic President; and that Democratic President—to-day at the head of the party which the gentleman declares is the great friend of the pensioners—signed the Mexican pension bill, making it the law of the land, and vetoed the dependent pension bill which if signed would have furnished to the old soldiers of the Republic something to live upon. And that veto sent more than 20,000 destitute old veterans and soldiers' widows to the poorhouses, or to become the subjects of charity. We waited till the Fifty-first Congress convened, when the President, Senate, and House were Republican. Then we passed the dependent pension bill. Then a Republican President signed it and it became the law of the land, and I believe no law was ever enacted that carried more comfort and gladness directly to the hearts of so many of our people who were suffering and deserving the nation's gratitude, than that Republican statute. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. I would like a few moments longer.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. OUTHWAITE). The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent to continue five minutes longer. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask a further question. Who was it, was it a Republican or a Democratic President, that vetoed private pension bills by the hundred after they had been reported to this House by the Committee on Invalid Pensions as being proper measures of relief for soldiers or their dependent relatives, after they had passed the House and the Senate? I ask again, who was it that during all of last Congress came here on pension nights and called a quorum, whenever no quorum was present, and thus prevented the opportunity to pass pension bills for the relief of sick and maimed soldiers, their widows and orphans? Was it anybody but members of the Democratic party? We on our side could not make a quorum; we had not members enough to do it. The Democrats would absent themselves. They would have two or three members stationed here just as crows have two or three of their fellows stationed on some tall tree to watch while the flock is stealing the grain. [Laughter.]

These Democratic sentinels, in the absence of the great majority of their party members, would call a quorum and prevent the passage of pension bills.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have not time, and it is not important for me to argue this phase of the question any longer. Every pensioner in this country, every old soldier, I think to-day, if he has never known before who his friends are, knows now. He and the people know that there is not one great, important law on the statute books of the nation, granting pensions to Union soldiers, that has not been passed by Republican votes, and in nearly every instance with the opposition of the Democratic members of the House. No Republican here has voted against bills to pension Union soldiers. Every attack made upon them, every denunciation of them and of pensions for them, has come from Democrats.

As it is in the House, so it is throughout the country. While not all Democrats are opposed to the granting of liberal pensions to the veterans of the Union armies, all who do oppose them are Democrats. You hear nothing of it here, you hear none of it anywhere from Republicans.

As during the war, among all the hundreds of thousands who attempted to destroy the country and erect a slaveholder's oligarchy upon its ruins, and among all those who in the North sympathized with the rebellion, gave it encouragement, declared the war a failure, and threw the weight of their influence against the Union armies, not one Republican was ever found, so now, of all the obstructions thrown in the way of granting just pensions to deserving Union soldiers, of all the misrepresentations

of their character and slanders upon their good names, none come, none have ever come, none ever will come, from the Republican party or Republicans. When the future historian shall record the transactions of this generation of Americans, he will make nothing clearer in the pages of his book than the loyalty and fidelity of the Republican party to the Union cause and its brave defenders. [Applause on the Republican side.]

From the dawn of its existence that patriotic party has carried but one flag and served but one country. It has never wandered away to worship strange political idols. Its devotions have been paid at but one shrine, which is the American Union. Whether in the contest with human slavery, the throes of civil war, the reconstruction of the Government after the defeat of a Democratic rebellion, the administration of the nation's finances, the shaping of an economic policy for the industries and labor of the people, or the just recognition of the heroic men who achieved the most beneficent victory that has ever been won in war, the guiding purpose of the Republican party has been the welfare, the progress, and the honor of this great nation which it has done so much to make one, and to make it glorious. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] informed us that a "prostituted public sentiment" favored the allowance of liberal pensions. A prostituted public sentiment! Indeed, has Democracy got so far as to call it that? A prostituted sentiment, is it, that sympathizes with the old Union veterans, that respects them, has an affection for them, and is so proud of the country which they saved, that the cheek would mantle with shame to see it neglect them in their old age, their infirmities, and, in too many instances, their poverty.

What sentiment was it that inspired these men to go to the front to face death and endure all the hardships and sufferings of war? What sentiment warmed the gentleman's breast when he so gallantly met his country's foes? Was it any other than that patriotic sentiment which inspires all true-hearted Americans to cherish and honor the Union soldier now? And does he call that a prostituted sentiment? I am sure he can not have meant it. [Applause.]

There are those, not he, who hate the Union soldier because he was a Union soldier. There are those who hate pensions because they create public expenditures, and therefore stand in the way of free trade. There are those who oppose appropriations of money for the old soldier out of the Treasury of the nation which he saved because it is popular to do so in certain localities. But when they and all their petty purposes are forgotten, his name will be honored, his memory will be revered, and the flag which he bravely carried through good report and evil report, in victory and defeat, until the grand moment of the final triumph of the cause which he loved, shall float as the proud emblem of the greatest, the freest, and the most honored nation in all the earth. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] be permitted to speak without limit. This is a privilege which I believe has been enjoyed by several gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. COOMBS. I shall not object, provided it does not interfere with the proper division of time between the two sides.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Not at all. I understand there will be ample time for all who desire to speak.

Mr. COOMBS. I do not object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio be permitted to speak without limit. Is there objection?

Mr. STOCKDALE. I will ask the Chair whether there has been any division of time agreed upon?

The CHAIRMAN. The division of time has thus far run along pretty evenly; and this proposed extension will come out of the time on that side of the House. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I hope I may not occupy time to such an extent as to cause the committee to regret their generosity in according to me this privilege.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to gentlemen composing this intelligent committee that I shall discuss the questions which have been brought prominently into this debate (for there seems to be little or no question so far as the passage of this bill is concerned) from the standpoint of fair and just investigation. In a very modest way I had something to do with the war a long time ago; and I had as much of it at that time as I wanted; and I do not want to renew it here on the floor of this House. My argument will not be made from the standpoint of a partisan, except as I shall answer incidentally some of the partisan arguments that have been made on the other side of the House. I am glad to accord to our friends on the other side my full confidence in the sincerity of their claim to just as full loyalty to

the Government as I have. And I have always found that the men who fought on the wrong side are much nearer right now than are those who did not fight. I hail the loyal ex-Confederate as a brother.

I concur in the remark of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] who has just taken his seat that it is somewhat remarkable that upon every occasion when there has been pending before Congress a pension appropriation bill we have always had this discussion. I do not say that the partisan portion of it has always emanated from one side of the House; but if you gentlemen on the other side are not making a partisan attack on this appropriation bill, what are you doing? What are you here for? What is the purpose of your speeches? Why was it that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] demonstrated his peculiar, his unparalleled, his incomparable efficiency as a partisan attorney? Why was it the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] devoted his time without limit to undertaking to prove the existence of certain facts? Why does he introduce that sort of argument here upon the question of the passage of this appropriation bill? They did not do all this for nothing. They had some well-defined theory, some plan of action. What is it? Do they feel that this Administration needs defense, or do they plan for advantage in coming campaigns?

We have reached almost the end of an average generation of men since the war closed, and we are here to discharge a single duty, and that duty is to appropriate money enough to meet the demands upon the Treasury of the United States to be made in pursuance of law by the soldiers of the country. If I felt absolutely sure, Mr. Chairman, that the administration of the Pension Office would disburse the amount of money carried in this bill, I should feel greatly relieved in my mind as a friend of my comrades of the late war. But when I read the statement of the Commissioner and see the illogical position in which he has placed himself, I am afraid that the threats which were made at the beginning of this Administration are to be carried out; and that the "roll of honor" which you are talking about is to become, so far as your actions can affect it, a roll of infamy. I do not believe it is possible—I do not believe any man believes it is possible—that the just claims upon the Treasury can be met by the appropriations carried by this bill.

I stand here now to sound a warning note, which I will reiterate, if my life is spared, a year from now—that you in passing this bill with this inadequate appropriation will do one of two things; you will either violate your duty to the old soldier in one of the ways which I will try to point out later on; or else you will have to create an enormous deficiency to be covered by this Congress in the year which is to follow.

And right here I might as well ask what is to be done during the coming fiscal year by the Pension Bureau, with the nearly 600,000 unadjudicated pension claims pending in the Bureau of Pensions to-day. What estimate is being made by the Commissioner of Pensions in this statement, which is a part of the report of the Committee on Appropriations connected with this bill in their behalf? What is to be done with those claims? I stand here to say that a close analysis of his entire statement shows that he does not propose there shall be during the coming year any considerable number of favorable adjudications of the 600,000 pending pension claims. In no other way can this estimate be accounted for.

I was told the other day—and I am going to make several revelations, and after awhile I propose to comment upon the facility with which both sides get information from the Pension Bureau—I was told that a single examiner in the Pension Bureau on a single day last week passed upon nearly 150 pension claims. It would have startled the gentle blood in the veins of the amiable gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] if he had known that such a thing as that was possible. But I could have relieved the shock by telling him that out of those 150 pension claims thus acted on about 125 were rejected.

It does not take a great while for an examiner who stands beside the wheels of the machine that is running and grinding to sign his name (with a stamp it may be) to approve the action of the machine that has rejected the pension of a soldier. Read the Commissioner's report to the Appropriations Committee. It will appear that there is now being made in the Bureau three rejections to one allowance, if I read the figures correctly. And I am forced to the conclusion, when I read the statement of the Commissioner of Pensions, in connection with this estimate—I am driven to the conclusion that he does not intend that there shall be a greater ratio of approvals than there has been in the past.

But, Mr. Chairman, I desire now to refer especially to the argument made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK], and I propose to devote my time very largely to a review or a reply, in so far as I am capable of making it, to the argument which he introduced.

He proposed to show three things to the country: First, that the Democratic party was not unfriendly to the soldier; second, that the Department had not been unfriendly in its administration; and, third, a defense, as I recollect, of the administration itself.

I care nothing about the administration of the Pension Office so far as individuals are concerned. I want to say right here that I do not know why the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] introduced the war record of the Commissioner of Pensions. I can not understand its pertinence. I think upon a point of order the Chairman of the committee would have had to rule that the whole of that part of the gentleman's remarks, the whole of that argument, the whole of that beautiful illustration, was out of order, as totally impertinent to the question under consideration.

We are discussing the character of the administration of the Pension Bureau now. What has the military record of Mr. Commissioner Lochren got to do with that? Did the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] feel that the Commissioner, in these letters which have been read from the desk, had been driven from the strong intrenchment of just administration, and had finally been compelled to take up his line of occupation in clouds of rhetoric and eloquence? If such is the case the Commissioner selected a most efficient officer to conduct and manage his change of position. If I have time, I may refer to the battle of Gettysburg, and I may introduce another actor in that bloody drama in our history, and I may connect the Commissioner of Pensions a little more closely with a tragedy which I will relate than did the eloquence of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] connect the Commissioner of Pensions with the victory that was won on that battlefield.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] wants to know why it is that the soldiers of the country complain of the Democratic party and the administration of the Pension Office. I will discuss both of his questions together.

In the first place, the soldiers of the country, rightfully or wrongfully, have no confidence in the President of the United States, so far as their interests are concerned. I think myself there may be prejudice beyond that which is thoroughly justified by the facts; but there is a connected history of his administration of this Government which justifies a doubt in the mind of the soldier whether or not he is a friend.

I do not refer to his early history during the war. I care nothing about that, because there is many a man who did not serve in the Army in his own proper person who was abundantly able to have done so, but who in the exercise of his own judgment saw fit to be represented by somebody else, who nevertheless has been loyal and faithful to the interests of the soldier ever since and during the war, and I make no point on that. But when he became President of the United States the soldiers of the country witnessed a spectacle that alarmed them, and the alarm extended from Maine to California, and has grown and spread wider and deeper since.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] has referred to two bills pending in this House at once. I very well remember that struggle. I was myself unalterably opposed to one of the sections of the Mexican pension bill, and yet when I saw that it was the only possible avenue to the passage of the so-called dependent pension bill, I voted for it. I know that there could be no honest contract among members of the House of Representatives to pass one bill in consideration of the passage of another, but I know there was an implied agreement. One bill carried, or was to carry, the other, and the President of the United States signed the bill that gave nearly 20,000 ex-Confederates a hold upon the Treasury of the United States, and vetoed a bill the vetoing of which sent to the poorhouses more than 20,000 Union soldiers and their wives and children. It reminded me of the reason why we have never had the veto power in the constitution of the State of Ohio.

Never during the history of that magnificent State have we ever trusted a governor to veto a bill, and the reason for it, it is said, came of the fact that away back in the Territorial history of the State, in the administration of the last Territorial governor, there was a proposition submitted to him to repeal a tax upon marriage licenses. It was felt that it was a tax upon the people of the country, that it was burdensome; but this tax was a perquisite of the governor, and the governor said he could not afford to have that much money taken out of his perquisites while his salary remained so small. So the Territorial Legislature passed a bill to increase the governor's salary by the estimated amount of the marriage license fees, and another bill to repeal the tax upon marriage licenses, and they were both submitted to the old governor at one time. He approved the bill to increase the salary and vetoed the bill repealing the tax on marriage licenses. [Laughter.] From that day to this we have never had a veto in Ohio.

Mr. Cleveland put himself in a worse position than did the old governor of the Territory northwest of the Ohio, for he understood as well as anybody understood that there was a demand upon him, first, of good faith, and, secondly, of patriotism, and he failed to respond to both. This act of the President raised a doubt in the minds of the old soldiers, and I deeply regret that time and subsequent events have not effaced that doubt and have deepened and strengthened the doubt. His words of cordial good will in his speeches, letters, and messages have been the "word of promise to the ear," but his public acts have been the instruments which have broken these promises "to the hope." That it is so I regret; that the facts as I state them exist can not be denied.

Now, says the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK], in one of his explosions of eloquence, the Democratic party has always been the friend of pension legislation. My friend from Illinois [Mr. BLACK], with all his acquirements, is utterly ignorant of the history of the party to which he belongs. He is without the ordinary information of a third-rate Democratic crossroads apostle, so far as the record of his party is concerned.

The Democratic party always in favor of pension legislation! Why, my Democratic brother, aside from that Mexican pension bill, which has been the subject of the greatest abuse there ever was in the Pension Office—and I will come to that later on—the Democratic party in Congress never gave a sufficient vote for any general pension bill to pass it in this House or in Congress. There is not a pension law on the statute books of the United States that by any fair construction can be called a general pension law that you ever voted for in numbers sufficient to pass it, and there is not one that you did not vote against by a clear majority of your members in both Houses of Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.] Deny this if you can. Deny it and I will confront you with the record.

What is the use of putting declamation against record? What is the use of putting eloquence and oratory against facts? How can you get rid of the record of Congress by a picture of Gettysburg? [Applause on the Republican side.] Do you think that the old soldiers of this country are to be humbugged by beautiful utterances? Do you think they do not know who has done all this, and who has refused to do all this? My comrades of the war are a most intelligent body of men.

Mr. ALLEN. If the gentleman will permit a suggestion from me, I believe he is trying to stir up party strife here. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, Mr. Chairman, my answer to the gentleman from Mississippi is, from a member of this House with his record of nonpartisanship, with his innocence upon a question like this, I am not willing to take his judgment as to what I am doing. I doubt whether he understands what partisanship is, he is so free from it himself. [Laughter.]

Coming back now to the legislation of the country, I am not doing this to irritate anybody. I am doing it only to answer the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK], who said that the Democratic party had always been in favor of pensions to the soldier. I will put into the RECORD, in the absence of objection, going back to 1878, to the bill to repeal the limitation of arrears act, and coming down to every one of the pension laws that grace the statute books of this country, and shine to-day as the stars in the diadem of the patriotism of the Republican party [applause], the votes in both Houses, and I will show you and show the country that the Democratic party has stood blocking the way to the doing of justice to the soldiers and they have done this from the earliest dawn of the beginning of this legislation in Congress down to the present time. [Applause on the Republican side.] I will add a full statement of this vote at the end of my remarks as an appendix with other matter to which I shall allude as I go along.

Aggregating all the votes that we have had for all the bills which have been passed, which I enumerate here, 417 Democrats voted for them, and 648 Democrats voted against them, while 1,066 Republicans voted for them, and not one Republican voted against them. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And yet there comes here a gentleman of high character, and under the glamour of his own oratory he loses his own recollection of what happened in this country, and appeals to the country to say that the Democratic party has always been in favor of pensions.

I am arguing now to show why it is that the soldiers of the country are in doubt—or rather are not in doubt—as to the attitude of the Democratic party upon this question. Going back to the days of George Washington and coming down to the present, when there were differences between the President and Congress, hot, bitter controversies, strong personal and political differences, yet from the beginning of the Government down to the close of Harrison's Administration, Mr. Cleveland vetoed 524 pension bills, against 5 vetoed by all the other Presidents of

the United States. This number includes pocket vetoes as well as written ones.

We come here to meet the declaration of the President, which was referred to by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] on yesterday, that in "thousands of neighborhoods they have well-known fraudulent pensioners" on the pension rolls. I do not believe that the charge made by the President has been successfully maintained on this floor. I do not believe that the advocates of the utterance that the pension roll is honeycombed with fraud have sustained themselves.

Now, I propose to answer some of their arguments, and in doing so to meet two of the propositions of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK]. One is, why do the soldiers of the country doubt the good faith of the Democratic party; and the second is, is there existing this condition of fraud that is talked about? These are the two questions to which the able gentleman mainly addressed himself.

I presume I hold in my hand the strongest utterance that can be made in support of the charges of fraud, for when a demand is made upon the Bureau of Pensions by a friend of that Bureau under its present organization, I take it for granted that we will get about all there is that can be said upon the subject. Recollect, this Bureau of Pensions has been almost a year in the hands of a Democratic administration. They were not novices when they went in there. Only four years before that they had had four years of administration, and it is presumable that the fullest information has been given by Mr. Commissioner Lochren in the letter which I hold in my hand.

Before I refer to it specifically, I want to say that the President of the United States charges the old soldiers of the country with being fraudulent pensioners. It was only a quibble with the gentleman on the other side—I do not remember who it was—to say that that charge is met by proof that attorneys have been guilty of frauds. The President says that thousands of neighborhoods are filled with fraudulent pensioners. A pensioner does not mean a man who has applied for a pension. A pensioner means a man who has acquired a pension, does it not? While a man's application is pending he is not a pensioner. When it is granted and he is placed upon the rolls, then he becomes a pensioner. Not until then.

Why, the charge is made that there are thousands of these pensioners in all the hamlets and towns of this country, and these charges have been made in all sorts of forms in this debate. I stand here and say, on behalf of the men of the Union Army, that these charges are without sufficient foundation and utterly, incomparably false. [Applause on the Republican side.] Not only false, but false and malicious; because the facts are known to the people of this country; and the man who, for partisan purposes, makes such an utterance as that against the Grand Army of the Republic of this country ought to be held to a strict accountability for his action. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Now, in answer to all this what do they say? You do not suppose that this gentleman, representing the Bureau of Pensions, and who it appears is one of the confidential advisers of the Executive, as we are told he is by an ex-confidential adviser, you do not suppose he held back somewhere a supply of information? Now, this letter will go in the speech of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE], and therefore I will probably not publish it in full, but I will refer to it.

"In compliance with your request"—

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him there?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. I just wanted to state in this connection, so that it might be known, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] has been called away to Providence, R. I. I desire to say that so that the RECORD will show that he is not present.

Mr. GROSVENOR. You allude to Gen. BLACK?

Mr. BROOKSHIRE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will not say anything that will be improper in view of the fact that Gen. BLACK is not present. I have a very great admiration for Gen. BLACK; and if the President of the United States had gone to Illinois and taken from down in the neighborhood of East St. Louis a gentleman who lay all night upon the bloody battlefield of Fort Henry, and who was a Democrat, educated and trained before the President knew the difference between a Democrat and a humbug [laughter], and made him—

Mr. LACEY. There is no difference.

Mr. HARTMAN. There is no difference.

Mr. GROSVENOR (continuing). And made him Secretary of the Interior, with an unclosed bullet wound through him, there would have been no such condition of distrust among the soldiers as we have had here in regard to the administration of Hoke Smith. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But it was because the President of the United States excluded from his counsel such men as William R. Morrison, the comrade and friend of the soldier [loud applause], and took men whom fame had never discovered, that this trouble has come. I may refer to that further on. We might as well call things by their right names while we are talking about them.

A MEMBER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Call a spade a spade, general.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Here, then, is the defense; here is the answer. I have it in my hand. The President of the United States says:

Thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners.

I challenge that statement, and say it is not borne out by the facts. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Here comes the answer; here is the answer: Demurrable, not admissible, incompetent, impertinent, insulting to the intelligence of this House. He states now—

Mr. MORSE. Who are you quoting from?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am quoting from the Commissioner of Pensions. He opens with a number of cases of what are known as the W. Bowen Moore cases. Now, what does he say in the gravamen in the Moore cases. Does he say that there is an old soldier involved in them? Does he allege a single thing against a soldier. Listen to what he says. Let us look at it. Let us be fair about it. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] introduced it in support of the position taken by himself. It is the best evidence he could get. It is incompetent evidence, and does not meet the issue.

William Bowen Moore, of Buffalo, N. Y., or William B. Moore & Co., of Rochester, N. Y., filed declarations and evidence to support the same. It has shown by special examiners that much of the evidence filed by Mr. Moore was prepared in violation of law. Many of the affidavits filed by him were not sworn to by the affiants—

How does that reflect upon the soldier?—

and others were materially added to after the affiants had left the office.

Forgery by a pension attorney is the allegation. I do not know how true it is. How does that prove dishonesty upon the part of the soldier?

Mr. ENLOE. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. ENLOE. Does the gentleman understand that the issue here is as to the dishonesty of the soldier, or fraud in the granting of a pension?

Mr. GROSVENOR. What does your President say?

Mr. COGSWELL. Read it again.

Mr. ENLOE. Read what the President said.

Mr. MARSH. Let him understand it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. These are the words. This is the charge made by Mr. Cleveland:

The discovery having been made that many names had been put upon the pension roll by means of wholesale and gigantic frauds.

I read from what purports to be the language of the President.

Mr. ENLOE. Is that a quotation from the President's message?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes, I so understand it, sir; but I will give the whole quotation. The exact language of the President is this:

Thousands of neighborhoods have their well-known fraudulent pensioners.

That is what I say.

Mr. ENLOE. Now, I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio this question, as he said that was incompetent testimony. If it appears that the testimony under which the pension was granted was fraudulent itself, does not that make the pensioner a fraudulent pensioner?

Mr. GROSVENOR. It depends upon who furnishes the testimony.

Mr. ENLOE. He is the beneficiary.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If he furnishes the testimony—

Mr. ENLOE. He is a fraudulent pensioner if his pension is fraudulent.

Mr. GROSVENOR. He says that "a great many of the affidavits were never sworn to, and a great many more were added to after the affiants had left the office."

Mr. ENLOE. And states that cases were made up by manufactured testimony.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It does not appear that one of the cases was made up by manufactured testimony produced by soldiers.

Mr. ENLOE. That is the very question being investigated.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, when you investigate you find that they are unallowed pensions; and does that justify the President in saying that the towns and villages in the country are honeycombed with fraudulent pensioners? Does it?

Mr. ENLOE. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that these are allowed claims.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not concur in what the gentleman from Tennessee says. Here is the testimony.

Mr. ENLOE. I refer the gentleman to the Pension Office.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, let us see next as to the New Mexico pension cases:

About 1,700 cases have been sent out for special investigation under order 218. This was done because it had come to the knowledge of the Bureau that one M. R. Marcellino, a notary public or pension attorney, had been guilty of manufacturing claimants.

Now, that is put in here to show that the pensioners of this country are fraudulent, is it? Somebody out in New Mexico, amid the cacti and the cowboys of that section of the country, was "manufacturing claimants," and therefore the President of the United States cries out that the pension roll is honeycombed with fraud.

It does not appear from this statement that one of them ever got on the pension roll. He says that he has suspended 1,700 cases. Why, when anybody presented 1,700 cases from New Mexico that were not already on the pension roll, it would not take a very brilliant Secretary of the Interior to know that that was a lie, and that somebody was trying to steal. They are 1,700 cases, unsuccessful pension applications, that is all. I have no doubt the people of New Mexico will condemn without qualification the man who attempted to bring disrepute upon the fair name of that Territory.

But Mr. Lochren forgot to state that Mr. M. R. Marcellino was indicted by a Republican United States district attorney, appointed by President Harrison, and that he pleaded guilty, and is serving a nine years' term in the penitentiary. This seems to relieve the present Administration from the credit of this discovery and conviction.

As to the Indian Territory cases, 1,400 of them they say:

It has come to the knowledge of the Bureau that many of the claims filed by persons having served in the Indian Home Guards were tainted with fraud.

That is all. Then comes the Iowa case, which was successfully explained yesterday. Then come the Norfolk cases:

There are 550 at Norfolk. They were filed for the most part by W. R. Drury, of Norfolk. Very few of the claims filed by him were valid, because of the irregularities in their execution. One Richardson, a notary public, had a desk in Drury's office, and it was Drury's custom to sign Richardson's name and affix his seal to the declarations filed by him.

That is what they are investigating there, and there is no charge that a single soldier was a party to any of these frauds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no disposition to make wholesale charges, but I will be justified by every member of this House when I say that after you have done your best, have collated all the evidence and laid bare all the frauds that have been perpetrated by Union soldiers upon the Treasury, you will find more frauds upon the Treasury committed—ten dollars to one—on every week day that passes over our heads, at the custom-house in the city of New York, than were ever perpetrated by all the Union soldiers of the United States put together, through the instrumentality of pensions. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STOCKDALE. If that is so, does not the gentleman think it would be a good idea to repeal the tariff. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. No, sir; I am not therefore in favor of repealing the tariff. I am in favor of standing by it. I do not say out that I want to destroy the institutions of my country simply because there is somebody somewhere who is dishonest. [Applause on the Republican side.] There are more illegal moonshine stills in the United States to-day, ten to one, than there are dishonest names on the pension rolls. [Applause on the Republican side.] There are more men engaged in the manufacture of counterfeit money than there are dishonest names on the pension rolls. I will come directly to a more pertinent matter, so far as I am concerned, but first I want to make this general statement: I deny that, out of the nine hundred and fifty-odd thousand men whose names grace the roll of honor of this country and make it the glory of the people, make it a thing back towards which their children and grandchildren will look with pride, there are one thousand names of men who are not honestly entitled to pensions.

Mr. Chairman, there are not five hundred; there are not two hundred. If there are two hundred your Commissioner of Pensions ought to be impeached and turned out of office. What is he there for? How long does it take him to ascertain whether a man is honestly or dishonestly on the pension roll? What is required to entitle a man to be a pensioner? Our friends seem to have overlooked that question entirely. Even the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK], with his long experience in the Pension Office, seems to be utterly oblivious as to what it is that constitutes the claim of a soldier to a pension. What difference does it make, under the law of 1890, whether the soldier served in the Army in battle or otherwise? There is but a single condition imposed by that law, and when the soldier complies with that condition he stands by the law of his country, and he has a right to stand by it, and no man has a right, be he

President or Congressman or cross-roads politician, to denounce that right.

The claim of the soldier is based upon the facts that he served in the Union army for ninety days, that he was honorably discharged, and that he is now suffering under a pensionable disability. It is not necessary to show that it was caused by service in the army. In this connection another mass of incompetent testimony or demurrable proof is sought to be introduced. The allegation is that there are thousands of dishonest pensioners on the pension rolls and that the act of 1890 is especially responsible for it. That is the charge; now what is the evidence? The evidence is that there are soldiers on the pension rolls that never were in battle! And at one time, when Judge Long was assailed, it was claimed by the Pension Department that an argument proper to be used against him was that he had brains enough still to be a judge of a court in the State where he lived, and that therefore it could not be that he was so disabled as to be entitled to a pension of \$72 a month!

If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] were in his seat I would ask him whether he subscribes to that doctrine. What has the pensioner to show? He has to show that he is disabled by some act of God; some agency that he could not control; some agency that was not set in motion by his own vicious habits, and when he has shown that he is entitled to a pension. Now, how many fraudulent pensioners are there under that law? I would like to see one man—one man who served three years, two years, one year faithfully in the army, who marched and bivouacked and fought and who can stand up to-day, thirty years after the close of his service, and say truthfully that he has no disability. Is there such a man on earth? Is there? If so, that man can not have a pension. If there is such a man as that and he gets upon the pension roll that is fraudulent. But, short of that, there is no fraud in going upon the pension roll of this country, and I caution my friends on this side of the House not to yield to the suggestion made on the other side, that the right to a pension is a question of actual service in battle.

Now, let me come to the attack made upon a couple of regiments belonging to my own State. At first the attack was made with great adroitness by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK]. He would not for the world tell us the name of the regiment; he would not state that it was the One hundred and eighty-second Ohio that he was assaulting. Oh, no. But like the fabled, and I believe now demonstrated to be false, illustration of the ostrich, he hides his head safely under his refusal to be cross-examined, but he left open the other end of the line in the Pension Office. [Laughter.] So we discovered that it was the One hundred and eighty-second Ohio. My friend from Illinois got wild on this question, wild in his facts and wild in his history. He said that it was a "hundred day" regiment, while in fact the One hundred and eighty-second Ohio was a one year regiment. He said it went down to Cairo, and he drew a picture of the birds and the flowers and the beauties of the spring-time there. That is his best hold. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the One hundred and eighty-second Ohio was a regiment formed at Toledo by Lieut. Col. John A. Chase and others. Who was John A. Chase? He had served from April, 1861, in the Fourteenth Ohio Volunteers, had marched and fought with gallant and glorious old Jim Steadman for three months, the regiment had been reorganized for three years, and he had served in all the battles of that famous regiment, and at the end of that service he had not got tired of fighting the Southern Confederacy, and he was appointed from a captaincy in the Fourteenth to the lieutenant-colonelcy of the One hundred and eighty-second. That regiment went South, in obedience to orders. The regiment was made up of three classes of men, and I want to speak of those three classes in the hearing of soldiers.

The first class was composed of the men who had served two and three years in regular regiments and who had been honorably discharged at the end of 1864; hardened, time-worn, battle-scarred veterans. Another class, we may as well admit, was made up as we said our enemies had made up some of their troops, by "robbing the cradle and the grave." We got a little short of troops on our side about that time. The other side got a great deal shorter, and we had that advantage; but we also were short in 1865, and when we enlisted the one-hundred-day men and the one-year men, we took in a lot of young fellows who had grown up from boyhood since the beginning of the war, and we also enlisted a class of men who under the law would have been exempt from service, men past the age when they could have been compelled to go into the service.

It is not strange, therefore, that these one-hundred-day regiments and these one-year regiments present a greater ratio of disabilities than the other Ohio regiments. Let me in this connection refer to some things that my friends who served in the Union Army and gentlemen who served in the other army will bear me out in. In the fall of 1864, as I have said, we were get-

ting a little short of troops; we had a series of long lines in our rear. Upon the line which I have now in mind, we had 600 miles of railroad to guard. Six hundred miles lay between our source of supply and the enemy in front; and we had a most vigilant and determined enemy.

The gentleman from Alabama, Gen. WHEELER, can tell you something about what we had to contend with; how, as if out of the mists of the night, he suddenly struck at a point 25 or 30 miles from where he had bivouacked at nightfall, and struck our lines of communication, and he and others did this again and again. He can tell what vigilance it required, what forces it took to hold that line in our rear. And in the summer of 1864 some of the very flower of the Army were stationed to guard the stockades and points along the line.

My friend says that this regiment, the One hundred and eighty-fourth or the One hundred and eighty-second, did nothing but guard some railroad lines and the stockades. There was a stockade—I remember it wonderfully well—guarded by two companies of the regiment to which I had the honor to belong. I remember that a whole brigade of the enemy's troops dashed upon it; and I remember we buried sixty-odd members of that famous command, and at the head of the column of the dead lay the son of the ex-governor of Texas, Capt. Houston. Stockades were not pleasant places. They were not pleasant either for the besieged or the besiegers. That service was not a "picnic." If my friend thinks it was a "picnic" he ought to have been there. There were no birds singing, as the gentleman says there were down at Cairo. There was death.

The commanders of the Confederate troops sent the very flower of their men to cut off the rear. Anybody who stood at Pulaski on a certain day in August, 1864, and saw the column of Forrest deployed, three men dismounting and two men leading the horses away, with the deadly Enfield rifle in the hands of the dismounted men, and the assault that was made upon the hill south of that town, will not undertake to talk about "birds" and "flowers" and "springtime."

What did we do? The authorities in the North ordered these one-hundred-day men, officered by the very flower of our Army, who had served their time out—men who had served in the ranks and become captains and majors and colonels—those hundred-day men were sent under the command of such men to guard these stockades and to open up and protect our line of communication. And the old troops were gathered together—were massed in the army of Sherman and hurled upon the Gate City of Georgia and ultimately made the triumphant march to Atlanta and the sea, while their brethren of the one-hundred-day regiments stood in the rear and made it possible that our lines of communication should be kept open. [Applause.]

I was not a one hundred-day soldier; but I stand here to say that the test of a soldier's good fellowship with me and his honor in my estimation is, Did he obey orders and do what he could? That is all I ask. [Applause.] And I condemn the scarred veteran, eloquent though he may be, who undertakes to cast insinuations against the men who on the right side obeyed orders and did what they could. [Applause.] We were not all Grants or Shermans or Thomases or Sheridans. It is enough if we did our duty. Enough if we gave our best endeavors to the cause we loved so well. The soldier who did that is my brother by birth if he fought on the Union side, and is my brother by adoption if he fought on the other side and stands for the Union and loyalty now.

The One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment was commanded by Col. Commiger, who fought in more than twenty battles of the war and led in the ranks of that One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment more than six hundred of the flower of the men that Ohio sent into the Army. Yet the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] assails that regiment. I do not want to say that he assails its honor; I do not want to say that he treated it quite as badly as the gentleman who dealt in "flowers" and "birds" did. But he made an unfair and unjust inference; and when he wound up his speech by saying that he was a wonderful friend of the Union soldier, I thought that I might have to apologize for the opinion I had before been inclined to entertain. I know he is a great friend of the Union soldier, for he says so; he admits it himself [laughter]; and the evidence is competent. But I have looked somewhat into his record in the first Congress that he served here.

Coming here with the enthusiasm of a young Tennessee politician, coming here to do something for the men he was so fond of, he introduced seventy-two bills to reimburse in small sums in some cases up to enormous sums in others, those gentlemen living down South who had incurred losses by reason of "the late unpleasantness." And I hold in my hand a bill which is the highest demonstration of his love for this sort of legislation. It is a bill to refund the cotton tax, involving a sum of money which has been figured out to amount to \$68,000,000. And among those

seventy-two bills I find one that proposes the increase of the pension of a soldier, and another which proposes to give a pension. Therefore, I know that my friend is overwhelmingly in favor of the Union soldier! [Laughter.]

Mr. ENLOE. Will the gentleman allow me a remark right there?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. ENLOE. I have never failed to introduce bills for any soldier in my district who wanted a pension, and who had any ground for claiming it; and I have never failed to support a pension bill here when it was apparent to my mind, from the facts presented, that the soldier was entitled to the pension. And certainly the gentleman will not undertake to prove that I am no friend of the soldier because I introduced bills here to pay loyal citizens residing in my district for property which had been consumed by the Federal Army during the progress of the war.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not want to make any reflection upon the gentleman from Tennessee—

Mr. KILGORE. Will the gentleman allow me one word?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Let me get through with the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KILGORE. I merely wanted to say to the gentleman that I am friendlier to the Union soldier now than I used to be—a great deal more so.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, I believe that. I believe the gentleman from Texas has learned a great deal by rubbing up against the Union soldiers in times of peace. [Laughter.]

But, as I was saying, I do not wish to reflect upon the fairness and justice of the gentleman from Tennessee. There was a time when I did not like him because he introduced bills of this character and vociferated here in their support. Since that time I have concluded that he has some sort of an honest opinion; that he thought somebody was on the pension roll that ought not to be there.

Mr. ENLOE. That is a very gratifying acknowledgment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I had expected that some day in the growth of his intellect and the development of his loyalty he would get up and apologize for all he had previously said on that subject.

Mr. ENLOE. I am afraid the gentleman will be disappointed as to the extent to which my feelings will grow.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I should have had no suspicion of the gentleman's admiration for loyalty if he had not introduced a bill which I have here somewhere, to dispense with proof of loyalty in the matter of Government claims. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ENLOE. If the gentleman would read that bill he would not make that statement. I am satisfied he has not read the bill.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, for the sake of doing absolute justice to the gentleman, I will print the bill with my remarks, in the appendix thereto.

Mr. ENLOE. I am perfectly willing the gentleman should do that; but I would like to have him state now the substance of the bill.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, it is a bill to drop from the pension rolls the names of pensioners who have forsaken their citizenship in the United States.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, I am still in favor of that measure.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is the first proposition. The second—

Mr. ENLOE. That bill was intended to strike those persons who have deserted this country to live in foreign lands at our expense.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And the second bill which raised just a slight doubt, which I am glad to get rid of, was a bill to pension soldiers of the Florida and Indian wars, and to dispense with proof of loyalty.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, that has been done since; and I suppose the gentleman helped to do it. I do not know whether he was in the Congress that passed the bill.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have done several foolish things since I have been in Congress.

Mr. ENLOE. There is no doubt of that; we all admit it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, I want to go to another branch of this subject; and it is one of more practical importance than the one about which I have been speaking. But before leaving this question, I want to say one word; and I wish to duly guard what I say, because I do not put implicit confidence in all that I get from a Pension Bureau officer. But I am told—and I regret that the gentleman from Illinois [Gen. BLACK] is not present—that the greatest number of fraudulent pensioners that ever were put on the pension roll of this Government—more numerous than all the others combined—were put upon the pension roll by the gentleman himself under the Mexican pension law.

In making that statement I qualify it by saying that I have

no personal knowledge upon the subject; but the statement comes to me from a high officer of the Pension Bureau, that under the Mexican pension law which gave \$8 a month to soldiers of the Mexican war and required that to receive the pension they should have served a given length of time—sixty days, I think, and that those sixty days should either have been spent in Mexico, or in going to or from Mexico, or that the soldier should have fought in a battle in Mexico—I am told that several thousand names were put upon the pension rolls upon the following evidence: First, that the man was mustered into the service on a given day; and secondly, that he was mustered out on a given day, the period between these two days being more than the length of time required by the law.

I am told that later on, when Congress saw fit to increase the pension to \$12 a month, an investigation of the character of the service of each one of these men was made through the War Department, and it was discovered that a large per cent in numbers important and significant had been placed upon the pension rolls at \$8 a month, who had never served to the extent required, and that no proof of that service had ever been asked for by the Pension Office. It is well known by those who are old enough to remember—I can barely remember the fact myself—that a large number of men were raised in New York and elsewhere who never left there; that almost a regiment was raised in Ohio which never left Ohio. The war was over. To tell you the truth about it at this late day, there was not much of a war anyhow, only as to three or four battles, and it ended very suddenly. These men never marched, never served, never were in Mexico, never were in a battle. All this goes to show how easy it is to get information from the Pension Office and bring it in here to prejudice the minds of the people of this country and build up a theory that has no real foundation in fact.

But now, Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of getting rid of this whole trouble. The greatest curse to the Union soldier, the greatest curse to all parties concerned, is the political aspect of this pension question, and I want to get rid of the whole of it, and I have introduced into Congress two bills which I will print in my remarks. One of them is for a \$12 general service pension, and the other for a per diem pension.

I will print them as an appendix to these remarks.

I want to show now for a few moments how much better it would be to pass one of these bills than to be doing what we are doing. There is no curse so great to the interests of all of us as the political character of this pension administration. I am not aiming my remarks especially at the present Administration. I only happen to have a few facts before me that I am going to present to this House and the country, and leave them to the country to say whether or not that sort of system ought to be upheld. The new Commissioner of Pensions went into office, I believe, in April or May, 1893.

Mr. MARTIN of Indiana. On the 6th of May.

Mr. GROSVENOR. On the 6th of May, 1893. Shortly afterward—the exact date is unimportant—he issued an order revoking or modifying the order issued by Gen. Raum. That was the source of all our trouble. It was about that that all this difficulty is happening. I do not say that the Democratic administration of to-day in the Pension Office is wholly guilty, and that nobody else is guilty of this political manipulation. I do not believe that they on whom the tower of Siloam fell in Ohio last November are guilty above all the men that dwelt in Jerusalem. [Laughter.] But I do say that if some of these gentlemen do not repent they shall surely all likewise perish, some of these days. [Laughter.]

So, Mr. Chairman, it happened that in the early days of this Administration there was a most important political campaign in Ohio. During the months of June, July, and August, and possibly extending a few days in September, there were suspended almost two thousand pensioners in Ohio. I have their names here, and will publish them in full in the appendix to my remarks, by counties; almost two thousand of them in the State of Ohio alone, suspended because it was alleged that they were fraudulently upon the pension rolls of the Government. The President had made the startling charge, and his subordinate assumed its truth and acted on the suggestion. The source of the evil was right there.

Shortly a very great excitement grew up. Soldiers' reunions were held all over the State, and the distinguished Secretary of the Interior was denounced. Nobody seemed to hurl any anathemas at the Commissioner of Pensions. Somehow or other they selected the head of the Department. They had seen his order. They had not heard the defense made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE], that the Commissioner of Pensions and the Secretary of the Interior are a couple of poor, helpless fellows who do not know anything that is going on about them, who sit there while confusion and chaos reigned, while a lot of bad men in the office were running the machine. They

had not heard of that. They supposed that somehow or other somebody was responsible, and they centered it down upon the honorable Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Hoke Smith.

They looked into the history of Mr. Hoke Smith, and they were lost in wonder as to why he was there anyhow! [Laughter.] They never had heard of him before, and when they came to look him up they discovered he was a lawyer down in Georgia that never had any connection with public affairs—possibly a very great man. They did not know about that. They had not been told, but they discovered that somehow or other he was a lineal descendant of somebody who, when they marched through Georgia, had been troublesome to them, and they got a prejudice against him.

Two thousand men were suspended from this pension roll in Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I can not undertake to compete with the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] in any description of the battle of Gettysburg. He spoke of the wonderful discharge of duty by the distinguished Commissioner of Pensions in resisting the charge that shattered the famous corps of Sickles. And I thought "There is a little addendum that ought to be put on that description, and another man whom I happen to know ought to figure in that picture." I thought of this Commissioner's order. I thought of one of the unfortunate two thousand in my State. And my mind was carried back to Gettysburg, and the terrible assault upon the second day, and I remembered a man who, in one of the Ohio regiments, in Howard's command, stood on Cemetery Hill, a brave young Ohioan, flushed with patriotism, proud of the fact that he was standing there defending the flag of his country, happy that his country had called to him, and how, when the deadly assault came, with a blanched face but a flashing eye, he charged with his musket, not as a second lieutenant, not as a file closer, but up to the very jaws of death, and on the last day of that enormous battle I remember that that soldier had the record of dashing within a very few yards of the fatal place where the gallant Armistead, of Virginia, marked with his life's blood the "high-water mark of the rebellion" on that fatal field. I remembered how that young soldier came home, proud of his achievements, honored by his fellows, and how for years he lived and struggled against disease and poverty, down until the law of 1890 was passed, and how he made application and was easily placed upon the pension roll at \$12 a month. I remember in the bright days of last August, just before I came to the extra session of Congress, that he came to me with an order from the Pension Office, signed by his comrade of Gettysburg, signed by the man who won fame as he did, charging him with being improperly on the pension roll, and suspending him from the benefits of that institution. I remember how he followed me about the town and said to me, "I do not care for the money, but I do not want my wife and children, when I am dead, to be told that I robbed the Treasury of my country that I fought for."

I remember, Mr. Chairman, that later on I read that he had been sent to the asylum, insane because of this affliction; and a few days ago I rode past a little country graveyard, and saw a little mound of earth, and upon it the American flag, that marked the remains of the gallant soldier who fought at Gettysburg, and who died smarting under the stigma of the document given under the hand and seal of William Lochren. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The scope of this order will never be fully understood until in the day of judgment we can tell how many soldiers have gone to the fate of my friend and comrade, how many men of all this great army that were suspended, eighteen or twenty or thirty thousand of them, have suffered the agony of mental sorrow and mental distress, how many of their children have gone without bread, how many of their wives have hung their heads in shame when it has been said of their husbands and their fathers "he was a fraud on the pension roll."

Mr. ENLOE. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him there?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. ENLOE. I did not catch the name of the soldier that the gentleman has told us about.

Mr. GROSVENOR. No, you did not and you will not catch his name from me.

Mr. ENLOE. I would like to know his name and his company and the number of his regiment.

Mr. GROSVENOR (continuing). And I do not propose that you shall catch the name. I have been in this business too long to expose any soldier or any soldier's wife or any soldier's child to an exposition like that.

Mr. ENLOE. You will not give it, then?

Mr. GROSVENOR. If the gentleman will just make a little trip with me I will pay the expenses, and I will verify every word which I have uttered.

Mr. ENLOE. What I want you to verify is not the fact that there is a grave at home, and that there is a soldier in it, or that there was a man who went crazy and who was sent to the asylum; but the fact I want you to verify is that the Pension Office did him an injustice, and you can do that by giving me his record and letting me see what that record shows.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I can give you his record, and it is as good a record as any man from Ohio ever had in the world. If you dispute my word, ask the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. ENLOE. I do not dispute the gentleman's word. I simply wanted to look at the record of this soldier.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman will not have the opportunity.

Mr. ENLOE. Then I presume the gentleman wants to conceal something.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I may read several letters here before I get through, but I will conceal the names of the soldiers. No prudent man would do any other way. I remember not very long ago that an exposure in this House of Representatives cost a very competent man his position in Government employment. I am not here to get up a disturbance. Do you doubt that that is a truthful list of 2,000 soldiers suspended in Ohio?

Mr. ENLOE. I do not know anything about the list. If the gentleman says that he got it from the roll of the Pension Office, I shall believe it is a correct one.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will show the gentleman where it came from.

Mr. ENLOE. The point I make against these gentlemen is this. I say it is not just to any Administration, and it ill becomes the gentleman from Ohio to get up here and allege that by an abuse of the law the Commissioner of Pensions has driven a soldier to insanity and death, and then will not allow an investigation to be made, to know what soldier it was and give an opportunity to deny or verify the statement.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is not the only case by a long way.

Mr. ENLOE. It may not be; but if the gentleman has got any facts he ought to give them. If assertion is to control in the argument, I do not care to take any part in it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. At the proper time, and under the proper circumstances, I will give the name; and the gentleman will regret that he called for it. His name is in this printed list.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield to me for one question; for information?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Do I understand the gentleman to say that this soldier was wounded at Gettysburg?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I say that he fought at Gettysburg.

Mr. SPRINGER. How long was he applying for a pension before the law of 1890 was passed?

Mr. GROSVENOR. My understanding is that he did not apply at all until after the passage of the act of 1890. He was pensioned under that act. I say that he struggled on and endeavored not to make an application, and did not make it until after the law of 1890 was passed.

Mr. SPRINGER. Was he not entitled to a pension outside of the law of 1890?

Mr. GROSVENOR. No, I think not. He was not wounded; he had only that general disability that all old soldiers have.

Mr. ENLOE. I will call the attention of the gentleman to the unfairness of that remark. A gentleman a moment ago told me that he had served four years in the Army. He called me to the door and called attention to the fact that the gentleman from Ohio was alleging that every man who had seen four years' service in the Army had some disability. Now he has as good a record as any gentleman on this floor. He said that he served four years in the Army, and that he has no disability and is not asking any pension.

Mr. GROSVENOR. If you can find that kind of a man I would like you to give me a photograph of him here.

Mr. ENLOE. He occupies a seat in the press gallery, and I will furnish the gentleman his name.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have no doubt there is such a man; I do not say there is no such man; but if there is, he ought to be thankful to God for the physical ability he is blessed with.

Mr. ENLOE. I have no doubt he is.

Mr. GROSVENOR (continuing). He is a very rare specimen.

Mr. ENLOE. But while I am willing to substantiate what I say by furnishing the names, the gentleman from Ohio is not.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have no doubt of it; but I want to say that I did not get these names from an official source. There are nearly 2,000 of them. But I will go forward, and I believe, gentlemen, that I am as strong or stronger than I would have been in that condition. This campaign became hotter and hotter; soldiers' reunions became more and more bitter; and on the 30th day of October, 1893, an official publication was made by the Bureau of Pensions, which I hold in my hand, giving the

names of 1,323 out of the 1,900 soldiers whose pensions had been suspended, who were restored to the pension roll before the election in Ohio.

Why, I imagine that I prove that the list of over 1,900 names is a correct one when I am able to produce the other list, corresponding to the extent of 1,323 of them that the Pension Office gives official notice have been reinstated. Is not that sufficient proof of the correctness of my test? Now, that is not all of it. That is not one-half of it. The Deputy Commissioner of Pensions came out to Ohio right on the eve of the election, and he did not make a political speech, but went down to Dayton, where there are 4,000 soldiers in the National Home, and on the Saturday night before the election he delivered a lecture on the "Pension policy of the Government." And I read a letter here from a gentleman of high character—and my friend, the distinguished gentleman occupying the chair at the present [Mr. OUTHWAITE], would certify, if requested, to his high character and integrity—and he gives this information:

Mr. Murphy, the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions, was at the Soldiers' Home on Friday, Saturday, and the following Monday.

That was the Friday, the Saturday, and the Monday before the election on Tuesday, immediately before.

He would get six or eight of the old fellows in a little knot and make them all kinds of promises. He had with him what was called his private secretary, who took notes, and they were all promised to be attended to as soon as the election was over. We had 2,000 majority in the Soldiers' Home, and I am satisfied it would have been 50 or 100 more if he had not interfered.

If a Republican Deputy Commissioner had done such a thing, every Democratic paper in the country would have jumped on him with both feet, and the people would rebuke such an interference. It is within my personal knowledge that he did come, and it is within my personal knowledge that this whole scheme was manipulated.

Now, I measure my words. I do not say that the Commissioner of Pensions understood what was being done. I do not say that the Secretary of the Interior understood, but my argument is that it was done, done in a manner to bring the blush to any honest man's face; and it is because of this defective legislation, and because of it we ought to have a radical change in the whole business. During the process which I have described, while 1,900 or nearly 2,000 were being suspended, 1,323 were being restored without examination and without much testimony. I can not say that the Commissioner of Pensions had no evidence that these men ought to be restored, but I do say that it is not very likely their cases were reexamined in so short a space of time as that.

I will read you two letters from the chairman of the Democratic State committee of Ohio, and you will see whether or not the soldier roll, this "roll of honor," was being tampered with in the interest of partisan politics; and if there is a gentleman on this floor who will defend conduct like this, then I have no argument to address to him. Bear in mind that 2,000 soldiers in Ohio had been stricken down, and bear in mind that one by one they were being reinstated. Bear in mind that a hot political campaign was in progress and the election was close at hand.

Here is a copy of a letter sent to an old soldier in East Liverpool, Ohio:

OHIO STATE DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE,
Columbus, Ohio, October 17, 1893.

DEAR SIR: On September 19 your pension was increased. This was done by a Democratic Administration. Do you approve its action? and can Republican politicians still make you believe that your vote is their property? They have, as you know, claimed the vote of every ex-soldier who obtained a pension during Republican rule. We make no such claim. You were granted an increase by a Democratic Administration because you deserved it, and not as a bribe or an act of charity.

The contest this fall is more between the farmers and working people against monopolies and trusts than between Democrats and Republicans. We ask you, as an intelligent citizen, to vote the Democratic ticket, because it is for your own best interests so to do.

Very truly yours,

J. P. SEWARD, Chairman.
WILLIAM T. WEAR, Secretary.

Read this letter carefully. "Your pension was increased." How did the Democratic committee ascertain that fact? Who told this committee, and for what purpose? When did this system begin? Who inaugurated it? "You were granted an increase by a Democratic Administration." Why was this said? And finally "we ask you * * * to vote the Democratic ticket." This is the whole thing. Shame! Shame! It is a disgrace to the brain which concocted the miserable scheme and I denounce the scheme as an outrage upon fairness and an insult to the old soldier.

This scheme in spirit and largely in detail was worked from one end of Ohio to the other. I can publish a mass of facts and details which will show how this was done. That the soldiers resented all this and voted to denounce and condemn it does not remove the stain. This fact does not change the deep disgrace of the whole wretched business.

Then I will give you another of the same kind. Here is one

which was sent to pensioners at the National Home at Dayton and the State Home at Sandusky:

OHIO STATE DEMOCRATIC COMMITTEE.
Columbus, Ohio, October 17, 1893.

DEAR SIR: We have fully exposed the Republican conspiracy to capture the soldier vote by having pensions suspended, and will now ask you to allow us to aid you, if possible, in securing your reinstatement, which from information we have you are entitled to. We will write Senator BRICE, asking him to look the matter up. You are probably one who was suspended on information furnished by some Republican sneak in your own neighborhood.

We propose to demonstrate fully to the soldiers of Ohio that this disreputable scheme will not work and that the Democratic party is really their true friend.

Very truly yours,

J. P. SEWARD, Chairman.
W. T. WEAR, Secretary.

Where did they get that information? When did the Democratic State committee of Ohio get authority to practice in the Pension Bureau of the city of Washington? How did they get that information? I will tell you directly, gentlemen of the committee, how they got it; but first let me refer again to this letter:

We will write to Senator BRICE, asking him to look the matter up.

[Laughter.]

They have got the information that the man is improperly taken off the roll and that he is entitled to be reinstated, and now they are going to call on BRICE to help them. Well, BRICE would do it. He is a splendid friend of the soldier, and I cheerfully so state; but he is just as good a friend of the Democratic party, and he was expected to couple the two together and make them trot together in single harness. [Laughter.] But if one had to suffer at the hands of the Senator, it would not be the interests of the soldier. I admit that; but to the letter:

You are probably one who was suspended on information furnished by some Republican sneak in your own neighborhood.

[Great laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the other side of the House it was said here yesterday that the suspensions came from the action of a set of Republican devils in the Department here who wanted to ruin Lochren. There he was, like an innocent boy; he did not know anything in the world. He sat there like the boy upon the burning deck "whence all but him had fled," and these devils were all around him trying to make trouble for him and to ruin him. [Laughter.] But, on the other hand, the Democratic committee of Ohio say that these suspensions resulted from the misrepresentations of sneaking Republicans in the pensioners' neighborhoods. [Laughter.] They say further:

We propose to demonstrate the fact to the soldiers of Ohio that this disreputable scheme will not work, and that the Democratic party of Ohio is really their true friend.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I will publish a short letter from the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], expressing his opinion about a man who would manipulate the pension roll in order to make Democratic or Republican votes, and the letter which called it out I publish, as follows:

OCTOBER 18, 1893.

MY DEAR SIR: I have the honor to inform you that I have received under the law of 1890 an increase of \$10 a month; also a letter from the Democratic headquarters at Columbus, stating that I had been granted an increase under a Democratic Administration, and also stating that the contest this fall is more between the farmers and working people against trusts and monopolies than between Democrats and Republicans, and that it is for my interest to vote the Democratic ticket. This is signed by James P. Seward, chairman, and William T. Wear, secretary. I thank them for their generosity, but must decline. I am too old and played out. I note there seems to be twice as many pensions granted in Ohio within the last few months as were granted all last summer. If I can be cared for outside of the Soldiers' Home with my family is all I want.

Yours, respectfully,

HON. JOHN SHERMAN, Washington.

Senator SHERMAN replied as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE CHAMBER,
Washington, D. C., October 20, 1893.

MY DEAR SIR: Your note of the 18th is received.

I am glad you received an increase of pension, but the letter of Chairman Seward is an extraordinary paper, which ought to defeat any party represented by him.

It needs an old soldier no evidence to learn that the Democratic party has not befriended him in the past, and is not likely to do so in the future.

Very truly yours,

JOHN SHERMAN.

In the revision of this speech for the benefit of my friend from Tennessee I publish the following special telegram published in the Philadelphia Press of March 7, 1894:

AN OLD SOLDIER DRIVEN TO DEATH.

SELINA, OHIO, March 6.

George Sherrick, an ex-Union soldier, who had spent nineteen months in Andersonville and Libby prisons, hung himself to-day. He had grown dependent over the suspension of his pension of \$12 a month.

Every scheme of this character that it was possible to work was worked. I hold in my hand a letter from a distinguished

official here in Washington, the Hon. S. S. Yoder, who undertook to put himself into the breach in Ohio at the time of the election.

I print his letter here, because I want him to have all the credit to which he is entitled for the result in Ohio that gave McKinley 81,000 majority. [Laughter.] I want it to be seen that nothing was left undone that could be done to avoid the disaster that came to the Democratic party in Ohio. His letter is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 2, 1893.

DEAR COMRADE: There are so many lies, lies and false statements, being circulated among the soldiers of Ohio by the Republican speakers and newspapers for political effect, that I take the liberty of addressing a few words to you, that my Democratic soldier friends in Allen County may be rightly advised, and not led astray by the stories which are being circulated for the purpose of helping the Republican party this fall.

In doing so I believe I can truthfully say that both in and out of Congress I have always stood up for the interests of the soldiers. While a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions I introduced and worked for the per diem pension bill, a measure which was recommended by the Grand Army of the Republic and the Union Veterans' Union, and which was undoubtedly the most just law that could have been passed. I only mention this to show my feeling and attitude toward the old soldier.

Much of the blame for those pensioners suspended attaches to the old Republican examining boards, who purposely made unfavorable reports in most every case which came before them after the November election of 1892, when Harrison was defeated, knowing that their reports would not be passed upon until a Democratic Commissioner would be appointed and then they would charge it to a Democratic administration. Many cases like this have been found; but as fast as the injustice of the Republican boards is being disclosed and brought to the attention of the pension officials it is being corrected.

Another thing which the soldiers should know is that Republican politicians have been filing charges against pensioners to have their pensions stopped, so as to create a feeling against the Democratic party. This underhanded effort has been going on in your county and it should be exposed and charged home where it belongs. No worthy pensioner need have any fear of being dropped from the roll, and if there are any of my comrades who have been unjustly dealt with as above indicated, if they will write me and give the number of their certificate, I will see that it is rectified.

I hope you will see and talk with your Democratic soldier friends and lay these facts before them, and when they properly understand it I have no fears of any of them voting the Republican ticket or for any candidate on it.

Trusting to hear a favorable reply from Allen County on November 7, I remain,

Your friend,

S. S. YODER.

I saw a letter, which I published in a Zanesville newspaper, and incorporated it in a speech of my own, in which the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions, in the latter days of October, notified a soldier who had been suspended that he had been reinstated, but said to him: "You had better go before a pension board and have an examination so as to insure your title, and you will not have any trouble in the future." That kind of thing was done all over the State of Ohio. Now, how is it possible that these could be honest transactions? Let us put it into a few words. If these 1,900 were legally and properly suspended, then the 1,323 were illegally and improperly reinstated. If these 1,323 were properly and legally reinstated, then that number of the 1,900 were unlawfully, improperly, and criminally taken off the rolls. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That is the way to put it. It was a crime, and if it had been done in any other than a political bureau of this Government the common judgment of the people would have arisen and denounced it in tones which would have been heard from one end of the country to the other. And the Democratic party did regain the soldier vote to a great extent. The soldier knew that the eyes of the Bureau of Pensions were upon him, that they were looking after him. He knew that he was no longer a mere item in a mass of soldiers. The old soldiers knew that they were being observed, and toward the end of the campaign they said to themselves: "The Democratic party has got the power. We see the purpose. Here is the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions out here lecturing on the pension system of this Administration. Here are our names published in the list. We must take care of ourselves. The bread of our families, the hope of our wives and children, depend upon this little pittance that we are getting out of the Pension Office."

In that way the Democrats regained the vote of the soldier to a very large degree in Ohio. My estimate is that the difference between the vote of 1892 and 1893, the soldier vote, did not exceed 5,000 on and 5,000 off, and yet, when the election was over, Mr. Lawrence T. Neal, the Democratic candidate for governor, in an interview, to which he gave wide publicity, declared that it was the pension policy of this Administration that had broken him down in Ohio. Very shortly afterwards the distinguished "Tall Sycamore of the Wabash" went out to Indiana and had a conference and made a speech at Indianapolis, it is said, denouncing the course of the President upon this subject. It was also published far and wide that the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] said that it was a piece of bad policy that ought to be arrested, and after that began the change in the course of the Administration. The soldiers gave no credit to the Administration, for they believed that it was the hard blows that had been showered upon Democratic heads that had

made the change, and not affection or regard for the rights of the soldier.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the remedy for all these evils lies in pensioning all the soldiers of the war. When you have done that you have practically got rid of this Pension Bureau. The proof necessary for a pension would be that the man had served honorably a certain length of time, that he was honorably discharged, and that he was still alive. That is all. You would get rid of this million dollars. In this connection I ought to say, that the Pension Bureau estimated that \$2,000,000 would be required for the local boards, and then the Commissioner of Pensions came before the Committee on Invalid Pensions and said that he would back down just one half, just one million. The soldiers of the country have taken alarm, for they believe that to be an indication that the policy of the Bureau is to cut off by one-half its expenditures. The law which I have suggested would get rid of these local examiners, would get rid of the Bureau in every county of every State.

I said yesterday that in the forty-six counties of Ohio represented on this floor by Republican members of Congress, so far as I know, there is a board in every county and there are but three Republicans in the boards of the whole forty-six counties, and, so far as I know, there is not one old soldier; not one man who served in the army. I do not believe that in the eighty-eight counties of Ohio there are to-day upon all the local boards ten Republicans, nor do I believe that there are ten men who fought in the war. These are the reasons why the soldiers are doubtful about the good faith of the Democratic party. They have heard of the debate in the Fifty-second Congress upon this same pension appropriation bill, and they have looked with consternation to the fact that a large vote was then given for an amendment which would have operated to suspend every soldier's pension granted under the act of 1890.

An amendment was offered to the appropriation bill which provided that no part of the money should be appropriated to pension any soldier except one who was suffering from disease incurred in the army, as I recollect it. If I am wrong I will gladly correct it.

In any event, the debate on that bill alarmed the soldier.

And they look with terror at the large Democratic vote which was given in support of the amendment to which I refer. These are the reasons why the soldiers of the country are in doubt and have no confidence in the good faith of the Democratic party.

Mr. O'NEIL. I know that the gentleman from Ohio does not mean to say anything that is not the fact. He will, therefore, permit me to say that no such amendment was proposed by the Committee on Appropriations last year.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, it was offered on the floor of the House; if not in terms, in practical effect.

Mr. O'NEIL. I do not speak as to that; but it did not come from the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I may be confused in regard to that point; but a friend near me says I did not say it came from the committee. I said it was offered on the floor of the House and received a large vote on the Democratic side.

Mr. O'NEIL. You said it came from the Committee on Appropriations, and received support from the majority of the committee.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It came from a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. O'NEIL. Not any amendment of that kind.

* Mr. GROSVENOR. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I will publish in my remarks the section of the amendment to which I refer.

Mr. O'NEIL. I had something to do with the amendments, and if the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman ought to know more about this matter than I do.

Mr. O'NEIL. There was no such amendment as you state offered by any member of the committee.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will read what I rely upon in support of my statement.

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 he has an annual income of less than \$600.

That is one of the amendments.

A MEMBER. Who offered that?

Mr. GROSVENOR. That was offered—

Mr. GROUT. That was a committee amendment, I think.

Mr. O'NEIL. That does not sustain the gentleman's statement.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will show a much worse amendment than that. I will read now the amendment of Mr. GEARY—

Mr. O'NEIL. He was not a member of the committee.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Very well; I am not confining myself to that.

Mr. O'NEIL. You did.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is entirely mistaken. In the rapid way in which I am speaking I may have been confused; but I spoke of the amendment simply as having been offered to the bill reported by the committee, and stated that there was a large vote for it here. Let me read this further amendment:

That from and after July 1, 1893, no pension shall be paid to any person who was drafted into the armies of the United States unless for actual disabilities incurred in the service, and shall show to the satisfaction of the Pension Office, by proper affidavits, that his annual income is less than \$600.

Mr. O'NEIL. That applies only to drafted men.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Very true; that applies only to drafted men. But I have here somewhere—I will not spend time now in finding it—something which sustains practically what I have said.

Mr. O'NEIL. If you can find it, I hope you will publish it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Certainly I will; and if not I will state in my remarks that I have been misled. I do not wish to do anything but what is absolutely fair.

Now, Mr. Chairman, unutterable confusion has grown up in this behalf; and I have here a letter which I will not publish, which I will not refer to except to say that it is one of the innumerable letters that we are getting showing the confusion that the Pension Office has gotten into in regard to the suspended soldiers, the reinstated soldiers, and the soldiers whose pensions have been cut down below what they were before.

It is due that I say that the words "who was drafted into the armies of the United States" in the amendment I have read were not noticed in the reading I gave the details of the debate of a year ago. I read the RECORD while in bed nursing an injury, and frankly make the explanation. I had depended upon my memory, and more than a year had elapsed.

The system of the Pension Office is an unauthorized and illegal system, and I put in very few words my claim in regard to this branch of the subject. I say that in a government which guarantees to every man that he shall not be convicted of crime without a trial by jury; that he shall be confronted with the witnesses against him; that he shall have compulsory process to procure witnesses in his favor; that he shall be defended by himself or counsel at his election—in a government whose fundamental law gives these guarantees to every citizen, it is a crime against public justice to take from the soldier the pension which has been awarded to him at the end of a litigation, at the end of a trial in court, if you please, where he has met an adverse board that has required from him the proof of the legality of his claim and has finally rendered judgment in his favor—I say to take away from him that pension, or to suspend it, or to brand him by implication with dishonor and dishonesty is a violation of the common principles of law and justice, and a plain outrage upon the rights of the soldiers of this country.

In violating these rights you put the soldier of the country upon a level below the commonest criminal. You say to the criminal in the dock, "You shall not be convicted until you have been tried." You say to the soldier, "We will convict you before you have had a trial." Yet, to-day, even with the outcry that comes from the country against the justice of such a procedure, we have the gentleman from Tennessee, while he declares himself a good friend of the soldiers, asking to repeal the legislation which has undertaken to prevent such a thing.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country have never complained of pension appropriations.

The people of this country are generous to the old soldiers of the country. The people of this country, in weighing pension appropriations, put in the other scale the great value of the services of the soldier. They appreciate this Government. They know something about the value of this structure of liberty and freedom. They put a high valuation upon the Union of these States. They put a high price upon the Constitution, the shield and protector of all. And the people of this country will demand that this Administration and all Administrations shall deal justly and generously with the soldier of the battlefield. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

APPENDIX.

No. 1.

List of soldiers whose pensions were suspended in Ohio after the incoming of the Cleveland Administration and before September 1, 1893.

ADAMS COUNTY.

Moses J. Hon, John Herdman, Cyrus Myers, Robert McGraw, Thomas Purcell, John W. Price, Joseph L. Reed, Henry C. Stroman, George J. Scott, Ethan A. Sellman, Anthony W. Shelton, James M. Thoreman, Samuel Warren, Stephen G. Lindsey, William Liter, Elijah Waldron, W. D. Pennywitt, B. F. Kellis, Abbott Richard, Marion Shriner, Aaron Shriner, John Campion, Thomas McHenry, A. B. Newan, S. A. Bradford, Alex. Waters.

ASHLAND COUNTY.

Albert Julius Daniels, Peter Fox, John Steele, Henry Van Gilden.

ALLEN COUNTY.

Freeman Burke, William H. Black, Hiram Cahill, John W. Crunn, Hugh L. Downing, Thomas Johnston, Abram Kiplinger, Ams'l Long, Uriah Miller, Robert M. Rockhill, Samuel M. Shindollar, Wilson Sawmiller, Jacob Wollert, William Cook, Henry O. Hyre, John Hoffman, Ira Burns, Daniel Shappell, Edward Halter.

ASHTABULA COUNTY.

Rufus A. Allen, George Bladon, Mark Chapman, Thomas Case, John A. Ford, Alvin C. Frazier, William Hay, John Johnson, Bradford Kendall, John E. Smith, Lynde C. Tinker, Absalom Tannis, Edward Tinby, Addison Thompson, Appalor P. Morris, Edward A. Morse, John H. McClure, John Stevens.

ATHENS COUNTY.

James Banfield, Marion Chambers, Lemuel E. Clemens, John W. Dillinger, John B. Eaton, John Might, James Milligan McVickers, George Ogg, James Penrod, Andrew Parker, Samuel W. Pickett, William L. Petty, Peter Smith, John Walsh, Thomas E. Dew, Augustus W. Moore.

AUGLAIZE COUNTY.

George Bieler, Mathew Coon, Bernard Drees, Anton Kreiger, Joseph A. Bubb, Alex. Wiermann, John W. Waterman, Joseph H. Brown, James P. Smith, Jacob Lapole, Silas C. Roney, James A. Burden.

BELMONT COUNTY.

John C. Addison, John Brown, Thomas Barnford, Thomas Bearew, David F. Coney, Jacob C. Case, George Colvin, William A. Clay, Noah B. Carle, William F. Crozier, John Cruman, Jacob Capito, Ephraim Douda, John C. Duffy, William F. Duff, Carter B. Denny, William S. Ellis, Isaac Fry, William Fry, John Frizzell, David Good, Joshua S. Holland, Morris Hibbits, John W. Houston, David Jones, William Jordon, John King, Gidere Lilley, Nicholas H. Major, William G. Major, Obediah Pittman, John Rumrey, Henry Rawis, Silas R. Sells, Anton Seals, Smith Thomas, Andrew Tunman, Ludwell Tinsman, William H. Warren, John Wilson, Josephus Waddell, Frederick Witchey, Joseph A. Yocom, John W. Yantz, Benjamin Zanes, George Price, Martin Cass, Gilbert Nelson, Armstrong Nealand, John Daugherty, Isaac C. Heed, Henry Williamson, Ebenezer Woods, Christopher Wineyman.

BROWN COUNTY.

Samuel Austin, Ezra Barker, William Cook, Charles Clenia, Joseph Doughty, John H. Duffy, Samuel Davidson, Hiram R. Harris, Benjamin Hamilton, Alfred Hawkins, Milton W. Parne, George Richards, James H. Anderson, Herman W. Beck, Timothy Bullard, John Pfeiffer.

BUTLER COUNTY.

Joseph Cot, John Hancock, Frederick Hasler, George W. Long, Nelson J. Lamberson, Leonhart Miller, Elathan Ross, Ezekiel Samuels, Francis Williams, Henry Huxley, William F. Tives, Andrew Bachman, Alfred Williams.

CARROLL COUNTY.

William M. Beatty, Adam Deets, John F. Masters, Mitchell Maple, Clark States, Richard Davis, Adam Deets.

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY.

Henry C. Clark, John W. Farmer, John W. Gearhardt, Samuel R. Jones, John F. Kite, Stephen Newland, James Pantany, Tobias V. Sivill, Silas Taylor, William W. Vance, John Van Pelt, Adam Vance, Boyd W. Bysart, Joseph H. Everingham, James M. Lary, George H. Guy.

CLARKE COUNTY.

John Armstrong, Marion P. Douney, Charles H. Berry, John Bailey, John D. De Hart, Robert R. Earnest, John W. Estep, Sebastian Gerhart, James Harris, Harrison Helvey, Fred K. Latham, Henry J. May, Samuel Metcalfe, John L. Peterson, Alfred Richards, John Wheeler, John Weaver, John White, Alexander Washington, Richard St. John, Thomas C. Todd, John Paden, William Dingess, Patrick Finn, William H. Krags, Simon J. Cutright, Daniel Riardon, Thomas Bolen.

CLERMONT COUNTY.

Fred Bachelor, James P. Frazier, William Kennedy, Andrew Lumifont, William R. Stewart, Mason M. Lee, Henry Lee, Walter Philip Fitz.

CLINTON COUNTY.

Samuel J. Arnold, Archie Anthony, John Buford, John Brittain, William Goodrich, Levi Kenney, James Keech, John S. McGregor, David Reed, William F. Smith, Benjamin J. Darbyshire, Charles Davis, William A. Brickett, John Tilton, James H. Emmons, Thomas Martindale.

COLUMBIANA COUNTY.

Samuel Bucker, James Blackburn, John J. Coleman, James Coyle, Abraham Cullen, Moses Chaffee, Willington Daggett, Andrew A. Douglas, Josephus Deahoff, John Frazier, William Halverstaelt, Jacob Karch, John A. Love, John Jund, William McGraw, Robert Orstelle, Charles Snyder, James O. Walter.

COSHOCOTON COUNTY.

Joseph Blackburn, John Cochran, John L. Doughty, Hiram W. Duling, Videllus D. Fuller, Samuel Goodwin, Daniel Jones, John J. Johnson, Andrew Karr, James Miskimler, George Moffit, Thomas Murphy, George W. Mohler, John McDonald, John Reed, Isaac Smith, John Stewart, James L. Rogers, Joseph R. Robertson, John A. Blackson, John W. Sherrard, John Moore, George W. Hughes.

CRAWFORD COUNTY.

Francis Cave, John H. Gaddis, Adam Rettig, William V. Green, Christian Leitz.

CUYAHOGA COUNTY.

Ezra S. Bullis, Albert H. Benhern, John C. Busell, Nicholas Bauer, Caleb Billson, Henry B. Belding, Daniel H. Brown, William Cotton, Alfred W. Fell, Nelson Grant, Harrison Griffin, John Glade, Mathias Hilsenbeck, Morgan Hale, Joseph A. Heck, John George Cruppell, Adam Leonhardt, Norman Miller, William J. Parker, Franklin Reed, John Stubbs, Joseph Summer, Stafford Williams, Robert A. Williams, John W. Wotring, William White, Richard Young, Balze Hermann, Martin Wright, John A. Porter, Amos Steese, John Eberling, Lewis F. Estinghauser, George F. May, Henry T. Peak, Charles S. Underwood, Edward Wolf, Chauncey Lewis, Creasy Foarque, John Frederick, William Jones.

DARKE COUNTY.

Christian Brown, Clark Fryan, Phillips Gardner, John M. Hess, John D. Hutton, Henry A. Jackson, Isaac Miller, William H. Morgan, William Penny, Isaac Reck, William Death, Alex Neal, Henry Ropp, James M. Abbott, Peter Miller, George H. Corzatt.

DEFIANCE COUNTY.

John Q. Adams, George Brown, Hiram D. Coleman, Ephraim Hay, Jacob Memmer, William A. Stevens, Robert J. Nutter, Fred A. Philips, Joshua West, Philip Hollingshead, Robert Mayhugh, John P. Rared.

DELAWARE COUNTY.

Tobias C. Bruce, William Brown, Gilbert M. Blairstead, Alex. Coomer, William H. Elzey, Amos Hall, Andrew A. Vear, Thomas P. Vining, Henry Williams, William Holly, Elijah Henderson, Levi Hedrich, George E. Pendleton.

ERIE COUNTY.

George H. Austin, Henry Cook, Charles Cusick, James Doran, Oscar Dwight, Edward Foley, George Fleming, John Geisser, George Krapp, John J. Lowry, John Monaghan, Adam Nagel, Mark O'Leary, Oliver Smith, Frederick Scheuerer, Cary Wetmore, Leonard Clark, George Fields, Conrad Vogt, Frank Helmick.

FAIRFIELD COUNTY.

George Bussard, Thomas E. Bope, Arch. Bone, William L. Conrad, John Hines, William Hege, John R. Kauffman, Levi Lutz, Abraham Reader, John Shue, Peter Turner, James Walker, Seymour P. Kenney, William H. Hentzly, Luther W. Bell.

FAYETTE COUNTY.

Warren D. Cole, William A. Miller, Brent Ott, William Smith, Chauncey Scott, John Willison, Lewis Janes, Jeremiah Ladd, Nicholas V. Pettiford.

FRANKLIN COUNTY.

George Boyd, Joseph Butcher, Patrick Cummins, Michael Costine, Daniel Clafey, Morris Davis, Martin Eberle, George W. Fisk, Charles Fleck, Nelson Grant, James Henry, Stephen L. Huddleston, Andrew P. Henderson, Wade Hampton, Benjamin Impson, George A. Irwin, William Jones, Henry L. Korte, Philip Kadel, James W. Kilpatrick, Jesse C. Lott, John A. Lloyd, Eli Lohr, Enoch Lechliter, Robert A. Lannon, William M. Leech, Adam Leech, Thomas J. Masters, Oliver P. Martin, Joseph R. Manning, Gaddis Neff, Milton Pierce, Nicholas Reiter, Augustus Sheaf, Henry P. Stewart, John H. Shaw, John F. G. Sheridan, Samuel S. Mathers, Alfred Shuler, Charles F. Schwab, David Stokey, John M. Taylor, Smith Tyron, Joseph Taylor, Andrew Van Houten, Benjamin T. Williams, Alonzo Wright, Hawley Wylie, George W. Wine, Henry Whetsell, Thomas Fleming, Francis Bodkins, Price E. Bowne, William D. Griffith, Henry Post, James Pixley, Brinkley Toont, David Wells, William Brant, Charles Perrin.

FULTON COUNTY.

Martin Buhler, Michael R. Hill, John Heffron, William B. Miley, Wilhelm Nagel, Louis Socie, Jesse G. Tracy, David Dewey, David Minich.

GALLIA COUNTY.

Samuel G. Atwell, Isaac Rucker, John Evans, Benjamin F. Halley, Asaph Thornton, Anderson C. Parker, Jefferson Markham, Jacob V. Smith.

GEAUGA COUNTY.

Sherebiah Burnett, Hamilton V. Carver, Howard Hemenway, Edwin M. Pease, Sidney Hall.

GREENE COUNTY.

James R. Anderson, George Ballard, James H. Butler, John W. Bell, Thomas Burns, Charles Getz, Thomas Hoagland, James W. Jones, Jacob Mosley, William Reading, Milo Randall, Humphrey Sanders, Charles Watson, Hiram Broke, James F. Hartsooke, David Lee, Suincey Monday, Francis C. Sims, Silas G. Brown.

GUERNSEY COUNTY.

Adam M. Anderson, Morgan S. Cornelius, William Douglas, Thomas Gill, James A. Hawthorne, William Lent, Albert Morris, David T. Morrow, Benjamin Valentine, John C. Woodbine, Archibald Thompson, Abraham R. Beal, Eli Clinger.

HAMILTON COUNTY.

Thomas Anspack, Heinrich Andres, John A. Ashbury, William G. Brookbank, Charles Brossart, Ned Brock, Jacob Beeler, Fritz Beidersallen, Philander Butler, Frank Brady, Fred Busse, William Baetz, Andrew Blevins, Julius Buck, George Briggeman, George Born, Thurston Bates, Richard Bodkin, George F. Bean, Jackson Boldock, William Bally, Theo. Beyring, Adam Cook, Jacob R. Coon, Jacob M. Crane, Isaac W. Craig, Thomas Clark, Andrew Dexter, John H. Dickman, Andrew Dittman, Franklin Davis, Andrew Evans, Samuel Ewin, Edward Enghouser, Levi Favors, John Fries, James L. Funk, Christopher Farlow, Francis Fearing, George Fisher, David Foxall, George Green, Charles Goodlander, Michael Gillen, Joseph Gerhardt, Christopher Gabel, George S. Gilmore, Francis Henry, Frederick Horn, Matthew M. Hayes, Albert J. Herbstreit, Albert Humphrey, John W. Hearn, Ralph Hammersley, John W. Hussey, Alonzo Hawkins, August Hunt, George Humphries, Jacob Hoffman, Frederick Huber, Harvey Johnson, Samuel L. Kellison, Leonard Kinley, Mathias Kreidler, Moses Kann, Jefferson Lewis, George Lutz, John Lightner, Thomas N. Lind, Irving Lee, Joseph Link, Herman Lump, Henry Miller, Richard D. Murks, George H. Murray, Alfred W. Mott, John Mehan, Christopher Murphy, Michael May, Charles Marten, James McGowen, Peter J. McQuain, Patrick McCabem, John Nowak, William O'Halloran, David Pierson, Henry Plassoller, John W. Pierce, Robert Quinke, Isaiah Robinson, George Ruhl, William Robbins, Alfred Winter, Robert Wallace, John Wrabten, Augustus Wichman, Robert A. Williams, Henry White, Casper Hornbrook, Alex. Porter, James Connelly, James Ryan, Joseph Fox, Jacob Decker, Simon Puding, John Rathan, Milton Blickerderfer, Arthur C. Buckminster, Richard L. Hughes, Jacob Koch, John Kramer, Jacob Lee, Andrew J. Parker, Robert Raider, James S. Simonton, Conrad Weitsel, Patrick H. Farmer, Thomas W. Pierson, George Siegel, George Summers, Conrad Soner, Samuel J. Robinson, Richard Ready, Joel A. Redus, Joseph Rath, Herman Rohrer, William Smith, John Smith, Nicholas Strechsel, Mathew Siegel, Anton Schlawzer, Frank Suhr, Frederick Schermer, Joseph Suchenbrot, James Sheridan, F. C. Snyder, James Shepherd, Joseph Streli, Henry Schmitt, Lewis Steinwart, Joseph Sessions, August Schwebel, David Schneider, Joseph Severs, Charles Talbot, Ceylon H. Tallmadge, George Vailhardt, John Wright, Isaac Wilson, William D. Wrench, Augustus D. Watson, Thomas McMahan, Dutton Herrettson, Benjamin F. Johnson, Daniel Bellingham.

HARDIN COUNTY.

Lewis Andrew, Ferdinand Copp, Alex. Chavis, William H. Edgengton, Oscar Fraktion, Jacob Handenshield, John Houseman, Lewis Johnson, Thomas Peever, Timothy Shepherd, Samuel Sinfit, Jacob Sherman, George D. Stevenson, Henry Roach, Philamour Rogers, Jacob Slechter, David Serks, Jerome B. Wolfe, Ebenezer Wingate, Albert Baum, Robert Shuce, John A. Patton, Henry S. Lehr.

HARRISON COUNTY.

Enoch Bricker, William Crider, Enoch Copeland, William Courtright, Peter De Walt, Thomas Hazlett, George Holmes, Thomas Laisure, Samuel Maryman, Lindley Watson, John W. Wyandt.

HENRY COUNTY.

William Barbile, sr., John B. Davis, Erastus Frederick, Benjamin Faurot, Moses E. Firman, Jonah Kirk, Philip Michael, Charles H. Roney, Francis M. Smith, Samuel L. Sweeney, Abraham Vanoleah, Jacob Frantz, Nelson Gray, Joseph Poisson.

HIGHLAND COUNTY.

Elias Broadstone, Charles A. Chaney, Charles Fustenburger, James Green, James M. Holmes, Charles E. Harris, Robert Jackson, Richard Morton, John Mottie, Henry Plummer, Robert Rogers, Absalom Roush.

HOCKING COUNTY.

Adam Bach, Amos B. Clark, Samuel Eastman, George H. Ellison, Martin V. Imboden, Lewis Neece, James Steel, Elias Delaney, James P. Matheny, George M. Walton, Harrison Pugh, Jacob Knece.

HURON COUNTY.

Ephraim T. Bearn, John Burt, Abraham Crabb, William S. Howard, William Keller, George E. Mattoon, John Nesbit, Milton Palmer, Alfred C. Stevens, Almer B. Wood, William E. Akers, Francis J. Brown, Lewis R. Livermore, Weden S. Chamberlain, Frederick F. Burdue, George H. Miller.

JACKSON COUNTY.

Thomas Brunton, Selden W. Carsey, William Claar, William Freeman, David Farley, Wesley Howard, Henry Jenkins, John Mercer, John H. Martin, Jesse N. Marquis, Thomas Rider, George W. Reigle, William Shields, Reuben Smathers, Morgan Williams, Alex. Wilson, Kendall Carter, George H. Downs, James Dunlap, John L. Burrows, James R. Carr, William Welch, George H. Finney.

JEFFERSON COUNTY.

Eli Albright, Lemuel Brandenburg, John Cooper, George J. Chamberlain, William Cole, William Cronin, Matthew Clark, John Dobbs, Ford D. George, Daniel Hall, John W. Hughes, Lewis Hammond, Reuben King, David N. Long, Henderson Mercer, William D. Linton, Adam Munn, William Mooney, Thomas T. Mann, James McCormick, John C. Phillips, Lyman Priest, Matthew Priest, Thomas E. Paxson, William Robertson, William Roe, William A. Urquhart, John W. Watt, John Yocom, Isaac Zimmerman, William Smith, Orlando P. Clifton, George W. Curry, Franklin Harr, Alexander Richey, James Mayhigh, Jonathan Crawley, Edward Elsom, John Culp, William Starkey.

KNOX COUNTY.

William J. Carson, James Mahaffey, Thomas McGee, Simon Seiler, Harmon P. Tarr, Thomas G. Ewers, Edrow J. Bruce.

LAKE COUNTY.

Samuel W. Hickok, Emory G. Hardy, Warren R. Hall, Daniel Saxton.

ROSE COUNTY.

William Arthur, James D. Bowman, Perry Bramfield, Joseph Bowman, Matthew Cullen, Sylvester T. Chick, Samuel K. Chatfield, Tate Cornute, James Ellis, James Gossett, George Jones, John C. Myers, Benjamin F. Osborne, William Porter, James Pine, Francis M. Ross, Charles Snyder, Martin V. Welman, Christopher Wilburn, W. M. Yates, W. F. Blackwell, Samuel C. Brown, Elisha Hatcliff, William Spiers, Isaac Winters, Daniel J. Turner, Creighton Wilson.

LICKING COUNTY.

George Armstrong, James K. Brown, George W. Matthews, Jacob Oakleaf, George W. Phillips, Henry N. Tippett, William Wright, Thomas B. Iden, Nathan Finnegan, James Comstock, Thomas G. Chidester, Salathiel Carter, George H. Dixon.

LOGAN COUNTY.

George F. Bailey, Edward Benton, Samuel Crenister, George Craig, Robert Downing, James H. Hemphill, Martin Krees, Charles Kinchlow, Isaac A. Moore, Joseph Neeper, Caleb Reams, Alonzo Underwood, Isaac H. Young, John Q. A. Bennett, John W. Carder, Samuel W. Patterson, William Stranier, James S. Winton, Samuel Wambaugh, John S. Wren, James M. Whitehall, Benjamin W. McKinnon, James H. Rea, Martin L. Hampsher.

LORAIN COUNTY.

James J. Bailey, John Bure, Frank Diedrick, George Lyon, Selden M. Payne, John R. Sherman, Gilbert W. Turner, Daniel Lucas.

LUCAS COUNTY.

Joe C. Berry, John H. Bandy, Isaac Brown, Theodore Brush, Alexander Cabasher, Peter Cluckey, Henry Davenport, Christ. Floering, Henry Jackson, Martin L. Jordan, Albert S. Kettrel, Ira Leach, Fridolen Meyer, James A. Moon, Nelson S. Mossir, John McCleogin, William A. Penfield, John Kulapough, William Sawyer, James H. Sprain, John T. Woolcut, Elias Boyer, Theodore Miller, John C. Merrifield, David E. Mohler, Lewis P. Newberry, Christopher Scheets, Delos H. Burch, Thomas W. Carpenter, Henry Neff.

MADISON COUNTY.

Sylvester Ames, Jeremiah Bradley, Joseph Jones, Alexander Prose, Nathan R. Quackenbush, William English, Marion B. Smith, Richard Jones, George S. Plumb.

MAHONING COUNTY.

Lewis Boromaster, Reuben Barr, Moses Brown, William Jackson, Henderson Reed, James A. Roseberry, Paul R. Robertson, Thomas Trumbull, Chauncey O'Dell.

MARION COUNTY.

Benjamin Williams, Wilson S. Evans, Jacob Miller, John McClafferty, James Noblet, Harrison Williams, Wolstyn H. Claypool, Guy Boynton, Thomas J. Sprague, Eli Winters.

MIAMI COUNTY.

Joseph Bradford, Isreal Clingman, Samuel Elliott, John A. Hyatt, William Hitchell, William F. Long, William P. McKee, Richard H. Sotherland, David Ward, Theodore J. Feiler.

MEIGS COUNTY.

William H. Black, Henry Bell, John Carterburg, John G. Embleton, George W. Evans, James Headly, Charles McGraw, Armstead Simons, Columbus Woods, Evanston Young, Fred R. Reynolds, William J. Smith, Charles P. Boyd, John Kappell, Naaman R. Ailer, Abram S. Coe, James Kimes.

MEDINA COUNTY.

George Armbruster, John Habfield, Wilson Hazen, Curtis F. Lutz, Luman G. Mills, Deweice H. Phillips, William Dobson.

MERCER COUNTY.

Jacob Bollenbank, Lorenzo D. Karr, John Scholler, William Wright, Frederick Yohn, John Zedesker, John Morehead.

MONROE COUNTY.

David Decker, William Mathews, Thomas McMasters, James L. Shields, Fred J. Weigle, David Wilson, Thomas Fleming, Lot S. Gregg, John Blue, William C. Charlton, Daniel K. Willison.

MONTGOMERY COUNTY.

John G. Alloson, Isaac B. Burton, Jonathan Bevington, Julius R. Bruce, Joseph Bendistrel, Hiram K. Brooks, David Cazard, Hiram S. Cass, John W. Carrigan, Joseph D. Carney, Thomas Doughty, Edmund DeWitt, Theodore Doll, William Duvall, Thomas Donnelly, Ely Jefferson, James Finch, Arthur Gillespie, John Hurt, Maurice Keating, Christian Lemwood, Paul Lambert, James P. Marshall, James A. Mudge, John J. Much, Isaac W. Murray, Adam May, Ralph Robinson, William H. Strader, Fielding McGoglin, John Owen, William A. Pritz, Francis Wright, John C. Warbrug, Theodore M. Wagner, John W. Willis, Harrison Williamson, Henry D. Warren, Warren Williamson, James Brown, Henry W. Kindig, Harrison Shroger, Benjamin K. Doudna, August Frank, Oscar F. Hoover, William M. Locke, James C. Taylor, Samuel Fuk, Michael Brousseau, Patrick Burke, Dennis Collins, Leonard Cross, Patrick Connell, Timothy Ronhan, Francis W. Sargent, Julius Schaifer, James Stewart, Ignatz Spring, Anthony Terwest, Albert Vogel, George W. Venable, Thomas J. Lloyd, Daniel Mant, Joseph Montell, Francis McLean, Thomas McDermott, Lorenzo George, Thomas Gallear, Douglass N. Koons, John Kersch, Charles Weber, Austin McKinney.

MORGAN COUNTY.

Moses Dorsey, John Hooper, John W. McGonagle, Thomas Risin, Thomas Wooly, Andrew Kelley, Jonathan Allard.

MORROW COUNTY.

Oscar L. R. French, Thomas Gaffield, William J. Hilliard, Edward Jenkins, David M. V. Kenney, Thomas C. Lord, Noah Mellick, Robert T. McKibbea, John D. Reynolds, Mordecai Vore, Alpheus Miller, Lloyd S. Nicewainer.

MUSKINGUM COUNTY.

James A. Allison, James T. Armstrong, Marion Allen, James Ballinger, William H. Belden, James W. Boyd, William H. Davidson, Elijah J. Fravel, Israel Fletcher Lafayette Gourley, John Jackson, John Kinner, John Lyons, Samuel N. Lynn, Henry Miller, John C. Miller, Levi Mitchell, Lucius Mercer, James Murphy, John W. Mohler, Edward O'Donnell, Elijah Oakley, Robert F. Smart, George Sungle, William White, John W. Snurr, Amos Dunkle, Luther C. Pace, Henry S. Thompson, Joseph Rot.

NOBLE COUNTY.

Miles T. Bevorn, Nicholas Osborne, William H. Piggott, Abner Robinson, John C. W. Schoyer, John F. Scalock, William H. Williams, Cropper D. Laws, William H. McAree.

OTTAWA COUNTY.

Anthony Huber, John Mitchell, John G. Micael, Albert Overmier, Charles H. Peters, Robert Henfelder.

PAULDING COUNTY.

Percival C. Bishop, Sylvester Butterfield, Robert Carkey, James H. T. Fox, William Hoover, John W. Loar, Thomas Mar Marcum, John McCanganhy, Nathaniel Rife, John Slaybaugh, George Sharp, David Trissells, Joseph J. Beard, Avannah Kinkade, Willis H. Knopp, John Levec, Washington Overmeyer, Adam Oberhour, Samuel B. Matthews, Wiley McPeters.

PERRY COUNTY.

Levi Barston, Nelson S. Brown, Hugh H. Dugan, Abram D. Johnson, William W. Lyons, Thomas Marshall, John Oiler, Spenser S. Sanders.

PICKAWAY COUNTY.

John S. Babcock, George Birschard, Isaac Dison, William Fisher, Martin V. B. Francis, William Kearney, Allison B. Michael, Francis B. Sears, James Trimble.

PIKE COUNTY.

James D. Aston, John C. Bateman, William J. Brown, Charles Darst, James H. Rose, Douglass A. Pearce.

PORTAGE COUNTY.

James C. Brooks, Joseph C. Caldwell, Lafayette Care, Curtis Smith.

PREBLE COUNTY.

James Baker, Theodore F. Brown, William Cromer, John Fowler, Jacob Poffenberger, Albert C. Smith, James H. Colville, Jacob Ryder, Isaac Lock.

PUTNAM COUNTY.

Orrin Abbott, Ailer Burgess, John A. Closer, Henry Gruberhoff, Wilson Martin, Thomas V. Myersin, James A. Mills, Timothy McGill, John Ward, William Wooly, Nicholas Ester, John W. Thomas, George McCom, Matthew Shinaberry.

RICHLAND COUNTY.

Andrew T. Divan, John Disbro, Solomon Feighner, Allen Haverfield, William Spoon, Daniel Sackman, James B. Snyder, George Suinehart, Henry S. Weaver, Daniel B. Woodside, Charles H. Lewis.

ROSS COUNTY.

Isaac Arledge, Martin Enderlin, Amos Harris, William H. Higgins, George Heibig, William H. Iseman, Nathan D. Jones, Noah Johnson, James E. Kinser, William Livingston, Dr. Powell, David H. Smith, Annas H. Wills, William S. Donohue, Martin Enderlin, John Williamson, Samuel Adams, Frederick Benner.

SANDUSKY COUNTY.

John Baker, Charles Benner, David Grant, William Holton, Stephen H. Keegan, Robert Key, William Rogers, Orwell P. Rorick, Charles Smith, Andrew J. West, William Boyer, Henry Zender, John W. Angus.

SCIOTO COUNTY.

William M. Burnett, George W. Coy, Cicero S. Cadot, Frederick W. Gist, Frank Henning, George A. Henry, Stephen G. Losee, Lyman T. Morris, William Neve, Felix Robert, Frederick Stearns, George M. Sargent, Daniel R. Spry, Henry Hush, Eli Jones, Jonathan James, Samuel S. Johnson, Josiah E. Jenkins, Frederick Keefer, Jacob Pollard, Franklin Stone, Sebastian Delahan, Thomas McHenry, James V. Sanders, John Dasken.

SENECA COUNTY.

Robert Barrows, John S. Crawford, Benjamin F. Hull, David W. Kelly, William Musselman, David Nighswander, John D. Opdycke, Thomas L. Park, Hiram L. Roberts, Henry Smothers, Lake Weller, George H. Gross, Isaac Weiker.

SHELBY COUNTY.

Thomas Bailey, Matthias Dye, Thomas W. Epler, John Gibbs, Samuel Higgins, Abram Harp, Harrison Mayo, Robert D. Pigg, William B. Simpson, William Waitman, John Tompkins, Robert Sutton, Milton L. Meranda.

STARK COUNTY.

Archibald Armstrong, George Bellamy, Jacob M. Boroway, Anton Crone, Joseph Cochenour, Andrew Daniels, John Goodenbeyer, Samuel Harman, John Miller, Adam Metzger, Nathan Moles, Sylvanus Mounts, Daniel Marshall, William L. Nahr, Joseph Remmle, William P. Rush, Fred J. Smith, William Thomas, Ephraim Foohl, Henry Gibson, Stephen Bloomfield, George T. Little, McLain Longshore, John Harter, Gilbert N. Clark.

SUMMIT COUNTY.

Simon Bonfine, Mathias Caff, Simon Coy, Abner Danforth, Anslo French, Rufus N. Jones, John C. Keller, Lorenzo Luce, Jr., Loving J. Philips, Daniel G. Sechrist, Charles P. Townsend, Henry C. Upson, Anthony Waltz, Matthew Whitacre, Amos Wills, George H. Yowells, Samuel Rearly, Alfred M. Wade, Henry Drees, Levi Mix, Erwin Davis.

TRUMBULL COUNTY.

Irwin J. Bates, John Booth, Jonathan Carroll, Benett Curtiss, Samuel Carlton, Anson W. Deline, Lewis B. Hall, Jacob Lynn, Reuben Mehuren, John O'Reilly, George Rahn, Charles W. Shephard, Wagner Spencer, William Taylor, James McCollum.

TUSCARAWAS COUNTY.

Gabrie T. Born, Jonas C. Barr, Charles E. Christ, John Fagley, Thomas H. Hill, David Henline, Hiram N. Laizure, Thomas Miller, Clempron Moore, George M. Mails, Theodore D. Neighbor, Joseph Robinson, John Rankin, Jacob Tice, Frederick Voheer, James Warren, Lewis L. Watton, William White, James L. Manley, Noah C. Christy, Garrett H. Fowler, Samuel Holdenbaum, Joseph Starr, Charles F. Sommer, Lorenzo Wardell, Moses B. Kennedy, Hiram Parker, Philip Geib.

UNION COUNTY.

Delbert Ayers, Samuel S. Davis, Samuel Grow, John Hosack, Jacob Mapes, James Moody, William G. March, Marion Munrele, Jonathan Rodgers, Daniel Rahl, David Westbrook, Nathaniel Brooks, Horace S. Colvin, John Wood, Lemuel James, James M. Laird, William B. Noggle, Joseph Price, Hiram Yarington, Martin Richardson.

VAN WERT COUNTY.

Theo. Aldrich, Rueben N. Balyeat, Thomas Gorman, John F. Hildebrand, Henry Johns, George Lawhead, John B. Longworth, Matthew Morehead, John A. Switzer, Christian Shaffer, William Meely, James Penner, William H. Echard, Miller T. Leitner.

VINTON COUNTY.

John Arthenharst, Thomas D. Brooks, James Hale, Isaac Hill, Philip Keck, James Morrison, Torrence Murrey, William Davis, Jasper Dillon.

WARREN COUNTY.

John Aellison, Charles Chaney, Ed W. Davis, James Grimes, Edward Nells, Edmund Stace, Thomas E. Seward, Joseph Seldenridge, Jacob D. Watson, Silas Brandenburg, Arthur M. Dunn.

WASHINGTON COUNTY.

William F. Bruckett, James Conleton, Leonard A. Jackson, Charles W. Lewis, Henry Miller, William McClintock, George Noland, Henry W. Petty, Milton Patton, William Radicker, Francis M. Sivesy, Joshua M. Witham, Aaron Fleming, Charles Buchanan, William H. Lewis, James M. Steed, Squires Thomas, James A. McAllister.

WAYNE COUNTY.

Michael Badger, Henry B. Eaby, Jonathan Gingery, Albert J. Harry, Zetus L. Numbers, Rudolph Paul, George Peabody, David Rook, Andrew Smeltzer, Newton S. Brice, Charles F. Dariah, Samuel Barden, Simon Norris.

WILLIAMS COUNTY.

James Bechtol, James B. Cass, Peter Friend, Phunnell Gruesbeck, Joseph Hively, Joseph Mapes, John Russell, William W. Spellman, Marvin T. Treat, Christian C. Crummell, Abraham Haines, Eli Isenhardt.

WOOD COUNTY.

Joseph S. Ash, Edwin B. Beach, Kirk Johnson, Jesse A. Jolly, Adam Knoll, John Phillips, Freeman Stodder, Augustus Sipple, John W. Weaver, Robert Black, William A. Montgomery, Aaron P. McMitt, John J. Smith, William W. Anderson, Levi Coleman.

WYANDOT COUNTY.

Daniel Brown, Louis Bloom, Thomas Coons, Jonathan Furney, William Ginther, William F. Hall, Joel Milum, John McAfee, Isaiah McCleary, Eli Ragon, Conrad Stephen, Peter Voolker, John Woossner, Matthias Zimmerman, Charles Smith, Joseph C. Balton.—*Ohio State Journal*, October 28.

NO. 2.

Official list of soldiers restored to the rolls in Ohio after September 1, 1893, and before the State election, November 2, 1893.

UNITED STATES PENSION AGENCY,
Columbus, Ohio, October 30, 1893.

MY DEAR SIR: Herewith please find a list of 1,323 names and post-office addresses of that portion of the pensioners on the rolls of this agency recently suspended who have been restored to the rolls.

The request contained in your favor of the 28th instant was that I should furnish the list of restorations by counties based on the list of suspensions as published in the *Ohio State Journal* of that date. The roll of pensioners is kept alphabetically for the entire State, without regard to county lines, and owing to the condition of our work I have been unable to compare and verify the *Journal* list.

Very respectfully,

JOHN G. MITCHELL,
United States Pension Agent.

Hon. JAMES F. SEWARD,

Chairman Democratic State Central Committee.

List of pensioners who have been suspended and payment of their pensions resumed:

I. Arledge, Adelphi.
J. W. Angus, Tinned.
W. Anderson, North Rochester.
H. Andres, Cincinnati.
J. R. Anderson, Xenia.
J. M. Q. Allison, Dayton.
N. R. Alier, Rutland.
R. A. Allen, East Orville.
S. Ames, London.
A. C. Armstrong, Canton.
D. Ayres, Marysville.
J. F. Armstrong, Carlwick.

S. Adams, Clarksburg.
S. Austin, Decatur.
G. Ambuster, Liverpool.
J. Allard, Stockport.
Wm. E. Akers, Norwalk.
J. Q. Adams, Defiance.
J. M. Abbott, Ansonia.
J. Ashenhurst, McArthur.
J. Q. Addison, Bellaire.
P. Anthony, Bass Lake, Ind.
S. G. Atwell, Harris.
T. Aldrich, Cavett.

Official list of soldiers restored to the rolls in Ohio, etc.—Continued.

A. Anderson, Cambridge.
J. H. Anderson, Neele.
E. Albright, Empire.
J. Allison, New Concord.
W. Arthur, Ironton.
J. A. Ashburg, Cincinnati.
M. Blieckendorf, Shanesville.
M. Badger, Apple Creek.
E. J. Brace, Fredericksburg.
S. Breman, Rockbridge.
W. Bauman, Dayton Home.
G. Born.
J. B. Bowman, South Point.
G. Bladen, Lindenville.
C. Brigerman, Cincinnati.
T. Burns, Xenia.
E. Beam, Lewisburg.
J. H. Bandy, Toledo.
T. C. Bope, Lancaster.
Wm. Bell, La Rue.
J. Bailey, Springfield.
J. Baker, Findlay, Station A.
J. Booth, Girard.
R. N. Balyeat, Van Wert.
S. Bandenburg, Hopkinsville.
J. C. Blair, Winfield.
Ira Burns, Lima.
A. Blevins, Cincinnati.
G. Brown, Brundersburg.
J. Blue, Beallville.
M. Neatty, Chicago, Ill.
T. J. Boien, Springfield.
F. M. Bodkins, Columbus.
T. C. Breece, West Berlin.
S. Bradley, Dayton Home.
P. Browne, Dayton Home.
J. Bradshaw, Dayton Home.
A. M. Blackford, Dayton Home.
D. Brown, Nevada.
H. Bell, Portland.
J. M. Bacon, Chicago, Ill.
A. Bachman, Point Union.
A. E. Buckmaster, Lawrenceburg, Ind.
E. Benton, De Graff.
E. Barker, Mount Orab.
F. Benner, Bainbridge.
G. F. Born, Gnadenhutton.
G. F. Bailey, West Liberty.
G. M. Blackford, Delaware.
I. J. Bates, Hartford.
J. M. Bowray, Navarre.
J. H. Butler, Xenia.
J. Bevington, S. S. Home.
R. Barn, Youngstown.
J. Burt, Norwalk.
J. C. Berry, Toledo.
J. H. Balsmeier, N. M. H.
L. J. Barston, North Stratesville.
S. Bonine, Akron.
W. Boyer, Lindsey.
P. Butler, Cincinnati.
J. A. Blackson, Coshocton.
J. H. Brown, New Hampshire.
S. C. Bevan, Bartramsville.
I. H. Barhight.
W. Brant, Briggsville.
W. T. Burchett, Watertown.
M. P. Bevan, Berne.
J. W. Bell, Yellow Springs.
H. B. Belding, Cleveland.
S. Brandenbaugh, Steubenville.
F. L. Blodgett, Dayton Home.
A. Burgess, Evansville.
J. Bradford, Piqua.
J. C. Bothin, Marseilles.
H. K. Booze, S. S. Home.
L. W. Bell, Basil.
T. D. Book, Zileski.
T. Brunton, Camba.
J. W. Bowman, Culbertson.
F. Burk, Delphos.
G. F. Bean, Cincinnati.
J. Busford, Wilmington.
C. Bossart, Cincinnati.
D. H. Burch, West Toledo.
C. H. Berry, Springfield.
E. Boyer, Fancher.
J. W. Boyd, Zanesville.
C. K. Bennett, Nat'l Military Home.
J. Braton, Sabina.
L. Bowmaster, Youngstown.
John Baker, Vickery.
M. Brown, Upper Sandusky.
A. Boch, Joe.
E. R. Beach, Bradner.
J. A. Burden, Wapakoneta.
J. Bandendirtel, Dayton.
J. Blackburn, Coshocton.
J. Brown, Dayton.
C. B. Brown, Gordon.
W. H. Black, Lima.
N. L. Brown, Somerset, Ky.
J. Bandeld, Nelsonville.
J. S. Babcock, Circleville.
S. Bricker, Negley.
N. Bauer, Cleveland.
T. Bullard, East Wood.
W. Baird, Dayton Home.
P. Burke, Dayton Home.
M. Brousch, Dayton Home.
A. Burger, Dayton Home.
D. Billinham, Cincinnati.

G. Ballard, Jamestown.
I. Boyd, Colorado.
J. C. Bissell, Cleveland, Ohio.
A. C. Baker, Sand Fork.
C. Buchanan, Waterford.
C. P. Boyd, Syracuse.
E. T. Beam, Waterman.
F. J. Brown, Norwalk.
F. F. Burdick, Collins.
G. Bellamy, Canton.
G. W. Baum, Kenton.
H. W. Black, Ash Ridge.
J. Boldack, Cleves.
J. H. Bailey, Kipton.
J. C. Brooke, Ravenna.
P. E. Brown, Columbus.
S. Bloomfield, Middle Branch.
J. C. Bateman, Pikelton.
J. Buck, Cincinnati.
J. R. Beace, Dayton.
R. Barrows, Green Springs.
S. Butterfield, Grove Hill.
W. H. Black, Middleport.
W. M. Neatty, Del Roy.
J. L. Burrows, Rays.
J. Barlow, N. M. Home.
S. G. Brown, Xenia.
T. Beavers, Bellaire.
W. H. Bolden, Zanesville.
T. F. Bower, West Alexandria.
G. Beeler, Cinderville.
G. Bussard, Carroll.
J. Bradley, Plain City.
W. Baltz, Cincinnati.
R. Beal, Guernsey.
H. Bourgmen, Dayton Home.
N. S. Brice, Orrville.
J. Butcher, Columbus.
T. Burt, Toledo.
G. W. Brooks, Dayton Home.
G. W. Cox, Olway.
W. V. Colrose, Nat'l Military Home.
H. Cahill, Delphos.
J. Cockenson, Canton.
S. F. Chick, Ironton.
T. Clark, Cincinnati.
J. N. Cattigan, Dayton.
C. W. Cook, Columbus.
L. Chamberlain, Columbus.
P. Cassell, Columbus.
W. Cook, Columbus.
S. P. Carlton, Columbus.
M. Coffman, Columbus.
J. C. Caldwell, Columbus.
J. W. Crum, Columbus.
J. M. Cram, Columbus.
B. Curtis, Columbus.
S. Cox, Columbus.
J. R. Coon, Columbus.
A. S. Cox, Harrisonville.
J. M. Cooper, Toronto.
J. A. Close, Kalida.
G. N. Clark, Canal Fulton.
C. Chaney, Murdock.
L. Clark, S. S. Home.
W. Calvin, Cincinnati.
H. E. Clark, National Military Home.
W. C. Charlton, Graysville.
W. Conneaut.
N. C. Christy, New Philadelphia.
W. C. Carson, Fredericktown.
S. W. Carsey, Judson.
J. Connelly, Cincinnati.
A. B. Clark, Carbon Hill.
C. Cursic, S. S. Home.
F. Case, Galion.
H. S. Cass, Dayton.
J. A. Carr, Coulton.
J. Canterbury, Pomeroy.
J. Curman, Wellsville.
S. D. Carudy, Germantown.
R. Caskey, Pakwood.
L. Coleman, N. Baltimore.
S. K. Chatfield, Sh'd'n C. W.
T. Coons, Little Sandusky.
W. Carpenter, Toledo.
W. Cook, New Harmony.
B. Crozier, Bellaire.
G. Chamberlain, Warrenton.
G. W. Curry, Steubenville.
W. Clare, Jackson.
W. M. Cupps, National Military Home.
C. C. Cadot, Portsmouth.
M. S. Cornelius, Boden.
D. Clopper, Brice.
J. Comstock, Kirkersville.
L. E. Clemens, Judson.
T. Carmute, Ironton.
D. F. Cosey, Flushing.
P. Cummins, Columbus.
L. Cross, Columbus.
P. Connell, Columbus.
W. Courtright, Columbus.
W. D. Cole, Columbus.
S. J. Cartright, Columbus.
M. Chaffer, Columbus.
J. Crowley, Columbus.
J. Coyle, Columbus.
I. Clinger, Columbus.
A. Culler, Columbus.
M. Chambers, Columbus.
C. A. Chaney, Willits.
J. Congleton, Marietta.

Official list of soldiers restored to the rolls in Ohio, etc.—Continued.

J. J. Coleman, East Liverpool.
 H. A. Coleman, Defiance.
 J. Carroll, Hubbard.
 M. Cron, Minster.
 J. Culp, Holt.
 H. E. Clark, National Military Home.
 D. Collins, National Military Home.
 W. Crider, New Athens.
 G. C. Cellar, Yellow Springs.
 J. H. Coville, Hood.
 J. S. Crawford, Fostoria.
 A. Cooner, Ashley.
 A. Clenia, Ripley.
 C. C. Crumley, Bryan.
 G. H. Corzatt, Gordon.
 H. Cook, Milan.
 J. B. Cass, Montpelier.
 J. Cochran, West Carlisle.
 J. M. Carder, De Graff.
 K. Carter, Camba.
 M. Clark, Toronto.
 S. Carter, Johnstown.
 T. Catlett, Roanoke, Ind.
 G. Chamberlain, Greenwich.
 W. Cromer, West Manchester.
 W. H. Claypool, Caledonia.
 L. Carl, Suffield.
 A. Crabb, Greenwich.
 P. Clifton, Steubenville.
 G. Conway, National Military Home.
 W. Davidson, Zanesville.
 W. Dobson, Whittlesey.
 W. Duval, S. S. Home.
 R. J. Derbyshire, Sabina.
 W. Dipes, Dayton Home.
 F. Duff, Martins Ferry.
 D. Becker, Bealsville.
 P. Dewart, Cadiz.
 R. Downing, Zanesfield.
 J. Dougherty, Kempston.
 J. Decker, Lockland.
 W. Death, Baker.
 S. Does, Dayton Home.
 B. K. Doudney, Dayton.
 T. E. Derr, Nelsonville.
 J. Doran, Sandusky.
 A. M. Dunn, Mason.
 M. Dye, Sidney.
 G. H. Drysdale, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. Dobbs, Steubenville.
 W. J. Davis, Bolts Mills.
 H. Davenport, Toledo.
 J. Dougherty, Georgetown.
 A. H. Delin, Kinsman.
 J. Disbro, Newville.
 A. J. Daniels, Ashland.
 A. Dunkle, Roseville.
 A. Dexter, Cincinnati.
 A. A. Douglass, Inverness.
 E. W. Davis, Maineville.
 E. Davis, Macedonia.
 G. H. Dixon, Newark.
 J. E. Davis, McClure.
 J. W. Dillinger, Lysander.
 S. L. Davis, Magnetic Springs.
 W. Daggett, Salem.
 W. Donahue, Clarksburg.
 R. Davis, Columbus.
 M. Dorsey, McConnellsburg.
 J. H. Dusley, Sardinia.
 J. Dyer, Dayton Home.
 W. Douglass, Cambridge.
 B. W. Dusart, Urbana.
 A. T. Diven, Newville, P'n.
 M. P. Downey, Springfield.
 E. Deyo, Middle Fork.
 R. Dixon, National Military Home.
 A. Danforth, Akron.
 F. Daenbemeyer, Dayton Home.
 J. B. DeHaven, Williamston.
 D. Dewey, Matamora.
 S. Delabar, Wheelersburg.
 J. Deahoff, Columbiana.
 F. Dietrick, N. Ridgeville.
 E. Dugan, National Military Home.
 C. Darst, Waverly.
 J. H. Dickman, Cincinnati.
 T. Donnelly, S. S. Home.
 L. Dison, Circleville.
 R. Davis, Dell Roy.
 A. Dennis, Findlay.
 A. Daniels, Canton.
 A. Dittman, Cincinnati.
 E. Doudna, Barnesville.
 F. Davis, Richmond, Mo.
 H. Drees, Akron.
 J. K. Dougherty, Roscoe.
 S. Davison, Surryville.
 T. Doil, Dayton.
 D. N. Edwards, Bannier.
 E. Elson, Island Creek.
 J. B. Embleton, Middleport.
 R. Earnest, Springfield.
 W. H. Eddington, Batter'n.
 W. S. Ellis, Martins Ferry.
 G. A. Ethison, Carbon Hill.
 J. Ellis, Proctorville.
 J. Eberling, Bement.
 L. F. Estonhaugen, Cleveland.
 T. G. Ewers, Fredericktown.
 S. Evans, Cincinnati.

J. H. Ervingham, St. Paris.
 W. Echard, Paulding.
 D. Edwards, Findlay.
 A. Evans, College Hill.
 J. Eby, Miamisburg.
 S. Elliott, Fidelity.
 S. Eastman, Logan.
 M. Eberly, Columbus.
 J. B. Eaton, Athens.
 H. Eaby, Wooster.
 J. H. Emmons, Wilmington.
 J. N. Estep, Catawba.
 M. Enkertin, Chillicothe.
 W. H. Elzey, Kilbourne.
 W. H. England, Plain City.
 H. Fibuary, Frenchtown, Pa.
 S. H. Fish, Fillmore.
 A. W. Fell, Bedford.
 G. Fleming, Birmingham.
 D. Farley, Coulton.
 E. Fouh, Canton.
 J. P. Frazier, Williamsburg.
 W. C. Fees, Dunkirk, Ind.
 B. Fisher, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. K. P. Fox, Cincinnati.
 I. Fitzgerald, Blue Rock.
 J. Fitzgerald, Nat'l Military Home.
 A. French, Akron.
 E. J. Frame, Rural Dale.
 G. H. Fowler, Dennison.
 G. W. Eisk, Columbus.
 L. Farrors, Cincinnati.
 B. Front, Columbus.
 L. P. Finkler, Dodgeville.
 M. E. Firman, Leshler.
 S. Fugher, Shelby.
 T. Fleming, Columbus.
 P. H. Farmer, Cincinnati.
 E. Foley, Sandusky.
 A. Foleyard, Clay City.
 A. J. Ferrow, Chili, Ind.
 C. Floring, Toledo.
 C. Fovargue, Jr., Glenville.
 J. Frantz, Holgate.
 J. W. Farmer, Urbana.
 C. Farlan, Cincinnati.
 E. B. Fimby, South Ridge.
 A. C. Frazier, Harbor.
 J. Fagley, North Philadelphia.
 J. Fisher, Elmwood Place.
 G. Fisher, Westwood.
 D. Foseall, Cincinnati.
 P. Fox, Nova.
 A. Furman, Bellaire.
 J. B. Funk, Cincinnati.
 J. Fox, Cincinnati.
 J. R. Farris.
 A. Fleming, Waterford.
 C. Fleck, Columbus.
 N. Finegan, Newark.
 A. Folyard, Clay City, Ind.
 B. Foster, Nat'l Military Home.
 B. Faurot, Napoleon.
 F. Flaring, Columbus.
 George H. Finney, Mabres.
 J. Frazier, Salineville.
 J. A. Ford, Phoenix.
 P. Friend, Ainger.
 T. Fleming, Marr.
 W. A. Freeman, Rays.
 J. Frier, Cincinnati.
 M. V. B. Framier, Circleville.
 W. Fisher, Circleville.
 A. Frank, Dayton.
 J. Frederick, Cleveland.
 N. D. Fuller, Coshocton.
 J. Funk, Dayton.
 F. Funk, Cincinnati.
 O. L. R. French, Shanks.
 J. M. Green, Nat'l Military Home.
 W. Ginther, Nevada.
 J. Green, Leesburg.
 J. Geissner, Sandusky.
 W. Green, Gallon.
 N. Grimm, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. Guner, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. Gaiser, Cleveland.
 A. Gallispie, Germantown.
 C. Getz, Yellow Springs.
 H. George, Mount Cory.
 J. Gossett, Millers.
 J. N. Gearhart, Urbana.
 M. Gibbs, Sidney.
 N. Gaut, Cleveland.
 T. Gafield, Edison.
 H. Griffin, Cleveland.
 T. Gin, Antrim.
 W. Griffith, Columbus.
 J. Gibbs, Port Jefferson.
 J. Gingery, Crestline.
 P. Geib, Canal Dover.
 T. Gallear, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. S. George, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. A. Gorgar, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. H. Gaddis, N. Washington.
 D. Good, Bellaire.
 H. Gibson, Middle Branch.
 H. Grubenhoff, Ottsville.
 L. Gomley, Frazeysburg.
 L. George, Nat'l Military Home.
 M. Gallops, S. Lake, Mich.
 S. Goodin, Roscoe.

Official list of soldiers restored to the rolls in Ohio, etc.—Continued.

C. Goodlander, Cincinnati.
 J. Grimes, Harveysburg.
 F. Hasler, Oxford.
 G. W. Hyles, West Carlisle.
 J. Handenshield, Kenton.
 J. E. Hulton, Arcanum.
 W. Goodbridge, Wilmington.
 T. Gorman, Van Wert.
 N. Geary, Deshler.
 F. Henry, Miami.
 F. S. Hildebrand, Findlay.
 I. Hill, Wilkesville.
 J. Houseman, Dunkirk.
 N. F. Hallely, Blendon.
 J. Hosack, Magnetic Spring.
 J. W. Hearne, Cleves.
 J. A. Heck, Cleveland.
 J. S. Holland, Barton.
 J. Hallim, Beta.
 S. H. Huddleson, Columbus.
 J. Howard, Chauncey.
 A. J. Harry, Wooster.
 H. Heminway, Montville.
 W. Hotley, Delaware.
 D. M. Hanna, McKeepsport.
 A. Haverfield, Epworth.
 H. Huxley, Hamilton.
 L. B. Holt, Branville.
 T. H. Hill, Uhrichsville.
 W. Hutchinson, Findlay.
 W. Henterly, Lancaster.
 L. Hammer, Jeffersonville.
 N. Harding, Freeport.
 R. Steinfelder, Genoa.
 S. Holderbaum, Shanesville.
 S. H. Hall, Huntsburg.
 B. F. Horen, Ironton.
 W. S. Howard, Bellevue.
 G. Hunter, Nat'l Military Home.
 F. Harmes, Nat'l Military Home.
 P. R. Hutton, Nat'l Military Home.
 H. Hush, Lilly.
 A. Harris, Montpelier.
 A. Harris, Waller.
 B. Hamilton, Ripley.
 D. Hall, Steubenville.
 E. Hay, Defiance.
 J. M. Herdman, Peebles.
 P. Hollinshead, Defiance.
 M. Hale, Cleveland.
 J. Hoffman, Cincinnati.
 S. Heath, Nat'l Military Home.
 W. Horan, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. Hoffman, Lima.
 A. P. Henderson, Reynoldsburg.
 M. Hallon, Monroeville.
 G. C. Hedges, Nat'l Military Home.
 S. Harmon, Canal Fulton.
 J. Haggerty, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. Hooper, Stockport.
 F. Huber, Cincinnati.
 H. O. Hyre, Herring.
 J. M. Herles, Lancaster.
 T. Gruesbeck, Montpelier.
 S. Gerhardt, Husted.
 C. Gabel, Cincinnati.
 G. H. Guy, Urbana.
 F. Helmick, S. and S. Home.
 H. Helvey, Springfield.
 J. Headley, Pomeroy.
 A. Hawkins, Cincinnati.
 D. Hervetson, Cincinnati.
 J. Harter, Canton.
 J. W. Hughes, Portland Station.
 J. Hively, Bryan.
 G. Hibbitts, Morristown.
 G. Holmes, Cadiz.
 G. A. Henry, Haverhill.
 M. J. Hoser, Cedar Mills.
 J. F. Hildebrand, Witsel.
 W. Hitchell, Troy.
 W. F. Hells, Upper Sandusky.
 F. Hawkins, Steubenville.
 G. Halbig, Richmondale.
 J. Hawthorne, Creighton.
 T. Hoagland, Cedarville.
 W. Halverstall, Columbiana.
 L. Hedric, Delaware.
 M. R. Hill, Wanseon.
 M. M. Hager, Cleves.
 A. F. Hoover, Dayton.
 S. Higgins, Kirkwood.
 S. Hunt, Eaton.
 W. P. Hale, Painesville.
 W. H. Hallard, Mount Gilead.
 J. Howard, Nat'l Military Home.
 F. Hartung, Nat'l Military Home.
 A. Herman, Nat'l Military Home.
 A. Hawkins, Aberdeen.
 A. Hunt, Cincinnati.
 A. Harp, Sidney.
 A. Huber, Port Clinton.
 C. Horbrock, Cincinnati.
 E. Halter, Spencerille.
 J. W. Holmer, Highland.
 J. F. Hartsook, Xenia.
 W. Hazen, Sharon Center.
 F. Henning, Portsmouth.
 W. Howard, Jackson.
 W. H. Hissong, Nat'l Military Home.
 M. Hoare, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. W. Hausten, Bellaire.

M. L. Hamaker, DeGraff.
 B. H. Hull, Fostoria.
 J. W. Hussay, Cincinnati.
 J. H. Hemphill, West Middleburg.
 L. Hammon, Steubenville.
 M. V. Imboden, Logan.
 B. Impson, Columbus.
 E. Isenhardt, Montpelier.
 J. Jones, Friendship.
 L. Jones, Jeffersonville.
 H. A. Jackson, Gettysburg.
 R. Jackson, Hillsboro.
 R. Jones, West Jefferson.
 J. W. Jones, Xenia.
 D. Jones, Bellaire.
 D. Jones, Covington.
 J. E. Jenkins, Waits.
 N. D. Jones, Chillicothe.
 R. N. Jones, Inland.
 H. Jackson, Toledo.
 A. D. Johnson, Perry.
 K. Johnson, Zanesville.
 B. F. Johnson, Cincinnati.
 H. Johnson, Cincinnati.
 W. Johnson, Columbus.
 S. R. Jones, Urbana.
 J. A. Jolly, Bowling Green.
 E. Jones, Abash.
 H. Jenkins, Jackson.
 L. Johnson, Kenton.
 M. L. Jordan, White House.
 J. Jackson, Zanesville.
 L. James, Marysville.
 N. G. Johnson, Waller.
 T. Johnston, Lima.
 S. S. Johnson, Lucasville.
 G. Jones, Ironton.
 W. Jackson, Youngstown.
 W. James, Berea.
 J. Jackson, Columbus.
 A. S. Kettrel, Toledo.
 W. H. Knoop, Paulding.
 P. Kiplinger, South Warsaw.
 A. J. Kelley, Neeleysville.
 J. Karch, Leetonia.
 J. R. Kaufman, Lancaster.
 M. B. Kennedy, Newcomerstown.
 S. M. Kellison, Cincinnati, 213 West
 Seventh street.
 J. Keach, New Antioch.
 J. C. Keller, Akron.
 C. Koeppl, Nat'l Military Home.
 W. Kearney, N. Holland.
 L. Kidd, St. Albans, W. Va.
 W. Keller, Bellevue.
 J. Koch, Cincinnati.
 J. Knese, Apple.
 J. E. Kinzer, Chillicothe.
 E. T. B. King, Nat'l Military Home.
 C. Kolb, Nat'l Military Home.
 E. N. Koons, Nat'l Military Home.
 P. Kennard, Nat'l Military Home.
 G. S. Knopp, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. W. Kirkpatrick, Columbus.
 L. Kenney, Blanchester.
 A. Karr, Keene.
 A. Kinkade, Grove Hill.
 J. Kappel, Sumner.
 L. D. Karr, Celina.
 R. King, Mount Pleasant.
 S. Kennedy, Lancaster.
 D. M. V. Kenney.
 E. G. Keifer, Harvey, Ill.
 J. Kimes, Chester.
 M. Kahn, Cincinnati.
 J. Kunier, Otsego.
 C. Kruchow, Walnut Grove.
 L. Kinley, Cincinnati.
 M. Kress, DeGraff.
 J. Kramer, Cincinnati.
 H. Kirsch, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. Kane, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. Kessel, Nat'l Military Home.
 D. W. Kelly, Ft. Seneca.
 M. Knopp, Nat'l Military Home.
 J. G. Knippel, Cleveland.
 J. Ladd, Jeffersonville.
 C. Lemwood, Dayton.
 I. Lock, West Manchester.
 L. Liconer, Nat'l Military Home.
 H. Luebber, Nat'l Military Home.
 C. Lewis, Chagrin Falls.
 W. Knaggs, Springfield, Ohio.
 E. M. Leckliter, Columbus.
 N. J. Lembertson, Hamilton.
 S. G. Lasse, Portsmouth.
 C. H. Lewis, Mansfield.
 C. W. Lewis, Beverly.
 D. Lucas, Kipton.
 F. D. Lamping, Findlay.
 M. J. Leitner, Cavett.
 C. F. Lutz, Chippewa Lake.
 T. J. Lloyd, Nat'l Military Home.
 S. H. Lees, Nat'l Military Home.
 H. B. Loomis, Nat'l Military Home.
 C. Liner, Cincinnati.
 P. Lambert, Dayton.
 W. H. Lewis, Fleming.
 J. W. Loar, Paulding.
 J. C. Lott, Columbus.
 G. Lutz, Cincinnati.
 A. Lunsford, Chilo.

Official list of soldiers restored to the rolls in Ohio, etc.—Continued.

C. Leits, Bucyrus.
E. Lehr, Canal Winchester.
H. Lee, Lerando.
H. Laupp, Cincinnati.
J. Lee, Cincinnati.
R. H. Lannon, Columbus.
W. N. Leach, Columbus.
J. Link, Cincinnati.
W. Livingston, Bainbridge.
I. Lilly, Bellaire.
T. Laisure, New Athens.
H. N. Laizure, Uhrichsville.
G. H. Long, Middletown.
J. Levee, Briceton.
L. Luce, Jr., Millberry.
M. M. Leww, New Richmond.
W. Liter, Stouts.
W. M. Lock, Dayton.
S. M. Lime, Zanesville.
J. M. Lacey, Mingo.
J. A. Lloyd, Columbus.
J. M. Laird, Broadway.
S. Long, West Cairo.
I. Lee, Cincinnati.
F. B. Latham, Pitcher.
J. Lapole, St. Johns.
T. C. Lord, Chesterville.
I. Leach, Toledo.
L. R. Livermore, Clarksfield.
M. Longshore, Limaville.
T. N. Lind, Cleves.
G. E. Mattoon, Greenville.
J. P. Marshall, Dean.
D. Martin, Nat'l Military Home.
J. Meehan, Cincinnati.
H. G. Mills, Wadsworth.
L. Mercer, Piqua.
M. Maple, Carrollton.
P. Michael, Deshler.
R. Mehuren, Braceville.
R. Mayhugh, Defiance.
S. B. Matthews, Payne.
W. Meely, Van Wert.
W. Martin, Columbus Grove.
T. Marshall, Hemlock.
J. A. Mudge, S. and S. Home.
J. Mohr, East Palestine.
J. Might, Athens.
A. B. Michael, Darbyville.
N. Mosier, Toledo.
F. Mason, Island, Okla.
I. A. Moore, Bellfontaine.
G. H. Miller, Chicago, Ohio.
T. Martindale, Lumberton.
W. Myers, Nat'l Military Home.
H. F. Myers, Nat'l Military Home.
D. Mauex, Nat'l Military Home.
J. Martell, Nat'l Military Home.
J. Millime, Sycamore.
J. A. Mills, Continental.
A. Munn, Bergholz.
F. Meyer, East Toledo.
T. V. Myers, Col. Grove.
J. Murphy, Adams Mills.
H. Mercer, Steubenville.
L. J. Morris, Lucasville.
A. P. Morse, W. Willesfield.
G. W. Mohler, C. Lewisville.
J. P. Matheny, Haydenville.
W. L. Masanner, Jackson City.
T. Miller, Toledo.
I. Morgam, Piqua.
H. Miller, Wolf Creek.
J. Mitchell, Port Clinton.
M. Moorehead, Van Wert.
T. T. Maim, Steubenville.
N. H. Mayor, Hendrysburg.
J. Mottie, Centerfield.
J. F. Miller, Cavett.
J. Morrison, Hampden Junction.
A. W. Moore, Hibbsville.
D. Minnick, Delta.
G. Moffett, Coshocton.
H. J. May, Springfield.
J. Moseby, Xenia.
J. Mayhew, Mingo Junction.
J. L. Manley, New Philadelphia.
J. Moorehead, Rockford.
J. J. Muck, Dayton.
A. P. McNutt, Bradner.
J. McLaughlin, Nat'l Military Home.
F. McLean, Nat'l Military Home.
T. McDermott, Nat'l Military Home.
M. McEntree, Nat'l Military Home.
J. McGaw, Nat'l Military Home.
J. S. McGregor, Wilmington.
T. McGill, Rushmore.
C. McGraw, Racine.
R. McGraw, Blue Creek.
T. McHenry, Buena Vista.
A. McGraw, East Liverpool.
J. McCollam, Hoytsville.
J. A. McCafferty, Caledonia.
T. McClosky, Nat'l Military Home.
W. McPeters, Mandale.
J. McGowen, Cincinnati.
O. P. Martin, Columbus.
G. T. May, Cleveland.
A. Miller, Columbus.
A. W. Mott, Harrison.
W. H. Montgomery, Haskins.
L. Mix, Inland.

M. Munnel, Marysville.
N. Miller, Cleveland.
P. Miller, Lightsville.
R. Morton, Winkle.
S. Mayman, Archer.
T. Marcum, Batson.
W. G. March, Marysville.
H. C. Miller, Zanesfield.
J. Markham, Patriot.
T. J. Morrow, Byesville.
J. Murphy, Columbus.
S. S. Mashers, Columbus.
A. Mueir, Westfield.
S. Monday, Cedarville.
N. Melick, Sparta.
J. F. Masters, Har. Springs.
J. C. Miller, Trinway.
S. H. Mount, Nat'l Military Hom.
J. Myers, Nat'l Military Home.
B. Marz, Nat'l Military Home.
J. H. Moore, Nat'l Military Home.
C. Marten, Cincinnati.
J. Mercer, Jackson.
M. May, Cincinnati.
S. Marshal, Minerva.
J. N. Marquis, Leo.
W. H. Morgan, Webster.
A. May, S. and S. Home.
J. A. Moon, Toledo.
U. Miller, Elida.
G. M. Maier, Canal Dover.
J. Mapes, Unionville C.
J. H. Martin, Jackson.
T. Miller, Dennison.
W. Musselman, Republic.
A. Morris, Lore City.
G. H. Murray, Cincinnati.
J. C. Myers, Ironton.
W. B. Miley, Wauseon.
F. Murray, Hampden Junction.
N. Moles, Massillon.
J. R. Manning, Harrisburg.
D. E. Mohler, White House.
H. Mayo, Wynthant.
C. C. Murphy, Cincinnati.
E. A. Morse, Jefferson.
G. E. Mathews, Homer.
I. N. Murray, Voorhees.
J. Mahaffey, Mount Vernon.
J. B. Morrison, Findlay.
J. Moon, Coshocton.
J. C. Mewfield, Waterville.
J. W. Mohler, Blue Rock.
J. H. McClure, Austinburg.
T. McCarty, Nat'l Military Home.
B. E. McKinnon, Belle Center.
J. McGonnell, Nat'l Military Home.
M. McGinnie, Nat'l Military Home.
H. McGill, Nat'l Military Home.
I. McCleary, Marseilles.
J. W. McGouagle, Rowland.
W. R. McKee, Troy.
R. T. Kibbin, Mount Gilead.
T. McKee, Mount Vernon.
G. McComb, Columbus Grove.
J. McCormick, Steubenville.
F. McCollin, Dayton.
J. McDermott, Nat'l Military Home.
A. McKinney, Dayton.
W. H. McAtee, Dudley.
J. Noblet, Marion.
G. Noland, Rockland.
S. Norris, Smithville.
A. Nagul, Sandusky.
W. D. Noggle, Richwood.
P. P. Newberry, East Toledo.
J. Nesbitt, Chicago.
E. Nills, Springboro.
L. Nicewamer, Mount Gilead.
J. Neeker, Harper.
W. Nagel, Archbold.
W. L. Nash, North Baltimore.
T. D. Neighbor, North Com'n.
A. Neal, Osgood.
Z. L. Numbers, Apple Creek.
W. Neve, Portsmouth.
G. Naples, West Unity.
H. Neff, Toledo.
S. Newland, Urbana.
J. Nowalk, Cincinnati.
G. Nelan, Bellaire.
G. Neff, Grove City.
J. Oller, North Lexington.
M. O'Leary, Milan.
A. Osborne, Summerfield.
J. O'Harmon, Columbus.
W. Overmeyer, Payne.
E. O'Donnell, Zanesville.
J. O'Riley, Warren.
E. Oakley, New Concord.
J. Oakleaf, Highwater.
C. E. O'Dell, Canfield.
J. S. Opolyske, Attice.
A. Obenbener, Timberville.
J. Piffen, Ripley.
H. T. Peak, Cleveland.
J. Pollard, Portsmouth.
G. Prater, Culbertson, Pa.
V. Pettiford, Washington C. H.
J. Perring, Nat'l Military Home.
D. A. Pearce, Coopersville.
H. Peasporter, Cincinnati.
S. Pudens, Cincinnati.

W. J. Parker, Cleveland.
A. J. Packer, Mount Healthy.
E. M. Pease, Chardon.
H. Post, Westerville.
J. Pennen, Scott.
J. Poisson, Deshler.
J. Price, Russ Creek.
G. W. Peabody, Shreve.
H. Potes, Eddiston.
H. Park, Urichsville.
W. H. Pritz, Dayton.
H. E. Peters, Detroit, Mich.
O. Pittman, Flencron.
G. Payne, Nat'l Military Home.
T. W. Pearson, Cleves.
G. S. Plunk, Range.
T. A. Purcell, Locust Grove.
J. Pixley, Columbus.
C. Perrin, Columbus.
H. Plummer, Rainsboro.
J. Pufferberger, Eaton.
J. C. Phillips, Steubenville.
M. W. Paine, Sheep Run.
J. Paden, Springfield.
W. Radlker, Watertown.
I. Robinson, Pleasant Run.
A. Rickey, Steubenville.
N. Reiter, Columbus.
A. Robinson, McClung.
T. Roberts, Nat'l Military Home.
W. S. Ridey, Nat'l Military Home.
G. C. Remfranke, Nat'l Military Home.
H. L. Roberts, Tiffin.
J. Ryan, Cincinnati.
J. H. Ross, West Middleburg.
J. Rath, Columbus.
C. Robb, Wellsville.
D. Riordan, Springfield.
W. Robertson, Steubenville.
J. Riley, Nat'l Military Home.
T. Rouhan, Nat'l Military Home.
F. M. Ross, Andis.
H. Rohmer, Cincinnati.
I. Rock, Yorkshire.
J. A. Roseberry, Youngstown.
J. Russell, West Unity.
J. P. Ranel, Sherwood.
R. Ready, Cincinnati.
W. P. Rush, Alliance.
R. Reynolds, Middleport.
R. Rogers, Leesburg.
A. Reiley, Bucyrus.
H. Rawls, Bellaire.
D. Reed, Reesville.
W. Robbins, Cincinnati.
J. D. Reynolds, Iberia.
W. Redding, Jamestown.
J. Reed, National Military Home.
P. Rogers, Kenton.
W. Roe, Mingo Junction.
J. T. Rose, Vanceburg, Ky.
O. P. Ramk, Fremont.
S. Ready, Buckeye.
J. Rummele, Massillon.
J. Ryder, West Sonora.
J. A. Ruble, St. Marys.
J. H. Rose, Buchanan.
J. L. Rogers, West Lafayette.
G. W. Roegle, Grahamsville.
C. Reames, West Liberty.
G. Rahn, Warren.
G. W. Richards, Mount Oreb.
E. Ratliff, Sheridan Coal Works.
J. Rinhard, National Military Home.
W. B. Simpson, Jackson Center.
L. Steinwart, Reading.
J. Shoefield, Columbus.
F. Sloane, Portsmouth.
W. Smith, Cincinnati.
John Stone, Cove Dale, Ky.
S. R. Sells, Bridgeport.
L. V. Socie, Archbold.
J. S. Simonton, Cincinnati.
J. M. Snowden, Columbus.
R. C. Silman, Columbus.
J. Sampel, Columbus.
T. Schuster, National Military Home.
M. Smith, National Military Home.
J. Schrenbrot, Cincinnati.
T. Seals, Bridgeport.
C. R. Shepard, Niles.
D. H. Smith, Kingston.
J. Shue, Lancaster.
J. Slabany, Hedge.
J. C. W. Shroyer, Chaseville.
J. W. Sharrard, Coshocton.
J. W. Snurr, Zanesville.
M. Shinaberry, Cincinnati.
R. Smathers, Rempel.
R. Sutton, Sidney.
R. Shreeves, Toquin, Mich.
W. Smith, Jeffersontown.
W. Spoon, Mansfield.
W. A. Spellman, Blakeslee.
W. A. Stevens, Defiance.
T. E. Sheward, Morrow.
J. F. Sanborn, Columbus.
F. W. Sargent, Columbus.
J. Strange, Columbus.
J. Schultz, Columbus.
C. Smith, National Military Home.
H. P. Stewart, Clintonville.
M. Siegel, Cincinnati.

A. C. Stevens, Monroeville.
D. Serks, McGuffey.
J. Sumner, Cleveland.
J. Sholler, Rockford.
J. Shunk, Willhelm, Pa.
J. D. Lamson, Columbus.
J. W. Sites, Clear Spring, Md.
J. Star, Urichsville.
O. Smith, Sandusky.
R. H. Sutherland, Troy.
S. Sinfit, Kenton.
T. C. Snyder, Montgomery.
W. Stahler, Logansville.
W. Sawmiller, Lima.
W. F. Smith, Wilmington.
G. D. Stevenson, Kenton.
H. Smothers, Bascom.
R. Shull, Roundhead.
W. J. Smith, Portland.
R. F. Smart, Janesville.
C. Snyder, Vesuvius.
D. R. Spry, Portsmouth.
F. Stoddard, Weston.
G. S. Scott, West Union.
J. S. Shields, Woodsfield.
W. R. Stewart, Chito.
G. M. Sargent, S. Webster.
C. Snyder, Columbiana.
D. Shappel, Lima.
F. M. Smith, Malinta.
G. S. Swingle, Rix's Mills.
J. V. Smith, Pine Grove.
T. M. Sherman, Findlay.
L. Sweeney, Holgate.
F. Scheffler, Sandusky.
J. M. Steed, Barlow.
C. Smith, Upper Sandusky.
W. Shields, Wellston.
C. F. Sommer, Sugar Creek.
C. Smith, Bootstown.
J. J. Smith, Walbridge.
H. Shoemaker, Hillsdale, Mich.
J. Siedomridge, Seelan.
D. Sackman, Shelby.
I. Spring, National Military Home.
J. Stubbs, Berea.
G. Summers, Cincinnati.
J. F. Sealock, Caldwell.
J. Severs, Cincinnati.
S. S. Sanders, Hemlock.
J. Slechter, Ada.
T. J. Shepard, Alger.
F. B. Sears, Circleville.
A. Sipfle, Scotch Ridge.
C. Shafer, Ohio City.
W. Shannon, Roscoe.
G. Giegel, Cincinnati.
I. M. Smith, Mounds.
J. H. Spain, Toledo.
A. W. Shelton, Dunkinsville.
A. Smetzer, Shreve.
C. Slates, Kilgore.
F. B. Sims, Spring Valley.
G. Sharp, Paulding.
H. C. Stroman, W. Union.
J. V. Sanders, Lucasville.
J. L. Sherman, Clayton.
R. St. Johns, Springfield.
J. A. Switzer, Van Wert.
J. H. Shaw, Columbus.
H. Shantz, Cincinnati.
D. Stookey, Columbus.
J. F. G. Sheridan, Columbus.
C. Smith, Fremont.
H. Sanders, Xenia.
A. Steere, Cleveland.
F. Suhr, Cincinnati.
J. P. Smith, St. Mary's.
A. Stabbe, Bellaire.
C. Scutt, Washington Court House.
C. F. Schub, Columbus.
G. Swishart, Butler.
J. Still, Volcano, W. Va.
F. J. Smith, Canton.
W. Starkey, Irondage.
T. J. Sprague, Marion.
J. M. Taylor, Columbus.
L. Tinsman, Hendrysburg.
S. Taylor, Erie.
H. M. Tippelt, Homer.
J. G. Tracy, Wauseon.
D. J. Turner, Dobbston.
A. D. Thornton, Land Fork.
J. D. Thoroman, West Union.
J. Tompkins, Sidney.
S. Tryon, Columbus.
W. Thomas, Alliance.
J. Thomas, Vaughnsville.
C. H. Tallmadge, Cincinnati.
C. P. Townsend, Akron.
J. C. Taylor, Gormanton.
J. C. Todd, Springfield.
A. Thompson, Conneaut.
J. Tice, Canal Dover.
W. Taylor, West Mecca.
S. Thomas, Belmont.
T. Turbull, Youngstown.
W. F. Tives, Middletown.
H. Thompson, North Concord.
A. Thompson, Indian Cmap.
H. P. Tarr, Mount Vernon.
C. Underwood, Cleveland.
A. Underwood, West Mansfield.

Official list of soldiers restored to the rolls in Ohio, etc.—Continued.

W. Urquhart, Stubenville.
 B. L. Valentine, Byesville.
 G. W. Venable, Dayton Home.
 F. Vorhem, Canal Dover.
 W. W. Vance, Urbana.
 J. Vanpelt, Holgate.
 A. A. Veer, Delaware.
 — Volherdt, Cincinnati.
 T. P. Vining, Delaware.
 A. Voegel, Dayton Home.
 M. Vore, Nelsonville.
 A. Vance, Urbana.
 A. Vanvleck, Holgate.
 C. Voegel, Sandusky.
 J. Van Pelt, Urbana.
 W. T. Wallace, Mattsville.
 J. Woessner, Little Sandusky.
 H. A. Williams, Lewis Center.
 D. K. Willison, Edwina.
 G. Warren, Cleveland, N. Y.
 J. H. Weyandt, Bowerstown.
 J. Waterman, New Bremen.
 J. West, Mark Center.
 W. White, Zanesville.
 J. Wood, Claiborne.
 D. Westbrook, Richwood.
 A. Wierman, Wapakoneta.
 A. Wright, Groveport.
 C. Wilburn, Hanging Rock.
 A. Wilson, Chapman.
 J. Watring, W. Cleveland.
 A. Wills, Cuyahoga Falls.
 A. D. Watson, Cincinnati.
 D. Wilson, Antioch.
 E. Wolf, Cleveland.
 F. Witchey, Bellaire.
 H. S. Weaver, Shiloh.
 J. Warner, Dennison.
 J. M. Whitehill, Bellefontaine.
 M. Whiteacre, Hudson.
 W. Wright, Celina.
 D. Ward, Pleasant Hill.
 S. Wambaugh, DeGraff.
 H. J. Wiegle, Columbus.
 J. Wollet, Lima.
 J. Willison, Washington Court House.
 L. Wardell, Canal Dover.
 U. Wilson, Ridge.
 L. Watson, Short Creek.
 E. Winters, Martel.
 W. White, Uhrichsville.
 C. Weber, Dayton Home.
 G. W. White, Dayton Home.
 J. C. Wing, Dayton Home.
 G. Widener, Dayton Home.
 R. Wallace, Cincinnati.
 J. Walsh, Athens.
 C. Wineman, Barnesville.
 J. W. Watt, Steubenville.

No. 3.

PENSION LEGISLATION—THE RECORDS OF THE TWO GREAT PARTIES FAIRLY CONTRASTED.

In 1878 a bill was passed by the Lower House of Congress, repealing all limitations of time in which applications for arrears of pensions should be made. Upon this the vote stood: Democrats for the bill, 48; Democrats against the bill, 61. Republicans for the bill, 116; Republicans against the bill, none.

Subsequently a bill increasing the pensions of widows from \$8 to \$12 was voted on, with the following result: Democrats for the bill, 80; Democrats against the bill, 63. Republicans for the bill, 118; Republicans against the bill, none.

The amputation bill, passed August 4, 1886: Democrats for the bill, 75; Democrats against the bill, 51. Republicans for the bill, 91; Republicans against the bill, none.

The widows' arrears bill (giving arrears of pensions, from the death of their husbands, to widows entitled to pensions) passed the Senate by the following vote: Democrats for the bill, 1; Democrats against the bill, 20. Republicans for the bill, 22; Republicans against the bill, none.

The disability pension bill (gives pension to all disabled soldiers and to dependent parents and children), passed June, 1890: Democrats for the bill, 28; Democrats against the bill, 56. Republicans for the bill, 117; Republicans against the bill, none.

Same bill in the Senate: Democrats for the bill, 3; Democrats against the bill, 18. Republicans for the bill, 31; Republicans against the bill, none.

In the Forty-ninth Congress a dependent pension bill was voted on in the Senate with the following result: Democrats for the bill, 7; Democrats against the bill, 14. Republicans for the bill, 27; Republicans against the bill, none.

In the same Congress a similar bill was voted upon in the House of Representatives, with the following result: Democrats for the bill, 66; Democrats against the bill, 76. Republicans for the bill, 114; Republicans against the bill, none.

This bill was vetoed by President Cleveland. An effort was made in the Lower House to pass the bill over the veto, with the following result: Democrats for the bill, 37; Democrats against the bill, 125. Republicans for the bill, 133; Republicans against the bill, none. Showing that 29 Democrats who had originally voted for the bill hastened to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded by the President's veto to vote against it, thus testifying their real sentiments, while 20 others who had dodged the first vote came up promptly to the support of the veto.

The vote upon which the dependent pension bill was finally passed by the Republican Congress, of which TOM REED was Speaker, stood as follows in the Senate: Democrats for the bill, 10; Democrats against the bill, 12; Republicans for the bill, 32; Republicans against the bill, none.

In the lower House it was sought to take up and pass the bill promptly, but the Democrats solidly opposed a motion to suspend the rules for that purpose, and the effort failed. Shortly after this, however, a second effort met with success, the vote standing: Democrats for the bill, 38; Democrats against the bill, 71. Republicans for the bill, 141; Republicans against the bill, none.

This bill was, as the old soldiers well know, promptly approved by President Harrison.

The next pension legislation of importance was the bill to pension prisoners of war, and giving them each \$2 for every day they were held by the Confederates. When it came up in the lower House the following vote was had: Democrats for the bill, 24; Democrats against the bill, 78. Republicans for the bill, 119; Republicans against the bill, none.

To sum up, the following gives the totals of fourteen votes in Congress upon the most important of the various pension measures presented since the war, viz: Democrats for the bills, 417; Democrats against the bills, 648. Republicans for the bills, 1,066; Republicans against the bills, 643.

The following statement, prepared from the official records, shows the number of pension bills to which each President since the war has refused his signature:

Lincoln	None	Garfield	None
Johnson	None	Arthur	None
Grant	5	Cleveland	524
Hayes	None	Harrison	None

Comment is unnecessary to enable the old soldier to decide which party is most inclined to deal justly and liberally with him.

No. 4.

[Fifty-third Congress, second session.]

H. R. 4981.

January 4, 1894.—Referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GROSVENOR introduced the following bill:

A bill providing a service pension to all honorably discharged officers and enlisted men of the military and naval services of the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, upon application therefor, the names of the surviving honorably discharged officers and enlisted men of the military and naval services of the United States who actually served ninety days, or more, subsequent to the 4th day of March, 1861, and prior to the 20th day of August, 1866.

SEC. 2. That pensions under section 1 of this act shall be at the rate of \$12 per month, payable from and after the approval of this act, for and during the natural lives of the persons entitled thereto: *Provided, however*, That this pension shall be in lieu of all pensions heretofore granted, if the applicant so elect.

SEC. 3. That all invalid pensioners who are now receiving pensions at a rate less than \$12 per month, and all applicants for invalid pensions based on service rendered or disability contracted between March 4, 1861, August 20, 1866, may by application to the Commissioner of Pensions, in such form as he may prescribe, receive the benefits of this act; and nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to prevent any pensioner thereunder from prosecuting his claim and receiving his pension under any other general or special act, at his election, at any time.

SEC. 4. That section 4716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby repealed so far as the same relates to this act or to pensions under this act: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to those persons under the political disabilities imposed by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. 5. That all laws or parts of laws which conflict with the provisions of this act shall be, and the same are hereby, repealed: *Provided further*, That the benefits of this act shall not be extended to any person who did not serve ninety days, or more, in the military or naval service of the United States between the 4th day of March, 1861, and the 20th day of August, 1866, and who did not receive an honorable discharge from such service.

No. 5.

[Fifty-third Congress, second session.]

H. R. 4984.

January 4, 1894.—Referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GROSVENOR introduced the following bill:

A bill providing a general per diem pension for all honorably discharged soldiers, etc.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, upon application therefor, the names of the surviving honorably discharged officers and enlisted men of the military and naval services of the United States who actually served ninety days, or more, subsequent to the 4th day of March, 1861, and prior to the 20th day of August, 1866.

SEC. 2. That pensions under section 1 of this act shall be at the rate per month of 1 cent for each day's service rendered, and payable only from and after the approval of this act, for and during the natural lives of the persons entitled thereto: *Provided, however*, That in each and every case where the services so rendered was less than eight hundred days, the pension shall be at the rate herein established for a service of eight hundred days, to wit, \$8: *Provided further*, That all invalid pensioners now on the pension roll, or who may hereafter be placed on the pension roll, by reason of a disability or disabilities which originated in the line of duty in the military or naval service of the United States since the 4th day of March, 1861, shall be entitled to receive such increase of pension as may be found due them under this act.

SEC. 3. That all honorably discharged invalid pensioners who rendered service specified in section 1 of this act and who are now receiving pensions under existing laws, or whose claims are pending in the Pension Bureau, or before Congress, may, by application to the Commissioner of Pensions, in such form as he may prescribe, receive the benefits of this act; and nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to prevent any pensioner thereunder from prosecuting his claim and receiving his pension under any other general or special act, at his election, at any time.

SEC. 4. That rank in the service of any officer or enlisted man shall not be considered in applications under this act.

SEC. 5. That section 4716 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby repealed so far as same relates to this act or to pensions under this act: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to those persons under the political disabilities imposed by the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States: *Provided further*, That the benefits of this act shall not be extended to any person who did not serve ninety days, or more, in the military or naval service of the United States between the 4th day of March, 1861, and the 20th day of August, 1866, and who did not receive an honorable discharge for such service.

SEC. 6. That all laws or parts of laws which conflict with the provisions of this act shall be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

No. 6.

[Fifty-third Congress, second session.]

H. R. 4982.

January 4, 1894.—Referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GROSVENOR introduced the following bill:

A bill to regulate the granting of pensions under the act of June 27, 1890.
Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the act of June 27, 1890, by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Pensions, and in the rating of pensions thereunder, all claimants showing a mental or physical disability of a permanent character, not the result of their own vicious habits, and which incapacitates them from the performance of manual labor in such degree as would be rated, under former laws and the rules and regulations of the Pension Office existing at the date of the passage of said act of June 27, 1890, at or above \$6 per month, shall be rated proportionally in the same manner as like disabilities of service origin are proportionally rated; and all claimants 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.

SEC. 2. That whenever, in consideration of pension claims under the act of June 27, 1890, the claimant has shown that he is disabled by more than one wound, injury, or disease, pensionable under said act, the accumulated degree of disability arising from all of said separate disabilities shall be the measure of the rating of the pension granted, as provided in the preceding section.

SEC. 3. That the Commissioner of Pensions shall have power as heretofore to establish at points most convenient for pensioners and applicants for pensions examining boards of three surgeons each for the examination of applicants for pensions. In selecting the members of said board surgeons having had military or naval service in the Army or Navy of the United States shall be preferred for appointment as far as practicable: *Provided, however*, That such boards be constituted as far as practicable of surgeons who belong to different political parties.

SEC. 4. That whenever the certificate of a board of examining surgeons shall show that a claimant for pension under act of June 27, 1890, is suffering from disabilities which, in their opinion, probably resulted from the vicious habits of the claimant, such case shall be placed in the hands of a special examiner of the Pension Bureau, who shall make an impartial examination into the facts of the case, at which special examination the claimant shall have full opportunity of being present, confronting and cross-examining the witnesses against him, and of introducing witnesses in his own behalf. When the report of the board of examining surgeons shall show that the disabilities found are, in their opinion, the result of causes not referable to the claimant's vicious habits, such disabilities shall be presumed to be resultant from pensionable causes.

SEC. 5. That, except in case of established fraud, no pension shall be suspended, withdrawn, or reduced, except after ninety days' written notice served upon the pensioner and a full and impartial hearing and investigation had upon sworn testimony, at which hearing the pensioner shall have the same privileges accorded him as provided in section 4 of this act as regards his right to be present, hear the testimony, and introduce further testimony, and upon said pensioner's request, made at any time after said written notice, the Commissioner of Pensions shall furnish to said pensioner a synopsis of the adverse testimony, with the names and addresses of the witnesses who have given the same: *Provided, however*, That the certificate of a duly appointed medical examining board may be used in evidence without the same being verified by the oaths of the members of such board signing the same.

No. 7.

[Fifty-third Congress, second session.]

H. R. 4983.

January 4, 1894.—Referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GROSVENOR introduced the following bill:

A bill to define and fix the status of pensioners under the laws of the United States, etc.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any pension heretofore or that may hereafter be granted to any applicant therefor under any law of the United States authorizing the granting and payment of pensions, on application made and adjudicated upon, shall be deemed and held by all officers of the United States to be a vested right in the grantee to that extent that payment thereof shall not be withheld or suspended until after due notice to the grantee of not less than ninety days and after a full and impartial hearing had upon sworn testimony, at which hearing the pensioner shall have full opportunity of being present, either in person or by attorney, and of confronting and cross-examining the witnesses and of introducing testimony in his own behalf. Such notice to grantee must contain a full and true statement of any charges or allegations upon which such decisions granting such pension shall be sought to be in any manner disturbed or modified, and shall also contain the names and addresses of the witnesses who have given testimony against him, with a synopsis of the testimony given by each witness.

SEC. 2. That if upon the hearing provided in section 1 of this act the facts shown to exist are in all respects similar to the facts existing when the pension was originally granted the rate of such pension shall not be changed.

No. 8.

[Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

H. R. 1848.

January 4, 1888.—Read twice, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENLOE introduced the following bill:

A bill to refund certain taxes collected by the United States on raw cotton, during the years 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868.

Whereas the sum of \$68,072,388.79 has been collected by the United States as a tax on raw cotton during the years 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, and 1868 under the provisions of the internal-revenue laws of the United States; and

Whereas the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States were equally divided in opinion as to the constitutionality of the laws under which said taxes were collected; and

Whereas the burden of said tax has fallen mainly upon the producer, both the white and colored race engaged in producing said cotton, who, while paying this tax on cotton, have, as other citizens of the several States of the United States, paid their due proportion of all other taxes, producing thereby great inequality in the taxes of the country; and

Whereas no other raw agricultural product of any of the States has been taxed, even during war; and

Whereas it appears on the records of the Internal Revenue Office that there was collected and returned from the State of Alabama \$10,388,072.10; from the State of Arkansas, \$2,555,638.43; from the State of Connecticut, \$193,64; from the State of Florida, \$918,944.98; from the State of Georgia, \$11,897,094.98; from the State of Illinois, \$379,144.42; from the State of Indiana, \$92,727.22; from the State of Iowa, 27 cents; from the State of Kansas, \$284,15; from the State of Kentucky, \$553,127.45; from the State of Louisiana, \$10,098,501; from the State of Maryland, \$51,349.52; from the State of Massachusetts, \$66,079.30; from the State of Mississippi, \$8,742,995.93; from the State of Missouri, \$592,098.36; from the State of New Jersey, \$3,656.42; from the State of New York, \$867,942.68; from the State of North Carolina, \$1,959,204.87; from the State of Ohio, \$447,127.12; from the State of Pennsylvania, \$78,535.06; from the State of Rhode Island, \$2,424.33; from the State of South Carolina, \$4,172,420.16; from the State of Tennessee, \$7,873,460.71; from the State of Texas, \$5,502,401.24; from Utah, \$1,375.34; and from the State of Virginia, \$825,856.87; and

Whereas the several States can more conveniently and satisfactorily refund said tax than the Government of the United States: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall cause bonds of the United States to be printed, in sums of \$100, \$500, and \$1,000, payable at the Treasury of the United States, at the end of thirty years from date, bearing interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum, payable semiannually, with coupons attached, to be signed and authenticated in the manner directed in section 3 of an act entitled "An act to authorize the issue of United States notes, for the redemption and funding thereof, and for funding the floating debt of the United States," approved February 25, 1862, and for the amount of \$68,072,400.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, when said bonds shall have been authenticated as aforesaid, shall be authorized, and he is hereby directed and required, to turn and deliver to the several governors or other authorized agents of the several States and Territories herein mentioned, bonds equaling in amount the amounts received by the United States from tax on cotton in the several States, to wit: To Alabama, \$10,388,072.10; to Arkansas, \$2,555,638.43; to California, \$430.04; to Connecticut, \$193,64; to Florida, \$918,944.98; to Georgia, \$11,897,094.98; to Illinois, \$379,144.42; to Indiana, \$92,727.22; to Iowa, 27 cents; to Kansas, \$284,15; to Kentucky, \$553,127.45; to Louisiana, \$10,098,501; to Maryland, \$51,349.52; to Massachusetts, \$66,079.30; to Mississippi, \$8,742,995.93; to Missouri, \$592,098.36; to New Jersey, \$3,656.42; to New York, \$867,942.68; to North Carolina, \$1,959,204.87; to Ohio, \$447,127.12; to Pennsylvania, \$78,535.06; to Rhode Island, \$2,424.33; to South Carolina, \$4,172,420.16; to Tennessee, \$7,873,460.71; to Texas, \$5,502,401.25; to Utah, \$1,375.34; and to Virginia, \$825,856.87, to be held by said States to be refunded and distributed to the parties who produced the cotton and actually paid said tax, through the agency of such legal tribunals as the Legislatures of the several States may establish or empower; and it shall be held sufficient proof, to entitle the claimant to recover, for him to show by competent and sufficient testimony that he raised the amount of cotton upon which he claims to have paid taxes, and that he, through himself or others, paid taxes upon said amount to the Government in any year between the years 1863 and 1868, inclusive. Claimants shall have three years within which to file their claims after the several Legislatures shall have established competent tribunals, or clothed existing tribunals with power to take jurisdiction and to adjudicate their claims; and all claims not filed within the three years shall be forever barred. Any portion of the money or bonds herein provided for that may remain in the hands of any of the States after paying all established claims shall be turned over to the custodians of the common-school fund of the States and be constituted a part of said fund, to be used as other school funds of the States are used.

No. 9.

[Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

H. R. 1851.

January 4, 1888.—Read twice, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENLOE introduced the following bill:

A bill granting pensions to the soldiers of the Florida war and other Indian wars.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to place on the pension rolls the names of the surviving officers and enlisted men of the Florida war and other Indian wars, not pensioned under existing laws, and the surviving widows of such officers and enlisted men.

SEC. 2. That the same rules and regulations and the same limitations and restrictions shall apply to the classes of persons named in the first section of this act that apply to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war and their surviving widows, under the provisions of "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes," passed the 23d day of January, 1887; and all the benefits conferred in said act upon soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war and their surviving widows are hereby extended to and conferred upon the soldiers of the Florida war and other Indian wars, and their surviving widows, subject to like conditions, limitations, and restrictions to those contained in said act.

No. 10.

[Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

H. R. 1850.

January 4, 1888.—Read twice, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENLOE introduced the following bill:

A bill to drop from the pension rolls the names of pensioners who have forsaken their citizenship in the United States and have given their allegiance to foreign governments.

Whereas it appears from the report of the Commissioner of Pensions that the United States is annually paying pensions to the amount of nearly \$300,000 to persons residing in foreign countries: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Pensions be, and is hereby directed to drop from the pensionrolls the names of all nonresident pensioners who have ceased to be citizens of the United States and have given their allegiance to foreign governments; and he is hereby authorized, directed, and empowered to institute such inquiries and investigations, through the consular service of the United States in the foreign countries where such pensioners reside, as he may deem necessary to determine the facts of allegiance and citizenship; and that all laws and parts of laws in conflict with this act be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

Mr. COOMBS. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was passed upon unanimously in the subcommittee of the Committee of Approp-

priations without criticism, I as a member of that committee imagined, in the innocence of my heart, that all that we would have to do would be to present the measure to the House, and after a few explanatory remarks pass it and go to other work. But I forgot one fact—I forgot one great duty of the House of Representatives, and that is for the members to make "records" for themselves or their party. And it seems to me that in the appreciation of duty on the part of members of this House that stands paramount to everything else.

We have spent days here in rehearsing the same old stories and listening to the same hackneyed charges. The other side of the House serenely assumes to be the only friend of the soldier. And when a good point has been made, and you have seen the benevolent expression that has begun by the relaxing of the mouth, has extended to the eyes, and then around to the ears, you have, some of you, been deceived into supposing that it was on account of sympathy for the soldier. But it only meant this: "What a mighty good point I have made for myself and for my party!"

Now, the gentlemen on the other side of the House begin with an advantage. Their party, being in a sense a sectional one, is mostly recruited from that section of the country that was loyal during the war, and that being their principal political capital, notwithstanding the war has been closed for thirty years, they make the most of it. But I venture to assert that there are just as good friends of the soldier on this side as over there, and from far more disinterested motives [applause]—men who will defend the interests and the rights of the soldier as zealously as you will—men who would not deny them a single right given to them under the laws or accorded to them by the gratitude of the country. You take an unjust and ungenerous advantage when you talk as you do in relation to the attitude of these men who were on the other side of the contest during the war.

I have never seen greater magnanimity than that of these Southern men who were our enemies in the late war. You do not find them fighting pensions, nor talking against them; you find them quietly acquiescing in pension legislation and conducting themselves in a most gentlemanly manner under your taunts, not even replying to them. Now, if your design is to benefit the soldier and not the Republican party, let us pass this bill. If you have any amendments, suggest them. But you evidently have no amendments to suggest. You do not even criticise the bill. The talk is so evidently for its political effect that it is almost ridiculous.

For myself individually, I have no record to make in regard to my loyalty to the soldier. A large part of my work in Washington, outside of this House, has been for years seeing to the claims of the soldiers, getting them through the Pension Office in every case where they were just, and never before as rapidly as under the present Administration.

I want to say here, in passing, that I never have heard such expressions of gratitude in reference to any work that I have done in my individual capacity as a Congressman as I have received from the old soldiers. I can not recollect a case where a man has received his pension through my interposition where I have not received from the poor old fellow a letter of thanks—sometimes badly spelled, sometimes written by another hand than his own, but always overflowing with expressions of the most grateful feeling. On the other hand, I have walked days and days through the Departments trying to get positions for men and have seldom had a word of thanks from them.

When I stood in the streets of New York and saw those fresh regiments marching down Broadway with banners and flags flying, to be embarked for the seat of war, and when I stood there again at the close of the war and saw those same regiments coming back—broken up, soiled by the dust of the camp or torn by the fury of battle, with their flags in tatters, I said, "I will always be a friend of the soldier." And I have never changed my mind. No vote and no act of mine shall ever detract from the bounty which the Government should extend to them, and my voice shall always be raised in their defense when their interests are imperiled; and that defense shall not be for the political advantage that it may bring to me, for it would lower my ideal of the holiness of the service.

Much is being made in the arguments on the other side out of the fact that pensions have been suspended. Now, that was done in response to the universal cry that went up throughout the country that the pension roll was being soiled by placing names upon it which should not be there. That cry came from no political party. It came as much from the old soldiers and soldiers' organizations as from any other source.

I believe, and admit, that the authorities of the Pension Office made a mistake in suspending the names of any of the pensioners; but that was done in response to a general clamor throughout the country, and no one, except for political motives, believed that it was done out of antagonism to the soldiers. They

almost immediately reversed that action, and to-day the soldier must receive notice, and he must be tried before the pension can be withdrawn. If there was an error made in the beginning, that error has been rectified.

Now, I wish to state before closing my remarks what my position is in relation to this matter. There should be no names upon the pension roll of men who do not belong there, for the reason that that is a misapplication of the national bounty, and it withdraws from those who are worthy sums that ought to go to them. But I say that before any such erasure shall be made, a fair and kind trial shall be accorded.

I believe that most of these names which have gone on the pension roll unjustly have not gone there as the result of the fault of pensioners themselves, but of pension agents who have deceived the pensioners. I furthermore believe that where a name has gone on the roll on account of testimony which is found to be untrue that another chance should be given the pensioner to establish his claim to a pension. I believe that every application for a pension should receive immediate and prompt attention; that no man should be kept waiting longer than is absolutely necessary, and to that end that our appropriation for the expenses of the Bureau should be upon a liberal scale, for the veterans are getting to be old and feeble and need it as soon as possible to make pleasant the remainder of their march to join their comrades in the upper camping grounds.

In the management of matters so large as this, involving such enormous sums, great errors must of necessity have crept in; but I think that when you look at this matter fairly and squarely in the light of history you will find that no such great sum, no such great bounty has ever been contributed more generously, administered more fairly and equitably than the pension fund of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

MR. BLAIR. Mr. Chairman, for many years the country has been filled with this indiscriminate, vociferous, and abominable cry that the pension roll is a fraudulent roll, that it is a roll of dishonor.

I remember as far back as the year 1881, a distinguished Senator of this country, not living to-day, a man of great ability and of great worth, but of strong prejudices politically, was so impressed with the idea that the pension roll was largely made up of men who had no right to be upon it, and whose money, paid from the Treasury, was obtained by fraud, that he introduced a resolution which passed the Senate, by which provision was made for a publication, and the distribution throughout the country, of several large volumes containing the pension roll *in extenso*, every name upon it.

The volumes were distributed to Congress. They went throughout the country. They were open and accessible to everybody. So far as I know, so far as I have ever heard, there was not developed one single instance wherein a name was wrongfully upon the roll by reason of that expensive investigation. The gentleman who introduced the resolution was my friend, and I have conversed with him about it and he himself never claimed that as the result of this effort of his there was any fraud detected, or that there was any purification of the pension roll found to be necessary.

But ever since that time, notwithstanding one would have supposed that the clamor would have been silenced by this effort to discover cause for it, the country has been just as full of the charges of fraud against the pensioners.

We know with what strong prejudices against the soldiers of the Union Mr. Cleveland assumed the duties of his office in 1885. Those who were in the public service will remember that there had accumulated at that time a large number of cases appropriate for remedy by special acts of Congress. As I remember it, there were nearly three thousand of them, which used to come before our committee in successive sessions, in the Senate. We could not obtain action upon them. There had been no concurrent disposition in both branches to legislate upon the subject, and so they had accumulated year after year, and there they were.

I came to have special connection with the Committee on Pensions, and had charge of the work; and during the

FIRST CONGRESS OF MR. CLEVELAND'S ADMINISTRATION

I made up my mind that those special cases should be disposed of, and our committee was kept in session until it was discovered that opposition to their consideration was useless unless members were willing to remain during the entire session with enforced attention to the business of the Committee on Pensions. The result of it was that the business was taken hold of in earnest, and instead of debating interminably upon single cases, as had been frequently done, they were taken up in good faith, carefully and fully examined and disposed of, either by the indorsement of the committee or by their rejection.

These cases went to the House and the House took hold of them in the same way, although the House differed in politics

from the Senate at that time, the Senate being Republican and the House Democratic. Those cases were as fully and as fairly investigated by as competent ability as is found in the judiciary of the country, received the indorsement of both Houses of Congress, and became, so far as the legislative department was concerned, laws of the land.

Of these special acts, as you remember, between 500 and 700 were vetoed. I see the number variously stated. My recollection is that between 600 and 700 cases were vetoed, after having received the indorsement of Congress.

We had occasion to re-examine the vetoes in the Senate. I went personally over every case which originated in the Senate, and as carefully and fully as I could. I examined every paper in review that was on file in the Pension Office, and the additional evidence which had been produced in almost every case before the Senate and House, and made available for the two Houses of Congress, which additional evidence, you will understand, had never been considered in the Pension Office at all. And I say here and now, as I have often said before, that of the cases vetoed, in my deliberate judgment, at least four-fifths of them were as meritorious as those which passed both Houses of Congress and received the approval of the Executive.

The Pension Office made a mistake which it ought not to have made, and so did the Executive, of failing to remember that Congress was in possession, oftentimes, of a great amount of evidence of which the Pension Office had known nothing, and when those cases passed both Houses of Congress, went to Mr. Cleveland, and were referred back by him, as appears in the statement of Gen. BLACK yesterday, to the Pension Office for examination there, with reference to his approval, they re-examined merely the old evidence upon which they had rejected the cases, that being all the evidence of which they were in possession. They made report sustaining their former action to the Executive, and the Executive, acting upon that report, and, as I always understood, upon vetoes drafted largely at the Pension Office, or at all events upon reports of the Pension Office, he based his veto messages.

So that it has come to pass, Mr. Chairman, that the action of the Executive in vetoing those pension cases may have been an honest action on his part, possibly in many cases an unprejudiced action upon his part, although Congress was right; and great wrong and even outrage were really committed upon hundreds of honest claimants who were denied pensions by these vetoes.

Mr. GROUT. If the gentlemen will allow me, I think I can give him the exact figures with reference to these vetoes.

Mr. BLAIR. I would be glad to have the gentleman do so, for the exact number has escaped my memory.

Mr. GROUT. I had occasion in the first session of the last Congress to collect them, and I think they are reliable. There were of actual vetoes just an even 250. There were 47 cases more than Mr. Cleveland put in his pocket, which amounted to a veto, making 297. Then there were 227 cases which became laws by his withholding his signature, which would make a total of 524, as I figure it as the total result.

Mr. BLAIR. As the total result of those cases that failed to become laws, except as some of them became laws through his failure to return them to Congress.

Mr. GROUT. Yes.

Mr. BLAIR. But the language employed in these vetoes was in very many instances such as to indicate beyond question the strong prejudice of the Executive against the claims. There can be no denial, I think, of the fact that the representative element of the Democratic party has for many years been strongly opposed to pensions and to the support, with just and proper liberality, of the soldiers who were engaged in the late war.

I do not, Mr. Chairman, make this charge with any reference to a section of the country; for it is my belief, and I take pleasure in saying it, whether I make a mistake or not, it is my belief that the claims of ex-Union soldiers in this country have received as strong support, as sympathetic support, and oftentimes more sympathetic support and vigorous support from those who fought them and who inhabited the hostile section during the war than from many who lived north of the line. I do not assert to what is so often said: that

MR. HOKE SMITH

necessarily and is really the central figure in the antipension demonstrations of the present times.

I have, Mr. Chairman, a strong belief, and I will be glad if somebody may be able to change my impression, but I have a strong belief that he is the ameliorator between his superior and his subordinate officer. I believe that Mr. Hoke Smith is no more hostile or inimical to the interests of the Union soldier than the President or the Commissioner of Pensions to-day, in fact that he mollifies them both; and I have had some reason to think that the action of the Pension Office, from whatsoever in-

fluence it may have been stimulated, has been remodeled and been made more merciful sometimes by the action of the Secretary of the Interior than it otherwise would have been. But whatever has been done in this matter, Mr. Chairman, all, I think, must admit that at the present time there can be no question that great difficulty exists in the adjustment of the claims of applicants for pensions under the laws of the country.

The difficulty that exists in this matter is not confined to those already upon the roll, but relates to original cases and is of a character for which the Administration is responsible, and must be so held. It comes from a motive positive, aggressive, if not malicious, so far as the interests of the soldiers who maintained the Union are concerned. And it must strike the observation of everyone that what has been done in the present Administration of Mr. Cleveland, so far as it has gone, has been done with a great deal of art; that it could not have been done if he had selected as the head of the Pension Bureau a Democratic civilian from the South or some Southern soldier. But he has put at the head of the Pension Bureau Union soldiers in both instances, Union soldiers with brilliant records, men in whose actions, in whose reputation, and whose ability, whatever he designed to accomplish, he could so be shielded from criticism. I ask you if what has been done could have been done without Mr. Lochren, or some man like him, in his position? I ask if what was done in the last Administration of Mr. Cleveland could have been done if Mr. BLACK of Illinois, or some man like him, had not been the Commissioner?

Why, sir, I believe that if a man open to the ordinary suspicion of official misconduct had occupied the position of the Commissioner of Pensions under the last Administration, and under the present one so far as it has gone, he would have been driven out of his office by public execration. Everywhere the country would have risen up and would have accused him of open, malicious, and almost a mendacious effort to administer the laws in such a manner as to be inimical to the interest of the Union soldiers. They are both most honorable gentlemen, but the general tone and policy of the Administration would have produced this result.

What has been done has been done in the names of these men, men of brilliant record, deserving well of the country; and yet they have been used to the injury of those who preserved the country. I will not say, as did my friend from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN], and I find no fault with his illustration, "That those who have made a brilliant record may afterwards sully it," when he alluded to the once illustrious Arnold. Whose blood has not tingled, and whose enthusiasm is not excited as he remembers how Arnold galloped along the line at Saratoga and was the dominant patriotic spirit of that great and decisive battle; and yet what was his subsequent record? But he almost redeemed his name from the odium of treason when with expiring voice he called for his American uniform, that he might be clothed in it for the grave.

Such is not the case with these gallant gentlemen, Gen. BLACK or Mr. Lochren.

THEY ARE PATRIOTS STILL.

But I would say this with reference to them, that the time is here, and if not here now, it is rapidly coming, when this country will exclaim, "Oh, BLACK, oh, Lochren, what crimes are done in your names!"

Gentlemen will remember that during the last Administration of Mr. Cleveland what was known as the Mexican pension bill was passed. I had something to do with the enactment of that bill. It was especially

A MEASURE FOR THE SOUTH.

It was pressed very strongly by some who lived at the North, and it was a very proper bill to be enacted into law; and yet it was specially urged by the South and carried, as you know, the principle of a service pension.

Most of the men who were to be placed upon the roll if it became a law were men who had been engaged in an armed struggle for the destruction of the Government; the officers who led the armies of the Confederacy had learned war at West Point and in Mexico under the national flag and at the national expense, and there was a very strong sentiment in the country against the enactment of any such law at all. At the North it was almost impossible to find any mass of men who would consent to it. Yet these men fought in one of the most brilliant wars in history.

It was comparatively unimportant on the whole, and of slight consequence so far as the destruction of life and actual military service was concerned, when compared with the gigantic war of the rebellion; but it has been followed with tremendous consequences. It enlarged the area of our country very nearly one-half, at least one-third. It laid the foundation of our empire upon the Pacific. In the exposure of life and health compared with the war of the rebellion it certainly was com-

paratively insignificant, but its memories appealed strongly to the liberality of the nation; and at the same time this bill was being pressed for consideration, a strong effort was being made among the soldiers of the North and their friends to secure the adoption of a service-pension law in their favor also.

Bills were pending in this House at that time for a service pension to men who had been engaged in the war for the Union. It was felt by those who had charge of the finances of the country that it was impossible at that time, with the national debt in its then situation, to assume the tremendous additional pecuniary burden of a service-pension law aggregating at least ten or twelve hundred thousand additional names to be placed upon the pension roll, and yet what was asked for the men who had served in the Mexican war and who had afterwards served in arms against the Government was all that was asked for the Union soldiers. It was very difficult to enact the Mexican service-pension law, it was in fact impossible, unless some provision should be made at the same time to satisfy to a reasonable extent the demand for a service pension for those who had served in the war of the rebellion.

Under these conditions, being in service upon a committee which made it appropriate that I should consider the subject, I prepared a bill of which I find a copy in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Forty-eighth Congress, page 4509, in which provision is made for the extension of pension to all soldiers who had been in the service of the country in any of its wars, the Indian wars as well as the Mexican war and the war of the rebellion, based upon any actual need which might exist.

The full scope of this act is indicated in the preamble, which is as follows:

A bill (S. 1342) to provide pensions for dependent soldiers, sailors, and officers who have been honorably discharged after three months' service in any previous war, or who shall hereafter be honorably discharged from the service in future wars at the expiration of twenty years after such discharge, and to their dependent relatives;

Whereas it is unjust and unworthy the American people that their defenders in time of war should be permitted to suffer for the necessities of life or to be dependent for them upon the charity of individuals or upon the ordinary relief and refugees of pauperism; and

Whereas the public revenues are ample, and by reason of the peculiar resources from which they are derived fall almost wholly upon the luxuries of life and slightly upon those classes of our people who are unable to submit to the burdens of taxation; and

Whereas those persons who served in the Army and Navy of the United States are generally dependent upon their personal labor and the assistance of others, wholly or partially, for support, and thus an increase of pensions, and of the classes of persons entitled to them, will consequently place upon the nation at large a pecuniary burden which belongs to it, rather than individuals and local communities; and

Whereas nothing can more generally develop the patriotism of a people than liberal provisions in the public and permanent laws of the land for those who in times of common peril risk their lives for the general welfare and for the preservation of institutions in which they have no more interest than others who, incurring no personal danger, share fully in the benefits of the common defense; and

Whereas under the administration of existing laws great injustice and delay is unavoidable by reason of loss or of difficulty in procuring evidence and many other causes which can not here be enumerated: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc.

As most of the soldiers of the country were men of small means, that would, without doubt, have included at least three-fourths of those who had fought in the war of the rebellion, and would have carried relief to almost every man who had served in the Indian or in the Mexican wars—the men for whom our friends of the South desired to provide.

THAT WAS OBJECTED TO, HOWEVER,

by the friends of the Mexican pension bill, and it was found impossible to pass it as an amendment to that bill.

The committee had considered it and had reported the Mexican bill in the Senate with the substance of that bill as an amendment. Gen. Williams, the Senator from Kentucky, "Cerro Gordo" Williams, of Mexican war fame, was very determined in his opposition, and notified me that the Mexican pension bill would be defeated unless it could be a service pension pure and simple, extending to himself as well as to others who had served in the Mexican war. At last we gave way. With a distinct understanding on my part, and I think generally on the part of those who were friends of the soldier element in the North, that a separate provision would be made for them in a separate act, substantially in the nature of that which I had proposed, we gave way and allowed the passage of the Mexican pension bill and it became a law. Effort was then made to enact the necessary measure for the relief of the soldiers of the late war along the lines of the original bill, which I introduced, as stated above, and I again introduced a bill making provision for all soldiers of the Union who were in need of assistance and who had fought in the war of the rebellion.

IN THE YEAR 1886, SENATE BILL 1886

(the number of the bill being the same as the year in which it was passed) was passed by the Senate, making provision for all who were incapacitated in any degree for manual labor, who had

served in the war and been honorably discharged, whose disabilities did not result from their own vicious conduct, and who were in need of assistance. Provision to the amount of \$24 a month was made for complete inability to perform manual labor, passing by proper gradations from that highest amount down, and also providing "that no pension under any law hereafter shall be rated at less than \$4 per month." The bill came here and was considered in the House, which was a Democratic body at that time, and, as a result, the bill as it came from the Senate was obliterated, and instead of it an amendment was passed by the House and returned to the Senate. By this amendment provision was only made for those afflicted with "total inability to procure their subsistence by daily labor," at the rate of "\$12 per month."

Only the class of soldiers totally disabled from daily labor were to be placed on the list of the pensioners of the United States and to be entitled to receive for such total inability—note the words, Mr. Chairman—"for such total inability to procure their subsistence by daily labor, \$12 per month, the pension to commence from the filing of the application in the Pension Office, upon proof that the disability then existed, and to continue during the existence of the same in the degree herein provided." This amendment, thus passed by the Democratic House and returned to the Senate, made provision for only a single disability extending to total inability to procure their subsistence by daily labor. To such soldiers \$12 per month was guaranteed by the bill.

Although we knew in the Senate that nearly everything we had contended for was gone, nevertheless we passed the measure with this limited and comparatively unimportant provision for the soldiers of the Union—which was all we received for generously yielding to the urgent need of the soldiers of the Mexican war—

AND EVEN THIS WAS VETOED BY THE PRESIDENT.

It was computed at the time, upon the best estimates we could make, that there were then not less than 15,000 old soldiers of the Union in the almshouses of the country, totally unable to labor, and to that class and to others like them who might be scattered throughout the country this provision would have been valuable for it would have given them \$12 per month. That was all there was to it; yet the President of the United States vetoed that bill.

Under even these circumstances I have always felt, and I feel to-day, as though I would not strike one name from the Mexican pension roll of which I have any knowledge. I am glad all those names are there. Yet I also feel that the Mexican pensioner has been provided for by what constituted—I mean morally—a legislative and executive fraud. If the people of the country had understood that the passage of that Mexican pension bill making this generous provision for men most of whom had undertaken to destroy this Government was not to be followed by the enactment of substantially the Senate bill which the House emasculated and which the President vetoed, that Mexican pension bill never would have reached the statute book unless accompanied by suitable provision for the soldiers of the Union.

Talk about fraud in the pension roll, fraud on the part of the individual who makes application, or upon the part of the pensioner. Here is a gigantic fraud which you can not reach, which you can not punish, because you can not indict and punish half a people, but it is in its true nature a fraud that should be remedied; and thousands who cry fraud in reference to the pension roll as it actually exists might better move to eradicate from that roll this great mass of fraud by moving to strike out the names they have put there themselves under the Mexican pension law. I do not mean that justice was not really done to them, but it is the injustice to others of which I complain.

Since that time, as you know, Mr. Chairman,

WE HAVE CONTINUED TO MAKE EFFORTS to pass a law which should provide for those who were soldiers in the war for the Union and are actually in need. A generation has passed away since their war service was rendered; and it is now almost impossible to get such evidence as is required. Under pension regulations evidence is demanded such as is not required in any court of the country in proceedings in which even the life of a human being is in issue. In actions at law in almost all the States in the Union a man can testify in his own cause, can establish it by his own testimony. If he be a man of good reputation for veracity and his testimony given to the jury under oath is not impeached, the jury is bound to render a verdict in his favor unless there be counterbalancing testimony. But in a pension case, whatever may be the reputation of the old soldier for veracity, no matter how unquestionable his word may be, his evidence is not sufficient to establish his claim.

On the contrary, there seems to be on the part of the authorities a marked and almost universal presumption against his statement. He is obliged to establish it by the certificate of an

officer or the oath of two privates in addition to his own testimony. Then he must have medical testimony. That is insisted upon almost universally, although after this great lapse of time scarcely any of the surgeons of the war of the rebellion are still surviving. In every direction

THE OLD SOLDIER IS HEDGED ABOUT

by practical impossibilities. The same evidence, or substantially the same evidence, is required to-day for the establishment of a claim that was required ten years ago, and I do not think there is any very substantial amelioration of the requirement so far as testimony is concerned since the administration of the pension laws commenced.

There was a time years ago in the administration of the pension laws when you could apply to the Commissioner and show the difficult conditions surrounding your case, and testimony of less formal kind would be weighed upon the statements of any responsible man. Members of Congress know how that was. At the present time it is almost impossible to get anything like the liberality which then existed; so that whether the Pension Office is blameworthy or not, it has come to be the fact that we have at least a million persons applying or anxious to apply for pensions or modifications of existing rates whose cases are not yet adjudicated. We have 566,000 applications pending which have never been acted upon at all—never examined, as I understand the report of the committee. And according to the testimony of Mr. Lochren we have a sufficient additional number liable to re-examination to make 811,000.

Over 200,000 applications, I believe, are liable at any time to re-examination, and the great mass of them undoubtedly honest and worthy cases. And we are confronted with this condition of things: The law of June 27, 1890, having at last been enacted, and the law now making fair provision for all these persons, yet they are practically as much without remedy as though this great remedial law designed expressly for them did not exist at all. There is more than one way of repealing a statute. You may do so by act of Congress—by the exercise of the same power that made it a law. But you can quite as effectually repeal a statute by its hostile administration. And this latter method seems to have been resorted to in this case.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BLAIR. Certainly.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. The gentleman seems to be dissatisfied with the present law, the law which was enacted June 27, 1890.

Mr. BLAIR. Not so much dissatisfied with the law as with its administration.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I wish to ask the gentleman this question: When that law was under discussion in the first session of the Fifty-first Congress, did not Mr. Yoder, of Ohio, then a member of the House, move to recommit the bill with an amendment providing that a service-pension bill should be incorporated with it, and is it not the fact that the members of the Republican party all voted against the motion to recommit, in order that the service-pension bill might be enacted in its place? Is it not a fact that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who has so eloquently spoken against this bill, also recorded his vote against that recommitment?

Mr. BLAIR. I do not remember about that. Very likely it was the fact.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I will state that, according to my information, that is the fact. I have examined the RECORD and I think I am not mistaken.

Mr. BLAIR. I presume the gentleman is right. I would have expected something of that kind. An amendment of that sort would have been the surest way to kill the bill.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. Now, it seems to me that it comes with very bad grace from the Republican party to be making war upon the measure that they themselves enacted, when they refused to enact a measure which they now say would have been a better one, and which would have prevented all this trouble.

Mr. BLAIR. The gentleman is laboring under a mistake. I am not finding fault with the law of June 27, 1890. The law as passed tends substantially, though in a less degree, to attain the same end that had been urged before by the Republican party, an opportunity to make provision for all who were actually in need of assistance from the Government, the enactment of a law which should dispense with the furnishing of all this testimony, which it is now impossible to obtain.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. Would not Mr. Yoder's motion to recommit the bill with instructions to report that provision I have offered accomplish what the gentleman favors now?

Mr. BLAIR. I take it this is the gentleman's first experience in Congress. Perhaps he will discover after awhile that the

enemies of a measure are very often likely to move amendments apparently in the same direction, for the express purpose of accomplishing the defeat of that to which they are opposed. The attachment to that bill at that time of an amendment providing for a service pension would have put it in a condition where it would have been utterly impossible to pass it through the House of Representatives.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. I have just asked the gentleman for information.

Mr. BLAIR. Well, the gentleman has the information, so far as I can give it to him. I am not finding fault with the law itself, but I do find much fault with the construction that is being placed upon it by the present Administration.

Mr. TALBERT of South Carolina. Both Houses of Congress being Republican at that time, any amendment could scarcely have killed the bill.

Mr. BLAIR. The Commissioner of Pensions in an order of June 9, 1893, construed the act of June 27, 1890. Under that act, as you know, the previous Administration had placed some 400,000 names upon the pension roll. The present Administration questioned the legality of the instructions which had been given to the Department by the former Administration, and so questioned the validity of its action in placing names upon the roll, and proposed a reconsideration. Many of the names were stricken from the roll, or suspended.

THE REEXAMINATION WAS ENTERED UPON.

It is now proceeding, though I believe that the names are not now stricken from the roll in advance of action. But a new construction of the law has been issued under this order, and under this construction the Department is at present acting, so far as it is acting at all. Of course we know that the roll itself is not being increased. During the last six months, or about that time, only one hundred and fifty names have been added to its aggregate. By death and natural changes which come along without any impeachment of the roll itself, it is probably diminishing at the present time considerably faster than it is being increased; but during the six months that I refer to, only one hundred and fifty names have been added to it.

Under the last Administration hundreds of thousands of names were added, and it was supposed, as you all have learned in this debate, that by the year 1895 the roll would have reached what is called high-water mark; that with the Pension Bureau in operation as it was in the Administration of Mr. Harrison, after June 27, continuing its then activity, the highest point would have been reached in 1895, so that these eight hundred thousand and more cases undecided, with the new applications which should have been made by that time, would probably have been substantially disposed of.

Now, however, no substantial progress has been made. You know that the construction placed upon this law by the Department at the present time is that the amount carried by this act, from \$6 to \$12, is to be distributed in this way: That for a total disability, a total incapacity to perform manual labor on account of a disability permanent in its character, not the result of the vicious habits of the applicant—for a total incapacity there shall be paid the sum of \$12. Now, the office seems to have commenced at that point where, under the general law, the recipient would have been entitled to \$72 per month, or if not \$72, at least \$50.

For a like disability under the general law the pensioner would receive from \$50 to \$72. We find he would get \$12 under this construction of the act of June 27, 1890, or a lesser amount down to \$6, which is the minimum carried by the law, distributed from the highest extreme of disability down to the slightest impairment of ability to perform manual labor. That seems to be the actual construction of the law. But Mr. Lochren has issued his order, and under his order, if he would live up to it, there would be a great deal less cause of complaint. Omitting matter which it is unnecessary to read, he says in the fourth section:

To give a claimant a pensionable status under this act the disability must be such as to incapacitate him from the performance of manual labor to such a degree as to render him unable to earn a support.

So as to disable him to earn a support; and yet the act recognizes the differences in the degree of such pensionable disability, giving "not exceeding \$12 per month and not less than \$6 per month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support;" that is the language of the law, rendering the claimant unable to earn support by manual labor. I give you the whole of it:

Which incapacitates them from the performance of manual labor in such a degree as to render them unable to earn a support shall * * * be entitled to receive a pension not exceeding \$12 per month, proportioned to the degree of inability to earn a support.

Now, I want to consider this order a moment. It is the admission and concession of the Commissioner, of the Department, and of the Administration—that for the lowest, for any

disability under that law in the lowest degree of such pensionable disability rendering the claimant unable to earn a support by manual labor the pensioner is entitled to \$6. It does not say that it shall be any sort of disability described in any other acts of Congress, but it is

A DISABILITY WHICH TO ANY EXTENT

disqualifies or incapacitates him from earning a support by manual labor; and for that, by their own construction, he is entitled to \$6. To be sure they do not carry it out, and the surgeons order, shows that they nullify the law in actual practice.

Now, what is a support? Why, a support is that amount of money which is necessary in order to maintain a man; to maintain this old soldier. Probably it would be a fair legal construction to say that a support is that amount of money which is necessary to maintain him and those legally chargeable upon him; but if we look at the man only as dependent, disregarding his wife and child, it must be enough to take care of the old man himself. What amount is that? Can we conceive of a man being supported in this country, furnished with food and raiment and shelter, and, in case of these old men breaking down, with medical attendance, with personal attendance, whatever is necessary in order to give them a comfortable living, a support—can we conceive of its being done for less than a dollar a day?

That will not give a man in this country more than a comfortable support; and if he is disqualified from the performance of manual labor so that he can not earn this whole \$30 a month, which is the very minimum, or a dollar a day for his three hundred laboring days, we know he is entitled to at least this pension of \$6 per month; and the Commissioner states in this order that under the lowest whatever of the pensionable disabilities he is entitled to \$6. If he is unable to earn \$29 in a month, or 29 out of the 30 parts which make up a support, for illustration, he is unable to earn a support, and he is entitled to \$6, and if you distribute the balance according to the degree of his incapacity, you must give from \$6 to \$12, according to the diminution of his earning capacity, so that he should receive as fast as he needs it up to the amount of \$12 per month.

THAT IS A FAIR CONSTRUCTION OF THIS LAW;

that was the intention of those who enacted this law.

Why, we were ashamed in those days of talking about pensioning at a smaller amount than \$6 per month. Here they are giving pensions to those who were injured during the war of the rebellion, and who established their right to a pension by reason of disability contracted in the service, at the rate of \$2 and \$3 per month. It is contemptible. It was discussed and debated as a contemptible thing in those days,

AND THE PROVISION WAS MADE

in this act that no Union soldier should receive a pension at a lower rate than \$6 per month unless he chose to. Under that provision we supposed and believed that Union soldiers all over this country who were pensionable under any of the existing laws, could, if they preferred, abandon their pension under the old law and receive under the act of June 27, 1890, so as to make the minimum given to every pensioner of the country \$6 a month.

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois. I would like to ask the gentleman from New Hampshire whether it was not understood at the time that bill was being discussed that the effect of granting a pension of not less than \$6 nor more than \$12 a month to those who were disabled from earning a living by manual labor would be that all those who were getting two, three, or four dollars a month would be put on the rolls at the rate of \$6 a month?

Mr. BLAIR. Certainly. That was the distinct understanding, and if gentlemen will examine the debates, they must find it cropping out all through them. The understanding was that either the existing certificates would be withdrawn and, under new examination, or by direct action of the Pension Office, every soldier who was getting less than \$6 would be raised to \$6 a month, and that if that was not done, then the soldier would have the right to waive his disability as having been contracted in the service and to be placed on the roll at the rate of \$6 as a minimum.

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois. If the gentleman will permit me, I would like to read a word from the debate in that connection.

Mr. BLAIR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois. Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa addressed to Mr. MORRILL, who had charge of the conference report, this question:

Is it not likely that the \$6 an \$12 a month provision in this bill will have the effect to cut out nearly all, or at least a vast majority, of these petty pensions of one, two, three, and four dollars a month?

Mr. MORRILL. I think the effect will be that nearly all those cases will come under the \$6 a month clause.

Mr. BLAIR. That was in the debate on the bill. The Senate bill which I had the honor to frame, which passed that body in

1886, and which was what we tried to get in substance by the act of June 27, 1890, contained the same idea,

FIXING THE LOWEST RATE OF ANY PENSION AT \$4 PER MONTH.

It was a matter of common talk and discussion, and the understanding, and it must be found cropping out all through the debate, that we were thereby to escape the dishonorable feature of the existing pension roll, that the pensioner was receiving a sum of money by the month or by the year that it was a disgrace for the country to pay. I speak of this as corroborative of the construction which the Commissioner has himself made, perhaps inadvertently—I will not put it that way—when he says that it attaches for the lowest disability, the lowest incapacity to earn a complete support.

Why, sir, you have no support

UNTIL YOU HAVE A SUPPORT,

and a support is that which is actually necessary to give a comfortable livelihood to the old soldier. Whoever will examine this matter in the line of the suggestions which I now make, will find that the fair, proper, and inevitable inference both from the concessions of our adversaries and from our own claims is that the law was intended to give \$6 to every man who was entitled to have his name on the roll at all, and \$12 when he was disabled for the performance of manual labor to the extent of \$6 more. If it be claimed that this is too liberal, then it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the \$6 would attach as soon as capacity to labor is diminished to the extent of \$6, and the remainder in proportion as the incapacity to labor increases, dollar by dollar, to the full amount given by the law. But here is this medical construction which the Commissioner has approved and which the office is now acting under, which only gives the \$12 a month when the man has become totally disabled and is a charge upon his friends, helpless as a dead man, or, at the best, utterly incapable of performing any manual labor whatever. As I said at the outset, that is the condition in which a man is entitled to \$72 a month under the old law, or under the amendment made by the last Congress is at least entitled to \$50.

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois. With the permission of the gentleman from New Hampshire I would like to read another extract from this debate.

Mr. BLAIR. I trust the gentleman will read it.

Mr. HENDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Sawyer, who was a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, took an active part in the debate on the bill and made the following remark:

Mr. SAWYER. That is what we propose by this bill. Every soldier who is to-day suffering from any disability, not the result of his own misconduct, who is so disabled that he can not earn his living by manual labor, we propose to put upon the pension roll at the rate of \$12 per month.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. SAWYER. I can not yield. If soldiers are not disabled to that extent, but are disabled to a less extent, then the \$12 a month is graded down to as low as \$6 a month, in proportion to the extent of the disability.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Chairman, much of the matter I have collected I will omit, but

THERE ARE A FEW ITEMS I WISH TO PRESENT,

and I will present them briefly. On page 7 of the report of the committee it will be found that there were pending on December 31, 1893, 811,572 cases; awaiting action, 567,886. Of these, original applications awaiting action under the old law, 204,000; under the law of June 27, 1890, 144,000; making 348,000, or, in round numbers, 350,000 original applications awaiting action.

About 400,000 cases were allowed under Mr. Raum's administration or had already been allowed under the law of June 27, 1890. In reference to these cases I wish to remind the House that the office is very largely employed now in the matter of their review, and whenever a proper case is found, as they look at it, it is disallowed; so that, as will be seen, the original cases are receiving, one might fear, almost no attention at all. Additional applications are of course swelling the amount of the original work never yet touched, although we are now thirty years beyond the war. The certificates issued from January 1, 1892, to June 30, 1892, amounted to 157,268; from July 1, 1892, to December 31, 1892, 115,000; making as one year's work 272,680. From January 1, 1893, until June 30, 1893 (embracing three months of the present Administration, the last two months showing a rapid diminution), the number was 76,776. From July 1, 1893, to December 31, 1893, 33,999 cases were allowed, of which, as will be seen from the testimony of the Commissioner as embraced in the same report, a number are readjusted cases allowed under the former Administration.

Mr. O'NEIL. Will the gentleman repeat his last statement; I did not quite understand it?

Mr. BLAIR. I say that, as I understand the statement of the Democratic Commissioner, the office is largely at work upon cases previously allowed. He says that 400,000 cases have been allowed under the act of June 27, 1890; and those cases are being reviewed. When a case is reviewed and a new adjustment is made a new certificate is issued.

Mr. O'NEIL. That is absolutely not so. I would like to know the gentleman's authority.

Mr. BLAIR. My authority is the statement of the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. O'NEIL. I do not so understand the testimony of the Commissioner. You asked that question of the gentleman from Vermont the other day when he was making his remarks—

Mr. BLAIR. I did.

Mr. O'NEIL. And the next morning I went to the Pension Office to find whether it was true, and I was informed it is not.

Mr. GROUT. What is not true? Let us understand each other.

Mr. O'NEIL. That when a certificate has once been granted, and the case afterward suspended and reinvestigated and the pensioner's claim allowed again to go upon the roll a new certificate is issued.

Mr. BLAIR. That is not what I am saying. But when a case is reexamined and in any way readjusted a new certificate does issue and always has issued.

Mr. O'NEIL. If a new rate is allowed.

Mr. BLAIR. Certainly; and you will find that in these cases of reexamination by these new boards, these new medical readjustments, without the aid of an expert who knows the soldier—under this new practice there is in a very large proportion of the cases a readjustment of the rate, followed by the issue of the new certificate.

Mr. O'NEIL. The report does not say so.

Mr. GROUT. No; the report does not cover that; but as the gentleman will remember, I stated that I had reliable information that from four hundred to six hundred notices were going out daily to pensioners that they must make their cases come up to the new standard of the office within thirty days, or if not there would be a modification, and those notices are followed in a great number of cases by a modification or a rejection altogether.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. Chairman, what time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Three minutes.

Mr. BLAIR. Then I must hasten on.

THERE IS SOME ADDITIONAL MATTER

I have here which I will ask leave, and without objection assume that I have the leave, to incorporate in my remarks.

On the 1st day of July, 1893, there were on the pension roll 966,012 names, and six months later, December 31, 1893, 966,142, an increase of but 130 names, and original applications had fallen off materially, says the Commissioner. Not much wonder at that. Or testing the work in another way. There were first payments during the first six months of fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, \$33,756,549, at the rate of \$67,513,098 per year. First payments of six months from June 30, 1893, to December 30, 1893, \$4,769,310, at the rate of \$9,538,620 per year under present Administration wholly, as against \$67,513,098 under Republican Administration, all but last three months. Doing either less than one-sixth the work, or if doing the same work, cutting off the pensioners, with less than what they were receiving under the Republican Administration.

The truth is, they were disallowing the claims, reducing amounts to those allowed, and concentrating their great effort upon a general raid upon pensions already allowed under the adjudication of former Administrations—combining thus every conceivable form of assaulting and destroying the operation of our wise and humane system of pension laws. Again, consider this subject in the light of these figures:

The last Republican Administration appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1894, the sum of \$166,530,350, and estimated for the next year, ending June 30, 1895, \$180,000,000.

This Democratic bill appropriates for this last year but \$151,581,590, or \$28,418,460 less than would have been undoubtedly expended by the Republican Administration—or in round numbers \$30,000,000 belonging directly to the soldiers of the Union Army.

That is confiscation of pensions.

If this process goes on the pension system is destroyed.

The increasing age, disability, and want of this vast body of men and women and children will require more and more pecuniary aid.

Who shall render it? Shall they suffer and starve for the want of the millions which are theirs by every motive of decency and gratitude and by the express provisions of law? Shall the nation which they saved bear the burden of love, or shall it be placed upon the local communities, mainly of the North?

With the destruction of our industries waged by the Wilson bill, with an income tax to be paid almost wholly by the North, and with the soldiers, despoiled of their pensions

CAST DEPENDENT UPON THE LOYAL STATES

it would indeed seem that the South is once more in the saddle, and the North groveling humbly at the stirrup of her power.

Every now and then we are invited to consider

OUR NORTHERN INFERIORITY AS SOLDIERS

and all that—our want of stamina and manhood as compared with our Southern friends, as illustrated in the war. The gentleman who seemed to have chips all over him—the gentleman who went about shaking his fists so much—I refer to the gentleman from Virginia, who is not present now—reiterated the old-time remark that 600,000 of them whipped almost 3,000,000 Northern soldiers or came so near doing it that for four years it was a question which would succeed and whether the Union would be preserved or not. All that may be well enough and proper enough for those who can find no other consolation.

But after all there are no facts behind such statements. I have taken the pains to go back to the census of 1860 to ascertain the facts about this matter so that they may go into the RECORD. Gentlemen may make the calculation for themselves. I have not gone to the muster rolls at all; but I have gone to the census in order to reach a comparison of these two peoples who met in that conflict. And I want to say here and now that no braver or more gallant people ever lived on the face of the earth than our brethren of the South. I will not undertake to depreciate their gallantry or their manhood, or, from their standpoint, their patriotic pluck as exhibited in that great controversy. And when I speak of the South I include those who really fought with the South—the thirteen States south of the Potomac, including Kentucky and Missouri.

The total population of the country at that time was 31,443,321. The population of the States who did the fighting for the Confederacy was 11,441,068, leaving the Northern population, as compared with the South, 20,000,000, and that largely tempered with the Northern copperhead element; so that there was good excuse for such men as my friend from Illinois, Mr. CANNON, whom I do not see present, staying at home: for such men had as patriotic business to do at home as many of us had to do at the front. Now, the negroes were at that time said to be about 3,500,000. I do not get the figures from the census.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Four and a half millions.

Mr. BLAIR. I think not at that time; but what I wish to say in regard to that is this, that they were the working population of the South. They were at home cultivating the plantations and furnishing provisions for the army, protecting the women and the children as they ought, without an outrage during the war, though you are lynching them right along for alleged outrages during these years of peace when you are all at home to take care of them yourselves.

Mr. KILGORE. You are lynching them up here at the same time.

Mr. BLAIR. We do if they do the things they are charged with, some of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask that the time of the gentleman be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for general debate is limited and several gentlemen have requested the Chair to recognize them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now I would just like to make a suggestion. Nothing depends upon it except historical accuracy, of course. But I wish to interject this inquiry as to whether the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] does not know that during the war the State of Missouri furnished a great many more men to the Union army than to the Confederate, and that the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, and Maryland each furnished almost as many soldiers to the Union army as to the Confederate?

Mr. BLAIR. I do not include Maryland, nor any contributions of the colored people to the army of the South. Maryland and Delaware are not included, and Kentucky furnished her quota to both armies, and Missouri undoubtedly furnished a great many on both sides.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. More for the Union Army than for the Confederate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In that arithmetical performance you ought to leave Missouri and Kentucky out, because they furnished more Federal soldiers than they furnished soldiers to the South.

Mr. BLAIR. To offset that I will submit whether Missouri and Kentucky did not give us Northern people as much fighting as any of the Southern States.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, man for man, they gave you more fighting than any other two States in the Union.

Mr. BLAIR. Then you impeach my statement by strengthening it. Excuse me now from any further interruption, if you will, because I have only five minutes. Assuming that the col-

ored population, which was the producing population, was of as much consequence as though it had been white, and it seems to me that you must admit that they were more so, because without them at home how would it have been possible to have carried on your farming or to have kept your army in the field for three months? Now, it is a very low estimate to say that there was one fighting man for five of the entire population. They give us a little more than one voter, you know, to every five of the population, and I assume thatas the basis of military strength on both sides.

It is just as fair for one side as for the other, and probably it is substantially correct, although you get good fighting men who are only 15, 16, and 17 years of age, as you know. Upon that basis the Northern military force would be 4,000,000 at the outbreak of the war, and the Southern white force 1,600,000; but with the negroes supporting the armies of the South, they should be included, and that would make the Southern fighting force 2,400,000 as against the fighting force of the North at 4,000,000. The young men who were 12, 13, 14, or 15 years of age at the outbreak of the war, coming in during the war, could not have been less than 100,000 yearly at the South, and I think you will admit that is within the limit.

That will give to the South, excluding the negroes, 2,000,000 fighting white men during the war who must have been in the service or who might have been in the service, and with the negroes at home to take care of the whole, making in all a really fighting population of 2,800,000 men. Now, the enlistments in the Northern army were 2,800,000. Of those not less than one-half a million were reenlisted, so that the Northern army in the field was not over 2,200,000 or 2,300,000 men. Against that the South had, including its negroes, a fighting force of 2,800,000, and yet you say to us that you fought us for four years, and that you with only 600,000 men, almost substantially for those four years defeated the whole 2,800,000 or really 2,300,000 of the Northern army.

If your statement of this matter is true, where were the 2,200,000 craven cowards at home? I heard Senator Brown say in the Senate once that you "robbed the cradle and the grave," and I do not doubt you did all you could, for I am defending your valor still. That you had nobody at home the last years of the war is a fact not only of the South, but was also very largely so at the North. You called upon everything that could shoulder a musket to take the field in defense of what you believed to be right, and to establish the independence of the Confederacy, and you had no 2,200,000, no 1,800,000, nor 1,000,000. You had not 250,000, and I do not believe you had 100,000 men to spare in the Confederacy on the day of Appomattox, did you? If you had, what becomes of the boasted gallantry and the devotion of Southerners to the "lost cause." [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

My time having expired without reaching the discussion of this point as I had intended, under the leave of the House I desire to present the following bills introduced by me last September, which embody my views of

THE PROPER LEGISLATION WHICH WOULD HELP

to remedy the evils of existing wrongs in the administration of our pension laws. A general service pension alone can now do justice to the soldiers of the Union Army, by whose valor our institutions were preserved and its chief value given to every dollar in this country, and can certainly now afford to go as far for them as we have already gone for soldiers of the Mexican war.

[Fifty-third Congress, first session.]

H. R. 1961.

September 9, 1893.—Referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLAIR introduced the following bill:

A bill granting pension to the surviving soldiers and sailors of the United States who served not less than sixty days prior to the 1st day of January, 1866; and to their widows so long as they survive unmarried.

Whereas the disabilities and necessities of the surviving soldiers and sailors of the United States whose services preserved the nation are rapidly increasing; and

Whereas by reason of the lapse of time confusion in the construction of existing laws and other causes great delays, difficulties, and expense attend the administration of those laws, so that many thousands of said soldiers and sailors have already died and many thousands more must hereafter die without receiving the relief which a grateful country designed for and promised to them unless immediate and further provision for their relief be made by law; and

Whereas the time has come when justice requires that the surviving soldiers and sailors of the war of the rebellion should be placed upon an equality of pension relief and honorable recognition with the survivors of the war with Mexico and of other wars of the Republic: Therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That any person who served in the Army or Navy of the United States for the period of sixty days prior to the 1st day of January, 1866, and was honorably discharged, and the widow, if any, surviving such person, so long as she shall remain unmarried, shall be entitled to receive a pension at the rate of \$12 a month: Provided, That such soldier, sailor, or widow shall certify under oath that the pension herein granted is necessary to their comfortable support: And provided further,

That if the applicant shall have attained the age of 62 years such certificate shall not be required.

SEC. 2. No person entitled to pension under any other act shall be deprived of his rights under the same by reason of receiving pension under the provisions of this act, but the amount received under this act shall be deducted from any pension otherwise paid to him.

[Fifty-third Congress, first session.]

H. R. 2342.

September 11, 1893.—Referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLAIR introduced the following bill:

A bill to regulate suspensions from the pension roll and the retrial of pension claims which have once been allowed.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever it shall be made to appear to the Commissioner of Pensions that the grounds upon which a pension shall have been adjudged to be due to any person should be reexamined for cause effecting the merits thereof, he shall notify the pensioner in writing of the charges against his claim, and therein shall set forth the names and residences of the witnesses and the substance of their statements and of all other proof in possession of the Commissioner in support of such charges, and a reasonable time, not less than ninety days after the receipt of such notice, shall be allowed him in which to make reply, filing therewith any evidence he may see fit. If such reply shall be deemed satisfactory by the Commissioner, no further proceedings shall be had except that reasonable costs shall be paid to the pensioner, if any shall have been incurred by him in making his defense, which may include a counsel fee of not exceeding \$25.

SEC. 2. That if such reply shall not be deemed satisfactory by the Commissioner he shall notify the pensioner, and thereupon the Commissioner may order a hearing before some competent, disinterested, and impartial agent of the Department, to be had at or near the home of the pensioner or other place convenient to him. At the hearing full opportunity shall be given him to present evidence and witnesses and be heard by himself and counsel, with right of appeal to the Secretary as in other cases. Should the claim of such pensioner be finally disallowed, his pension shall cease from the date of such disallowance, and he or any other witness may be prosecuted for any fraud or perjury for which he may appear to be guilty in the proper courts of the United States, and he shall be held liable for any pension money fraudulently obtained by him at any time. But if the final adjudication shall be in his favor, he shall be paid his reasonable costs and charges, including counsel fees, and in no case shall the regular payment of his pension be withheld or suspended until his claim shall be finally disallowed.

SEC. 3. That this act shall take effect on its passage, and any pensioner whose name has been dropped from the rolls within five years last prior to the passage of this act, upon petition to the Commissioner, and it appearing that injustice may have been done to him, shall be entitled to its benefits.

If a service pension can not be enacted the act of June 27, 1890, should be construed substantially as provided in the following or this bill should become a law.

[Fifty-third Congress, first session.]

H. R. 1962.

September 9, 1893.—Referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLAIR introduced the following bill:

A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," and to fix the lowest rating of pension under any law.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of an act dated June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," be, and hereby is, so amended as to provide 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, who are disabled by any mental or physical cause or causes, not the result of their own vicious habits, which in any degree incapacitated them for the performance of manual labor, shall be entitled to receive during the continuance of such disability, a pension of \$6 a month and for any increase of such disability beyond that for which the rating by the Pension Office would ordinarily be \$6, an increase of pension in proportion to such increased disability to the amount of \$12 a month, according to the ratings in medical examinations under other acts.

SEC. 2. That under any act the lowest rating for pensionable disability shall be \$6.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, to ascertain the status of the two parties in regard to the pension business mere assertions will not determine the question. The records of Congress since 1865 furnish ample proof of how the two great political parties have stood towards the soldiers of the Union. Now, in what I am saying I do not propose to charge the members of the Democratic party as individual members, at least not all of them, as being opposed to soldiers receiving proper pensions, because to make an assertion of that kind would be untrue. I know of my own knowledge, in my country, in the State in which I live, of many members of the party opposing bitterly the policy of the Administration to-day. I mean men in your own party; and to show you that what I state is true, in the last election in Pennsylvania in which Mr. GROW was elected Congressman at large, by that enormous majority of 188,000, you can not attribute the increased Republican vote to the tariff question alone.

I make the assertion here without fear of successful contradiction, believing that I know the soldier vote of my own State, that over 25,000 Democratic soldiers in my State and their friends voted in the past two elections the Republican ticket,

simply to demonstrate to this Congress that, as Democrats, they are opposed to the policy which the Pension Office is pursuing towards these men.

Mr. BOATNER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MAHON. Certainly.

Mr. BOATNER. Do you hold this House responsible for the Administration?

Mr. MAHON. They hold the Democratic party responsible for the Administration. They hold you responsible for everything done by this Democratic Administration against their pensions. You are in power in this House and in the Senate, and you have every branch of the Government; and, as we were told by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] that the Commissioner of Pensions is a sort of sub-Cabinet officer, it is fair to assume that he has private conversations with the President before he acts. I am satisfied that Mr. Lochren, who was a brave soldier, would not pursue the policy he is to-day if he was not pursuing it at the instance of the gentleman who lives in the White House.

Now, you can pursue this policy, and if I desire to obtain political advantage in this matter I would say I want you to pursue it. I tell you to keep track of the soldier vote, and do not be surprised if in the next Congressional election Pennsylvania sends a solid Republican delegation into this House. [Applause on the Republican side.] Do you suppose that any of these men who went into the service of their country will forget what is being done against their interests? Although the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] stated that the only service they rendered was "drawing their breath and rations," I say that these men, when the country called for men, stepped forward like men, putting on the blue uniform, and swore to protect the flag of the Government. I do not care whether they were in the service thirty days or one hundred days or four years; they showed one thing—that they were willing to lay down their lives if necessary to protect their Government. Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the record of the Democratic party in Congress since the war? (I will not make any reference back of 1865, because the Northern people know full well how the Northern Democrats conducted themselves upon the floor of Congress while you Southern men were fighting for what you believed to be right.)

You were a brave and gallant people, generous and hospitable, believing in your cause, and like brave men you stood by your flag and stood by what you believed to be right; but I refer to the men who in the North had stood as it were between the two lines and caused the continuance of our bloody warfare for at least two years longer than it would have been. The record of Congress shows that on every measure offered in this House to give the soldiers more pay, to give them their bounty, and to provide them with supplies and with tents, and with all comforts necessary to make a soldier's life tolerable, that almost the solid vote of the Democratic party from the North was cast against them. But I will now give the record of the Democratic party on pension legislation since the war, and I will not go back of 1878. In 1878 a bill was passed by the lower House of Congress repealing all limitations of time in which applications for arrears of pensions should be made. Upon this the vote stood: Democrats for the bill, 48; Democrats against the bill 61; Republicans for the bill, 116; Republicans against the bill, none.

Subsequently a bill increasing the pensions of widows from \$8 to \$12 was voted on, with the following result: Democrats for the bill, 80; Democrats against the bill, 66. Republicans for the bill, 118; Republicans against the bill, none.

The amputation bill, passed August 4, 1886: Democrats for the bill, 75; Democrats against the bill, 51. Republicans for the bill, 91; Republicans against the bill, none.

The widows' arrears bill, giving arrears of pensions, from the death of their husbands, to widows entitled to pensions, passed the Senate by the following vote: Democrats for the bill, 1; Democrats against the bill, 20. Republicans for the bill, 22; Republicans against the bill, none.

The disability pension bill (gives pension to all disabled soldiers and to dependent parents and children), passed June, 1890: Democrats for the bill, 28; Democrats against the bill, 56. Republicans for the bill, 117; Republicans against the bill, none.

Same bill in the Senate: Democrats for the bill, 3; Democrats against the bill, 18. Republicans for the bill, 31; Republicans against the bill, none.

In the Forty-ninth Congress a dependent pension bill was voted on in the Senate, with the following result: Democrats for the bill, 7; Democrats against the bill, 14. Republicans for the bill, 27; Republicans against the bill, none.

In the same Congress a similar bill was voted upon in the House of Representatives, with the following result: Democrats for the bill, 66; Democrats against the bill, 76. Republicans for the bill, 114; Republicans against the bill, none.

This bill was vetoed by President Cleveland. An effort was made in the lower House to pass the bill over the veto, with the following result: Democrats for the bill, 37; Democrats against the bill, 125. Republicans for the bill, 138; Republicans against the bill, none.

Showing that 29 Democrats who had originally voted for the bill hastened to avail themselves of the opportunity afforded by the President's veto to vote against it, thus testifying their real sentiments, while 20 others who had dodged the first vote came up promptly to the support of the veto.

The vote upon which the dependent pension bill was finally passed by the Republican Congress, of which TOM REED was Speaker, stood as follows in the Senate: Democrats for the bill, 10; Democrats against the bill, 12. Republicans for the bill, 32; Republicans against the bill, none.

In the lower House it was sought to take up and pass the bill promptly, but the Democrats solidly opposed a motion to suspend the rules for that purpose, and the effort failed. Shortly after this, however, a second effort met with success, the vote standing: Democrats for the bill, 38; Democrats against the bill, 71; Republicans for the bill, 141; Republicans against the bill, none.

This bill was, as the old soldiers well know, promptly approved by President Harrison.

The next pension legislation of importance was the bill to pension prisoners of war, and giving them each \$2 for every day they were held by the Confederates. When it came up in the lower House the following vote was had: Democrats for the bill, 24; Democrats against the bill, 78; Republicans for the bill, 119; Republicans against the bill, none.

To sum up, the following gives the totals of 14 votes in Congress upon the most important of the various pension measures presented since the war, viz: Democrats for the bills, 417; Democrats against the bills, 648; Republicans for the bills, 1,066; Republicans against the bills, none.

Gentlemen, that is the record of the Democratic party in Congress since 1878. Let me come now to the gentleman who is dominating the Pension Office and the Democratic party to-day and see where he stands—and he is no greater, nor wiser, nor more patriotic than the men who have preceded him in the Presidential chair.

The following statement, prepared from official records, shows the number of pension bills to which each President since the war has refused his signature:

Lincoln	None	Garfield	None
Johnson	None	Arthur	None
Grant	5	Cleveland	524
Hayes	None	Harrison	None

That is the record made by the Democratic party in Congress since 1878, and that is the record of the man at the White House. After these bills had been examined and reported favorably by the Committee on Pensions of the House of Representatives, where the Democratic party was in control; after they had been examined and reported favorably to this House and the House had passed them, they were sent over to the Senate and referred to the Committee on Pensions of that body, controlled by Republicans, examined there, reported back to the Senate favorably, and passed by the Senate. After all that scrutiny those five hundred and twenty-four bills, passed by both Houses of Congress, and after the persons named in them had thus been declared to be deserving of pensions both by the Democrats controlling the House and by the Republicans controlling the Senate, President Cleveland vetoed those five hundred and twenty-four bills; making such a record that no man, unless he chooses to close his eyes to facts, can doubt that he has always been, is to-day, and always will be, hostile to pensioning the men who served this Government in the war for the Union.

If these facts which I have stated are not correct, the record will show me to be mistaken.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are three classes of cases. I do not propose to indulge in any epithets. I simply want to deal with facts, and I know what I am talking about. I have heard it charged on the floor of this House, and I have read it in the newspapers, that there are men upon the pension rolls who were deserters, who deserted the flag they had sworn to defend. I do not believe it. Yet possibly a few may have got upon the rolls, but very few. The first thing a soldier does when he goes to get a pension is to file his application, and in that he states his disabilities, gives his war record, his company, his regiment, and his State.

The first thing they do in the Pension Office is to send to the War Department, where every soldier who wore the blue has a record, to ascertain whether his statements are true. If the man has been a deserter he is so marked upon the records of the War Office, and if the Pension Office is conducted with proper care, it is impossible for any man who has been a deserter to get

further than the filing of his application. All the cases that have been filed and allowed, against which fraud is not charged and where it is not alleged that they have been allowed by accident or mistake, the first thing done is to require the applicant to furnish the legal proof and put it on file. He must state where his injuries were received, what was his condition when he went into the army, and what was his condition when he came out of the army, if he is claiming for a disease contracted in the service. He must show when and where he was wounded. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] charged here yesterday that the pensions of 50 men were suspended because a sergeant or lieutenant had prepared the pension papers of 20 or 22 men in one company, and the gentleman claimed that upon that showing the Commissioner of Pensions had a right to suspend those men on the ground that this one man would not be likely to know of the physical condition of so many of his comrades.

Mr. ENLOE. What is the gentleman's statement?

Mr. MAHON. I understood the gentleman from Tennessee, when he was speaking of this regiment in Sandusky, to say that an examination showed that a large number of their pension papers were in the handwriting of one man, a member of the organization.

Mr. ENLOE. What do you say I said the Commissioner had a right to do about it?

Mr. MAHON. I understood you to say that he had a right to suspend the pensions of those men, because it looked as if there was something wrong about it, as this one man would not be likely to know about the physical condition of so many men.

Mr. ENLOE. I said the Commissioner had a right to investigate those cases.

Mr. MAHON. Yes; that he had a right to suspend them pending investigation. Now, sir, I remember well, in the early days of the war, when 100 young men, whose ages ranged from 19 to 22, entered the service of their country. I knew every one of them personally. I knew what their physical condition was. I stood in line with them, and we were undressed and carefully examined. Every man down to the last was examined by a board of physicians to see whether he had ever had a broken limb, or whether he was subject to any chronic disease, and after a careful examination those young men were passed. Thirty-two of them are alive to-day. I want to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that, while I am an attorney by profession, I never have charged a soldier for any paper that I have prepared for a soldier, and I never intend to charge for such service. I have prepared affidavits of these old soldiers and their comrades who have come into my office; and if you go into the Pension Department you will find that much of the testimony in cases of soldiers of Company E and other companies of the Twenty-first Pennsylvania Cavalry are in my handwriting. I knew the physical condition of the most of those men when the war closed; I have known the men ever since. Why might you not just as well suspend the pensions of those men because the affidavits were prepared by me, a member of said company and regiment?

You may talk about frauds in pensions; but I want to say, to the credit of the men who have filled the office of Commissioner of Pensions (and I include the gallant BLACK from Illinois), that if you undertake to get a pension through the Pension Department, undergoing the careful scrutiny that is exercised there, you will find it is not an easy matter. What is required of an applicant? The Government appoints a medical board. The members of that board are selected on account of their high professional standing as physicians and as citizens of probity and honor. The applicant must present himself before the board, and, whether he has been in the service one hundred days or four years, he is carefully examined by those Government officers, in whose selection he has no choice or part. These gentlemen take the application or certificate sent to them from the Pension Office; and if heart disease is alleged, the man is examined for that disability alone. If this board of physicians, after careful examination, find that the man has chronic heart trouble, or that he has rheumatism, or any other disease, or has been badly wounded, it is upon the examination of these sworn officers of the Government that the Commissioner of Pensions acts in granting or withholding a pension. All the applications and all the affidavits filed in the office count for nothing if these medical officers of the Government fail to find that the man is disabled to a pensionable degree. If their report is unfavorable his case is turned down, and that is the end of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, shortly after the 4th of March a new board was organized in the Pension Office, not to examine claims on file which had not been passed upon, not to examine into cases where pensions were alleged to have been obtained through mistake or accident; but the Commissioner of Pensions at the instance of some person organized a board—for what purpose?

Mr. GROUT. It was organized under a special order of Secretary Smith.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, sir; and I do not propose to abuse Secretary Smith, because he is not responsible for this. I hold the man at the head of the Democratic party responsible for the hostility against the old soldiers of the country. I know the man who was put in charge of that board. The board was selected to go back and re-examine all the cases that had been passed upon by the Pension Bureau and the pension board since 1865. That office had been administered just as carefully in the past as it is at present.

These cases had all been passed upon; the rate of pension had been allowed, and the pensioners had been placed on the rolls and had been drawing their pensions, many of them for years. Now, I believe that after a pension has been fairly granted—after the soldier has filed his application, produced his evidence, and gone before the medical board—after his legal evidence has been examined by the legal board in the Department and a medical examination has been made by the medical board, and after the case has been referred to the medical referee—if, after this full, fair, and careful examination an applicant is placed on the pension rolls at a certain rate, it is an outrage to permit or allow a succeeding Commissioner of Pensions or Secretary of the Interior to come in and undo all this work.

Mr. Chairman, there is another class of cases, but they are very few. Occasionally a pension is granted by mistake. John Smith, for instance, files his application and another John Smith does the same. The pension is granted in the one case, and the certificate is sent to the other applicant bearing a similar name. After a while it is discovered that the man holding the pension certificate has been placed on the pension roll through accident or mistake. In such cases the Pension Office always has had and have now the right to correct a mistake of that kind.

Mr. Chairman, the part of the State of Pennsylvania I represent had a great many men in the service. I know many of them. Some weeks ago when I went home a man came into my office who had belonged to an independent battery. His name was John Hearn. He was with that battery two years and nine months, participating in numerous bloody engagements in Tennessee and the Southwest. That battery came home with two guns and about fifty men. This unfortunate man went down over a bridge forty feet and the wheels of a cannon fell upon him. He has ever since been a walking living wreck.

He was put upon the pension rolls at \$12 a month, and about six months ago he received notice from the Pension Office that his pension had been reduced to \$4 without any explanation or reason, without any opportunity being given him to have a hearing. I have since learned that his pension has been restored to \$12.

I have another case in mind of a man by the name of Jacob Buck, a member of Lincoln Cavalry of the State of New York, who lived in my town, an old soldier, a German, who, when he lived in the Fatherland, served his country, a man who was as good a soldier as ever put on a uniform, who went through the war from the beginning to the end, and after this Government had passed the act of 1860 he took advantage of it. He was a man without any property in the world. He was in his sixty-second year. He was 59 when he was put upon the roll. He had an old wife. His children had grown up or died. In our community he stood well. On that little pension of \$12 a month he paid \$6 for rent, and the other \$6 he used for the support of himself and his wife. Notwithstanding this man had not a dollar in the world, notwithstanding he had reached the age 62, the power that has been making all this sorrow and distress among these men reached out and laid its hand upon that man's pension, and deprived him of it. He fretted over this for a day or two.

I believe if he had been alone he would have gone to the almshouse and submitted to the outrage; but on the third day after he received notice that the pension was taken away, he went into an upper chamber in his little home, and there with a pistol took his life. If you gentlemen want it, I can state to you one hundred cases of as brave soldiers as ever defended the flag whose little pittance given them by pension laws have been suspended. Simply because these unfortunate men could not live on \$8 a month, and some of them on \$6, using every penny of it to pay for the rental of their houses, compelled, though physically unable, to go out and attempt to work and earn a little in our mills and fields to support their families, as soon as they did do a little work somebody reported that these men were out in the fields laboring, or that they were working in the mills on half time, their pensions were suspended.

The bravery of these men, I say, was equal to that of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BLACK] who defends the Pension Department; and when I say they were as brave men as he, I am putting a high standard upon their bravery. There is no man in this country who has greater appreciation than I have for the gallant Gen. BLACK, of Illinois. He went into the service a young man. He stood in the front of the

battle. He defended the flag of his country. When the war ended he was almost shot to pieces; but I say that there are thousands upon thousands of men who have been deprived of their pensions since the 4th of March, 1894, who were just as brave, just as loyal, and just as true to this Government as either Gen. BLACK or Commissioner Lochren. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I say that I am surprised that my distinguished friend defends this business. I know that he has been sent to this Congress to represent an intelligent constituency. I know that he represents them well and eloquently. I know that he draws his salary of \$5,000 a year like the rest of us. He is entitled to it. If you would double that amount and make it ten thousand it would not be too much pay for a man of his ability. I know that this Government gives him a pension of \$100 a month. If I had my way I would not begrudge him five hundred, because I am one of those who believe that a man who has exposed his body to shot and shell, who has gone down into the hell of battle and come out a physical wreck is entitled to the care of this Government, and that care should not be given to him as a bounty, as the Commissioner of Pensions has said in his late letter in answer to a resolution offered here by the gentleman from Minnesota, but it should be given to him as a right, as a vested right, never to be disturbed as long as he lives.

I know another gallant soldier of this country, who enlisted in Company A, of the Eighth Michigan. He was a young man, in his twentieth year. He went into the service of his country, and at Wilmington Island, Mississippi, on the 16th of April, 1862, he was shot in the left arm. Amputation followed above the elbow. To-day his arm is gone and his sleeve is empty. Scarcely had he received that wound when another minie ball pierced him in the left hip, passed through his body, and lodged in the right one, making him a physical wreck from these wounds. So badly is he wounded he needs the constant attendance and care of a servant. On that day when he stood upon Wilmington Island defending the old flag, neither Gen. BLACK nor Mr. Lochren at Gettysburg displayed more bravery. This Government, under the rulings of the Pension Office prior to Mr. Lochren's coming into the office, gave him a pension and rated him at \$72 a month as a total physical wreck. The present Commissioner has been beating him from pillar to post, from court to court, hounding him day and night, to reduce his pension from \$72 to \$50, simply because he draws a salary from the State of Michigan as a judge of a State court. He does not draw it as a judge of a United States court.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE. I ask that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

Mr. MAHON. I refer to Judge Long, of Michigan, and I am surprised that Gen. BLACK will stand up here and defend Mr. Lochren in making this assault upon this gallant soldier, and other soldiers equally as brave and deserving.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to be brief, this Congress in last December passed an act in which they declared that a pension once granted, where it was not allowed by fraud, accident, or mistake, should be a vested right. But the Commissioner of Pensions has got to quibbling with these words, and says that if it is a vested right that Congress can not give or take away a vested right. A vested right is held by and protected by authority of law or by a custom that has become law from usage. This Congress declared in the bill referred to that a pension heretofore granted to a soldier should be treated as a vested right. The bill passed the Senate and was approved by the President. I would like to know why that law should be defied by the Secretary of the Interior or by the Commissioner of Pensions. It is for this body and for the Senate to say and for the President of the United States to say whether a pension is a vested right or a bounty, and not for the Commissioner of Pensions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have prepared an amendment which I propose to offer to this bill when the time comes. I want to read it now, for the information of the House, so that it may go into the RECORD. This amendment I have drawn is not only to protect the soldiers of the Union, but the Government as well—

Mr. BLAIR. The gentleman says, as I understand him, that the act makes the pension a vested right.

Mr. MAHON. Yes, sir; I say that it is now a vested right until Congress says it shall not be. Now, I will offer this as section 2 at end of bill, which reads as follows:

SEC. 2. That any pension heretofore or that may hereafter be granted or allowed under any law of the United States authorizing the granting and payment of pensions shall be considered a vested right, and shall be so treated by all the courts and officers of the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is right. There is no question about it. There is no doubt about it. We desire that what Mr. Lochren does shall not be disturbed by the man who succeeds him.

We do not want the old soldiers to be knocked about from pillar to post, or be made subject to the whims and fancies of every man who comes in. I now read the remainder of my amendment:

No pension once allowed or granted shall be withheld, suspended, diminished, or annulled, unless the same was obtained by fraud, accident, or mistake. Where a pension has been allowed by accident or mistake the same may be suspended until the case is investigated and a decision thereon had. In every case where fraud is alleged, the person or officer of the United States making the charge of fraud shall file his or her statement, setting forth fully all the facts in the case, said statement or charge to be sworn to by the person or officer making the same. When said statement is filed in the Pension Department the Commissioner may then suspend, and not before, the payment of the pension until said charge is proven or dismissed. Within thirty days from the time of filing said notice with the Commissioner of Pensions, notice of not less than thirty days shall be given to the pensioner, together with a full and complete statement of all allegations of fraud against his or her pension, and of the time and place a hearing will be had in the case. The pensioner or his duly authorized attorney, or both, shall have the right to be present at said hearing and to cross-examine all witnesses produced by the Government. The pensioner or his attorney shall have the right to produce witnesses in denial of the charge. If the charge of fraud is sustained, then said pension shall be annulled and vacated. If the charge is dismissed, the suspension shall be removed and payment of pension made from date of last payment. The right of appeal to remain as now allowed by the Pension and Interior Departments. That any pension heretofore suspended, withheld, diminished, or annulled, where the same was not obtained by fraud, accident, or mistake, shall be restored, and payment made to pensioner for the full amount allowed him or her.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just one word. There is no court in this land, there is no court in Christendom that would not indorse a proceeding of that kind. It is fair to the Government; it is fair to the pensioner. It is simply a provision for a fair hearing where fraud is alleged, and certainly no man should be deprived of a hearing in this country, whether he be a citizen or a soldier under the pension laws. Upon this amendment we can all stand irrespective of party, and I believe its adoption will put an end to the bitterness now existing between the pensioners and the Pension Department, because under its provisions all will be, all must be, treated with candor and honesty. The rights of the Government as well as the rights of the pensioner will be fully protected. What more could either party ask for?

Mr. O'NEIL. 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. OUTHWAITE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5482) making appropriation for the payment of invalid and other pensions, had come to no resolution thereon.

IMPROVING THE METHODS OF ACCOUNTING IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], who at this moment is temporarily absent from the Hall, I present a privileged report from the Joint Commission to Investigate the Executive Departments. I ask that the bill and report be printed, and I also ask that the bill retain its privileged character.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5750) to improve the methods of accounting in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. This bill and report will be printed, and it will retain any privilege it may now have.

INVESTIGATION OF JUDGE JENKINS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to call the attention of the House to the fact that the resolution agreed to this morning, directing the Judiciary Committee, or a subcommittee of that committee, to investigate the charge against Judge Jenkins contained a provision for the appropriation of \$500, or so much thereof as may be necessary to cover the purpose. In the resolution it was provided that the money be appropriated out of the Treasury. It should have been from the contingent fund of the House. Without objection, that alteration will be made in the resolution, so that it will provide that the money shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House rather than from the Treasury.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. PEARSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 4770) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Arkansas River at or near Van Buren, Ark.; when the Speaker signed the same.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DRAPER, for two weeks, on account of important business.

And then (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.), on motion of Mr. SAYERS, the House adjourned.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS.

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:

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims:

A bill (H. R. 6120) for the relief of Mrs. Agatha Lutz, widow and executrix of Andrew Lutz, deceased, in lieu of H. R. 2083, which was ordered to lie on the table. (Report No. 538.)

Also, from the same committee, the bill (H. R. 4801) for the relief of Dr. John R. Hall, with amendments. (Report No. 539.)

By Mr. COOPER of Texas, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 3855) for the relief of James Sims, of Marshall County, Miss., with amendments. (Report No. 540.)

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims: The bill (H. R. 5741) directing the payment of certain awards in favor of parties therein named, with amendments. (Report No. 541.)

By Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs: The bill (H. R. 2640) for the relief of Brig. Gen. John R. Brooke, U. S. Army, with an amendment. (Report No. 544.)

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced, and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COCKRELL: A bill (H. R. 6122) authorizing the Kansas City, Oklahoma and Pacific Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 6123) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Monongahela River at the foot of Dickson street, in the borough of Homestead, in the State of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WISE: A bill (H. R. 6124) to promote the efficiency of the Revenue Cutter Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 6125) to provide an American register for the steam sloop Willie, owned by the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GEAR: A bill (H. R. 6126) to amend an act to authorize construction of a bridge at Burlington, Iowa, approved August 6, 1888, and amended by act approved February 21, 1890—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPRINGER: A bill (H. R. 6127) authorizing the construction of a road from the national cemetery at Camp Butler, Ill., to the city of Springfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMAN: A joint resolution (H. Res. 134) authorizing the Court of Claims to determine the rights of Edwin D. Chadick and R. T. Wilson & Co. in the loan of \$6,640,000 loaned by the Cherokee Nation to the United States under the provision of the act of March 3, 1893, in relation to the Cherokee Outlet—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL: A joint resolution (H. Res. 135) authorizing Capt. Thomas O. Selfridge, United States Navy, to accept the cross of an officer of the Legion of Honor conferred upon him by the President of the Republic of France—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BRYAN: Resolution to pay Louis G. Olt for services as clerk to the late Hon. George W. Houk from February 1 to February 9, inclusive—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RUSK: Resolution authorizing the Doorkeeper to expend \$1,000 for folding speeches—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARUTH: A bill (H. R. 6128) granting a pension to George Sutton, of Louisville, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 6129) for the relief of William D. McLean, alias Donald McLean—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWFORD: A bill (H. R. 6130) for the relief of Michael Kries—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 6131) to grant a pension to Sarah E. Roebuck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAGE: A bill (H. R. 6132) to make Westerly, in the State of Rhode Island, a port of delivery—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUSK: A bill (H. R. 6133) removing the charge of de-

sertion against Philip Bradley, late of Company F, Seventy-second New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6134) for the relief of Mrs. Margaret E. Brooks, deceased—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TRACEY: A bill (H. R. 6135) for the relief of Lawrence Collins and Edward J. Flanigan—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. BRODERICK: Petition of J. P. Moore and others, of Holton, Kans., in favor of the Christian amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARUTH: Petition of George Sutton and 64 others, that said Sutton be placed on the invalid pension rolls of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Kentucky Conclave, No. 110, Independent Order of Heptasophs, in favor of the reduction of postage on fraternal society and college journals—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CHICKERING: Petition of W. G. Northam and 75 other citizens of Watertown, and resolutions of Lodge No. 809, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, of Watertown, N. Y., asking for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: Petition of many citizens of Missouri, touching improvement of the Missouri River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. COBB of Missouri: Petition of Rev. T. A. Rusk, J. P. Montgomery, and others, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of 300 firms and business men of St. Louis, Mo., recommending the reduction of letter postage to 1 cent—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COCKRELL (by request): Resolution by the Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce, favoring the presentation of Government land adjoining Oklahoma City to the city for school purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. COGSWELL: Petition of Edward M. Cooke and others, of Salem, Mass., in favor of legislation for the fraternal and benevolent press—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Edwin H. George and others, of Groveland, Mass., for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COOMBS: Petition of Lodge No. 29, Boiler Makers and Iron Shipbuilders' Union, against the Fithian free ship bill—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. COUSINS: Petition of members of the White Fawn Lodge, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Anamosa, Iowa, favoring the Manderson-Hainer bill H. R. 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CRAIN: Four petitions of residents of Laredo, Tex., for the passage of the House bill for the exchange of site of Fort McIntosh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP (by request): Memorial to the Congress of the United States from the governor and Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Utah, for the allotment of Indian lands in severality—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by request), petition from the governor and Legislative Assembly of Utah, protesting against the removal of the Southern Ute Indians from Colorado and Utah—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Allegheny, Pa., for passage of joint resolution recommending an amendment to the Constitution in acknowledgment of God—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVEY: Petition of Mrs. Luella A. Oteri, of New Orleans, La., owning the steamship Joseph Oteri, jr., praying for remission of fine imposed for a technical, innocent violation of United States customs law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of the faculty of St. John's School, Salina, and 20 more citizens of Clay County, Kans., in favor of Government telegraph and telephone service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DINSMORE: Memorial for the relief of William T. Baker and others, survivors of the Mountain Meadow massacre—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIS of Oregon: Resolutions and remonstrance from Thomas R. Kemp and H. E. Girard, in behalf of the First Secular Church, of Portland, Oregon, protesting against the Frye-

Morse proposed amendment to the preamble of the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of C. B. Durbin and 46 others, of Antelope Lodge, No. 44, Antelope, Oregon, favoring the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Conrad B. Bennett and 14 others, asking for favorable consideration of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of citizens of Orleans, Vt., to Congress for a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the Ancient Order of United Workmen of Massachusetts, in favor of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HEINER of Pennsylvania: Petition of 117 citizens of Brush Valley, Indiana County, Pa., for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution recognizing Deity—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa: Petition of H. Graening and 54 others, of Bremer County, Iowa, together with two petitions from H. G. Koob, H. P. Jackson, and 70 others, of Black Hawk County, Iowa, favoring legislation to protect the dairy products of the United States—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, joint resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa, requesting the Senators and Representatives of that State to use all possible and reasonable means within their power to prevent the passage of the Wilson tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial and joint resolution of the Twenty-fifth General Assembly of Iowa, favoring the improvement of the Missouri River near Council Bluffs, Iowa—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of J. G. St. John and 118 others, of Waverly, Iowa, together with resolution of Cedar Lodge, No. 301, Ancient Order of United Workmen, of Waverly, favoring the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of 48 citizens of Silver Creek, N. Y., in support of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of 96 residents of Sinclairville, N. Y., in favor of the Hill bill, to restrict sale of butterine, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HULL: Memorial and joint resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa, favoring an appropriation for the improvement of the Missouri River at Council Bluffs—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of N. W. Gales and 26 other citizens of Colo. Story County, Iowa, asking that imitation dairy products be made subject to State law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of C. Q. Thorpe and 7 others, citizens of the Seventh Congressional district of Iowa, asking the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LACEY: Petition of I. M. Atwater and 40 others, favoring the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LOUD: Memorial of Bernal Lodge, No. 19, Ancient Order of United Workmen, favoring the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and the Post-Roads.

By Mr. SWEET: Petition of certain citizens of Idaho Falls, Idaho, in favor of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LUCAS: Petition of H. Riedemann and 66 other citizens of Scotland, S. Dak., asking for lower postage on fraternal society and college publications—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Michael Cannon and 33 others, citizens of Ashland, Wis., asking for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McALEER: Memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States with reference to the improvement of the Delaware Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota: Petition of H. Mogensen and other citizens of Sleepy Eye, Minn., favoring the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Mankato Board of Trade, Charles A. Chapman, secretary, favoring a tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Grand Council of Pennsylvania, American Legion of Honor, advocating the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MARVIN of New York: Petition of A. Gordon and other citizens of Middletown, N. Y., for the better protection of American labor—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of William F. Sherwood and 41 other citizens of Liberty, N. Y., for the passage of House bill 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MEIKLEJOHN: Petition from Emerson and Cedar Rapids, Nebr.; also, of G. A. Gregory and others, for admission to the mails as second-class matter publications of fraternal and benevolent societies—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MORSE: Petition of Albert T. Morse, esq., and 40 other citizens of Canton, Mass., together with 104 citizens of Somerville and 30 of Boston and vicinity, praying for a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Brockton Central Labor Union, against the further issuing of bonds by the United States Treasury—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Boston, Mass., in favor of the pending constitutional amendment acknowledging Almighty God in the preamble to the same—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of F. H. Kasson and 5 others, citizens of Massachusetts, praying that Congress pass a law to give efficiency to the moral legislations of the States against lottery enterprises—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. OATES: Petition of 120 citizens of Lodi, Wis., for the passage of the joint resolution amending the Constitution so as to recognize the Deity in the preamble—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAGE: Petition of Samuel Fessenden and 79 other citizens of Saylesville, R. I., for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHAW: Petition of E. P. Hassinger and other citizens of Brodhead Wis., and D. Huntley, C. E. Bushnell, and 89 others, citizens of Grand Chute and Appleton, Wis., praying for establishment of a Government telegraph and telephone service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of Myron W. Hunt and 25 other citizens of Stittville, N. Y., asking for the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAM A. STONE: Numerous petitions of citizens of Allegheny, Pittsburg, Sheridanville, Buena Vista, Wilkinsburg, Harrisville, and Uniontown, Pa., together with several petitions of citizens from the State at large, for an amendment to the Constitution recognizing Deity—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Indiana: Petition to Congress favoring the passage of the Manderson-Hainer bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of many citizens of Illinois favoring House bill 4897—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, March 7, 1894.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate for the printing of 6,000 copies of all papers and messages sent to Congress by the President since January 1, 1893, relating to the Hawaiian Islands, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed enrolled bill (H. R. 4770) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Arkansas River at or near Van Buren, Ark., and it was thereupon signed by the Vice-President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. HIGGINS presented the petition of George H. Hall and 83 other citizens of Milford, Del., praying that fraternal college